

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WOULD COLUMBUS BE PROUD?

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues thoughts of a 10-year-old boy in my district on the subject: "What Does Columbus Day Mean?" With this essay, he won a contest sponsored by the St. Columille Council 5317, Knights of Columbus, Oxon Hill, Md.

Stephen Hayes is in the fifth grade at St. Columba School in Oxon Hill, Md., yet his thoughts in the essay far exceed his years and show a mature wisdom which can give us hope for his future and for ours.

What is unique about the essay is the incisive thinking to the very essence of the subject and its application to the world of today. As has been said in the Psalms:

Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings has thou ordained strength . . .

I recommend that my colleagues read it carefully.

Stephen Hayes is a very outstanding young man with whom I am personally acquainted and of whom I am very fond. I congratulate him for winning the contest, but above all, for having given us these words to ponder in this moment of America's turmoil. We can be reassured that the future of our country in the years ahead will lie in good hands when we read such thoughts from a 10-year-old today. Here is the essay as written:

WOULD COLUMBUS BE PROUD?

(By Stephen Hayes, St. Columba School)

If someone were to ask you who Christopher Columbus was, you would undoubtedly answer "He discovered America." And, if someone were to ask you why we have Columbus Day, you would probably say "To honor the man who discovered America."

But Columbus Day should honor him for more than his discovery—it should honor him for being a truly great man. Christopher Columbus was many things. He was brave enough to go where no one had gone before, smart enough to believe the world was round, and had enough spirit to speak out when he knew he was right, even though many laughed at him.

If Columbus were here in America today, what would he think? He might get angry at his friend Amerigo Vespucci for "double-crossing" him and having the place named America. But he would also be proud of having discovered one of the greatest countries on earth. Or would he? would he be proud of the slums, the poverty, the killings and riots? Columbus *isn't* here today, and even if he was, he wouldn't be able to change these things much. Only we can do that—the citizens of this great country. And, we certainly should be able to. After all, aren't we the ones who sent three men millions of miles into space to land on the moon? Didn't we place a plaque there announcing that we "came in peace for all mankind?" Yes, we were the people that sent three modern day Columbuses to "discover" a "new world," not in galleons this time, but in a rocket ship. If we were clever enough to do that,

we certainly should be clever enough to make peace among ourselves.

The president can't order everyone to stop killing, or clean up the slums. But each of us can help. If every American did his duty, this would be a country Columbus would truly be proud of. And if he were here today, I'm sure he would agree with me.

Happy Columbus Day.

JOBS FOR HANDICAPPED VETERANS AND CIVILIANS

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in the last month I have visited more than 100 disabled Vietnam war veterans in Walter Reed hospital here and in Fitzsimons Hospital, in Denver. Anyone who visits at length with any of these boys becomes acutely aware that for these returned servicemen, the war is far from over.

The battle they wage now is very personal and, in some cases, for life itself. In other cases, the battle is to regain sufficient physical health to return to their families, communities, and jobs. Their needs transcend health care to include rehabilitation, education and job counseling, training, and placement.

It is a monumental task to which all of us—in the Federal, State, and local governments, as well as in the private sector—must be committed.

In this regard, I recall a speech in New York City on September 30, at the annual meeting of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies. The speaker was William P. McCahill, who is executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Mr. McCahill, a forceful spokesman for the handicapped and a disabled veteran himself, cited some challenges to State employment security leaders and others in helping to restore handicapped Americans to dignity and economic independence.

It is a speech recounting past deeds well done and a charting of opportunities for the future which must be exploited now if the hope of sufficient, satisfactory employment is to be realized by more Americans with handicaps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McCahill's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF WILLIAM P. MCCAHILL

I returned last week from the 11th World Congress of the Handicapped in Dublin to find an imperative phone call from Gerry Foster waiting me. As a result, I'm on this side of the mike, instead of being out there with you listening to a dynamic man born without legs, Henry Viscardi, your scheduled speaker, and Chairman of the New York Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Half an hour isn't a long time. But, multi-

ply it by an audience of 400 and you have 200 hours or five work weeks. I hope to make these five work-weeks productive and stimulating in behalf of the disabled for whom I am privileged to speak.

It is an irony of fate that a former quartermaster and reserve Marine like me, should be teamed up with the legless WW II Red Cross volunteer, Henry Viscardi, in a race against time for the disabled. I guess it just proves that the Good Lord has a sense of humor. It also proves that anybody can get into the act, an act in which the State Employment Security Agencies have been playing a leading role for a quarter century and more.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

Next week, we celebrate the 25th "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week". I hope most of you get home in time to discharge your important leadership roles in this national campaign. Twenty-four years ago, the Public Employment Service and the Disabled American Veterans teamed up with Paul Strachan's American Federation of the Physically Handicapped to observe the first NEPH Week and to coin the slogans, "It's Good Business to Hire the Handicapped." A year later, Oliver Kincannon, who died this summer, called me at the Retraining and Reemployment Administration from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and suggested that RRA coordinate a "Week" I had never heard of. Well, what has happened since then is a small part of the social and economic history of our times. It has been great being involved with you as a small partner and catalyst in one of the most humanitarian and common-sense efforts which ever joined government and private groups together.

PCEH AND THE CONFERENCE

Since we're probably the oldest President's Committee and have both legislative and Executive Order independent status, we feel our early partnership with the employment security and vocational rehabilitation family was helpful in establishing a climate of mutual trust and confidence which made it easier for the host of special programs that followed.

In any event, I've had the high honor to work with you since 1946. I thank you from a full heart. This is personal, and I mean it to be. I have enjoyed your friendships and your confidences. I have gloried in our mutual victories and rolled up my sleeves when we have suffered setbacks. The Committee has had a most unusual and rewarding relationship with this Conference. Colonel Kendall and now Clem Bassett have served on our policy-making Executive Committee. Working with Conference leaders like Sam Bernstein, Bernie Teets, Curt Harding, Willard Dudley and a host of others has been most rewarding.

And what can I say to express my appreciation to Gerry Foster, who faithfully has seen that we had our say at your Executive Committee meeting, your Employment Service and Veterans' Committee meetings, and on Conference Annual agendas for enough years to turn my hair to gray.

Our Chairmen, Admiral McIntire, General Maas and now, Harold Russell, have crisscrossed the Continent, meeting with you in your states and cities, working with you in a most unique relationship. Ours has been a relationship built on common agreement on need, and on common commitment to meeting that need. You have backstopped and midwived the Governor's Committees and local committees for almost 25 years. The wonder of it is, now that we come apart at the seams now and then, here and there, but that the basic dedication and personal commit-

ment is still there in spite of more new programs than you can absorb or I can recite.

In bringing you the personal best wishes of Harold Russell, indeed of our entire staff, I do so in a spirit of profound gratitude. Saying this, I can also promise you that our office will do everything humanly possible to make certain that you remain as good as you can be in the service of the handicapped.

From time to time we have to speak up. You wouldn't respect us if we didn't nor would we be carrying out our official responsibilities. Over the years we have always been heard. We're still being heard. It's no secret that we were unhappy when the Division of Special Worker Service was set up with no top official having specific responsibilities for "Services to Handicapped". We felt the states might follow the lead of Washington and one did. This isn't a trend, but it does bear watching. Ours is a government of laws and rules and not of men and women. Although people now in positions of influence will watch out for the handicapped, people do change jobs. Just look around you here today and you'll have to agree.

1968 MEETING: A MORALE BOOSTER

However, the initiative shown in scheduling a Conference for State Supervisors of Services to the Handicapped immediately following the 1968 National Rehabilitation Association Convention was a tremendous morale booster for those of us who felt that the handicapped were in danger of losing their place in the galaxy of special services. The scheduled conference following this year's NRA Conference is another evidence of the Manpower Administration's continued commitment to the handicapped. I was delighted to accept Bob Brown's friendly invitation to speak at their luncheon and to provide staff support.

DELIVERY OF SERVICES

This summer Chairman Russell made a major policy speech at the IAPES Convention where he sounded a warning that the handicapped were not getting Wagner Peyer services at enough local state employment security offices and were being selected out of too many MDTA-type training programs for which they were otherwise eligible.

At the IAPES Convention, Harold pointed with pride to the progress since 1954, but said that too many of the old problems of lack of money and staff time were still with us. He singled out what he said were "new problems arising from redirection of effort, transfer of staff and an emphasis on individuals who for one reason or other, usually called cultural, educational or economic, are given priority in service."

He said that he favored providing every individual with the assistance needed to become productive and economically independent, but not at the expense of downgrading and lessening of services to the physically and mentally handicapped in order to provide services to other groups of individuals. He emphasized the necessity of increasing and improving our cooperative efforts so that the handicapped know about and receive the kind and quantity of services they need.

SERVICES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

He also spoke strongly in behalf of services to disabled veterans and then came home and involved our Committee in a major backstop effort to increase private sector cooperation with agencies responsible for the disabled of Vietnam. He wrote every Governor's Committee Chairman (and a few are here in this room today), and every individual member of the President's Committee, asking for innovative and imaginative efforts in behalf of the returning war wounded.

As you know, military experience will be helpful to some of the returning disabled veterans, but not for most of them. All our disabled veterans must receive priority attention over everybody else in the labor force

and receive whatever assistance needed on their way back to jobs and economic independence.

The large bulk of the disabled will require the most intensive and finest job counseling, training and job development and placement you can provide. If we aren't ready for this kind of involvement, this kind of commitment, then we'd better get ready, all of us. I can pledge every possible cooperation from our office. You can be sure that the disabled veteran won't be left out of any of our promotional efforts this year. The title of this year's Ability Counts writing contest in the high schools is not accidental. It is "The Disabled Veteran As a Manpower Resource In My Community" and hundreds of thousands of young people will be researching and writing on this theme. Nor is the inclusion of a line in the 1969 Joint Statement being issued this Wednesday over the signature of the entire Cabinet and four other top Independent Agency heads accidental. It calls upon the Civil Service Commission to "expand its efforts, particularly stressing opportunities for the returning disabled Vietnam veteran."

We don't have much authority and very little money, but if moral suasion and major policy statements mean anything, we're doing our part to help you to do what you know should be done and what you know so well how to do in the field of veterans.

Like you, we are watching with interest the work of the President's Committee on the Vietnam Veteran. Like you, we were shocked and surprised to read in a veterans column that the inclusion of the Secretaries of Labor and HEW was inappropriate on this Presidential Committee, particularly since both Secretaries had served with distinction in the Marine Corps as combat officers. But, and there is always a but, the fact remains that too many stories are coming to us that veterans are not getting served. It is generally the white veteran who isn't getting the service, just as it is the white handicapped who isn't getting the referral or job training slots. I am not talking out of school. You all know it, if you read your own reports as I do.

I'm not here as the veteran spokesman, but one last comment. We've heard a lot about backlashes. Secretary Wirtz once said that you'd never see a paraplegic in a wheelchair leading a protest march or picketing a government building. Maybe not. But, if large numbers of returning disabled veterans of Vietnam find out that they aren't getting the services the Congress, the President and the American people have promised them, we may be in for some rude awakenings.

THE TASK AHEAD

All your states have taken part in the Statewide Planning for Rehabilitation Planning and some Employment Security leaders have had a leading role, as in Maine. But, if you think you've got problems serving the disabled now, listen to the capsule highlights just released from the first 14 final reports evaluated.

The total client caseload of 570,000 today is estimated at 3.2 million in 1975.

Caseloads in individual states will increase between 200% and 800% by 1975.

States plan to double or quadruple rehab staffs by 1975.

An estimated 25,000 VR counselors will be needed in '75 against 5,000 in '67.

States are recommending VR budget increases of from 300% to 1400% for 1975.

Total dollars needed in 1975 for VR will approximate \$2.4 billion, versus the 1967 total budget of \$303 million the year the studies got underway.

Just as some questions are being raised in veterans circles as to whether the state employment security agencies can actually serve the veteran, there are sure to be serious questions raised as to whether you can provide services in terms of the above projections for the handicapped who are also

caught up in the urgency of rising expectations.

I raise these questions more in sorrow than in anger, for I know what you want to do. At a recent appearance before the ICESA Employment Service Committee I was asked by the Chairman if the current emphasis on the disadvantaged wasn't hurting the handicapped. I said that it would be unrealistic to answer to the negative, but that it had been my experience that regardless of the word from Washington, the States would probably find a way to do what should be done for the disabled they had served so nobly for two decades. I still feel that way and hope that many of you will earnestly try to carry out the forthright resolution on this subject which you have before you at this Conference.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION ROLE

I'd like to take this occasion to thank the Manpower Administration publicly for its financial backing of our efforts for the mentally retarded and the mentally restored, as well as generous support for Project Earning Power in the sheltered workshop area. These projects have given significant impetus to the almost unbelievable advances in employment of the retarded and in the dawning of a new day for the mentally restored, those with a past history of mental or emotional illness.

I would hope that the priorities for the future would provide for some additional innovative and imaginative efforts in other MDTA-type projects such as the recently-completed project in the field of epilepsy.

The new and wonderful two-color Manpower Administration magazine has featured the handicapped time and time again and this month has given us the back cover for the 1969 "NEPH Week" poster, which most of you know is paid for entirely from granted funds, just one more in a litany of a thousand acts of cooperation, small and large which would take me too long to recount.

I was delighted on my return to Washington to read Mal Lovell's statement on Hire the Handicapped Week in which he said "that improving our services to handicapped persons is a year-round crusade, but I urge all Manpower People, in the national organization and in the States, to devote special effort in this direction during the first week of October."

CLARIFYING FIELD MEMO 44-69

But, we still have problems. For instance, when Field Memorandum No. 44-69 on Uniform Standards for Applying the Definition of the Term Disadvantaged Individual was issued, we pointed out that the last paragraph on page 9 had some unfortunate connotations since it included persons with a history of alcoholism, drug addiction, parolees and prison releasees as "handicapped." Secretary Weber quickly responded, saying that a clarifying revision of the Field Memorandum would be issued.

Then, we found out that this not only affected the "image" of the handicapped, but that it resulted in reporting figures which to us were meaningless since the placements of handicapped workers now reflect these other groups. Lest I be misunderstood here, as in my earlier references, we have no desire to see any decrease of services to these hard-core unemployed. We just want to tidy up reporting.

In response to the Chairman's second letter on the subject, Secretary Weber replied that he would recommend that his staff explore possibilities for a computer breakout of the drug addicts and law offenders under the ESARS program. He further said that the current administration would continue its efforts to help the handicapped, "not only because of our legal mandate, but also because of a moral obligation."

We were proud to have Secretary Shultz as a featured speaker at our Annual Meeting this year and as the President's personal rep-

representative. He has since published an editorial in our monthly magazine and next month we'll feature Secretary Finch. Harold and Bernie Posner and I have met with V.A. Administrator Don Johnson and set an early date for our Committee on Disabled Veterans meeting where we will explore with the veterans groups some of the problems mentioned here. We are working with Bud Wilkinson, our White House liaison, on an early date for our Advisory Council meeting where we will place before this Cabinet-level group some of our problems which government can help solve within the family. In a word, we have been doing everything we can to influence and direct policy at the top.

PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE HANDICAPPED

And, speaking of policy at the top, the President issued a statement to all agency heads after less than two months in office in which he reemphasized the Federal policy of hiring the retarded, the restored and the physically handicapped in the Federal service. He followed this up with a Rose Garden ceremony at the time of our Annual Meeting and just this month signed our 1969 Proclamation and issued a new Executive Order for the Committee. This Order adds the Secretaries of HUD and DOT to our Advisory Council and bolsters our efforts to remove architectural barriers and transportation barriers to disabled veterans and other handicapped Americans. He also assigned us for the first time an official responsibility of working cooperatively with international organizations.

THINGS ARE HAPPENING

Together, we have reached the stage where both the National Association for Retarded Children and the National Association for Mental Health have a national awards program for an "employer of the year" who has done the most in these two areas. The Post Office Department, the Federal Aviation Administration and now the U.S. Civil Service Commission have a "Handicapped Worker of the Year" program and the Commission has just issued a Handbook of Selective Placement for use by agency coordinators in a partnership with vocational rehab and employment service personnel throughout the country. Things are happening and will continue to happen.

Two of our newest programs should be of special interest to you, one a Rural Areas Committee pilot project in West Virginia, Florida and Iowa and the other a Youth Committee. We hope to find better ways of helping the handicapped in Rural America in the first project and, in the other, are involving the major youth groups of the Nation for the first time. We have a young man with sideburns and under 30 serving on our Executive Committee and telling it like it is. It's too early to tell you what will come of it, but we expect considerable high school and college involvement in helping people to help themselves.

Another significant step has been the appointment of an Ad Hoc Blue Ribbon Committee of outstandingly successful handicapped persons, including several former Handicapped Americans of the Year, to advise us in a number of areas of their own selection as to how goes it in America for the Handicapped.

I could go on and on, but let me wind up by saying that we have compiled and released statistics on 229 state institutions for the mentally retarded and on 200 mental hospitals showing what steps are being taken to prepare the retarded and restore them for employment. In the most recent survey just completed, we found that there were 6 full-time and 20 part-time state employment service counselors on the grounds of Institutions for the retarded against 126 full-time and 50 part-time VR counselors. These studies have been or will be shared with the state

employment security agencies in the hope they will be helpful in future planning.

A recent study of the strengths and weaknesses of the Governor's Committee has been completed and shared with your State offices. Chairman Russell has made State liaison a priority responsibility of our staff for the year ahead, a liaison which would have us meeting in a shirt-sleeves discussion session with all appropriate groups each time we visit a State capital. We also are under instructions to arrange meetings with Governor's Committee representatives at the time of the various NRA Regional meetings.

EIGHT RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, I'd like to make the following suggestions, requests or what have you:

1. That all of you here take seriously the Resolution you will pass and personally see what you can do to implement it within your own State, particularly those of you from States furnishing the Executive Secretary or Chairman of Governor's Committees. This means giving local office personnel time to act as local NEPH Committee secretaries.

2. That a pilot project be written and financed which would indicate the quality of the placements of the handicapped today, the percentage of long-term or short-term placements, the percentage of seriously disabled placed and the possible desirability of establishing a percentage figure for placing the seriously disabled, regardless of time and cost.

3. That a project to study the work record of the handicapped in government be written up and financed in cooperation with an institution of higher learning or an organization like the Brookings Institution, as was first proposed to OMPER in early 1967.

4. That the handicapped be included in the various training programs and that they specifically be mentioned in the language of the announcement and in the agency plans for implementation since too often not being mentioned results in being forgotten.

5. That a Manual amendment be prepared to handle the travel approval for specified employment security state personnel to the President's Committee Annual Meeting in order to avoid the recent "cliff hangers" where the clearance process inordinately delayed issuance of what should be a routine matter after some 20 years.

6. That a study be undertaken on "Impediments to Hiring the Handicapped in the 50 State Governments" since government must practice what it preaches and since very few, if any, states can match the U.S. Civil Service Commission record percentage-wise of an average of 15,000 handicapped accessions annually and employment of more than 5,000 qualified retarded workers in the last three years.

7. That the recently released "Summary Report of a Study on the Problems of Rehabilitation of the Disabled" by the Roper Research Associates be reviewed by the Manpower Administration with a view to possible R&D projects complementary to the Study and by State Employment Security Agencies as a check against their own programs for the handicapped.

8. Finally, the Employment Service Committee of the ICESA Report on Additional Resource Needs of the Employment Service in Fiscal Year 1971 be favorably received and implemented, particularly the third paragraph in section 4, Special Manpower Programs and Services, which say that the E.S. must be equipped to meet the ever-increasing demand for services to the handicapped.

I'm not quite sure what use will be made of it, but I most sincerely hope that the Greenleigh Associates Report on "A Study to Develop a Model for Employment Services for the Handicapped" will be one of the first orders of business for the new Employment Service Committee on this Conference.

I have with me most of the reference ma-

terial on all the items I have mentioned specifically and will be happy to discuss them with those interested. I also have with me three sets of our most recent materials which I will leave with Clem Bassett, Gerry Foster and your President-elect.

Well, that should do for starters. In the negative world of the handicapped our function is to topple all barriers which impede our facilitating the development of maximum employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, to paraphrase our Executive Order. We can't do it alone. Working with you, we can do it together.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Butte, Mont., Standard, in the State of Montana. The editorial follows:

No "TRUCK TRAINS"

There is a bill before Congress that should be of much concern to those Montanans who have fought against "truck-train" use of our highways. It would permit longer and larger trucks on the federal interstate highway system.

We oppose the proposed legislation and are confident if the "truck trains" are permitted on the interstates they soon will be driving on other highways.

The trucking industry has attempted before to put larger and longer trucks on Montana's highways. Their efforts so far have been rejected. Opponents contend the bigger trucks would materially speed up the deterioration of the roads and increase the hazards of traveling.

We have become apprehensive more than once, and tightened our grip on the steering wheel, when massive trucks roared by. From such experiences and for the sake of one's safety we oppose trucks being larger and longer.

But aside from the safety angle and the disturbing effect on autoists, there is the possible impairment of the highways.

The Wall Street Journal points out that "even if it were perfectly safe and sane to operate larger trucks on the interstate highways, it is unrealistic to assume that they would operate only there. Obviously enough the heavier vehicles also would have to travel on connecting roads, many of which were never intended for trucks of such weight and size."

The truckers' position is the wider, heavier and longer trucks would be safer because their larger size would permit improved safety features and make driving of them easier. They say that less damage would be caused to bridges and highways by bigger trucks because the weight distribution would be more favorable.

Actively opposing the bill are the American Automobile Association and American Association of State Highway Officials. Questioning the truckers' contentions, also, are some federal highway people.

A spokesman for the AASHO recently asserted the "larger trucks even at their present sizes and weights do not pay their total share of the highway cost." Even though the truck bill had official Johnson Administration support, and has a powerful lobby, we just can't see Congress making "truck-train" use of the peoples interstate system. We feel confident autoists, millions of them, will protest the bigger trucks, if for no other reason than their personal safety. This objection could be called defensive driving.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S
WEEK

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, October 19 through 25 marked the observance of National Business Women's Week. I join those who paid tribute to the achievements of the business and professional women in their communities.

The more than 3,800 member clubs of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., recently spotlighted woman's role in today's world by means of congresses of career women leaders. They are actively aware of the importance of an informed and active electorate and with the necessity for civic responsibility and service. The interest of their members in legislation before Congress has long been known to me.

I ask unanimous consent that the legislative platform adopted by the members of the national federation at their 50th anniversary convention in St. Louis this past summer be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM, 1969-1970

Action items

Item 1. Constitutional Amendment. Support legislation to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

Item 2. Actively work for pending legislation providing for: (a) a broadened head-of-household benefit under the Internal Revenue Code; (b) increased personal exemption and credit for dependents under the Internal Revenue Code; and (c) a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

Item 3. Propose and support legislation to provide: (a) uniform laws and regulations for men and women as to working hours, working conditions, rates of pay, equal employment opportunity, including retirement for age; (b) equal treatment for working men and women in the area of survivor and retirement benefits; and (c) increased child care deduction under the Internal Revenue Code.

Item 4. Propose and support state legislation to provide for uniform jury service and uniform qualifications in the selection of men and women to serve on grand or petit juries in any court.

Item 5. Propose and support legislation to bring about more effective crime control and law enforcement.

Policy item

Support measures within the framework of the Constitution of the United States that promote peace and strengthen national security and make more effective the United Nations and such other international organizations of which the United States is a participant, without relinquishment of our basic freedoms.

Special note is called to the United Nations Convention pending before the United States Senate on the political rights of women and to the long-standing support for ratification of this convention by the Federation.

PROCEDURE

State federations and clubs are urged to review the National Legislative Platform as published in *National Business Woman*.

Who may submit proposed changes

National Legislation Committee.

Executive Committee.

National Board of Directors.

State Federations.

Clubs may also submit suggestions for changes in the National Legislative Platform, but such proposals must be submitted through their state federations for review and possible recommendation.

Procedure for submitting proposed changes

State federations shall submit proposed changes to the National Executive Offices within ten days after adjournment of their state conventions. Such proposals shall be signed by the state president and forwarded by certified mail with return receipt requested.

The Executive Committee, National Board of Directors and the National Legislation Committee shall submit proposed changes, properly signed, to the National Executive Offices at least 30 days prior to the date the National Legislation Committee convenes, except in cases of emergency. If such proposals are mailed, they shall be forwarded by certified mail with return receipt requested.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted earlier today, I include a statement highlighting congressional actions as of a recent date on the budget recommendations of the President:

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Congress does not annually act upon all of the appropriations or new budget (obligational) authority requests. Something in excess of \$81 billion or so of the grand total currently estimated for fiscal 1970 arises from previous permanent-type legislation that does not require action in bills this session (interest, social security and other trust funds, etc.).

About \$132.6 billion of the 1970 total is presently involved in the form of specific budget requests in connection with the 13 regular annual appropriation bills—\$49.5 billion in the eight bills passed by the House and \$83.1 billion in the five bills not yet reported.

Another major part of the total is a \$3 billion allowance for the July 1, 1969, civilian and military pay increase.

The gross total in the April 15 budget revision by the new administration, relating to fiscal 1970, was \$219.6 billion. The Summer Review of the Budget reflects many changes in details and identifies several of them, but does not include a new grand total. But the total remains in this vicinity. The October 22 "scorekeeping" report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures—distributed to all Members—supplies more details.

STATUS OF THE 13 REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

House actions

The January budget of the outgoing administration for fiscal 1970 was reviewed and revised by the new administration, which released its revision on last April 15. The House has acted on eight of the 13 regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1970 (three of them before July 1, five after July 1).

The other five are still in the Committee on Appropriations. Most hearings were completed weeks ago.

The Defense appropriation bill has been delayed, awaiting disposition of the related defense authorization bill now in conference.

The Military Construction appropriation bill has been delayed, awaiting disposition of the related authorization bill which has passed the House but not the Senate.

The Foreign Assistance appropriation bill has been delayed, awaiting disposition of the related authorization bill which has not yet passed either body.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill has been delayed, awaiting disposition of the related District of Columbia revenue bill which has now cleared conference.

The Transportation appropriation bill is to some extent dependent on authorizations, but will be reported shortly.

Senate actions

The Senate has passed four of the regular bills for fiscal 1970. Four others are pending there.

Final actions

Two regular bills for fiscal 1970 have cleared Congress—the Treasury-Post Office bill and the Interior bill.

BUDGET ACTIONS OF THE HOUSE—IN APPROPRIATION BILLS

Recommendations on the spending side of the budget are handled mostly in appropriation bills, dealing—in this session—with supplements to fiscal 1969 and with the main budget for the current fiscal year 1970. A handful of items relate to fiscal 1971. And a number of actions with impact on the pending budget have been taken in bills out of the legislative committee—the details of which are reported on in the latest (October 22) budget "scorekeeping" report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

The eight regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1970 involved consideration of about \$49.5 billion of the President's budget requests for new appropriations and other new budget (obligational) authority. Against this total, the Committee on Appropriations recommended about \$49.3 billion—a net reduction, overall, of \$204 million in round figures.

But the House, through floor actions in the eight bills already voted on, made net additions of \$725 million to the committee recommendations, with the result that the eight bills—as finally voted in the House—are above the related budget requests by some \$523 million in news spending authority. The principal floor additions occurred on the Labor-HEW bill, increased \$922 million above the committee total.

In terms of expenditures—or more precisely, budget outlays—it is tentatively estimated that House actions to date in the eight appropriation bills already voted on would result in increasing budget expenditures for 1970 by roughly \$340 million.

The late passage of the second supplemental bill for fiscal 1969, in which reductions were made, resulted in some spillover effect of the reductions in relation to expenditures for fiscal 1970 which began July 1, in consequence of which it is tentatively estimated that the \$340 million increase is diminished, on the basis of final passage of the second supplemental to about \$265 million above the budget projections.

FISCAL 1969 SUPPLEMENTALS

In respect to fiscal 1969 supplementals at this session, budget requests for new budget spending authority totaled nearly \$5.9 billion. Amounts approved by Congress totaled \$5.4 billion, a reduction of nearly a half billion dollars—\$461.9 million—from the budget requests.

BUDGET ACTIONS OF THE SENATE—IN APPROPRIATION BILLS

The Senate has passed four of the regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1970—Treasury-Post Office, Agriculture, Interior, and Legislative. They involve \$11,045 million of new budget spending authority requests, against which the Senate voted \$11,648 million, a net increase of \$603 million above the budget.

FINAL ACTIONS ON 1970 APPROPRIATION BILLS

Two bills for fiscal 1970, the Treasury-Post Office and the Interior appropriation bills, have cleared Congress. As enacted, they appropriate \$10,163 million of new budget (obligational) authority on a gross basis, a reduction of about \$49 million from the related budget requests.

The amount in the Interior bill is \$1,380 million.

On the net basis used in the budget, that is, counting estimated postal revenues as offsets to postal appropriations rather than as budget receipts, the net amount enacted in the Treasury-Post Office bill is roughly \$2,276 million. But this does not take account of the revised estimate for postal revenues that was projected in the summer review of the 1970 budget, released September 17; that review now assumes enactment of new postal rate legislation effective January 1, 1970, valued at \$315 million, and makes a slight refinement of the estimate otherwise.

THE APPROPRIATION AND LEGISLATIVE BILLS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET

Folding in the various spending actions in legislative bills that bear on the budget with

those in the appropriation bills for fiscal 1970, the latest (October 22), budget "scorekeeping" report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures projects a more comprehensive picture of congressional actions or inactions thus far on the budget. These reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriation-wise and expenditure-wise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures (backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on).

And on this more comprehensive comparison, the picture of congressional action in relation to the 1970 budget is somewhat different than it is when using the regular appropriation bills alone. According to the October 22 "scorekeeping" report:

1. The House, as of October 22, was *above the budget* by \$1,677,437,000 in budget obligational authority; \$1,543,937,000 in budget outlays (expenditures).

2. The Senate, as of October 22, was *above the budget* by \$1,277,960,000 in budget obligational authority; \$1,187,265,000 in budget outlays (expenditures).

A summary table in support of these totals appears at the end of this report. There have been additional floor actions since then—a sizable one in terms of immediate budgetary impact being the Federal salary comparability bill. Still other unbudgeted items are in various legislative stage of consideration.

These developments are in the face of the action of Congress in July in adopting an overall budget expenditure ceiling for 1970 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, directing a cut of at least \$1 billion below the \$192.9 billion expenditure (outlay) budget for fiscal 1970 projected in the President's April 15 budget revision—a figure to which the President holds in the summer review of the 1970 budget, released September 17.

Following is Supporting Table No. 1 from the October 22 "scorekeeping" report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—ACTIONS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF OCT. 22, 1969)

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget) ¹			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget) ¹		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
Fiscal year 1970:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the budget):						
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office (H.R. 11582, Public Law 91-74).....	-42,382	-34,519	-38,482	-37,000	-30,600	-34,000
Agriculture and related agencies (H.R. 11612).....	-160,907	+675,236		+53,000	+556,000	
2d supplemental, 1969 (H.R. 11400).....				-110,000	-82,000	-75,000
Sec. 401 outlay ceiling ²					(-1,900,000)	(-1,000,000)
Independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 12307).....	-471,325			-113,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 12781).....	-15,810	-8,090	-10,481	-15,300	-11,800	-7,800
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies (H.R. 12964).....	-130,070			-71,000		
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (H.R. 13111).....	+1,078,365			+521,000		
Legislative branch (H.R. 13763).....	-26,850	-29,842		-7,900	-8,800	
Public works (H.R. 14159).....	+301,469			+10,500		
Subtotal, appropriation bills.....	+532,490	+602,785	-48,963	+230,300	+422,800	-116,800
Legislative bills with spending authorizations (changes from the budget):						
Civil service retirement benefits (H.R. 9825, Public Law 91-93).....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	\$ +86,100	\$ +94,700	\$ +94,700
Defense: Overseas mailing privileges (H.R. 8434).....	+8,900			+8,900		
Veterans readjustment benefits (Public Law 91-22).....	+1,362	+1,362	+1,362	+3,952	+3,952	+3,952
Veterans hospital care for 70-year-olds (H.R. 693).....	+16,225	+16,225		+16,225	+16,225	
Veterans care in State homes (H.R. 9334).....	+2,803	+2,803		+2,803	+2,803	
Veterans care in community nursing homes (H.R. 692).....	+5,954			+5,954		
Veterans outpatient care (H.R. 3130).....	+8,000	+8,000	+8,000	+8,000	+8,000	+8,000
Veterans nursing home care (service connected) (H.R. 2768).....	+1,500	+1,500	+1,500	+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
Veterans non-service-connected benefits (H.R. 372).....	+8,538			+8,538		
Additional district judges (S. 952).....		+1,473			+1,473	
Additional clerks for House Members (H. Res. 357).....	+3,600		+3,600	+3,600		+3,600
J.F.K. Center (H.R. 11249, Public Law 91-90).....	+5,000	+5,000	+5,000	+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Appalachian highways (H.R. 4018).....	+20,000					
Food for needy children (H.R. 11651).....				+100,000		
Veterans education assistance (H.R. 11959).....	+206,500	+383,000		+206,500	+380,000	
Veterans Vietnam insurance (S. 2003).....		+1,700			+1,700	
Veterans additional \$5,000 insurance (S. 1479).....		+45,000			+45,000	
Veterans double indemnity insurance (S. 1650).....		+100,000			+100,000	
Veterans dismemberment insurance (S. 2186).....		+10,000			+10,000	
Veterans increased dependency and indemnity compensation (S. 1741, H.R. 13576).....	+61,565	+52,840	+61,565	+61,565	+52,840	+61,565
Navajo Indian road (S. 404).....		+5,000				
Savings bond interest (H.R. 14020).....	+18,000			+18,000		
Travel per diem (H.R. 337).....	+27,000	+40,000		+27,000	+40,000	
District of Columbia delegate in House (S. 2163).....		+145			+145	
Federal salary comparability (H.R. 13000).....	+750,000			+750,000		
Public Health Service retirement (S. 2452).....		+110			+110	
Prisoner-of-war medical care (S. 1279).....		+1,017			+1,017	
Subtotal, legislative bills.....	+1,144,947	+675,175	+81,027	+1,313,637	+764,465	+178,317
Total, fiscal year 1970.....	+1,677,437	+1,277,960	+32,064	+1,543,937	+1,187,265	+61,517
Fiscal year 1969:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the budget):						
2d supplemental, 1969 (H.R. 11400).....	-580,794	-354,636	-461,948	-464,000	-254,600	-325,000

¹ Accurate estimates of the cost impact of congressional actions on mandatory spending legislation are frequently difficult to obtain—especially for outlays. Cost estimates are obtained from various sources, including Committee reports, floor debates, government agencies and informal staff contacts. Sometimes cost estimates on new legislation are not available. What is reflected in this Congressional action table is the best that the staff has been able to put together. Occasionally it is necessary to revise an estimate as more current information becomes available.

² Reflects floor action increasing milk funds by \$120 million, but does not reflect effect of \$20,000 limitation on subsidy payments adopted by House. The Appropriations Committee assumed a reduction in P.L. 480 spending which if not realized will result in higher spending than estimated.

³ The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1969, carried an overall expenditure limitation for fiscal 1970 which was different in all three versions. The House-passed version set the ceiling at the April 15 budget figure of \$192.9 billion with provision for increases or decreases depending

upon actions or inactions of the Congress affecting the budget. The Senate version made a flat reduction of \$1.9 billion in the overall ceiling but exempted certain items from the ceiling. The enacted version made a flat reduction of \$1 billion, provided for increases or decreases depending upon action or inaction of Congress affecting the budget, and granted up to \$2 billion of flexibility in the ceiling to the President for certain uncontrollable items.

⁴ Not available.

⁵ Updated estimate based on revised assumptions of number who might retire under the new law.

⁶ Cleared for signature.

⁷ Committee action.

⁸ As amended on House Floor costs could vary between \$500 million and \$1 billion.

CHANGING TRAVEL PATTERNS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, recently spoke before the International Trade and Transportation Seminar at the University of Wisconsin on the subject, "Changing Travel Patterns."

In this fascinating talk, Mrs. Knight traces the history of the passport and shows how her office has been handling the ever more complicated and extensive work load which has resulted from modern-day travel.

Renown for her innovative methods of administration, Mrs. Knight has made the Passport Office one of the most efficient in the Federal Government.

Mrs. Knight has very interesting ideas on ways in which some of the serious problems now facing our country could be solved, as well as a perceptive glance into what the future holds for foreign travel. For this reason, Mr. President, I feel certain that Senators would like to study a copy of her talk.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Knight's address, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DISCUSSION ON "CHANGING TRAVEL PATTERNS" AT THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND TRANSPORTATION SEMINAR, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, WIS.

(By Frances G. Knight)

Gentlemen: This has been a difficult talk to organize because I really have more questions to pose than answers to give on the international travel situation. Naturally, I relate travel to the affairs of the Passport Office. Like Department stores preparing for Christmas in July, we no sooner get through one travel season when we start planning for the next.

I have tried to arrange this discussion into the following divisions: The passport of the past; the present and the future.

I do not know how many of you are acquainted with the history of passports, much of which has been lost in the mists of time. But for a brief moment, let's consider past history.

The first known reference to a passport appears in the Bible—in the Old Testament—when Nehemiah, a cup bearer to the King of Persia, wrote:

"Moreover, I said unto the King, if it please the King, let letters be given me to the Governors beyond the river, that they may let me passthrough till I come unto Judah." (Nehemiah: Chapter 2, Verse 7.)

The word "passport" is formed of two French words—"passer" meaning "to pass" and "port" meaning "a port or harbor". Originally, the document gave permission to enter or leave a port or harbor, and records show that passports were issued to ships as well as to individual travelers. In the strict sense of international law, passports were classed with those documents known as "safe conducts" or "letters of protection", authenticating the traveler's right to protection.

Our archives, beginning in 1796 show that many of the passports issued abroad by U.S. Legations in London and Paris, were valid for a limited period of three to six months. The first United States Passport issued overseas is dated October 27, 1795.

The first passport on record as being issued in the United States is dated July 8, 1796. This was prepared in the form of a letter and signed by Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State under George Washington.

Many of the early passports were in the form of letters signed by Presidents of the United States. Some were written in French, the international language of the day. The handwriting was fancy, and many of these documents were veritable works of art, adorned with ribbons, colored sealing wax and intricate scroll work. Those were the days before passport pictures were used and, in my opinion, the verbal description of the bearer was almost as harsh as the photographs which were to follow.

For instance, a passport signed and sealed by President James Monroe in 1804, described a citizen as follows:

"Thin, brown hair; eyes, crossed; nose, large; forehead, low; middling mouth; chin, round with scar; head, square."

In the absence of any law on the subject, the issuance of passports to United States citizens fell to the Department of State as one of its proper functions, but it was not an exclusive function. Governors, Mayors and even notaries public issued passports causing a great deal of confusion and many problems for the traveler. Finally, on August 18, 1856, an Act of Congress provided that only the Secretary of State was authorized to grant and issue passports and, in 1870, there was organized within the Department of State the first Passport Bureau.

While there is no statutory definition of the United States Passport, it has always been considered a document of identity and nationality, issued to persons owning allegiance to the United States.

It is a fact that many seasoned travelers never leave U.S. borders without a passport, even when traveling to areas where passports are not required.

In doing my research for this paper, I checked back into talks I made in 1958, after I had completed an extensive reorganization of the Passport Office. On February 10, 1958, I spoke to a group in New Orleans and stated: "I think a very significant trend is developing in the 25% increase in passport applications received in 1957 from young people under the age of 20," and I also noted that "there are more and more retirees traveling." I predicted that these trends would continue, thus changing the travel pattern of U.S. citizens. And at that time, I also stated that "We do not have a crystal ball, nor can we forecast national or international situations, but the travel explosion is beginning, and we must be prepared to cope with it." I said, "We must make every effort to maintain the security of the passport, yet meet the requirements of speed, accuracy and efficient public service in the jet age." Remember, that was in February of 1958, and I say with some sadness and distaste that there was bureaucratic opposition every inch of the way to virtually every improvement that was suggested.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 established the Passport Office in the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State. Since that time there have been numerous attempts by Members of Congress to establish us as a "United States Passport Service", thus severing our ties with a Bureau, which since its inception has had political overtones. But, unfortunately, this step in the right direction, has also been thwarted by the bureaucracy, and politics.

Most people think of the Passport Office as a Government agency which engages exclusively in the issuance of passports. This is not true. Our assignment has a wide spectrum. The activities and responsibilities of the Passport Office are officially described as follows:

1. Administers laws, and plans, formulates and recommends regulations and policies relating to nationality and the conduct of all

passport activities including protection, documentation, and control of travel of United States nationals.

2. Coordinates and provides general and technical direction to the work of the domestic passport field agencies and the Foreign Service posts in this functional area.

3. Our Domestic Operations Division formulates, coordinates and implements policies, practices and procedures regarding diplomatic, official, and "no fee" passports and the general issue of passports within the United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

4. It examines passport applications originating in the United States and determines if applications are supported by evidence of citizenship, and properly executed, and if applicants are eligible to receive passports in accordance with existing laws, regulations, and policies.

5. Replies to correspondence from and conducts interviews with persons in the United States relating to passport facilities. Issues, renews, amendments, and extends passports and maintains appropriate records relating to this activity.

6. Coordinates and directs the domestic passport field agencies. Maintains continuous studies and develops recommendations relating to the advisability of establishing new agencies and continuation of existing ones.

The extent and diversity of Passport Office activities in supervising citizenship and passport services overseas are defined as follows:

1. Provides direction to the activities of the Foreign Service in the effective application and administration of the laws and regulations governing the nationality status of persons abroad who purport to be United States nationals and governing passport issuance and related services.

2. Administratively adjudicates cases involving claimants to United States nationality originating at Foreign Service posts in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and other pertinent laws and regulations.

3. Determines which United States nationals residing abroad are entitled to the protection of the United States Government to the extent that such protection is determined by the issuance of passports.

4. Subject to the coordination with other responsible areas of the Department, conducts liaison with, and gives guidance to, officials of other Government agencies and official representatives of foreign governments on matters of nationality and passports, particularly regarding interpretation of laws and international agreements to which the United States is a party.

5. Renders information to United States nationals concerning foreign nationality and recommends formal or informal representations to foreign governments in behalf of those nationals of the United States who have been wrongfully inducted into foreign armies or who have been required to serve prison sentences in lieu of military service.

6. Furnishes assistance to the Office of the Legal Advisor on United States nationality cases, and conducts interviews with attorneys in cases involving loss or possible loss of United States nationality or the right of certain individuals to receive the protection of this country.

I do not wish to bore you with details but our job is worldwide, supervising the passport and citizenship activities of approximately 275 overseas posts and offices in addition to the issuance of passports in the United States through ten field agencies.

Now, how did we cope with the challenge of the jet age? First, let us consider the rate of increase in passport issuances. In fiscal year 1950, we issued or renewed 306,871 passports; in 1960 that figure rose to 828,512; in 1969 we issued 1,759,286 passports and by 1970 we could easily exceed the 2,000,000 mark. These statistics indicate an increase of over 500% in passport issuances in the past 20 years.

One of our first efforts was to simplify the validity of the passport. At the urging of the Passport Office, on September 14, 1959, Congress increased the validity of the passport from four to five years, but the law continued to provide for a renewal feature, making the passport initially valid for three years and renewable for two. I should explain that this was done so that naturalized U.S. citizens who returned to the country of birth or to a third country for more than three years without returning to the U.S., could be warned that they would lose their citizenship if they continued to reside abroad. However, in 1964 the Supreme Court held that a naturalized citizen would not lose his citizenship solely for residence abroad, thus making it possible to abandon the renewal feature. The Passport Office immediately asked for legislation to establish a straight five year passport. This may be hard for you to believe, but it took four long years to get that simple, patently efficient, non-controversial and highly desirable legislation through the interminable red tape of the Government bureaucracy. Finally, on July 26, 1968, a bill was passed which extended the initial validity of the passport to a full five years, with no renewal feature. This one simplification permitted us to insert in the passport, at the time of processing, the date of expiration, as well as the date of issue. This, in turn, eliminated approximately 60% of our "emergency" calls from international airports where citizens found themselves with expired documents at the moment of departure.

It is a sad commentary on the alertness of the U.S. public that, generally speaking, they do not read, they do not follow instructions, and apparently they cannot count. Now the passport holder does not have to tax his brain to add five years to the date of issue to determine whether his passport is valid—we do it for him. The expiration date is now printed in the passport.

As a preliminary step towards speeding up the issuance of passports, a moderate revision of the passport format was adopted in April 1956 so that it could be processed on an electric typewriter instead of a slow, cumbersome hand-operated flat-bed machine. The Passport Office was instrumental in the development of the sophisticated passport writing machine which was subsequently adopted.

The passport format was again revised in 1961 so that it could be prepared on modern, high speed machinery. The cover was redesigned to better withstand wear and tear. The message from the Secretary of State on the first page of the passport was rewritten in the third person so that with a change of Secretaries we would not be left with tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of passports which would have to be overprinted or overstamped with a succeeding Secretary's name. There were sixteen major physical changes made in the passport document to improve its appearance, its durability and security. The information within the passport was rearranged to facilitate and speed up its inspection by immigration, border control and transportation officials. The Passport Office was the first Federal Government Agency which requested, tested and finally approved the use of color identification photographs.

Prior to December 1, 1955, all passports were sent to applicants by registered mail. A careful survey of this system revealed that only a very small fraction of one percent of the passports sent by registered mail were either lost or delayed in the mails. So, we decided to send them by regular mail. The percentage of loss or delay remains the same, but the cumulative savings since 1955 resulting from this action alone, exceeds \$3,000,000.

On February 1, 1956, the first wire transmission system was installed to provide the Passport Office and its field agencies with

rapid, recorded clearance of information required for issuance of a passport. Prior to this installation, clearance requests were sent by mail and emergencies were cleared by telephone, when and if the lines were open.

Year after year we have made changes and improvements in our intercommunications. In 1967 a completely new teletypewriter network system was designed for compatibility with computerization. All ten Passport Agencies are now connected with Washington, and at the rate of 100 words per minute, we obtain clearances on passport applications from an IBM 360 computer in a matter of seconds. In addition, we get automatic recordings, and passports are issued anywhere from one to three days after the application is received. A far cry from the three to six weeks required for passport issuance prior to 1955.

Like most Government agencies, the Passport Office was bogged down with an accumulation of files and records. In March 1966, we embarked on what appeared to be an impossible task. We had over 20 million index cards which were our only tool for the retrieval of passport application files dating back to 1906. This card index was kept in 165 file cabinets which took up valuable floor space. We culled the files, cleaned them, mended the documents, put them in proper order, microfilmed them, boxed them and sent the original records to the Federal Records Center for permanent retention—all this was done between March 18, 1966 and August 22, 1967.

The microfilm project was an outstanding success. We did not hire additional personnel. We released 900 square feet of floor space, and the use of microfilm made possible faster and easier retrieval. We saved 182 man-days of research time per year. The total savings averaged \$8,240 annually.

The decision to gear our clearance operation to the computer was made in 1964. We knew that we would have to adjust our entire lookout system comprising a quarter of a million cards, which since its inception had been manually checked, into the standardized type of codes and entries which could talk to the computer and get answers. Well, we did it. It was a four year job, completed in 1968, and today our computerized name check feeds in the question, searches and checks the name, and returns a response in one second flat. As a result, personnel costs in our filing and research areas have been reduced materially, with a net saving of \$99,885 in one year. Space requirements for the new system are one-half the former space requirements, permitting an additional savings of \$4,812 annually. In the first full year of computer operation, the savings totaled \$104,697.

There have been scores of lesser improvements and savings, all of which have been geared to the present travel requirements of United States citizens. One in which I take great pride is the work productivity of the individual Passport Office employee. In 1955 there were 1,404 passports issued per man year of employment. In 1960 this rose to 2,164 passports issued per man year employment. In 1965, the figure rose to 2,820, and in 1968 we reached 3,190. In other words, the productivity of the Passport Office employee rose 127% between 1955 and 1968. This was due to training programs and our special concentration on trying to develop supervisors from within the ranks rather than use the historic bureaucratic system of superimposing echelon upon echelon of new and untried employees.

In the past fiscal year, my Administrative Division advised me that a very conservative estimate of the cumulative savings to the U.S. taxpayer, resulting directly from the changes made in our operations and management over the past decade, totaled \$20,000,000.

So much for the past. What about the present?

The 1969 travel season was utter chaos. The Passport Office was denied 22 permanent

employees it requested in Fiscal 1968. It was denied an additional 24 permanent employees requested in Fiscal 1969—the year terminated on June 30 past. We were denied funds for the opening of three new Passport Agencies requested for 1969 and sorely needed to alleviate workload in such overburdened Passport Agencies as New York, Chicago and New Orleans. As a result, we entered the 1969 travel season with a total of 46 permanent employees short, and that is administrative murder in a relatively small operation.

Certainly it is no secret that the spectacular increase in overseas travel in the past few years is a result of our affluent society. Even those who do not have the money to travel can borrow it.

The introduction of inexpensive charter flights has enticed citizens to travel overseas who never would have considered such trips in the past. As some of my own acquaintances have said—we can't afford to stay home. It costs more to spend a week at the beach than it does to make a ten day tour of Europe.

Today, young people consider international travel as part of their education, and they get very attractive group rates. With bigger and better social security, more and more of the retirees are traveling overseas. Teachers, secretaries and club women have always been avid travelers, and as these categories grow, so do the number of applicants for passports.

I am sure many of you have read about or perhaps seen the mobs of people who stood in line for hours to file their applications at our Passport Agencies during the past May, June and July. We didn't have the staff to cope with the situation. Temporary employees, while welcome, do not overwork themselves. I suppose this is understandable. Permanent Passport Office employees, who put in some 17,000 hours overtime in the past year, were groggy on the job; some were ordered home by their doctors, and others threatened to resign. Overtime is expensive, not only in dollars, but in the health of employees and in the high rate of errors made from fatigue.

We are also faced with a personal problem to which little or no weight is being given by those who try to solve all difficulties with platitudes. Men and women do not like to work at night, thanks to the crime-ridden streets of our cities. It is not safe for a woman to stand at a bus stop in Washington, D.C. at night. It is not safe for a man or woman to walk the few blocks between the bus stop and home at night in our nation's Capital. It is not safe to travel the subway route in the fun city of New York at night. No husband wants his wife en route from office to home after dark. Temporary employees and overtime might have been the emergency answer to heavy workloads ten years ago, but not today.

Another off the cuff suggestion has been to use the Post Office for passport services. This is not a very practical idea considering the horrendous problems the Post Office has had and is having in handling its own business, approximately eighty-one billion pieces of mail yearly. It takes several days to get a letter from New York to Washington, which is more time than it takes us to issue the passport.

Another idea being pushed forward by interested parties is to turn over to the national banks the job of accepting passport applications. The American Society of Travel Agents is adamantly opposed to this because there are thousands of operators of small travel agencies who eke out a living by arranging travel for the families, friends and neighbors. Banks are trying to get into the travel business; some already are in the travel business, but as of today it is competitive. A passport application is a privileged document and has no relation to a bank account or a credit rating. For the United

States Government to turn over to the banks the job of accepting passport applications is giving the banks the first whack at the tourist business. It would be a travesty for this Administration to cut the ground out from under thousands of small travel agency operators.

The truth of the matter is that the Passport Office cannot operate under the present official restrictions to its growth. Unless we get more permanent employees and are permitted to open up new Passport Agencies where needed, we cannot cope with the volume of business we expect in 1970 and succeeding years. We have no funds for research into the future. We have little or no support for our concern about the impact of the supersonic jets. Expedient, makeshift remedies are not the answer now or later.

Well, what of the future? If the past is prologue, then we see nothing but frustration and difficulty ahead. It was only by a Herculean effort on the part of dedicated Passport Office employees that we pulled ourselves up by our own bootstraps to meet the requirements of the jet age of the 1960's. Every effort to organize and equip the office to meet the needs of the public was questioned and delayed and blocked for weeks and months at a time, thanks to red tape and inept bureaucrats.

Now, the President has given the green light to the supersonic jet. I am sure you all have read of the highly publicized performance of the SST, due to enter commercial service by 1978 which will be four or five years after the British-French Concord SST and the Soviet TU-144. In the meantime, we will be struggling with the impact of the Jumbo Jets which they claim will be in operation by the end of this year. I seriously doubt it. I don't know how many of you have seen the Boeing 747, but it is a tremendous vehicle seating between 360 and 370 passengers. Over 180 747s have been ordered by international airlines. Food will be served from six galleys; there will be 14 stewardesses on each plane; there will be ten doors for the entry and exit of passengers. Following the 747 will be other giant aircraft, such as Lockheed's L-1011 and McDonnell Douglas' DC-10. These fantastic carriers will cut a half-hour to an hour from Trans-Atlantic flights, and probably more from the Pacific runs.

Are the airports ready for this? The answer is no. Are the cities of departure and entry ready for this? The answer is no. Is air safety and traffic control ready for this? The answer is no. Sure, everybody is working on an investigation or a study or a survey of a certain facet of the over-all problem, but they've been doing this for years in the past, and apparently will continue for years in the future. In the meantime, these planes are being built and will be in service in a matter of months.

The air traffic problem, airport congestion and the inner city, baggage handling; personnel problems—are all in the collective laps of the experts. I have a headache of my own—that is the documentation of U.S. citizens for travel abroad in the decade of the Seventies.

The most emphasized and often-repeated requirement of the future is speed, which is necessary, we are told "to prevent too great a disparity between the ever diminishing flying time and the time needed to clear passengers and their baggage." Another requirement is reasonable cost of producing, issuing and maintaining the travel document, as well as related citizenship records. A third requirement, but certainly not the least important, is security, not only on the national level, but on the individual citizen level.

In this day and age, it is very easy to overemphasize speed, but speed, like every-

thing else, must be relative. In the case of travel, it must be related to security, accuracy, sufficiency of information and passenger convenience.

Emphasis on "speed" has brought about the so-called "one-man clearance" at airports which supersedes clearance of passengers through public health, immigration, agriculture and customs. One inspector is supposed to handle the primary inspection for all four agencies. If he detects a "problem case," he refers the passenger to a specialist for a secondary or more detailed inspection. Just how successful this rapid clearance system will be when related to undetected entry of drugs, contraband, pornography, human and agricultural diseases, is a matter for future analysis. The proponents of this system stress the convenience of the passenger. They stress the lack of customs search in other countries, but they fail to stress the high rate of disease to animal and plant life; communicable human diseases; the lucrative international traffic in smuggled goods, and so forth, ad infinitum. They fail to stress that the U.S. is the target for drugs and contraband because this is where the money is, and the financial kick-back in the U.S. is likely to be the largest in the world. Who in a foreign community cares if American citizens are saddled with a staggering tax bill to prevent the spread of agricultural and animal diseases. Who in a foreign community cares about the destruction of American youth by narcotics? Who cares if America is plastered with pornographic literature, pictures and films?

Do you know how much it costs you, as a taxpayer, to fight plant and animal disease and the destruction of our natural resources from the infestations introduced into this country by the illegal entry of fruits, plants, vegetables, seeds, meats and meat products? A minimum of two and a half billion dollars annually. This figure was given to me two days ago by the Plant Quarantine Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Is there no significance to such statements as made by President Nixon when he pointed out that "between the years 1960 and 1967 juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 800 per cent. New York City alone has records of some 40,000 heroin addicts, and this number rises between 7,000 and 9,000 a year." Consider this for a moment and to our shame: During Fiscal 1969 the Customs Service chalked up a record-breaking 6,200 arrests as against 4,343 in Fiscal 1968—a 42% increase—related directly to drug smuggling. In keeping with the times, import of all types of drugs has increased—heroin, opium, cocaine and hashish have skyrocketed. The same can be said of pornographic literature entering the U.S. But thanks to our court decisions, we are now manufacturing our own—almost as authentic as the filth which was and still is smuggled into this country. But we have developed a permissive society, more intent on protecting the lawbreaker than the law abider. And we are reaping our just rewards.

The U.S. citizen gripes about inconvenience if he is delayed about ten or twenty or thirty minutes when Customs inspects his baggage or when he is questioned about food or bulbs or seeds he may have hidden in his belongings. When the Health Officer asks the homecoming traveller where he spent the two weeks prior to his return, in order to find if he had been exposed to contaminated areas, our emancipated citizen snarls back that it's nobody's business. Of course, no one expects or wants 100% baggage inspection. As we heard this morning, over 70 million bags, crates and packages enter the U.S. annually, and it would be physically impossible to inspect all of them. On the other hand, there is a vast difference between haphazard inspection and adequate inspection geared to safeguard our national interests,

If you read the newspapers you couldn't have missed the furor being raised by some of our so-called intelligentsia regarding a few questions being asked by the Census takers in the hope of getting accurate data regarding our population. U.S. citizens have bucked the checking of social security records as an "invasion of privacy." The search for narcotics is an "invasion of privacy."

You may not see the connection between these facts and the accent on speed and accommodation of the international traveler—the connection is this: We are curtailing virtually all phases of interrogation, search and inspections and compromising national security and well-being in order to satisfy a national psychosis for speed and more speed, individual convenience and rights. What about the requirements and rights of good government serving all our citizens and not just the vocal and organized few?

I am in full agreement that better methods of clearing international travelers at ports of exit and entry *must be developed*. But I would *never* agree to lessening the national security to accommodate speed and convenience.

There has been considerable pressure from various quarters, primarily the airlines, to substitute a card passport for the present book passport. The card could be scanned electronically. It would feed its reading into a computer which would give a "go" or "no go" signal to the passenger who would then proceed to pick up his baggage. The "no go" passenger would move along to a visual inspection by an official. It sounds great. But we are not living in the best of all possible worlds, and the incidence of counterfeiting and fraud are too prevalent to entrust individual identification to a document akin to a credit card. Certainly, you all must be aware of what is happening in the credit card business. The loss to U.S. business and the Government is in the scores of millions of dollars, and this loss is financed by your tax dollars.

Of course, every country must establish its own criteria in the security field, and while 100 percent security in personal identification *has never been achieved*, and *may never be achieved*, it is *imperative* that any new system of international, personal, identity documentation attain a higher degree of security than we have today.

Without getting into the details of the *insecurity of plastic cards* and the cost of computer clearances and the technical problems involved with the establishment of such automatic clearances at some 300 ports of entry and international land border crossings, let me state that this type of solution to mass travel is a long, long way off. If we could not obtain the funds for 22 or 24 employees for fiscal 1968 and 1969, or the funds to establish three new Passport Field Agencies for 1970, where do you suppose we will get the funds for such sophisticated equipment as computers and scanners? This equipment costs millions of dollars. This is my first practical question.

I have recommended for some time an interim solution—that is the standardization of all passports—the world over. As long as visas are required, the passport book is required. But if the format of the passport were standardized, it would aid and speed up border inspections everywhere. And believe me, we are well on our way towards such standardization. Some 49 foreign nations have sent their representatives to the Passport Office to study our methods of accepting applications, as well as processing the document, and our format has already been adopted by a number of countries. In due course, this may spread. Other standardizations recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization are being adopted, so that we are moving towards the development of a better travel document.

As of now, a card passport is not feasible. It is not secure, and it does not provide for visas. If we are to provide accurate identification of the individual, security of the document and the flexibility required for international travel, we must develop a fool-proof document. This leads to my opinion, that this country, sooner or later, will have to move towards a national registration. This is no invasion of privacy—it is a personal safeguard. No intelligent, law-abiding citizen can seriously object to a national registration which would establish his identity and safeguard such accounts as his social security, bank, tax and insurance benefits. Most of the loop-holes and errors in today's identification methods which result in enormous tax evasion; social security frauds and national crime, could in large measure be corrected by national registration. Scores of millions of tax dollars are going down the drain annually because there is no practical fool-proof method or system by which criminals who are defrauding the Government can be apprehended if they have no tax record, or social security record or bank account. Other countries have solved some of these problems by national registration—why can't we?

One other word on behalf of the law-abiding citizen who normally would not object to national registration. This will make you shudder because we have all been brain-washed about fingerprinting. Do you know that there are over 190 million individuals in this country who have been fingerprinted? All Government employees are fingerprinted. So are all members of the military services and employees in defense plants. There is no better identification in this world than a fingerprint, and I suggest that a secure, counterfeit-proof, national registration card, with or without the fingerprint, may be the genesis of the international passport card of the future. If the format can be standardized, let us say by ten nations with the largest volume of tourism, we would be well on our way towards an acceptable international identification document.

However, I don't believe that the American public is sophisticated enough to accept this idea at the present time. We may have to go through more traumatic experiences, such as the assassinations of the past few years; increased crime and violence and widespread drug addiction and all their related national and international off-shoots before our citizens will demand an accurate accounting of who's who.

The real question is: Do we want an international travel document with integrity, or do we want a travel document which sacrifices integrity and security for speed and the convenience of the passenger? I believe we can attain a high degree of all three—integrity, security and convenience—if we can get the support for the interim research which has to be conducted before we reach any conclusions. We are at that point now, and we need judicious support from business and industry for the further development of the international identification document of the future.

Thank you.

SISTER ST. MARY ORR OF
MARYWOOD COLLEGE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it has been so often true in the annals of American education that there should arise a person who quietly steps forward to a position of leadership and, when the years of that person as an educator are finished,

we should all realize that in that person's time a veritable revolution in education had been accomplished.

Such a person is Sister St. Mary Orr of Marywood College.

No other could more fittingly be called the complete daughter of Marywood. She was a member of the first graduating class of Marywood. She went from the college into the Order of the Sisters Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and put her keen mind to work on the problems of the troubled child.

Under her expert care there was founded at Marywood the psychoeducational clinic at Marywood College. It became the principal consulting service of the St. Joseph's Children and Maternity Hospital. It became, also, the great hope of countless mothers and fathers who took their troubled children to Marywood for help, and found help in abundance. To the clinic also came very bright children who had somehow fallen behind in their reading abilities, and who found the road to education blocked by their inability to read well. Again, countless children found that, through the help of this magnificent educator and her associates, there was a road to reading that could be opened for them, and they joined their classmates as peers, or even better than peers.

Sister St. Mary Orr was selected to be dean of students, then worked for 6 years as assistant to the Mother General of her order. Her extraordinary intellect and administrative talents were then called upon when she was selected as the president of Marywood College in 1961.

For 8 years she has worked to make Marywood one of the truly distinguished women's colleges in America. That she has been successful is attested to by the record of the graduates of Marywood, whose talents are in demand all across America, and all across the spectrum of learning.

At the very height of her achievements, Sister St. Mary Orr has announced that she has chosen to retire, to give the presidency of Marywood into the hands of a younger woman. I know that the whole community would like to turn to her, to ask that she remain as the president of Marywood a little longer. But I know also that the whole community respects her profound wisdom, and recognizes that her judgment in this matter must be followed just as we have learned to follow her judgments in the past.

I am paying, today, my own personal tribute to Sister St. Mary Orr and to the other magnificent educators of Marywood College. It is the college from which my own wife was graduated. It is the college from which thousands of other young women were graduated, to spread the tradition of learning which was given to them so generously at Marywood.

Each generation must pass the torch of learning to the next generation. I know no hand in which the torch of learning has burned more brightly as it has burned in the hand of Sister St. Mary Orr. By whatever test she might be measured—be it as woman, as educator, or as president of a college—I have no doubt that Sister St. Mary Orr will always be known as one of the truly outstanding servants of God and one of the outstanding Sis-

ters Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append here an editorial and an article from the Scranton Tribune, and an article from the Scranton Times.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune,
Oct. 7, 1969]

MARYWOOD'S SISTER ST. MARY

The action of Sister M. St. Mary Orr in submitting her resignation as president of Marywood College, and the decision of the college's governing body to accept the resignation effective with the appointment of a new president, prompt the mixture of emotions typical of such instances.

One feels a touch of regret that Sister St. Mary, after nine years as head of the Catholic women's college, and with an identity with Marywood extending back to membership in its first graduating class 50 years ago, is leaving an office in which she served with great ability and fidelity.

Yet, there is complete understanding that sister feels the burdens of the office—and they are heavier than ever—should be undertaken by "a younger person." And there is total understanding, too, that sister has well-earned some ease and respite from the responsibility which falls to administrators in the area of higher education today.

Much of love and unselfishness is woven into sister's decision. Her real motivation is the advancement of the institution which has so well served our area and its people. It is a conclusion drawn from her own words: "... a strong belief that a younger person should continue the pursuit of the common goals of those most concerned with Marywood College."

During Sister St. Mary's term as president of Marywood the college experienced a record of unprecedented growth. Land acquisition enlarged the campus and the Nazareth Hall Student Center; Madonna Hall, a student residence; Emmanuel Hall, a faculty residence, and the Learning Resources Center, with a new library at its core, were constructed and tremendously enlarged the college's capacity as a regional asset adapted to the needs of today and the challenges of tomorrow.

Sister's term has been distinguished further by the establishment of the first graduate school of social work in Northeastern Pennsylvania and the initiation of a teacher-exchange program. Familiar as we are with the productivity and progress Marywood has known through sister's direction and guidance, we heartily join in the expression of "well done" which she has earned and wish her health and satisfaction as she prepares to enter a new phase in a life dedicated to the work of God and man.

Sister M. St. Mary Orr, IHM, who for nine years steered the largest Catholic woman's college through the turbulent waters of higher education, tendered her resignation as president of Marywood College to the Board of Trustees at their annual meeting at the college on Saturday. This just one week to the day after she celebrated the Golden Anniversary Homecoming as a member of the first graduating class of the local women's institution.

Convinced of the continuing vitality of Marywood and with characteristic foresight, the president explained: "My resignation was based on a strong belief that a younger person should continue the pursuit of the common goals of those most concerned with Marywood College."

The governing body which made the decision to accept Sister St. Mary's resignation effective when the new president is appointed is itself an example of her adaptability to change. Composed of lay and religious members, the revised Board of Trustees was organized last year under the first lay chairman, Dr. Clarence C. Walton.

During Sister St. Mary's term, the local women's college has enjoyed a period of unprecedented growth. Campus boundaries were expanded by the purchase of land; buildings were erected—Nazareth Hall Student Center, Madonna Hall Student Residence, Emmanuel Hall Faculty Residence and more recently, the Learning Resources Center in Northeastern Pennsylvania, the inauguration of a teacher-exchange program and participation in such cooperative efforts as the Lehigh Consortium and NEPIC were some of the academic steps taken under Sister St. Mary's direction.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, Oct. 7, 1969]

PRESIDENT RESIGNS POST AT MARYWOOD

The president of Marywood College has resigned, according to the board of trustees.

Sister M. St. Mary Orr, I.H.M., president of the Catholic women's college for the past nine years, submitted her resignation at the recent fall meeting of the governing board.

In accepting her request the trustees asked that Sister St. Mary agree to serve as acting president until a successor is named.

It is expected a new president will be named in the spring, near the close of the current academic year, said the announcement.

During the near-decade of her term in office, Sister St. Mary indicated in a recent report, the college has witnessed an acceleration of pace and an awareness of the times unequalled in any comparable period.

"Caught in the tide of a society tossed by crosscurrents of political and social issues, Marywood has been anchored in faith and intent upon its mission of nurturing personhood and intellectual discovery. Most of all we are a college meeting the contemporary on the strength of the past, cutting what we hope will be a clear path into the future of independent higher education," she declared.

Speaking of her resignation she said, "Such an objective imposes a daily burden best carried on by those equipped with the youth and vitality demanded by the task. . . . My resignation was based on a strong belief that a younger person should continue the pursuit of the common goals of those most concerned with Marywood College."

Sister St. Mary, a native of Scranton, received a bachelor of arts degree with the first class graduated from Marywood in 1919. She earned a master of arts degree at Catholic University and a doctorate in psychology at Fordham University. She has taught in the parochial schools of the Scranton Diocese and at Marywood Seminary.

With Sister M. Cuthbert, dean, she founded the Psycho-Educational Clinic at Marywood and was chairman of the Department of Psychology.

She served for a time as dean of students and for six years was assistant to the mother general of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, immediately prior to her appointment as president of Marywood College in September, 1961.

She is a fellow of the American Psychological Association, a diplomate of the American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, a registered clinical psychologist of Pennsylvania, a charter member of the American Catholic Psychological Association, and professor of psychology and education.

Under Sister St. Mary, a major building program at Marywood was inaugurated and the dedication of Madonna Hall, resident for students; Nazareth Hall, the Student Union Building; Emmanuel Hall, residence for the priests on the faculty, and the Learning Resources Center took place.

Under her supervision and direction the 50th Jubilee Campaign Fund was organized and the 50th anniversary of the founding of the college was celebrated.

A spokesman for the board of trustees said Sister St. Mary's success as an administrator

has been manifested in many areas: The material growth of the college in terms of buildings and acreage, her ability to attract faculty of high competency, and the extending and enriching of the curricula within the various degree programs.

Her greatest success, however, cannot be measured statistically, he said, explaining it is her capacity to instill in faculty and students alike what she calls "the exciting pursuit of excellence."

Sister St. Mary was honored recently by the Catholic University of America with an alumni award for distinguished achievement in higher education.

THY FIRST LOVE

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr., were in Chicago recently. He presented a paper to the Bryan Society entitled "Thy First Love." Because I wish to share Dr. Reuter's thoughts about two of our former colleagues in this body—William J. Bryan and Ruth Bryan Owen—with the current membership, I include with my remarks in the RECORD this paper:

THY FIRST LOVE

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

Slightly over twenty years ago, a delightful book, *The Flight of the Jew*, was published. The editor and one of the authors is Dr. Gerald L. Stover. Dr. Stover is still one of America's greatest Christian statesmen. While these wise men said many profound things, I am concerned here with only two. First, Dr. Stover said: "This is God's purpose in this age of grace in which we live. His purpose is to draw out from every kindred, tribe, and nation by His Holy Spirit a people who shall bear His Name. This body shall be comprised of Jew and Gentile, bond and free, male and female, rich and poor. This multitude of believing children of God is spoken of as the Church, His body, His building, and His Bride."

Later, Dr. Stover noted: "Love is not gone, but first love has been left. The fervency of it all, the wonder of His very presence, the glory of His touch, the sweetness of His words—these are left. Affections have been divided between the world and the Lord Jesus, the place of prayer and communion have been exchanged for the tinsel and camouflage of a world that crucified its Savior. And in the glory His great heart yearns for her love, for her return to the ecstasy of first love. But thank God, it is His purpose in grace to one day deliver us from all the spots and stains of our unfaithfulness to our Lord."

GOD'S SERVANTS

We are immersed in the stream of time. As history bears us onward over its cataracts of change we cannot be certain of all facts in life. Charlemagne's followers never thought of themselves as "coming out of the dark ages." The people of the late Middle Ages did not know their period was giving away to the Renaissance. Yes, historical change has a way of deluding its observers.

All through the skittish 1969's, America has been almost obsessed with its alienated minorities—the incendiary black militant and the welfare mother, the hedonistic hippie and the campus revolutionary. Suddenly, this focus is changing. "You better watch out," barks Eric Hoffer, San Francisco's bare-knuckle philosopher. "The common man is

standing up and someday he's going to elect a policeman President of the United States." The odd thing is that the common man did not plan it that way. Of course, apology has become the American posture. The liberal virtue of self-criticism is becoming the national vice of self-hate. We seem to see everything about ourselves except what is good, everything about our past except what we have achieved. Groveling has become the national disease. Democracies are seldom murdered. More often they commit suicide. A democratic society cannot be destroyed except with the collaboration of its victims. In our time we can see a foreshadowing of this collaboration in the widespread tendency to Spiritual Appeasement. Yes, spiritual appeasement is the disease of those who lack faith in themselves, in their institutions, and in the struggle to make all men fully human. The antidote is not hate: It is faith, trust, and pride.

William Jennings Bryan, who was born in Salem, Illinois, on March 18, 1860, and who died on July 26, 1925, retired from this world an undefeated heavy-weight Christian statesman. He was the son of Judge Silas Lillard and Mariah Elizabeth (Jennings) Bryan. When he received his A.B. degree from Illinois College in 1881, he was graduated with highest honors and valedictorian. Later, in 1884, he received an A.M. degree from that historic college. The Union College of Law of Chicago awarded him the LL.B. degree, and he received LL.D. degrees from the University of Nebraska, the University of Maryland, and the University of Arizona. He was admitted to the bar in Illinois in 1883 and practiced in that state until 1887, when he started practice in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Dr. Bryan served in the 52d and 53d Congresses (1891-1895) from the First District of Nebraska. He was the Democratic nominee for U.S. Senator in 1894, but a Republican legislature made the selection. We all recall that he was the Democratic nominee for President in 1896, 1900, and 1908, but he was also Secretary of State from March 4, 1913 to June 9, 1915, and during this latter period, he negotiated 30 treaties with governments representing ¾ of the world's population. Also, during his busy life, he was Editor of the *Omaha World-Herald* from 1894-1896; Editor of *The Commoner*, a political magazine; he raised the 3d Regiment of the Nebraska Volunteer Infantry for the Spanish American War in May, 1898, and became its first colonel; and he toured the world in 1906 and contributed to newspapers.

Statesman Bryan married Mary Elizabeth Baird of Perry, Illinois, on October 1, 1884. This charming lady was born on June 17, 1861, and was a student at Monticello Seminary of Godfrey, Ill., from 1878 to 1879, and was graduated from the Presbyterian Academy for Young Women at Jacksonville, Ill. in 1881, as valedictorian. Later, she took special work at Illinois College and the University of Nebraska. Also, she was admitted to the bar in Nebraska by the district and the supreme court. While the historian remembers Mr. Bryan's books: *The First Battle*, 1897; *Under Other Flags*, 1904; *The Old World and Its Ways*, 1907; *Heart to Heart Appeals*, 1917; *The Menace of Darwinism and The Bible and Its Enemies*, 1921; *In His Image*, 1922, etc. Mrs. Bryan was the mother of Ruth; W. J., Jr.; and Grace (Mrs. R. L. Hargreaves). Mrs. Bryan died on January 21, 1930, in Miami, Florida.

The world remembers at least two other members of the Bryan Family. First, there was Charles Wayland Bryan, a brother, who was born in Salem, Ill., on February 10, 1867, and who passed away on March 4, 1945. He was educated at the University of Chicago and Illinois College. He married Bessie Louise Brokaw on November 29, 1892, and their children were Silas Millard, Virginia, and Mrs. Mary Louise Harnsberger. He settled in Lincoln, Nebraska, in 1891. He was Publisher

and Associate Editor of *The Commoner* in 1901 to 1923, and Editor of the *American Homestead* for five years. Also, he was engaged in farming and the wholesale coal business (State Coal Co.). The world recalls he was Mayor of Lincoln from 1915 to 1917 and 1935 to 1937, Governor of Nebraska from 1923 to 1925 and 1931 to 1935, and the Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1924. He was also active as a member of the Odd Fellow, Woodman, Elk, and Kiwanis groups.

Second, there was Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, the eldest daughter of W. J. Bryan. She was born on October 2, 1885 and died on July 22, 1954. She was the first woman ever chosen to represent the U.S. in another country—she was Minister to Denmark from 1933 to 1936. She was born in Jacksonville, Illinois, and educated at Monticello Seminary (1899-1901), the University of Nebraska (1901-1903), and held LL.B. degree from Rollins College in Florida (1927), Woman's College of Florida (1935), and Denison University (1946), and the L.H.D. degree from Russell Sage College (1931) and Temple University.

She married Major Reginald A. Owen on May 3, 1910, and the following children were born to that union: Ruth (Mrs. Jonas Reimer), John, Reginald, and Helen (Mrs. Harrison Brown). After the death of her husband in December of 1927, she became the first woman sent to Congress from Florida—she served from the 4th District from 1929 to 1933. She served as an alternate to the U.S. Representative to the General Assembly of the United States in 1949. Mrs. Owen married Captain Borge Rohde of the Danish Royal Guards on July 11, 1936. Her last American home was on Wolden Road in Ossining, New York. She is buried in St. Albans Church, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Mrs. Rohde was as proud of her membership in the D.A.R. as her father was as President of the National Dry Federation in 1918. She was also a fine writer, including the following: *Elements of Public Speaking*, 1931; *Leaves from a Greenland Diary*, 1935; *Denmark Caravan*, 1936; *The Castle in the Silver Wood*, 1939; *Picture Tales from Scandinavia*, 1939; *Look Forward Warrior*, 1943; and *Caribbean Caravel*, 1949.

On Sunday, October 12, 1969, Dr. John R. Spaulding of Omaha took the speaker and his wife to Lincoln, Nebraska. Out on Summer Street in the southeast section of that city, stands a dignified old mansion that would have become the "Monticello of the Midwest" had William Jennings Bryan been President of the United States. Mr. Bryan spent \$10,000 on Fairview in 1902. On its front steps the Silver-tongued Commoner accepted for the third time his party's nomination for the Presidency. William H. Taft and Woodrow Wilson later visited Fairview. Today, Lincoln has grown up around Fairview and until a few years ago, the Bryan home was a nurses' residence hall serving adjacent Bryan Memorial Hospital. The house is much the same as when Bryan left it to move to Florida for his wife's health in 1917. Efforts to restore its interior to its original state have been highly successful, although few of the furnishings are original. On that rainy day, I recalled that "God's Servants" lived there many years. More people should avail themselves of the opportunity for such a visit to the home that was reopened a few years ago by the Junior League of Lincoln.

CONCLUSIONS

If this family of statesmen were alive today, they would tell the world that there "first love" is still Christianity but that wise leadership via Christian principles is still essential. They would be concerned with current issues such as:

1. Providing for autonomy in all areas.
2. Providing for justice and equality.
3. Providing for tax reform.
4. Providing for reduction of the depletion allowance for oil.

5. Providing for the continuation of non-sectarian and nondenominational prayers in public schools.

6. Providing guidelines to live with the cost of living.

7. Providing for continuation of internationalism as the answer to isolationism.

8. Providing for quality in education of all. "God is not mocked." We reap as we sow. I beg you love one another and all God's children. Let us purge our hearts of hatred and thus purge our land of all misery. Let us not merely love one another sentimentally; let us do the works of love, the first of which is justice. With the Christian faith as demonstrated in the lives of the Bryans, all of us have a bright tomorrow.

COMMENTS ON 10 MORAL ISSUES

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in the media lately about the Nation's intellectuals rising up in some kind of unanimous righteous wrath about this country's allegedly "immoral" war in South Vietnam. The fact of the matter, however, is that the architects of surrender, even in academic circles, are far from unanimous, neither do they have the patent on morality.

On the eve of the infamous moratorium, an eminent scholar of political science, Prof. Albert Wehling, of Valparaiso University, in my hometown of Valparaiso, Ind., did a first-rate job of "telling it like it is," both morally and intellectually. His remarks were reprinted in the October 14 issue of the Valparaiso *Vidette-Messenger*, and I insert the story at this point in the RECORD:

COMMENTS ON 10 MORAL ISSUES

On the eve of the national moratorium against the war in Vietnam, planned locally and nationally for Wednesday, Dr. Albert Wehling, professor of government at Valparaiso university, today told The *Vidette-Messenger* that "there are 10 moral issues intimately connected with the participation of the United States in the Vietnam conflict."

Herewith is Prof. Wehling's commentary on that timely issue:

"I have no authority to speak for Valparaiso university and do not do so now. The university has no authority to speak for me, expressly or tacitly, by actions or sanctions except on matters of principle previously announced in its official publications. Our country's engagement in Vietnam is not one of these.

"There has been in effect for about five years or more a moratorium on facts, reason, and particularly on the great moral issues involved in that engagement. The later are inextricably and properly intertwined in our system with legal and political principles and decision.

"I submit that there are 10 moral issues intimately connected with the participation of the United States in the Vietnam conflict.

"First is the moral issue of the obligation of the United States under a valid treaty and of the national honor in fulfilling it. Just as the Supreme court is the final interpreter of the Constitution and of Congressional statutes, the official interpretation of a treaty is in the presidency. (Treaties are not made under the Constitution but under the sovereign authority of the United States.)

"Four Presidents and four secretaries of

state have agreed upon our country's commitment under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and its protocol, both made to respond to the criminal trespass of international villains.

"Second is the normal issue of responsibility to the approximately one million inhabitants (mostly Roman Catholics) who fled to the south relying on the protection of the government in authority there and on the announced support of the government by the United States.

"Third is the moral issue of the duty of a great and civilized world power to further the development and expansion of a world rule of law. An effective and accepted system of international law is now 'the last best hope on earth' because the only alternative to world law is world war or, more properly, world destruction. It is elementary and axiomatic that such law depends absolutely upon the principle of the sanctity of treaty commitments.

"A position on adherence to or repudiation of existing international obligations may well be the greatest moral issue of our time. It could be that President Nixon had this in mind when he said in effect that the time of our presence in Vietnam and the devotion of our troops there in support of our position constitute one of the finest hours in our history.

"Fourth is the moral issue of him who will not, as a conscientious objector, support this position by military service. It is self-evident that he can exercise his right to object only if enough men will put their lives on the line to defend his right to object conscientiously. I submit that this is not only unconscionable but immoral.

"Fifth is the moral issue of him who dodges military service by any ruse. His sensitive conscience is seemingly undisturbed by the knowledge that someone must take his place. More despicable and immoral is the one who counsels another called for military service in ways to cheat his country.

"Sixth is the moral issue of bitter, irresponsible, uninformed dissent from official policy, knowing such dissent gives to the enemy aid and comfort—psychological and physical. Such contemptible dishonor to the more than 40,000 men who have died and the more than 100,000 wounded in this conflict, and disservice to the more than half million troops in the field reach the madir of immorality.

"This kind of damaging dissent is all the more reprehensible because the military forces have fought under unprecedented orders not to seek a military victory but to use every reasonable precaution to protect noncombatants, while fighting an enemy who rejected the laws of war and gave no quarter.

"Seventh is the moral issue of the easy way—of remaining silent or of opposing, not because our country is wrong but because being right in this cause is to support that which is expensive, irritating, inconvenient, divisive, and unpopular. Persons who take the easy way should remember the retired 'politician' down in Texas who would rather be right than be president.

"Eighth is the moral issue of whether the United States is to continue in its reluctant but natural role as the leader of the peoples of the world who would be free. A country which does not keep its word cannot lead very many very far very long.

"Ninth is the moral issue of permitting that excess of freedom which destroys freedom. 'Every form of government has within itself the seeds of its own destruction.' A democracy is especially vulnerable and delicate; it is always one short step away from a mobocracy to which it descends when freedom becomes license. Anti-war protesters in substantial numbers have already reached this level.

"Tenth is the moral issue of allowing the Constitution to be a refuge for those who

would destroy it when and if they can. To interpret the guaranty of constitutional rights as applicable to the activities of disloyal makers of national mischief is to prostitute the meaning and purpose of the Constitution.

"Those are the immense issues of personal, national and international morality involved. The price of abandoning high principles and a firm moral stance is national self-contempt and mortification unless traditional values have been so diluted or forsaken that our country has lost its soul.

"Some of us have felt on occasion a sudden mysterious breeze on a tranquil day and for which there seemed to be no explanation. From the distant past has come the belief founded in the wisdom of the ages that this phenomenon is God sighing when the most beloved of his creations reach for the noble heights of which He made them capable—and they falter because in the ultimate push too many are too weak, too selfish, too thoughtless, too cowardly, too faithless, too immoral.

"If this should be true, there will be that sudden, mysterious breeze, somewhat stronger than usual, blowing across our land this mid-week. And we will know the reason why."

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL TRENDS IN THE 1970'S

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in a speech to the Arkansas Petroleum Council on October 15, James G. Morton, director of Government relations for the Manufacturing Chemists Association, presented a thorough, realistic appraisal of this Nation's economic and political outlook for the 1970's.

Mr. Morton, an able substitute for our distinguished colleague from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), who served as special assistant to three Secretaries of the Department of Commerce, stated that the economic and social problems of the next decade will have no simple solutions. He predicted, however, that the American business community will lend a great deal of support to our efforts to solve these problems and that the individual businessman will be much more issue oriented, pragmatic, and public-service minded than heretofore.

I wish to insert the text of Mr. Morton's remarks at this point in the RECORD, and I trust that the business community will take his pertinent suggestions to heart:

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL TRENDS IN THE 1970'S (Remarks by James G. Morton before the Arkansas Petroleum Council, Oct. 15, 1969)

It is a pleasure to be here today to pinch-hit for my friend, David Pryor. I always welcome the opportunity to return to this land of scenic wonders and warm-hearted, down-to-earth people. The new dynamism in Arkansas is as invigorating as the mountain air; it gives exciting promise to your future.

Congressman Pryor has earned a reputation in Washington for wit, charm, and eloquence—all of which are well known to the people of Arkansas. He is one of the bright young leaders on the national scene. It thus took considerable temerity on my part to agree to appear in his place.

For me to come here was like a bench warmer replacing Bill Montgomery in the

backfield of the Razorbacks. But, come to think of it, it is a more welcome assignment than Wichita State faces a week from Saturday.

Economic forecasting is being followed with no less enthusiasm than football predictions these days, even in Arkansas. So I shall try to sketch a few dimensions of our economic future and also size up the changing shape of American politics in the 1970's.

As our country proceeds into the final third of the 20th Century swift and sweeping changes are occurring in our economic life as well as in our politics.

Powerful forces of growth and change produced by the wave of new technology are, indeed, remaking America. We should welcome the challenges of change, not fear them. But the transition will be more satisfactorily negotiated if we achieve an adequate measure of control over the forces affecting our future.

This is easier said than done, of course, as one perceives in our frustrated efforts to end the war in Vietnam and dampen the fires of inflation. These two complicated and difficult tasks relate in various ways to nearly all our other major problems.

President Nixon is finding, like Lyndon Johnson, that unless he succeeds in ameliorating the Vietnam situation there are narrow limits on what else he may accomplish.

Equally vital to our nation's future and to each of us as individuals is the urgent need to curb inflation. The noted economist George Hagedorn recently penned a proverb for our times when he wrote: "Fear of inflation is the beginning of economic wisdom."

The Administration is following a carefully gauged path of gradualism to contain inflationary forces rather than risk disrupting the economy by slamming on the brakes.

The object is to lessen inflationary pressures effectively while minimizing the price which must be paid in reduced employment. The President must negotiate the difficult passage between the Scylla of unemployment and the Charybdis of inflation, either of which could prove ruinous in the election year of 1970.

A return to normalcy could well result in an unemployment rate of four and a half to five percent in the first half of next year. That might be tolerable in some circumstances, perhaps, but under present conditions it would have to be offset by governmental actions to alleviate the effects on the ghettos. Increased idleness among Negroes could be explosive.

The unemployment rate reached four percent in September, the rate which prevailed during the high employment economy prior to escalation of the military effort in Vietnam.

This sign was read with much hope by the Nixon Administration that restraints are working and the economy is cooling off.

One hopes the return to more normal, sustainable employment levels indicates that we are getting inflation under control but there is no firm evidence that increased unemployment will spell the end of either inflation or high interest rates.

The experts now think they see the top of the price spiral but this kind of forecasting is at best chancy business. A certain amount of wishful thinking influences economic analysis when one is fighting inflation psychology. It is, in fact, essential in striving to dispel hedge buying and other inflationary practices.

The picture at this point is mixed and one can interpret the indicators either way. Several basic indicators clearly suggest undiminished strength in the economy. Personal income is expanding and further large increases are in prospect during the coming months. A continuing strong flow of income will be translated into large spending by consumers.

Industrial production has been increasing at a brisk pace and new orders show no

slackening. Consumer spending, marked by increased purchases of services of all kinds, continues strong. These are scant signs of a moderating economy in these key indicators.

The root-cause of inflation is rising costs—labor costs, interest rates, insurance, construction costs, but especially labor costs. In key industries the two and three year contracts provide wage hikes substantially in excess of productivity increases.

Taking the steel industry, as an example, workers were granted a 7-8 percent wage increase last year. The contract automatically gave them another six percent rise on August 1 of this year and another sizable increase will take effect next year. Steel prices have been rising as a consequence and the effects are felt in widening circles throughout the economy.

In assessing the economic outlook one can reasonably anticipate that inflationary restraints will take hold in a significant way in the period ahead, most pronouncedly in the first quarter of next year.

It is predictable that—

The unemployment rate will continue its uptrend.

Plant and equipment spending will head downward after this quarter.

Housing will suffer the effects of credit restraints for a prolonged period.

Corporate profits will lag as a result of the tightening squeeze.

On the other hand, the cost of living is likely to continue upward after the end of the year. Some easing may be expected if food prices cease to rise. Cost of services will continue their 9% inflationary pace. Wage increases are apt to counteract some of the anti-inflationary gains as they are translated into consumer spending.

While we will continue to feel the troublesome effects of inflation for some months to come, it appears at least to be slowing from a gallop to a trot. The consequences of the readjustment will be painful to many Americans, most particularly in lost jobs.

The Administration has failed to utilize moral suasion and public opinion to help hold the line on wages and prices. The failure to act will draw mounting criticism unless the President takes the inflation issue to the people. It is my belief he will not delay longer in employing the power and prestige of his office to demand price and wage restraints, the latter being related to productivity increases.

The passing problems we are experiencing, however, should not obscure the long-term prospects of the giant American economy. In any direction we look the potentials are breathtaking.

Sometime next year or the year after—depending on the rate of growth and the rate of inflation—the Gross National Product of the United States will cross the trillion-dollar mark.

That is a fantastic figure, far beyond the comprehension of the ordinary mortal. It will be an economic high water mark for all history. It could be achieved only by a fantastically productive economy like ours.

It will be more than a tribute to the American system; it will provide us the means to better that system for ourselves and for every citizen.

The petroleum industry will play its full part in this economic miracle, in the future as in the past.

The total value of crude, natural gas liquids, and natural gas produced in the United States last year topped \$14 billion—some \$83 million produced by you here in Arkansas.

Crude oil is the leading mineral product of the United States in value—as it is also in your own state.

Our increasingly industrialized, increasingly mobile society will continue to demand energy in enormous quantities. This is no less true of the rest of the world as living standards rise and mobility becomes an imperative.

Oil and gas will supply nearly three quarters of the world's demand for energy in the foreseeable future, particularly since the prospects for nuclear energy, while they remain bright, are not as glowing as once appeared.

Moreover, petroleum is growing in significance as a life stream of the burgeoning organic chemical industry. It provides the basis for almost nine-tenths of the organic chemicals manufactured in the United States—and the demand for petrochemicals is expanding at the rate of 9% to 10% a year.

I might finally add that oil and gas account for nine-tenths of the space heating that keeps Americans living and working in comfort.

There has been so much controversy over import quotas lately that people forget that petroleum and petroleum products contribute to our export performance as well—\$350 million last year in the face of the stiffest kind of foreign competition.

The most sensational new development is, of course, the emergence of the North Slope of Alaska with its tremendous potential for production. That prospect has already resulted in bringing to reality the dream of explorers over the centuries—the commercial use of the Northwest Passage. The maiden voyage of the S.S. Manhattan was clearly an outstanding success, and she will be repeating that trip this coming spring.

In the years to come, a fleet of giant tankers will carry fuel to the oil-hungry East Coast. Alaskan oil will also be going by pipeline and tanker to our rapidly growing and rapidly industrializing Pacific Coast states.

Do any clouds darken the far horizon? Some of you, I suspect, are already worrying about the electric automobile. But the best forecasts I can get from experts in and out of government is that this is many years—fifteen at a minimum—away from being a practical possibility for the many millions of American drivers. That gives ample time for the scientists and technologists to develop a smog-free fossil-fueled automobile engine—and I have enough confidence in the creative ingenuity of Americans to believe they will find the answer.

It is exciting to consider the majestic panorama of the American economy in the year 1975—only half a decade from now. Our population will number more than 218 million. This means an average increase of 2.4 million a year between now and then, portending very large market growth.

On the assumption we will maintain a 4% annual rate of real GNP growth and prices increase only moderately, the Gross National Product in 1975 would soar to \$1,200 billion—that's one trillion, 200 billion or, putting it in a time frame, \$2 million per minute.

Projections of the National Industrial Conference Board show that less than one-fourth of the families will have an income of less than \$5,000 in 1975, down from one-third in this decade. The proportion of families falling within the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range will be only 34% in 1975, down from 43% a decade before.

But the dramatic shift takes place in the proportion of families with incomes over \$10,000: an increase to 42% in 1975 from 25% a decade earlier.

Thus, a substantial shift into upper income ranges is expected in the 1970's—a fact with far reaching implications for the kinds of consumer goods and services which will be in future demand.

Petroleum will have a prominent place in this stupendous market growth. One needs only to consider the housing demands and transportation required of this kind of economy to gain perspective of the potential. It will not be surprising if new car purchases exceed 13 million in 1975.

I would like to turn now briefly to the political scene. Perhaps one of the most pro-

found changes which will occur in politics in the 1970's will be in the makeup and in the philosophies of the major political parties themselves.

The political landscape today is cluttered with obsolescent and decaying structures which are giving way to the new ideas and the realities and the challenges of our times.

In the South, for example, we see the emergence of a two-party system in place of the monolithic structure which had prevailed for nearly a century following the Reconstruction. The term "the Solid South" is a political anachronism buried under the economic and social upheavals of the new day. This will benefit the South because it will no longer be politically like the good wife who is taken for granted.

We see a spreading revolt against some of the outworn political machines which once held many of our major population centers in the tight grip of powerful big city bosses.

We see a decline in the political power of the agricultural bloc as more than seventy percent of the American people now live on one percent of our land area in dense urban concentrations.

We see a breaking up of the old coalitions and alliances of minority groups, hypheated Americans, the underprivileged and the exploited who were joined by common fears and misery.

The broadening stream of a well educated, industrious, and prospering American middle class is producing an evolution, if not a revolution, in the ideologies, philosophy, and assumptions which had cast the mold of politics in America since the Roosevelt years.

There are few indications that the Nixon domestic program will differ to any substantive degree from the Johnson domestic program. One might conclude that in the present day of complex, difficult, and costly national problems, disagreement centers not on the definition of fundamental objectives but on the approach for attaining the objectives.

This could well mean that politics in the 1970's will be strongly influenced by demonstrated management ability in government. Certainly more and more Americans are going to insist on more efficient and economical management of the Federal Government from planning and the ordering of priorities to productivity and cost effectiveness.

There are clear signs of this in the debate over reform of the postal system, as an illustration.

There seems to be a turning of the tide in the flow of organized labor toward one political party and business toward the opposing party. This is a welcome development because it would prove extremely unfortunate if labor and business were to become polarized into opposing political parties which would thus become their captives.

We have only to consider the difficulties of England today to comprehend the danger. The strength of our society rests to an important degree on our broad diversity and the free running streams of pluralism. We invigorate and enhance our two-party system by ensuring that each preserves diversity and a certain universality within its framework.

Both the Republican and the Democratic parties need the wisdom, experience, innovative talents, and resourcefulness of businessmen. The problems of our times are of such scale and complexity that we shall not find satisfactory solutions to many without the full participation of businessmen.

American businessmen have had a leading role in building for our nation the world's largest, strongest, and most productive economy. Without our great economic leaps forward there would be small hope of eliminating squalor and want.

The government cannot decree economic success; but it can help set the conditions for businessmen to achieve it. This is the essence of the constructive partnership that holds real hope for the attainment of our

social objectives as well as continued economic progress.

It is extremely unfortunate that so many people in public life who should know better persist in pursuing a business-baiting course which too often exaggerates the shortcomings of industry while obscuring its towering contributions to social and economic gains which have made our country the envy of the world.

To the well-intentioned but misguided business-baiters I say let's cease those tactics which tend to create general distrust of the business community and undermine confidence in our economic system.

We should and must continue to eliminate abuse and shoddy practice wherever we find it but let us reject those who paint businessmen as villains in order to obtain headlines.

Our system isn't perfect; nor will it ever be. But no system has worked so well for so many. We must exercise great care in our actions affecting the economic engine that has taken us so far so fast.

In assessing the shape of politics in the 1970's I predict that businessmen will take a broader, more energetic and enlightened role in public affairs than at any time in the past.

It is also predictable that businessmen will increasingly support candidates of both parties who understand the problems and the needs of business. I think the healthy pragmatism which has characterized business decision-making will assert itself in the political sphere. It is difficult to conceive of a modern day business executives persisting in dogmatic loyalties which have come to be empty of meaning.

In the 1970's the business executive will not buy dogma and demagoguery; he will be issue-oriented and will carefully assess the plans and alternatives proposed by the candidates. His loyalty will be less to a political party and more to those who set the conditions that are good for our economic system irrespective of political affiliation.

Finally I would like to say that I feel we are approaching a new political epoch in the 1970's. Perhaps at this moment there is not apparent on the scene the ideas and the inspirational drive which mark great political movements.

But it is my belief that a powerful new political movement is in the making.

There has never been a great civilization which has not had as its seat great cities. We cannot continue as the world's leading nation if we permit our cities to decay.

Rather must we build cities of beauty and splendor worthy of the real America. These cities must be more than the mirror of our advances in science, medicine, the arts, architecture, literature, commerce and industry.

They must shine as examples for the world that in a free society all things are possible—and that they are possible for all. The next truly great political movement in America will in my judgment embody this assumption.

This movement is now awaiting its leader who may well become the next political giant in our history. He will succeed only if he draws upon the strengths of the great mainstream of middle class America which, in truth, provides the foundations for building a renewed and better nation.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a detailed and thoughtful letter from Noble Lee, dean of the John

Marshall Law School in Chicago on the subject of the Selective Service Act. In his four-page letter to me, Dean Lee discusses his remedies for the current inequalities, particularly in the area of deferments and exemptions from military service. Dean Lee's letter follows:

THE JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL,
Chicago, Ill., October 28, 1969.

HON. RICHARD BOLLING,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOLLING: In the Chicago Sun-Times for Sunday October 26, there appeared a story concerning your endeavor to amend the present draft law. After twenty-eight years as a member of the House of Representatives of the Illinois General Assembly (as a maverick Republican), I have some conception of what you are up against, both as to "bucking" the administration and as to "bucking" a plan that has a tremendous lot of undeserved but quite understandable backing.

While I do not know the extent of the amendments in which you are interested, nevertheless I heartily concur in your opposition to continuing to make college boys a specially favored class.

Admittedly, as a veteran of World War I, I rank as antediluvian. However, I feel that it has been a terrible mistake that for years we as a people have failed to emphasize military service simply as a primary obligation of every man.

In the course which I teach in Illinois Constitutional Law, I have emphasized for thirty years the simple proposition that, for practical purposes, ours can be deemed the only nation in the world which, at the same time it drafts its manpower for military service, nevertheless pays the market value of the services for which they were drafted. The Ordinance of 1787 embodies the first geographically widespread application of the principle that the government can take neither the property nor the services of an individual except for public use and upon payment of full, fair compensation.

In every country in Europe, including Great Britain, a drafted man is not "paid" in the American sense, but merely gets a tiny spending-money allowance—a few cents per day, since his country is, legally, the paramount owner of his services. By contrast, except for the artificial effect of the maintenance of the union scale in a city like Chicago, the American Army private gets in cash, clothing, food, shelter and medical service the full equivalent of what he would earn on the basis of a forty-hour week at common labor.

It has been somewhat of a struggle to convince our students (85% of whom have college degrees and the remainder the legal minimum of three years of college) that our constitutional provision does not refer to what they may be earning presently or may aspire to earn or may be capable of earning, but means merely the market rate for the kind and rating of services for which they are drafted—and that in the scale of "labor" in any military establishment, a private is "common labor", (my own rank for 27 months in W.W.I.). However, I must say that when hammered upon, the idea gradually sinks in, and I have even overheard students unaware of my presence, "show off" their superior knowledge by stating this fact in arguments with others—thus indicating their acceptance of the thesis.

Both in classes and at our semi-annual commencement exercises, I have never failed to emphasize the debt under which every man lives and the fact that the debt exists whether he likes it or not, and furthermore, that it cannot be repaid to his actual creditors because, with the exception probably of their immediate families, their creditors have been dead for years or centuries, and they

are living on the accumulative bounty handed down to them by those who have gone before. Consequently, the only conceivable method of repayment—on a moral basis at least—is repayment in kind to their contemporaries and to their successors.

It is always easy to point out that whether they like it or not, the sovereign body politic always has, and historically had, the legal right to make such use of its members as is deemed necessary by the policy determining body in that body politic. Even in this republic, with the highest range of freedom of choice existing anywhere, the individual's freedom of choice is still subject to the completely involuntary obligation which fell upon him by the fact of birth.

I have watched with distress for the whole period since 1950 the growth of the resentment against the existence of this obligation and even greater resentment against satisfying it, in any fashion. Despite the high-flown vocabulary which now attaches to all sorts of manifestations of "dissent," the basic fact remains that its evolution and growth in the last two decades has been based upon fear and self-centered unwillingness. These are harsh words, but their truth was much more apparent ten and twelve years ago than it is today, because now an aura of respectability and intellectualism serves as a camouflage for baser motives.

The final crown of respectability was placed upon the entire "dissent" philosophy by virtue of the fact that at the present time a tremendous proportion of the men teachers in both secondary schools and colleges have managed to use the inequities of the selective service system to avoid completely the performance of a military service obligation. Consequently (in the Freudian jargon which is their habitual language), to justify themselves in their own past draft-dodging, they need to place their actions on some high moral plane, regardless of truth or fact. I have watched, personally, too many specific instances of this sort of evolution to have any doubt as to either its reality or its efficacy.

To get down to earth, it seems to me the only conceivable answer is to stop the nonsense of "selective" service—because no selection can ever be anything but arbitrary and discriminatory, if by no factor other than the human fallibility of its inevitably bureaucratic administration.

Therefore the only remedy that I can conceive of which is consistent with our basic concept of the legal equality of men is to replace "selective" service with universal service. Nothing could more completely fulfill the demands of "democracy."

The only exceptions I can contemplate with equanimity would be those due to a substantial physical impediment. In World War I, every European nation engaged made no such nonsensical exception as flatfeet, poor eye-sight, and the host of actually non-interfering ailments which can beset man. They merely put these persons at work in non-combat services—depots of all sorts, offices, administrative jobs, etc. I can well recall a French general, commander of a combat division, laughing himself nearly sick at the thought of my having been turned down three times by the American Army on account of poor eye-sight and a left elbow broken so that the arm has never been full straight since—but finally getting into the American Army by the expedient of an early morning examination by an American Army doctor in Paris whose idea of a complete physical examination was to take my pulse and blood pressure—and then write up the rest of the record showing me to be a perfect physical specimen.

If every young man were compelled to serve, unless manifestly unable to do even office work or tend the lawn in front of the

Officers Club at Otis Air Base—the present antagonisms would never conceivably have developed to the point they have now reached. Everyone would have known that everyone else was "in the same pot," and that those on the "soft" jobs were rated unfit for anything else—or else were men who had re-enlisted voluntarily and wanted to make it a career.

The overall period of service could have been reduced to eighteen months—in spite of Army objections. A semi-active reserve status of five years could easily have been attached—even without a really wasted two weeks annually in camp.

The knowledge of the inevitability and the universality of service would have brought it down to a very commonplace incident instead of an avoidable accident. It is the incredible discriminations which have gone on under the selective service system, and the possibility of utilizing "escapes" within the limits of that system until a person reached the age of twenty-seven and was deemed entirely "out of range" which have been the all-pervasive basic and continuously operative cause—out of which so many ancillary discontents have grown.

In view of the fearful waste of time that goes on in military training, eighteen months would have been adequate to cover a nine month tour of duty in Vietnam—if that were deemed necessary—by every able-bodied man—plenty of others in the services of supply. In both World Wars, three months—and even in many cases within my own personal knowledge, seven weeks was considered adequate before a man was sent out to join a combat unit as a replacement in France, as soon as he could get there. I have seen men in trenches in 1918 ten weeks after they exchanged their civilian clothes for uniforms. I am not advocating that but merely, to me, it illustrates the large part of the fallacy in the opposition of the military establishment to any 18-month service. Further proof of the fallacy is afforded by the ease of early discharge, throughout the entire last decade, when men have gotten out four months and even longer, before the date when their two years were up, on an incredibly wide variety of excuses—but including that of going to college.

Universal service could also answer in a manner which I conclude from the newspaper is along your own line of thinking, the present discrimination in favor of those able to attend college.

It would be necessary only to provide that upon the attainment of the specified age, every man would be examined to ascertain his fitness for service in one form or another, or else his outright unfitness for any service. If fit for service, he could immediately be inducted and then given a leave for a specified period of time to attend college, subject to the maintenance of scholastic standards. However, he would already be in the service, so there would be no possibility of this type of educational deferment being employed as a long stride toward ultimate, complete avoidance as is the case today.

This would, even more effectively than the President's lottery scheme, terminate uncertainty and fraud. Furthermore, all of the services can well use college-trained men, so the educational advantage they derive through the postponement is something by which the services themselves would benefit.

This is the present method of operation under the ROTC system. We now have in this law school three young men who received commissions as Second Lieutenants of Infantry upon graduating from college, after ROTC training. They are in law school subject to maintenance of the required academic standards, but completely and expressly within the scope of the military forces, so that there can be no argument, upon their completing this law course, of their performance of their obligation.

Furthermore, in the case of this and other professional schools, the professional training can in many cases be of great utility to the armed services. For example, by decision of United States Supreme Court, the Armed Forces are compelled to make some kind of arrangement to have an actual attorney involved in General Court-martials. Whether the three students in this category which we now have will become part of the official JAC establishment is beside the point. If they do not, they will very definitely be law officers by virtue of that decision, since it will be a long time before there are sufficient to satisfy the requirements of that Supreme Court opinion.

Despite my strong feelings on the subject, this is the first time I have written to a member of Congress about it—and unquestionably that is part of the explanation for my present verbosity. I have discussed this matter several times with Senator Dirksen (my friend for 30 years) and as recently as four months ago, he told me that the idea of universal service had grown to impress him more and more, and he felt that the principle involved would go a long way toward quieting the discontent.

In any event, I wish you success in bringing the academic world back into the field of reality, rather than special privilege.

Yours very truly,

NOBLE W. LEE,
Dean.

EDITORIAL IN PRAISE OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Herald Traveler today did for it what is quite unusual. It ran a front-page editorial in praise of President Nixon's speech on Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial makes the point that no President has ever needed—or deserved—the Nation's support more than this President.

I commend it as must reading for all, regardless of their personal convictions, as follows:

President Nixon last night offered the United States the leadership which Americans elected him to provide. There can be no question but that the nation will respond with the strength and support Mr. Nixon clearly needs and merits.

The Nixon Doctrine, first proclaimed in a statement issued by the President in Guam and now applied for the first time in our history, is simply this: We will support freedom and self-determination—but those who would be free must be prepared to fight for it.

In Vietnam, the progress already made as a result of accelerated training of native troops is encouraging. For the first time since we began escalation of our direct military involvement, we are reducing the number of American troops in the battle zone. Under Mr. Nixon's plan, the process will continue until he has undone the situation which he inherited.

It was a speech completely free of any promise of instant solution. It was an uncomfortable speech, thorny with facts. It was definitely not a speech for Camelot: in the difficult months ahead, we were told, we will have to achieve our goal despite inclement conditions which we cannot control by fiat of fantasy. But what the speech may have

lacked in charisma, it made up for in candor: the President spoke to us as though we were responsible adults. He will find his fellow citizens to be both—responsible and adult.

Stripped of decorative and even slippery language, the choices forcing us were, after all, pitifully few. We could have decided to attack North Vietnam and "end all the nonsense." We could have decided to lose—to get out and forget our promises and close our eyes to the massacres that would have followed. We could have elected to continue as we have been doing since the first 16,000 American soldiers were committed in the beginning of this decade. We did not in conscience want the first. We could not stomach the second. We might have had difficulty surviving the third.

Therefore, only one other course remained: to do what we should have done from the beginning, to help the Vietnamese take over their own fight for their own right to self-determination.

This is the direction that has been chosen. It is the right direction.

Never has an American President needed the nation's support more. Never has one deserved it more.

A MOTHER'S THOUGHTS
ON VIETNAM

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, with more and more voices being heard on our role in Vietnam, a mother from my district has written me of her wish to make her feelings known. She is Mrs. John Scull, of Glen Ellyn, Ill., and her son was killed in Vietnam in 1966. I believe her story should be heard:

GLEN ELLYN, ILL.,
October 28, 1969.

To all demonstrators against the war in Vietnam:

So you hate war.

You hate it because it kills, wastes, and destroys.

Other Americans have also despaired of the killing, the waste, and the destruction in Vietnam; but they did not surrender, they did not demonstrate, and most did not complain. Their commitment to democracy was firm and unyielding. These Americans served their country, obeyed its laws, fought and died, probably hating war more than you do.

As demonstrators for immediate withdrawal you have chosen to abandon them, to "bug out" on responsibilities that are distasteful to you and, inadvertent as it may be, to aid and abet the cause of communism.

You vigorously pursue the rights bestowed upon you with the blood of generations of American men who fought to keep alive the democracy that many of you have not helped to earn and that some of you are unwilling to defend. I submit that most of you have squandered their magnificent legacy upon yourselves with no thought of generations to come.

It may well be that destiny has been kind to my beloved son, whose death among thousands of others you profess to mourn, for he is not here to endure the treachery of your pursuit of peace at any price and your willingness to deny the value of his participation in a war he felt to be justified.

The memory of my sweet, gentle son is vivid and needs no prodding from demonstrations of those who hate war but not enough to hate both sides of it—theirs and ours.

When you are ready to take your long list of war dead to the streets of North Vietnam, to sing your songs in the by-ways of Red China, to utter your prayers and shout your speeches in the factories of Russia . . . then I will be ready to clasp you to my heart, join you in your pleas and stand beside you in your cause . . . unto death . . . because you see my son, too, hated war.

Mrs. JOHN J. SCULL.

THE AMERICAN TERRITORIES
OF TODAY AND TOMORROW

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, some 2 years ago the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration instituted a scholarly series of conferences to provide a wider channel of communication between the archivist, the academic historian, and those interested in our Nation's documentary heritage.

Last evening I had the honor to be invited to attend the fifth in this series of conferences which concerned the history of the U.S. Territories. One of the distinguished speakers of the evening was the Hon. Harrison Loesch, assistant secretary for Public Land Management, Department of the Interior. The remarks of Assistant Secretary Loesch convey an excellent and basic understanding of American territorial developments. For this reason, I recommend that my colleagues take the opportunity to read the interesting statement of Assistant Secretary Loesch, entitled "The American Territories of Today and Tomorrow," which I include with these brief remarks:

THE AMERICAN TERRITORIES OF TODAY AND
TOMORROW

(By Harrison Loesch)

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: Thank you for the honor of speaking to you this evening. A review of your conference program shows aspects of the history of U.S. territories being brought sharply into focus. The papers you receive will be valuable to those who later do research in this field.

The National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration is to be commended not only for its contribution in this regard but also for its timing—a number of important events are occurring in the territories, with a rising tempo in the near future. Before I discuss the present and future, however, a brief reference to the past may be helpful in setting the scene.

By 1925 the United States had acquired all of the geographic areas which came to be known as the insular possessions or territories of the United States, and Cuba already had been granted independence only four years after the Treaty of Paris.

The territories of the United States were acquired by purchase, conquest, and cession. Alaska and the Virgin Islands were purchased. Hawaii and American Samoa became associated with the United States through acts of cession. Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Philippines came to us as a result of the Spanish American War and its Treaty of Paris.

The manner in which these areas were acquired, while perhaps interesting histori-

cally, bears no relation to how they were and are administered, or to their ultimate destiny.

The Constitution of the United States, Article IV—Section 3, vests in the Congress plenary authority with respect to territories. Since 1900 the Congress had dealt with the insular territorial areas on an individual basis, making provision for each according to its needs and, generally, the desires of its people. This action, over the years, has taken various forms resulting in a variety of kinds and degrees of political status. Independence, Commonwealth status, organized and unorganized, incorporated and unincorporated, and statehood are the terms we associate with territorial political development.

Independence, granted to Cuba and the Philippines, and statehood, accorded Alaska and Hawaii, are well understood terms. Between these polar extremes of self-government, our system, as implemented by the Congress and by the Executive, has had flexibility for the accommodation of varying needs of different cultures, economies, and heritages. The method takes into account the dynamics of social and political development and growth. It has seen simple forms freely evolve into other, more advanced institutional arrangements.

Defining our terms:

Whether or not a territory is organized is determined by whether the U.S. Congress has enacted organic legislation defining the form of the territorial government. Incorporation means that the territory is under the umbrella of the Constitution of the United States, and the term has carried with it an implied promise of ultimate Statehood.

Commonwealth status has no constitutional basis, but in different forms was created for the Philippines and Puerto Rico as those areas reached higher stages in their development and capability for independent administration.

Prior to statehood, Alaska and Hawaii were organized, incorporated territories. The Virgin Islands and Guam are organized, unincorporated territories, and American Samoa is unorganized and unincorporated.

Immediately after World War II, the United States became involved in an entirely new sort of territorial concern. Pursuant to a Trusteeship Agreement between the United States and the Security Council of the United Nations, we assumed full responsibility for and complete jurisdiction over a vast area in the Western Pacific called the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. But this strategic trust does not result in sovereignty, as such, over Micronesia.

Today, as the overseeing Assistant Secretary, my involvement is with the present and future of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Micronesia. The Department of the Interior is charged with responsibility for other small insular possessions but our concerns with those areas are different. They are largely uninhabited, uninhabitable specks of land as to which, oddly enough, sovereignty is sometimes disputed.

The Department of the Interior is not officially concerned with areas such as the Panama Canal Zone or the Ryukyu (re-yoú-kuh) Islands, which include Okinawa, and are administered by the Department of the Army. The leased Canal Zone and Okinawa are not considered to be American territories.

The four areas which I have said concern us most vitally today fall into three levels of association with the United States.

Let us look first at American Samoa.

Situated some 2400 miles south of Hawaii and 26 degrees south of the equator, the territory of American Samoa consists of the principal island of Tutuila, Two-twilah; the small island of Annu'u (ah-nú-oo); just off the eastern end of Tutuila; the three small Islands of the Manu'a (Mah-nu-ah) group eight miles away; and, two hundred miles from Tutuila, Swains' Island, A coral atoll about a mile in diameter.

In 1925, Swains, geographically part of the Tokelau (Tok-a-low) Islands, was extended U.S. sovereignty and appended to American Samoa for administration in recognition of its private ownership by an American citizen.

The population of the territory is about 30,000. Its citizens are our nationals. As such, while not citizens, they owe permanent allegiance to the United States.

The territory is still heavily dependent upon grants appropriated to it annually by the Congress as a part of the Department of the Interior budget. In recent years, the ratio between local revenues and appropriated grants has changed. The increasing local revenues will soon equal half the fiscal needs of the territory.

While the territorial government remains the largest single employer, rapid improvement in the private sector accounts for the economic growth. Two major fish canneries process tuna delivered to them by foreign fishing fleets and in turn support an operation by the American Can Company and create a substantial business in supplying petroleum products to the fishing fleets. The newest and still developing industry is tourism.

Politically, American Samoa is an unorganized, unincorporated territory. Congress decrees that the President shall be responsible for the government of the territory. That responsibility has been delegated to the Secretary of the Interior, and was discharged initially through the promulgation of Secretarial Orders creating a three branch government for the territory patterned upon our own democratic form.

Secretarial direction has been superseded now, however, by Secretarial sanction and promulgation of a constitution created through the efforts of a constitutional convention held by the people of American Samoa. That constitution, locally drafted and ratified by the electorate, is the basis for the government of the territory today.

The Virgin Islands and Guam illustrate another level of status or development.

The territory of Guam is a single island, with a population of approximately 100,000. The Guamanians are citizens of the United States, as of course are the considerable numbers of military personnel and their dependents who are stationed there.

The Virgin Islands—St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix—in the Caribbean about eighty miles east of Puerto Rico, have a population in excess of 60,000. The Virgin Islanders, too, are United States citizens.

These territories are alike insofar as political status is concerned. Each is an organized, unincorporated territory. The Congress enacted organic legislation for the Virgin Islands in 1936 and added a major revision in 1954. The Guam Organic Act dates from 1950. Since 1954, these two acts have been uniformly amended to maintain virtually identical treatment for the two territories.

Economically Guam is dependent largely upon a private sector devoted to serving the extensive military activities situated there. Light industry and tourism are areas of development yet in their infancy.

The Virgin Islands, on the other hand, have been the beneficiaries of a ten-year economic boom, due largely to the amazing influx of tourists which has stimulated growth in almost every facet of the economy. This is supplemented by the substantial development of the watch movement assembly industry. Heavy industry is limited to an oil refinery and an alumina facility.

Neither territory seeks appropriated Federal funds to support governmental operations, but a special category of funds is appropriated annually to Guam under the terms of the Guam Rehabilitation Act which followed the devastating typhoon which hit the island in 1962.

That Guam and the Virgin Islands do not seek appropriated funds does not mean these

two territories have achieved fiscal self-sufficiency. Each is heavily subsidized.

The Congress has extended the Federal Income Tax to each of the areas with the provision that the tax shall be in the nature of a territorial levy. Collection is made locally and the proceeds are retained by the island governments.

In addition, Guam receives the Federal withholding taxes collected by the United States from persons living or stationed there. That return in fiscal year 1970 will approximate \$7 million.

In the case of the Virgin Islands, Federal law provides for the return annually of Federal excise taxes collected on products of the Virgin Islands shipped to the United States, to the extent that such funds are matched by local revenues.

In recent years such local revenues have risen to far exceed the amount of excise taxes collected, with the result that each year the territory receives the entire amount of such excise tax collections less only refunds and costs of collection. In fiscal year 1970 the return to the Virgin Islands of the so-called "matching funds" will reach \$11.2 million.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Micronesia—occupies a third category. Spread over an area of the western Pacific slightly larger than the United States, it consists of about 2,000 islands, of which approximately 120 are inhabited. The total population is about 94,000.

The responsibility for discharging our trust obligations with respect to Micronesia is vested in the Secretary of the Interior, who consults with the Departments of State and Defense on matters involving defense and foreign policy.

The government of Micronesia has its basis in Secretarial Orders promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior. The form of government is like that of the territories of the United States—an executive branch, an independent judiciary, and an elected legislature, called the Congress of Micronesia.

Economically, Micronesia is the most under-developed of the areas with which we are concerned. It must rely upon Federally appropriated grants for 98 per cent of its annual budget. Economic growth in the private sector, while improving, still leaves much to be desired, and this is an area on which we shall concentrate in the next few years.

This, then, is where we are today.

Within the framework of the governments I have described, each of the areas administers its own affairs with a minimum of Federal intervention. This is consistent with our policy of according the maximum degree of home rule consistent with the level of development and ability in each of the areas.

As we consider the existing relationship between the territories and the United States and speculate upon the future of these areas, we cannot escape awareness of the international concern with "colonialism", old or new.

In the parlance of the United Nations, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands are categorized as non-self governing territories and, as such, are of concern to the United Nations General Assembly's "Special Committee on the Situation With Regard To The Implementation Of The Declaration On The Granting Of Independence To Colonial Countries And Peoples." This mouthful is better known as the "U.N. Committee of 24."

Micronesia and its development are under the particularly close scrutiny of the Trusteeship Council to which the Security Council has delegated its review responsibilities for this strategic trusteeship.

The United States, usually as a part of an international political ploy, is charged from time to time with maintaining a colonial posture. It is said we are not doing enough soon enough in the discharge of our "obligation" to permit the peoples of the territories and Micronesia to choose their destiny

through self-determination. I cannot agree with such charges.

An examination of our history will prove that we have never been a colonial power in any traditional sense. People in the off-shore areas have been, and are, free to work out political relationships with the United States best suited to their circumstances. It would be difficult to document an instance which might be construed as exploitation of those peoples or their resources. Over the years an element of our territorial policy has been to give rather than to take.

Neither has our policy been static nor directed toward maintenance of the status quo. As time, circumstances, and most particularly the wishes of the people of the territories have required changes in our relationships, those changes have been made. Not all at once and not always in the fullness the people desire at any given time, perhaps, but they occur.

Our policy does not lay down inflexible rules requiring a certain level of "progress" before making changes. If it did it could not be responsive as it must be to the wishes of the people. Our past performance is illustrative of how our system works, but it is not binding precedent.

This policy, system or approach is not a newly enunciated one in response to our critics. It is basic to the American philosophy of government and the rights of the people. In 1900 President McKinley, in speaking of the Philippines said "the government they are establishing is designed not for our satisfaction nor for the expression of our theoretical views, but for the happiness, peace and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands."

I need not rely upon a quotation from 1900, however, to support my thesis. In the weeks just past we participated in an extended series of meetings here in Washington with representatives of the people of Micronesia. Those representatives were charged with responsibility for negotiating with the Federal establishment a course of substantive action which will ultimately determine the future policy status of Micronesia.

The course of action can only succeed if the Micronesians on the one hand and the Executive Branch and the Congress on the other, are successful in efforts to meld the aspirations of the people of Micronesia with national and international considerations arising from the realities of today's world. There is no question in my mind but that we will succeed.

Since my involvement in territorial affairs is of quite recent date, it is especially gratifying to me to be able to participate in this intimate way in the deliberations concerning the future political status of Micronesia, starting as we are almost at the beginning of the process. The unique experience is possible only because—as in other areas of modern life—we are moving faster on a geometrical progression.

Our concerns are not, by any means, limited to the future of Micronesians. We are as interested in the other areas I have mentioned.

A major political development involving the Virgin Islands and Guam was the recent enactment of legislation permitting their people to elect their own governors in 1970.

This significant increment of increased home-rule is an example of the flexibility of our system. The people of Alaska and Hawaii were at no time prior to statehood allowed to elect their governors. On the other hand, the citizens of Alaska and Hawaii were bent on achieving statehood.

The peoples of Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands have not spoken out with respect to their views of the desired ultimate status of those territories, although it is a matter of concern and contemplation.

Several years ago the people of the Virgin Islands convened a constitutional conven-

tion and through the report of that body made known to us the views of the people insofar as recommended changes and amendments in the Revised Organic Act are concerned.

In September, an American Samoa Status Commission appeared in Washington after visiting in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. The report of that group is not yet available to us.

In Guam a "constitutional" review group has recently been organized. But a different kind of question also occupies the attention of the people. It has been suggested by some that the time has come to reunify the Marianas in Micronesia with Guam, in view of the historical ties and the present community of interest.

A reunification plebiscite to test local sentiment is being held in the islands of the Northern Marianas and at this very moment the people of Guam, through a plebiscite, are expressing their wish in this regard.

Incorporation of the Marianas into the territory of Guam, if that be the wish of the peoples concerned, could not be accomplished without action by the Congress—and the United Nations would certainly take a position on the question. Furthermore a satisfactory solution for the rest of the Trust Territory would have to be developed.

If the people of the two areas strongly favor such a course, the United States Government would doubtless consider it.

I cannot tell you what the future holds for the territorial areas of the United States. We do not have a grand scheme which plots by day and year the course of their development and their ultimate status.

I submit that it is not for us to devise such a scheme. Their destiny will, I am certain, be more the product of the will of the people than of our judgment as to what is good—or better—or best for them. That is the way it should be.

Our immediate goals are less sweeping than the issue of ultimate status.

The United States citizens resident in the territories are not able to vote in the national elections for President and Vice President. That should be remedied.

None of the territories is represented before the Congress. A non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives may be appropriate.

While the Federal Courts in Guam and the Virgin Islands, created by the Organic Acts of those territories, offer access to the Supreme Court of the United States, the citizens of American Samoa and Micronesia, within those areas, do not have recourse to the Federal Courts. Perhaps they should.

At the local level we intend to assist in every way to insure that the people of the territories, during the period of growth and development, have a government strong enough to serve their needs and an environment conducive to the happiness, peace, and prosperity of which President McKinley spoke, and conducive, as well, to rapid and worthwhile growth politically, economically, and socially.

The environment we envision presupposes the absence of fear—fear of corrupt government, fear of economic instability, fear of adverse external influences, and fear of shortages in physical necessities.

So there we are—our challenge is where do we go from here?

WRITE HANOI FOR BETTER POW TREATMENT

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper article outlines

the gallant efforts of three young ladies of Danville, Va., to organize a chain letter program in behalf of the nearly 1,400 Americans missing or known to be held prisoners by North Vietnam or the Vietcong.

Through this effort, these young ladies have become a meaningful part of a national movement that is gaining momentum to focus worldwide attention on the inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and the continued violation of the Geneva Convention by Hanoi.

The article follows:

[From the Commercial Appeal, Danville (Va.), Oct. 27, 1969]

ORGANIZED EFFORT BEING MADE TO WRITE HANOI CONCERNING POW'S

Three local women, Mrs. Ronald W. Williams, Mrs. John Ryland III, and Mrs. Walter Hodges, have started a chain letter in this area aimed at entreating the North Vietnamese government to grant better treatment and living conditions to American prisoners of war.

First mailed in the Danville area, it is hoped that the letter will be picked up and mailed by more and more Americans, creating a "snowball" effect, with everyone involved writing a letter of protest to the Hanoi government.

In addition to a plea for decent conditions and treatment for American prisoners, the letter also asks that the government in Hanoi release information regarding the welfare and conditions of some 1,400 American soldiers listed as either "missing in action" or "prisoner." To date, the North Vietnamese have not released any word on the 1,000 men listed as missing. It is believed that a number of these men may be held prisoner in the North.

The basic plan of the chain letter is for everyone receiving a copy of it to write to Hanoi. The chain letters are being mailed along with copies of a Register & Bee editorial on the subject, reprinted by J. T. Townes Printing Company. Copies of the letter, itself, were printed by The Commercial Appeal. Roughly 500 copies of the letter and editorial have been started on their way by the ladies mentioned above. Each time these letters are remailed, another 500 letters will hopefully be sent to North Vietnam.

Mrs. Williams asks that anyone receiving a copy of the chain letter and writing to Hanoi try to keep their letters simple and brief. If the letter is to the point and short, it will be more effective. She has hopes that within six months, a total of 250,000 letters will have reached the North Vietnamese government.

All those writing to the Hanoi government should address their letters in this fashion: The Office of the President, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

The chain letter reads in part:

"Yes, I wrote to Hanoi. Won't you please do the same, but do not stop there. Send a copy to your President and Congressman. Let them know you are trying to help. I am not asking you to take a stand on the war, but to take a stand against the inhumane treatment of our servicemen and their families by the government of Hanoi. No man, no government has the right to disregard human feelings so completely for any reason . . ."

"We do not want (the chain link) to be broken until word is received from every American Hanoi is holding. We want the chain to reach around the world to let those serving for our flag and country know we care for them and their families . . ."

"All you have to do is write your letter to the address given in the editorial, add your name to the bottom of this letter and send this one on to a friend . . . If you are not satisfied with adding only one link, let us

know. We will be thrilled to help you add as many as you wish, just write."

"To insure the continuation of the chain after it has left your hands, remember the only one who can carry it through, and ask Him."

QUESTIONS COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTES INVOLVING NATIONWIDE STRIKES

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in the field of labor-management disputes involving nationwide strikes, as presently illustrated in the strike against the General Electric Co., the attention of an increasing number of editorial writers is directed to the proposal of compulsory arbitration. Quite surprisingly, it seems to me, there is widespread doubt that compulsory arbitration is in the general public interest. Today's Wall Street Journal, November 4, carries an editorial which I consider to be of significance. The House Republican Task Force on Labor Law Reform will have this matter under advisement when it confers tomorrow with representatives of the Associated General Contractors.

The Wall Street Journal editorial follows:

ARBITRATION'S ILLUSORY ALLURE

As the strike against General Electric Co. increasingly looks like a long one, more observers are suggesting the dispute should be submitted to compulsory arbitration. The idea has a great deal of appeal to the public, not only in connection with the GE impasse but for other costly and disruptive labor-management confrontations.

The International Union of Electrical Workers and the United Electrical Workers thus may have scored some public relations points when they proposed, less than 24 hours before the strike deadline, that the dispute be submitted to the American Arbitration Association for binding settlement.

It's easy to see why the concept is so appealing. When two parties can't settle a disagreement, submitting it to an impartial third party seems so much more civilized than merely slugging it out. The appeal is even greater when, as in the GE strike, innocent bystanders are sure to be hurt in the slugfest. Arbitration's supporters can argue that the procedure already is used, quite successfully, to handle such matters as workers' grievances.

Despite all of this, any careful examination of arbitration should show up its shortcomings as a method for settling labor contract disputes. It really doesn't matter whether one looks from the vantage point of labor, management or the general public.

Labor unions long have made clear their strong opposition to compulsory arbitration, and for understandable reasons. (The electrical unions' proposal was no more than a political ploy, one that they could be certain that GE would reject, as it did.)

Unions, after all, are not organized to serve merely as social clubs. An individual worker has little power to induce an employer to raise his pay or improve his working conditions, but a large group of workers can at times be extremely persuasive.

For better or for worse, then, a union is a power bloc. If it becomes no more than an information-gathering organization to sub-

mit briefs to an arbitrator, a lot of workers will start to wonder whether they are getting their money's worth for their dues. Find a union that sincerely supports compulsory arbitration, and you've found one that has no faith in its own power.

Power also influences the employers' attitudes. A company that delegates its wage-setting to outsiders, no matter how able they may be, has handed over an important part of the power to run its own business.

Any company must consider the interests of its employees; a disgruntled work force is seldom very productive. At the same time, though, it must consider the interests of its stockholders and the future prospects of the enterprise. If a corporation does not hold its costs at reasonable levels, furthermore, it won't be a reliable source of future jobs.

No company can expect a union to take so broad a view of any dispute, nor can it really expect an arbitrator to do so. While arbitrators may try to arrive at a just solution, their primary object is peace. And whether their decision is binding or not, their goal is usually a settlement that both sides can more or less accept and live with.

Such a goal, however, is hardly ever attainable. Where arbitration has been tried, the common result has been some sort of split-the-difference decision that has left neither side truly satisfied. The decisions thus end one dispute only by assuring future battles.

As that suggests, arbitration also is no solution for a public distressed by disruptive labor disputes. Compulsory arbitration is the law in Australia, and yet strikes are numerous. Unions have become so heavily involved in arguing before national tribunals that local leadership, which might head off local strikes, is too weak to be able to do so.

In the U.S. the balance of power in labor-management relations for too many years has been tilted toward unions, and new legislation is needed to redress the balance. General Electric presumably can take care of itself, but the same cannot be said for many other employers.

Equality in bargaining may be no formula for labor peace. But it surely makes more sense than succumbing to arbitrations' illusory allure.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, Wyoming's superintendent of public instruction, Harry Roberts, delivered a speech October 28 in which he looked not only at the principles of academic freedom but at the problems that have beset the campus of the University of Wyoming in recent days.

Noting that "academic freedom is basic to the educational process," Superintendent Roberts asserted that "we are going to have to define responsible academic freedom versus irresponsible academic freedom." This responsibility, he maintained, rests with the educational community.

Superintendent Roberts has delivered a very thoughtful comment on education and I include his speech at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PERILS TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Today across our country we are witnessing a process of change on many university campuses. There has always been change, and

certainly we couldn't exist today with the same educational programs that were in common use 50 or 100 years ago.

It's how this change occurs that creates the problem. No one can, or should, condone illegal or destructive acts, many of which we have seen during the last few years. The majority of our universities and colleges have established better communications between boards, administration, faculty and students. This is on the plus side of the ledger. All of these segments on the college campus should be in close communication if we are to maintain our universities as the prime sources of knowledge for those wishing post high school degrees.

During the last two weeks we have seen the first significant sign of dissent on our own university campus at Laramie. At this point I would commend the board, the administration, the faculty and the students for their handling of the situation. If responsibility had not been part of the picture an explosive situation could have occurred.

Academic freedom is basic to the educational process. Academic freedom might be defined as the free contest of ideas and the right of the instructional staff to teach what they think is important, without limitation of expression of points of view. Let me make it clear that I support academic freedom, but I say it must be responsible freedom. Harold Howe, Commissioner of Education during the Johnson Administration said that university instructors should be free to criticize on the basis of responsible knowledge, and I would emphasize the last part of that sentence 'the basis of responsible knowledge.'

In my opinion there are certain responsibilities that must accompany academic freedom and I would suggest that somewhere along the line, we are going to have to define responsible academic freedom versus irresponsible academic freedom. When in the name of academic freedom there is an abuse of the academic process or where there is behavior not in line with true professional performance, then perhaps we have gone too far and I believe firm action should be taken.

Perhaps one of the less publicized ramifications of the recent dispute at Laramie was the effect it had in the classroom. It has been reported that there were a number of healthy discussions in the classrooms on the pros and cons of the situation, and the whole procedure was conducted in an orderly manner under the careful supervision of the instructor.

There is another side of the coin however. One might guess that there were more phone calls from students to parents last week than in any normal week of the school year. Some students walked out of classrooms, and I emphasize that this was in a minority of classrooms.

In my opinion the college classroom on any campus is not the place or the time for an instructor to circulate and urge the signing of a petition to support one side of a situation which he, himself, endorses, without a proper presentation of the other side. Teachers at all levels have a tremendous responsibility to conduct their classroom in an objective manner.

I do not believe that it is within the bounds of responsible academic freedom on ours, or any campus, for instructors to bring in outsiders to sway the feelings of students in only one direction in order to support personal opinion that the instructor might hold. This is particularly true when there is a relationship to a current problem that students may be asked to vote upon. In such a case, a complete presentation of both sides is imperative. In addition, there is no place in any educational classroom for the use of foul and profane language on anybody's part; it is even worse when the instructor makes no effort to control it.

I bring this to your attention because across this country, if we go beyond the lim-

its of responsible academic freedom, we will damage the instructional process and, in turn, the universities themselves.

I see all this primarily as a challenge to the university professor and his profession. To keep things within bounds. To see that the academic process is not abused, and as I said earlier, the great majority who teach responsibly are going to have to be the watch dogs of their fellows who exceed the bounds of their teaching responsibilities.

The people of this, and every other state, are vitally concerned with the educational process from kindergarten through the university. They have demonstrated their support with appropriations and tax levies to the point where education consumes a large amount of the tax dollar.

Time and time again the people have shown their willingness to endorse the development of improved educational programs as they want the best possible education for their children. It is up to those in the educational community to see that academic freedom is responsible.

THE FALL OFFENSIVE: COMMUNIST MANIPULATION, EXPLOITATION, AND SUBVERSION

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, I addressed the House briefly on the character of the so-called fall offensive being organized by the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam—New Mobe—an organization which, as I pointed out, the evidence strongly indicates is dominated by Communists.

In my remarks, I referred to the Vietnam moratorium committee and stated that the VMC's program is an integral part of the fall offensive, which I characterized as "a propaganda maneuver designed and organized by Communists and other revolutionaries."

Because my remarks have been misconstrued by some—and even misquoted in some instances—I have instructed the research staff of the House Committee on Internal Security, on which I serve as chairman, to prepare a detailed analysis of the available evidence in order to clarify first, the exact relationship of the Vietnam moratorium committee and its program to the New Mobe's fall offensive; and second, the extent to which Communist and other revolutionary elements are playing a dominant role in the organization and execution of the fall offensive.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues in the House and all other Americans are apprised of the nature and extent of this blatant propaganda assault upon our Nation, I include the staff study in the RECORD. Of course, I recognize that a majority of the people who participated in the Vietnam moratorium were loyal Americans who were exercising their constitutional right to dissent against the war in Vietnam. Ninety percent of the demonstrators may have consisted of such persons, but it further appears that 90 percent of the revolutionizing Marxists in this Nation also participated and their untiring organizational efforts should be

made public. It is not surprising, in view of the evidence, that many well-known Americans have backed away from the November demonstrations of New Mobe.

The staff study follows:

STAFF STUDY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY ON THE FALL OFFENSIVE

The October 22 issue of the *Daily World*, official newspaper of the Communist Party, U.S.A., carries an article entitled "March against death Nov. 15: Peace groups unite for huge capital rally." The article reports on press conferences held here in Washington, D.C., on October 21 by leaders of the Vietnam Moratorium and New Mobilization Committees, two of the key organizations behind the so-called "Fall Offensive" praised recently by North Vietnamese Prime Minister Pham Van Dong.

According to the *Daily World's* account, "Sam Brown, Moratorium coordinator, declared here, 'On November 15 the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam is sponsoring a peaceful and legal mass march and rally in Washington, D.C. Coordinators of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, as well as Moratorium supporters from around the country, plan to march. We will provide support for local Moratorium groups who will be coming to Washington and we encourage others to join us in the March on Washington.'"

Immediately following the Moratorium group's press conference, leaders of the New Mobe held their own press conference in the same room in what the *Daily World* termed a "deliberate unit demonstration" that "dashed President Nixon's hopes of driving a wedge between the two massive anti-war movements. * * * This unity 'guaranteed an enormous anti-war outpouring' against the war, declared the Moratorium committee."

Another group which has given its unqualified endorsement to the November demonstrations is the Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, an organization which, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, "is controlled by members of the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth group of the Socialist Workers Party. . . ." (The Socialist Workers Party is the largest Trotskyist Communist Party in the United States and has been declared subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities and two Attorneys General.)

SMC Executive Secretary Carol Lipman announced on October 20 that her group was backing "all anti-war activities," including the expanded Moratorium scheduled for November 13-14 (the same days as the New Mobe's "March Against Death" and SMC's November 14 student strike) and the Washington march scheduled by the New Mobe for November 15. And a Student Mobe leaflet circulated recently exhorts the faithful to "Join the Fall Antiwar Offensive" and states categorically that "SMC has endorsed and is actively building the November 15 demonstration."

This three-way collaboration is of particular interest because of the independence which some people claim for Moratorium activity.

The Fall Offensive was formulated at the National Anti-War Conference held in Cleveland, Ohio, over the July 4 weekend of this year. This conference, hosted by the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, the regional affiliate of the Communist-oriented National Mobilization Committee, predecessor of the New Mobe, was characterized by an extraordinarily conspicuous Communist presence, especially from members of the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party and its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance. The SWP's official newspaper, the *Militant*, later boasted of the "central role" of the SWP and YSA and the "key" role of the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee

in winning broad support at the conference for the November demonstrations.

Documents from the National Anti-War Conference show that Vietnam Moratorium Committee coordinator David Hawk was present and took an active part in the proceedings. These same documents also reveal that Hawk was a member of the conference steering committee as the representative of the Moratorium.

The Vietnam Moratorium Committee, then, was already in existence at the time of the National Anti-War Conference. The exact time of its formation is not clear, but formal announcement of the October 15 Moratorium date was made last in June, prior to the convening of the National Anti-War Conference in Cleveland.

One of the results of the conference was the organization of the New Mobilization Committee to carry on the work of the now-defunct National Mobe in organizing the Fall Offensive. Most of the members of the conference steering committee, including Moratorium leader David Hawk, were named also to the steering committee of the New Mobe.

An official New Mobe mailing circulated later in July includes a document outlining the accomplishments of the Cleveland conference. Among the decisions made at the conference, according to this official Mobe document, was the scheduling of "the most intense anti-war campaign ever undertaken in the United States—the Fall Offensive." The program was to include the October 15 Moratorium, one of the three projects "being organized by associated groups" which the Communist-saturated National Anti-War Conference formally endorsed and incorporated into the Fall Offensive.

Subsequent Moratorium and Mobe literature reflected this. The VMC, in literature mailed to editors of GI newspapers, referred to the Vietnam Moratorium Committee "and its part in the 'Fall Offensive' against the war in Vietnam. . . ." And New Mobe Offensive literature speaks of those numerous groups, including the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, which will provide the "principal resources" that will assure the success of the November actions.

It is clear, then, that the Moratorium is indeed an "integral part" of the Fall Offensive. Organized ostensibly by an independent organization, it wound up instead as part and parcel of a program formulated and adopted by Communist-dominated "anti-war" conference. Again, so that there may be no possibility of confusion or misinterpretation, the Vietnam Committee is not necessarily Communist or necessarily under Communist leadership. No doubt many of the leaders are sincerely motivated. However, as the evidence plainly indicates, the Moratorium's program and leadership have become intimately allied with a distinctly pro-Communist program and leadership.

And what of the planning for the Fall Offensive? Documents issued by the Mobe itself leave no doubt that, from the beginning, the organization of the Fall Offensive has been characterized by blatantly heavy Communist participation.

On August 5, for example, there was a meeting of the New Mobe's San Francisco Action Project. A memorandum to the Executive Committee and Steering Committee of New Mobe from Sidney Peck, an East Coast Co-Chairman of New Mobe and former State Committeeman in the Wisconsin CPUSA, reveals the broad composition—and heavy Communist complexion—of the session. Included in the list of those invited to attend were:

- (1) Alex Forman, Joe Hill SDS;
- (2) Art Goldberg, West Coast Bureau of the revolutionary Communist newsweekly *Guardian*;
- (3) Curtis McClain, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, a union headed by Harry R. Bridges;

(4) Keith Eickmann, ILWU;
 (5) Karen Talbot, employed by the official West Coast newspaper of the Communist Party, the *People's World*;

(6) Andrew Pulley, a member of the Young Socialist Alliance;

(7) Phil Shapiro, a member of the Medical Committee for Human Rights and supporter of the Black Panther Party-sponsored United Front Against Fascism;

(8) Donald Kalish, member of the Southern California Peace Action Council, West Coast Co-Chairman of New Mobe, member of New Mobe steering committee, and, by his own admission, somewhat to the left of the CPUSA;

(9) Ronald Dellums, Berkeley City Councilman and frequent speaker for the Black Panther Party;

(10) Terry Hallinan, West Coast Co-Chairman of New Mobe and member of the Communist-front National Lawyers Guild and W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America;

(11) Eleanor Ohman, delegate to the World Peace Assembly, held in East Berlin in June of this year under the auspices of the World Peace Council, international Communist "peace" front;

(12) Dr. Carleton Goodlett, West Coast Treasurer of New Mobe and also a delegate to the World Peace Assembly;

(13) Irving Sarnoff, an identified member of the Communist Party, leader of the Southern California Peace Action Council, and member of the New Mobe steering committee;

(14) David Hilliard, Chief of Staff for the Black Panther Party;

(15) Harold Supriano, a founding member of the Communist Party's official youth front, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America;

(16) Barry David, Student Mobilization Committee and YSA; and

(17) Lew Jones, a long-term functionary in the Socialist Workers Party.

Thus, of the 40 people invited to attend this session to help plan the Fall Offensive, at least 17 were outright members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., the Socialist Workers Party, or their fronts, or were affiliated with organizations of a demonstrably pro-Communist or revolutionary nature.

On August 17-18, a New Mobe steering committee meeting to plan the "Fall Offensive—1969" was held at the Central YMCA in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Among those invited to this meeting were the following:

(1) Allen Young of Liberation News Service, the New Left's pro-Castro, pro-Vietcong wire service;

(2) Anne Braden, identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF);

(3) David Herreshoff, member of the New Mobe steering committee and prominent supporter of fronts and causes of the Socialist Workers Party;

(4) Norma Becker, coordinator with Dave Dellinger of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, New York affiliate of the New Mobe, and member of New Mobe steering committee;

(5) Rennie Davis, New Mobe steering committee member and Vietcong supporter, currently on trial in Chicago for conspiring to foment violence during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention;

(6) Dave Dellinger, East Coast Mobe Co-Chairman and self-styled non-Soviet communist;

(7) Jerry Gordon, New Mobe steering committee member and head of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, a Mobe affiliate;

(8) Fred Halstead, New Mobe steering committee member and long-time leader in the Socialist Workers Party;

(9) Arnold Johnson, New Mobe steering committee member and National Legislative Director for the CPUSA;

(10) Irving Beinin, New Mobe steering committee member and an employee of the Communist newsweekly *Guardian*;

(11) Sid Lens, East Coast Co-Chairman of Mobe and former official in the Revolutionary Workers League, designated subversive by the Attorney General under Executive Order 10450;

(12) Carol Lipman, national executive secretary of the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee, member of New Mobe steering committee, and formerly on the editorial staff of the YSA's official magazine, the *Young Socialist*;

(13) Sidney Peck, East Coast Co-Chairman of Mobe, leader in the Ohio Peace Action Council, and former Wisconsin State Committeeman, CPUSA;

(14) Irving Sarnoff, former member, District Council, Southern California CPUSA;

(15) Sylvia Kushner, member of New Mobe steering committee and the Chicago Peace Council, a Mobe affiliate, and wife of Communist Party member Sam Kushner;

(16) Donald Kalish;

(17) David Hawk, member of New Mobe steering committee and coordinator of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, which is closely allied with the New Mobe;

(18) John Froines, currently on trial in Chicago for conspiracy to foment violence during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention;

(19) Terry Hallinan;

(20) Unnamed representatives of the YSA, W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, and Veterans for Peace (founded in January 1966 by Communist Party member Leroy Wolins);

(21) Otto Nathan, Communist and member of New Mobe steering committee;

(22) Dagmar Wilson, leader in Women Strike for Peace who has proclaimed publicly her advocacy of the North Vietnamese cause;

(23) Dr. Benjamin Spock, sponsor of the New Mobe's November demonstrations, member of the National Council of the Communist-run National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and supporter of the Communist-created Freedom and Peace Party;

(24) Carleton Goodlett;

(25) Louis Goldblatt, member of the Communist Party and official in the Communist-ILWU;

(26) John Wilson, formerly of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and leader of the National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union, an offshoot of the Student Mobilization Committee, and a member of the New Mobe steering committee;

(27) Pvt. Joe Miles, member of the New Mobe steering committee and Young Socialist Alliance; and

(28) Allen Myers, member of New Mobe steering committee and editor of SMC's *GI Press Service*.

The official minutes of a Chicago Steering Committee meeting on September 12 reveal participation by the following persons:

(1) Sidney Lens;

(2) Irv (Irwin) Bock, member of New Mobe steering committee and the Communist-founded Veterans for Peace;

(3) Tony De Leon, representing the Student Mobilization Committee;

(4) Rennie Davis;

(5) Sylvia Kushner;

(6) Ben Friedlander, identified member of the CPUSA; and

(7) Jack Spiegel, identified member of the CPUSA and a leader in the united front Chicago Peace Council.

In addition, two members of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee were present at this session; Joe Valadez and Rob Roberts.

Topics discussed at this meeting included the October 15 Moratorium and the November student strike. Among the organizations scheduled to participate in activities looking forward to these demonstrations were Veterans for Peace, the Chicago Peace Council, and the DuBois Clubs, all of which are under definite Communist influence or control.

On September 13, there was a meeting of the New Mobe's Washington Action Com-

mittee in Washington, D.C., with the following people among those present:

(1) Irving Beinin;

(2) Barbara Bick, member of Women Strike for Peace and among the American delegates at the Communist World Peace Assembly in East Berlin, June 21-24, 1969;

(3) Don Gurewitz, staff employee of New Mobe and member of the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee;

(4) Fred Halstead, leader in the SWP;

(5) Gus Horowitz, member of New Mobe steering committee and a "leading SWP activist in the antiwar movement," according to the *Militant*;

(6) Carol Lipman;

(7) Allan Myers;

(8) Otto Nathan;

(9) Sid Peck; and

(10) Peer Vinther, member of New Mobe steering committee and the SWP's Young Socialist Alliance.

One item of business at this meeting is perhaps of particular interest. Susan Miller of the Mobe staff reported, according to these official minutes, that the Moratorium Committee will lend major support to the "March Against Death," Mobe action scheduled for November 13-14, just before the mass rally on November 15. This shows irrefutably that, despite any surface indications conveyed by regular press accounts, the Vietnam Moratorium Committee's support of the New Mobilization Committee's plans is by no means recent or fresh—that it has been a matter of settled fact for at least five weeks.

The Steering Committee of the New Mobe met in Washington on the following day, September 14. According to the official minutes of the session, Sidney Peck acted as chairman, with the following people listed as being among those present:

(1) Marc Beallor, member of New Mobe steering committee and representative of the Communist Party-controlled W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America;

(2) Barbara Bick;

(3) Rennie Davis;

(4) Dave Dellinger;

(5) Don Gurewitz;

(6) Fred Halstead;

(7) Arnold Johnson;

(8) Carol Lipman;

(9) Allan Myers;

(10) Abe Weisburd, who has served on the administrative committee of Mobe's New York affiliate, the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, as the representative of Trade Unionists for Peace, described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as an organization "set up by the Communist Party;" and

(11) Leroy Wolins, member of Mobe's Washington Action Committee, founder of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, and identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

At this meeting, a committee was set up to handle legal and police problems anticipated in connection with the November march. On this committee, among others named, is SWP leader Fred Halstead. The March Against Death Committee includes SMC leader Carol Lipman, with Moratorium coordinator David Hawk among those also suggested. The committee to decide the program for the November rally consists of ten members, among whom are SWP member Fred Halstead, non-Soviet communist Dave Dellinger, former CPUSA Wisconsin State Committeeman Sidney Peck, and CPUSA National Legislative Director Arnold Johnson.

Peck, according to the minutes, "reported that the Black Panther Party will be relating to the demonstration on the West Coast." Members of a committee to deal with such "Black and Third World Participation" includes Dellinger, Weisburd, and Rennie Davis, with YSA member Andrew Pulley among those also suggested for membership.

The minutes further reflect that Fred Halstead was "hired immediately to work on logistics" for the march, while Carol Lipman

and Arnold Johnson were named to serve on a committee concerned with "International Aspects." The committee on "Labor Participation" includes Weisburd, Beallor, Peck, Lens, Halstead, and Johnson (six of the seven designated); and the "Promotional Material" committee includes, of the ten named to serve, Gurewitz, Lipman, Wolins, Peck, and Dellinger.

The important subject of "Youth Participation" is being handled by a committee of five members, including SMC leader Carol Lipman, Vietnam Moratorium Committee coordinator David Hawk, and W.E.B. DuBois representative Marc Beallor.

On September 18, the New Mobe held a press conference in New York City to publicize the Fall Offensive. New Mobe leaders, according to a Mobe press release dated September 18, "revealed detailed and comprehensive plans for a fall 'offensive' of anti-war activity." Among those present at this news conference were Benjamin Spock; Mobe Co-Chairman Stewart Meacham, Dave Dellinger, and Cora Weiss; and Vietnam Moratorium coordinator David Hawk.

The official New Mobilization Committee publication, the *New Mobilizer*, carries in its September 25 issue a lead article entitled "Fall Offensive Skyrockets—Meetings Held with over 5000 in 50 Key Cities!" In this article, there are capsule accounts of numerous meetings held around the country during the week of September 15. Conducted by "New Mobe traveling teams," these sessions resulted in area offices being established "in between seven and ten locations. . . ." Plans for both the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium and the November New Mobe demonstrations were laid at meetings in the following listed cities: Milwaukee and Madison, Wisconsin; Columbus and Toledo, Ohio; Portland, Maine; Miami, Florida; New Orleans; and Dallas-Fort Worth. The New Orleans session included representatives from Women Strike for Peace and Students for a Democratic Society.

A meeting held near St. Louis, Missouri, on September 27 and 28 provides us with yet another instance of major Communist participation in Fall Offensive planning. According to public press accounts, which are confirmed by other information which has come to me, this meeting was called to plan for the October 15 Moratorium and the November 15 march on Washington. Among the groups sponsoring the session were Students for a Democratic Society and the Young Socialist Alliance. One of the featured speakers at the September 27 evening session was YSA member Andrew Pulley. Two discussion leaders were identified as Communist Party member Hershel Walker and YSA member Larry Swingle, a St. Louis area contact for the New Mobe. Another Communist Party member, Orville Leach, was present at the conference; and a key workshop on organizing resistance to the Vietnam war among military personnel was led by two members of the Communist Party: Hershel Walker and Elliot Waxman.

And, as a final piece of evidence of Moratorium-New Mobe collaboration prior to the October 21 formal announcement mentioned earlier, an article in the *New York Times* for Sunday, October 5, stated flatly: "Student organizers of the Oct. 15 Vietnam Moratorium joined forces yesterday with the National [New] Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. The two organizations held a news conference and together pledged 'the most massive and, we hope, final demonstration against the war in Vietnam.' Both actions are a part of a 'Fall Offensive' . . ." This item confirms the statement made by Susan Miller at the September 13 Washington Action Committee meeting—a good two-and-a-half weeks before the October 21 announcement in Washington.

Two conclusions must be drawn from this

mass of evidence. First, it is obvious that collaboration between the Vietnam Moratorium and New Mobe people has existed from the beginning. No matter what Moratorium partisans may try to claim, the cold fact is that VMC plans and leadership have meshed precisely with the plans and leadership of the New Mobilization Committee.

A second conclusion to be drawn is that the leadership of the New Mobilization Committee is top-heavy with Communists and pro-Communists, including members and partisans of both the Communist Party, U.S.A., and, most particularly, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. Add to this the unqualified endorsement given to both the Vietnam Moratorium and the New Mobe marches by the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee, along with the very active participation of both YSA and SMC activists in Fall Offensive planning around the country, and we can see the all-too-clear pattern that emerges.

This pattern is not one of legitimate, sincere protest against presumed inadequacies in our Vietnam policies. Rather, it is one of blatant Communist manipulation, exploitation, and subversion. From the very beginning in Cleveland at the National Anti-War Conference, the Communist presence has been conspicuous. Whenever major planning sessions have been held—whether in San Francisco, Philadelphia, Chicago, or Washington—the trained members and supporters of the Communist and Socialist Workers Parties have been present, lending their invaluable expertise.

Just look for a moment at some of the organizations officially represented in the New Mobilization Committee:

(1) the Chicago Peace Council, several of whose leaders are known Communists and/or closely associated with Communists, represented by such people as Sylvia Kushner and Sid Lens;

(2) the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, New York Mobe affiliate in which Communists of varying hues have played an extraordinarily active role, represented by Dave Dellinger and Norma Becker;

(3) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, organized in Chicago during January 1966 by Communist Party member Leroy Wolins, a member of New Mobe's Washington Action Committee;

(4) the revolutionary Communist news-weekly *Guardian*, represented by Irving Beinin and Art Goldberg;

(5) the "Conspiracy," an organization made up of defendants currently being tried for conspiracy to foment riots during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, represented by Dellinger and Rennie Davis;

(6) the Student Mobilization Committee, YSA-controlled, represented by Carol Lipman and Allen Myers;

(7) the Student National (formerly Non-violent) Coordinating Committee, represented by Eric Jones;

(8) the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, official youth front for the Communist Party, U.S.A., represented by Marc Beallor;

(9) the Communist Party, U.S.A., officially represented by National Legislative Director Arnold Johnson;

(10) the Socialist Workers Party, represented by such SWP stalwarts as Fred Halstead, Harry Ring, and Gus Horowitz; and

(11) the SWP's official youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance, represented by Peer Vinther, Joe Miles, and YSA National Chairman Larry Seigle.

In addition, at least four national leaders of the New Mobe and participants in Mobe planning and strategy sessions were delegates from the United States at the World Peace Assembly held in East Berlin during June 1969; New Mobe steering committee member and identified Communist Irving Sarnoff; New Mobe West Coast Co-Chairman Carlton

Goodlett; Eleanor Ohman; and steering committee member Barbara Bick. This tie is extremely significant because of its international character. As pointed out above the Assembly was sponsored by the World Peace Council, long-standing and notorious international Communist "peace" front.

Surely, the evidence is conclusive. Despite participation in the New Mobilization Committee-Vietnam Moratorium Committee-Student Mobilization Committee Fall Offensive by sincere pacifists and others concerned with our foreign policies, the dominant presence is clearly a Communist one.

In the words of the Communist Party's West Coast newspaper, the *People's World*, "the Moratorium is being viewed not as the climax or high point but the opening shot of the Fall Offensive against the war." The usage may have been inadvertent, but it is nonetheless apt; the Fall Offensive is indeed a "shot"—a shot at the heart of America during a time of crisis.

Let those who chose to continue to participate in this Fall Offensive do so with no illusions. No matter what their intentions, the result will only be aid to the cause of the Communists in Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi—and their adherents and agents here at home.

HELICOPTER AMBULANCES, LIFE-SAVING MACHINES OF THE AEROSPACE AGE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been directing the attention of my colleagues in the past to the question of civilian use of helicopters for emergency services here in the District of Columbia as part of the proposed Ambulance Service Corps as envisioned in my bill, H.R. 12552. I think that this article is just one more substantiation of their effectiveness in an age which demands that we use the best latest methods to save lives.

For your information, I submit this article from the Federal Aviation Agency's southeastern regional publication, *Southern Wings* of October 1969:

HELICOPTER AMBULANCES, LIFE-SAVING MACHINES OF THE AEROSPACE AGE

Your life may be saved some day by a helicopter. Certainly you're not looking forward to such an event but if it comes, you'll surely become a helicopter enthusiast in a hurry.

The Korean War was the setting for the birth of helicopter ambulances. As in every war, men were being shot up right and left, but in that war, men who had been wounded in the field had a better chance of survival, thanks to an extensive military helicopter ambulance setup. The medics were able to get to the wounded more quickly than ever before and to evacuate the war-smashed men to hospitals away from the action with much greater speed than was possible before. Helicopters and the men who flew them increased the wounded men's chances of survival to the extent that it was said that if a helicopter reached a man while he was still living, he'd have almost a 100% chance to survive.

In the Vietnam War, using more modern, jet-powered helicopters, the corpsmen are able to get in even faster, give the wounded immediate medical assistance and transport them to hospitals in jig time, resulting in many fewer deaths per hundred warriors wounded than in any previous conflict.

Meanwhile, back in the United States, it's not uncommon for the victims of an automobile crash to wait endlessly and sometimes die before ground ambulances can pick their way through dense traffic to reach the accident scene. It appears that, in some instances a man would be better off to be a wounded soldier in the field than to be an injured motorist on an expressway.

Is anything being done to bring the life-saving technology developed in war, to help the bent motorist in peacetime? Yes, An emphatic Yes!

In various metropolitan areas around the country, demonstrations of helicopter ambulances are taking place. They're being conducted by manufacturers and operators of the whirlybirds, cooperating with ambulance firms, hospitals and municipal government officials, to show the value of air ambulances and to find the funding necessary for setting up the new life-saving services. Funds are available from the U.S. Government's Department of Transportation highway safety pocketbook for assistance in setting up helicopter ambulance programs for communities that will undertake extensive research proving the necessity and usefulness of such programs.

A demonstration was held earlier this year in Columbia, South Carolina. A "Southern Wings" observer was on hand to cover the first day of the program. The rooftop heliport on the Capital Cabana Motel in Downtown Columbia was the site of base activities for the practical demonstration of jet helicopter ambulance operations. The helicopter used was N747FH, a red and white Fairchild Hiller FH1100 with ambulance markings on each side of its tail boom.

Taking part in the program were experts in their various fields including helicopter men, ambulance authorities, medical technicians and local municipal officials. Principals in the operation were Michael J. Hayes of Atlanta, Georgia, demonstration sales pilot for the Fairchild-Hiller Corp. of Germantown, Maryland; Al Futrell, of Alexandria, Virginia, Washington Office operations manager for Evergreen Helicopters; and Tom Hulfish, President of Paramed, Inc. of Alexandria, Virginia. Paramed is a professional ambulance operation and management firm serving cities in Virginia and the Carolinas. The company owns Carolina Ambulance Service which manages the emergency medical system for the City of Columbia. Also joining in the program were Henry Pettit, General Manager of Carolina Ambulance and Samuel Richard Fryerson, Ambulance technician who rode shotgun in the right rear seat of the specially equipped FH1100, and Calvin Burkhart, Washington Representative for the Franklin Institute of Arlington, Virginia. Burkhart is working with the Department of Transportation highway safety people in emergency medical services development.

The demonstration in Columbia was not just a simulation of what a helicopter might do in the event of an emergency, but a practical showing of the use of the workhorse helicopter in actual emergency conditions. The first day of the demonstration, the weather was almost zero/zero. The pilot was unfamiliar with the Columbia area. Yet despite all these disadvantages, the ambulance helicopter reached the scene of its first assigned accident in good time proving the worth of such equipment. Helicopters save precious minutes in ambulance work and, according to Hulfish, those minutes are often the difference between life and death or between permanent disablement and total recovery. He said that the primary consideration in emergency medical service is in getting trained medical technicians to the injured. Contrary to what most have long thought, it is not the high speed transportation from accident scene to hospital that saves lives, so much as it is the speedy pro-

urement of trained medical help at the scene of the accident. Modern medical helicopters such as the FH1100 used in the Columbia demonstration can be equipped with all sorts of life saving equipment including oxygen and stomach pumps, to assist the medical technician.

Important to such a system is that it be operated on a thoroughly professional basis like the Carolina Ambulance system. Carolina had been in operation in Columbia for less than a year at the time of the demonstration yet had already transformed the system into one of the most modern and thoroughly professional in the country. Every ambulance technician here is a well-paid former corpsman. A doctor is near the ambulance radio base at the hospital 24 hours a day to give instructions to the technicians by radio, when necessary.

Modern hospitals are installing helicopter landing pads near their emergency room doors so that they can quickly handle patients arriving in helicopter ambulances. Recently completed was a pad installed on the grounds of the Florida Sanitarium and Hospital in Orlando, Florida. The Heliport is located at the edge of one of Orlando's hundreds of lakes and has a clear approach over the lake. Already a number of workers from the Cape Kennedy/Patrick Air Force Base have been brought in to the hospital by helicopter for emergency treatment. The real big use for the pad though could come in the event of a large-scale disaster either at an area industrial plant or at one of Central Florida's numerous military installations.

Helicopter ambulances are expensive life saving tools, but so are iron lungs and artificial heart-lung machines. Helicopter ambulances are needed especially in the metropolitan areas of the United States and forward thinking people are working hard to establish the civilian version of the "Jolly Greens."

The Hughes 500, the Bell JetRangers, and the Fairchild FH1100 are all competing for first place in the race to serve the big cities with air ambulances.

A very interesting film, prepared in Arizona by Fairchild-Hiller, with cooperation of Arizona State University, showing the helicopter in action and telling of the economies of an air evacuation system is available from Fairchild-Hiller or through Al Futrell, Evergreen Helicopters, 3007 Cunningham Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22309. Sounds like a good idea for a civic-minded organization's next program.

MR. NIXON'S NEW DIRECTIONS

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 2, 1969, there appeared in the Miami Herald an excellent editorial concerning President Nixon's "new directions" in our policy toward Latin America.

This editorial concerns the President's pledge to realine our Latin American policy, which in my opinion is one of the most important and significant aspects of our U.S. foreign policy, insofar as our Nation is concerned.

The President in his new directions of our Latin American policy calls for progress by action. Certainly, we can agree that a new policy is long overdue.

We in South Florida can hope that the importation of revolutionaries by way of

Communist Cuba will be minimized, or perhaps even halted, by the new policy proposed.

I commend the Miami Herald for its excellent editorial and call the attention of it to my colleagues:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Nov. 2, 1969]
AS PROMISED, MR. NIXON SHOWS "NEW"
LATIN POLICY

President Nixon kept his showdown with Latin America and produced an abrazo rather than a shoot out. He had promised realistic "new directions," and he delivered them.

Action for Progress will be his theme, and it apparently will be a pragmatic version of the Alliance for Progress.

Latin America is a tough audience, but his policy speech in Washington pleased even the Latins. Editors and publishers at the Inter-American Press Association meeting there reacted for the most part enthusiastically.

On four major points, the President responded directly to Latin anxieties that have built up during the past 10 months while waiting for him to speak.

Significantly, he called for the upgrading of Latin America within the State Department. He wants the chief Latin officer to hold the rank of Under-Secretary of State, rather than the present Assistant Secretary. The man in this position will "coordinate all U.S. government activities in the hemisphere." This change, long advocated by The Herald, should provide more clout for Latin America in Washington.

Aid was "untied," which means that Latin nations can spend their loan dollars anywhere they like in the hemisphere. This corrects a situation that had been demeaning, wasteful and inefficient. There previously had been a requirement that the dollars be spent in the U.S.

Equal partnership will be the aim of U.S. policy. This in effect means the United States will give up trying to remake Latin America in its own image and will accept it as it is.

As the President put it, experience "has taught us that economic and social development is not an achievement of one nation's foreign policy but something deeply rooted in each nation's own tradition. It has taught us that aid that infringes on pride is no favor. It has taught us that each nation, and each region, must be true to its own character." This kind of talk will be applauded in Latin America, which has chafed under U.S. paternalism.

The U.S. prefers to deal with democratic governments, but "on the diplomatic level, we must deal realistically with governments in the inter-American system as they are." This follows the line of a resolution already passed by the U.S. Senate that diplomatic recognition should be a matter of acknowledging the government in power.

In a direct reference to Cuba, the President added: "The 'export' of revolution is an intervention which our system cannot condone, and a nation which seeks to practice it can hardly expect to share in the benefits of the community." This serves both to lay down the rule that Cuba will continue to be excluded by U.S. policy, and to open the way for it to return to the community if it adopts a policy of non-intervention.

Major criticism of the Action for Progress policy probably will center around its practicality as opposed to the idealism of the Alliance for Progress. Some will find it lacking in advocacy for the democratic principles.

Neither was there any direct mention of the Hickenlooper Amendment, which calls for a cutoff of U.S. aid to any nation which expropriates U.S. property without adequate compensation. Along with "untying aid," revocation of this amendment has been a particular hope of the Latins.

However, the President responded to almost all the other demands of the 21 Latin nations who met at Vina del Mar, Chile, last summer to develop a consensus posture toward the United States. Additionally, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller indicates the policy is a direct reflection of his own findings during his controversial mission.

It must be remembered that unity is not a characteristic common to the Latins. They disagree from nation to nation, and within each nation from faction to faction, just as we do here in the U.S. So their initial enthusiastic response to the President must be regarded as extraordinary.

As one Washington wag commented, "Don't forget that there is no plug-in Messiah." The problems—political, social and economic—are immense.

But the President's good and practical start toward helping the Latins meet them with a working partnership is encouraging.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, SEPTEMBER 1969

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted earlier today, I include a release highlighting the September 1969 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY FOR SEPTEMBER 1969

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of September totaling 2,958,374. This was a net decrease of 70,147 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of August, reflecting reduction in temporary seasonal employment and temporary summer employment under youth opportunity programs.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1970, which began July 1, 1969, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1969.....	3,062,319	9,276	
August.....	3,028,521		33,798
September.....	2,958,374		70,147

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of September was 1,661,976, a decrease of 39,081 as compared with the August total of 1,701,057. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in September was 1,296,398, a decrease of 31,066 as compared with 1,327,464 in August.

Civilian agencies reporting the largest decreases were Post Office Department with 14,475, Department of Health, Education and Welfare with 6,661, Agriculture Department with 5,686 and Interior Department with 4,355.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 15,530, Navy with 10,285, Air Force with 4,253, and Defense Supply Agency with 740.

Total employment inside the United States in September was 2,710,128, a decrease of 69,829 as compared with August. Total employment outside the United States in September was 248,246, a decrease of 318 as compared with August. Industrial employment by federal agencies in September was 577,207, a decrease of 9,675 as compared with August.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

The total of 2,958,374 civilian employees reported for the month of September 1969 includes 2,633,286 full-time employees in permanent positions. This represents a decrease of 6,418 in full-time permanent employment from the preceding month of August. These figures are shown in the appendix (p. 17) of the accompanying report.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,958,374 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 112,217 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during September who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in August was 113,060.

NOTE.—The monthly report has been distributed, but a limited supply is usually available at the Committee, room 329, Old Senate Office Building.

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY: A STUDY IN CONTRADICTIONS

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in these concluding articles, parts 9 and 10 of a series, Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of the Daily Oklahoman, summarizes his reactions to the Soviet Union and its people gleaned on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. as one of 10 members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

He concludes with the South African author Laurens van der Post, who also once visited Russia, that the most important factor in winning our ideological war with communism is to make certain that the example we set lives up to the ideals of our own society.

The concluding articles follow:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oct. 9, 1968]

SOVIET NOT SO ROSY AS CLAIMS

(By Charles L. Bennett)

What kind of society has been produced by 50 years of Socialist-Communist rule in the Soviet Union?

According to Soviet leaders, it's like this: The society is Godless and classless. Crime and alcoholism are minor problems, and drug abuse is none at all. The people are well-behaved, and not regimented. They have no racial or ethnic problems nor any with nationalism in the many countries that have been absorbed into the U.S.S.R. Family life is exemplary and the notion that government nurseries and schools have usurped parental functions is incorrect.

That's the official picture, but even the brief glimpses obtained by our group of touring editors cast serious shadows of doubt across that rosy portrait of the Soviet today.

"We don't think the guy with four pairs of pants is in a different class from the guy with one pair," said Joe Adamov, our guide-interpreter from Radio Moscow.

It may be true that material possessions provide less "status" measurement in the Soviet Union than in some other countries. If so, it's at least partly because relatively narrow pay ranges, between the highest-

paid and the lowest, and short supplies of consumer goods like clothing, cars and luxury appliances make acquiring "fancy" possessions difficult for everyone in the Soviet.

Then, too, apartments are assigned by the government and the look-alike buildings in which nearly everyone lives in the cities—managers and workers side by side—enforce a leveling effect as far as housing is concerned.

But other kinds of class distinctions are obvious. The deference paid to high government officials, their big black Zim limousines that zoom down the streets in utter disregard for scattering pedestrians, the salutes and bows given as they pass all testify to their "rank".

Top academicians, we were told, have "complete freedom of movement" within the country. That, in itself, is a distinction ordinary Soviet citizens cannot claim. Writers, authors, composers, playwrights and leading performers in music and ballet constitute a class in themselves with social standing far beyond mere recognition of their talent.

One knowledgeable source said about 30 million Soviet citizens receive about one-third of the total personal income in this nation of 240 million people. Ruble millionaires, he estimated, might total 100 or more. These would be, mainly, composers and playwrights who get royalties for widespread performances of their work, and some farmers who can raise enough high-value crops—such as citrus fruits—on small plots to acquire large personal profits.

Money alone though, he pointed out, doesn't really create a "wealthy class" in the U.S.S.R. simply because there is so little that can be done with money. No labor can be hired and funds can't be invested to make more money, except in state bank accounts that pay 2½ per cent interest, or 3 per cent on longer-term savings.

"A wealthy person can buy a second house in the country, a better car, or take longer or better vacations—but that's about all," he commented.

Money and personal property can be inherited in the Soviet Union and inheritance taxes are negligible.

Income taxes go only as high as 13 per cent for the highest-paid people and make up only seven per cent of the total national budget. There are no state or local taxes. Installment buying has been available in the U.S.S.R. for about ten years, with carrying charges of one-half to two per cent.

When we suggested that class distinction is based on four factors—power, freedom of action, wealth and intellect—our Soviet acquaintances rejected the whole definition. Class simply means ownership of the means of production, they said, and since all means of production are owned by the state in the Soviet, they couldn't have any classes.

In Moscow, when we asked Mayor Vladimir Promyslov about crime, he said: "I can assure you of one thing. You can walk safely anywhere in the city, in the suburbs or anywhere else. No one will touch you."

"There are bound to be certain excesses," he said, "from jealousy, derangement, etc. But if you took all the offenses in Moscow for a day, they would fit on one page of paper."

He said the city of more than six million has 4,000 to 5,000 policemen, whom they call militia. "In addition," he said, "we have voluntary citizen patrols, people who get no pay but wear a red armband and help patrol at night." Some 300,000 people, it was explained, are assigned through their places of work and do patrol duty one night each month—which would put a force of about 10,000 of these civic watchdogs on the street every night.

Our group encountered absolutely no trouble in late-night strolls in any of the cities we visited. We did have an opportunity to see a civilian patrolman in action in Sochi.

One blast on his whistle and a few sharp words quickly silenced a noisy group that came singing down a street after midnight.

"Anyone who's drunk or causing trouble would much rather be stopped by a regular militiaman than one of these citizen patrolmen," said Vasili Isayev, deputy mayor of Moscow. "The civilian patrolman will surely report the person to his place of work, for discipline, where the militiaman might not."

Yuri Filonovich, assistant editor of *Izvestia*, told us in Moscow: "We do not find people turning to crime because there is no other way to support themselves, and there is no organized crime. There are cases of robbery and hooliganism, mostly from unrestrained use of alcohol, and some murder and rape cases. Ninety per cent of our crime is committed under the influence of alcohol but, generally, crime is decreasing in the country."

"In 1964," he recalled, "there was a killer here, who did several murders in a short time. Disguised as a gas worker, he entered apartments and robbed and killed the occupants. He is still remembered. The militia blocked all the roads and he was caught, sentenced and shot."

"We don't believe crime has biological causes," he said, "but social. We will not try to idealize the situation. Some steps have been taken toward curbing alcoholism, but not very effectively. We are not thinking of prohibition."

We did see, in each city we visited, a few men on the street who obviously had managed some "overuse" of vodka. There was no way to tell, of course, the extent of alcoholism but several Soviet officials exhibited concern about the problem in their country.

"The problem with our police," interpreter Adamov commented, "is that they don't dare hit even a troublesome drunk, even if he pulls a knife."

That's because we were so strict about not wanting citizens to be abused by police. Only recently, a law was passed that allows a policeman to defend himself in such circumstances."

"We just don't have any racial problems," said Madame Atina Zhaketova, magazine editor in Kazakhstan, one of the republics with the greatest variety of ethnic groups in the U.S.S.R. "There's no friction at all." Kazakhstan is reported to have segments of what once were 114 ethnic groups and 14 separate nationalities.

"There was friction under the Czars," she said, "because they counterposed one nationality against the other. But now the law forbids any manifestation of great power, chauvinism or discrimination. It's not fear that holds the people together, but education and actual equality. The major nationalities don't fight with each other but try to preserve their culture, traditions and costumes."

Non-Soviet observers say the Russians mainly responsible for absorption of non-Russian areas into the Soviet Union tended to integrate local aristocracies and leaders into the governments and this helped prevent strong anti-Russian feelings. We saw no outward signs of discrimination although we were told that Kazakhs, who make up only about a third of the Republic's population, hold most of the key governmental posts.

Balancing against Madame Zhaketova's description of the situation are reports that especially in the Crimea, nationalistic feelings have led to suppression of minority leaders there. In the Ukraine, as well, there have been signs of recurring nationalistic feelings from time to time.

Negroes who actually are citizens of the U.S.S.R. are an almost infinitesimal number—including one all-Negro village in the Caucasus mountains. There are a number of Negro students from foreign countries at U.S.S.R. universities.

On somewhat surer ground—because ap-

pearance and behavior of young people was easily apparent to us as we traveled around the country—we were inclined to take at face value the Soviets' assurance that there is no "youth revolt" in the U.S.S.R.

"One of our good traditions was the unflinching obedience of children to their parents, and we still have that good tradition," Madame Zhaketova said.

The vice-chairman of the Soviet Women's Committee, Ksenia Proskurnikova commented: "Of course there are some parent-child difficulties, but this has not evolved into a social problem. Much attention is paid to the coordination of education of young people by the schools, in the home and in society. We have to teach the parent a scientific attitude toward bringing up the child. It is a difficult job to bring up a child."

Of Moscow's "stellagi" of a few years ago, she said "There never were very many of these early 'hippies' in the first place. They stood out like a sore thumb but the numbers were never great. It was mostly a fad for fashions more than anything else but lost its attraction because there was nothing behind it. There are some of them still around."

Seated in a hotel lounge one night, two of us did witness a brief but vicious fight involving three young men of 19 or 20. Two of them apparently attacked the other but the lone battler had all the best of it before hotel personnel stopped the fight. They said "It was over a girl."

But we never saw anyone resembling a hippy as we traveled about. Long hair and mini-skirts certainly are not the Soviet style.

One late-night encounter on a Leningrad street, when two young girls propositioned the photographer who accompanied us, seemed to indicate Adamov's note that "there are exceptions" was true.

His indignation over that incident reflected the rigid standards of "the new morality" which is so much a part of the modern Soviet outlook. Almost puritanical in some aspects, it is sort of a non-religious but moral-ethical "Thou shalt not" code that constitutes a set of unwritten "culture rules."

These rules put great stress on dignified behavior and that may explain, in part, why one of Khrushchev's sins was his allegedly "buffoon" actions, like pounding his shoe on the table at the U.N.

"No self-respecting man would sit on the floor," Adamov once chided one of our more informal editors. Chewing gum is frowned on for the same sort of reasons and I was abruptly shushed by an attendant when I absentmindedly whistled softly while looking at some paintings in the Hermitage at Leningrad. "It may seem ridiculous," Adamov half-apologized, "but it's a custom here not to whistle in public."

It's also a custom not to litter in the U.S.S.R.—so much so that after only a couple of days the smokers among us were self-consciously snuffing out their cigarettes army-style and stuffing the dead butts into their pockets.

Whether or not these moral rules are part of the "substitute" religion of the Soviet Union, it is apparent the Soviets have adapted many church-like rituals to their own uses. The veneration at Lenin's tomb gives it the atmosphere of a shrine and his presence as a god-like father figure is everywhere. Portraits of him look down from the walls of offices, schools and most public buildings, his statue is seen frequently and Lenin quotations are featured on the signs on buildings as inspiration posted along highways and to the workers.

Officially atheistic, Soviet government says in its pamphlets that individuals are entitled to their own beliefs about religion but discourages any practice of religion. "A religious marriage rite, as well as other religious rites, has no legal significance," one pamphlet notes.

More personally, Adamov put it this way:

"We find no place in modern society for religion. If people believe in a supreme being that's their business; we don't believe we should use force to control or eliminate it."

We were told that Moscow, before the 1917 revolution, had one million population and 560 churches but now, with over six million population there are only 40 churches "and most of them are half empty most of the time."

In Leningrad, the next largest city, churches still open include 11 Russian Orthodox, and one each for Moslems, Roman Catholics, Baptists and Jews.

"But only old people ever go," one Leningrader said. In contradiction, non-Soviets living in the country told us many churches are crowded at Christmas and Easter and many young couples still take their babies to church for baptism.

Akai Nusupbekov, historian and vice-chairman of the Kazakhstan Academy of Science, commented: "There are some phenomena in society that are positive and negative. In its time, religion was positive, such as the influence of Christianity against paganism. The religion that propagandizes certain standards of living (behavior), is positive. When Russia adopted Christianity, it was positive."

"But when scientific interests clashed with religion, when such great men of science as Galileo were burned at the stake, then religion became negative."

"Here in Kazakhstan, besides Islam we had leftovers of witch doctor customs, but you cannot consider that as something that will continue to exist in the minds of people. No one crosses religion off the map. With the growth of the consciousness of man, religion drops off."

"Some old people still go to church but propagandists of science educate and brush aside all this past."

We asked if he thought religious belief continues in some other form.

"We have built socialism," he said, "and we are building Communism. We have not crossed off religion, legally. Lenin said a man should be free to go to church or to a museum, as he chooses. We'll never prohibit religion by law. As people learn more, they will leave religion."

We learned little of current treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union, except to have one official say that they could leave the U.S.S.R. at will to go to Israel. When we picked this up, saying we wanted to quote him, he said that really wasn't his field and we shouldn't quote him but ask higher authorities about it. We did and learned that Jews, like any other citizen, are certainly not free to leave the country at will. The U.S.S.R. considers each citizen to have obligations to the country that must be fulfilled; leaving them behind would be traitorous.

We thought it significant, though, that one official pamphlet offered to us was entitled "Treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union." It consists mainly of history of the persecution of Jews before the revolution—when they were allowed to live only in certain cities—the slaughter of Soviet Jews by Nazi soldiers and assurances that Jews have equal treatment with all other citizens now.

One Soviet resident told us there is a dissident element of Baptists in the U.S.S.R. that may include as many as three to five million people. He also said there have been stories published in the Soviet press about members of Jehovah's Witnesses smuggling religious materials into the western Ukraine and that some have been caught, tried and jailed. Most of the material had to do with conscientious objection to military service, he said.

A Minsk journalist commented, "The prospect for building any new churches or synagogues is very low. We are not afraid to say this because we bring up our children in a spirit of materialism and atheism." Another

journalist added: "And in the west, you do the same."

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oct. 10, 1969]
SOVIET TOUR OFFERS MANY CONTRADICTIONS
(By Charles L. Bennett)

Alexander Arustamenko may not be a typical Soviet citizen; in fact I feel sure he's not. Yet I feel sure, too, that much of what he is also exists in many of his countrymen. Tall, slim, tanned—looking fit with only the slightest suggestion of a stomach bulge—he is perhaps 55. He has the classic Mediterranean face, looking Greek perhaps, or maybe Roman or Lebanese. Dark eyes and a crinkle of white-grey hair are less noticeable than the nobly arched nose that dominates his face.

He wears slacks, a short-sleeved white sports shirt and casual shoes—suitable attire for the editor in Sochi, the Soviet's Riviera-like resort area on the Black Sea.

Courteous, almost courtly, he speaks softly and never seems hurried or harassed, or anything except at peace with himself. He gently shepherds his flock of visiting American editors to see the sights of the lushly green region where his compatriots come each year to rest.

He is a gentle man—and a philosopher.

We asked him if he thinks the Russian soul, as some writers have described it, is a sad soul.

"No, no," he said. "That is not true. It is a merry, gay soul."

What, then, we asked, makes you happy?

"I am happy I was born after the revolution," Alexander said, "and that I was brought up in the spirit of Lenin. It is these ideas that help me to enjoy life. And I am happy to meet you. It was one of Lenin's behests to be friendly to all nations, large and small."

But aside from the government or Lenin, we asked, just within the family—personally—what are your sources of happiness, satisfaction, the rewards of your life?

"I have one family; I stick to one woman; I'm that kind of man. My older daughter is a student, in her fifth year at the power institute in Moscow. Her husband is the same. And now I have a grandson."

"My second daughter hopes to enter medical college. She wants to follow in the footsteps of my sister, her aunt—who helped to rid this area of malaria."

"The happiness of the family is my happiness. You cannot bypass Lenin here, either. He called the family the first unit of society."

When your family is together what do you talk about?

Alexander smiled a little and said, "It is likely to begin with Yuri Gagarin and end with the Apollo flight. I am sorry I wasn't there. I wanted to be a space pilot."

"The fact that I was at the North Pole four times makes me happy."

"I took part in the battles at Stalingrad, Berlin and Sevastopol. I am happy I lived through it all."

"Being a newspaper man is very fulfilling. I want no other profession. I worked 24 hours the day before you came."

"For the cause of peace, I would be happy to work a thousand hours a day. I do not want to see my grandson maimed, or anyone else's."

Sir Winston Churchill once said in a broadcast speech on Oct. 1, 1939, "Russia is a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma." To those of us living outside the Soviet borders, much of the riddle remains. Contrasts, contradictions, still-unanswered questions seem to be the lot of anyone who takes a close-up look.

It is a country that values education and has almost unlimited manpower and resources. Yet, its industrial production still—almost 25 years after the war that devastated much of the country—lags behind

countries less favored and similarly devastated. But then, it was also the first country to launch vehicles and men into space.

It is a nation that includes many areas once independent nations in themselves, and perhaps a wider variety of ethnic and language groups than any empire in all history. Its leaders say all these people now are equal and there is no friction among them. Yet, there are obvious signs of suppressed nationalistic yearnings in some of the "adopted" areas. There are other signs that Jews generally are discriminated against there, too, as they have been in so many other nations.

Conversations with the Alexanders of the Soviet—and the Ivans and Vladimirs—give one a distinct conviction that these are people to whom feelings are all-important. Slav or Kazakh or Georgian—whatever they may be—people of the Soviet seem to live in a world in which feelings and understanding are far more important than physical realities. They have emotions that even a stranger can feel without even knowing their language. Yet, these people operate under a system that says materialism is everything, seeming to deny the most essential qualities of humanity.

They look backward to "the days before the revolution" for their favorite comparisons to prove how much better off they are now. They look outward to the United States for their measurements of what they would like to accomplish. Yet they also preserve with loving care—as the best among their rare beauties—the buildings and relics of the pre-revolutionary period. And their admiration for things American is mixed with scorn for decadent, capitalist, imperialist America.

Soviet managers and officials freely admit some of the problems with which they struggle—low productivity, troublesome international relations, the need for more technicians and skilled workers. Yet, they are secretive and defensive about a great many things and herd most foreign visitors through carefully-channeled itineraries under constant escort.

They take great pride—and justly so—in their music, opera and ballet. While some of it rests on nationalistic or propaganda themes, much of it does not, and ranks high among artistic performances of the world. Yet, newsmen and authors must express only that which serves the interests of Communism and the government. Jail can be the penalty for non-conforming thought.

Their scientists, physicians, engineers and physicists say they have free exchange with their counterparts "in the outside world." Yet, last year 30,000 Americans visited the Soviet Union and only 1,500 Soviet citizens came to the United States.

They say they want peace—that this is the foremost desire of all Soviet citizens and their leaders. Yet, they foster and promote hate of former enemies and insist the world around them consists almost entirely of current or potential new enemies.

Of Khrushchev's ill-famed comment, "We will bury you," our interpreter Joe Adamov said: "I think it's still on the agenda." Then he hastened to explain he didn't think it was on the agenda militarily—but just through the spread of Soviet influence, and economically.

An Australian girl we met in Novosibirsk as she traveled alone through the U.S.S.R., at each stop escorted by an Intourist guide, said: "I feel sorry for these people—just because they have to live here."

Our group of editors, after our days of observing, listening and talking, decided we did not feel that way.

One of them put it into these words: "I can't honestly say that I think these people feel enslaved or are unhappy." Another added: "No, they aren't—because they believe what they are being told and get so little information or stimulus from outside."

Laurens van der Post, the South African author, who now lives in England, once traveled through the Soviet Union too. Two things he later wrote express, for me, perhaps the most important conclusions of all. One was:

"Neither British nor Americans any longer can remember what it means to be invaded and conquered, so long ago is it since the experience. Consequently they are in danger of underrating what they have and the value of what they are."

The other was when a young Russian told him, gleefully, of something he had learned from an English play performed in Russia. It was a rather small and silly bit of knowledge but its importance was that it was something "from outside."

That "convinced me," van der Post wrote, "how much the example we set matters even down to the smallest detail. If we fail in that we fail not only ourselves and our own young but also the young of Russia."

"The example we set, our capacity to practice what we preach, to live out in the routine of life the fine things we think, are our only true ways of winning the clash between ourselves and Communism."

I left the Soviet Union remembering all the things I had seen, and, even more, remembering Joe Adamov and Alexander Arustamenko and Leonid Proksha and Nikolai Bezraydin and all the others . . . perhaps Alexander most of all.

NEED FOR ORDERLY MARKETING LEGISLATION CRITICAL

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, something must be done about the constant overflow of imports into the American marketplace. Report follows report and figure after figure discloses the continual increase in the importation of shoes. Factories continue to close and American workers continue to lose their jobs, and it becomes increasingly difficult to understand how Congress and the executive branch can justify their present course of inaction.

It is apparent that Members representing shoe districts are going to have to take a more active course. The Orderly Marketing Act of 1969, H.R. 733, provides the flexible basis necessary for the adjustment of the U.S. economy to expanded trade. It gives foreign nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. market—but no more. Those sitting on it in committee should bring it before the House for consideration now.

As evidence of the need for immediate action, the following information supplied by the Foreign Trade Committee of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association is compelling:

NONRUBBER FOOTWEAR IMPORT-PRODUCTION
COMPARISON, JANUARY-JUNE 1969

NOTICE TO TRADE

The Business and Defense Service Administration today released preliminary statistics comparing nonrubber footwear imports and production for the first six months of 1968 and 1969.

During the first half of 1969, imports of shoes and slippers, excluding those with soles vulcanized to fabric uppers, totaled 108.3 million pairs, an increase of 11.7 percent over

January-June 1968 imports of 97 million pairs. Domestic production for the first six months of 1968 declined 9.9 percent, to 299.9 million pairs, from the comparable 1968 period when 332.7 million pairs were produced. First half 1969 footwear imports were equal to 36.1 percent of domestic production compared with 29.2 percent for the same period of 1968.

Almost half (45 percent) of all January-June 1969 imports of nonrubber shoes and slippers had uppers of supported vinyl. Virtually all of these imports came from Japan, Hong Kong and Taiwan. Vinyl upper footwear imports increased 9.1 percent from 44.7

million pairs in the first half of 1968 to 48.8 million pairs in the first half of 1969. The average foreign value per pair of these imports increased from \$0.64 to \$0.72 or about 12.5 percent.

During the first six months of 1969, imports of nonrubber footwear, excluding footwear with supported vinyl uppers (predominantly leather and part-leather footwear), totaled 59.6 million pairs, an increase of 13.9 percent above the 52.3 million pairs imported in the same 1968 period. Average foreign value per pair of these imports increased 14.2 percent from \$2.54 in 1968 to \$2.90 in 1969.

January-June 1969 domestic shipments of

nonrubber footwear totaled 292.3 million pairs with a value of \$1.4 billion. Imports during this period, totaling 108.3 million pairs valued at \$207.5 million, were equal to 37 percent of the quantity and 14.5 percent of the value of domestic shipments.

U.S. exports of nonrubber footwear during the first half of 1969 totaled 1.1 million pairs and had a value of \$3.9 million. Exports were equal to 0.4 percent of the quantity and 0.3 percent of the value of domestic shipments.

Import data consist of 78 footwear items, while comparable production data consist of 23 items, including both leather and non-leather footwear.

TABLE I.—U.S. PRODUCTION AND IMPORTS OF SHOES AND SLIPPERS EXCEPT THOSE WITH SOLES VULCANIZED TO FABRIC UPPERS AND IMPORTS AS PERCENT OF PRODUCTION AND PERCENT OF CHANGE, JANUARY-JUNE 1968 AND JANUARY-JUNE 1969, BY KINDS

[Quantity 1,000 pairs]

	January-June 1968		Imports as percent of production	January-June 1969		Imports as percent of production	Percent of change, 1968-1969	
	Production	Imports		Production	Imports		Production	Imports
Shoes and slippers (except rubber).....	332,679	96,986	29.2	299,856	108,310	36.1	-9.9	+11.7
Shoes, sandals, and playshoes (excluding athletic).....	274,110	94,197	34.4	243,581	104,977	43.1	-11.1	+11.4
Men's, youths', and boys' shoes.....	77,826	15,958	20.5	74,317	20,505	27.6	-4.5	+28.5
Men's work shoes, 6 inches high and over (including over-the-foot boots).....	13,626	1,621	4.6	14,595	1,075	7.4	+7.1	+73.1
Men's handsewns (genuine moccasin construction).....	6,624	91	1.4	5,725	186	3.2	-13.6	+104.4
All other men's, youths' and boys' shoes.....	57,576	15,246	26.5	53,997	19,244	35.6	-6.2	+26.2
Women's, misses', children's and infants' shoes.....	196,284	78,239	39.9	169,264	84,472	49.9	-13.8	+8.0
Women's wedge shoes.....	14,270	14,384	100.8	10,183	9,913	97.3	-28.6	-31.1
Misses', infants' and children's wedge shoes.....	5,852	1,057	18.1	4,407	877	19.9	-24.7	-17.0
All other women's misses', children's, and infants' shoes.....	176,162	62,798	35.6	154,674	73,682	47.6	-12.2	+17.3
Athletic shoes.....	3,827	629	16.4	4,064	951	23.4	+6.2	+51.2
Slippers.....	53,608	986	1.8	51,336	1,060	2.1	-4.2	+7.5
Other footwear.....	1,134	1,174	103.5	875	1,322	151.1	-22.8	+12.6

¹ Work footwear covers footwear having outsoles 1/4 inch or over in thickness (measured at the ball of the foot) and having uppers of grain leather extending above the ankle.

Source: Production—Current Industrial Reports, Bureau of the Census. Imports—BDSA; based on census data. Prepared by Consumer Products Division, BDSA, October 1969.

U.S. FOOTWEAR IMPORTS, JANUARY-SEPTEMBER 1969

September imports of 13 million pairs of leather and vinyl footwear amounted to 23%

more than were shipped during the same time last year. Leather and vinyl imports were 28% of an estimated September production of 46.7 million pairs.

The table below summarizes the growth of imports over the past ten years:

U.S. SHOE PRODUCTION AND IMPORTS, LEATHER AND VINYL

[In thousands of pairs]

	U.S. production			Total new supply ¹	Imports			Total new supply ¹	Percent imports of total supply															
	1960	1961	1962		1963	1964	1965			1966	1967	1968	9 months: 1968	1969										
1960.....	600,041	592,907	633,238	604,328	612,790	626,229	26,617	36,668	55,057	62,820	75,372	87,632	4.4	6.2	8.7	10.4	12.3	14.0	4.2	5.8	8.0	9.4	11.0	12.3
1961.....	592,907	633,238	604,328	612,790	626,229	26,617	36,668	55,057	62,820	75,372	87,632	4.4	6.2	8.7	10.4	12.3	14.0	4.2	5.8	8.0	9.4	11.0	12.3	
1962.....	633,238	604,328	612,790	626,229	26,617	36,668	55,057	62,820	75,372	87,632	4.4	6.2	8.7	10.4	12.3	14.0	4.2	5.8	8.0	9.4	11.0	12.3		
1963.....	604,328	612,790	626,229	26,617	36,668	55,057	62,820	75,372	87,632	4.4	6.2	8.7	10.4	12.3	14.0	4.2	5.8	8.0	9.4	11.0	12.3			
1964.....	612,790	626,229	26,617	36,668	55,057	62,820	75,372	87,632	4.4	6.2	8.7	10.4	12.3	14.0	4.2	5.8	8.0	9.4	11.0	12.3				
1965.....	626,229	26,617	36,668	55,057	62,820	75,372	87,632	4.4	6.2	8.7	10.4	12.3	14.0	4.2	5.8	8.0	9.4	11.0	12.3					
1966.....	641,696	599,964	645,942	489,503	439,574	96,135	129,134	175,438	132,907	152,181	15.0	21.5	27.2	34.6	737,831	729,098	821,380	622,410	591,755	13.0	17.7	21.4	21.4	25.7
1967.....	599,964	645,942	489,503	439,574	96,135	129,134	175,438	132,907	152,181	15.0	21.5	27.2	34.6	737,831	729,098	821,380	622,410	591,755	13.0	17.7	21.4	21.4	25.7	
1968.....	645,942	489,503	439,574	96,135	129,134	175,438	132,907	152,181	15.0	21.5	27.2	34.6	737,831	729,098	821,380	622,410	591,755	13.0	17.7	21.4	21.4	25.7		
9 months: 1968.....	489,503	439,574	96,135	129,134	175,438	132,907	152,181	15.0	21.5	27.2	34.6	737,831	729,098	821,380	622,410	591,755	13.0	17.7	21.4	21.4	25.7			
1969.....	439,574	96,135	129,134	175,438	132,907	152,181	15.0	21.5	27.2	34.6	737,831	729,098	821,380	622,410	591,755	13.0	17.7	21.4	21.4	25.7				

¹ Domestic production plus imports.

All major footwear supplying countries, listed below, scored excellent increases in September. Japan increased shipments by 5%

over September last year. Italy sold 37% more pairs, and Taiwan maintained her growth by shipping 72% more pairs over the same month

last year. Details through September are shown below:

Shoes and slippers (leather and vinyl) from—	January-September				Shoes and slippers (leather and vinyl) from—	January-September				
	1969 pairs (thousands)	1968 pairs (thousands)	Percent change, pairs, 1969 from 1968	Percent share of total		1969 pairs (thousands)	1968 pairs (thousands)	Percent change, pairs, 1969 from 1968	Percent share of total	
										1969
Japan.....	50,390	50,691	-0.6	33.1	38.2	18,706	10,878	+72.0	12.3	8.2
Italy.....	47,265	44,507	+6.2	31.1	33.5	17,552	14,401	+21.9	11.5	10.8
Spain.....	16,017	10,127	+58.2	10.5	7.6					
France.....	2,251	2,302	-2.2	1.5	1.7					
China (Taiwan).....						152,181	132,907	+14.5	100.0	100.0
Othe countries.....										
Total pairs.....										

TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THE-FOOT FOOTWEAR

Type of footwear	September 1969 (thousands of pairs)	Percent change, September 1969/September 1968	9 months, 1969			Percent change, 1969/1968	
			Pairs (in thousands)	Value (in thousands)	Average value per pair	Pairs	Dollars value
Leather and vinyl, total.....	12,238.6	+19.3	146,677.1	\$316,049.3	\$2.15	+13.5	+31.9
Leather, excluding slippers.....	5,635.4	+32.2	75,263.5	258,482.4	3.43	+16.5	+32.7
Men's youths', boys'.....	2,049.0	+39.6	22,529.8	95,040.4	4.22	+30.0	+41.2
Women's, misses'.....	3,120.8	+33.5	46,359.1	146,669.4	3.16	+8.2	+28.0
Children's, infants'.....	188.3	+17.3	4,275.1	6,712.4	1.57	+88.7	+107.9
Moccasins.....	40.7	+29.2	491.6	595.8	1.21	-5	+11.3
Other leather (including work and athletic).....	236.6	-10.7	1,607.9	9,464.4	5.89	-3.5	+3.2

TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THE-FOOT FOOTWEAR—Continued

Type of footwear	September 1969 (thousands of pairs)	Percent change, September 1969/September 1968	9 months, 1969			Percent change, 1969/1968	
			Pairs (in thousands)	Value (in thousands)	Average value per pair	Pairs	Dollars value
Slippers.....	52.1	+51.5	276.4	568.9	2.06	+9.7	+0.5
Vinyl supported uppers.....	6,551.1	+9.8	71,137.4	56,998.0	.80	+10.5	+29.1
Men's and boys'.....	851.2	+29.5	7,459.9	8,554.3	1.15	+22.9	+42.8
Women's and misses'.....	4,920.0	+3.0	55,910.0	43,234.0	.77	+6.6	+25.2
Children's and infants'.....	658.6	+44.8	6,411.7	4,499.8	.70	+36.3	+47.5
Soft soles.....	121.3	+54.7	1,355.9	709.8	.52	+16.5	+21.5
Other nonrubber types, total.....	860.3	+119.6	5,503.7	5,800.0	1.05	+49.5	+101.5
Wood.....	123.7	+1,004.5	786.4	1,906.9	2.42	+315.2	+364.4
Fabric uppers.....	620.7	+87.7	4,056.0	3,086.2	.76	+29.1	+46.1
Other, not elsewhere specified.....	115.9	+131.8	661.3	806.9	1.22	+89.9	+126.6
Nonrubber footwear, total.....	13,098.9	+22.9	152,180.9	321,849.3	2.11	+14.5	+32.7
Rubber-soled fabric uppers.....	3,695.4	-10.1	34,468.4	25,737.4	.75	-10.9	+9.2
Grand total, all types.....	16,794.3	+13.7	186,649.3	347,586.7	1.86	-8.8	+30.7

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

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

TABLE II.—U.S. PRODUCTION AND IMPORTS OF SHOES AND SLIPPERS EXCEPT THOSE WITH SOLES VULCANIZED TO FABRIC UPPERS AND IMPORTS AS PERCENT OF PRODUCTION AND PERCENT OF CHANGE, JANUARY-JUNE 1968 AND JANUARY-JUNE 1969, BY TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION PROCESSES

[Quantity in 1,000 pairs]

	January-June 1968		Imports as percent of production	January-June 1969		Imports as percent of production	Percent of change 1968-1969	
	Production	Imports		Production	Imports		Production	Imports
Shoes and slippers (except rubber).....	332,679	96,986	29.2	299,856	108,310	36.1	-9.9	+11.7
Shoes, sandals, and playshoes (excluding athletic and work shoes less than 6 inches high).....	260,484	93,576	35.9	228,986	103,902	45.4	-12.1	+11.0
Men's, youths' and boys' shoes.....	64,200	15,337	23.9	59,772	19,430	32.5	-7.0	+26.7
Men's shoes:								
Cemented and slipstapled.....	17,833	14,941	27.7	15,676	16,749	43.1	-12.1	+36.6
Goodyear welt (including silhouwelt).....	29,220	1,470	5.0	25,687	1,912	7.4	-12.1	+30.1
All other men's, youths' and boys' shoes.....	17,147	8,926	52.1	18,359	10,769	58.7	+7.1	+20.6
Women's, misses', children's, and infants' shoes.....	196,284	78,239	39.9	169,264	84,472	49.9	-13.8	+8.0
Women's shoes:								
Cemented and slipstapled.....	123,131	30,383	24.7	108,242	30,313	28.0	-12.1	-0.2
Goodyear welt (including silhouwelt).....	2,101	(¹)		1,846	(¹)		-12.1	
Misses', children's, and infants' shoes:								
Cemented and slipstapled.....	28,872	2,587	9.0	25,331	3,969	15.6	-12.1	+53.4
Goodyear welt (incl. silhouwelt).....	6,189	(¹)		5,441	(¹)		-12.1	
All other women's, misses', children's, and infants' shoes.....	35,991	45,269	125.8	28,354	50,190	177.0	-21.2	+10.9
Work shoes (6 inches high and over).....	13,626	4,621	4.6	14,595	4,075	7.4	+7.1	+73.1
Athletic shoes.....	3,827	629	16.4	4,064	951	23.4	+6.2	+51.2
Slippers.....	53,603	986	1.8	51,336	1,060	2.1	-4.2	+7.5
Other footwear.....	1,134	1,174	103.5	875	1,322	151.1	-22.8	+12.6

¹ Cemented only.

² Includes cements and casuals.

³ Women's, children's, infants', and boys' combined, beginning Jan. 1, 1966.

⁴ Work footwear covers footwear having $\frac{1}{4}$ inch or over in thickness (measured at the ball of the foot) and having uppers of grain leather extending above the ankle.

Note: Production imputed by applying 1966 percentages of production by construction process to totals for each category.

Source: Production—Current Industrial Reports, Bureau of the Census. Imports—BDSA, based on census data.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

TABLE III.—U.S. SHIPMENTS AND IMPORTS OF SHOES AND SLIPPERS, EXCEPT THOSE WITH SOLES VULCANIZED TO FABRIC UPPERS AND IMPORTS, AS PERCENT OF SHIPMENTS AND PERCENT OF CHANGE, JANUARY-JUNE 1968 AND JANUARY-JUNE 1969, BY KINDS—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	January-June 1968		Imports as percent of shipments	January-June 1969		Imports as percent of shipments	Percent of change 1968-69	
	Shipments	Imports		Shipments	Imports		Shipments	Imports
Shoes and slippers (except rubber).....	\$1,453,761	\$161,354	11.1	\$1,434,534	\$207,453	14.5	-1.3	+28.6
Shoes, sandals and playshoes (excluding athletic).....	(¹)	154,389		(¹)	197,281		(¹)	+27.8
Men's, youths' and boys' shoes.....		44,921			64,229			+43.0
Men's work shoes, 6 ins. high and over (including over-the-foot boots).....		2,069			3,191			+54.2
Men's handsewns (genuine moccasin construction).....		503			800			+59.0
All other men's, youths' and boys' shoes.....		42,349			60,238			+42.2
Women's, misses', children's and infants' shoes.....		109,468			133,052			+21.5
Women's wedge shoes.....		22,587			16,796			-25.6
Misses', infants' and children's wedge shoes.....		1,243			1,026			-17.5
All other women's, misses', children's and infants' shoes.....		85,638			115,230			+34.6
Athletic shoes.....	(¹)	4,313		(¹)	6,507		(¹)	+50.9
Slippers.....	(¹)	715		(¹)	735		(¹)	+2.8
Other footwear.....	(¹)	1,937		(¹)	2,930		(¹)	+51.3

¹ Detail not available.

² Work footwear covers footwear having outsoles $\frac{1}{4}$ inch or over in thickness (measured at the ball of the foot) and having uppers of grain leather extending above the ankle.

Source: Shipments, current industrial reports, Bureau of the Census. Imports, BDSA; based on Census data. Prepared by Consumer Products Division, BDSA, October 1969.

THE POOR IN THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in late October my very distinguished colleague, Representative BROCK ADAMS of the Seventh District, spoke before the Washington Association for Social Welfare giving an excellent summary of welfare problems.

It is my pleasure to place his remarks in the RECORD so that all Members may have the privilege of sharing his views:

THE POOR IN THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

(By Congressman BROCK ADAMS)

THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

In the decade since the beginning of the Kennedy Administration in 1960, we have had almost nine years of continuing prosperity that has reduced those living in poverty (i.e., below \$3300 per year for a family of four in 1968) from 22% in 1960 to 14% in 1968. This definition of poverty is not accurate, however, because we have many families in the United States who are really the "working poor." The heads of these families work full time and do not receive any assistance from the government and yet are forced to live at bare subsistence levels.

The grave problem in our immensely wealthy country is that most of our people have been able to find a job and earn a living for themselves and their families, but we have not developed a program for those who cannot. The poverty in America today is in hard-core spots and not chronic overall unemployment such as existed in the 1930's, yet our welfare programs are to a great degree patterned on the problems of the 1930's. These programs, such as welfare and unemployment compensation do not appropriately deal with the problems of the 1960's. They will not deal with the problems of the 1970's.

Our nation's welfare system today is dehumanizing to the recipients, wasteful to the taxpayers and debilitating to the working poor.

A new program must break the cycle of chronic welfare and at the same time maintain the incentive in America for people to work and contribute their talents to our society. I know you are aware that in some parts of the country a family can draw more money in the Aid to Dependent Children program than an unskilled working father can earn. He therefore is forced to leave his family. For example, in New Jersey the average monthly AFDC payment for a family of four is \$263 per month. The minimum wage at the present time is \$1.60, and for 160 hours a month a man will earn \$256.00, less taxes, Social Security, etc. If he is laid off for part of the month (which happens frequently), you can see that he earns less than his family can receive on welfare. Many families have been broken by the impact of this system.

THE PRESENT WELFARE SYSTEM

Welfare in its broadest sense can refer to all government spending for domestic purposes, but we are not discussing that today but instead are discussing social welfare programs based on the "need of benefit recipients." There are four federal assistance programs in this category which provide money to the states:

1. Old Age Assistance;
2. Aid to Families with Dependent Children;
3. Aid to the Blind; and
4. Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled.

There is a fifth category called "General Assistance" which is a program for needy people who are not eligible for any federally assisted program and that must be financed entirely by state and local government.

The four categories mentioned above are entitled to cash grants from the federal government and in addition payments are made available to vendors of medical services for these groups.

Despite the fact that our gross national product has been growing rapidly and unemployment until recently has been at an all-time low, we have had cash public assistance outlays rise from \$4 billion in 1960 to \$9.9 billion in fiscal year 1968. The two major factors causing this growth have been the rise in medical payments under the impetus of Medicaid (aid to the needy) and the rise in number of persons receiving assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. Medical assistance payments rose from \$493 million in 1960 to \$3.5 billion in 1968. The number receiving AFDC payments rose at the rate of 325,000 a year in the 1960's from 3,080,000 in 1960 to 5,707,000 in 1968.

It is necessary to review these figures (and I have a chart available showing the amounts paid in cash living allowances under the public assistance acts) to see that the welfare costs are not with the unemployed male as is so often stated in public rhetoric but with categories that are not easily moved into the work force, such as the elderly (over 65), mothers with children under 18 (AFDC), the disabled and the blind. In fact, an examination of the percentages of people on welfare indicates that general assistance has dropped from 9.8% in 1960 to 8.8% in 1968, whereas Aid to Families with Dependent Children has risen from 30.5% of the program in 1960 to over 50% in 1968.

Each of these programs had a very reasonable background in terms of the 1930's but these are no longer relevant. For example, the AFDC program started in 1935 as an adjunct to the program many states utilized in aiding widows with dependent children. Today, however, the bulk of the payments are made to families who do not have an employable male at home because of divorce, separation, desertion or the fact the children are illegitimate. In fact, as we all know, in many cases the father of the children has left the home in order that the mother could obtain welfare payments and he could surreptitiously add to the family's income by working and then only visit at intervals.

We will always have the problem of aiding the disabled and the blind but these are a relatively small drain on the treasury. The three major groups which must be cared for in any future program are:

1. The elderly;
2. Dependent children; and
3. The working poor.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL

Without going to great detail because this had been available in the newspapers and elsewhere, I want to quickly outline the basic thrust of the President's proposal.

(a) Family assistance plan: This program would establish a nationwide \$1600 payment for families of four, and in addition would allow the family to earn \$60 per month without any reduction in benefits. The family would then be able to earn additional amounts up to \$4,000 with the federal benefits decreasing. I have attached a second chart to my speech, this one indicating the manner in which this sliding scale would work.

(b) Food stamp proposal: Second, it is proposed that food stamps be made available for such a family so that benefits up to \$2,350 per year (including the \$1,600 per year) would be available to every family.

(c) Aid to the aged, blind and disabled: The aged, blind and disabled would have a nationwide income floor of \$90 per month

per person, which would mean \$2,160 per year for two persons. (This is up from the \$65 per person originally proposed by the President.)

(d) Training and day-care centers: It is proposed that 150,000 new training opportunities be funded under the Manpower Training Act and that approximately 450,000 child care positions be funded.

IMPACT ON THE STATES

This program proposes a national set of minimum benefit levels with the recipients registering for the benefits at their Employment Service office. This would result in raising payment levels in 10 states and for about 20% of the present welfare recipients. It would also provide \$2.9 billion in new federal money for expanded cash assistance. Of this an estimated \$700 million will go to states to help meet their present costs. These states would either have a savings of \$700 million or could grant supplemental benefits. This is meant to be a minimum federal assistance program and the states would be entitled to supplement this program with such additional amounts as they might deem appropriate.

A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR THE POOR

I support a number of the proposed changes suggested by President Nixon but I believe the suggested program must be drastically improved if it is to do the job. I believe one of the key factors in any future welfare programs should be to relieve the pressure on our major cities caused by the crowding of the poor into central core ghettos. This has been caused by the harsh laws of some of our states. Without going into the details of each of these 10 states, we can take, for example, the State of Mississippi and compare it to the State of New Jersey. In the State of Mississippi the AFDC payments average \$39 per month for a family of four while such a family receives \$263 a month in New Jersey. In the State of Washington the average payment is \$199.40. The result of this is that states such as New York which has a \$241 payment per month has experienced a 193% rise in AFDC caseload whereas the State of Alabama with average monthly benefits of \$53 and a 20% decrease between the years 1959 and 1967. Overall, the 10 states with the highest benefits experienced an average AFDC caseload rise of 149%. Conversely, the 10 states with the lowest benefits had an average growth of only 11%. Nationally the growth for the period was 75%. The effect of this has been to force the rural poor, many from the south, into the ghettos of the large northern cities with tragic implications for the country.

I believe we should stop trying to encourage these states to increase their programs by using matching funds and simply go to a federally-administered program by using the Social Security Administration and the United States Employment Service offices, and not the states', so that it will become attractive for many of the poor and unskilled to remain in rural and small-town America and will make it possible for them to supplement their wages and living conditions by remaining out of the cities or by returning to their home communities. This must be coupled with a national program of effective minimum wages for all types of employment, including agricultural workers, so that certain segments of our economy will not take advantage of the working poor.

This must also be coupled with a national program of extensive day-care centers to enable the mother of dependent children to leave the home for at least portions of each day. I am convinced that in modern America most women want to spend a portion of the day out of the home and that the concept of remaining all day in the house with the children, other than for very small children, is out of date. Think of your own acquaint-

ances in our affluent society and check as to how many spend all day at home with the children. These day-care centers should be a positive educational force and not a "holding tank" or babysitting operation. The positive Head Start approach that has been used, for example, by the Washington Citizens for Migrant Affairs in eastern Washington gives a good example of this. These day-care centers stress learning skills, the teaching of abstract concepts and preparation of children of migrant workers so they can compete in the standard American public education system. The experiments conducted in these day-care centers show that a different type of education at an early age is necessary for the child whose parents have been required to work very hard at unskilled jobs and have been unable to prepare their children for so-called middle-class education as have other parents. Without either praising or condemning our present system of public education, it is a fact that we can more easily attack the problem of the relatively small number of culturally deprived children by aiding them than we can by immediately changing the whole American system of public education.

The problem of assisting the pockets of poverty in America is a federal problem and should no longer be looked upon as a state obligation. The migration of the poor to the cities affects the entire nation and must be reversed. This can only be done by having national standards for welfare payments.

This also answers the argument about federal revenue-sharing with the states. I do not believe you should separate the spending powers from taxing powers in a government. This is what is proposed when it is suggested the federal government raise funds through the federal income tax and then disburse these funds to the states to be spent under state control. Instead I suggest we establish a federal system of public assistance. We will lift from the states a burden which will enable the states to then spend their tax revenues as each state desires and at the same time we will have the federal government raising and spending the federal welfare money.

You will notice that I have supported a number of parts of the Nixon program. I believe its greatest weakness is that it does not provide the jobs that it is demanding that people take, and it does not provide minimum wage protection for these people and the working poor. Its levels of subsistence are also too low in most areas and therefore many states may have to supplement the program and we could fall back into the same trap that presently exists wherein certain states will continue to have very high benefits compared to the rest of the nation with the result that the migration to these states will continue. This can be corrected in one of two ways—either by raising the basic federal payments or by making federally-assisted jobs available at a minimum wage in all parts of the country. I favor the second approach because it would create an incentive for those on public welfare to work and thus have pride in their existence and would enable the poor who cannot migrate to have an opportunity to supplement their incomes sufficiently to live in decent surroundings.

I would like to close by reading a portion of a letter I have just received from my sister, who is one of the middle class who has been forced out of New York City because of the living conditions there. She points out in her letter that a person in the middle-income brackets cannot afford to live in New York City and relates her experiences in trying to live in New York in proximity to the poor. She has had personal experience with the problems faced by the poor, and I think she states it far better than I could in a recent letter she sent to me:

"It really is hell to be poor. The effects of slum living on the human spirit are unbelievable. I feel that I now know whereof I

speak. After only a few months of that kind of existence I can perfectly well understand why slum dwellers let themselves and their homes go to pot. The treatment, or rather lack of everything decent that these people endure soon depresses them to a point where they just don't care anymore. When nobody collects the carefully stacked garbage bags in the hall, it is only one small step until you're tossing it out of the window or down the airshaft. When there is no heat or hot water, it soon becomes too much trouble to heat water for washing and too cold in the winter to bathe. Then it is just too much trouble to change your clothes or bed linen or to shove a mop or dust rag. Finally you just sit and stare out the window at a bleak world which ignores you and obviously doesn't care whether you're dead or alive. So I wonder why the 'haves' of this world are puzzled by things like dirty neighborhoods, filthy buildings, slovenly people, drug addiction, prostitution, and, God forbid, law and order! To me it is utterly amazing that any of these should survive at all—let alone turn into anything even resembling what the middle-class calls responsible citizens! How can they, and why should they?"

AMOUNTS OF CASH LIVING ALLOWANCES UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE BY PROGRAM, SELECTED CALENDAR YEARS, 1950-68

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Total	Old age	Families with dependent children	Disabled	Blind	General assistance
1950	2,395	1,470	554	8	53	295
1955	2,526	1,490	532	135	68	214
1960	3,282	1,632	1,000	238	86	322
1965	4,027	1,601	1,660	418	88	259
1966	3,930	1,411	1,695	439	75	310
1967	4,504	1,454	2,097	521	77	355
1968	5,046	1,393	2,570	561	77	445

PROPOSED BENEFIT SCHEDULE (EXCLUDING ALL STATE BENEFITS)

Earned income	New benefit	Total income
0	\$1,600	\$1,600
\$500	1,600	2,100
\$1,000	1,460	2,460
\$1,500	1,210	2,710
\$2,000	960	2,960
\$2,500	710	3,210
\$3,000	460	3,460
\$3,500	210	3,710
\$4,000	0	4,000

Note: For a 4-person family with a basic payment standard of \$1,600 and an earned income disregard of \$720.

WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the October 20, 1969 issue of Air & Water News carried a report on developments relating to the effort to secure adequate funding for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's program of grants for the construction of waste treatment facilities. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read the report of Air & Water News on this matter, I include its text at this point in the RECORD.

DOMINICK ASKS SENATE PANEL FOR \$600 MILLION MAXIMUM

WASHINGTON.—Before a skeptical Senate subcommittee on public works appropriations, FWPCA, Commissioner David Dominick last week defended the Administration's

recommended limit of \$600 million on sewage-treatment plant grants this fiscal year.

Although Interior Secretary Hickel did not testify, he had the previous week written the House Appropriations Committee, reaffirming the Administration's original \$214 million request. Hickel added: "In any event, it is our best estimate that existing capacity of the state, local and private sectors could support no more than \$1.5 billion worth of new municipal waste treatment plant construction during the remainder of Fiscal Year 1970, so that no more than \$600 million in federal grants effectively could be used."

Sen. Allen Ellender (D-La.), chairman of the subcommittee, questioned why FWPCA can't use the full \$1 billion authorized for Fiscal 1970. Answered Dominick:

"Under a billion-dollar appropriation, you have about one-third of the money—\$300 million—which is not usable for 18 months under the present allocation formulas. That is because the allocation formula is so written by the Congress to give certain states which are small in population large sums of money which in actuality are in excess of their present needs and present abilities to spend."

STATES CAN'T USE IT

When pressed, Dominick agreed that inability to raise the money to match the federal grants was the dominant factor, rather than lack of "need." He added that "the figures . . . come from the states themselves, showing what applications are processed and ready for funding."

Dominick explained that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (which allocates the first \$50 million of grant money specifically to sparsely-populated states, and apportions the rest according to state population but not according to need) gives the states 18 months to qualify for their allocated funds by raising matching funds and meeting a few other requirements. After the 18-month period, the Secretary of Interior is allowed to reallocate unclaimed money.

Based on all applications pending as of Aug. 31, Dominick said 20% to 30% of the amount appropriated won't be used by the states authorized it (see table). If \$600 million is appropriated, only \$500 million would be committed by Dec. 31, 1970. If \$750 million is appropriated, only \$600 million would be committed in the 18-month period. If the full \$1 billion is authorized, only \$700 million would be committed.

"Under the existing allocation formula, and the fact that we have to allocate for 18 months under that formula, we would be tying up a significant amount of money which would not be spent until the expiration of the 18 months—plus six months for re-processing," he said.

The basic problem with tying up funds for this time, Dominick indicated, was the present tight-money period. "Carryovers . . . have not been too favorably received by the appropriations committees."

Nor by the Bureau of the Budget, either, he might have added. BOB usually subtracts carry-over funds automatically from the Administration's budget requests long before they are submitted to Congress. Knowing this, most federal agencies try to commit the bulk of construction appropriations by January of the following fiscal year. FWPCA, for example, has not carried over more than \$10 million in any year since the program started.

MANPOWER'S SHORT

Besides the allocation limitation, Dominick mentioned other difficulties FWPCA foresees in spending all the money Congress seems willing to appropriate this year. The agency is currently staffed with about the right number of personnel (209) to handle a \$214-million appropriation; for \$600 million it would need an additional 130 people; for \$750 million, about 40 more than that; and for \$1 billion, it would need 459 personnel.

Finding and training this number of people—discounting the current "freeze" on personnel—would be a problem. And, of course, the states and communities would have similar problems.

Some other difficulties outlined by the FWPCA commissioner: "The overcoming of local financing difficulties . . . high interest rates, the inability to float bonds because of the interest rate limits, and/or debt limits by state or local laws and constitutions, the provision of sufficient and qualified design engineering, and construction capability for waste treatment works in a very short time frame, and the timely production and delivery of material and equipment."

REACTIONS TO DOMINICK

A quick check by AWN of some of the proponents of full funding elicited strong reaction against the Administration's arguments. Donald G. Alexander, a legislative counsel for the National League of Cities, said "Every argument Interior makes is true. But with a high-enough priority project like sewage-treatment plants, I think local governments can overcome all of them."

There are various devices, for example, to get around borrowing "limits," such as issuing short-term 8-year bonds instead of 20-year paper to get money otherwise unavailable at 6 to 6½%. Although 24 states still have 6% debt limits on general obligation bonds, many are considering raising this limit of market realities.

Also, Alexander pointed out, a lot of special districts are not subject to as stringent an interest-rate limit, and these are many of the present applicants.

As for the argument that there aren't enough applications (Alexander claimed that many states have been discouraging local governments from applying—knowing money wasn't available.

Dominick's argument about lack of design engineering capability was challenged by the Consulting Engineers Council. On Oct. 9, CEC released results of a recent survey of 114 of its 2,200 member firms that concluded "U.S. consultants can assimilate design work covering more than \$5 billion in Fiscal 1970 waste treatment plant construction without adding a single man to existing staffs. Not only are there engineers available, but they are looking for work."

The director of the utilities of the Associated General Contractors of America, Joseph Ashoo, told AWN that contractors have "plenty of capacity" to handle the \$2.5 to \$3-billion of work that would be generated by a \$1-billion appropriation.

Labor would be available, too, according to the president of the AFL-CIO's building trades union, C. James Haggerty. Even a "crash" program, if well conceived, would be supported by sufficient force of the six basic crafts, Haggerty told AWN. "Take the missile program. We built in the most remote areas of the country, where they got nothing but jackrabbits." It might be a bit tight, Haggerty admitted, but he was positive sufficient labor could be found, "providing the ordering body doesn't schedule it all in one day in one place."

The Administration's arguments against more than \$600 million this fiscal year don't seem good enough. Interior's strongest case is its contention that some states wouldn't be able to spend it all. But, as Dominick himself pointed out, the more of the \$1 billion appropriated the more applications will be funded. And there's no good reason to believe that states authorized funds in excess of their present applications wouldn't do their darndest to come up with more applications before Dec. 31, 1970.

Even if they didn't, there's a good chance the uncommitted carry-over funds would not be deducted from the Administration's Fiscal 1971 budget request, assuming the current mood of Congress for full funding continues —R.R.

BREAKDOWN OF WASTE PLANT FUNDING

(In millions of dollars)

States	Pending applications (as of Aug. 31)	Allocation based \$600 million	Allocation based \$1 billion
Alabama	0.5	11.1	18.3
Alaska	2.0	1.4	1.9
Arizona	1.8	4.9	7.8
Arkansas	4.6	6.6	10.6
California	68.9	48.3	82.8
Colorado	1.5	6.1	10.0
Connecticut	29.6	8.3	13.9
Delaware	.7	2.0	3.0
District of Columbia	36.8	2.9	4.6
Florida	37.7	15.9	26.8
Georgia	8.7	13.0	21.6
Hawaii	3.0	2.7	4.1
Idaho	.1	3.0	4.5
Illinois	128.9	32.1	53.4
Indiana	34.6	14.9	25.2
Iowa	6.3	9.2	15.2
Kansas	3.9	7.4	12.2
Kentucky	3.1	10.3	17.9
Louisiana	7.6	10.9	18.1
Maine	19.7	3.9	6.0
Maryland	46.8	10.1	17.0
Massachusetts	20.4	16.3	27.7
Michigan	183.1	24.4	41.6
Minnesota	29.4	11.2	18.7
Mississippi	1.8	8.0	12.8
Missouri	17.9	13.9	23.4
Montana	.3	3.0	4.5
Nebraska	3.5	5.1	8.2
Nevada	5.0	1.6	2.2
New Hampshire	11.2	2.7	4.0
New Jersey	48.2	19.1	32.4
New Mexico	1.4	4.1	6.2
New York	1,290.6	51.5	88.4
North Carolina	5.7	14.7	24.8
North Dakota	.1	2.9	4.3
Ohio	44.9	30.2	51.5
Oklahoma	1.9	8.0	13.2
Oregon	16.0	6.2	10.1
Pennsylvania	28.9	35.1	60.0
Rhode Island	9.4	3.4	5.3
South Carolina	6.4	8.4	13.6
South Dakota	2.5	3.2	4.7
Tennessee	23.8	11.9	19.7
Texas	20.3	29.9	51.0
Utah	.2	3.7	5.6
Vermont	2.4	2.1	3.0
Virginia	14.5	12.9	21.7
Washington	17.1	9.4	15.7
West Virginia	5.1	6.7	10.8
Wisconsin	94.3	12.8	21.5
Wyoming	.2	1.9	2.6
Guam		1.6	1.7
Puerto Rico	2.6	8.5	13.7
Virgin Islands		1.5	1.6
Total	2,356.3	600.0	1,000.0

OUR THRESHOLD OF SHOCK IS DISAPPEARING

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, people throughout our land are concerned about the lowering standard of conduct and the resultant loosening of our moral fiber here in America. This is a matter of wide concern.

One evidence of that increased concern is the editorial comment appearing in our newspapers. An example of this is the following editorial written by Editor Don Olson in the award-winning Marshall Messenger in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Mr. Olson's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I heartily recommend its reading to my colleagues:

OUR THRESHOLD OF SHOCK IS DISAPPEARING

Arthur Goldberg, in a guest editorial in Life magazine, says he is appalled . . . indeed frightened . . . by the deterioration of our national standards of morality and law.

He cites the dropping of murder charges against the Green Berets as a case in point.

In the past, he says, from Valley Forge on, Americans have given even spies and traitors their day in court. During World War II Nazi saboteurs who were landed on our East Coast were given a fair trial.

Almost tearfully he asks, "Has the time now come, after all these years, to adopt a lower standard of conduct?"

We don't know where the former Supreme Court associate justice has been these past 30 years but during that time his question has been answered a billion times as we kept lowering our standard of conduct.

Each time standards were lowered one more notch, our threshold of shock was pushed back, making further lowerings more acceptable.

There was a day when a scantily-clad body was shocking. Today a naked body is only mildly shocking to a majority of Americans . . . and not shocking at all to others. Rising sex crimes are hardly shocking at all . . . providing they happen to somebody else.

Destruction of public property once was a shocking thing that could get the vandals not only their day in court, but some days in jail.

Today park benches are chopped up and burned just to keep a few persons warm while demonstrating. Trees, 50 or more years old, are destroyed, buildings burned or sacked.

It is so commonplace most of us yawn, turn off the TV set and retire for the evening, thankful only that it didn't happen where we live.

Honesty once was expected of all except the common criminal. Now we expect many elected officials to line their pockets while in office, and we aren't alarmed by the general thievery that goes on in every community in the nation.

The burden is on the property owner to protect his property. If he leaves it unguarded, it should be stolen. This seems to be the attitude.

So Arthur Goldberg is appalled and frightened because most Americans greeted the dropping of charges against the Green Berets with a sense of relief.

What did he expect? Shock? Outrage? How stupid!

We Americans don't shock easily anymore. We've dropped our standards so low we've pushed our threshold of shock almost out of sight.

This is what silly old moralists warned about years and years ago.

HARRY L. BROOKSHIRE, OF
MARION, OHIO

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Mr. Harry L. Brookshire, minority clerk of the House, retired after 30 years of outstanding public service in both local and Federal Government.

His life is the great American success story. Harry is a fellow "Buckeye," having been born in Forest, Ohio, the son of a village blacksmith. From humble beginnings, fortune led him into public service where his integrity and talents have served well the executive branch and Members of this House. As minority clerk, his office door was always open to Members and staffers alike who came to request his wise and patient counsel.

Men of Harry Brookshire's caliber

have helped make this House a great institution of a free people.

The following June 10, 1956, public service broadcast by Mr. Joel McCaffrey entitled "Personalities in Your Government," chronicles the distinguished career of Harry Brookshire before he came to serve the House of Representatives, and why many of us, as new Members, learned early to go to him for counsel.

Harry L. Brookshire, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield's executive assistant is a friendly man from Marion, Ohio. But before he arrived at the Post Office Department more than 3 years ago, he spent a long time on Capitol Hill as an assistant to one of the best known Members of Congress. And in between the jump from Capitol Hill to the Post Office Department, Brookshire has held some of the toughest political jobs ever placed on a man's shoulders.

During the 1952 Presidential campaign, Brookshire, working in team with Robert Baker of Seattle, Wash., acted as advance man for the campaign train of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Brookshire recalls today with a shudder:

I was supposed to keep 10 days ahead of the train, but I'd wake up at night thinking I heard the train whistle blowing—some days I was only 5 or 6 days ahead—when the campaign was over I was ready to fall into bed and stay there for a month.

But he was not allowed to take it easy. He was immediately drafted to work on the Eisenhower inaugural. And here again he was kept so busy with so many headaches that he never had time to have the luxury of a headache of his own:

I remember sitting in Inauguration Headquarters on New Year's Eve—holding the phone in my hand and trying to track down Republicans all over the nation to confirm their hotel accommodations—or whatever it was I needed to talk to them about.

And for Harry Brookshire the grind still goes on. After he cleaned up his work on the Eisenhower inauguration in 1953, he again planned to take some time off and get caught up on his sleep and rest.

But the finger waved again and he moved into the Post Office Department to serve as confidential assistant to an Assistant Postmaster General. Next he was appointed to special assistant to the Postmaster General himself and last October he was named as General Summerfield's executive assistant.

Brookshire said:

It's a wonderful job—anything to do with the boss would be. He's just that kind of a man to work for and to work with—this department is perhaps the most challenging in the government. I never realized, settling back in his chair, the vastness of this department and job it actually does day in and day out.

Harry Brookshire's job is to act as a liaison between the Department and Congress. For one who has been so active in politics it is surprising that Brookshire never showed any interest in politics during his younger years. During the days of his hometown's greatest glory—when its leading publisher moved up from the Senate of the United States to become President of the United States.

It took, Brookshire admits, quite a bit

to get him interested, but once interested, he stayed that way.

He says with deep sincerity—

And any success I might have had in public life, is traceable to a person I regard as a really great man—Doc Smith.

And by that he means former Congressman Frederick C. Smith of Marion, Ohio, the man who made a national reputation even before he got to Congress by pulling Marion out of bankruptcy as its mayor. It was Doc Smith, a highly successful practicing physician, who, as Brookshire says, "sparked" his interest in politics. And to it, Brookshire emphasizes that he owes his success.

But before Smith "sparked" his political interest Brookshire had put in a lot of hard years fighting the depression and gaining an education.

He was born in June of 1902 in Forest, Ohio, where his father was a blacksmith. Shortly afterward the family moved to Kenton, Ohio, where he attended the first two grades of grammar school. The family moved to Marion, Ohio, and he continued in school there until his sophomore year in high school. At that time his father died and he was forced to get out and work to help his sister, Lelia M. Brookshire, through Ohio Northern University. Miss Brookshire now teaches junior high school in Marion, Ohio. To help support his mother, Brookshire went to work on the railroad first as a helper and later he worked his way up to a machinist's job. It was during this time that Harding was serving as President after winning the 1920 election by the very simple campaign method of sitting on his front porch and letting the Republican leaders from around the country come to him, rather than having the candidate go to them. The most vivid memory Brookshire has of Harding is a tragic one. He was one of the men who helped drape the locomotive which carried Harding's body back home to Marion, Ohio, after his death which so stunned the Nation. Brookshire was over 21 when he returned to high school to finish up there. Upon graduation he enrolled at Miami University at Oxford, helping pay his way by working in restaurants and other jobs he picked up. In 1926, he had to drop out because of the death of his mother and he did not go back until 4 years had passed when he returned for a year. He left then without his degree and never did return.

He recalls today:

I was offered a good job with the Osgood Steam Shovel Company in my hometown as a public relations man, so I took it . . . little did Brookshire know then that this job would lead him into an active—and for the first year or so—a hectic political career. At this time—1935—the city of Marion was in bad financial shape. Taxes were high and so was the bonded indebtedness.

The city council was proposing the purchase of a water plant. One of the leading opponents to the purchase was Dr. Frederick Smith, who up to then had kept busy enough with his practice and his private clinic. The city council ignored Smith and his supporters and voted to buy the water plant.

I'll never forget going to visit the Doctor the next evening. He was sitting on his front porch, swinging back and forth and snorting. As soon as I stepped on the porch Doc started storming about how the new water plant couldn't go through. "The people have a

right to vote on it" said Doc. Well, how are you going to stop it? I asked him, remembers Brookshire. "I'll run for mayor", replied Doc . . . it's now almost five o'clock, run down and get me a petition—tonight is the deadline for filing.

And like that—on the spur of the moment—began a political career that was to reach as far as the U.S. Congress. Actually, it started two political careers, because Brookshire was swept along with the Doc Smith tide.

Smith won the election only to move into the mayor's office to find the city broke and some \$80,000 in unpaid bills filed away in the bottom drawers. There was not a penny in the treasury and in order to buy coal for the fire department and the hospital Doc Smith had to pledge his own money. There was not money enough to buy drugs for the hospital and doctors had to bring their own ether in order to operate. Before Smith walked into this beartrap, however, he had armed himself with a pretty good aide. He had persuaded young Brookshire to serve with him.

Mr. Smith said:

I'll be rough, because you'll have to work nights and weekends—but there is a job to be done and we have to do it.

However, reluctantly, Brookshire moved in with the new mayor. He rapidly became enthusiastic as Smith chewed into one problem after another. In 1937 Smith stood for reelection. Never in more than 20 years had a mayor of Marion—regardless of party—been reelected. Smith was reelected to office. In 1938, Smith ran for and was elected to Congress. He took Brookshire along with him to head up his Washington office. Brookshire stayed with Smith until illness forced Smith to give up his seat. Brookshire, reluctantly, made the run for the vacant House seat, carrying five counties out of the six—but ending up a couple of hundred votes shy of the nomination.

Next came service with Congressman Howard Buffett as administrative aide and then came the hectic 1952 political campaign. Although he still is going at top speed, Brookshire retains his friendliness, his calm approach to problems and his appetite for hard work.

I've always enjoyed my work, and I owe everything to a great man—Doc Smith who is still keeping busy back there in Marion, Ohio.

That is the story of a man who has spent more than 20 years in political life—but never wanted to get into it in the first place, Harry Brookshire, of Marion, Ohio.

END OF INVERSE SUBSIDIES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago Agriculture Secretary Freeman coined a new term called inverse subsidy. It was clearly a euphemism intended to make an export tax sound like something else. Of all the curious

devices cooked up over the years in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, this one should qualify for some sort of award as the most curious of all. Imagine the imposition of an export tax on a commodity which had been in serious surplus condition since the war years. Happily, last week the inverse subsidy was terminated, and I hope for good.

Enclosed is an editorial comment on this bureaucratic curiosity as published by the Southwestern Miller magazine:

END OF INVERSE SUBSIDIES

A milestone in export pricing of wheat was passed last Tuesday when, for the first time since June of 1968, all classes of wheat could be exported from any coast of the United States without the imposition of the so-called inverse subsidy. The last of the export charges to be eliminated was on soft wheat clearing from the Pacific coast, at a zero level on Friday, compared with a charge of three cents a bushel a week earlier. Only several weeks before, the inverse subsidy, or export certificate payment, had been eliminated on soft wheat for shipment from Gulf and Atlantic ports. In effect, elimination of the export certificate charges, along with the payment of export subsidies on a number of classes of wheat, signifies the desire of the Department of Agriculture to adopt a competitive stance in world marketing of wheat. Of equal significance, the absence of export levies symbolically marks the removal of the last vestiges of adherence to the unrealistic pricing goals in the international Grains Arrangement.

Inverse subsidies were first imposed by the Department of Agriculture on June 13, 1968, the date the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of the I.G.A. The charges were designed to make up the gap between domestic prices and minimums in the Arrangement. In other words, foreign buyers were quoted higher prices than the actual market in the United States, and the inverse subsidy payments went to the Commodity Credit Corp. This unworkable system, which continued throughout the 1968-69 marketing year, reached its most ridiculous point in September, 1968, when an inverse subsidy of 48 cents a bushel was in effect on soft wheat to be sold for export from the Gulf or East coasts. The latter, the highest of the inverse charges, was a tax equal to more than 40 per cent of the market price for that class of wheat. The result of inverse subsidies, as the tool for U.S. compliance with the pact minimums, is history—a drop in exports in the 1968-69 crop year to the smallest aggregate in a decade. While this export performance cannot solely be attributed to the impact of inverse subsidies, because many other unfavorable developments occurred that reduced foreign sales, it is much more than a coincidence that the fall in business abroad accompanied an impossible procedure to raise export prices by highly artificial means.

The trend toward elimination of inverse subsidies began on July 18 of this year when the Department of Agriculture cut export levies in order to make certain classes of U.S. wheat competitive in world markets. This initial step was followed by a series of similar policy moves. The wisdom of these decisions, which were implemented only after considerable agonizing at the highest levels in the U.S. government, is evidenced by the response of the domestic market itself. Since the end of July, or just following the first step to abandon the I.G.A. as a pricing guide, wheat futures have registered just above twelve consecutive weeks of upturns. It is not foolhardy to attribute the persistent upward course in the domestic market, which in turn has facilitated final elimination of export levies on wheat, to the beneficial impact of a competitive stance for U.S. wheat in world markets.

The only disturbing note for those who believe that the export policies launched July 18 are in the best interests of the entire U.S. wheat economy is provided by rumors and hints from competing exporting countries of a resurgence of interest in seeking to raise the level of world wheat prices. In light of the present world wheat supply-demand situation, which is still marked by a substantial stock excess in relation to prospective import needs, it would be foolhardy for the United States again to fall into the trap of artificially seeking to raise export quotations. This country suffered to an acute degree in pursuing that course during 1968-69, and it should be assiduously avoided in the months ahead. Competitive pricing of wheat into world markets is not only essential to participating in current dollar business abroad. It is a prerequisite to needed adjustments in world production patterns in the coming years. Now that inverse export subsidies have been finally eliminated, they should never be restored.

A NEW CONCEPT OF FORESTRY

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent from Athens, Ga., Dean A. H. Herrick, School of Forest Resources at the University of Georgia, has written a very enlightening article on a new concept of forestry. This new system, which is being explored by forestry scientists in Georgia, will be of great importance in helping meet our growing needs for timber and its products.

It is my understanding that this article has been distributed by the U.S. Information Agency to its posts throughout the world for use in various overseas publications.

I think this article will be of great interest to all of the Members of Congress. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD:

GROW A FOREST IN 3 YEARS

(By A. H. Herrick)

Harvesting trees for pulpwood every two to three years—compared to the present 20 to 40 years—is a revolutionary new concept being explored by forestry scientists in Georgia.

It holds promise of helping the United States and other nations meet growing needs for timber, pulp, and other wood-based products. And costs would be greatly reduced.

The new system called "silage sycamore," consists of planting sycamore trees at a very close spacing and then harvesting crops of sprouts with a silage cutter every two to three years. Time and space savings are comparable to conventional wide-spaced tree plantations for pulpwood or other wood products. And higher yields of wood fiber per acre of land are expected. Trees are now harvested for pulpwood every 20 to 40 years.

Regeneration of forests by sprouts is not new. Willow shoots have been grown for basket weaving since the dawn of civilization. But bulk production of fiber or cellulose, by harvesting young sprout growth of trees, would be a real innovation. What we need for our two- or three-year forest is a tree that has the fiber properties sought by industry to make reconstituted products such as particleboard and paper.

Ten years of sycamore studies by the U.S. Forest Service at Athens, Georgia, proved the great versatility of that species. It occurs naturally in all states east of the Great Plains except Minnesota and grows on a wide

range of soils and sites. Under reasonably good sunlight, soil, and moisture conditions, sycamore grows fast. It sprouts prolifically from a low stump and responds well to fertilization. Then, too, it has relatively few insects and disease enemies in the South.

Not to be overlooked are other species such as sweetgum, yellow-poplar, and cottonwood. Even boxelder is a possibility because of its rapid early growth, light wood color, seeding characteristics, and possibilities for direct seeding. But sycamore is favored.

In the beginning, the new sycamore forest should be planted on a well-prepared site by using seed, seedlings or cuttings. Use of cuttings is particularly attractive since genetic gains are realized quickly; superior stock can be selected in one or two years and reproduced vegetatively.

Mechanical weed control and cultivation improve survival and growth. Repeated croppings will require fertilizer applications, and intensive management may call for irrigation. Possibly both irrigation and fertilization can be accomplished by applying discharges from sewage treatment plants to the forest crop.

Fertilizers, and pesticides if necessary, can be applied from aircraft. Likewise, when the product to be manufactured will not tolerate leaves, an aerial spray can be used for defoliation during the growing season. It would be nice to do all the harvesting in the dormant season when the leaves have fallen, but mills need supplies of chips the year round. The two- or three-year forest will replace itself by sprouting after each harvest cutting.

Sprout stands differ from annual crops which must be harvested when ripe and then stored. The sycamore tree silage can be stored on the stump for one or more years when harvesting needs to be delayed for any reason.

Experimentation so far suggests that initial growing space should equal the square of as many feet as they are years in the harvest interval. For example, in a planting designed for a three-year cutting cycle, the trees would be given nine square feet (.837 square meters) initially. The close spacings make full use of the site almost immediately. In conventional cuttings at eight-by-eight-foot (2.4-by-2.4-meter) or wider spacings, the tree crowns do not fully shade the ground for several years.

Two-year-old rootstocks in a nursery planting of sycamore placed one foot (.3 meter) apart in four-foot (1.2-meter) rows produced an average of more than 17 tons of one-year-old sprouts per acre (42 tons per hectare). When a similar planting was harvested after six years, only a few of the trees had died, but growth was drastically reduced during the last four years. At the end of six years, 42 tons of green material were produced per acre (104 tons per hectare). This equals seven tons or a respectable 2.3 cords per acre (17 tons per hectare) per year. However, if the sprouts had been harvested each year for six years, the total yield probably would have exceeded 100 tons per acre (247 tons per hectare) or about two and a half times the total of the single cutting.

A rig like a forage harvester is used to convert the forest of sprouts to chips. In one pass, the machine severs the stem three or four inches (7.6 to 10 centimeters) above the ground, chips up the entire miniature tree, and blows the "silage" into a trailer towed behind. When full, the trailer is hauled to a loading dock or transport terminal for dumping. Chips are either stored or sent to the mill for processing.

Foresters are not the only ones pleasantly surprised with sycamore as a short-term wood producer. Pulp and paper technologists have been amazed to discover that this "upstart" of the timber world has excellent characteristics for making certain types of products. Its very thin bark permits use of

the whole tree and eliminates the cost of debarking before chemical conversion.

Fresh samples of paper made from un-beaten pulp show green flecks from the chlorophyll in the leaves that were cooked with wood and bark just as the sprouts came out of the slage chopper. Yet, the strength properties, bleaching qualities and printability of whole-tree young sycamore sprouts command the respectful attention of the paper industry.

A vast variety of paper products, fiberboards and hardboards or molded articles for building and other purposes, can be manufactured from seedling-sprout slage, as is now being done from wood grown the conventional way. Soon, entire wall units as well as floor and deck units for homes and other small buildings may be molded in pairs, with a dead-air space in between to serve as insulation. These units would be light in weight and structurally very strong. The wall units would be ready to receive completed door and window units. Such buildings could be erected quickly at low cost.

With the slage sycamore concept, some tremendous cost savings in wood production can be expected. Gains are accomplished by cashing in on both biologic and economic principles. Every square foot of growing space is used. Yields are near capacity, and rotations (number of years between crops) are minimized. Consequently, both time and space are conserved.

Our sprout forest continually renews itself and yields heavy crops, thanks to close spacings and rapid growth. Rootstocks not only replace the newly-harvested stems by sprouting, but also stimulate new growth by giving the sprouts carbohydrates stored in root tissues. Yields per acre are tremendous. The young stems are easy to harvest and chip with fairly simple and light equipment. The young wood is relatively uniform in its characteristics. Bark and leaves are not considered trash in the manufacture of some products.

Maybe the young forest of sprouts will mass-produce raw material for mass-produced housing to help shelter exploding populations. What about the other two necessities of life—clothing and food? Rayon, along with other chemical converts, may also be an end product of the new forest, helping to clothe people in generations to come.

Sugar, molasses and yeasts can also be derived from wood. They could help considerably to provide the world with vital and urgently needed foods and proteins at low cost.

SECURITY AND SAFETY AT ROCKY FLATS

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared on September 7, 1969, in West magazine, a weekly publication of the Los Angeles Times, on the hazards of radioactive contamination.

After hundreds of mishaps and a major fire last May, some people think the Atomic Energy Commission and the management at the Rocky Flats, Colo., plutonium plant are not conducting the best of all possible safety programs, either for workers or the people living nearby.

According to the article the May 11 fire "was the biggest step the United States has ever taken toward nuclear disarmament. More than \$20 million worth of plutonium burned in the fire—roughly enough plutonium to build 77

atom bombs like the one that incinerated Nagasaki."

The story discusses the problems of cancer arising from the radioactivity and I want to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

SECURITY AND SAFETY AT ROCKY FLATS

(By Roger Rapoport)

The road from Denver northwest to Boulder, Colorado, is an enchanting, 20-mile drive, uncluttered by gas stations, hamburger stands or motels. At night, when traffic is light and fierce winds howl out of the 8,000-foot Flatirons, it can be a scary place to run out of gas or blow a tire. But more often than not, an angel of mercy will show up behind the wheel of a pickup truck, armed with a can of gas, the know-how to fix flats and plenty of Western hospitality.

The men in the pickups seem anxious to be good, unobtrusive neighbors to the 1.1 million people of metropolitan Denver. And in this way they have something in common with the people who run a plant at Rocky Flats nearby. But some of the reasons are different.

The Rocky Flats plant is operated by the Dow Chemical Company for the Atomic Energy Commission under a cost-plus contract. It employs 3,200 persons and its specialty is the fabrication and processing of plutonium, a radioactive grayish metal (worth \$43 a gram) created as a by-product of nuclear reaction and the key ingredient in most atomic bombs. The plant also repairs and replaces defective bomb and warhead components which are sent back to it when spot checks of nuclear stockpiles turn up duds.

All this dangerous work so close to a metropolitan area has made the plant's management, certain union leaders and the AEC sensitive about the issue of safety, both for the general area and for the workers at the plant. How much of the safety is substantive and how much is empty reassurance has become a matter of bitter debate in recent years.

Plutonium is doubly hazardous to work with. Minute quantities of it inhaled or imbedded in the skin can be lethal. It has a radioactive half-life of 24,400 years (something that makes it imperative that any of it that gets away not be left to lie about). Its radiation, of course, can cause permanent damage to living cells leading to leukemia and other forms of cancer. It also oxidizes quickly, making it a serious fire threat.

From its side of the fence, Dow and the AEC emphasize super-safety precautions, and boast that the plant "ranks first in AEC facilities for safety and holds the fourth best all-time mark in American industry—2,122 consecutive days (24,295,542 man-hours) without a disabling injury."

Rocky Flats officials tell about the elaborate safety precautions taken in the final assembly area (buildings 776 and 777). All workers in the area were heavily shielded and the entire plutonium assembly line with its milling machines, furnaces and presses was enclosed in glove boxes (ventilated, shielded, enclosures) connected by conveyors. Moreover, to guard against the accidental release of plutonium into the atmosphere, the entire production area was sealed off inside a self-contained unit with a special internal filtration system. An elaborate network of automatic heat and radiation sensors plus roving teams of safety monitors guarded against accidents.

But at 2:29 p.m. on Sunday, May 11, this fail-safe system fell through, a fire broke out in the final assembly area. Despite the efforts of the Rocky Flats fire department, the blaze spread through both buildings 776 and 777. Smoke billowed so thickly that some of the firemen (wearing air tanks to protect against radiation danger) had to crawl along exit lines painted on the floor to make their way out.

By 5:30 p.m., when the blaze was brought

under control, it had caused more than \$50 million worth of damage. The worst accident in AEC history, the fire put the final assembly area out of commission and forced a halt in American nuclear missile production for part of the year.

Potentially, the disaster was the biggest step the United States has ever taken toward nuclear disarmament. More than \$20 million worth of plutonium burned in the fire—roughly enough plutonium to build 77 atom bombs like the one that incinerated Nagasaki.

But rather than signal Geneva, Congress quickly shelled out \$45 million in supplemental funds to clean up the mess, a figure equal to the entire fiscal 1969 Rocky Flats budget. Now 240 Rocky Flats regulars and 60 summertime college students are sifting through charred debris to recover the burned plutonium. Meanwhile hundreds of railroad cars will ship 330,000 cubic feet of radioactive wastes to AEC burial grounds in Idaho.

Anxious to understand how the AEC's safest plant could produce its worst disaster, I paid a visit to Rocky Flats recently. I learned that despite the vaunted precautions there have been over 200 small fires since the nuclear weapons facility opened in 1953. Recently, fires had been occurring about once a month in the buildings where the \$50 million blaze took place. But on the Sunday afternoon the disaster started, only one ventilation system operator was in the building. Says Rocky Flats General Manager Dr. Lloyd M. Joshel: "I think we're going to have to review our monitoring procedures in this area."

All this has led local scientists to ask Rocky Flats officials if they shouldn't also review the possibility of moving their plant away from Denver. The Denver scientists are worried even though health surveys show that there was no release of plutonium from the plant site during the fire. Most of the smoke was trapped by the special filtration system.

Denver may not be so lucky next time.

Even the clean-up of the May 11 fire is causing more trouble. On July 30 two plastic bags surrounding a can containing some of the plutonium recovered from the \$50 million blaze caught fire. Two workmen in the area were contaminated.

Their names are only the latest addition to the roster of more than 325 workers who have experienced radioactive contamination at the plant. Officially, AEC spokesmen say there have been a mere 21 disabling injuries and one fatality since the plant opened. But they refuse to disclose the number of workers who have received their maximum permissible dose of radiation and been transferred to cold (non-radioactive) sections of the plant. The local union is not allowed to see medical files of contaminated workers or make an independent investigation of plant accidents.

Perhaps the biggest question looming over Rocky Flats is the number of workers who have cancer or have died from it. Dow public relations man Mike Carroll says "It would not be discreet to discuss this. I've got the figures but I won't give them to you."

One known cancer victim within the plant is 60-year-old Everett Holloway, an inspector with terminal leukemia: "I started checking into my medical records at the plant to see if I could establish some compensation. But I discovered that the company has lost some of my quarterly urine sample reports (which are taken to measure radioactive contamination). I was told that there was nothing the company could do for me until I become completely disabled. Supposedly they have switched me into a cold area but they're still machining a lot of radioactive material in my area and I don't know what effect it will have on my condition. I can't afford to quit because when a 60-year-old man like me comes asking for a job they look at you like you're poison."

Of course no one saw the plant as a liability when it came to Denver in 1953. Geographically, the rocky cow pasture 25 miles northwest of Denver was a smart choice because it was close by Colorado University in Boulder, skilled manpower in Denver and attractive recreational opportunities in the mountains. The plant soon grew into a crucial link in the AEC nuclear weapons complex.

In all, the bomb work was divided between eight AEC facilities. Design research and testing was done at New Mexico and California plants. Rocky Flats was responsible for plutonium components, the Kansas City plant made electro and electro-mechanical components, a Dayton, Ohio, plant made detonators and a plant in St. Petersburg, Fla., made neutron generators. These parts were assembled into nuclear weapons at plants in Burlington, Iowa, and Amarillo, Texas.

In the late 1950s, the plant mushroomed and radiation hazards grew with it. Between June 14, 1957, and October 28, 1958, there were 24 documented fires, explosions, plutonium spills, and contamination incidents at the plant. Testimony by Rocky Flats union leaders and government officials at AEC radiation hazard hearings in Washington during March, 1959, detailed many of the accidents; among them were serious fires in June and September of 1957.

Rocky Flats union leaders were particularly concerned about management's reluctance to bring in health physicists (who supervise worker health) after serious accidents took place. For example they testified that on October 28, 1957, a "chip fire in a production area occurred and as usual health physicists were not notified. No air samples were taken nor were any respirators worn to guard against inhaling dangerous plutonium. Health physicists learned of this operation after a worker involved in it coughed up black sputum at his home and became thus concerned with the method in which the incident had been handled by his supervisors."

The union leaders also pointed out that on September 4, 1958, supervisory personnel instructed workers to clean up a radioactive materials spill "using no respirators and without health physicists being informed of the situation." Subsequently, health physicists were notified, and recommended respirators and "area supervision gave in and allowed the workers to wear them on subsequent cleanup operations of the spill."

On October 3, 1958, another supervisor "stopped health physicists from allowing the men to know what the airborne contamination was in their production area on the grounds that it was his business only as to what the level was."

A variety of serious contamination incidents were also reportedly in supposedly cold areas. For example, on September 10, 1958, a "cafeteria survey showed 50 to 54 smears (taken to measure radiation) to be over allowable tolerance level." Ninety-seven of 99 smears in the locker room also showed contamination. Radioactivity was also found on drinking fountains, sinks, laundered caps, shoes, drums, flasks, carts, lifts and saws in cold areas.

As health hazards increased some workers were disappointed to see modification of some safety procedures. For example, prior to March, 1961, health physicists checked all employees out of hot areas with an alpha counter to make sure they were not carrying excessive radiation. But after March, 1961, workers were given more discretionary authority to monitor themselves out of hot areas.

Then and now, Rocky Flats officials felt that national defense precludes public discussion of these matters. But in the meantime they have been quietly documenting their problems in articles for the scientific community. For example, in 1964, Rocky Flats health physicists S. E. Hammond and E. A. Putzier had this to report in the sober international journal *Health Physics*:

"The Rocky Flats wound counter was developed in 1957 to measure the amount of plutonium contamination present in wounds incurred in process areas. Since that time more than 900 wounds have been monitored of which more than 300 have indicated some degree of plutonium contamination . . . the material is completely removed when possible. However, in cases where the plutonium is deeply imbedded or where physical impairment might result from complete excision, small amounts of plutonium may be left in the wound."

By 1965 union officials felt it was time to make a strong pitch for a new safety package in their contract negotiations with Dow. They asked for a joint "Radiation Safety Committee" with the company that would meet bi-monthly "to discuss problems arising from radiation safety complaints from any employees." They also proposed adding three union members to the company's Executive Safety Council and making radiation records of all employees available to "the union at least once each year in writing." All the proposals were rejected by management.

By 1967 it was becoming clear to *Health Physics* readers that the situation at Rocky Flats was getting worse. In an article titled "Evaluation of Lung Burden Following Acute Inhalation Exposure to Highly Insoluble PuO₂ (plutonium oxide)," J. R. Mann and R. A. Kirchner of the Rocky Flats staff reported that "On 15 October 1965, a fire in a plutonium fabrication plant resulted in a large-scale spread of plutonium oxide. The Rocky Flats body counter (a device that measures radioactivity in the body) was used to measure the plutonium in the lungs of all employees working in the area. Of approximately 400 employees counted, 25 were found to have enough plutonium in their lungs to deliver a dose of 15 rem/year. (In line with federal radiation standards Rocky Flats generally tries to keep worker exposure under 5 rem/year, although a complicated formula permits special exceptions.) On the average, 30 percent of the material initially deposited was cleared in 2 to 3 months. The remaining material is clearing very slowly with little or no measurable absorption into the bloodstream."

In another 1967 *Health Physics* article, C. R. Lagerquist, E. A. Putzier and C. W. Piltingsrud of the Rocky Flats staff described the gradual amputation of the thumb and second finger of a worker injured by the "explosive reaction between hot plutonium metal and carbon tetrachloride." They wrote that eleven months after the amputation "it was thought that there was a high concentration of plutonium in a small portion of the remaining thumb stump." But the operation was only a partial success and six months later "the remaining portion of thumb was removed."

Dissident members of Rocky Flats Local 15440 of the International Union of District 50 of the United Mine Workers finally got a little of the safety story out into the open in late 1967. At the time the goal-conscious international leadership of the United Mine Workers was conducting a vigorous campaign against a proposed nuclear power plant at Platteville, 30 miles north of Denver. Spearheading the campaign was the Ralph Nader of the atomic energy industry, a United Auto Workers official named Leo Goodman.

As Secretary of the Atomic Energy Technical Committee of the AFL-CIO, Goodman had served as a consultant to unions working in atomic energy and proved a nemesis to the AEC.

His files suggest about 6,000 Western states uranium miners are now dying of cancer. He also points out that there have been 1,400 known accidents in atomic plants and 200 known cases of cancer. Naturally these statistics are useful to the United Mine Workers in their fight to protect coal power

and guard against the inherent dangers of nuclear power.

So in November, 1967, Goodman joined UMW leaders in a trip to Denver where they worked to block the proposed atomic power plant at Platteville.

After reading in a Denver paper that Goodman was in town, a group of Rocky Flats employees visited him at his motel room. They told the atomic hazards expert that safety was deteriorating rapidly in their plant, and reviewed case histories of workers who had contracted cancer and then been denied medical pensions. Reporters for the *United Mine Workers Journal* and *Cervi's Journal*, a muckraking Denver business weekly, were present and published accounts of the meeting. To the chagrin of Dow officials and leaders of Rocky Flats Local 15440 of District 50 of the UMW the stories pointed out that "Officials of District 50 of the UMW representing the Dow Chemical workers will not discuss the radiation dangers involved for workers at Rocky Flats. If they do, they face loss of their security clearance."

This story ignited a feud within the UMW. International Leaders of the UMW were already sore at District 50 (with a regional office in Denver) because it refused to join their fight against the proposed atomic plant at Platteville. After the stories on the meeting with Goodman were published, District 50 officials went out of their way to back the new atomic plant. In February, 1968, a delegation of Rocky Flats local 15440 leaders headed by President Jim Kelly traveled to Washington for a regional directors conference of District 50. Aided by their Denver regional director Sam Franklin, the Rocky Flats union leaders extolled the virtues of the safety program at their AEC plant. Using color slides provided by the Rocky Flats management they showed how "the Rocky Flats plant has achieved one of the world's best safety records . . . through a highly effective program of industrial safety." They pointed out that "The design of Rocky Flats facilities insures that each worker's exposure to radiation is kept to a minimum . . . The average work-related exposure of a Rocky Flats employee for an entire year is barely above the radiation received during a chest x-ray . . ." Gene DeCarlo, chairman of the union's radiation committee told how "all employees are particularly careful about cuts and scratches on their flesh as the radiation danger increases in an open flesh."

According to District 50's Denver Regional Director Sam Franklin, the assembled directors "were so impressed by the presentation that they subsequently passed a resolution calling for the expansion of District 50's role in the atomic power industry."

Back at Rocky Flats, workers soon received news of the meeting in the February 26, 1968, edition of *District 50 News*. In the lead story it was reported that District 50 International President Elwood Moffett declared that "District 50's future is 'clearly interwoven' with the progress and development of the atomic energy industry." Further, the International Executive Board of District 50 promised to "continue to represent and safeguard our membership employed in every phase of that industry . . ."

The paper also carried the text of District 50's resolution endorsing atomic power plants ". . . contrary to the thinking of those who sporadically would remind us that progress in the field of nuclear energy represents a destructive force which could annihilate humanity . . . mounting scientific statistics amassed through the 2,000 man-years of experience in the Atomic Industry discount this pessimism."

Rep. Chet Holifield, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, inserted the District 50 resolution into the Congressional Record. Beneath the Holifield story in the March 11, 1968, *News* issue was a Freudian slip of a filler that did not amuse the Rocky Flats workers: "1.4 million Americans now alive have been cured of cancer. Early de-

tection and prompt treatment saved their lives. The American Cancer Society urges you to become familiar with cancer's seven warning signals and to fight the disease with a checkup and a check," it read.

The International leadership of the United Mine Workers was also not amused by District 50's endorsement of atomic power at the expense of coal. In March, 1968, the UMW International expelled District 50 charging that it was "willing to risk the lives of every citizen of this country in potential nuclear reactor accidents for the sake of a few members they have in atomic plants."

Since the break, District 50 has been getting along better with Dow and worse with the UMW. In March, 1968, just after District 50 endorsed atomic power, one of its biggest locals, 12075 in Midland, Mich. set a "chemical industry precedent" by winning an 80-cent-plus, three-year package from Dow. This paved the way for a 60-cent-an-hour direct wage hike plus a wage reopen in the third year for Rocky Flats Local 15440. The latter contract was ratified in June, 1968. But Local 15440 again lost its demand for the safety package originally proposed in 1965.

The UMW, through Washington atomic consultant Leo Goodman, subsequently charged that "Because the workers revealed the real hazards in the UMW Journal and *Cervi's Journal* of Denver (in November, 1967) . . . a sweetheart agreement was negotiated between District 50, Dow and the AEC (June, 1968) to foreclose any public discussion of the unsafe operating practices in the Rocky Flats plant . . . Thus, in order to cozy up to Dow Chemical, District 50 not only abandoned labor's traditional role in behalf of workers' safety in the plant but also collaborated with AEC-Dow Chemical in hiding from the people of the Denver community the great hazard which this plant brought to them."

Rocky Flats Local 15440 President Jim Kelly hotly denies these charges. The senior radiation monitors says that "If anyone told me to my face that we were playing sweetheart with management I'd knock him clear across the table. The real problem is that individual workers are afraid to turn their own plant health records (which they are eligible to see) over to the union. They think they'll lose their job. These guys raise a lot of hell in the locker room but they don't have the courage to get involved."

But on July 24 Kelly suddenly found that 200 of his chicken-hearted men had turned into wildcats. They walked off their jobs in building No. 44 when a plant official sent a union vice-president home because he refused to stop investigating an alleged work violation on company time. The grievance was the use of an inadequately trained radiation monitor on the cleanup of the May 11 fire. It is now in arbitration. The union vice-president and 154 of the wildcats received temporary layoffs and were docked on pay.

Both President Kelly and District 50 Denver Regional Director Sam Franklin are reluctant to talk loudly in public about their problems. They refuse to give out their records on the number of workers who have pick up their maximum permissible body burden of radiation and been transferred out of hot areas of the plant. Explains Franklin: "I'd appreciate it if you wouldn't bring up anything about this radiation business and men getting cancer because it will scare a lot of people."

But quietly, local 15440 is trying to arrange for some Washington-style publicity. Letters have been sent to Senator Edward Kennedy and to chairman Chet Holifield and vice chairman John Pastore asking for a meeting to discuss safety problems surrounding the fire on May 11 as well as discriminatory hiring practices. Chairman Holifield has already spoken with the union leaders by phone and they say Sen. Kennedy's staff is trying to

set up a meeting in Washington for mid-September.

But even should the meeting come off, the Q clearance may well save the day for the AEC. For the Q clearance is the real barrier to the truth about Rocky Flats. Ostensibly invoked to protect the national defense, it is really used by plant officials for self-defense. The Q clearance is the nation's highest security classification and explains why every Rocky Flats employee down to janitor is reluctant to discuss plant safety. For violating security can cost an employee his clearance, job, and pension as well as leave him open to federal prosecution. In the end, though, this silence may be shattered by disaster.

The May 11 fire has led the Colorado Committee for Environmental Information, a group of scientists from colleges and industries in the area to voice "real concern for the health and safety of Colorado citizens because of possible accidents involving large quantities of radioactive chemicals at Rocky Flats, located in the rapidly growing metropolitan area between Denver and Boulder."

Rocky Flats officials are not oblivious to this fear themselves. The AEC's Mike Sunderlind, who has been with the plant since it opened, keeps a thick civil defense manual nearby at all time: "If some plutonium smoke went up we'd call all the police agencies, tell them which way the smoke was going and ask them to move everybody out of the path. Afterwards decontamination teams would have to scrape all the plutonium off everyone's roofs—it would take months. Then we'd have to bring in all the people and put them through our one body counter (designed to measure radiation). It would be one hell of a mess."

The AEC is particularly anxious to minimize fears about atomic power, and with good reason. At this writing, there are 15 American atomic power plants in operation, 31 being built and 42 in the planning stage. Several have had serious accidents and two good new books *The Careless Atom*, and *Perils of the Peaceful Atom*, document the hazards. One accident in Michigan endangered the lives of 133,000 people. After a 1957 accident at the Windscale Works breeder reactor in England, authorities had to seize all milk and crops within 400 square miles of the plant. And a 1957 AEC survey shows that a reactor built 30 miles from the nearest city could kill 3,400 people, injure 43,000 and cause \$7 billion damage in a bad accident. The risks of atomic power are so bad that insurance companies will not sell policies for these reactors. Only a special act of Congress provides \$500 million worth of insurance for atomic power plants and absolves them for liability over that amount.

Thus a panic in Denver over Rocky Flats could jeopardize the future of the entire atomic energy industry. For if the public figures out that nuclear war is not inevitable and nuclear accidents are, the AEC is in trouble. Of course the AEC does its best to discourage this kind of thinking. When I first started work on this story, the AEC made a special effort to dissuade me from visiting Rocky Flats. After I insisted on takings a look, I was accompanied by three p.r. men (one flew in 400 miles from Albuquerque; another was an FBI agent) who shadowed me into toilets and wouldn't let me within 100 yards of the firesite. George Dennis, the AEC man who came in from Albuquerque (his office governs Rocky Flats) pleaded with me "Not to give any of our secrets away to the Russians."

At a time when six nations have atom bombs and most high school physics students know the basic of atom bomb making, it seemed like he was really trying to invoke old-fashioned patriotism to keep AEC secrets from the Americans. After all, the AEC is spending a record \$7,891,000 on Q clearance investigations of 17,300 personnel

in fiscal 1970. Each investigation takes several months and one middle-aged Rocky Flats worker told me that "when they investigated me they went all the way back to my first grade teacher and she was 84."

Apparently the AEC is getting its money's worth. For security is a good way of keeping problems like leukemia, plutonium spills, and \$50 million fires in the AEC family. Veteran Rocky Flats employees confess they still don't know what really happened on May 11: "Normally they have 8 to 10 guys patrolling those buildings for fires and radioactive contamination. Either they were playing around with something they don't want to admit to or they're guilty of the most incredible safety blunder I've ever heard of. If you had fires regularly in a building wouldn't you keep people on guard?"

In the end, the plant work force and the people of the Denver area are dependent on the AEC's good faith for their safety. Responding to public concern, Colorado Governor John Love arranged for a private briefing on the fire with Brig. Gen. Edward B. Giller, director of the AEC's military applications division. In an interview with *West*, Gov. Love indicated he found the AEC reassuring: "They seemed to be quite certain no radiation escaped from the plant site during the fire and will take precautions to make sure this kind of thing doesn't happen again. If you've got to have nuclear devices in the country I guess you might as well have the work done here as any place else."

But at a time when the United States has enough nuclear weaponry to wipe out the world several times over, one wonders what Rocky Flats is doing with enough plutonium to make at least 77 Nagasaki size atom bombs. While cleanup crews put the final production area back together Rocky Flats is moving ahead with a \$75 million dollar expansion program. Some critics feel this is the wrong direction in the wake of the AEC's worst disaster. Says UMW atomic consultant Leo Goodman: "Now's our chance to get together with the Russians and ban nuclear weapons together. It will save us a lot of money and be a lot safer."

But this is only wishful thinking. Clearly the AEC will continue running the plant, paying the salaries, regulating security, determining health standards, monitoring radioactive leaks and investigating accidents. Questions about deteriorating safety conditions, accidents and worker health will remain unanswered. For Dow officials are beholden only to the AEC.

As criticism has grown there has been a predictable reaction inside the plant. Rocky Flats General Manager Dr. Lloyd M. Joshel inserted a brief message in his house organ *Dow Newsline* to remind employees that silence is golden: "We are facing a difficult situation as a result of the fire May 11. Certain uninformed people have questioned the value of our presence here and have attacked the integrity of both the AEC and Dow. It is hard not to make an angry rebuttal, but I hope each of you will help our efforts to solve this problem by not commenting on the situation either by letters or by discussions off the plant site."

TAX REFORM BILL OF 1969

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Post of Monday, November 3, 1969, gives a detailed breakdown of the tax reform bill of 1969, and the differences in the Senate-House versions of this measure:

TWO TAX BILLS HAVE MUCH THE SAME FISCAL IMPACT

(By Frank C. Porter)

Sometime this month, either after or in the midst of the consideration of Judge Haynsworth's nomination, the public will be treated to the first free-wheeling Congressional debate on the monumental tax reform bill.

Two versions of this vital measure—House and Senate—were forged behind closed doors and a number of the issues were not even illuminated in the preceding open hearings. It is true the 368-page bill got an airing on the House floor. But the less than two-day debate occurred under a closed rule: Members could vote the entire bill up or down and so there was little incentive for a point-by-point consideration of its many provisions. And much of the bill's contents was clearly above the heads of many, if not most of the members.

It will be different on the Senate floor. Except in the unlikely case cloture is invoked, discussion is likely to stretch out for weeks and few of the 29 broad areas of tax reform and relief the bill embraces are expected to escape scrutiny. The bill's sponsors already shudder at the flood of expected floor amendments as individual members move to protect the interest of diverse constituents—or at least to have their concern recorded.

NEARLY THE SAME IMPACT

In the main, the House and Senate versions have roughly the same fiscal impact—\$9.2 billion in tax relief and \$6.8 billion in reforms when they are fully implemented 10 years hence for the House bill, \$9.0 billion in relief and \$6.5 billion in relief for the Senate measure.

There is little difference in the relief provisions. But the Senate bill is gentler on some of the more visible and controversial tax preferences such as oil depletion, municipal bond interest, capital gains and the bad debt reserves of financial institutions.

This easier treatment is largely compensated by tightening up in less spectacular areas—extending the minimum income tax to corporations, for example, and cutting back on depreciation concessions for anti-pollution equipment.

Following is a point-by-point comparison of the major features of the House and Senate bills. Revenue estimates assume full implementation of the bill's provisions, a few of which are not fully phased until 1979.

TAX RELIEF

Rate cuts

Both the House and Senate Finance Committees voted general rate cuts that, when combined with other relief measures would provide at least a 5 per cent reduction for all individual taxpayers and considerably more in the low-income brackets. For most wealthy persons the rate cut would be more than offset by reforms that would limit present preferences such as farm losses and oil depletion. The present top rate of 70 per cent (not including the surtax which temporarily raises it to 77 per cent) would be reduced to 65 percent.

The House bill would make these cuts in two equal steps, one in 1971 and the other in 1972. But to prevent a shortfall of revenue in the former year—when the Nixon administration feels it still may need a healthy budget surplus to fight inflation—the Finance Committee made one-quarter of the total cut in 1971, the other three-quarters in 1972. Under both measures, the ultimate tax loss would be \$4.5 billion beginning in 1972.

Single persons, widows, and widowers

Acknowledging growing complaints that single persons bear a disproportionate burden of income taxes (because married cou-

ples benefit from lower rates since they are allowed to split their income), the House bill permits single persons over 35 and widows and widowers of any age to use what has been known as head-of-household rates. These are midway between the rates paid by single and married taxpayers.

The House would also permit widows and widowers with dependent children, now filing as heads of household, to split their income and file joint returns just as though their spouses were still present.

Senate Finance considered the special tax treatment accorded single persons over 35 discriminatory and adopted a new "intermediate" schedule for all single persons.

This would be a lesser cut than provided by the House and there would be no change in the lowest and highest brackets. But it would affect far more people by removing the age qualification and there would be considerable savings in the middle brackets (see tax rate chart).

Whereas single persons now pay as much as 41 per cent more than married couples with the same income, the new schedule would insure that they pay no more than 20 per cent above the joint level.

The committee, disagreeing with the House, would keep widows and widowers with dependent children at head-of-household rates but these rates would be moved downward, resulting in a cut deeper in the middle brackets than the general reduction.

The regular rates, now applicable to single persons, would continue to be used by married persons filing separately and for joint returns (at double the regular brackets).

The House version would result in an ultimate revenue loss of \$650 million a year, the Senate bill \$445 million.

Low income allowance

Both the House and the Senate Finance Committee wrote into the bill an ingenious formula created by Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, which would remove from the tax rolls more than 5 million persons, including virtually all the remaining 2 million families classified as poor under federal standards and part-time breadwinners such as college students with summer jobs.

In place of the present minimum standard deduction of \$200 plus \$100 per personal exemption up to a maximum of \$1000, a taxpayer would be allowed to deduct a flat \$1,100. When combined with personal exemptions, this amount almost exactly matches the federal poverty cutoff for each family size.

This means that no tax would be due from a single person with income up to \$1,700, married couple with \$2,300, family of three with \$2,900, family of four with \$3,500 and so on.

Cohen recommended a phase-out of the low income allowance so that its effects would be concentrated on low-income Americans. Thus for every \$2 of income above the nontaxable level, the low income allowance would be reduced by \$1.

To protect the prospective budget surplus, the House adopted the phase-out for 1970 only. Thereafter the low-income allowance would be available to all as a minimum standard deduction (most moderate and high-income taxpayers wouldn't use it because their deductions would exceed \$1,100).

The Finance Committee made one change: It continued one-quarter of the effect of the phase-out through 1971—again to insure against eroding revenues. Thereafter, the phase-out would die.

In both versions the low-income allowance for those below the poverty line would cost \$625 million a year. Making it available to others through elimination of the phase-out provision would cost another \$2 billion.

Standard deduction

Present law permits taxpayers to deduct 10 per cent of adjusted gross income (total income less business expense and sheltered items such as oil depletion and the untaxed half of capital gains) up to a maximum of \$1,000 in lieu of itemizing their deductions.

The House bill would raise this to 13 per cent with a ceiling of \$1,400 in 1970, 14 per cent with a \$1,700 ceiling in 1971 and 15 per cent with a \$2,000 top in 1972. This would benefit an estimated 34 million returns. It would also result in substantial simplification since an estimated 8.4 million persons who now itemize would find it worth their while to shift to the standard deduction.

The Senate committee adopted this provision intact. It would cost an ultimate \$1.4 billion in lost revenues.

Maximum tax on earned income

The House wrote a provision which would put a ceiling of 50 per cent on the taxation of earned income—mainly wages and salaries as opposed to so-called unearned income such as dividends and capital gains. By giving an incentive to earned income, it sought to discourage the search for tax shelters. This would have resulted in an ultimate revenue loss of \$100 million. The Senate Finance Committee deleted this provision.

TAX REFORMS

Municipal bonds

Interest on state and municipal bonds is presently exempt from federal taxation. This creates a shelter by which wealthy Americans can and do escape taxation altogether and the bonds' consequent desirability means they can be marketed at interest rates far lower than those for conventional bonds.

The House Ways and Means Committee provided a no-strings federal subsidy of up to 40 per cent of the interest costs to encourage states and cities to market taxable bonds. Treasury claimed that the added tax revenue from these bonds would more than offset the subsidy and that the subsidy would actually improve the marketability of the bonds. The net revenue effect would have been small.

But governors and mayors wouldn't buy the argument and put heavy pressure on the Senate committee to delete this provision, which it did. The committee also eliminated the House's inclusion of municipal bond interest under the limit on tax preferences (minimum income tax) and allocation of deductions (to be discussed later), thereby leaving a loophole whereby wealthy persons may still escape taxation altogether.

Capital gains

Gains from the sale of securities, real estate and other property held more than six months are now taxed at half of ordinary rates up to a maximum of 25 per cent. For all practical purposes, half of these gains escapes taxation.

The House voted to extend the holding period from six months to a year for an estimated revenue gain of \$150 million. The Finance Committee deleted this.

The House voted to remove the 25 per cent ceiling, which would let the maximum rise to 37½ per cent under present ordinary rates (without surtax). This would raise \$360 million. The Senate versions would deny the 25 percent ceiling only to those with other preferred income of more than \$10,000 or those with capital gains in excess of \$85,000 for single persons and \$140,000 for couples. The revenue again would be \$330 million.

Present law permits full long-term capital losses to be deducted up to \$1,000 from ordinary income although only half of capital gains is subject to tax. Both House and Senate committees ruled that only half the net capital loss can be deducted from ordinary income. The revenue gain would be \$65 million.

Lump-sum distributions of pensions and profit-sharing plans are now taxed at the lower capital gains rate. Both versions call for the taxation of that part of the payment contributed by the employer after 1969 will be taxed at ordinary rates. That part attributable to employee contributions, capital appreciation and dividends would still be taxed at capital gains rates and a five-year average formula would help reduce the one-year tax bite. The revenue gain would be \$50 million.

Both House and Senate versions would also increase the maximum capital gains rate for corporations from 25 to 30 per cent with an estimated revenue gain of \$175 million.

Mineral depletion

To encourage exploration and in recognition that supplies of natural resources can be exhausted, present law allows a mineral developer to deduct a fixed percentage—27½ per cent for oil and gas to lesser amounts for various other minerals—of his gross income from his net income before computation of taxes, but not more than 50 per cent of net income.

The House reduced the oil and gas allowance to 20 per cent and that for most other minerals by a proportionate amount. It also eliminated the depletion allowance for foreign oil and gas production. The revenue gain would be \$400 million.

The Senate committee reduced oil and gas depletion to 23 per cent and left allowances for other minerals as they now stand. It would raise the 50 per cent of earnings ceiling on depletion to 65 per cent for companies with a gross of less than \$3 million. The revenue gain would be \$155 million.

Both versions would end a complex system of evading limitations on depletion allowances by juggling income and losses among different years through so-called carved-out and ABC production payments. The bill would treat these transactions much the same as mortgage loans and produce savings of \$200 million a year.

Foreign income

The House inserted complex provisions that would recapture the tax benefit of deducting foreign losses from domestic profits when the foreign operation subsequently produces income. Another rule would limit the amount of foreign tax credits on mineral income to the amount of U.S. tax on that income. These two items would produce \$65 million in added revenues. But the Finance Committee deleted both pending further study of the issue.

Financial institutions

Under present law the commercial banks are permitted to deduct 2.4 per cent of outstanding loans from income as a bad-debt reserve and mutual savings banks and savings and loan institutions may deduct either 3 per cent of loans or 60 per cent of income.

This results in these institutions paying far lower effective rates of taxation than the 44 per cent for corporations on average: 23 per cent for commercial banks, 17 for savings and loans and 6 per cent for mutual savings banks.

The House would reduce the 2.4 bad debt reserve of banks to the far lower actual loss experience of the past five years, eliminate the 3 per cent reserve for mutual thrift organizations and scale down the alternative deduction from 60 per cent of income to 30 per cent over 10 years.

The Senate cut back this increased taxation by 60 per cent—from \$375 million in added revenues to \$140 million—by keeping a fixed debt reserve for commercial banks but reducing it to 1.8 per cent and shaving the 60 per cent deduction for the other institutions to only 50 per cent.

The House measure would raise commercial

bank taxation to 30 per cent, savings and loans to 29 per cent and mutuals to 19 per cent. The Senate version would raise commercial banks to 25 per cent, S & Ls to 19 per cent and mutuals to an estimated 13 or 14 per cent.

Both bills would pick up an added \$85 million through changed treatment of these institutions' capital gains.

Minimum income tax and allocation of deductions

In an effort to reduce tax shelters and insure that wealthy persons pay some share of their income to the government, the House devised a limit on tax preferences (LTP). This calls for taxes at half ordinary income rates on the total of regularly taxed income plus certain types of presently excluded income if the latter exceeds the former plus \$10,000. The excluded income to be included in the base would be (1) municipal bond interest, (2) excluded half of capital gain, (3) untaxed appreciation in value of property donated to charity, (4) excess of accelerated over straight-line depreciation on real estate, and (5) excess farm losses.

A companion measure would reduce personal deductions in the ratio of preferential income to total income, this preferential income being defined as under LTP plus excess drilling expense deductions and oil depletion allowances. LTP would raise \$85 million additional and the allocation of deductions \$460 million.

The Senate Finance Committee junked both these items in favor of a flat 5 per cent minimum income tax levied on 12 different kinds of preference income in excess of \$30,000. This would be in addition to the regular income tax. Not included among the preferences taxes would be municipal bond interest, appreciated value on gifts and farm losses. The House provisions would apply to individuals only and while they would not be taxed as heavily under the Senate version the latter raises more revenue (\$700 million) by extending the minimum tax in corporations.

Foundations

The House passed a long series of complex regulations prohibiting self-dealing between foundations and their donors or principals, grassroots lobbying, more than 20 per cent control of an individual business. It provided heavy fines for violations, required that income of 5 per cent of assets (whichever is higher) be disbursed currently, made foundations responsible for the way recipients spend grants, and levied a 7½ per cent tax on investment income, the first in history.

The Senate relaxed many of these rules. It eased slightly self-dealing regulations, permitted business ownership up to 50 per cent, reduced the foundation tax to one-fifth of 1 per cent of assets at fair market value and called it a supervisory fee for tightened Internal Revenue Service audits. It dropped tough language prohibiting foundations from trying to influence public opinion in order to influence legislation in favor of present language which bars outright lobbying but permits research into social problems involving the government.

The House bill would raise \$100 million in new revenue; the Senate measure, \$55 million.

Other tax-exempt organizations

Despite a number of technical differences, the bills generally follow the same course in tightened up tax treatment of these groups. They would extend the tax on unrelated business income to churches and similar groups, tax the advertising non-profit publications such as the National Geographic and American Medical Association Journal and tax the investment income of social clubs. Both bills would raise about \$20 million.

Charitable contributions

Both versions phase out the special unlimited charitable deduction and raise the regular deduction from 30 to 50 per cent of adjusted gross income.

Real estate

The House limited double depreciation, now available for all new building, to new housing construction. Other new building would be limited to 150 per cent depreciation presently permitted on used property, which henceforward would be limited to straight-line depreciation. The bill also tightens up recapture of excess depreciation by taxing part of the gain on sale at ordinary rates. These rules would raise \$1 billion in new revenues. The Senate versions, which made a number of minor changes, would raise \$980 million.

OTHER REFORMS

The House bill would lose \$110 million, the Senate bill \$100 million through liberalized deductions for moving expenses.

The Senate wrote tighter fast-depreciation concessions for railroad rolling stock (to ease effects of the investment tax credit termination), reducing the loss in the House bill from \$170 million to \$100 million.

Similarly, the Senate was much tougher on 5-year writeoffs for anti-pollution equipment, limiting this tax break to installations in existing plants. The House bill would lose \$400 million, the Senate \$120 million.

Despite minor differences, both bills would raise \$235 million by ending the surtax exemption for multiple corporations.

Both bills liberalize rules for income averaging whereby persons such as authors or athletes with extraordinary income in a single year can reduce the tax bite. But by disallowing the House inclusion of capital gains and other non-wage income, the Senate committee reduced the tax drain in the House bill from \$300 million to \$110 million.

The House would permit interest on loans used to buy investments to be deducted only against 1) dividend income and 2) capital gains. The revenue gain would be \$20 million. The Senate deleted this pending further study.

Changes in the depreciation procedures for regulated industries in both bills would permit the government to recapture \$310 million in taxes that would otherwise be lost.

GENERAL FISCAL MEASURES

Both bills would:

Repeal the 7 per cent investment tax credit for an ultimate revenue gain of about \$3.3 billion.

Extend the present 10 per cent income tax surcharge at a reduced 5 per cent rate for the first six months of next year. This would increase revenues by about \$3.1 billion.

Postpone for a year reductions in telephone and automobile excise taxes scheduled for Dec. 31. This would add \$1.2 billion to revenues (both this and the surcharge extension are already included in administration revenue estimates).

COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED INCOME TAX RATES

To arrive at taxable income, subtract all business expenses, exclusions, exemptions and deductions from total income. For those who don't itemize deductions, subtract either \$200 plus \$100 for each exemption or 10 per cent of adjusted gross income up to \$1,000 under present law. Under proposed rates, subtract a flat \$1,100 (low income allowance) or 15 per cent up to \$2,000 under proposals to be fully effective in 1972. To compute tax, multiply first \$500 (for single person) by 14 per cent (under present law), the next \$500 by 15 per cent, next \$1,000 by 16 per cent and so on. New rates reflect cuts when fully implemented in 1972. Present rates don't include 10 percent surcharge.

Taxable income (in thousands of dollars)		Tax rate (percent)				
Single, married persons filing singly and heads of household	(Married-joint)	Present regular (single, joint and married filing singly)	Present head of household	New regular joint and married filing singly	New head of household	New intermediate (for all single persons)
0 to 0.5	0 to 1	14	14	13	13	13
0.5 to 1	1 to 2	15	14	14	13	14
1 to 1.5	2 to 3	16	16	15	15	15
1.5 to 2	3 to 4	17	16	16	15	16
2 to 4	4 to 8	19	18	18	17	18
4 to 6	8 to 12	22	20	21	19	20
6 to 8	12 to 16	25	22	23	20	22
8 to 10	16 to 20	28	25	27	22	24
10 to 12	20 to 24	32	27	30	23	26
12 to 14	24 to 28	36	31	34	25	28
14 to 16	28 to 32	39	32	37	27	30
16 to 18	32 to 36	42	35	40	29	32
18 to 20	36 to 40	45	36	42	31	34
20 to 22	40 to 44	48	40	44	32	35
22 to 24	44 to 48	50	41	47	34	37
24 to 26	48 to 52	50	43	47	36	37
26 to 28	52 to 56	53	45	49	38	42
28 to 32	56 to 64	53	46	49	40	42
32 to 36	64 to 72	55	48	50	43	47
36 to 38	72 to 76	55	50	50	45	47
38 to 40	76 to 80	58	52	52	47	52
40 to 44	80 to 88	58	53	52	48	52
44 to 50	88 to 100	60	55	54	51	54
50 to 52	100 to 104	62	56	58	53	55
52 to 60	104 to 120	62	58	58	55	58
60 to 64	120 to 128	64	59	60	55	60
64 to 70	128 to 140	64	61	60	55	60
70 to 76	140 to 152	66	62	60	55	60
76 to 80	152 to 160	66	62	61	57	61
80 to 88	160 to 176	68	64	61	57	61
88 to 90	176 to 180	69	64	61	57	61
90 to 100	180 to 200	70	66	62	60	62
100 to 120	200 to 240	70	67	63	62	63
120 to 140	240 to 280	70	68	63	62	63
140 to 150	280 to 300	70	68	64	62	64
150 to 160	300 to 320	70	69	64	63	64
160 to 180	320 to 360	70	70	64	63	64
180 to 200	360 to 400	70	70	65	64	65
200 to 300	400 to 600	70	70	65	64	65
Over 300	Over 600	70	70	65	65	65

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Omaha World-Herald of July 11 and July 12, and the North Platte, Nebr., Telegraph, in the State of Nebraska. The editorials follow:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, July 11, 1969]

PUTTING LEGISLATURES IN TEMPTATION'S WAY

The big-truck bill cosponsored by Rep. Robert V. Denney of Nebraska has come under attack in a House highway subcommittee.

Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa spoke against the bill on the grounds that it would increase safety problems by introducing wider, longer, harder-to-handle trucks on the highways.

Rep. Richard D. McCarthy of New York said the bill would allow states to authorize the lengthening of trucks by as much as 11 feet.

"This legislation is going to be a green light," McCarthy declared. "I'm sure every state legislature (would be the target) of high-powered trucking lobbyists going in to seek an extension to 70 feet."

To this Denney replied:

"You have no confidence in your legislature to behave sensibly."

At this point we must pause to wonder whether Denney has taken a look at his own state's Legislature lately.

With a whoop and a holler, the Nebraska lawmakers decreed that Nebraska roads may

carry the heaviest trucks in this part of the country.

Given this record of performance, it would not be hard to envision the Legislature yielding again, and giving Nebraska truckers permission to widen and lengthen their vehicles to the maximum allowable in Denney's bill. After all, what is a maximum for, if not to be crowded to the utmost?

The Nebraska Legislature already has created enough potential for damage to highways and worsening of safety problems by voting for 47½-ton trucks. It should not be given the temptation, via the Denney bill, to take further action detrimental to the public interest.

Rep. Schwengel predicted the bill will die on the House floor. We hope he's right.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, July 12, 1969]

WIDER TRUCKS ARE SAFER? THEY HAVE TO BE KIDDING

Bus operators and truckers told a House highway subcommittee that wider, longer, heavier vehicles than are now on the road would be more comfortable for bus riders and safer than are present buses and trucks.

Not so, said Rep. Fred Schwengel, R.-Ia. He said that drivers he talked to did not agree with their bosses. The drivers said they had enough trouble handling present-sized buses and "stated flatly that increasing the width of buses would increase safety problems and make their jobs more difficult."

The average motorist has some experience in driving behind and around the trucks and buses now on the road. Congress should ask him what he thinks about the chances of increasing safety by widening vehicles to 102 inches from the present 96 inches and authorizing lengths of 70 feet.

The truck-bus lobby had better stick to its economic arguments that bigger trucks are a fine thing.

Never in this world can it convince the

average auto driver that wider, longer, heavier trucks speeding along the country's jammed highways will make those highways safer.

[From the North Platte (Nebr.) Telegraph, Aug. 2, 1969]

SCHWENGEL, DENNEY: SIMILAR OPPOSITES

(By Bob Poos)

WASHINGTON.—Two congressmen, remarkably alike in many respects, have taken opposing positions in a House battle over a bill that would permit bigger trucks on the federal interstate highway system. Fred Schwengel and Robert Denney, both moderately conservative midwestern Republicans—and personal friends—are on the public works subcommittee studying a bill that makes them antagonists.

It is House Resolution 118708, "the big truck bill."

Schwengel, of Iowa, is its foremost opponent and Denney, Nebraska, is one of its cosponsors.

The measure would permit wider, heavier and in some cases longer trucks and buses on interstate highways.

Witnesses in favor of the bill during three weeks of testimony were mostly representatives of the trucking or allied industries but did include Norber T. Tiemann, governor of Nebraska, where the subject is a touchy one. Those against comprised a wide range of interests, including the American Automobile Association, the American Association of State Highway Officials, county highway engineers' groups and the Federation of Women's Clubs.

Opponents said bigger trucks would be more dangerous to other motorists and would break up highways and bridges much more than present maximum size trucks.

Proponents said the bigger trucks would have improved braking and steering systems, better load distribution and would actually be easier on roads and bridges.

Also, they claimed, resultant economic benefits would permit them at least to hold the line on transportation costs and thus fight inflation.

Schwengel and Denney fought for their sides eloquently, vigorously and at times heatedly.

Both are obviously convinced they are right and each is confident of the outcome.

Schwengel said in an interview, "They've got the votes to get it out of subcommittee. But just maybe we can block it in the full Public Works Committee. There are a lot of committee members who don't want to see that bill get out on the floor where it would embarrass them."

Schwengel said if he cannot stop it in the committee "I'll take it to the people of the United States. I'll make a speech on the floor of the House every day. They won't get it through a roll call vote."

Denney, on the other hand, calls it "a good bill" and said in an interview he expects to get it out of the committee onto the floor of the House.

"Look," Denney said, "I know people, some of them, are going to say 'you're for the truck industry.' But let's put it this way, I'm for agriculture, not trucks." Citing one reason bigger trucks are needed, he said "The railroads are taking off more trains continually."

As Denney envisions it, the big trucks will use the interstate highways to get to large cities and smaller trucks will take over on the state highways.

"The new truck bill means that shippers such as cattlemen and grain growers will now be able to rent one, rather than two, trucks to get their products to market," Denney said.

But Schwengel, also from a rural area, contends the bigger trucks would be acutely more dangerous and would cause more expense in road and bridge destruction.

CHARLES MARSHALL WASHBURN

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I was exceptionally pleased to learn that Mr. Charles Marshall Washburn, a longtime writer for the Bangor Daily News has been presented the Distinguished Service Award from the American Forest Institute.

The AFI is the communications and education arm of the forest industries and presents its Distinguished Service Award each year as it did Tuesday at the Mayflower Hotel.

The award is presented to an individual outside the forest industries who has made an outstanding contribution toward a better public understanding of the industries.

I would like to note just a few of the comments of Mr. J. V. Sutton, chairman of the AFI board of trustees, during the presentation. Mr. Sutton said:

We in the AFI have the responsibility for communicating the programs and problems of the forest industries to the public. The importance of our work increases in direct proportion to the intensity and sound of the demands to withhold timberlands from production.

Our future depends upon the public's understanding of our duty to provide an adequate timber supply for domestic uses. Without this understanding, both the forest industries and our country would be in serious trouble.

This understanding can come about only through fair, objective reporting. And fair, objective reporting is an active job. It requires digging for all the facts, rather than re-writing handouts. It requires a balancing of viewpoints, rather than biased presentations. And finally, it requires giving all of the facts, rather than a few judiciously selected to support a particular point of view.

The highest compliment that I can pay Mr. Washburn is to say that he is a fair, objective journalist. In a very brief summary of his work, the citation that goes with this award tells you why I say that.

I am happy to include the citation which accompanies the Distinguished Service Award, and a news release on the presentation, as follows:

CITATION

Charles Marshall Washburn is a man who comes face-to-face each day with the advancements of the 20th Century space society, but treasures the simple virtues of having the respect and admiration of his fellow men.

As the Forestry, Farm and Fisheries Editor of the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Mr. Washburn has been closely associated with the popular issues of conservation and the practical developments of the forest resources for many years. Throughout his career he has endeavored to understand and present each side of public issues. In recent years when it has become daring to challenge public crusades, he has performed research to determine the accuracy of the vari-

ous statements and to correct misunderstandings.

He has visited forests and wildernesses for an on-the-site study of the developments; he has attended public hearings to learn the attitudes of land owners and the needs for public use of the lands; and he has personally conducted tours for conservation leaders to clarify areas of doubt.

His reward for this continuing effort to better inform the public has been the respect and admiration which his readers generously extend to him.

There are few men who have achieved the trust which conservationists, educators and industry leaders have placed in his news stories.

One conservation leader has written: "One of the finest reporters in Maine is Charles Marshall Washburn of the Bangor Daily News. His articles on matters of conservation, whether the subject be forestry, agriculture, or wilderness, such as the Allagash Waterway, are always vital and extremely readable, with a wealth of information wrapped in each sentence. In my work with the Audubon Group and the Bird Conservation Club of Bangor, I have always found his reports on controversial issues to be as fair and unbiased as is possible for any individual."

The Director of the School of Forest Resources of the University of Maine has added:

"(Mr. Washburn) has done a great deal in this state to help people understand the problems of forestland owners and the importance of the forest products industry and the economy of Maine."

An official of the forest industries has rounded-out the general confidence in his work by writing:

"Mr. Washburn has consistently written feature stories on our industry . . . presenting fairly and favorably the conservation work which the industry has undertaken and accomplished as well as interpreting for the public some of the issues involved in the public use of our lands."

The American Forest Institute is privileged to join in the tribute extended to Charles Marshall Washburn by awarding him its Distinguished Service Award for 1969.

V. J. SUTTON,

Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

OCTOBER 28, 1969.

WASHBURN WINS AFI'S DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 28.—Charles Marshall Washburn, Forestry, Farm and Fisheries Editor of the Bangor, Me., Daily News, today was presented with the Distinguished Service Award of the American Forest Institute.

Washburn was presented the award, a plaque and a \$500 honorarium, by V. J. Sutton, chairman of the Institute, at the organization's annual meeting at the Mayflower Hotel here.

The Award is presented annually to an individual outside the forest industry in recognition of outstanding contribution toward a better public understanding of the industry. Washburn, who has covered developments in Maine's extensive commercial timberlands since 1954, has won the respect of both the forest industries and conservationists.

In presenting the award, Sutton said:

"Mr. Washburn has been closely associated with the popular issues of conservation and the practical developments of the forest resources for many years.

"Throughout his career he has endeavored to understand and present each side of public issues. In recent years when it has become daring to challenge public crusades, he has performed research to determine the accuracy of the various statements and to correct misunderstandings.

"His reward for this continuing effort to better inform the public has been the respect and admiration which his readers generously extend to him.

"There are few men who have achieved the trust which conservationists, educators and industry leaders have placed in his news stories."

EX-REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK IS NOW "PROFESSOR CHARLIE"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I insert the following story by Robert P. Mooney, from a recent edition of the Indianapolis, Ind., Star. I am sure all of us who knew Charlie Halleck over the years, and who miss him so much here in the House, will be pleased to read of his new and rewarding career in the college classroom:

EX-REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK IS NOW "PROFESSOR CHARLIE"—TEACHES HISTORY COURSE (By Robert P. Mooney)

RENSSELAER, IND.—Former United States Representative Charles Abraham Halleck, now becoming known as "Professor Charlie" to a number of college students, believes America is at the crossroads of returning to a new isolationism.

An isolationist before World War II, Halleck later enraged several of his Republican Hoosier Congressional colleagues and state GOP leaders by transforming into an advocate of foreign aid.

He backed such foreign aid programs as the Marshall Plan, designed to rebuild a war-wrecked Europe, and also supported (at the request of a former, scrappy President) the Truman Doctrine, basically drawn to stem the tide of Communist aggression.

While Halleck still is strongly anti-Communist and supports President Richard M. Nixon's policy in Vietnam, he does not try to impose his own opinions on students at St. Joseph's College.

Shortly after he announced his plans to retire from Congress on Jan. 23, 1968, Halleck was offered a teaching position by the Rev. Charles B. Banet, president of St. Joseph's. Father Banet later was to remark:

"Getting Halleck into a classroom made the trip to the moon anticlimactic."

Halleck and St. Joseph's officials came up with an assignment to teach one class a week in History 57—or more favorably called "Washington since 1934."

Halleck set a maximum of 25 students each fall semester. He still will winter in Florida.

On registration day, the class was filled in 20 minutes. Halleck relented and accepted four "emergencies." Most of the students are history and political science majors, but a few students with other majors, such as accounting, slipped into the class.

Halleck's course deals with Republican national conventions from 1940 to 1968, government and labor relations, foreign aid legislation, domestic problems, defense commitments, etc.

Of course, Halleck's background is formidable for the task.

Halleck was elected House majority leader in 1947, serving in that capacity until 1953. He pushed legislation which reduced taxes, balanced the national budget and lowered the national debt. The Taft-Hartley Act, a landmark of labor legislation, also was a result partially of Halleck's efforts.

Elected minority leader in 1959, Halleck was instrumental in the passage of the Landrum-

Griffin labor law and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

From 1952 to 1960, Halleck was one of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's closest advisors and confidantes.

Halleck first entered Congress in 1935. He was appointed to such dubious committees as "Pensions" and "World War Legislation."

Halleck, a Hoosier lawyer (and former Jasper County prosecutor), once recalled that he does not remember that the committee on "Pensions" ever met. But another first appointment was to the Civil Service Committee.

When Halleck entered his final and 17th Congressional campaign in 1966, he held the distinction of being the only living American to serve as both majority leader and minority leader in the House of Representatives.

The former Congressional leader was offered a healthy fee for his one-semester a year, weekly class. He accepted, but not for his personal use—the fee will go into a fund to provide scholarships for students hoping to attend St. Joseph's.

Halleck has taken his teaching duties seriously, missing but one class since he started. That was two weeks ago when he went to South Dakota to hunt pheasant. He is an avid hunter and fisherman.

The Rev. Donald F. Shea, chairman of the history department at St. Joseph's, said Halleck was nervous, but sincere, about his new duties.

"When I was in London last summer," Father Shea said, "he sent me an outline syllabus (course of lectures) for my review and approval. I was amazed."

When he first started lecturing, Halleck had bulky, copious notes but he quickly found out that he didn't need quite so much material. The class is scheduled for one hour, 30 minutes, but he sometimes cuts the time to an hour.

He doesn't stand at a platform and lecture. He stresses informality and openness in all class discussions.

There is little doubt that a few of the students enrolled just to have the privilege of having a class under Charlie Halleck. And there are others who take the attitude:

"This course is like a story hour at the public library. It's so interesting because Mr. Halleck makes it so real—after all, he was there."

Halleck also is on the board of trustees at St. Joseph's.

A replica, but smaller, of Halleck's old office in Washington is set up in the college administration building. He had his desk and chair shipped from Washington and also the nameplate, "Mr. Halleck," which fronted his office door in the nation's capital.

Many photographs of highlights in his career adorn the walls of the comfortable office.

One of the famous Eisenhower signatures reads:

"To Charlie Halleck: With the admiration and affectionate regards of his devoted friend, Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Halleck often spends two or three hours daily in his campus office. He still has a law office in downtown Rensselaer and converses frequently by telephone with former Democratic Governor Roger D. Branigin. The two have been friends for years and formed a semi-partnership of accord when Branigin left office earlier this year.

Halleck last week threw his class into open discussion on Vietnam. Like most discussions on Vietnam, it was confusing, contained some misinformation, revealed partiality and much apprehension and left Halleck groping for answers to some well directed questions that even long-time experts on Vietnam have failed to answer to the satisfaction of questioners.

But the class was open and free. Nobody lost his temper. Halleck, like a cagey boxer, wove in and out of the more difficult questions. A few times, when backed into a corner, Halleck simply, but honestly replied, "I don't know."

There was one refreshing note of student behavior. When Halleck entered the classroom to start proceedings, the students stood up out of respect, a mark of good training and personal courtesy.

Most of Halleck's students favor President Nixon's phased withdrawal of troops in Vietnam, but a third or more replied that they had favored the national moratorium on Vietnam and unilateral withdrawal. These students were more vocal and participated more in the discussion than did those who favored President Nixon's policy.

Later, when Halleck entertained the class at a reception in his new home in Rensselaer, followed by dinner at Former State Senator Roy Conrad's Sportsmen's Inn at Monticello, several of Halleck's students who favored the moratorium admitted that it probably was impractical to pull all U.S. troops out of Vietnam at once.

A few of the students remarked that Halleck's easy-going, amiable attitude as a teacher belied his "gut fighter" reputation in Congress where the Halleck wrath had chased many a foe to the sanctuary of a nearby cloakroom.

They got a wee sample of the old Halleck after the dinner when an Indianapolis senator, Ken Griffin, a member of the Marine Corps Reserve, proposed a toast to "Professor Charlie."

Griffin drew a laugh when he said that Halleck should know that he had worked for the re-election of U.S. Senator Birch E. Bayh Jr. (D-Ind.) in the 1968 election.

But Halleck drew a louder response, when he quickly retorted:

"If you can stand him (Bayh), I guess I can."

Then the "Professor" blew a policeman's whistle.

"The show's over, let's hit the road back to Rensselaer."

He turned to Conrad, saying:

"Roy, I'm going to have to bring you a new picture, that one's getting a little old, isn't it?"

Conrad has a framed picture of Halleck on the wall of his dining room.

It looks like it was taken not too long after Halleck first went to Congress.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN C. HAZEN

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the retirement of a distinguished national spokesman for our private enterprise system: John C. Hazen.

Representing the National Retail Merchants Association in Washington for 25 years, 17 as vice president for government affairs, John has earned the title "Mr. Retailing," in the Halls of Congress and the executive branch.

John's quarter-of-a-century record of integrity and responsibility leaves the Nation, and particularly the tens of thousands of retailers across our land, in his debt. In the years since John came to Washington from a career as a publisher and civil defense administrator, many of the Nation's leaders have

come to value his friendship and respect his judgment, his unflinching sense of humor, and his confidence in America's private enterprise economy. Those qualities, applied with great measures of hard work, have helped to shape many of the important legislative and executive decisions in Washington over the past two and a half decades.

During John's years with the National Retail Merchants Association, America's department stores emerged from a wartime economy and so prospered that their customers now enjoy a wider selection of merchandise, at higher quality levels than at any other time in history or place in the world.

Our system of government has worked, in no small part, because able and dedicated men like John Hazen have not let us forget that government is the servant of the people and freedom is our most precious asset.

So to John, on this occasion, we offer best wishes, and hope we may continue to call on his good counsel.

FOUR-MONTH MAIL SERVICE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, after reading and listening to the torrent of words which have been spoken and written over the past year about the defects of our present postal system, I feel sure that our fine Postmaster General needs little more evidence of the chaotic conditions which, unfortunately, beset the U.S. mail service. I also recognize the fact that "Red" Blount has been striving mightily to gain congressional approval for his postal reorganization plan and for those reasons I am reluctant to add even a jot of criticism to his already heavy burden. However, I feel constrained nonetheless to cite one more case of ineptitude because it seems almost impossible to believe. The incident in mind concerns a special delivery, air mail letter that was addressed to me and mailed July 9 from San Bernardino, Calif.; the postmarks indicate that it arrived in Washington, D.C., on July 10. That's great speed, so far; but that letter was delivered to my office yesterday, November 3.

Though the temptation is great, I will refrain from the now normal analogy with the era of Pony Express service. And if this were a matter of a box of Christmas cookies gone astray, I might be inclined to pass off the incident with a facetious aside but this was a far more important letter. It concerned a Federal matter of great interest to about 700,000 people in my district. The fact that the county board of supervisors spent 55 cents to dispatch it attests to its urgency.

I do not know how many other Members here can cite similar incidents. But I do want to say that this situation causes me considerable distress. As we all know, letters and communications of all sorts are the very lifeblood of every Congress-

man and when something happens to interfere with the vital interchange of correspondence between a constituent and his elected representative, then we become the victims of derelict service.

One of Mr. Blount's predecessors was wont to say on frequent occasions that the postal service was in a race with catastrophe. Well, for my money the race is over and the name of the winner begins with "c." Make that capital "C."

PHILANTHROPY SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED—NOT CHOKED OFF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long sought comprehensive tax reform I have been heartened by the progress made thus far on this most complex matter. However, I am concerned that in some areas we may, in fact, take action contrary to the objectives we seek of creating an equitable and realistic tax system. One aspect of the omnibus tax reform bill which must be very carefully considered is the question of changing the tax treatment of charitable foundations. There are certainly great abuses by many so-called foundations which actually are established as tax havens, but I seriously question the wisdom of the action by the Senate in setting a limit of 40 years on the existence of all private foundations.

In this connection, the Newark Sunday News of November 2, 1969 published an excellent editorial which I ask to be printed in the RECORD at this point. As the editorial notes, much more detailed information on all foundations is needed, and until this is available we must take care that we do not act to correct abuses by "shackling the varied and valuable initiatives many responsible foundations have shown in helping to ease social problems."

The editorial follows:

CURBING FOUNDATIONS

Limiting the life span of private philanthropic foundations to 40 years, a move endorsed by the Senate Finance Committee, reflects congressional resentment over abuses uncovered in use of the tax-exemption privilege. Yet they scarcely warrant such drastic action as contemplated.

Radical differences over how foundations should be treated are found in Senate and House versions of the tax-reform bill. No one knows what compromise will finally emerge but apparently tough new restrictions on operations and finances are coming.

One difficulty in deciding what should be done is lack of knowledge about what the current picture is. Sketchy details compiled by Internal Revenue indicate there are at least 30,000 private foundations, with assets of perhaps \$20 billion, but the real totals may be higher. As a first step toward needed regulation, the government should compile details, including classifications of the foundations by purpose, size and nature of donors.

Some curbs on foundation activities are obviously needed. While individuals are saddled with a special 10 per cent surtax to

meet government needs, a few foundations are using untaxed income to pay for the education of their founders' children or finance the recruiting of college football players. One spends \$500,000 on public relations. Some finance corporate acquisition programs. Others control retail store chains, an aircraft company, an oil complex, a breakfast food manufacturer.

As minimum steps to eliminate abuses, any legislation finally adopted by Congress should prohibit self-serving dealings between foundations and their major donors, limit involvement in businesses unrelated to the foundations' charitable functions, restrict direct attempts to influence political decisions, and assure that net income is distributed, not accumulated.

Such correction should be accomplished, however, without unnecessarily shackling the varied and valuable initiatives many responsible foundations have shown in helping to ease social problems. Philanthropy is one of man's nobler traits. It should be encouraged, not choked off.

MODERN HYPOCRISY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Eric Sevareid's recent comments point out the essential hypocrisy of those youthful agitators who condone violence for their own objectives but decry it when necessary to preserve the Union. Because of the intrinsic dangers to the preservation of a government of law and not of men implicit in any subjective yardstick measuring when violence is proper, I include Mr. Sevareid's thoughtful remarks at this point in the RECORD.

WHO'S A HYPOCRITE?

(By Eric Sevareid)

The youthful avant-garde, both black and white, is persuaded that feeling is where it's at, not thinking, that the soul is superior to reason. So perhaps it should surprise no one that they demand that the churches fork over a half billion dollars to black Americans, in reparation for the historical sufferings of Negroes. No discount allowed, apparently, for the big role played by the churches in abolishing chattel slavery in this country. And none of the loot to be shared with the descendants of the 300,000 or so white men who died fighting against slavery in the Civil War.

Many young rebels, black and white, disclaim any personal responsibility for what their parents did wrong, and properly so. But their parents are to be held responsible for what their parents or grandparents did wrong. Nice work if you can get it.

True pacifists aside, the young militants claim they hate war and love peace. They hate this particular war in Asia, but they love their own substitute wars on campuses and elsewhere. They are, in fact, warriors, containing within their breasts all the hate, fear, envy, aggression and boredom out of which so many wars have been born. They assume the right to commit acts of common criminality, but demand exceptions from the common penalties.

One of the basic complaints of young revolutionaries is that adult society is full of hypocrisy. But it appears that hypocrisy is one phenomenon that has managed to bridge the generation gap.

MEETING OF THE INTER-AMERICAN CONFEDERATION OF THE PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE HELD IN FLORIDA

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, 18, and 19, the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Confederation of the Partners of the Alliance held their first meeting in Coral Gables, Fla. The Board, composed of representatives of Latin American and U.S. Partner organizations, met to establish priorities for private sector activities in social and economic development in the hemisphere. The Secretary of the Inter-American Confederation is Mrs. Jeanette Westfall. She is executive secretary of the Iowa Partners of the Alliance and has been instrumental in the success of the Partners nationwide.

At the meetings, Dr. Edgar Barbosa Ribas of Curitiba, Brazil, President of the Inter-American Confederation, noted that he hoped that an expanded interchange among the people of the hemisphere will result from the initial discussions concerning the Partners that were taken in Coral Gables. He stressed the two-way nature of the Partners as an important part of the program's concept. While Latin Americans are receiving technical assistance for self-help projects, they are also contributing to their U.S. Partners in cultural and educational fields. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance in the Agency for International Development, also stressed the importance of the Coral Gables meeting by noting that it marks the transition of the Partners program into a truly Inter-American effort.

The Board of Directors unanimously passed a resolution in support of Congressman DANTE FASCELL's bill, H.R. 13120, to establish the Inter-American Social Development Institute. The resolution stated:

Whereas, Congressman Dante Fascell of Florida is leading the efforts to establish a private sector "Inter-American Social Development Institute" which offers so many possibilities for meaningful and significant contributions to the mutual self-help development movement within the Americas and,

Whereas, Congressman Fascell has given effective leadership and support to the resolution adopted by the Fourth Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance which called for the allocation of a "Partners Plan for Peace" to the Inter-American efforts of the Partners programs,

Therefore, be it resolved that: The Board of Directors of the Inter-American Confederation of the Partners of the Alliance expresses its gratitude and appreciation to Congressman Dante Fascell for his dedicated enthusiasm, outstanding leadership and effective contribution to the improvement of Inter-American understanding and development.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an article that appeared in the

Miami Herald on Sunday, October 19, which discussed the objectives of the Partners program and gives added emphasis to the importance of the meetings held in Coral Gables:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IS FLOUNDERING BUT ITS PARTNERS ARE WELL

(By Don Bohning)

The Alliance for Progress is floundering but its "partners" are still alive and well.

The Partners of the Alliance program was created in 1964 to help personalize the Alliance for Progress between Latin America and the U.S. by putting the emphasis on people instead of governments.

Individual U.S. states pair off with countries and areas throughout Latin America to help promote regional development through high impact but frequently low economic priority self-help projects.

It might mean, for example, a fire truck from Wisconsin for a volunteer fire department in Matagalpa, Nicaragua. Or 1,200 pieces of used dental equipment from Iowa for work among the Mayan Indians of the Yucatan Peninsula. Or technical know-how and potato seed from Delaware to aid in establishing a potato chip factory in Panama.

There are now 40 states working in direct relationship with 40 areas in 17 Latin American countries and the benefits are not all one-way.

"The Latin American Partners, while receiving technical assistance for self-help projects, are also contributing to their U.S. Partner in cultural and education fields," says Dr. Edgar Ribas of Curitiba, Brazil.

He cites art exhibitions, musical performances and assistance to U.S. language instruction programs among the contributions made by the Latin American Partners.

Ribas is president of the newly formed Executive Council of the Inter-American Confederation of the Partners which concludes its first meeting in Coral Gables today.

Creation of the Council is another effort to assure continuation of the Partners program, regardless of what happens to the Alliance for Progress.

The Council is composed of representatives of U.S. National Association of the Partners of the Alliance, a Brazilian Confederation of the 15 Brazilian state Partners, a Central American and Panama Confederation and a Confederation of the remaining Partner countries. All are non-governmental.

"The meeting here is the first organizational step to make coordination, planning and direction of the Partners program genuinely Inter-American," says James Boren, its founder and director.

"It's not proper for the U.S. association to make all the decisions and call the shots," says Boren. "We want the Latin American participation to be not only in name but in fact."

President Nixon still has not publicly outlined his Latin American policy although Administration spokesmen have indicated the Alliance for Progress as conceived by the late President Kennedy will be in for an overhaul.

Boren sees any policy change as having only limited, if any, effect on the Partners program, since it is largely operated outside the governmental sphere now.

Additionally, both Nixon and Charles M. Meyer, assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs, have praised the Partners program and indicated continued administration support for it.

The Council removes the Partners program even further from the governmental realm.

Boren and his seven-man staff now operate under the U.S. Agency for International Development on a budget of less than \$500,000 a year.

His office functions primarily as a catalyst in bringing private sector leaders from the Partner areas together. Then they are on their own.

It is hoped by mid-1970 that the entire program, including Boren and his staff, will be completely outside the governmental realm.

"If ever we needed citizen-to-citizen communications in this hemisphere, we need it now," says Boren, who just returned from a five-week tour of some of Latin America's most remote regions.

One of the Partner program's most immediate needs, says Boren, is transportation.

They hope it will come in the form of a "plane for peace," a project being pushed in Congress by Florida Rep. Dante Fascell, chairman of the House subcommittee on inter-American affairs.

The resolution, as presented by Fascell, calls for the U.S. government to provide a plane to transport people and equipment involved in Partner projects.

"At the present time we have many, many tons of equipment and supplies throughout the U.S. ready for shipment to Latin America but no way to ship it," says Boren. "And in Latin America we have students with scholarships available, large numbers of painting exhibitions and musical groups that would be brought to the U.S. if there were means to get them here."

Boren echoed delegates to an Inter-American Partners' meeting in Salt Lake City earlier this year who wondered "with so many planes being given over to purposes of war, why could not just one airplane be provided for the cause of peace and understanding in the hemisphere."

RETIREMENT OF HARRY L. BROOKSHIRE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have come to know Harry L. Brookshire well are going to miss him very much. I certainly want to join with my colleagues in wishing the retiring clerk to the minority a long and happy retirement. He leaves the U.S. House of Representatives after many years of diligent and faithful service that began far before my service. I understand Harry first came to Washington in 1939 with Congressman Frederick C. Smith, of Ohio, and took up his duties with Doc Smith as his top assistant.

When the Eisenhower administration came into office, the search for capable talent reached out and touched Harry who became the executive assistant to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield.

In retrospect it was only logical for the Republicans in the House to recognize Harry L. Brookshire's outstanding ability and to pick him as their clerk to the minority, in which position he was serving when I first came to Congress in January 1961. Indeed, he had already received well earned recognition for his executive ability and his keen sense and awareness of moving politics in America. This was very much self-evident the first time a newcomer to the House of Representatives like myself had the occasion to consult with and to seek his wise counsel.

Some of the qualities that endeared us to Harry were his loyalty, dedication, sincerity, and his ever-constant desire not only to serve but to serve well.

Most assuredly, if there has ever been anyone who has reached retirement age and deserved to be honored by a retirement program, then Harry L. Brookshire ought to be listed right on top.

He will take with him, I know, many fond memories and recollections of his years on Capitol Hill which I am sure will fill his reminiscences with a warm glow. We hope that he will remember us with the same warmth that we too will remember him.

A PROFESSOR SPEAKS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the splendid speech delivered recently to the Omaha, Nebr., Rotary Club by Mr. William H. Thompson, dean emeritus of the University of Nebraska.

Mr. Thompson was for 30 years a member of the faculty at the University of Nebraska. The speech of this outspoken educator follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. THOMPSON

I submit the following qualifications for appearing before you: ten years teaching in high school; ten years teaching in college; thirty years as college professor and administrator. During the Great Depression of the 1930's and in the years following World War II, I survived two campus riots and a student body strike. I fired ten faculty members in one day and thirty-five students in a day. I have endured innumerable parades, complaint committees, appearances before my superiors, and a bushel basket of unfriendly newspaper comments. During my career, I have made many mistakes—among them was the flunking of the mayor's son. I've appeared before boards of education, boards of regents, superintendents, presidents, faculty and ministerial committees to answer for my deeds. I have only one virtue—I didn't run away! These, gentlemen, are my credentials.

A recent visit to the campus of the University of California at Berkeley is the stimulus producing my reaction today. As I stood at the entrance to the campus of one of the world's most beautiful and famous universities, and saw it spew out a scummy product, my heart was sick. To walk along Telegraph Avenue leading to the main gate is an unforgettable experience. It was hard to believe my own eyes as I saw the dirty, ugly horde of young people eating, drinking, sleeping in what was formerly a lovely street. The desecration was made worse by odoriferous hawkers of underground newspapers paid for by pro-Chinese Communists and distributed as a means of support for Communist China. These newspapers are pornographic and contain indescribable filth. An editorial spoke of the "New Utopia" to be brought about by a revolution that would dissolve the family as a social unit. The first page of a newspaper ran an advertisement inviting all to a party: "Come bottom-less or top-less, or both; however, you have to furnish your own pot."

I was told that Telegraph Avenue has the highest venereal disease ratio in the world. Its inhabitants are supported by welfare, that

is, by contributions from parents and by money from Communist sources.

Policemen on campus describe the university population as of two kinds: bright, well-adjusted young people; others ranging from bearded Left-wingers to the most degenerate "hippies." I was told that about a third of the faculty members are hippies. I talked with one of them. He had food in his beard and a stale-beer breath. I asked him what he represented at the university. He replied, "The New Left." I felt he should have been left somewhere else long ago.

The real villain in the situation is never mentioned; he gets no publicity. Yet, in my judgment, he is largely responsible for many of the unspeakable conditions on the faculties of our universities. The villain is the man who hires the faculty, too often on the basis of academic proficiency alone. I submit to you that our youth deserve better than the character of "the New Left." Our universities owe it to the young generation that it should be led and instructed by men of good character, personality and basic appreciation of the real issues of life—certainly by men loyal to our country, which preserves us all.

The policemen told me about a new breed called "street people," who are joined by the hippies. The policemen said the campus plan of the pro-Chinese Communists is to corrupt the bright youth of this generation and prepare the downfall of our nation. The police told me that people come from everywhere in the world to witness this festering menace. Without Governor Reagan's strong support, the police couldn't control the situation.

I have talked with many college administrators from various parts of the country. They tell me that what is happening at Berkeley is part of the plot by which Communists plan to achieve the destruction of our republic by those who have received its greatest benefactions. They are skillfully and intelligently led; their agents invade every campus, break no laws and prey upon the credulity and the urge for adventure that exists in all youth. They ply their destructive schemes by use of an ingenious and insidious philosophy which challenges our whole system of values.

I had sometimes felt that perhaps men like J. Edgar Hoover exaggerated the Communist danger. But when I saw the existing situation at Berkeley, I changed my mind.

One asks the question: How can these things be? The agony of this question should be borne by every American. Perhaps we should thank God for the many thousands of dedicated professors and scientists who are faithful to their responsibilities, and for the further fact that they still are in the majority. Many administrators are alert to the threatening disaster, but often feel helpless for many reasons. I should like to discuss a few with you:

(1) It is my opinion that the television networks and some members of the news media have been large contributors to the present situation. In my view, too many publications have become journals of abnormal psychology, and television is the most modern means of confusion, distortion and disorientation of the mind of man yet invented. The dregs of campus society are glorified through presentation by the news media.

Too often today, one must turn to page 16 of the newspapers or switch the TV to soap operas or movies made long ago to find anything normal or natural about the human animal.

(2) Our universities have become temples of data processing. Freshman Joe is only a number. He is too often offered a curriculum of pap such as, "How to fish in the Northwest," or "How to play games on the recreation field," or "English I" as a euphemism for fourth grade English. Freshman Joe is taught by a graduate student

who couldn't care less about him and is interested only in how to finish a thesis for a master's degree and thus disappear from the legitimate function of the university—teaching—to go into "research." Freshman Joe is hounded by a horde of disinterested, ill-prepared, poorly paid harpies known as "counselors." At the end of the year, he finds himself depersonalized and on probation because he didn't make the necessary grade point averages. Meanwhile, highly paid academicians empty bottles into test tubes, push rats through mazes, cook bacteria, write scholarly papers for scholarly journals and make 13 copies for their government grant. Freshman Joe sees the name of the "great man" in the university catalogue or on an office door; that's about as far as he ever gets to knowing him or learning from him.

It is sad to think that the great multi-university of today has no room for the olive grove of Socrates, or the crack in the castle wall of Pestaiozzi, or the walk to Emmaus with Christ.

(3) While one may find many faults in the great civilizing institution called the university, the predicament we face is not totally explained in terms of the university. Recently, a seven-year-old boy was sent to me for psychological analysis. He had set his home on fire three times and the last time he nearly destroyed it. I asked him why he had done it. He looked at me with big earnest eyes. "It was the only way I could get my folks to come home," he explained.

We have produced a generation gap by perching on cocktail stools, rushing into all the social and economic go-getter-isms, and, when at home, turning on the TV. We live with our children as strangers, little realizing that there are others who do communicate with them and who think with them. The English have a saying, "We send our son to the schoolmaster, but the school boy educates him."

There are many facets to the problem.

Our political leaders compromise with indolence, greed and sloth, forging more and more chains to hamper the producer and adding more and more stuffing to the feather-bedding for those who will not work.

We have witnessed the degeneration of the theater and the debauchery of the motion picture. We place heavy emphasis on sex obscenity, have emptied sex of its spiritual values, and accepted the poverty-stricken fare of motel short order sex.

In our great city of Chicago, there stands in the city square a tremendous so-called "art form." The politicians and professors gathered together at the unveiling. They talked of public relations, international relations and modern art. The crowd gaped at the big shots. "I don't know what it's all about," said a taxi driver, "and I don't think they do." This modern exhibit of sculpture, in the center of one of our nation's greatest cities, daily speaks of the *depersonalization* of man. Modern art critics praise the monsters that wriggle from the caverns of Picasso's subconsciousness.

From the mouths of our clergy, too often, comes the dragon-breath of Marxism, welfareism, Mao-ism, that leads to personal degeneracy in the name of the social gospel. Our educators, too often, compromise with ease and get-something-for-nothing pressures from a public that wants the symbols of education without the price. Consequently, we have divested our curriculum of the difficult discipline of the classics. We have accepted, too often, the concept of education as a custodial function. "Just keep them off the street!" Thanks to the non-failure policy of our public and parochial schools, we have overwhelmed the universities with a host of semi-illiterates. These institutions adjusted to this flood of incompetence by cheapening the curriculum and debating the worth of a college degree. Nowadays, it serves merely as an I.D. card for job

application or as a ticket of admission to the Society of the Lounge.

Our courts of law have compromised with crime, and officers of the law are badgered as never before in the history of our nation.

All this is not unnoticed by our youth. You had better believe it! It would be a complete distortion to think that what I have been saying here is the real picture of our youth or characteristic of the majority of it. Never has there been a generation whose average health and strength is greater. Never before has there been, among the children of men, a generation equal to the present one in intelligence, ability and capacity to perform. These young people now provide the footfalls in the halls of our institutions of learning. They are capable of meeting the challenge of greatness. However, they are the victims of our generation, which daily bathes them in the glorified dregs and iniquities of our society as portrayed by many of our artists, writers and self-anointed intellectuals, and by muckrakers in the news and communications media. Our young people are frustrated by the lock-step of inferiority imposed on them in our schools. They are neglected yet indulged by their parents, uninspired by our churches, and disillusioned by our own political infidelities to the principles of our Constitution. Thus many of our young people have become easy prey to those who lead them into moral degeneration, political anarchy, religious nihilism and personal disaster.

I ask you: What is wrong with an honest devotion to the things that have made our country great? What is wrong with "In God We Trust"? I ask you: Shall we stand again on our proven values, or shall we go stuttering and stumbling, brawling and burning, reeling and bleeding, back to barbarism?

DECLINING FAITH IN THE MILITARY—A FACT TO CONSIDER CAREFULLY

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our so-called Military Establishment is the center of widespread public discussion and often heated debate, an editorial which recently appeared in the Sunday Call-Chronicle newspaper in Allentown, Pa., is worthy of widespread dissemination.

In his editorial, Mr. Edward D. Miller offers a thought-provoking commentary on present day public opinion regarding the "military."

I am pleased to bring this to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and representatives of the executive branch of our Federal Government. It deserves our thoughtful consideration.

Mr. Miller neither condones nor dismisses lightly the errors which have produced an avalanche of antimilitary criticism. On the other hand, however, the editorial points out the potential dangers of applying our criticism with a broad and indiscriminate brush.

The editorial referred to follows:

DECLINING FAITH IN MILITARY

(By Edward D. Miller)

There was a time when a general with a sufficiently impressive cluster of ribbons could walk into a congressional hearing, request a few billion dollars for a new weapons

system and get it without much discussion. Those days are over.

Citizens of yesteryear respected a man in uniform almost automatically. His service to his country, the thinking went, set him apart. Seldom were his motives questioned. His dedication overshadowed everything. Those days are over too.

The pendulum of public opinion, which used to be permanently fixed in the dangerously extreme portion of blind respect, is swinging to an equally dangerous resting place—blind suspicion and contempt. Fortunately it has not reached that point yet and it must not be allowed to. But concerned citizens should understand why it is moving and what it will take to stop it.

Respect of the military has declined seriously during the last five years because of a series of blunders, miscalculations, bad judgments, inefficiencies and scandals. Consider the following incidents:

The Air Force's C5A transport plane is probably going to cost the taxpayers about \$2 billion more than the original Pentagon estimates.

The Safeguard antiballistic missile system will cost anywhere from \$10 billion to \$50 billion, depending on how successful the military is in lobbying for a complete system.

Costs for the Vietnam War are running about \$35 billion a year. About every six months since 1964 the Defense Department has blithely told the American public that "we have turned the corner in Vietnam," or that "we can now see the light at the end of the tunnel."

The Army's former provost marshal general and chief of the military police corps has been charged with unauthorized private sales of military and civilian firearms and stripped of his Distinguished Service Medal.

Several sergeants, including the first sergeant major of the Army, have been accused of raking in more than \$1 million while operating or selling to service clubs in this country and in Vietnam. They have been accused of skimming money from slot machines, stealing funds for capital for their own corporation and accepting kickbacks on the bookings at the clubs.

The Special Forces has been linked with the Central Intelligence Agency in the execution of a Vietnamese double agent. The Army dropped the charges without sufficient explanation.

An Army nerve gas test killed hundreds of sheep in the Rockies and the Army denied any blame for 18 months before confessing responsibility.

A Marine doctor and chaplain have accused the corps of brutalizing prisoners in the Camp Pendleton, Calif., brig.

These are but a few of the incidents in the last few years which have contributed to the sinking image of the military. The confusion about the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the capture of the Pueblo, the ability of a Russian-built Cuban Mig to land at a Florida Air Force base without U.S. jets rising to meet it and growing awareness of the inequities in the military judicial system have further fanned the fires of discontent.

The danger this eroding public opinion presents is that the military will be forced into a corner of society—defensive about criticism, secretive, inward-looking. If the dedicated career officers feel their sacrifices are not appreciated, they will either leave the service of their country or band together as a rejected class. Even a brief reading of history points out the dangers present in a military class which feels separated from the rest of society.

To prevent this decay from becoming permanent, the military establishment must realize that its greatest mistake of the past has been a lack of candor with the rest of society. As the nation becomes more responsive to the needs and aspirations of its young, its black, its poor, the military must also open up to society rather than turn its back.

An attitude which says that once a man

becomes a soldier he is U.S. government property and has no rights must be peeled away. The idea that the national treasury is bottomless when it comes to military hardware must be eliminated.

Military leaders must be wise enough to see that what has been standard operating procedure will no longer suffice. Not only must the individual soldier be treated with dignity and justice, but society itself must be accorded its priorities.

The armed forces cannot claim to be defending the free enterprise system when their own abuses are undermining the financial stability of that system. The military cannot argue that it fights in Vietnam for individual freedom and justice when its own code of justice violates those principles with brutal and unwarranted punishments.

The military has established a fine record during our history. It cannot afford to have this blemished by extreme public reaction to its excesses.

NEED NATIONAL UNITY ON VIETNAM ISSUE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that President Nixon has reemphasized in a very objective and logical manner the need for national unity over Vietnam and has appealed to the public for an understanding of our long-term foreign policy goals, he hopefully will receive a strong display of public support. However, it is obvious that the President's sane approach to international problems will still be subject to intense criticism and the professional organizers of next week's moratorium will continue their protest.

An article carried in the Thursday, October 23, Blue Island, Ill., Sun-Standard by Columnist Leonard Carriere, is as an effective commentary on the subject of moratorium performance as any I have seen and therefore I place it into the RECORD to draw attention to this sound commentary:

IN PASSING

(By Leonard Carriere)

Every now and then someone comes along with the ability to voice an idea that touches the very depths of your soul. Malcolm Thompson of Las Vegas, Nevada, whose 18 year old son was killed in Viet Nam, in responding to the Moratorium of October 15th, had this to say:

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

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

There is no more that need be said.

In truth, the dissidents are not great in number—they have high visibility. They achieve an effect greatly disproportionate to their numbers. Their actions, their thoughts, strike a responsive chord in certain publications as well as members of the fourth estate, as a result of which their visibility is ma-

terialized, while the vast, vast majority, not representative of their views, go about their daily affairs unnoticed and unheralded.

One of the immediate results of the unbalanced picture is that the world does not understand us, our purpose, nor our determination. The enemy understands it less. The antics of the few provide Hanoi with great comfort and hope, hope in that the seemingly derisive forces in our society cause Hanoi to take more time. More time translates itself into more death. The list of the dead will be longer, made longer by those whose aim is to eliminate it altogether. When again they read those names let them choose and mark with an asterisk those which appear there in consequence of their misguided motives. The bullets that kill are not all fired by the soldier in the field.

We do not have a state of declared war although there is no doubt that we are at war. It was a state of declared war that led this country to imprison tens of thousands of loyal Japanese during World War II who did nothing and said less, while our present-day monsters go abroad unpunished in the land, advocating treason, sedition and rebellion. Somewhere, somehow, the ends of justice are not being served.

The world must be made to understand that the American people are not divided to the extent that they would believe. This cannot and is not being accomplished with the present format. The world is only willing to believe that which it can see. Come November 15th another and more intensive Moratorium demonstration is being planned. Is it not logical that those of us who are of a contrary mind display our loyalty and purpose by counterdemonstration of such magnitude that the actions and antics of those who would serve the enemy appear but as a fly speck on the devils dung heap? And could this not be best accomplished on November 11th when we traditionally honor the fallen, led by their brothers in the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, aided and abetted by the various civic and fraternal organizations, whose sons make up the list of the dead?

This, Hanoi can understand. This the world can understand. Let our purpose and actions end the list of the dead, rather than to have the few unwittingly add a single name thereto. The fabric of peace is woven by many hands, not the least of which are yours. Let us not yield to those who have not only killed our sons but whose stated intent is to destroy us all. Some would say that that which we do is immoral. I say, there is less morality in capitulation; in capitulation we dishonor not only dead, but ourselves. That is the greater evil.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS, UN- SUNG HEROES OF THE SKYWAYS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, America's air traffic controllers are the unsung heroes of the skyways. Only gradually is the general public becoming aware of these men behind the scenes—of the tremendous responsibilities they carry, the pressures under which they work, the mental, physical, and emotional stamina they must have to make repeated rapid-fire, accurate decisions. On their alertness rests our safety in the air.

My own admiration for these dedicated men has been boundless for many years. Both as a private pilot and a fre-

quent traveler on commercial planes, I know how much depends on them.

It was with great pleasure that I opened last Tuesday's Plain Dealer to discover an excellent, full-page article featuring two of my good friends, Bobby C. Coil and Emil R. Emery. Essentially, Terence Sheridan's fine story is a graphic profile of Bob Coil on the job as an air traffic controller at Cleveland Hopkins Airport. It tells of his devotion to his work as well as the tensions which accompany decisions that may literally mean life or death.

I am glad, too, to have this opportunity to salute Bob's crew chief, Emil Emery, a dean of air controllers who has given so much of his life to air safety.

These two great men, Emil Emery and Bob Coil, and all of the air controllers like them across the Nation are long overdue for an expression of the gratitude we feel to them. The article follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 28, 1969]

TENSION, WORRY PLAGUE HOPKINS AIR CONTROLLERS

(By Terence Sheridan)

Bobby C. Coil, a 31-year-old air-traffic controller at Cleveland Hopkins International Airport, expects to burn out in nine years.

He assists aircraft to arrive and depart safely at the airport, the 16th busiest air terminal in the nation with 150,177 commercial airline operations in 1968.

Near misses in a crowded sky are burned into his mind.

"You don't think of near misses," he says. "You are too damn busy to think of them, but they are there, back of your mind."

Three weeks ago a light plane zipped out of a cloud into the path of a climbing jet. The jet screamed into a 500-foot dive and avoided collision.

"Just one of many near misses," says Coil.

Coil, one of 8,500 air-traffic controllers working for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), has been at Hopkins since 1963.

He works in the control tower, a glass box called "the cab" 80 feet above the runways.

He has worked in air-traffic control in Seattle and Atlantic City. By the time he is 40, he will have 23 years in air control, counting four years in the Air Force.

He has a \$15,000 annual salary, a wife, two children, a private pilot's license and worries.

He worries about the near misses, the traffic jam in the sky and the jets yet to come, like Boeing's B747, a behemoth fitted out to carry 362 passengers.

With adjustments the B747, scheduled for a Dec. 15 New York-London-Frankfurt commercial flight, can accommodate 490 passengers, seated 10 abreast.

Coil and 30 other air controllers helped last year with 318,396 aircraft takeoffs and landings at Hopkins, the 29th in the nation in terms of total airport operations.

"Air traffic has increased 25% a year," said Coil. "By 1974 our traffic will double."

"This airport is too small for them. Airports are 10 years behind the times."

"One of the biggest problems is shortage of air controllers with outdated equipment at outdated airports."

Coil is chairman of the local safety committee of Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO).

"Tension? There's nothing to compare with it, nothing in industrial work."

"It's quite standard to stop and have a beer and unwind. Have a bull session to cut the tension. After a busy day, you are so keyed up you can't get to sleep. Even when the fatigue is there you can't get to sleep."

Some of the tension is reduced by alter-

nating positions on live control and instrument control in the tower.

Controllers also split their work day by manning one of four 16-inch scanning scopes in the third-floor radar room.

As ears become adapted to the crackle of headsets, so eyes become adjusted to the dimly lit radar room, which electronically monitors Hopkin's jurisdiction, and air corridor covering a 30-mile radius.

As green blips sparkle and recede on the radar tubes, controllers herd aircraft, separating them in trail for landing or overflights, picking them up at points designated by the regional air-control center in Oberlin.

At 3 p.m. Coil put on a subdued brown sport coat and lights another cigarette. This week he is working from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. Next week it will be 3 to 11 p.m. Every sixth week he works from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m.

"I won't come in on overtime, if they call me. I feel five days is enough," he said.

Coil's wife, Roseann, said: "I don't really like the shifts very much. I have to bring up the children by myself."

The family lives at 16104 Ramona Drive, Middleburg Heights.

"I don't take my work home with me," says Coil. "But my wife knows when I've had a hard day and she stays away from me."

"The job has a lot of pressure," says Mrs. Coil.

Coil adds: "There's something about aviation that keeps you in it, something you can't put your finger on."

Feeling that their complaints to the FAA were going unheeded, 477 U.S. controllers called in sick two consecutive days last June, paralyzing air traffic in many parts of the country.

The public had discovered air controllers.

"There is so much traffic and so few controllers you have to be on the lookout all the time, like being on a swivel," says Coil.

He moves gracefully, swiveling his 6-foot-three, 210-pound frame fishing a mentholated cigarette out of the pocket of his drip-dry shirt.

At 11:18 this morning a Boeing 737 was cleared for takeoff by Coil. The jet taxied down 23 Left, the 9,000-foot runway, longest at Hopkins.

The ceiling was 3,000 feet, the sky broken by clouds.

Someone handed Coil a cup of coffee, his sixth of the morning. Two weeks after a coffee maker was installed in the tower, the controllers had drunk 3,200 cups of coffee.

While Coil's cup of coffee steamed untouched, United Flight 402, a Boeing 707, was cleared for landing on 23 Left.

"Wind is two five degrees at two zero," Coil informed the arriving plane.

Four jets lined up for departure as Coil's cigarette burned down in an ash tray.

The jets departed at one-minute intervals, beginning at 11:28.

An average work load in the tower means a plane arriving or departing every minute.

A Cessna 392 radioed it was coming in from the south, 10 miles out, and requested landing instructions.

A Boeing 727, arriving from the southwest, was cleared to land.

A few seconds later two Apaches and two Cessnas approached the airport from different directions, and a Beechcraft took off.

Coil, a button transmitter in his left hand and a cigarette in his right hand, said:

"The thing is to keep your verbiage down. You have to use minimum words."

From 11:18 a.m. to 1:01 p.m., 100 aircraft had arrived or departed.

"A light day—a real breather," said Emil R. Emery, crew chief.

"At 45 you're over the hill in this business," said Emery, in air control 26 of his 45 years.

"This is a young man's game."

"If I'm not off the (control) boards at 40, I'll resign," says Coil.

"I feel that's the maximum age I should be working the boards."

PERMANENT LABELING

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, because of our concern today over inadequate and improper labeling of poisons which are contained in many standard household supplies, I would like to present the following news item from the Screen Printing Association which calls for "direct, permanent, childproof" printing on common containers.

The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that between 500,000 and 1 million persons are victims of accidental poisoning in the United States each year; almost half of that number are children. Permanent printing which would become an integral part of the container would make possible immediate identification of the poison or caustic agents involved and therefore, would signal the immediate administration of the negating antidote procedures. Too often, the paper labels are lost as the news release indicates. I hope the Federal agencies will take cognizance of the safety possibilities.

The article follows:

SCREEN PRINTERS REQUEST NIXON ADMINISTRATION HELP IN PROPER LABELING OF POISON CONTAINERS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Screen Printing Association today called upon the Office of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Commerce for leadership in helping save the lives of hundreds of children who are annually poisoned by improperly labeled, dangerous household supplies and toxic substances.

In a simultaneous communication to Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans and President Nixon's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Mrs. Virginia Knauer, the Association pointed to the many potentially poisonous household products that become a "mysterious danger" when the container label is removed or lost. SPA pointed out that mothers are often unable to tell their community or hospital Poison Information Centers what their children have swallowed because of improper labeling, thus negating proper antidote procedures.

Both Administration officials were urged to help formulate and promote enactment of Federal regulations requiring labelling information to be printed directly and permanently on all containers of hazardous and toxic substances.

In its letter, the Association stated:

"We abhor the increasing record of scores of young children being poisoned annually while helpless mothers stand by unable to tell the emergency doctor or hospital Poison Information Center what the child has swallowed—simply because the container label has been lost or marred. Our Nation's technology can put an end to this 'mysterious' danger through proper labelling."

"Direct, permanent, 'child-proof' printing on all types of containers is today a well-established practice, as evidenced in any grocery or drug store (Coke bottles, toothpaste tubes, beer cans, shaving cream cans, plastic bottles, lip-stick tubes, etc.). The identification—screen printed—becomes an integral part of the container. We ask: Why not do so universally on all containers for dangerous and toxic substances?"

The Association pointed out the seriousness of the situation by stating:

"The National Clearing House of Poison Control Centers, U.S. Public Health Service,

estimates that between 500,000 and 1,000,000 persons are accidentally poisoned by solid and liquid substances each year in the United States. While these figures are estimates, 105,000 accidental poisonings were reported in 1968 by the 420 Poison Control Centers which voluntarily submitted statistical information to the Federal agency. Children under the age of five accounted for 71,563 of these poisonings, while an additional 6,152 incidents concerned children age five to fourteen. The National Vital Statistics Bureau reported 2,506 known deaths by accidental poisoning in 1967."

A pledge of SPA's "full support and counsel" was tendered to all interested Nixon Administration officials by the Association's Executive Vice President, Carl D. Soresi, for "any constructive Container Marking Program calling for the life protection of the consumer."

Parents who are concerned about this matter are invited to write SPA, 708 Associations Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

RONALD A. DOUGAN, WISCONSIN DAIRYMAN

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ronald A. Dougan, of Beloit, Wis., recently sold the entire dairy herd of what had since 1911 constituted the basis of the largest dairy in and around Beloit. With the sale of his herd, an era of 62 years of service to southern Wisconsin was brought to a close.

Ron Dougan, a dairyman, seed grower, conservationist, experimenter, patron of the arts, and teacher has contributed much to the people of southern Wisconsin. It is with pleasure, and with some remorse, that I place an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the Beloit Daily News on the closing of the Dougan Dairy and with it commend Ron Dougan for his outstanding leadership in business, agriculture, and community:

DOUGAN HERD SOLD; ERA ENDS

(By Bill Behling)

He brushed away the sawdust bedding to reveal two childsize handprints in the concrete floor.

"The biggest one is mine," chuckled Ron Dougan. "My brother and I left our marks in the floor when our father built this barn in 1911." That's when Ron Dougan got into the dairy business; Friday, he got out.

It was a day for such nostalgic interludes in and around the great, round barn on Colley Road east of Beloit.

It was Dougan's last hurrah as a dairy farmer.

Inside a large tent an auctioneer's chant went on for hours; interrupted frequently by the interjected comments of a ringman extolling the virtues of the cattle being sold.

"Look at her, boys!" the ringman shouted, "She's safe with calf, and look at her width. She's all cow; she'll make you a lot of money..."

COAXED PRICES UP

And the auctioneer resumed, coaxing and chiding the sparse crowd of farmers to bid the price up. He started most of the animals at \$350 or \$400, then accepted a lower opening offer and usually managed to get the bid well over his starting figure before crying "sold!" Top price was about \$500.

The animals had brought a good, if not spectacular, price. "Not as much as I had hoped, but more than I feared," said Dougan.

The sale attracted only about 40 people, and as it began Dougan was "sick about it." But it soon became clear that those who took time off from harvesting corn and soybeans, were there for a purpose. They added some heavy producers to their herds: the Dougan cattle have been making around two tons of milk daily. Buyers were here from throughout Wisconsin and northern Illinois.

Standing by the chute leading to the sale ring was Dougan, hatless and in work clothes. As the cattle were herded, one by one, into the ring Dougan glanced at the sale book and murmured something, usually to himself, about the cow on sale.

WIFE BREWED COFFEE

Then he'd turn away and talk about other things. Of his father, the late Rev. W. J. (Daddy) Dougan, who came to Beloit and established a dairy business in 1907. Of the satisfying years, when the dairy and a seed corn business (still operating) flourished. Of his son and daughters and grandchildren. Of his wife Vera, nationally prominent in music club circles, who spent Friday brewing coffee for the auction crowd because a commercial lunch wagon never arrived.

Dougan, the indefatigable tour guide, has shown thousands of Beloit youngsters the wonders of a dairy farm. He was still at it Friday, pointing out interesting things to sale visitors. Such as the "Aims of This Farm," painted on the side of a huge silo in the center of the familiar Dougan round barn.

The "aims" were painted there well over 50 years ago by Dougan's Father:

1. Food crops.
2. Proper storage.
3. Profitable operation.
4. A stable market.
5. Life as well as a living.

TALK OF FATHER

Reminiscing: "My father's method of protecting the market price was different from that of the co-ops and other organizations. He believed in 'vertical integration,' growing the feed, raising the calves, milking the cows, processing the milk, and selling the milk at the customer's doorstep. I followed his lead."

It's the same with the Dougan seed business. Hybrid corn is raised on the farm, processed there, and sold direct to farmers throughout the Midwest. Dougan plans to continue that part of the business. He disposed of the dairy operation three years ago and then decided to sell the herd.

It wasn't an easy decision.

Selling the herd was a little like selling a part of himself.

Ron Dougan was only 11 when he placed his right hand in the still-soft cement of the round barn's floor. The barn was designed with the milking cow stanchions circling the silo, from whence came much of the feed. In feeding, as in milking, "You worked your way around the barn and the tools and utensils ended up right where they belonged," Dougan said.

An early-day professor suggested the round barn design, and the Dougans have been following the advice of the experts ever since. The farms have been showplaces of soil conservation practices; new varieties of seed have been developed there, new feeding and cattle handling techniques have been tried in the Dougan barn.

Dougan's progressiveness as a farmer led him to be associated with many agricultural experimental endeavors, including the artificial breeding of cattle. He was a founder and longtime director of the American Breeders Service and the Rock County Breeders Cooperative. He was a director of the American Society for the Study of Genetics, which in its early years mainly concerned itself with dairy cattle.

ONCE HAD GUERNSEY

The Dougan Dairy once boasted all-Guernsey milk, which is somewhat richer than

the milk of most other breeds. But the public's preferences changed and in later years Dougan gradually switched from Guernseys to Holsteins, a breed that produces heavily. Through the means of artificial insemination he experimented with various crossbreeds, eventually settling on straight Holstein breeding although not insisting on purebred registration.

The Dougan policies were not calculated to please purebred cattle people. Using Dairy Herd Improvement Association testing records for his own herd, and selecting the semen of bulls with a background of heavy producing, Dougan built a herd of milking cows long on production but not always meeting the coloring and type requirements of the breed purists. Many of the Dougan animals sold Friday were registered, however, and in most cases brought a higher price.

"Maybe," mused Dougan, "these breed people have a point."

When it was over, 117 cows and calves had been auctioned off and Dougan was out of the dairy business. After 62 years.

Friday was the end of an era.

BESTIRRING THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last night in his speech on the situation in Vietnam, President Nixon referred to the "silent majority." He no doubt used the expression as a contrast to the vocal elements who have, and will, participate in the fall offensive, that series of demonstrations sponsored by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, the New Mobilization Committee and the Student Mobilization Committee during October and November. As I pointed out in my remarks of October 16, the overall goal of these demonstrations is an immediate unilateral withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam regardless of how unprotected the South Vietnamese troops and people are as a result of our leaving. As has been observed before, this is truly the making for foreign policy in the streets if such protests are heeded.

If recent events are any indication, it would seem that elements among the silent majority are bestirring themselves. The Washington Daily News of October 31, for example, carried an article reporting on upcoming Freedom Rally on November 11—Veterans Day—at the Washington Monument. Sponsored by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, the rally will feature addresses by Members of Congress, patriotic bands and other entertainment.

In New York City, the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism—NCRP—announced its efforts to declare November 10 to 16 as Honor America Week. As in the case of the above-mentioned rally in Washington, the positive approach is accentuated. Recommendations set forth by the New York committee include the flying of the flag, headlights turned on, visits to veterans hospitals, and the honoring of our dead servicemen and prayers for our servicemen in Vietnam and for an honorable

peace as quickly as possible. These are but some of the proposals which advanced by the NCRP to help the silent majority express their feelings.

These wholesome projects are, I believe, most appealing to the majority of fair-minded and concerned citizens. Whether by their prayers or by participating in public patriotic events these efforts are highly recommended and should merit the consideration of all who still believe in the heritage and integrity of this Nation.

I submit the above-mentioned article from the Washington Daily News of October 31, along with the press release of the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 31, 1969]

**A TRIBUTE TO THE "GOODNESS OF AMERICA"—
VETERANS WILL RALLY 'ROUND THE FLAG
HERE**

(By Michael Bernstein)

"We are going to have flags like this distributed," said James Wilson, pointing to his red, white and blue lapel pin, "as a symbol of positive Americanism and a faith in the goodness of America."

One of the places Mr. Wilson and other American Legion officials will be distributing the American Flag pins will be at a Freedom Rally Nov. 11 (Veteran's Day) at the Washington Monument.

The purpose of the 2 p.m. rally, Mr. Wilson and other leaders said here at a press conference yesterday, is to let the "silent majority speak out for peace with freedom in Vietnam and in all the world." While the rally is two days before the Nov. 13-15 anti-war marches here, leaders said it is not a "counter protest."

Dr. Charles Moser, rally chairman and a professor of slavic languages at George Washington University, did however, differ with the anti war groups that are demanding an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam. "If there was a conflict," he said, "we would pick freedom over peace. The other group (the anti-war people) would pick peace."

Dr. Moser said, "The war in Vietnam is not just a civil war. It is part and parcel of a campaign being conducted all across the world against our concept of freedom."

The Nov. 11 rally, he said, is part of a National Unity Week—Nov. 9-16, when people will be encouraged to turn on lights, wear the lapel pins and fly the American Flag every day.

Lee Edwards, coordinator of the rally, which is sponsored by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, said, "We expect a good crowd, a happy crowd, a patriotic crowd." He said Congressional speakers, "patriotic bands" and other entertainment are planned for the Monument program.

"We want people to come who believe this is really America and this is the time to stand up and be seen and heard," said Frank Manson, a national VFW official.

He said the VFW feels that if there is no real progress in the peace talks in the next 90 days, "We support new and expanded military efforts to achieve such progress."

[From the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism, Inc.]

HONOR AMERICA WEEK, NOVEMBER 10-16, 1969

Calling for a positive image of the United States, the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism is appealing to Governors, Mayors, and other officials to declare November 10-16 as Honor America Week. Referring to the present climate, Charles W. Wiley, Executive Director of the NCRP, said:

"The United States cannot survive a con-

tinual barrage of destructive criticism from within. In a very short time, we will have raised an entire generation that has heard from all sides that its country is evil—and not worthy of survival. If we treated our children as we do our nation, and judged them solely on the basis of their faults, they would be psychopaths, and we would hate them."

In conjunction with its campaign, the NCRP will distribute posters and "Honor America" buttons, decals, and bumper stickers. The public is asked to contribute funds to help the project. The Committee has headquarters in the Commodore Hotel, N.Y.C.

Among the activities suggested for Honor America Week:

(1) Schools and colleges to hold classes on American heritage—with our Country measured by the yardstick of the reality of human beings and the world we live in, instead of the perfection of Utopia.

(2) All-out support of Veterans' Day ceremonies.

(3) Flags to be flown for the entire week.

(4) Headlights to be turned on, and other symbolic activities conducted during the weekend.

(5) Visits to Veterans Hospitals, and the honoring of our dead servicemen.

(6) Prayer for our gallant men in Vietnam and for an honorable peace as quickly as possible.

(7) Urge all citizens to send their views on current problems to the President.

(8) Radio and TV to feature Honor America themes. Theatres to show films that salute our country.

(9) Businesses to place pro-U.S. advertisements; Unions and other organizations to carry on Honor America projects.

COMMITTEE BACKGROUND

The non-partisan National Committee for Responsible Patriotism has sponsored numerous activities dedicated to show support for the men and women of our armed forces, respect for law, pride in our heritage, and love of country. In October 1967 the Committee initiated a nation-wide program that included turning on vehicle headlights during the day to indicate approval of these causes. In May 1967 the Committee organized the "Support Our Men in Vietnam" parade down New York's Fifth Avenue, the longest parade in the United States since 1947. Last year, the Committee coordinated the "Free the Pueblo" petition campaign and other non-political activities backing the Government in any honorable action to obtain the crew's freedom.

NCRP projects have received the endorsement of President Nixon, the late President Dwight Eisenhower, former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey, the late Senator Robert Kennedy, Governors of 41 States, and numerous other outstanding public figures. The NCRP is a non-profit organization, supported by contributions from the public. Its activities are decided by a board of directors elected by the membership. It has received the cooperation of major veterans' and fraternal organizations, police and firemen's line organizations, labor unions, ethnic and youth groups, etc.

AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION

427

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East situation is of extreme concern to all of us in the United States.

In expressing this concern over the continuing conflict between the United Arab Republic and Israel, the 51st

American Legion convention readopted a resolution urging the United States to assist Israel in maintaining a Mideast balance of power.

The following resolution, which I was happy to receive from the members of Mountain Brook Post No. 75 of the American Legion in Mountain Brook, Ala., which it is my pleasure to represent in the Congress, should be of interest to all my colleagues:

RESOLUTION No. 427

Whereas, the position adopted by the American Legion at its 1967 National Convention concerning the Middle East urged the President of the United States to use his utmost influence in an effort to bring about direct Arab-Israeli negotiations, and to lift the U.S. embargo against sales of arms to Israel if the Arab nations re-armed while refusing to negotiate; and

Whereas, the Arab nations continue to resist entering talks for settlement of differences and have instead re-armed to a level higher than that for the period preceding the June 1967 six day war; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion reaffirms its position on the Middle East as expressed in Resolution N. 524, adopted at the 1967 National Convention; and

Further Resolved, That the Government of the United States is urged to take whatever measures are feasible so as to permit the government of Israel to provide itself with any arms it might require in order to maintain a balance of power against its hostile neighbors, pending such time as a full and equitable settlement of Middle East problems is reached and agreed to by the nations concerned.

GIVE THE CONSUMER HIS DAY IN COURT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a fundamental tenet of our legal system declares that every party with a genuine cause of action is entitled to his day in court. Recent proposals by the administration for consumer class action suit suggest that the consumer may have as much trouble getting into judicial chambers as he has had for years past.

Although the new administration bill recognizes the need to enable many consumers with small financial grievances under Federal law to band together to obtain counsel and a proper hearing, it does not go far enough. It erects a barrier to the use of this new power. It requires the Justice Department to initiate and win a prior action before private citizens can bring suit. In effect, it requires the consumer to be dependent on the cumbersome bureaucracy for his protection, instead of upon himself. This self-reliance was the very core of the intent of the bill and the new bill does much to defeat this intent.

Make no mistake, I am encouraged that the President has taken such a strong proconsumer stand and that he has recognized the need for this vital legal tool. But my colleagues, as well as the administration, must be made aware of the potential for frustration that is in the new bill.

A recent article in the New York Times has described the somewhat mixed reaction to this proposal of New York City and State officials, who deal most intimately with consumer protection and know government's inadequacies in protecting the consuming public. I would like to place the article in the RECORD at this point:

CONSUMERS SCORE A NIXON PROPOSAL—CITY AND STATE OFFICIALS ASK WIDE DAMAGE-SUIT RIGHTS

A key provision in President Nixon's consumer message to Congress generally disappointed some consumer affairs officials and experts here.

The provision would allow private citizens to bring damage suits against businessmen, but only after the Government had already proved their case in court.

The city's Consumer Affairs Commissioner, Mrs. Bess Myerson Grant, State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz and officials of the Consumers Union in Mount Vernon, N.Y., were among those critical of Mr. Nixon's proposal.

Mrs. Grant said she felt "extreme disappointment" at this part of the President's message.

"There is no reason why consumers should have to wait to get money back which is rightfully theirs until the Attorney General chooses to act, and there is even less reason for the Government to force individual consumers to go to court on their own after it has won their case," Mrs. Grant said.

Mrs. Grant's counterpart in the President's office, Mrs. Virginia M. Knauer, drafted some of the proposed consumer protection legislation that Mr. Nixon said he would send to Congress.

BLOW TO "HIGH HOPES"

Robert L. Smith, assistant director of the independent Consumers Union, said that "high hopes" raised by Mrs. Knauer's public statements last summer "are largely exploded by the limitations on the class action right imposed in the message."

Both Mr. Smith and Mrs. Grant, however, said they welcomed the broad thrust of the President's message and thought it would advance the cause of consumer protection.

Mr. Lefkowitz said he would prefer a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs, instead of the Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President, which Mr. Nixon proposed in his message.

Mr. Lefkowitz has also filed a brief in a New York State court case supporting the right of consumers under state law to bring class actions where they feel they have been defrauded.

The case involving three New York City consumers who brought suit against the Coburn Corporation of America, a finance company, is now before the State Court of Appeals.

ILLEGAL FINE PRINT CITED

The principal appellant, Edna A. Hall, is seeking to recover service charges for herself and all other persons who bought merchandise under installment plans prepared by the finance company.

Her case is that the contracts violates state law because they were printed in smaller type than was required.

The case has been struck down in two lower courts, principally on the issue of the right for individuals to sue on behalf of many others under state law.

"In filing our brief, we request that recognition and right be given to bring class actions where one or more consumers can sue for themselves and for others who may have been the victims of alleged similar fraudulent business practices," Mr. Lefkowitz said.

Mrs. Grant's Consumer Affairs Department has also proposed city legislation that would enable the city to sue merchants on behalf

of defrauded consumers here and to distribute any money recovered to those who were cheated. The proposal is under consideration by the City Council.

POOR CALLED VICTIMS

Philip G. Schrag, a lawyer who helped draft the city proposal, and counsel in the Hall-Coburn case, criticized President Nixon's more restrictive measure as having "no effect" for poor people who could not afford an individual lawsuit to recover money from merchants who had cheated them.

A broader consumer-protection bill than the one suggested in the President's message has been sponsored by Senator Joseph D. Tydings of Maryland and Representative Bob Eckhardt of Texas, both Democrats.

This bill, pending in Congress would enable consumers to bring class actions in Federal courts without the conditions suggested in the Nixon message.

THE CROSSROAD DIGEST OF MUSICAL MINUTIAE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, although highly unlikely, it occurs to me that it is possible that a Congressman might be called upon to comment about a subject in which he is not really expert. I believe the following article will enable him to acquit himself well:

POOF! YOU'RE AN EXPERT—THE CROSSROAD DIGEST OF MUSICAL MINUTIAE

I. GENERAL RULES

The name of the game is musical onepmanship. Play it hard, fast, clean and ruthlessly and you can't lose. Give in to sympathy or permit yourself to be swayed by facts and you can't win.

The object of the game is to perplex and befuddle your opponent . . . with full knowledge that he would do the same to you if given half a chance.

All the ammunition you need to stamp out Beethoven Bullies and Bach Bigmouths is contained in this handbook. Use it wisely and well. Follow the simple guidelines we have set forth and the spoils of victory are yours.

Look at it this way. Maybe you can hum the first few bars of "Swan Lake." Maybe you can distinguish a Steinway from a Stradivarius. Forget it. Musical knowledge is not power in the world of conversational infighting. It can only confuse and frustrate your efforts.

Stick with us and we'll get you through.

A word of caution, however: any attempt to step beyond the bounds of this handbook may result in acute embarrassment, for which Crossroads Records cannot assume responsibility.

Good luck.

II. REQUIRED Demeanor

Playing attitude counts. As in physical sport, form is essential. To the astute conversational strategist, even momentary hesitation at a crucial moment can be disastrous in terms of lost face. And face is all.

Therefore it is important to assume a demeanor of confident invulnerability. The opinions of others must be dismissed as erroneous, misguided or incredibly naive.

To effectively project this indispensable attitude of superiority, an heroic disregard for opposing views is paramount.

This is often best accomplished by facial expression alone. The non-verbal putdown is virtually unanswerable. Your repertoire should include the glacial stare in retort to

contradiction, the exasperated brow-knit, and the barely perceptible shrug of the shoulders as you turn away to devote yourself to worthier opponents.

Remember Mona Lisa. The enigmatic smile is mightier than the sneer.

III. BASIC GAMBITS

1. Never come right out and say you like anything. It may be inferred that you have low or flexible standards.

2. Never tap the feet or drum the fingers in time to music. It is assumed that your internal metronome needs no physical outlet.

3. Never comment on an entire work. Single out one movement. If there are no movements, single out a section of the orchestra (brass, strings, etc.) for criticism (always adverse). If it is a quartet, say the cellist has poor playing posture or find a misspelled word in the program notes and criticize the impresario. (You need not know who he is. You will not see him. If you did, you would not recognize him.)

4. Always maintain absolute silence when listening to recorded music. When you are certain the piece is over (the needle will begin to scratch), say "My 1913 pre-electric recording of this piece captures the real essence of what he was trying to tell us." (N.B.: First be certain it wasn't written in 1914. For modern recordings, smile knowingly and say, "Have you heard the Crossroads reading?" Whether we have actually recorded the work is unimportant unless your opponent has the handbook. In that event, the game is an automatic draw.)

5. Never respond directly when challenged on factual content. Simulate distraction and wave at someone you know over your adversary's shoulder.

IV. CONCERT HALL PLAYS

The concert hall can be dangerous ground . . . or it can be the scene of your greatest triumphs. Use these simple stratagems and meet any situation with dignity and aplomb.

1. Late Arrival at Concert—"I'm only here to see what he does with the third movement." (N.B.: Check your program to be certain there is a third movement. If not, give your ticket to a standee and go to a movie.)

2. Early Arrival at Concert—"I wanted to observe them tuning up. Individual technique means so much in a work like this."

3. Unavoidable Absence From Concert—"I just couldn't bear the thought of hearing them hack away at that again." (N.B.: Not applicable for debut performances. Substitute, "Is anything really new?")

4. Unescorted Attendance at Concert (Failure to Get a Date) "Some things can only be experienced in solitude." (Drape your cape over the empty seat.)

5. Falling Asleep at Concert (On Awakening)—"If you listen . . . I mean really listen . . . there are subtleties here." (If you wish, you may now resume your nap without compunction. Avoid loud snoring.)

V. COMPOSER CRITIQUES

It is important to seem to know something about the people who write music. Most are strange indeed. Some are eccentric and others infirm. They have funny names and many of them are dead. Do not concern yourself with this, as it can only lead to confusion. Take it on faith and use the following.

BEETHOVEN. "If Ludwig had heard this, would it have been so great?"

MAHLER. "Poor Gustav! Always striving to reach God!"

BRUCKNER. "Poor God! Always striving to reach Anton!"

SCHUBERT. "Poor Franz!"

HAYDN. Same as above, except when Schubert and Haydn works are performed together. Avoid these.

MOZART. "Ah, Wolfgang Amadeus! All elegance and rococo." (Do not elaborate. Mozart already has.)

BACH. Johann, Johann Sebastian! "Will

there ever be another?" (There probably won't. The name is out of style. So you should be home safe.)

HANDEL. "It just doesn't compare with The Water Music." (N.B.: Unless it is The Water Music. Then say, "The Water Music is over-rated.")

STRAVINSKY. "Ah, mon enfant terrible." (That's "tu-reeble." Your command of French will close the issue.)

When delivered in an appropriate subdued tone with the eyes closed in meditation, these are all you need. Again, never explain. A condescending shrug turneth away rude inquisitors.

Other composers are not as easily dealt with. When you encounter their works, maintain eloquent silence. Shake your head impatiently in response to impudent questions. Or whistle through your teeth and gaze upward for deliverance.

As a last resort, feign a violent coughing seizure. All artistic people are in poor general health.

VI. PERIOD PARRIES

There are many different styles and periods of classical music. Most of them sound very much like one another and they overlap awkwardly. To bring order out of chaos, you need know only five basic categories.

1. Baroque: "The ornaments are interesting, but quite unacceptable in historical perspective."

2. Rococo: "Really! But it's just too much!"

3. Renaissance: "How human! And hence, of course, how droll."

4. Modern: "It has definite merit, but I had always hoped he would someday settle down to fulfill his early promise." (N.B.: For middle or late works, substitute the Stravinsky one-liner in Part V.)

5. Opera: (People will be shouting at one another on stage. The orchestra will have retreated downstairs to escape them. For reasons that will be obvious, this is called the pit.) "If only he had lived to supervise the production." (N.B.: If he is alive, say, "If only they had given him a free hand." If they did, say, "His genius, alas, was music, not drama.")

As before, answer no questions and venture no comments on music that does not fit the categories. If you are uncertain what type of music you are hearing, your only admissible recourse is a benign, "What is there to say? The music says it all."

VII. ARTIST SIDESTEPS

From time to time you may be called upon to comment on individual performers. First look to see what they are doing. If they are facing away from you and have long hair, they are conductors. If they are not there, they are composers. Once you have recognized them for what they are, you can use these:

COMPOSERS. "His premise is shaky and his antecedents disturb me, but what a craftsman!"

CONDUCTORS. "One really must admire his stickwork." (Check first to see if he is waving a little stick at the others. Some don't. If you get one of these, say, "His tempi are fanciful." and let it go at that.)

SINGERS. "His (her) tessitura seems rather limited."

PIANIST. "His pedalwork is rather heavy." (If the pianist is wearing a dress, substitute, "Her pedalwork is rather light.")

VIOLINISTS. "I understand he (she) uses the Russian bowing technique." (Since even Russians cannot agree on what this is, your posture is unassailable.)

BRASS SECTION. (A group of men holding funny trumpets. They often look like brothers. They often are.) "Did they miss their double-tonguing there?" (It's gone, so your opponent cannot refute you.)

REED SECTION. (Usually thin ladies huddled together to the left.) "Are they thin, or is it me?" (A clever play on words.)

PERCUSSION SECTION. (That man who runs around a lot and can't seem to decide which instrument he wants to play.) "I think he has a damp tympano there. Would you agree?" (Your opponent will be forced to comment on the weather rather than the music, and no one can do anything about that, anyway.)

VIII. ALL-PURPOSE COPOUTS

You may have need of several functional comments to carry the day with the occasional upstart. If you cannot dispatch him with a snort, use one of the following.

Beethoven's Fifth: "Overexposed and underdeveloped."

All of Tchaikovsky: "Hopelessly enamored of past forms."

Most Cacophonous Modern Music: "It is impossible to understand this without total immersion." (By implication, yours.)

Italian Opera: "He gave the singers too much freedom."

German Opera: "He didn't give the singers enough freedom."

Spanish Opera: "Like any good Spanish composer, he was pure French."

French Opera: "What do you think of De Gaulle?" There is, of course, an ultimate copout. But it is volatile and should be used only in dire straits. Here it is, for those with the courage and style to carry it off:

"Lenny and I were discussing that very point only last week. I think he could tell you all you need to know. You have his number, of course?"

IX. SCORING

The devoted tactician carries a small pad in which he takes note of significant milestones in his quest for unquestioned authority.

You would be well advised to purchase such a notebook and use it to tabulate your progress. The following scoring system is in widest favor.

On reaching an overall score of 50, you are entitled to put this handbook aside and go it on your own:

	Points
Reducing Harvard Undergraduate to Tears of Shame.....	4
Embarrassing Hostess Before Her Assembled Guests.....	3
Persuading Journalist to Quote You in His Review.....	9
Getting Away with Wearing Long Hair.....	6
Encouraging Young Musician to Forsake the Piano for the Autoharp.....	8
Advising Electrical Engineer that his Stereo System is Faulty.....	5
Vanquishing Juilliard Graduate in Full Repartee.....	8
Convincing Friends that Benny is Just Not Good Enough for their Chamber Music Group.....	7

(Naturally, ingenious improvisation is healthy and permissible.)

X. THE COMPLEAT MUSIC EXPERT

Once you have mastered the techniques herein, you will be equipped to meet and master all on the field of honor. Success is assured. Do not overburden yourself with clumsy and unnecessary additional information.

But when you are armed to tilt with troublesome know-it-alls, you are also free to devote private listening time to music you can enjoy on its own merits.

HANOI'S DANGEROUS GAME

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the actions of the leadership of the North

Vietnamese with respect to our men who are their prisoners of war is nothing short of heinous. When the first group of wives from Texas visited with their representatives in Paris, they were assured that they would hear about their husbands. To this date, they have not. The Paris representatives indicated on the occasion of this first visit of wives that they would be glad to talk to anyone providing they were not Government-sponsored. This they have done, but they have used this means now to urge these wives and families to join in the antiwar demonstrations.

The Washington Daily News on October 29 editorialized this policy of the North Vietnamese and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include this editorial, as follows:

HANOI'S DANGEROUS GAME

North Vietnam frequently boasts, without any proof, of its "humanitarian" treatment of U.S. prisoners of war. Now it is clearly trying to use these unfortunate men to manipulate United States opinion and build up the "peace movement" in this country.

From the start, the Hanoi humanitarians have been vulnerable on the PW issue. In violation of the Geneva convention on war prisoners, North Vietnam has not released their names, nor permitted them a regular flow of mail, nor allowed an impartial group like the Red Cross to inspect the camps, nor released sick and wounded prisoners.

With a particularly Communist view of human life, Hanoi's Politburo views the prisoners as a tool with which to pry concessions out of the American government.

This callous tactic began to backfire when world opinion noticed that the self-proclaimed "victims of U.S. aggression" were behaving in a thoroughly uncivilized way. Hanoi's discomfiture grew when small groups of missing men's wives came to ask its delegation to the Paris peace talks whether they were "wives or widows."

Off balance at first, Hanoi's delegates told the women they would receive news of their husbands. They haven't. Later the North Vietnamese told the wives the best thing they could do for their husbands was to join the anti-war demonstrations in the United States.

It goes without saying that this latter tactic has the nasty smell of blackmail.

Next the Hanoi delegates summoned two leading U.S. pacifists to Paris. They happened to be on trial among the "Chicago eight," and their lawyer went instead. He returned with the "momentous" news that the Communists would give out the prisoners' names and permit them to receive mail—thru the radical peace movement.

This has since been hedged by Hanoi's man in Paris: "if" the North Vietnamese have any PW information to announce they will do it thru the anti-war mobilizers.

By now Hanoi's strategy is obvious. By refusing to deal with the U.S. delegation in Paris on the PW question, it is attempting to portray our government as incapable of protecting its captured servicemen.

By working thru the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, Hanoi is trying to enhance that group's stature and win for it influence and adherents.

In lending itself to this maneuver, the "movement" is coming close to giving aid and comfort to the enemy, which is proscribed by the Constitution. Quite wisely, our government is overlooking this point, stating it will welcome news about our PWs from any source.

Hanoi has an exaggerated idea of its understanding of U.S. public opinion, and could be making a dangerous mistake. There are many decent people, in and out of the

peace movement, who want to see the war over, and who are repelled by the sight of U.S. citizens collaborating with the enemy over the fate of helpless prisoners.

North Vietnam would be well advised to give up its dirty game before it provokes an unwanted backlash—against it and against its peace supporters here.

A TRIBUTE TO WOMEN

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to submit to the attention of my colleagues an address by the Honorable Bess B. Stinson, member of the Arizona House of Representatives. This very fine speech, "A Tribute to Women" was delivered at the awards luncheon of the National Federation of Republican Women, on September 27, 1969. I was privileged to hear Representative Stinson deliver her message in person, and I am confident that the Members of this body will share my admiration for this beautiful testimonial to the contribution that American women have made to the building of America:

A TRIBUTE TO WOMEN

"For everything there is a reason, and a time for every matter under heaven . . . a time to plant and a time to harvest."

Through the centuries, women have worked and carried their share of the burdens . . . and waited . . . but the harvest for them has not yet been full equality.

Theirs has been the role of planting, cultivating, tending and enduring. The wheels of time turn slowly, but they do turn, and today the star of woman is in the ascendancy. Much has been accomplished—but much more remains to be done.

Let us go back down history's trail for a moment. For centuries man dreamed of freedom but seldom achieved it or held it for very long, though he never gave up the struggle.

It was finally to be achieved in a new land at places called Plymouth . . . Philadelphia . . . Valley Forge. A new kind of self-government was devised based on the concept that our inalienable rights come from God and government is the tool to safeguard those rights. It was to be chained down by a Constitution.

All this began in a virgin country, the wealth and expanse of which the founders never dreamed. With their newly-found freedom came exciting and daring opportunities to go beyond the immediate horizon and explore the vast territories to the West.

There were great men and women in that virgin society who shaped the destiny of the nation and set it on its course.

Before the next hundred years had passed, miracles had been wrought and man's hold on freedom has been dramatically strengthened.

Slaves were freed and in 1869 were enfranchised. March 15th of that same year a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was proposed to the Congress. It failed to pass.

Women endured equally—almost unequally—the bitter hardships of Colonial and Pioneer life. They worked side by side with their men but they were classed as inferior citizens and denied the right of franchise.

As early as 1848 a Convention was held in Seneca Falls, New York to promote women's

suffrage by an Amendment to the Constitution. We owe much to the dogged determination of Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Lucretia Mott, as they worked to free women from legal, financial and voiceless servitude.

The road to emancipation was long and heart-breaking. Its foremost heroines did not live to see its full achievement, but rejoiced in the small victories and exciting anticipation of things to come. Against the opposition of the clergy, ridicule by the press, and unyielding hostility, the pioneers endured. They were magnificent!

The first break-through came out of the West in the territory of Wyoming in the year 1869. Women were acknowledged as independent beings and full suffrage was granted them. It was a victory guided by the determined efforts of Mrs. Esther Morris of South Pass, Wyoming, who was shortly afterward appointed Justice of the Peace of South Pass—a truly Western salute to what the West always admires—sheer grit.

Hard on the heels of Wyoming, the territories of Utah and Washington granted women suffrage. The ladies fought on—Colorado, Idaho and California joined the ranks, then Arizona, Kansas and Oregon. It was almost a phenomenon of the West . . . and with good reason.

Nowhere had women worked, struggled and borne hardships with more tenacity, fortitude and endurance than the women who traveled to the West in Covered Wagons.

There had been years of backbreaking toil, life in sod dugouts with scant furnishings. There were years of apprehension . . . droughts, locusts. There was never enough food. There were bowed heads and thanks to God for their blessings. There were harsh winters—snow, blizzards, sickness and no doctors. Sometimes prairie fires that were terrifying . . . and there was always WORK! There was spinning and weaving, garment making, patching, quilts to be pieced, and feather beds to make; clothes to wash on the scrub boards—and ironed with the old flat irons; canning and preserving of everything available.

In spite of the hardships that tested their endurance, there was the sweet taste of freedom to nurture their enterprising spirit. There was faith and love of family—neighbor helping neighbor—that kept them striving and working always for a better tomorrow. Their unfulfilled dreams lived on in the hearts of their children who brought many of them to fruition.

The settlement of the West, or any other part of this Country for that matter, owes more to the endless toll of pioneer women than to all other factors in its history. A character in Edna Ferber's *Cimarron* tells it this way:

"You can't read the history of the United States, my friends, without learning the great story of those thousands of unnamed women . . . women in mud-caked boots and calico dresses and sunbonnets, crossing the prairie and the desert and mountains enduring hardship and privation. Good women with a terrible and rigid goodness that comes of work and self-denial. Nothing picturesque or romantic about them, I suppose. . . . No, their story has never been told, but it's there just the same. And if it's ever told straight, you'll know it's the sunbonnet and not the sombrero that's settled this country."

That is a glimpse of the past—of how America was built. The essence of it all was a love of freedom, willingness to work. Faith in God, enterprise, indomitable spirit and helping one's neighbor. No other land can match this conquest of the unknown, the untried, nor the major role of its women.

The greatest of all observers of the American scene, de Toqueville agreed. Over 100 years ago he said, "If I were asked . . . to what the singular prosperity and growing

strength of the United States ought mainly to be attributed, I should have to reply "To the superiority of its women!."

This was a great man's highest tribute, richly and nobly deserved by women who were more than great.

Today, we celebrate the 100th anniversary of that victory in Wyoming and the 50th Anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment by Congress which finally gave all women the right to vote. In the interim, life has greatly changed in America, but the quest has not ended. Full equality as citizens should be our well-earned right, not just the vote alone.

No one knowledgeable in the history of America's women, their triumph over adversity, steadfastness in character and fidelity to purpose, doubts the outcome as they continue to minister to the needs of the nation.

And so, at this Awards Luncheon of our 15th Biennial Convention, we pay tribute to American Women, past and present. We honor all that they have been, take pride in all that they have become.

The slogan of those early, intrepid leaders has the same meaning, the same validity today:

"Principles, not policy; justice, not favor; men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less."

It is still a time for planting that the harvest may be more bountiful for all and Freedom more secure.

Our Country still needs the devotion, the effort, yes—even the sacrifice—of women to insure that "this Nation under God shall not perish."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUP- PORTS REPEAL OF TITLE II

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times for our country and for our world, we would do well to pause and examine the ideals and values which traditionally have been associated with our great Nation. As we examine these ideals and values which we consider as being peculiarly American, we must also bear in mind that perhaps the most urgent task confronting the United States today is that of developing a thoughtful, well-informed, and responsible citizenry, able to cope with the complex problems of our time. It has been said by wiser men than I that in a democracy such as ours we can have no greater enemy than citizen indifference. This is an enemy which can be overcome by commitment and involvement, flowing from a deep concern for the common good and nurtured by as deep a faith in the dignity of man and his destiny. I know that these are concerns truly and deeply felt by many Americans, and particularly by many Americans of Japanese ancestry.

During this, the centennial of Japanese immigration to the United States, this sense of commitment and involvement and a deep concern for the common good are evidenced in a resolution recently adopted by the Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce, strongly urging the repeal of title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950—the Emergency Detention Act.

This resolution reads in part:

Whereas, the Emergency Detention Act thus violates the basic rights of the individual guaranteed by the Constitution of these United States and provides for detention procedures which are inconsistent with our normal judicial procedures, Now therefore

Be It Resolved That, the Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce strongly urge the repeal of sub-title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 . . .

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the resolution in support of pending legislation to repeal the Emergency Detention Act:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce, being a duly ordained and organized group of Americans in the State of Hawaii, recognizes that sub-title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Emergency Detention Act) presents a serious threat to the civil rights of all Americans, and

Whereas, The Emergency Detention Act authorizes detention of any person on the mere probability that he will engage in, or conspire with others to engage in acts of espionage or of sabotage during proclaimed periods of "Internal Security Emergency", and

Whereas, The Emergency Detention Act fails to provide for trial by jury, or even before a judge, substituting instead hearings before a departmental preliminary hearing officer and a detention review board where the detainee must prove his innocence but the government is not required to furnish evidence or witnesses to justify detention, and

Whereas, The Emergency Detention Act thus violates the basic rights of the individual guaranteed by the Constitution of these United States and provides for detention procedures which are inconsistent with our normal judicial procedures, now therefore

Be it resolved that, The Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce strongly urge the repeal of sub-title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and

Be it further resolved that, copies of this resolution be forwarded to:

Gov. John A. Burns; U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye; U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong; U.S. Congressman Spark M. Matsunaga; U.S. Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink; Senator David McClung, President, State Senate; Representative Tadao Beppu, Speaker, State House of Representatives; Mr. Ray Okamura, JAACL National Cochairman; Mr. Mike Masaoka, JAACL Washington Representative; Dr. Robert Suzuki, JAACL Executive Liaison; Mr. A. A. Smyser, editor, Honolulu Star Bulletin; Mr. George Chaplin, editor, Honolulu Advertiser; Mr. Takeshi Fujikawa, editor, Hawaii Hochi; Mr. Ryokin Toyohira, editor, Hawaii Times; Mayor Frank F. Fasi, city and county of Honolulu; Councilman Walter Heen, chairman, city and county of Honolulu.

EISENHOWER'S FORECAST OF ATLANTIC UNION SAVINGS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Freedom & Union magazine

published in Washington, D.C., by the Federal Union, Inc., with Clarence K. Streit as editor, carries an editorial which discloses a forecast made years ago by General Eisenhower as NATO commander in chief but which still has relevance today.

During an interview with Mr. Streit, General Eisenhower made the following statement:

I believe if we got effective political union in the Atlantic we could cut our defense cost by half.

As we contemplate the \$80 billion annual outlay the United States is now making and the limitations of the military power it buys as evidenced in Vietnam, Ike's forecast of 18 years ago has special meaning.

After leaving the White House, General Eisenhower gave his support publicly to a resolution proposing a convention of NATO nations where the federation idea would be explored. He did this on April 6, 1966, in a letter addressed to me as one of the sponsors of the proposal.

The need for the exploratory convention is even greater today than when Ike first forecast its financial advantage to the U.S. taxpayer in 1952 and when he first urged the convention idea in 1966. The opportunity to give it the needed Presidential initiative now rests with Richard Nixon who also in 1966 gave the proposal eloquent support.

Here is the text of Mr. Streit's editorial comment:

WHAT PRICE ATLANTIC UNION DELAY?

(By Clarence Streit)

Ike's now disclosed answer: "I believe if we got effective political Union in the Atlantic we could cut our defense cost by half." (Saving \$38-Billion in '69 . . . \$480-B. Lost already).

The time has come, I believe, for me to disclose a statement which General Eisenhower made to me in a private talk, when he was NATO Commander-in-Chief. I do so because it is so relevant—so helpfully relevant—to several major issues now raging in Congress, press and public.

Coping with Arms—and Hornets. It concerns primarily the question of reducing U.S. military expenditure, and the swarm of hornets buzzing around it. It is dangerous both to fail to cut this burden substantially and also to cut it in ways that would seriously weaken the defense of Freedom. The Eisenhower statement points out a way to avoid these dangers, whether of action or inaction.

The way he suggested would, by his "guesstimate," permit a huge reduction in U.S. military cost—far more than current proposals would. Yet it would demonstrably strengthen, instead of weaken, Freedom's defense. Moreover, because of the huge economy he estimated it would bring, it would provide means massive enough to meet, instead of nibble at, the dangers and urgent needs which those who call for cutting the military burden stress.

Massive Means Needed. Certainly far more massive economies than those now sought are needed to end the ominous inflationary trend, and the risk of depression it brings—one triggered by the crash of the world monetary system which is based on the dollar remaining "as good as gold." Depression, of course, can also result from the methods now being used to halt inflation, such as soaring interest rates and "cooling" an economy which can get out of hand from a chilling slide even more easily than when rising with the heat.

It is no less obvious that massive means are required to cope with the dangers in racial conflict, campus unrest, the trend—left and right, white and black—toward extremism and revolution, the plight of the cities, the population "explosion" and air, water, mental and moral pollution . . . to mention no more.

With such a sea of dangers facing us today, and such need for massive means to meet them, it is high time to disclose, and ponder, the way by which General Eisenhower told me he believed we could safely make a huge reduction in the U.S. arms burden.

1951 Talk with Ike. I had a 25-minute talk with General Eisenhower in his Paris office on April 26, 1951, when he was Commander-in-Chief of SHAPE. I told him, as Justice Roberts [then President of the Atlantic Union Committee] had requested I do, of my talks with leading European statesmen in Britain, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland—and of the widespread hope they had expressed that the U.S. would lead in forming an Atlantic Federal Union.

General Eisenhower listened most sympathetically, and told me of the difficulties he had experienced in trying to get results through the alliance system. Dealing with the NATO Council, he said, was "like being in a boat in the Atlantic ocean without any oars and without any helm." Our talk reached its climax at the very end.

Ike Saw Big Saving In Union. As General Eisenhower conducted me to the door of his office, he said:

"I don't see how anyone can get away from it—in union there is strength. It seems as simple as that to me." Then at the door, he added: "I believe if we got effective political union in the Atlantic we could cut our defense costs by half."

I wrote his words down immediately after closing the door. His estimate was obviously meant as a rough guess, but no one was in better position than he to make a fairly accurate guess.

Harriman Agreed. When I returned a little later to Washington, I had a talk with Averell Harriman, then a Special Adviser to President Truman. Since he, too, was highly qualified to speak on the subject, I told him of General Eisenhower's estimate of what might be saved on defense through Atlantic Union. Mr. Harriman studied a bit and then added his broad guess:

"Yes, I suppose we could cut our costs by half if we formed a real United States of the Atlantic."

\$38-Billion Saving on Arms This Year. No one would take the Eisenhower-Harriman guesstimate as more than an offhand but highly educated guess nor hold them to the figure, *one half*. This was only a vivid way of saying that the saving on defense which Atlantic Union would allow would be enormous, huge, massive. But since General Eisenhower did use a figure, and it does permit at least a closer idea of the economy Atlantic Union would bring than do such adjectives as "enormous," let us apply it to the present expenditure on arms.

The total defense item in the budget now under debate in Congress was when submitted, \$76.56-billion. This does not include \$4.6-billion for the Atomic Energy Commission; though much of it is for defense, it also is for civilian purposes, and the AEC finds it too hard to disentangle the two. Nor does the defense figure cited include the cost of foreign military aid—which also could be cut by Atlantic Union—or pensions and care for veterans, or interest on the national debt caused by war.

Consequently, the \$76.56-billion figure is a conservative one for getting a concrete idea of how much Atlantic Union would save U.S. taxpayers this fiscal year on arms alone, by the Eisenhower guesstimate.

Half of \$76.56-billion is \$38.28-billion. Even if Ike overshot the mark, even if Atlantic Union saved only one quarter instead of one half, the saving would still be enormous—\$19.14-billion in one year.

A Shocker. If you are so used to billions that you think a mere \$19-billion isn't huge, please note that it is nearly twice the entire U.S. military expenditure in 1949—which was only \$10-billion in that happy year. Note also that \$19-billion isn't much less than the \$23-billion total the U.S. spent on defense in 1942—the first year of World War II.

Now, a Worse Shocker. The \$76.56-billion military budget submitted to Congress this year is half a billion greater than the \$76-billion total the U.S. expended on this item during a two-ocean war in 1944—the year of the invasion of Europe. This item reached its peak in U.S. history in 1945—\$80.5-billion. The present figure is only \$4-billion under it, and climbing fast.

At the average rate of increase in this item through the past five years—\$5.4-billion annually—military expenditure in the next fiscal year will pass its World War peak and set a new all-time record of \$82-billion. An ephemeral record, of course, for at that rate of \$5.4-billion more each year, it would be \$87-billion in 1971—and would have soared to \$114-billion in 1976 when the U.S. marks the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Union Could Save \$340-billion by 1976. In those seven fat years—for the Pentagon, not the taxpayers—military expenditure (always assuming that the annual average increase during the past five years continues) will have totaled \$680-billion . . . and the bonanza, which taxpayers could save in that brief period by Atlantic Union would be \$340-billion, according to the Eisenhower guesstimate.

All such projections are, of course, very speculative. Yet those who think my figures are far above probability should ponder military expenditure during the past 20 years in Table 1 (see page 2). The average annual increase in those 20 years was \$3.1-billion; if the rate for the next seven years was no greater than that, the total for them would be \$665-billion—or but \$15-billion less than by the rate for the past five years.

Skeptics should also consider the effect of inflation, to which such expenditure has already contributed so dangerously; it is bound to continue to depreciate the dollar's value if this expenditure is not cut—hugely. Then there is the ever-higher skyrocketing cost of modern weapons—quite apart from inflation—and the fact that they become obsolete soon after put in use—a factor to which I'll return later. Finally, skeptics should note none can be sure that before we get out of Vietnam we may well get into much more dangerous and costly war in the Mideast (with how many doves and hawks changing beaks?) Certainly any economy in Vietnam that encourages communism to stage new Vietnams elsewhere will add heavily to the arms burden.

Experience (please see page 8 for mine in 1948) and true conservatism, I submit, make it more prudent to err in over-estimating than in under-guessing future military expenditure, while nationalism divides the free Atlantic peoples.

State's Fateful 1949 Choice. How much U.S. arms will cost Taxpayers in future—without Atlantic Union—is guesswork at best, however useful such reasoned guesswork is. Turn now to the firmer ground of past experience where definite figures are at hand. Let us start with 1949—the truly fateful year when the U.S. Government first made the choice between Atlantic Alliance and Federation. Led by the State Department, it signed and ratified the NATO Treaty. Immediately afterward, Senator Estes Ke-

fauser, who had supported the Alliance as a stopgap, introduced the Atlantic Union resolution calling for a convention of NATO nations to explore the possibility of transforming their alliance into a federation.

It was cosponsored by such powerful conservatives as Senator Walter George (D., Ga.) and Rep. James Wadsworth (R., N.Y.) and by younger men who have risen since to seats of power, such as Senator Wm. Fulbright, now chairman of the Foreign Relations committee, and Rep., Hale Boggs, now Majority Whip in the House. They were joined as cosponsors by Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon when these two entered the Senate a little later. Despite the impressive backing on the Hill, and the fact that President Truman told Justice Roberts he favored the resolution, the State Department managed to block it.

What Price, Power by Alliance? What has that policy of the State Department—whose bureaucracy still continues it against the current Atlantic Union resolution—cost the taxpayers already? U.S. military expenditure (excluding atomic weapons, foreign military assistance, etc.) in the 21 years, 1949-1969, totals \$959.86-billion.

Rep. Paul Findley (R. Ill.) stressed this \$960-billion total in re-introducing June 5 the Atlantic Union Resolution which had gained during the previous Congress the strong endorsements of Richard Nixon, Hubert Humphrey, General Eisenhower, Barry Goldwater and the late Robert F. Kennedy. Rep. Findley also emphasized that during those 21 years the U.S. had spent nothing on exploration of the federal alternative:

"We have spent since 1949 almost \$1-trillion more on the strength that comes from arms"—and, he later added, "alliance"—than on exploring Atlantic federal union. Yet we all know that the immense productive, financial, scientific and armed power of the United States came from federal union. Our Founding Fathers had the foresight, when the alliance of the 13 States proved weak and unreliable, as NATO is today, to call the kind of exploratory convention in 1787 we urge today. That convention resulted in the discovery that a federal union was the way to unite the free effectively and democratically, which has brought us our great strength."

\$480-Billion Lost Already. By General Eisenhower's 1951 guesstimate (which Mr. Findley was not aware of then) half of that \$960-billion—or \$480-billion—could have been saved had the State Department not blocked exploration of Atlantic Union and gambled so enormously on alliance instead.

What \$480-Billion Could Do. Consider tax relief. The entire U.S. budget now before Congress totals \$193-billion. If we subtract half the \$76-billion military item, the total is \$155-billion. The \$480-billion saving on arms would pay the total U.S. budget for three years at that \$155-million rate.

Put in another way, the saving by Atlantic Union during the past 21 years could have given U.S. taxpayers one tax-free year in every seven—a year-long "Sunday" in which to rest from paying taxes.

Billions for Budget Cinderellas. Suppose the \$480-billion went instead to the Cinderellas of the budget. Consider how much could have been done to avert or ease the problems we now face from urban decay, rural slums, ghettos, poverty, ignorance, disease, air and water pollution, racial conflict, campus revolt, extremism.

The annual saving in those 21 years would have averaged \$23-billion. Let those who know tell what could have been done—and could still be done—with that amount available annually, and divided, say, between public and private efforts for more or better housing, schools, education, libraries, hospitals, medicine, disease and drug prevention, technological and scientific research.

WHERE IKE LOST OUT—BUT HELPED NIXON TO WIN NOW

Why didn't General Eisenhower, in his eight years as President, lead the way to the Atlantic Union he believed could reduce defense expenditure hugely, and bring other blessings?

Many will ask that question now; as History will later. On April 2, 1952—less than a year after my talk with him at SHAPE—he wrote in his final report:

"Peacetime coalitions throughout history have been weak and notoriously inefficient. * * * There is power in our union. . . . Visible and within grasp we have the capability of building such military, economic and moral strength as the communist world would never dare to challenge. . . . Then the Atlantic Community will have proved worthy of its history and its God-given endowments. We shall have proved our union the world's most potent influence toward peace."

On April 6, 1966—14 years later—General Eisenhower wrote Rep. Findley, endorsing in these words his resolution for a Convention of NATO nations to explore the possibilities of Atlantic Union: "I strongly favor your undertaking; let there be no mistake about that."

Senator Kefauver had reintroduced his basically similar resolution in 1955; it had the support of powerful Senator Walter George, then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He left it in July 1956 up to the President whether his committee should report it favorably. On July 24 I wrote President Eisenhower, asking him to lead. Only two days later he replied: "I am aware of your deep interest in furthering a closer unity among the members of the Atlantic Community. Because I share that interest, I have given your letter earnest study."

He then explained that NATO had recently adopted a Dulles proposal to have a Committee of Three to study how to strengthen the Atlantic Community, and so, to avoid "creating confusion" by the U.S. seeming "simultaneously to support two different concepts of Atlantic unity" he had "decided not to take, at this moment, a position in support" of the Kefauver bill. He added: "This by no means forecloses future consideration of the alternative you support. I am most deeply appreciative of your continuing interest in this subject."

Enter, Tragedy. That proved to be the peak Atlantic Union reached in his Administration. Later in the very day he wrote me, Nasser seized Suez; result: far worse than confusion split us from our closest Allies. While we were in tragic conflict with France and Britain, Hungary revolted . . . and Freedom's finest opportunity in East Europe was lost by Atlantic disunion.

History may answer why President Eisenhower did not grasp his own opportunity to be the George Washington of the NATO nations by leading them to federate as the latter led the 13 States to do. I do not have the answer, but only some attenuating circumstances History may weigh—and future Euripides may find makes the drama at once more tragic and more human.

While President, General Eisenhower was plagued by ill health and operations. Trained to delegate power, he relied too much on Secretary Dulles, who once reaffirmed to P. F. Brundage and me his belief in Atlantic Union, but added: "I guess Clarence here thinks I always find some reason for deferring it."

Most important, I think, was another factor which General Eisenhower himself mentioned on two occasions after he left the White House, in discussing Atlantic Union with different friends of mine. In substance he said, sadly, "The great difficulty in the White House is that the urgent is always

crowding out the important." He might have added that each President is surrounded by loyal associates who seek to protect him mainly from the nearest pitfalls. Each President has devoted secretaries concerned with saving his "image" on tonight's TV, tomorrow's press, Floor attack, or intrigue on the Hill or in Bureaucracy. I know of none who has had anyone assigned to protect him at History's Bar—which disregards these urgent trivia and is concerned with the man, not his image. This may help explain why, in 180 years, History bows only to three Presidents: Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. It may be in the interest of Euripides-to-come that this situation should continue. It is not in the interest of any President, or his devoted friends or enemies, or the People.

What of President Nixon? This is the most formidable challenge he now faces. History—and events that jump in before its judgment—will be harsher to him than to Ike for several reasons. Ike did not cosponsor the Kefauver resolution; Senator Nixon did. Ike did not commit himself publicly before election to the proposal to explore Atlantic Union; Mr. Nixon did in 1966—and in terms History will find unanswerable. The need, and demand, to cut military cost was not nearly so acute in Ike's terms, as now. Nor had any President, or great General, in President Eisenhower's time, said that Atlantic Union would cut these billowing billions in half. But our publication of Ike's statement does make known now what otherwise only History would know.

This information thus becomes what "fact" always is: A powerful instrument for either good or bad, depending on the use made of it. Known, but ignored by President Nixon, it can hurt him in History. Known, and made much of by him. General Eisenhower's belief that Atlantic Union could cut defense cost by half, would greatly help him de-fang the venomous domestic and foreign threats he faces.

There are some causes that can not fail, and so statesmen who back them strongly, publicly can't fail either. Even if they seem to, History will call their effort noble. Is Atlantic Union, such a cause? On President Nixon's answer hangs his fate.

FARMERS NOT AT FAULT

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Robert B. Lyon, editor of the Schleswig Leader in Schleswig, Iowa, has performed a fine public service by compiling the figures to prove the inflationary cost of feeding a family is not the fault of farmers, but, rather, the result of increased costs to the food processor—increased wages, taxes, and rentals. In my district there are over 32,000 farms and more than 120,000 rural inhabitants who are weary of being blamed by our urban friends each time food prices rise. Increased costs are not lining the farmer's pocket.

A loaf of bread which sold for 13.5 cents 20 years ago brought the farmer only 3.3 cents. The same 1-pound loaf which sells today for 22.9 cents on the average still brings the farmer 3.3 cents.

In 1951 more than 23 percent of take-home pay went for food. Now the cupboards can be stocked with a better variety and quality for only 17 percent of the take-home pay.

The housewife should look to the shopping gimmicks and giveaways which are paid for by her shopping dollars. The increases are not to the benefit of America's farmers.

Mr. Lyon's editorial should be of special interest to American housewives who deserve to know why their food prices continue to rise:

[From the Schleswig (Iowa) Leader, Oct. 23, 1969]

EDITORIAL OBSERVATIONS

(By Robert B. Lyon)

When it comes to women, farmers are cowards.

Take most any farmer. He'll risk it all in a gamble with the weather. He'll take on a new variety of insects, weeds or disease in the cattle herd. He's even willing to put a seed drill into the ground every spring without any idea what his price will be in the fall.

But when it comes to an irate housewife marching up and down in front of a supermarket trying to drive down food prices, farmers get jittery.

Food prices are up. But only two-thirds as much as other consumer goods and services. And while farmers probably stand to lose more than anyone else in this current protest movement against supermarket prices, the blame is not really theirs.

As the Associated Press reported recently, more than two-thirds of the cost of food is added by the processors and marketing agencies. And that's where most of the price increases have been going.

A loaf of bread which sold for 13.5 cents twenty years ago brought the farmer 3.3 cents. The same one-pound loaf which sells today for 22.9 cents on the average still brings the farmer 3.3 cents.

Still, the housewives picket. And some of them will go home after a day's picketing and pop a pre-baked cake into the oven to thaw out and then open a flip-top box of prepared frosting for it.

Mother used to add milk, vanilla and egg whites to powdered sugar to make frosting.

Grocers say this growing demand for frozen three-course dinners and instant breakfasts is what drives the price up—together with higher wages for employees, higher taxes on store buildings to support schools and a 99 percent increase in rent over the past twenty years.

Actually, farmers are the housewife's best friend. In 1951 more than 23 percent of dad's take-home pay went for food. Now the cupboards can be stocked with a better variety and quality for only 17 percent of the take-home pay.

Housewives who take a notion to picket supermarkets might try a different approach—like spending more time being a housewife.

Prudent shoppers prepare shopping lists—and stick to them. Shop selectively, watching grocery ads and taking advantages of sale items. When the price drops on items you need, stock up on them.

Have a supply of food ahead. Many people store a full year's supply of nonperishable items. It makes it easier to ride out periods of high prices.

Another suggestion for irate housewives. How about a campaign against trading stamps. The National Commission on Food Marketing says "the increased use of trading stamps has increased food store prices by an amount about equal to the cost of the stamps."

While housewives continue the search for a villain in the rising cost of living, they might concentrate on their own spending habits as well as inflationary spending by government.

If you ask the farmer the whereabouts of

the villain, he'll correctly point his finger in that direction and tell you, "he went that-a-way."

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I discussed at a press conference last week the significance of the steps proposed by the President for improved consumer protection and the improvements in his approach which I believe Congress will make. I summarize my remarks below.

The President's consumer message made some good points:

The Federal Trade Commission does need additional powers which the President's message urged.

The limited steps to improve the operation of the Food and Drug Administration are important but should be expanded.

Legislation on medical devices is badly needed and the President's support, following that of President Johnson last year, may help effect passage of this proposal.

The Consumer Bulletin, to compile Federal consumer action in a single document, is an important aid for consumers trying to find their way through 33 agencies and 260 programs in the Federal Government which affects their interests.

And the President's interest in warranties represents a well-established and important concern.

TROUBLESOME PARTS

The other parts of the President's message are troublesome for they tend to proliferate the disparate consumer programs of the Federal Government without regard for their administration or even their ultimate effectiveness. Congress has passed many good consumer laws in recent years. Many go unenforced, or are badly administered.

We need a strong central consumer office in Washington which can give the American consumer the "one door" he needs for proper attention to his many and varied problems.

For many years, I proposed a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs to this end. Hearings on my bills—H.R. 6037, H.R. 6038, and H.R. 6040—were held September 16 through 18 by the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee under Chairman JOHN BLATNIK.

Ralph Nader, Consumers Union, Consumer Federation of America; Esther Peterson, former Presidential consumer adviser, and Dr. James L. Goddard, former FDA chief, all testified. Each made important suggestions.

ULTIMATE GOAL

Most of these leading consumer experts testified that a department, although perhaps ultimately the desirable goal, is not achievable at this time. But all the

witnesses strongly supported the establishment of a new central consumer agency, by statute, with real powers and far-reaching responsibilities.

Since I share with these experts an overriding concern for the immediate creation of a separate Federal agency for consumers, these changes in the bill have been made: Changed the Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs to an independent consumer protection agency—CPA—in the executive branch; and left the administration of existing consumer protection programs in their present agencies and departments.

Nevertheless, the revised bill, which is the product of numerous meetings with Nader, Consumer Union, and the Consumer Federation of America, retains the force of H.R. 6037.

I will propose these revisions within the subcommittee as amendments to the original bill. I am confident that the bill will be reported out by the subcommittee. It will be a model consumer agency bill with the broadest possible support.

Mrs. DWYER, the ranking Republican member of the Government Operations Committee, introduced a bill in September which provides for a strengthened statutory Office of Consumer Affairs in the White House. The President's proposal on consumer representation, provides for continuing the Office of Presidential Consumer Adviser with no new powers.

Neither the Dwyer bill nor the administration proposal meets the urgent need for a separate, self-contained, and independent agency with full statutory responsibilities.

A SINGLE SPOKESMAN

Patching up the existing consumer mechanism in Government—which is the President's prescription—will not solve this basic problem of representation in the heart of the Federal Government. The consumer needs a single articulate spokesman in Washington.

I consider our present efforts for the Consumer Protection Agency as a most important step toward the goal of a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs. And I am confident that Congress will respond to the President's consumer message properly with careful consideration of those steps which should be taken now for the consumer, the most important of which, in my view, is the creation of the Consumer Protection Agency.

I include below an analysis of my committee amendment, to be proposed soon, and an article from the Washington Post describing my proposal and its wide support.

I also include an editorial from the New York Times which both praises the President's consumer principles and asks Congress to reshape the programs he suggests so that those principles can become truly effective.

The material referred to follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY ACT OFFICERS

Administrator, appointed by President with senatorial consent.
Consumer Counsel.
Director of Consumer Information.
Director of Consumer Safety.

Director of Consumer Research.
Director of Economics.

REPRESENTATION OF CONSUMERS BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES AND COURTS

The Consumer Counsel with a staff of attorneys, economists, and scientists, will intervene in matters pending before courts and federal agencies which substantially affect consumers. Every federal agency must notify the CPA when taking consumer-related actions and must furnish it with its consumer data, including access to investigatory files.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

The Administrator will transmit an annual report to Congress on the CPA's activities and accomplishments, its legislative recommendations, and an evaluation of federal consumer programs particularly with respect to improved coordination.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

The CPA will receive, evaluate, act on and, if necessary, transmit to the appropriate agency, consumer complaints.

CONSUMER INFORMATION

The Division of Consumer Information will develop and disseminate information—including product test results—from public and private sources which will benefit consumers.

CONSUMER SAFETY

The Division of Consumer Safety will take over the responsibilities of the National Commission on Product Safety upon its termination. It will also design and develop improved safety features for categories of consumer products that are considered unsafe.

CONSUMER RESEARCH

The Division of Consumer Research will encourage, initiate, and coordinate research and studies leading to improved products, services, and consumer information.

CONSUMER EDUCATION

The CPA will encourage, initiate, participate, in consumer education and counseling programs (including credit counseling).

STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE

The CPA will give technical assistance to states and local governments for the establishment of consumer protection offices and arbitration programs.

ANALYSIS OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY ACT OF 1969—H.R. 6037, AS AMENDED, OFFERED BY MR. ROSENTHAL

Section 3(a): This section establishes as an independent agency within the Executive Branch of the Government, the Consumer Protection Agency. The Agency shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) There shall be in the Agency the following officers:

1. The Consumer Council;
2. The Director of Consumer Information;
3. The Director of Consumer Safety;
4. The Director of Consumer Research;
5. The Director of Economics.

Section 4: This section sets forth the powers and duties of the Administrator of the Consumer Protection Agency. He shall have the authority to select, appoint and fix the compensation of officers and employees; employ experts and consultants; enter into contracts; appoint advisory committees; promulgate such rules as may be necessary; utilize, with their consent, the services, personnel, and facilities of other Federal agencies.

Subsection (c): authorizes and directs each "Federal agency" to "make its services, personnel, and facilities available to the greatest practicable extent within its capability to the Agency;" and "subject to provisions of law, executive orders, and rules

relating to the classification of information in the interest of national security, to furnish to the Agency 'such information, data, estimates and statistics, including access to investigatory files,' as the Administrator may determine to be necessary in the performance of the functions of the Agency."

Subsection (d): requires the Administrator to transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include—

1. a comprehensive statement of the activities and accomplishments of the Agency during the preceding calendar year;
2. such recommendations for consumer legislation as may be deemed necessary;
3. a summary and evaluation of selected major consumer programs of each Federal agency, including comment with respect to the effectiveness and efficiency of such programs as well as deficiencies noted in the coordination, administration or enforcement of such programs.

Section 5: This section sets out the functions of the Consumer Protection Agency, the broad mandate of which is to "advise the President and the Congress as to all matters affecting the interests of consumers; and protect and promote the interest of the people of the United States as consumers of goods and services . . ."

Subsection (b): sets forth the specific functions of the Agency, as follows:

1. Advise Federal agencies and report to the Congress on the coordination of Federal programs and activities relating to consumers and help resolve differences among Federal agencies with respect to such programs and activities;
2. Assure that the interests of consumers are presented and considered by the appropriate levels of the Federal Government in the formulation of Government policies and in the operation of Government programs that may affect the consumer interest; including representing the interests of consumers in proceedings before Federal agencies and courts;
3. Receive, evaluate, act on and, if necessary, transmit complaints to the appropriate Federal or other agency, concerning actions or practices which may be detrimental to consumers;
4. Develop information from other Federal agencies, other public and private sources which is of benefit to consumers, including test results and economic analyses of consumer products and services; and to disseminate such information in the most effective manner possible;
5. Conduct economic surveys in accordance with the provisions of the Act;
6. Continue the work of the National Commission on Product Safety;
7. Encourage, initiate, and coordinate research and studies leading to improved products, services, and consumer information;
8. Encourage, initiate and participate in consumer education and counseling programs (including credit counseling);
9. Cooperate with and give technical assistance to State and local governments in the establishment of State and local consumer protection offices and with respect to programs to arbitrate consumer complaints;
10. Cooperate with and assist private enterprise in the promotion and protection of consumer interests;
11. Submit recommendations to the President and the Congress on measures to improve the operation of the Federal Government in the protection and promotion of the consumer interest.

Section 6: This section provides for effective and timely representation of the consumer interest in matters pending before any Federal agency or court (except in a criminal proceeding). In any hearing, investigation or other proceeding affecting substantially the interests of consumers, the Agency through its Consumer Counsel may

intervene and, pursuant to the rules of practice and procedure of that Agency or court, may enter an appearance in that proceeding for the purpose of representing the interests of consumers.

Section 7: This section requires that every Federal agency, in taking any action which can reasonably be expected to substantially affect the consumer interest, must—

(1) provide specific notice of such action to the Consumer Protection Agency and

(2) take such action in a manner calculated to give due consideration to the consumer interest.

Section 8: This section directs the Consumer Protection Agency to receive, develop on its own initiative, evaluate and take action on consumer complaints that involve violations of Federal law or rules or orders of any Federal agency or which disclose any commercial act or practice detrimental to the interests of consumers.

The provision requires that the Consumer Protection Agency notify producers, distributors, retailers or suppliers of complaints concerning them or their products, and directs the Agency to maintain a public file and listing of complaints arranged in meaningful and useful categories.

Section 9: establishes a Division of Consumer Information, which shall be headed by the Director of Consumer Information.

The Division shall develop on its own initiative, gather from other Federal agencies and non-Federal sources and disseminate to the public, information, statistics, product test results, economic analyses, price studies and other data which would be useful to consumers of the United States.

Subsection (c): directs all Federal agencies to cooperate with the Consumer Protection Agency in making available to the public all useful consumer information in their possession.

Section 10: creates a Division of Consumer Safety headed by a Director of Consumer Safety. The responsibilities of the Division are similar to those now performed by the National Commission on Product Safety. Additionally, the Division of Consumer Safety is authorized to design and develop improved safety features for categories of consumer products which are deemed unsafe.

This section shall not take effect until the termination of the National Commission on Product Safety.

Section 11: establishes a Division of Consumer Research and authorizes consumer product testing by the Agency and the National Bureau of Standards.

The Division of Consumer Research shall be headed by the Director of Consumer Research who shall—

(1) Oversee and coordinate all activities of the Agency involving product research and testing;

(2) Develop methods for testing consumer products and for improving consumer services;

(3) Make recommendations to other Federal agencies with respect to research, studies, analyses within their authority which could be useful and beneficial to consumers;

(4) Investigate and report to Congress on the desirability and feasibility of establishing a National Consumer Information Foundation which would administer a voluntary self-supporting "Info-Tag" program similar to Great Britain's "Tel-Tag" program.

Subsection (c): authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to establish facilities, or utilize existing facilities, for the purpose of determining, through testing, the performance and safety characteristics of consumer products. Such tests would be authorized only upon request made by a manufacturer or by the Consumer Protection Agency.

Section 12: establishes a Division of Economics which shall be headed by the Director of Economics.

The Division of Economics shall—

1. Conduct economic surveys with respect to matters of interest to consumers and including the levels of prices for goods and services affecting consumers and the factors entering into their establishment; suitability of goods and services affecting consumers; and the degree to which the trade and commerce of the United States succeeds in satisfying consumer needs for goods and services.

Economic analyses would not duplicate those of the Federal Trade Commission or the Justice Department.

Section 13: authorizes the establishment of a Consumer Advisory Council composed of 12 private citizens appointed by the President, to advise the Consumer Protection Agency on a wide variety of consumer matters.

Section 14: is the "Saving Provision." Among other things, it states that "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as relieving any Federal Agency of any authority or responsibility to protect and promote the interest of the American consumer . . . or as eliminating the need for consumer representation within the Executive Office of the President."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 1 1969]

CONSUMER BILL OF RIGHTS

The speed with which public demand has grown for stronger consumer protection is reflected in the message President Nixon has sent to Congress proposing a "buyer's bill of rights." In the election campaign just a year ago Mr. Nixon was putting most of his emphasis on "self-reliance" in the market place. Now he invokes the shades of Upton Sinclair and Rachel Carson to stress his identification with the concept that "consumerism" is here to stay.

Unfortunately, the braveness of the President's rhetoric is not matched by recommendations remotely adequate to give consumers the safeguards they need against fraudulent and deceptive practices. The effect of most of the Nixon proposals would be to water down much sounder measures now awaiting action in Congress and already assured of strong support.

This effect appears most glaringly in the section which purports to clear the way for damage suits on a collective basis where private citizens have been the victims of fraud or deception. The right way to open this avenue for class actions would be through a law authorizing consumers to initiate such suits on their own.

Under the President's plan, however, citizens would be able to act only if the Justice Department took the initiative by first establishing fraud through a Federal suit. Even then recovery would be limited to eleven types of fraud. Both these restrictions ought to be eliminated in any bill finally passed on Capitol Hill.

Another major defect in the Nixon package is his proposal for putting the projected Division of Consumer Protection into the Justice Department and thus separating it from the new Office of Consumer Affairs, which the President visualizes as the consumer's chief governmental watchdog. The office ought to be set up as a wholly independent administrative agency, with a fully staffed legal division of its own and with authority over all consumer programs.

In a dozen other specific fields relating to consumer protection the message promises "surveillance" and "study" rather than concrete measures to prevent shoddy or unsafe goods from being marketed.

The most affirmative section is the one proposing new legislation to clarify and extend the consumer protection functions of the Federal Trade Commission and to empower it to obtain injunctions against unfair or deceptive practices. The proposed review of substances on the "safe" list of the Food and Drug Administration also is highly salutary.

The President has articulated most persuasively the urgency of far-reaching Federal activity to police the market place and prevent the unscrupulous from defrauding both the consumer and the honest businessman. The important thing now is for Congress to reshape his proposals to achieve the sound objectives Mr. Nixon has enunciated.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1969]

TOUGHER BILL COUNTERS NIXON'S CONSUMER

PLAN

(By Morton Mintz)

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), charging that President Nixon's consumer package contains more air than "cornflakes," countered yesterday with a bill to set up a powerful, centralized, independent agency for consumer protection.

Rosenthal predicted that the House Government Operations Committee will report the bill within a few weeks and that the House will pass it by year's end. He recalled that he had about 100 co-sponsors in the House and Senate for his earlier proposal for a department of consumer affairs.

The congressman made his prediction at a news conference where he won support from consumer advocates including Ralph Nader; David Swankin, Washington representative of Consumers Union, Howard Frazier, president of the Consumers Federation of America; and Rep. John A. Blatnik (D-Minn.), chairman of the Government Operations subcommittee with jurisdiction over consumer bills.

The agency proposed by Rosenthal would have an "unfettered" consumer counsel whose primary duty would be to intervene on behalf of consumers in administrative and court proceedings.

Under the "Buyer's Bill of Rights" that Mr. Nixon sent to Capitol Hill Thursday, a consumer protection division—also with power to intervene in agency and court cases—would be created in the Justice Department. Virginia H. Knauer, the President's consumer affairs adviser, would have statutory coordinating powers similar to those she now has under executive order.

"I can't visualize Mrs. Knauer telling Attorney General John Mitchell in which cases to intervene," Rosenthal said. "It won't work."

Esther Peterson, President Johnson's first consumer adviser, agreed. Mrs. Knauer would find herself "absolutely helpless," she told the news conference.

Nader charged that the President's plan has a "built-in conflict of interest" because the Justice Department sometimes represents agencies opposed by consumers and because Justice has almost no lawyers dealing with "corporate crime" that, he said, steals "at least 20 per cent" of consumers' total income through usurious financing charges and other abuses.

In addition to its counsel, the agency sought by Rosenthal would have:

An administrator who would audit for Congress the consumer performance of government agencies (the reports required by the Nixon plan would be made to the President.)

A director of consumer information who would tell consumers about the performance of brand-name products tested by the government. (The President is committed to dissemination of "general information.")

A director of consumer safety who would take over the work of the National Commission on Product Safety when the panel expires next June 30. (The President seeks "continued surveillance" by Mrs. Knauer's office pending possible new product safety legislation.)

Rosenthal said the agency would have a staff of about 1,000 persons, which he said was 1 per cent of the number of employees in the Agriculture Department but 20 times

the number envisioned for the new Justice Department unit.

Nader said the agency "should be funded at least to the extent of one atomic submarine," which he priced at between \$150 million and \$200 million. Mrs. Knauer's current budget is \$451,000. She has 21 employees.

Nader praised Mrs. Knauer while accusing the President of enfeebling his consumer proposals in response to "pressure" from Commerce Secretary Maurice H. Stans and White House aides Bryce Harlow and Peter Flanigan.

COMMISSION STATEMENT ON ASSASSINATION

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH and I are privileged to serve as members of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. We were appointed by President Johnson in those hours of national distress which followed the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy as he campaigned for the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party.

When the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention was appointed, we were charged with, among other things, to examine, to analyze, and to make recommendations how to prevent the assassination of public leaders.

Last weekend, the Commission issued a comprehensive statement on assassination, and I am now inserting in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people:

COMMISSION STATEMENT ON ASSASSINATION,
OCTOBER 1969

(Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman, National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence)

This Commission was established in the dark hours following the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy as he campaigned for the presidential nomination of his party. Just two months earlier, one of America's great spiritual and moral leaders, the Reverend Martin Luther King, had been slain by an assassin's bullet. Not quite five years before these terrible murders, President John F. Kennedy had been assassinated in the prime of his life.

As we Americans mourned the loss of these three young and vital men, we could not help but wonder if the slayings were grotesque symptoms of some awful disease infecting the nation. Had assassination become part of our political life? What did these assassinations signify for America and its future?

Assassination is only one of many topics within this Commission's purview, but an especially important one. Eight American Presidents—nearly one in four—have been the targets of assassins' bullets, and four died as a result.

Violence has been a recurring theme in American life, rising to a crescendo whenever social movements—agrarian reform, abolition, reconstruction, organized labor—have challenged the established order. Though presidential assassinations have not been typical of these periods of great stress, such periods have often produced assassinations of other prominent persons. Consistently they have subjected political leaders to vilification and threats to their safety.

The 1960s afford a grim example. The present decade, though by no means the worst in American history, has witnessed disturbingly high levels of assassination and political violence. No clear explanation emerges from a consideration of the men who have been slain; no ideological pattern fits murders as diverse as those of George Lincoln Rockwell and Medgar Evers or President Kennedy and Doctor King.

In comparison to the other nations of the world, the level of assassination in the United States is high. It is still high when the comparison is limited to other countries with large populations or other Western democracies.

Probably no other form of domestic violence—save civil war—causes more anguish and universal dismay among citizens than the murder of a respected national leader. Assassination, especially when the victim is a President, strikes at the heart of the democratic process. It enables one man to nullify the will of the people in a single, savage act. It touches the lives of all the people of the nation.

The reaction to the slaying of a President lives in the public memory and is recorded in national surveys. Americans were shocked by the killing of President Kennedy. Most described themselves "at a loss" or "sad" or "hopeless." Many adult Americans wept, were dazed and numb or felt very nervous; others had trouble sleeping and eating. Many were ashamed of their country and felt a burden of collective guilt for the assassination. Some escaped the feeling by insisting that the act had been committed by a foreign agent.

The other side of the public reaction was an outpouring of rage and vindictiveness against the assassin. Only one out of three Americans felt Lee Harvey Oswald deserved a trial; one in five was pleased that Oswald had been murdered. (Vindictiveness attended earlier presidential assassinations: John Wilkes Booth, for example, probably shot himself, but a Union sergeant claimed to have killed him as an agent of God and was widely acclaimed for the alleged killing. Garfield's assassin, Charles Guiteau, though not killed was shot at twice—also with widespread approval. The trial of Leon Czolgosz for the assassination of McKinley took less than eight and a half hours, including the time spent impaneling the jury.)

Deeply affected by President Kennedy's assassination, many chose conspiracy as the only possible explanation of the dreadful and otherwise senseless act. Although three out of four persons believed Oswald was the assassin, 62 percent believed others were involved. When asked who or what was to blame, apart from the man who pulled the trigger, only 20 percent could specify a group: 15 percent said Communists or leftists and 5 percent said right-wingers or segregationists.

Suspicions of conspiracy are rooted in the history of American presidential assassinations. When a deranged house painter tried to kill Andrew Jackson in 1835, rumor spread that the man was an agent of a Whig conspiracy against Jackson. Charles Guiteau's sister and others argued that President Garfield was killed by a member of the conservative faction of the Republican party. When Giuseppe Zangara shot at President-elect Roosevelt in 1933 but killed the mayor of Chicago instead, some claimed the killing was not a mistake but the intent of a gangland conspiracy. Technically a conspiracy existed in the murder of Abraham Lincoln, though the conspirators were a motley few with no backing from powerful groups; still the suspicion survives in folklore that Booth and his crew were associated with prominent government officials. Suspicions about Oswald as conspirator may survive as long, despite the exhaustive investigation and contrary findings of the Warren Commission.

Considering the high visibility, the substantial power, and the symbolic (as well as

actual) importance of the American presidency, it is not surprising that Presidents are prime victims of assassination, or that conspiracy theories attend the event. The presidency is the fulcrum of power, the focus of hopes, and the center of controversy in American politics. What better target for those who wish to punish a nation, strike out at a symbol of great power, or simply draw the attention of the world and history to themselves? John Wilkes Booth remarked that the person who pulled down the Colossus of Rhodes would be famous throughout history.

II

The evidence from American history is overwhelming: no presidential assassination, with the exception of an abortive attempt on the life of President Truman, has been demonstrated to have sprung from a decision of an organized group whose goal was to change the policy or the structure of the United States Government. With that single exception, no United States presidential assassin has ever been linked to such a group, either as a policy maker or as a member or hireling carrying out its directives.

The occasions on which American Presidents have been assassination targets have in common this absence of an organized conspiracy. But they have little else in common. The type of President, his party affiliation, his public policies, the length of time he was in office, his personal characteristics, his political strength—all of these provide no clue to the likelihood of his assassination. The men who have been targets differ greatly. For example, Lincoln was the President of a divided nation during a civil war, Garfield a compromise candidate of a faction-torn party, and McKinley a popular President of a relatively unified and stable society.

To the extent that a pattern exists at all, it exists in the personalities of those who have been presidential assassins. In the biographies of these lonely, demented men we may discern common elements that help to explain their actions. From those common elements we may begin to draw a picture of the archetypal assassin.

Richard Lawrence, the house painter who attempted to kill President Jackson in 1835, was a man of grand delusions. At times he claimed to be Richard III of England; he believed the United States owed him large sums of money and, further, that Jackson was responsible for blocking his claim. As later assassins would do, Lawrence focused his mind on a particular political issue. Jackson had vetoed the bill to recharter the Bank of the United States; if Jackson were killed, Lawrence believed, the bank would be rechartered and all working men would benefit.

Other assassins were self-appointed saviors. John Wilkes Booth apparently believed that Lincoln had achieved the presidency through voting fraud and intended to make himself king. Booth claimed that he had acted as an agent of God in killing the President. Charles Guiteau thought it was his God-appointed task to kill James A. Garfield. After killing President McKinley, Leon Czolgosz claimed that he had removed "an enemy of the good working people." John Schrank, who attempted to kill Theodore Roosevelt, saw McKinley's ghost in a dream and heard it accuse Roosevelt of the McKinley assassination; Schrank also regarded himself as an agent of God. Giuseppe Zangara apparently believed himself a savior of the poor; he bore no personal malice toward Franklin D. Roosevelt, but attempted to kill him just because he was the chief of state (though he had not yet taken office).

Alone among assassins, Oscar Collazo and Griselio Torresola were members of a recognized political movement. Both were ardent Puerto Rican nationalists, and their attempt to storm Blair House, the temporary residence of President Truman, appears to have been part of a plot to dramatize the

cause of an independent Puerto Rico. Yet the plot was inept, not only because Blair House was well-secured, but because Truman was an inappropriate target. As President he had initiated important steps toward self-determination for Puerto Rico. After the attempted assassination, Puerto Ricans quickly denounced Collazo and Torresola.

Presidential assassins typically have been white, male, and slightly built. Nearly all were loners and had difficulty making friends of either sex and especially in forming lasting normal relationships with women. Lawrence, Schrank, and Zangara were foreign-born; the parents of all but Guiteau and Oswald were foreign-born. Normal family relationships were absent or disrupted. Booth was an illegitimate child; Guiteau's mother died when he was seven; Czolgosz lost his mother when he was twelve; Schrank's father died when Schrank was a child; Zangara's mother died when he was two. Oswald's father died before he was born and his mother's subsequent marriage lasted only three years. All of the assassins were unable to work steadily during a period of one to three years before the assassination. All of the assassins tended to link themselves to a cause or a movement and to relate their crime to some political issue or philosophy. All but Oswald used a handgun. At great risk to themselves, nearly all chose the occasion of an appearance of the President amid crowds for the assassination attempt.

Thus it might have been hypothesized in 1968 that the next assassin to strike at a President—or presidential candidate, as it turned out—would have most of the following attributes:

From a broken home, with the father absent or unresponsive to the child;

Withdrawn, a loner, no girl friends, either unmarried or a failure at marriage;

Unable to work steadily in the last year or so before the assassination;

White, male, foreign-born or with parents foreign-born, short, slight build;

A zealot for a political religious, or other cause, but not a member of an organized movement;

Assassinates in the name of a specific issue which is related to the principles of philosophy of his cause;

Chooses a handgun as his weapon;

Selects a moment when the President is appearing amid crowds.

We do not know with any degree of certainty why these characteristics appear in the presidential assassin. (Certainly the personal attributes can be found in many valuable, trustworthy citizens.) Nor do we know why the assassin politicizes his private miseries or why he chooses to express himself through such a terrible crime. Perhaps he comes to blame his own failures on others. Maybe because he does not live in a true community of men and has no rewarding relationships with others he relates instead to an abstraction: "the poor" or "mankind." Once his own inner misery becomes identified with the misery of those whom he champions, he places the blame for both on the nation's foremost political figure. Incapable of sustained devotion toward a long-range goal, the assassin is capable of short bursts of frenzied activity which are doomed to failure. Each failure seems to reinforce the self-loathing and the need to accomplish—in one burst of directed energy—something of great worth to end his misery and assert his value as a human being.

III

Deranged, self-appointed saviors have been the murderers of American Presidents. They have also been responsible for many of the assassinations of other national leaders and public officials. This Commission's Task Force on Assassination studied 81 assaults, fatal and non-fatal, on American Presidents, members of Congress, governors, mayors, and other officeholders. In case after case, their

study reveals, the attacks were prompted by fanatic allegiance to a political cause or revenge for some petty slight or imagined evil. Only in the years immediately following the Civil War were assassinations typically undertaken by organized groups to alter or terrorize government.

While non-conspiratorial assassination has been the American pattern, it surely has not been typical for the rest of the world. Throughout most of the world assassination has been used as an instrument of calculated political change, as a means of seizing power or terrorizing a government until it falls. Thus, for example, assassinations were a major part of the strategy of mass revolution in Russia and Eastern Europe beginning late in the nineteenth century. In Latin America assassinations have been committed less by fanatics or unstable persons than by daring political adventurers bent on seizing power for themselves or their supporters. And in the Middle East, assassination continues to be used as a deliberate political weapon by one political group against another. Where conspiratorial assassination is common, many besides the chief of state are apt to be targets.

Because assassination typically serves a political function, it is possible to predict with a fair degree of accuracy, using characteristics that are crudely measurable, what countries will experience high rates of assassination at particular moments in their history. For example, high rates of assassination tend to occur in countries experiencing political instability, in countries undergoing rapid economic development, under regimes that are coercive but not wholly totalitarian, in nations with high rates of homicide but low suicide rates.

By several of these measurements, the United States should be a nation with a low rate of murders of political figures—contrary to the actuality of its high rate. Thus, for example, almost alone among the nations with the highest level of economic development and greatest degree of political freedom the United States has a high assassination rate. Countries with high suicide rates tend to have low assassination rates; the United States is among a handful of exceptions.

During only one period of its history did the United States experience the turmoil and instability classically associated with high assassination rates: in the Reconstruction era immediately following the Civil War. During that decade, America experienced close to half of all the assassinations in its history. In the defeated South, still occupied by Union troops, many officeholders were not regarded as "legitimate" incumbents by the population. Many white Southerners resented the continuing presence of the military, the systematic disenfranchisement of former Confederates, and the new political power of former slaves and Northern "carpetbaggers." Some took violent action: two governors of Louisiana and a host of other state and local political figures became victims of assassination plots.

A century later the assassination rate in the United States is only a small fraction of the rate during Reconstruction, but still it is comparatively high and remains to be accounted for. A number of explanations have been offered: our frontier culture, the ready availability of guns, tensions among diverse groups, a low standard of political decorum.

It may be that persistent low-level turbulence and non-conspiratorial assassination are associated, just as conspiratorial assassination usually occurs amid other intense forms of political violence. Consistent with its principles of freedom, the United States tolerates a fair amount of political tumult—not enough to inspire political assassination, but perhaps sufficient to provide the condition under which the twisted mind of the

assassin decides that an imagined evil must be set right through violence. Dissidents in the United States have often been very vocal and very abusive; they sometimes have heaped scorn on a President, even vilified him. Americans demonstrate boisterously, stage emotion-charged strikes and sit-ins, hurl stones and filth and foul language at authorities who, in turn, have not always been restrained and fair in their use of power. Though an assassin is mentally deranged, the violent rhetoric of our politics and our constant flirtation with actual violence may be factors that bring him at least halfway to his distorted perception of what actions are right and legitimate.

Although the United States has differed significantly from the rest of the world in the kind of assassination it has experienced, there are indications that the future may bring more similarities than distinctions. Many of the conditions associated with conspiratorial assassination in other countries appear to be developing in this country:

Political violence in the United States today is probably more intense than it has been since the turn of the century. If civil strife continues to become more violent, political assassinations may well occur.

There is much talk today of revolution and urban guerrilla warfare by extremists, and there have been outbreaks of violence with aspects of guerrilla warfare, as in the Cleveland shoot-out of July, 1968. If extremists carry out their threats, we can expect political assassinations.

Even if the rhetoric of revolution and vilification of governmental authority is never translated into deed, the constant exhortation of America's institutions and leaders may destroy their legitimacy in the eyes of other segments of society. The assassinations during the Reconstruction era arose in just such a context.

Throughout the tragic history of race relations in this country, Negroes have been victims of white terrorist murderers. To this recurring threat is added a new one: plots and murders from within the radical wing of the black protest movement. The increasing number of Negroes holding public office and positions of political prominence will thus be running risks of assassination from two opposing extremist groups. From whichever direction, such attacks would appropriately be regarded as political assassinations.

Racial tensions have been at a high level in this country during the 1960s. If violent racial confrontations increase, the level of political violence in the United States could approach that of countries in which political assassinations typically occur.

Finally, the United States may in the next few years undergo even more rapid socio-economic change than it has in the recent past. Rapid change is another characteristic that correlates with high levels of conspiratorial assassination.

Present trends warn of an escalating risk of assassination, not only for Presidents, but for other officeholders at every level of government, as well as leaders of civil rights and political-interest groups. Accordingly, this Commission suggests:

1. that the Secret Service be empowered to extend its protective services to that limited number of federal officeholders and candidates for office whose lives are deemed imperiled as a result of threat, vilification, deep controversy, or other hazarding circumstances. A Joint Resolution of the Ninetieth Congress, in June of 1968, authorized the Secret Service to protect "major" presidential and vice-presidential candidates, the eligibility of persons to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after consultation with a special advisory committee consisting of the Congressional leadership. Specifically, we recommend that the Secretary and the special advisory committee be

empowered to designate, without publicity, a limited number of persons (federal officeholders or candidates) as temporary assassination risks and to assign them Secret Service protection wherever and whenever needed.

2. that state and local governments carefully review the adequacy of the protection accorded to candidates and officeholders, especially governors and mayors, and that the protection be strengthened where it is deficient. The responsibility for protection should be clearly delineated, and new avenues of cooperation should be opened between those with state or local protective responsibilities and the Secret Service and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to include a sharing both of technological information and of information about dangerous persons and potential assassins.

In our statement on firearms control we made recommendations that, if adopted, would greatly curtail the risk of assassination to all who might be targets. We have recommended drastically limiting the availability of handguns through restrictive licensing. We have further recommended intensified research to develop mechanisms that would assist law enforcement officers in detecting concealed firearms and ammunition on a person. Handguns are the weapons favored by assassins (by all but one presidential assassin, for example); effective detection devices would minimize the risk of assassination in meeting halls and other enclosed gathering places.

The precautions we are urging are worthwhile whether or not this nation faces a new outbreak of political assassinations. We do not predict that such an outbreak will occur. But we feel compelled to note that some of the conditions for such an outbreak are present or may be developing. These conditions add urgency to the need to develop effective protection against assassination.

We can only hope, along with all Americans, that the conditions which have kept our society free of the scourge of conspiratorial assassination will prevail—conditions such as the ability of the American people to absorb radical challenge, to respond to the need for reform, to keep their basic democratic values intact even in periods of bewildering and buffeting social change.

IV

Whatever the future holds for the United States, it is clear that, among all public figures, Presidents, will continue to run the greatest risks of assassination. It is in the nature of their office; it is in the nature of the distorted logic by which assassins choose their targets.

The death of President Kennedy poignantly demonstrated the resilience of the American people in the face of tragedy and of their institutions of government at a time of abrupt transition. With skill and grace President Johnson exercised a calming influence on the nation, and the nation rallied in support of the new administration. That has been the pattern in the American past. We cannot safely assume, however, that our republic will always fare so well. An assassination of a President occurring during an edgy, critical moment in history could have disastrous consequences. Moreover, even when an assassination does not impair the strength of the nation or the continuity of its policies, the murder of a President is a tragedy of unrivaled proportions.

In the years since President Kennedy's death, and as urged by the Warren Commission, the policies and procedures for guarding Presidents have been thoroughly studied and imaginatively reconsidered, and many improvements have been made. A detailed discussion here of new procedures would lessen their effectiveness. We simply state that the Secret Service has reported to this Commis-

sion improvements in equipment and the various procedures of intelligence work. The Secret Service is confident that, had its new intelligence system been in effect in 1963, the activities of Lee Harvey Oswald would have brought him to the attention of the Secret Service before the fatal attack on President Kennedy. As we have pointed out, more research is needed, especially in the technology of concealed weapons detection.

There can be no perfect system for guarding the President short of isolating him, confining him to the White House and limiting his communication with the American public to television broadcasts and other media. This extreme solution is neither practicable nor desirable. For political reasons and for the sake of ceremonial traditions of the office, the American people expect the President to get out and "mingle with the people." (Among the eight Presidents who have been assassination targets, all but Garfield and Truman were engaged in either ceremonial or political activities when they were attacked.)

Still, a President can minimize the risk by carefully choosing speaking opportunities, public appearances, his means of travel to engagements, and the extent to which he gives advance notice of his movements. He can limit his public appearances to meeting places to which access is carefully controlled, especially by the use of electronic arms-detection equipment. Effective security can exist if a President permits. Moreover, during the past twenty years television has proven an accepted and effective vehicle for presidential communication with the American public, and its continued and possibly expanded use by the President is to be encouraged.

During election campaigns there are extraordinary pressures both on the incumbent President and the contenders for his office that serve to maximize their risk as targets of assassination. Rightly or wrongly, presidential candidates judge that they must be personally seen by audiences throughout the country, through such rituals as motorcades, shopping-center rallies, and whistle-stop campaigns. Whether the long grind of personal-appearance campaigning is really the most effective investment of a candidate's time is debatable, since even the most strenuous travel schedule will expose him to only a small percentage of the American people. It has been argued that the grueling pace is itself a test of the candidate. It is more difficult to argue that political rallies test the candidate's reasoned consideration of the issues, since the speeches usually are brief, superficial, and suited to the carnival atmosphere of rallies. While campaign rallies involve the public in the electoral process by bringing that process close to them, they cannot be said to involve the public deeply in the pressing, complex issues of the nation.

A more reasonable defense of personal-appearance campaigning is that it provides important "feedback" for the candidate: he can sense the public mood through audience response to his speeches, learn of their problems and feelings through the questions they raise and comments they make, and observe firsthand—as Kennedy is remembered to have done in his West Virginia campaign—the conditions that will demand his attention if he is elected. Yet this function can be better served in the quieter atmosphere of an enclosed meeting place where, we note, the risk of assassination can be significantly reduced.

But the most promising vehicle for campaigns effective in reaching large audiences and safe to the candidates is television. The intimacy with which television projects events and personalities has been amply demonstrated, and it is doubtful whether heavier reliance on television appearances need sacrifice any of the intimate contact

with American people which candidates now associate with personal appearances. It has also been demonstrated that the American people have come to rely heavily on television in forming their opinions of presidential candidates. In a poll conducted for the Television Information Office in November, 1968, 65 percent of the respondents said television was their best source for becoming acquainted with candidates for national office.

The fuller potentiality of television for presidential campaigning has not been explored primarily because of the high cost of television time. Yet the value of television in reaching large audiences has been recognized, and more and more campaign funds are being invested in its use. Indeed, as campaign costs continue to soar, some fear that presidential politics will eventually become a contest where only millionaires need apply.

Out of concern for the safety of Presidents and presidential candidates, this Commission recommends that the Congress enact a law that would grant free television time to presidential candidates during the final weeks preceding the national election. The amount of television time allocated to the candidates should be adequate to establish a new pattern in presidential campaigning and to reduce significantly the pressure toward personal appearances in all parts of the country.

To ensure that candidates used their time for responsible, informative presentation of themselves and their views, the free time might be allocated only in half-hour blocks. Within his allotted time, however, a candidate would be free to choose the format best suited for his presentation.

It has long been recognized that broadcasters have a public-service commitment to the American people in exchange for their licensed use of the airwaves. To ensure an equitable sharing of that commitment, consideration would have to be given to the question of whether all networks should be required to carry each program or only one network at a time, with the burden shared in rotation. Moreover, a formula would have to be devised for allotting time in a way that would give fair expression to important minor parties.¹ Consideration should also be given to expanding greatly federal support of public television facilities for the express purpose of having these facilities share the political education function with the commercial networks.²

¹ Given television's superiority, a shift toward its greater use by presidential candidates appears inevitable. But other campaign reforms, such as the increased use of enclosed meeting places, may require strong endorsement by the major political parties if they are to be effected. It is unrealistic to expect individual candidates, acting upon their own initiative, to alter significantly the traditional pattern of campaigning.

² A *Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era* has just issued its report, suggesting among other things that the Federal government pay for television time for presidential candidates at one-half the normal commercial rate. The Commission has also recommended a formula for the allocation of such time, called "voters' time," between major and minor candidates. Though the recommendations of the *Twentieth Century Fund Commission* are somewhat different from ours, we hope they will be given consideration by the President and the Congress, along with those we submit in this statement. We also note that Great Britain, with more than twenty years experience in allocating broadcast time to a number of political parties, offers proof that this knotty problem may be equitably solved.

Though this proposal is put forth out of a desire to lessen the risk of assassination to Presidents and presidential candidates, other considerations lend merit to the proposal. The superiority of television as a forum for serious consideration of modern complex issues has already been noted. Moreover, political rallies attract the curious and the party faithful. Many of the marginally motivated stay home. On the premise that it is easier to flick a dial in the living room than to drive across town to a rally, we note that television programs could widen the base of political participation in America.

v

Broader participation in American politics might be an antidote to the political violence that has been a recurring feature of American life and which has recently been on the upswing. Our concern is not simply that the future may bring to America the alien phenomenon of conspiratorial assassination. Irrational, non-political killings of national leaders will also be a continuing risk as long as political violence, in rhetoric or act, is present to inspire the assassin. For while such assassins are mentally unbalanced, their beliefs are not wholly antithetical to what other Americans believe but simply distortions thereof.

Thus, assassins are not alone in believing in the efficacy of political violence. Nor are they alone in their simplistic, exaggerated view of the power of the American President. Ever since George Washington's day, we Americans have mythologized our Presidents. We have attributed to them powers beyond human limitation and far beyond the realities of our constitutional system. Through the nation's press we follow every move, public and private, of the President—sometimes in adulation, sometimes in malicious anticipation of some sign that the man is only human.

Political violence often arises when a group feels the government has been unresponsive to legitimate demands. This Commission recognizes, as do many Americans, that the political institutions in our democracy need to be made more sensitive and responsive to the interests they are intended to represent. It is not difficult to understand the impatience and alienation of those who believe that the government has been consistently neglectful of their welfare. It is noteworthy that many are organizing new political groups to press for reforms. They are demonstrating a basic truth of American politics: groups that appreciate the complexities of American government, and that can organize to promote their ends through persuasion at the right times and places, benefit the most from policy decisions. The counter-trend—shortcutting to violence before the peaceful means of redressing grievances have been exhausted—can only be deplored. That counter-trend has been alive in this decade but not unique to it. Except for those to whom the complexities of government are workaday business, Americans have not typically been patient with the subtleties of political issues. In part this stems from the natural preference for simplicities; in part it reflects the glossing over of subtleties by politicians, journalists, and the educators of our nation's children.

A significant decrease in the level of political violence in our country requires a new level of participation in the increasingly complex processes of local, state, and federal government and a new level of communication between government and the people it serves. Those responsible for the institutions of government must serve both needs—by clarifying their functions and purposes, and by responding to the needs and legitimate

grievances of all they are intended to represent.

Thus legislators and administrators must creatively use the political processes to ensure the prompt amelioration of wrongs. Thus legislators, administrators, and private citizens must share with the President the responsibility for realistic demonstration that the society is in fact acting in behalf of all citizens.

The nation's press must respond to these needs—by clearly representing the complexities of the institutions of government, by fully and fairly reporting the issues these institutions face, and by delving into the issues deserving governmental attention. By lessening its attention to the personal lives of the President and his family, with correspondingly greater attention to the working nature and limitations of the presidency, the nation's press may achieve the additional effect of discouraging a simplistic notion of the presidency that assassins are not alone in holding.

The nation's schools must also respond to these needs: by emphasizing in American history and social studies the complexities and subtleties of the democratic process; by shunning the myths by which we have traditionally made supermen of Presidents, "founding fathers," and other prominent persons; by restoring to history books a full and frank picture of violence and unrest in America's past, in confidence that children will repudiate violence and recognize its futility.

There are themes in American culture that have served us for good and ill. American folklore has always emphasized—and continues to emphasize in television heroes—direct action and individual initiative. Equally compelling within the American experience has been the emphasis placed on freedom of conscience. Many of the authentic heroes of American history have been individuals willing to suffer ostracism and to employ unconventional (and even violent) means to realize goals unpopular to a majority of citizens. While these qualities have been a source of strength and a goad to progress for our nation, it is not difficult to see that perverse relationship to the act of a demented assassin.

Perhaps a new generation of Americans, trained to these subtleties of American life, shamed by its violence as they are proud of its achievements, determined to achieve a better record for their time and sophisticated in the ways to achieve it, will guarantee a more peaceable America.

vi

These are long-range hopes, and responsible citizens must give serious attention to how we can best realize them. For the short range, this nation is not powerless to prevent the tragedy of assassination. We conclude with a reiteration of the steps that can be taken to minimize greatly the risk of assassination:

Selective expansion of the functions of the Secret Service to include protection of any federal officeholder or candidate who is deemed a temporary but serious assassination risk;

Improved protection of state and local officeholders and candidates, and strengthened ties between those holding this responsibility and the appropriate federal agencies;

Restrictive licensing of handguns to curtail greatly their availability;

Development and implementation of devices to detect concealed weapons and ammunition on persons entering public meeting places;

A significant reduction of risky public appearances by the President and by presidential candidates;

A corresponding increase in the use of public and commercial television both as a vehicle of communication by the President and as a campaign tool by presidential candidates.

POW CRUELTY BY HANOI CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1969, nearly 300 Congressmen cosponsored legislation calling upon the regime in North Vietnam to adhere to the terms of the Geneva Convention and stop mistreating U.S. servicemen held captive by that country.

Despite the overwhelming response of world opinion condemning the barbarous acts being perpetrated against American servicemen by Hanoi, the Communists continue to flagrantly disregard the Geneva Convention.

Navy Lt. Robert Frishman is one of only nine Americans freed from North Vietnamese prisons in the past 5 years. Every American should be shocked by his first-hand description of the pitiful plight of our captured men at the hands of their uncivilized Communist captors.

I think that every Member of this House has a solemn duty to continue to rally world opinion against the atrocities and inhuman treatment being inflicted on our POW's. Every American should know and feel the agony that these men suffer for us.

Let no one be deceived by the false promises of humanitarianism, peace, or understanding advanced by Communist nations.

A news interview of Lieutenant Frishman follows my remarks:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 29, 1969]

HANOI HIDES FACTS, BUT POW REMEMBERS

(By William Delaney)

Long days alone in a tiny, stifling room; a bowl of pumpkin soup twice a day; an open arm wound that stuck to his blanket each night; a fellow officer with cigarette burns on his arms and fingernails yanked out . . .

Locked in the tortured memory of 28-year-old Navy Lt. Robert Frishman is probably as thorough a report as anyone in America now has on the condition of the 1,320 U.S. servicemen captured or missing in Vietnam action.

Frishman, one of the nine Americans freed from North Vietnamese prisons in the past five years, recalls an anecdote from childhood to describe "the worst" part of his 20 months in captivity.

NOT MUCH IS KNOWN

"When I was a little kid and I did something wrong, my dad would ask, 'Do you want to have a beating, or else you can't go out with the boys in the afternoon.'

"I would always take the beating. The isolation and the solitary confinement is the worst on you."

But neither Frishman nor the U.S. government knows the worst that has befallen those who have not been freed.

In fact, the government does not even

know from Hanoi whether these men are today alive or dead.

All it knows, as it cautiously appraises reports of an imminent break in Hanoi's POW silence, is that varying sorts of evidence suggest that at least 414 individuals are probably now in enemy prisons.

The evidence on these "confirmed" prisoners—letters from more than 100 of them, images and voices in North Vietnamese propaganda, U.S. intelligence information, reports from foreign journalists, and firsthand accounts of returnees like Frishman—indicate that the bulk of them are in camps within North Vietnam.

More than 50, however, are believed to be scattered among enemy units in South Vietnam. According to reports from some 40 Americans released or escaped from captivity in the South, these men are not held in camps but individually, at the most in twos or threes.

Only last Sunday, the Viet Cong announced that three more of these men would be released but did not say when or where.

As for the 906 Americans missing and unaccounted for, the Pentagon feels that perhaps half of these may be in North Vietnamese prisons.

150 IN LAOS

The rest include some 300 missing in South Vietnam and about 150 missing in Laos.

Of all the 1,320 listed as either POWs or missing, nearly two-thirds are Air Force pilots or crewmen. For the most part, they were downed during the 2½-year-long bombing of North Vietnam—which ended a year ago this week.

Many others are Navy pilots, like Frishman. They include Lt. (j.g.) Everett Alvarez Jr., who was downed Aug. 5, 1964, in the first U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam, during the Gulf of Tonkin crisis.

Alvarez has been captive longest of any of the confirmed POWs, according to the Pentagon.

More than 200 others have been in Communist hands over 3½ years.

Some of the captured or missing men are Army personnel—all of them in South Vietnam or Laos—and the Defense Department believes "a few" Marines are being held in North Vietnam.

As for the conditions in the enemy POW camps, probably the freshest and most thorough information available to the U.S. is that obtained from Frishman and the two other Americans released by Hanoi last August.

Like the six earlier returnees, the latest trio personally saw only a limited number of other Americans (Frishman remembers a total of "around 150" in two camps where he was held).

But what Frishman saw and heard, and smelled and felt, all served to confirm Washington's conviction that not only has North Vietnam failed to honor one basic tenet of the Geneva POW Conference agreement—listing the prisoners. It has also, as Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said, "violated even the most fundamental standards of human decency."

For example:

Right after Frishman was shot down by a surface-to-air missile on Oct. 24, 1967, he was driven blindfolded through a gun emplacement and stoned.

He was refused treatment for the elbow wound he initially suffered unless he would agree to give information.

When he passed out, he was taken to a hospital and roped to a stool until he passed out again. ("In two days your feet swell up, and then it creeps up your legs until they're numb . . .")

When his elbow finally was amputated,

fragments of the missile remained in his arm. It took six months for the incision to heal because it formed a scab against his blanket each night in the 45-degree winter.

Most of Frishman's time was spent in solitary confinement in 10-by-11 or 14-by-26-foot rooms, where he shivered in the winter and suffered from a heat rash during the sultry summer. Twice a day the prisoners were served pumpkin soup with pig fat in it and some bread.

Most Americans are allowed to read only North Vietnamese propaganda and to listen to Radio Hanoi.

"They took pictures of me reading Newsweek magazine," said Seaman Douglas Hegdahl of Clark, S.D., who was released along with Frishman. But he said that as soon as the picture was snapped, "they took the magazine away."

GOT SOME MAIL

Hegdahl also confirmed that in a Japanese newspaper photo of him reading "Christmas mail" at the POW camp, the letter he was looking at was dated the previous April 2. He said he got 15 other letters from home, but that packages were rifled if he got them at all.

"Many POWs do not write or receive mail," he said.

The 1949 Geneva Convention permits the exchange of two letters and four cards per month between the POW and his family.

During the five years since Alvarez was captured, a total of only about 800 letters have been received by the families of more than 100 of the POWs. "The mail there really should have been something like 20,000 to 22,000," says a Pentagon source.

Frishman and Hegdahl also said they had no contact with the Red Cross, which is authorized to inspect POW camps under the Geneva Convention.

Most prisoners, they said, are kept in "isolated" situations, some in solitary confinement, some in two- or three-man rooms.

After initial "rough treatment" to obtain military information, the captors later apply pressure to obtain statements that the POWs are receiving "humane" treatment.

Frishman said he was rehearsed before an interview with an Italian journalist. "You try to do what you can to resist that thing, but, like I say, they have ways of forcing you . . ."

A WEIGHT PROBLEM

The North Vietnamese, though "capable of giving good medical care," do only what is necessary to keep the POWs alive. Both Frishman and Hegdahl lost about 50 pounds in captivity.

In contrast to the reports from American POWs, the Pentagon says South Vietnam and the Red Cross have supplied Hanoi with lists of the 28,000 to 30,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese prisoners currently being held in six POW facilities in South Vietnam.

The camps are regularly inspected by the Red Cross, and the prisoners regularly receive mail.

Hanoi has been informed that 60 of the prisoners are sick or wounded. But Hanoi has failed to arrange for their return to the North—in some cases, for as long as two years.

Over the past five years, more than 400 of the POWs held in the South have been released, partly in hope that such action would inspire a counter-release by Hanoi. That figure does not include the 88 whose release Saigon proposed yesterday.

LAIRD'S DECISION

Only in recent months, however, has the U.S. begun applying the pressure of world opinion to the plight of its enemy-held servicemen.

According to a Pentagon spokesman, Laird

reviewed the entire POW problem after taking office last January and became increasingly convinced that America's discreet past posture on the matter didn't seem to be obtaining results.

Furthermore, the halt of bombing of North Vietnam and the public forum provided a chance to put pressure on Hanoi. A final factor was a feeling that the families of the men needed reassurance from their government that "they have not been forgotten."

Working closely with the State Department, Laird repeatedly made public appeals to Hanoi to abide by the Geneva convention—to list the prisoners, release the sick and wounded, treat them properly and provide regular mail and impartial inspections of POW camps.

During the summer, Richard G. Capen, Jr., deputy assistant defense secretary for public affairs, was dispatched to speak with more than 1,700 members of POW families in 21 U.S. cities to assure them of the government's interest. He also told them the government would no longer discourage any efforts on their part to secure the release of the men.

WOMEN ON THE MOVE

Although feelings among the families are mixed, and some wives fear retaliation against their husbands if they speak out, many of them organized to put the POW plight in the national and international spotlight.

From California to Colorado to Long Island, they have handed out bumper stickers, written countless letters to Hanoi, pleaded with congressmen, corporation presidents and newspaper editors.

In the last six weeks, several of them visited Paris and won assurance from North Vietnamese delegates that they would soon be informed of their husbands' status.

In a third prong of the world opinion against Hanoi attack, delegates at the International Red Cross conference in Istanbul last month approved, without dissent, a resolution calling on all parties to the 1949 Geneva POW Convention to abide by its tenets.

The resolution, which did not specifically mention North Vietnam, was approved by attending representatives of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia among other Communist powers. Neither North Vietnam nor its Red Cross society attended.

In addition, American Red Cross officials say they are "greatly pleased" by 11 positive responses to their separate plea to Red Cross societies in 30 countries—including Russia, Yugoslavia, and many neutrals—asking them to appeal to Hanoi in behalf of the Americans.

As for Hanoi's reported new promise last weekend to release all POW names to anti-war militants here, the State Department says it welcomes information "through whatever channel."

But privately, government sources dared not regard the new hope as a sure thing.

"I'M HOPING . . ."

Neither does Candy Parish of Alexandria, who was told by North Vietnamese in Paris 3½ weeks ago that she would soon be told the status of her missing pilot husband, Navy Lt. Charles C. Parish. As of yesterday, she hadn't.

"I'm hoping that something will come of it," she said, referring to the reported new Hanoi move. "It may be that this is the form the answer (promised her) will take."

Remarkably one official source close to the POW dilemma: "It's possible that the weight of world opinion played some role in bringing this about . . ."

"But I'm afraid Hanoi is going to stretch it out for every dime's worth of propaganda they can get."

THE QUESTION OF AIRCRAFT
HIJACKING

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when aircraft hijacking is a recurring and serious international problem, the World Peace Thorough Law Center has proposed a convention for consideration by the nations of the world with a view of taking affirmative legal action to meet this growing problem.

I respectfully call the attention of my colleagues to this convention and urge them to study the proposal and to offer any suggestions or criticism they may have to strengthen and improve it:

CONVENTION TO DETER AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

The States parties to this Convention:

Believing the increasing incidence in every continent and the accelerating tempo of aircraft hijacking is causing grave and universal alarm; that both national and international law are necessarily involved in its prevention; and that the legal steps taken so far have proven largely ineffectual,

Considering that unlawful acts of seizure or exercise of control of aircraft in flight jeopardize the safety of persons and property, seriously impair the operation of international air services, disrupt freedom of transit, imperil air navigation, and undermine the confidence of the peoples of the world in the integrity of civil aviation,

Realizing that these hijackings are often being perpetrated by criminals, the mentally ill or emotionally unbalanced or immature seeking refuge or publicity and heedless of dire consequences, and that only by inaugurating measures including the denial of asylum of any kind can the imperative goal of immediately halting these offenses be achieved,

Recognizing the urgent need for expeditious action to denounce, prevent, dissuade, and punish such acts or attempts with utmost severity, by adopting provisions additional to those of international agreements in force and in particular to those of the Tokyo Convention of 14 September 1963 on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Each Contracting State undertakes with all deliberate haste to promulgate such legislation and regulations as may be necessary and proper to implement the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE 2

1. While on board, whoever commits or attempts to commit aircraft hijacking, as herein defined, or who is an accomplice, shall be deemed a pirate.

2. As used in this Article, the terms—

(a) "Aircraft hijacking" means any seizure or exercise of control, by force or violence or threat of force or violence and with wrongful intent, of a civil commercial aircraft in flight in air commerce;

(b) "In flight" means from the moment power is applied for take-off to a completed landing.

3. Respective where the initial act or attempt shall have occurred it shall be deemed to continue until the aircraft hijacked lands.

ARTICLE 3

Each Contracting State shall reasonably insure that persons on aircraft and the aircraft itself are protected from the presence of deadly or dangerous weapons, explosives, and any other object capable of injuring

such persons or property or threatening the lawful operation of civil commercial aircraft.

ARTICLE 4

Each Contracting State, in whose territory a civil commercial aircraft initially hijacked elsewhere lands—

(a) Will restore immediate control thereof to its lawful commander, and release automatically and instantly the aircraft, crew, and passengers to continue the scheduled journey as soon as practicable.

(b) Will apprehend, disarm, and restrain the alleged hijacker and effect his departure under guard either in said aircraft, if practicable, or by any other available means to the State to which the aircraft was destined before the hijacking.

(c) Will refrain from detaining anyone on board for any reason, except for the alleged hijacker to the extent necessary to accomplish his expulsion and delivery to the originally scheduled destination of the hijacked aircraft.

ARTICLE 5

Each Contracting State undertakes to make the offense of aircraft hijacking punishable in a manner commensurate with its gravity.

ARTICLE 6

1. Each Contracting State will establish its jurisdiction over the offense in the following cases:

(a) When committed on board an aircraft registered in that State;

(b) When committed in its territory;

(c) When the aircraft lands and the alleged offender leaves the aircraft in its territory.

2. This Convention shall not apply where the aircraft on board which the offense was committed neither took off nor landed outside the territory of the State of registration of that aircraft.

3. This Convention does not exclude any criminal jurisdiction exercised in accordance with national law.

4. In order to effectuate the purpose of depriving an offender of any benefit whatsoever from an aircraft hijacking, manifested by the contents of Article 4 hereinabove, the Contracting States shall appropriately defer their own jurisdiction, if any, accordingly.

ARTICLE 7

The Contracting States which establish joint air transport operating organizations or international operating agencies, which operate aircraft not registered in any one State, shall, according to the circumstances of the case, designate the State among them which, for the purposes of this Convention, shall be considered as the State of registration and shall give notice thereof to the International Civil Aviation Organization which shall communicate the notice to all States Parties to the Convention.

ARTICLE 8

1. If for any supervening reason immediate expulsion of the alleged offender is not feasible, and upon being satisfied that the circumstances so warrant, the Contracting State in the territory of which the aircraft lands and the alleged offender leaves the aircraft, shall take him into custody or take other measures to ensure his presence. The custody and other measures shall be as provided in the law of that State but may only be continued for such time as is reasonably necessary to enable any criminal or extradition proceedings promptly to be instituted before a competent tribunal with due process of law.

2. Such State shall immediately make a preliminary enquiry into the facts.

3. Any person in custody pursuant to paragraph 1 shall be assisted in communicating immediately with the nearest appropriate representative of the State of which he is a national.

4. When a State, pursuant to this Article, has taken a person into custody, it shall

immediately notify the State of registration of the aircraft and the State of nationality of the detained person and, if it considers it advisable, any other interested States of the fact that such person is in custody and of the circumstances which warrant his detention. The State which makes the preliminary enquiry contemplated in paragraph 2 of this Article shall promptly report its findings to the said States and shall indicate whether it intends to exercise jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 9

The Contracting State which has taken measures pursuant to Article 8, paragraph 1, shall, if it does not extradite the alleged offender, be obliged to submit the case to its competent authorities for their decision whether legal proceedings should be initiated against him. These authorities shall make their decision in the same manner as in the case of other offenses.

ARTICLE 10

1. The offense shall be deemed to be an extraditable offense in any extradition treaty existing or to be concluded between Contracting States.

2. The Contracting States which do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty or reciprocity shall recognize the offense as a case for extradition as between themselves.

3. The offense shall be treated, for the purpose of extradition, as if it had been committed not only in the place in which it occurred but also in the territory:

(a) Of the State of registration of the aircraft;

(b) Of the State in which the aircraft lands and the alleged offender leaves the aircraft.

ARTICLE 11

At the request of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization, each Contracting State shall furnish to that Organization as rapidly as practicable all relevant information in its possession relating to:

(a) The circumstances of such offenses;

(b) The measures taken in applying Article 4 a, and b, above;

(c) Measures taken in respect of the alleged offender, in particular the outcome of any extradition or other legal proceedings.

ARTICLE 12

Contracting States shall, in accordance with their law, afford one another the greatest measure of assistance in connection with proceedings brought in respect of the offenses.

ARTICLE 13

1. All States or any of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations may become parties to this Convention at any time by (i) signature without reservation as to approval; (ii) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance; (iii) acceptance.

2. Acceptance shall in no way imply recognition as a State where none exists and no treaty relations will arise between such parties as a consequence of acceptance.

3. Instruments of acceptance shall be deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

4. As soon as ten States have deposited their instruments of acceptance of this Convention, it shall come into force between them on the fifteenth day after the date of the deposit of the tenth instrument of acceptance. It shall come into force for each State adopting thereafter on the fifteenth day after the deposit of its instrument of approval.

5. As soon as this Convention comes into force, it shall be registered with the Secretary-General of the United Nations by ICAO.

ARTICLE 14

Any Contracting State may denounce this Convention by notification addressed to ICAO, which shall take effect six months after the date of its receipt.

ARTICLE 15

1. ICAO shall forthwith send certified copies hereof to all States Members of the United Nations or of any Specialized Agency.

2. It shall further give notice to the aforesaid, as well as to all other parties hereto:

(a) Of any signature of this Convention and the date thereof;

(b) Of the deposit of any instrument of acceptance and the date thereof;

(c) Of the date on which this Convention comes into force in accordance with Article 13, paragraph 4;

(d) Of the receipt of any notification of denunciation and the date thereof; and

(e) Of the receipt of any declaration or reservation or other notification affecting or modifying any acceptance hereof and the date thereof.

ARTICLE 16

This Convention consists of three authentic texts in the English, French, and Spanish languages.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, having been duly authorized, have signed this Convention.

INFLATION AND LIVING COSTS FOR THE NATION'S ELDERLY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, inflation is sapping the modest buying power of the Nation's 25 million elderly people. In order to help rectify this crisis, this week I submitted testimony to the Ways and Means Committee setting forth a viable legislative program for giving retirees the buying power they need in their later years.

I would like to share my testimony on proposals to amend social security with my colleagues, at this point:

STATEMENT OF HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

Mr. Chairman: These hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on proposals to amend the Social Security Act are long overdue recognition that the retirement benefits accorded the nation's Senior Citizens are totally inadequate to meet the minimum needs of life.

After a life-time of contributing to the productivity of America, retirees have a right to expect to live free of hardship and despair. Social Security benefits must be realistically aligned to reflect today's cost-of-living and built-in provision must be made to protect retirees against future inflationary increases in living standards.

Indeed, Social Security benefits are clearly inadequate to offset the inflationary pinch on retirees living on fixed incomes. The result of our grossly unfair law is to consign many honorable, hard-working Americans to the poor house when they become old.

Three out of 10 people over age 65 are living in poverty, in contrast to 1 in 9 younger people considered poor. And the gap is widening: retirees have less than half of the buying power of those working.

A realistic reappraisal of Social Security is needed then, building into the system automatic benefit increases which will "depoliticize" old-age insurance.

Retirees have a right to live their declining years in reasonable comfort, yet current benefits are as slight as \$44 monthly or even less in some cases—hardly very reassuring for someone who has worked all his life.

I urge the committee to give utmost consideration to H.R. 14149, which I co-sponsored, which will increase cash payments by

50 percent. It would provide a \$103 monthly minimum in three steps over the next four years.

Let me emphasize that retirees are not looking for a handout. They have worked steadily and faithfully for a great many years, or they wouldn't be on pensions. They deserve to have some protection against the inflation that is cruelly diluting their only sustenance.

Even a 50 percent increase would provide a very modest living level for today's impoverished retirees. With this increase, a retiree would average no more than \$1,764 yearly and elderly couples would average about \$2,970 annually.

Under the bill I co-sponsor, the present minimum monthly benefit of \$55 would increase to \$103 by 1974, with an immediate 15 percent Social Security boost to \$80 in January 1970. Other provisions of the bill include:

Benefits would be adjusted automatically every 2 years for each 1 percent increase in the cost-of-living starting in 1975.

Widows would get 100 percent of their deceased spouse's benefit at age 65, instead of today's fragmented 87½ percent. And the age 50 limit for qualifying disabled widows is eliminated, providing them with regular benefits.

The elderly can earn \$1,800 yearly without reduced benefits; now the ceiling is \$1,680. And in any one month earnings can rise \$10 to \$150 without loss of benefits.

Reduce the waiting period for disability benefits from 6 to 3 months and liberalize definition of disability.

Extend medicare health insurance coverage to the disabled and include prescription drugs in coverage for the elderly.

The cost for these increases will be met by raising the contribution base to \$15,000 a year, which is equivalent to the \$3,000 base used when the program was started in 1935. Social Security tax increases will be one-tenth of a percent for employees and employers. After two years, the Federal government would start contributing nearly a third of the cost.

The need for a significant and immediate Social Security increase is dramatized by the consumer price index for September 1969—a 5.8 percent increase over a year ago. The major victims of this relentless upward trend are the elderly who must subsist on small fixed retirement incomes. Medical costs, which impose a particularly heavy burden on the elderly, increased at an even faster rate during this same period, by 7.7 percent.

The Department of Labor has just released three typical budgets for retired couples, which describe the kind of standard of living to be expected for a given income in the Spring of 1969. The Department reports that rising prices between Spring 1967, the last period for which other budgets had been prepared, and Spring 1969 added about 9 percent "to the cost of goods and services required to sustain the retired couples."

The cost estimates of the retired couple's budget are for an urban family of 2 persons—a husband age 65 or over and his wife—who are presumed to be self-supporting and living independently. The budgets permit the couple to maintain its health and well-being and to participate in community activities. The three budgets are divided into lower, intermediate, and high. Couples living under the lower budget can expect average total costs of \$2,671. The intermediate budget cost is \$3,857 and the higher budget totals \$6,039. The lower budget assumes a small proportion of home ownership while the intermediate budget assumes 65 percent of home ownership and the higher budget assumes that 75 percent of the couples own their homes.

Consumption items such as housing, food, transportation, clothing and medical care totaled \$2,556 in the lower budget, \$3,626 in the intermediate budget, and \$5,335 in the

higher budget. While representing a comfortable standard of living the higher budget definitely is not an affluent budget. Obviously, an income of \$5,000 would require a tight budget.

I would also point out that the elderly pay taxes that may seem small compared to that paid by an employed person, but to the elderly man trying to support his wife, this tax added to his other expenses may create an economic crisis. The retiree is also faced with rising taxes at the State and local level. For those who own their homes, property taxes have been rising steadily. In addition, sales taxes are often imposed on food and non-prescription drugs.

The elderly should not have to be satisfied with a hand-to-mouth existence. These people have worked hard all their lives and deserve to look forward in their final years to a time of dignity and reward not to one of foreboding and degradation.

THE CHRISTIAN AND MILITARY SERVICE

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the relationship of the Christian ethic to service in the Armed Forces, particularly in time of war, frequently is a matter of concern to those who profess a belief in God and a respect for Christian teachings.

In this connection, I found of interest the view one military chaplain takes of his ministry, as expressed in a sermon on the Sunday prior to the Vietnam moratorium demonstration.

Because I believe it would be of interest to other Members of the House, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of this sermon, delivered by Post Chaplain (Col.) Alexander L. Paxson, in the Post Chapel, Fort Myer, Va., as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN AND MILITARY SERVICE

I feel that I must be a bit personal as I begin my message this morning. I think it is accurate to say that my public ministry here could be characterized as Bible-centered preaching. I admit to staying close to God's Word and make no apologies for being what is called a "Bible preacher." In short I do not address myself to themes that are socio-economic or political, particularly avoiding PARTISAN politics. However, I recognize that all preachings, if it has any value whatever, must be involved with social, ethical and political issues as these touch the life of a given congregation. The Gospel speaks to the WHOLE of life. Christianity cannot be confined to a sanctuary and a chancel. The Christian message is not worth the effort to destroy it if it must stay behind the pulpit. I do not subscribe to the ancient saw, "preacher stick to the gospel." The Gospel I proclaim must go out into the market place. I really wanted to say go into the streets, but that has another meaning now, yet in spite of that modern implication, I WILL say the Gospel must go into the streets.

This morning I want to address myself to an event that is to take place here. As I understand it, the participants in the Anti-Vietnam Moratorium will assemble less than a quarter of a mile from this chapel on the other side of this holy hill, our national shrine, Arlington Cemetery. I cannot be silent in the face of that demonstration. Now please understand I do not disapprove of dissent. These people, the young and the old,

the student and the non-student, the black and the white, the minority representative and the majority, have a perfect right to do what they are doing. I am sure that we who represent the various military services would defend that right, for if ever the right of peaceful assembly, peaceful demonstration, and sincere dissent is denied our country will have lost its pursuit of liberty. I am not criticizing what they are doing. But I am saying that they represent one opinion. They give voice to one particular idea. There IS another side to this debate, but no matter how diligently I search for an expression of the other side I cannot find it. It is not in the secular press, at least in this city. It is not represented in the religious press. I am going to take the opportunity to voice the other side of this great debate. Moreover, I am persuaded that the principles I present here today are firmly based in religious, that is to say, Christian ethics.

This is one of the most unpopular wars in which the United States has ever engaged. It is not, contrary to expressed opinion, the only war to arouse dissent, public, political, and popular. The Mexican War was acceptable only to certain sectional interests. U. S. Grant participated in it, but in his autobiography he called it immoral. Almost every facet of the current debate was foreshadowed in the public revulsion toward that most UNcivil, fratricidal blood-letting called the Civil War. There were demonstrations against it, there were draft riots, there was violence and dissent. The Union had its Copperheads and their counterparts existed in the South. Lincoln, who is now revered as a saint and a martyr, was vilified, hated, almost driven out of office. One member of his official family called him a gorilla. The great debate raged on in the press, in the legislative halls, in the body politic. However, it is certainly true that this is an unpopular war. For a long time the pollsters reported that there were more hawks than doves, that the "silent" majority supported the administration. In preparation for this sermon I have been watching these reports and just this morning Mr. Gallup reports that 57% now favor withdrawal. This is the official position of the administration, but one would think that the opposite were true. In fact it would appear even now only the doves, leftists, intellectuals (self appointed), SDS, and assorted others of these types are the only "peace-makers". As far as I can see this is because they are articulate, loud, emotional, and persistent. I am not certain that a majority exists whose ideas may differ from those of the Moratorium people, but a very strong minority exists whose voice is seldom if ever heard.

Never before in my career as a chaplain have I had so many soldiers come to me in genuine agony of spirit seeking help in the old problem of the Christian and War. It is consistent with the temper of the times. These men reflect their generation. They are conscientious participators and their motives are just as sincere as the man who refuses induction. The question usually centers on the Christian's attitude toward all war, but it always moves on to a confrontation with the issues raised by the Vietnam Conflict.

There has always been a minority of Christians who hold tenaciously and sincerely to the belief that a Christian cannot participate in war. The Christian, these contend, must be neutral and pacifist. But the majority of Christians, and certainly the historic church has consistently held that participation in the unhappy and undesired business of war is a Christian obligation.

A good many of you have completed your Vietnam tour, some will soon complete your military obligations altogether. There is not a man among you who needs to apologize for, nor regret your participation in this bloody and brutal conflict, you have a thoroughly defensible position as a Christian soldier. It

is my purpose to give you some ammunition you may find useful in the war of ideas in which you may find yourself caught up. If you make a career of the military service I offer you some guidelines by which to order your life. A Christian soldier has a grand heritage upon which he may draw for the moral authority of his vocation. There are certain principles by which we may live and serve in the military.

THE RESTRAINT OF EVIL

There was a time in the history of the Hebrew Nation when every man "did that which was right in his own eyes". The Bible record tells us that the people became disenchanted with the resultant anarchy and insecurity and demanded a king who would put their society in order. This was the beginning of the Israelite Monarchy which helped bring into being a great nation and an orderly society whose contributions to legal processes have been the foundation of human dignity, liberty and security for thirty centuries.

The New Testament expanded this idea and teaches us that God ordained governments for our own good and for the further purpose that evil might be held in check. Evil is aggressive. It will not restrain itself. This is a truism on every level of existence from the individual to the family to the local community and right on up to international relationships. Good men must be strong enough to limit the spread of evil.

The good man must not only be strong enough to restrain evil, he must be willing to do so. The Christian police officer limits evil on the local level. The Christian soldier limits evil on the international level. He supports and helps to create the orderly society.

THE DEFENCE OF THE GOOD SOCIETY

The benefits of our society, blessings material and spiritual, have come down to us as a sacred trust. Good men and citizen soldiers from the Revolution of 1776 to the present conflict have invested their life's blood to secure and maintain the privileges and opportunities we enjoy today. Granted not all our citizens enjoy the same blessings. Not all members of our society are permitted the opportunities and privileges that are taken for granted by the majority. There are minorities among us who are not accorded their rights. The black man is not yet free and so long as he remains in bondage the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) majority is not fully free. But this does not mean that we destroy the system that has brought us these blessings so much desired by all men in this land and everywhere else on earth. Sometimes when I hear what is being said by the activists, the Lunatic Left, the witless intellectuals and their ilk I am reminded of the poor old nurse-maid who was so enthusiastic about her cleaning activities that she threw the baby out with the bath water. The Christian Soldier wants to extend, yes, fight to extend these blessings to every person in our society regardless of his national origin, his race, or his creed. He is supremely conscious of the indubitable fact that a good society has a right to perpetuate and protect itself. It is his right and duty to do so.

Every person who voices his disagreement with government policy and society's practice is indebted to a lot of soldiers who paid with their lives for his right to dissent. I think the compelling reason that brought this message into being was the fact that this demonstration is to begin right down here at Arlington Memorial Gate. Those men and women who gather there will indulge in denunciation, vituperation, and all the oratory of opposition, while just to their backs, on the other side of the wall lie the thousands of honored dead, known and unknown, who "gave the last full measure of devotion" and who by their death created the society that allows them to "do their thing."

It is the Christian soldier's privilege and

duty to defend that society and to develop this heritage and extend it to all men if he is to give as much to his children as was given to us. We often hear that it takes two to make a quarrel. That is true on the childish level and in some adult relationships, but it is not always true. In fact it is often absolutely inconsistent with the harsh facts of life. When the first murderer, Cain, took club in hand and beat out the brains of his Brother Abel, you may be sure he got no help from Abel. He carried that quarrel to its bloody conclusion all by himself. When Hitler murdered the Jews of Europe and all the others who disagreed with his policies those innocents were not accessories after the fact. They were victims sacrificed on the altars of hate. One man with hate in his heart can create hell on earth until he is stopped cold by good men—Christian soldiers, if you will—who are strong enough and courageous enough to strike him down. The Christian soldier DEFENDS the good society.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

The Christian soldier assumes all the obligations of citizenship—social, political and military. What manner of man is he who can enjoy the blessing brought into being by the blood, toil, sweat, and tears of other men and yet remains unwilling to make a similar contribution to the general welfare himself? The Christian soldier assumes his rightful share of the load of life. He does not leave the protection and defense of his own life, of his family, and/or of his country to others. In this day and age he is expected to come to the aid of other people and other countries who are too weak to defend themselves from subversion within their own borders or from aggression by neighboring states.

Our own country was once weak and insecure. Its own government was as shaky and unsure as the whole series of governments that have attempted to direct the affairs of the bleeding and unhappy land in which our soldiers now fight and die. Another country came to our rescue; its government sent its armies to aid us when we so desperately needed it. This is a fact conveniently forgotten by the doves, the peace-niks and sob-sisters of today. That is one of the reasons we are in Vietnam today. We Americans are driven by an historic social conscience to help others as we were once helped.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE OUGHT TO BE

It is distinctly Christian to be responsible for things as they are. It is also equally Christian to assume responsibility for the way things ought to be. Strength owes a debt to weakness. The man who has a God-given power to restrain evil and does not do it stands condemned.

The famous parable of the Good Samaritan has its obvious lesson. A good neighbor helps a man in need. But suppose the Good Samaritan had come upon the scene while the robbers were assaulting the traveler. Do you really believe that he would have stood to one side waiting for the gangsters to finish their work so that he could then administer first aid? I cannot believe that Jesus was describing that kind of a man. He would have waded in to help at risk to life and limb. Saint Ambrose, one of the early church fathers wrote, "He who does not defend a friend from injury is as much at fault as he who commits the injury".

The love of liberty

In the breast of every true man there burns an unquenchable fire. It is the love of liberty. No matter what his condition, no matter the length of his servitude, nor the manner of his bondage he longs to be free. Only man knows this drive. The greatest and the strongest of the wild beasts will at length trade his freedom for food and security. Had it not been for Christian men who prized freedom above all else—even

life itself—there would be no such land as ours. And for all her faults, in spite of all her shortcomings she is still the greatest and the best. In all the centuries of human history no land and no society has offered so much to so many. The lode-star that has drawn mankind to its fold has been its people's love of liberty. Above all else the Christian soldier treasures freedom for himself and for all men everywhere.

I am well aware, as is everyone else who has been there, that freedom as we know it does not exist in Vietnam—North or South. What I have never been able to understand is why the opponents of past and present American policy seem to believe that the bondage imposed by Ho Chi Minh and his successors is preferable to the apparent bondage imposed by the South Viet government. Communism recognizes no form of freedom. The present Saigon regime is all that we have. We cannot impose our will upon it lest we betray our own love of liberty. May I remind you that it is only one of a number of government administrations in Saigon? Each began with great hope. None has fulfilled our hopes. It is no fault of any American administration that the Western concept of liberty is an unknown quality to the Vietnamese mind. It was the goal of the American policy to try to instill that concept in the heart of every Vietnamese from the Prime Minister to the last and least peasant. We have not failed completely for here and there are those brave men and women who have tasted the heady wine of freedom and someday it will ferment in every Viet soul. The Christian soldier works and prays for that miracle.

There is no room in the Christian Soldier's thinking for such a cowardly philosophy as "better Red than dead." Such confusion turns Patrick Henry's dictum inside out—give me tyranny and give me life. God forbid that we should have to learn the value of our freedom by being deprived of it. Czechoslovakia has lost hers. Hungary is in bondage. Whoever thinks of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia anymore? These were people who loved liberty, but were not strong enough to defend it. These are only a few of those who have been crushed beneath the heel of ruthless tyranny.

Abraham Lincoln spoke for all Christian soldiers when he said: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and we have planted the seed of despotism at our own door."

RETIREMENT OF HARRY L. BROOKSHIRE

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 31, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I have always been highly impressed by the quality of the employees of the House of Representatives. Sometimes, I believe, that we have taken their excellence for granted and it is only on an occasion such as this when one of the most able of these employees is about to retire that we realize the great service that they render not only to us but to the Nation as a whole.

On the retirement of minority clerk, Harry L. Brookshire, we shall have lost a man of great legislative expertise. He

came to this body for the first time over 30 years ago and for many years served as an executive and administrative assistant to two very able Members of Congress. Later he served in the campaign of President Eisenhower and with the Republican National Committee. Former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield then chose him as his executive assistant.

Harry Brookshire had a great love for U.S. House of Representatives and gladly returned to it as minority clerk in 1958.

I know that I was but one of the many Members of this body who sought him out for his advice on matters of legislation.

We, Ohioans, have always had great pride in the ability of Harry Brookshire. Born and educated in our great State, he overcame the handicaps of poverty and rose solely by his own efforts.

Now he and his charming wife, Ruth, will return to their beloved Ohio to spend their days in retirement.

We, of Ohio, are proud of the long list of famed public officials that we have given to our country. We now add the name of Harry L. Brookshire to that list.

POPULATION, RESOURCES, AND THE GREAT COMPLEXITY

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population I have made numerous comments on the complex interrelationships between population growth and our earth's resources. Our task force has sponsored legislation to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. We have also cosponsored legislation to redesignate the Department of the Interior to the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population.

The words ecology, environment, pollution, population, family planning, birth control, and earth resources have become more increasingly part of our everyday vocabulary here in the Congress. We need to make these words more common to the general public. We must create an acute awareness of the problems that are procreated by increasing population growth.

The following article well depicts the problems of which I speak and I recommend its reading by my colleagues:

[From the Population Reference Bureau, August 1969]

POPULATION, RESOURCES AND THE GREAT COMPLEXITY

(By Durward L. Allen)

"It is too late to solve today's problems," states a noted ecologist. "Tomorrow's problems can be solved only if we agree to be responsible for them." As human crowding gives rise to an exponential increase in social and economic crises, Americans would do well to reconsider their national obsession with growth.)

Over the past quarter-century, an increas-

ing body of scientific leadership has been concerned with the accelerating increase of world population. Since the early 1940's major advances in the control of infant mortality and epidemic disease, as well as aid to areas of food shortage, have reduced death rates in many tropical countries by about half. Humanity as a whole is in a logarithmic phase of the population curve. The 3.5 billion people now inhabiting this globe are on the way to doubling by the end of the century. Unless strenuous countermeasures are taken, in the United States our 200 million citizens will grow to more than 300 million in the same period.

It is a looming threat that already more than half the world's people are underfed. Although food-production technology has made important recent gains and food scientists are making every effort to rescue mankind from major disaster, there appear to be few authorities who expect such efforts to overtake the irruption of human numbers. There is, instead, a growing consensus that the chance of avoiding a demographic reckoning in the so-called "developing" countries is small, and that within 20 years hundreds of millions of people will be faced with a debacle of starvation and its associated ills.

This is the context in which we must consider our policies and programs in North America. We are deeply involved at present in food shipments to the needy, and our technology is being exported at an increasing rate. Unfortunately, while there is a growing belief that population limitation is essential and inevitable in this nation and elsewhere, our leadership in these matters is not in depth. It is a leadership of a few informed and concerned individuals, diluted by the attitudes of the many who, with an ear to the political ground, do not yet hear the tramp of approaching millions.

Although some sociologists and economists will not agree, I postulate that the problems of human welfare are biological, behavioral and economic—in that order. There are no interfaces where one leaves off and another begins. Understanding these problems requires both the detailed knowledge of the specialist and the broad appraisal of the generalist. Such a generalist is usually a biologist who has extended his interests far enough into the problems of human society to communicate with the specialists. The time is not far ahead when generalists will be appointed to high government commissions and committees.

My present purpose is to suggest relationships that can help us understand many of the problems that plague mankind increasingly with each passing year. It may be that we do not fully grasp what is happening to us and that a re-examination of primordial adjustments will be profitable. Long before the human line became human there were millions of years of evolution in which the ancestral stock occupied its functional niche in the ecosystems in which it was found. We probably pay penalties when the primitive inner man is outraged too far, and there could well be clues to rights and wrongs in the social and habitat adaptations of some of our common animals and birds. A few of these characteristics are worth reviewing, for they are nearly universal.

BIOLOGICAL ANALOGIES

In our latitude, the young of most species are born in spring and summer, and they develop to a "subadult" stage in late summer and fall. These adolescents commonly wander widely in a "fall shuffle," evidently seeking a place to live. The farther such individuals move in strange country, the higher their mortality rate. They are at every kind of disadvantage, including the need to invade desirable space already occupied by their own kind.

When the wanderer finds a location where food, cover and other requisites are in useful combination, it settles down into a "home range." This is a unit of habitat where the animal becomes familiar with the terrain, develops its routes of travel, knows the location of every necessity, and is best able to escape from its enemies. Seasonally, at least, it does not leave the security of its home range. Here it has relationships of tolerance with other individuals of the same species whose ranges overlap. A high quality home range is a small one, where daily needs can be fulfilled with a minimum of movement. Both economic security and behavioral ease are found by the animal in its own familiar surroundings. Residents tend to display antagonistic behavior toward strangers.

Let us now consider a human analogy—the resident of a small town in rural America, perhaps in the more simple times of 40 years ago. This person has a high degree of self-sufficiency. He has a garden and a cellar stocked with food. He has a well, his own outdoor plumbing, and his supply of fuel for heat and lighting. He disposes of his own trash and garbage.

His home range is small; he commonly gets to his work or wherever else he needs to go by walking. He recognizes most of the people of his community. Here he has feelings of security and comfort. There is, he says, no place like home. His high degree of independence becomes particularly evident under "emergency" conditions. He can ride out a winter blizzard with composure, and he can meet most of the dislocations that affect him with his own efforts. He needs a minimum of public service.

Compare his situation with that of a dweller in one of four large cities today. Passing over the social and economic enclaves that produce something akin to small-town conditions, I select an individual who is representative of urbanized man. Wherever he lives, he is dependent on a wide range of public services. His food, water, fuel and power are brought to him, and his wastes are taken away. His work is likely to be many miles removed from his home. To fulfill a specialized function in his community, he must meet a rigid transportation schedule in getting to his place of employment and returning home daily. Likely enough, he passes through territory that is largely unexplored and unfamiliar, and he has continual contacts with individuals with whom he is unacquainted. He has lurking anxieties in dealing with a wide range of unpredictable situations. He may develop the social callouses and aggressive behavior frequently observed in the residents of large cities. In a measure, the city dweller has lost his identity in a social melange that is diffuse and uncertain.

This individual is dependent for many things. He is vulnerable to every kind of public emergency. A drought or power failure, a strike or riot, a heavy snow that ties up traffic, can immobilize him and jeopardize his security. In this aggregation of largely strange humanity, he finds many of his activities organized and regulated. In turn, he needs protection from his fellow men. Aberrant and antisocial behavior must be dealt with. Health hazards must also be guarded against. It is testimony to the unusual adaptability of man that he can so often tolerate these essentially unnatural conditions reasonably well.

THE DENSITY DETERMINANT

Since all "higher" animals are socialized in some degree, a measure of association between individuals is beneficial. It follows that with the increase of numbers an optimum density is reached in terms of behavioral needs and available habitat resources. At still higher concentrations, we see the development of competition for space and other necessities and the breakdown of normal social relationships.

The behavioral and logistic attrition that builds up can be described conveniently by the term "stress." Eco-social stress is an elusive phenomenon—difficult to define, analyze and quantify. For good reasons, scientists have largely avoided this baffling universe of inquiry in their investigations of population mechanics and animal relationships, although the physiology of stress is somewhat better understood. The physical and psychic well-being of the individual is tied closely to environmental conditions.

To appraise the nature of high-density stress in human society, we may review, for want of more appropriate terms, some of the findings of Alfred Korzybski, known for his innovations several decades ago in the field of general semantics. In a paper of 1943, largely drawn from three earlier sources, Korzybski explored the increase in complexity of functional relationships or problems as individuals are added to a managerial system. He cited the work of V. A. Graicunas, who calculated the growth of problems faced by a supervisor as assistants with related work were added to his responsibilities. Deriving an appropriate formula, Graicunas solved for the increasing relationships as follows:

		Possible relationships
Number of assistants or functions:		
1	-----	1
2	-----	6
3	-----	18
4	-----	44
5	-----	100
6	-----	222
7	-----	490
8	-----	1,080
9	-----	2,376
10	-----	5,210

We need go no further than ten in the series, since it illustrates beyond question that the addition of individuals or functions in this relatively simple organization gives rise to some kind of exponential increase in relationships. "At the root of the problem," said Korzybski, "lies the significant fundamental difference in the rate of growth between arithmetical progression, which grows by addition, for example, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, etc., and geometrical progression, which grows by multiplication, for example, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc." He stated further: "My whole life's work, and particularly since 1921, has been based on the life implications of this neglect to differentiate between the laws of growth of arithmetical and of geometrical progressions." In effect, he despaired that those who govern could find the wisdom and means to meet their proliferating managerial tasks satisfactorily.

It seems evident that concentrations of people and, more generally, the growth of nations, produce a great complexity that expands in geometric proportion to the build-up of population density. If, for example, our present world population of 3.5 billion doubles by the year 2000, it might be supposed that the problems of government and social affairs would be twice as great. Using the scale of the Korzybski example, however, we can see that such a concept would fall far short of reality. The buildup of eco-social stress would undoubtedly take place much more rapidly.

THE COSTS OF OVERPOPULATION

Americans customarily think of mass production as a means of attaining efficiency and lowering the cost per unit—an approach that clearly does not apply to human beings. As people multiply and concentrate, they require more protection and services of every kind, and they are correspondingly more costly.

Thus, a significant question: Is this great and burgeoning complexity related to our increasing costs of government, our deficits, our inadequacies in dealing with social prob-

lems—especially the rising rates of mental and psychosomatic disease and crime? Does it help to explain why municipalities and state governments find it progressively more difficult to collect enough taxes to carry out their commitments to education and other multiplying functions?

If population growth beyond an optimum begets problems that increase more rapidly than human numbers, it might be assumed that this only bespeaks the immaturity of our social and economic science—that in due time, man and his computers will handle the dilemma and produce a higher living standard despite the difficulties. To an extent, such optimism may be justified. But whether management skills can overtake a problem that is growing geometrically—and whether they can do so soon enough to be a relief to this generation and those immediately ahead, is highly questionable.

It is particularly evident that many of the high-density problems of humanity exist in the world's cities. Ironically, many educated Americans hold the view that the rural populations of the "underdeveloped" countries must be gathered into cities and their land given over to large-scale mechanized agriculture. It is assumed that industrialization in our image will bring this two-thirds of the world the blessings of modernity.

Yet, to an impressive degree, we have ourselves fallen far short in dealing with the challenge of urban complexity. Some 70 percent of the American people now live in cities of more than 50,000—a proportion that is increasing. The President's Council on Recreation and National Beauty has remarked: "No major urban center in the world has yet demonstrated satisfactory ways to accommodate growth. In many areas, expanding population is outrunning the readily available supply of food, water, and other basic resources and threatens to aggravate beyond solution the staggering problems of the new urban society."

Perhaps the most widely evident sign of our overabundance is degradation of the environment. The technological "explosion"—a term that suggests a consciousness of some of the exponentials involved—has been accompanied by a corresponding reworking of the face of the land. The widespread pollution of water and air, and the despoliation of natural beauty need no particular documentation here. The solid wastes to be disposed of now aggregate 4.5 pounds per American per day. Thermal modification of natural waters as a result of power production is doubling in ten years. There is ample evidence that in North America we have exceeded the capacity of the biosphere to degrade and assimilate our wastes. Not only should we be making strenuous efforts to avoid further population increases, but real and rapid progress toward better standards of life in America probably must await the attaining of a negative growth rate.

Finally, the concept that American-style industrialization can be the salvation of overpopulated and impoverished peoples seems to neglect the fact that the U.S. system is based on an abundance of native and imported wealth. *The inhabitants of North America—only seven percent of humanity—are using about half the world's yield of basic resources.* Sociologist Philip M. Hauser has stated that, at our standard of living, the total products of the world would support about half a billion people. This seems a dim outlook for the 3.5 billions now alive and those yet to come.

OUR GROWTH OBSESSION

Nowhere in the state of nature do we find animals prospering so well, surviving in such large numbers, living so long, and reproducing so abundantly as when a population is expanding to fill a vacant environment. Of course, this is what has happened to our own species in North America during the past 300 years. The white man displaced the Indian and took over his resources for use at a

"higher" cultural level that could support many more people. It is perhaps understandable that modern Americans have developed an expansionist euphoria that attributes collective weal to the growth process itself, rather than relating it to the availability of resources on which growth can take place. The "expanding economy" idea has passed from the stage of useful realism to one of economic dogma.

Two of the "easy" approaches to success in business and industry have become routine. First, we have assumed the right to pollute air, water, and land or to mutilate the scenery as a valid part of the profit-taking process. Secondly, and because we have always had it this way, it is assumed that every enterprise has the "right" to expand through continuous increases in customers—which takes place through additions to the population. The view that this process should go on indefinitely and that it holds the key to the "American dream" is behind the huge promotion now under way to "attract new industry" and build population in practically every community that can support more people through private or public development.

We need to understand clearly that human numbers do not grow in thin air. Their increase is a response to the broadening of the resource base and the opening of vacant or sparsely occupied areas through developments that support new communities. This is one way in which population can be manipulated—by creating more centers of buildup or, in the other direction, by deliberately preserving our open spaces for less intensive uses. We have no legitimate incentive to increase population, yet our planning is consistently in this direction.

MANIA FOR DEVELOPMENT

One who reads the transactions of the Western Resources Conferences will learn that, as of 1960, there were \$22 billion worth of water development projects for 17 states in the files of the Bureau of Reclamation—plans that engineers considered "feasible." These projects are scheduled for construction by the year 2000. It is assumed that every river system must come under complete control, with the total water supply utilized to establish new agriculture, new industry, and more people in all of the "undeveloped" open space that can be found. There are many enthusiastic promoters of this program in Congress, and, needless to say, in the local electorates.

I do not imply that all such enterprises are against the public interest. But to make these far-reaching resource decisions, our representatives in Congress must have access to every kind of information. Today they draw much of their information from—and are frequently reminded that they represent—the construction beneficiaries who move the earth and pour the concrete. But our harried Congressmen also represent every taxpayer who supports the great works, with their wonderful and baffling cost-benefit ratios. They represent the millions of people at large who make use of the scenic and recreational features of this land—people who have little concept of what is happening to their environment. Most Americans know only that we are dedicated to "progress." Where that progress leads, or what kind of world it is contriving, they are never told. Has someone decided for them that we are to have no hinterland? Are there to be smokestacks in every wilderness, a smog over every countryside, the threat of extinction over every flowing stream?

There is another concept of resources management that sees our continent as a composite of environmental types, each with its own character and its particular contribution to the national scene. The latter view presupposes that there are many and diverse ways to achieve a pleasant life and that various regions have much to offer in their existing features and natural assets.

The wild creatures of this earth have survived because each performs a useful function in a reasonably stable ecosystem. Any living thing that is too successful destroys the sources of its livelihood and disappears with the community on which it depends. Man's vast power play in using, if not inhabiting, nearly every environment on this planet could be self-defeating if he does not have the insight to impose his own controls and work for that necessary stability in his ecosystem.

The 1968 report of Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, observed that "... the population explosion is fundamental to the requirement for environmental management. Population must come under control and be stabilized at some number which civilization can agree upon. Otherwise, the best use of natural resources will be inadequate and the apocalyptic forces of disease and famine will dominate the earth."

Stability and an "agreed-upon" population level are indeed worthy objectives in realistic planning for the future. For now, a curb on the birth rate by every acceptable means and a major reduction of the government-sponsored environmental onslaught are two requisites of the greatest urgency. It is heartening to see signs that these are getting attention in Congress.

DEMANDS OF CRISIS

We have come to a threshold in world and national affairs where there is immediate need to apply sophisticated, up-to-date thinking if we are to mitigate, rather than augment, the growing miseries of mankind. Around the earth, much that needs to be done is blocked by a mass of ignorance. However, it certainly is true that the wars of history have made greater personal demands on men of many countries than what must be asked of the world's people in the years ahead. The population issue does not brutalize the masses and inflict hardship on the innocent. It calls for an appeal to reason backed by all the skills social science can muster. In our own nation, public acceptance of new ideas is of such great urgency that every effort must be applied in bringing it about. Many of our old traditions, assumptions and slogans need a searching review with open-minded willingness to innovate.

Most of us are all too aware of the unrest of the new generation of our citizenry. I make no case for those who march and protest with no real effort at problem solving. But we probably can ascribe some of their social malaise to the frustrating complexity of the world in which they find themselves.

THE FAILURE OF EDUCATION

There is, to be sure, an "establishment" devoted to high-sounding maxims that are supposed to be worthy and venerable by definition, but which seem to confuse rather than simplify our problems. In the sum total of their ecological malpractice, the elders are heading humanity toward the damnation of the lemmings. If young people do not see this at once, there are good reasons; for no one has given them any rational concept of man's relationship to the earth or any basic ethos of human respectability. In our overgrown institutions of higher education, the husbandry of intellects is monitored by humanists who are not biologists and biologists who are not humanists. They learn marvelous techniques but are the why of nothing.

This is to identify one of our overshadowing difficulties. In this time of television, moon exploration, and the imminent availability of nearly unlimited sources of energy, it is obvious that accomplishments in engineering and its supporting sciences are awe-inspiring testimony to the human mind's capacity.

Attending all our technical triumphs, however, is a growing realization that we have a critical area of weakness. While we know how

to do fantastic things, we frequently do not know when and where—nor indeed why—to do them. The problem transfers itself from physical science in the development and use of hardware to another sphere in which we are less competent—that of the biology and ecology of man.

The nature and proportions of this problem actually bespeak the relative complexity of the systems of nature. Even though the physical characteristics of matter and energy are inconceivably involved, they are far less so than the limitless intricacies of the world of living things. Biological systems include all the variables of physical science plus the endless elaborations of more than two billion years of organic evolution. To the structure and physiology of the living organism are added the organization of ecosystems and the behavioral adaptations that are essential to survival.

In these dimensions were the origins of man, and now his culture has taken over to reorient his own speculation and vastly modify the habitat in which he developed. If, with the tools now at his disposal, he blunders unaware into the throes of overpopulation and environmental ruin, he could in a tick of the geological time clock be carried away to oblivion by the mechanical monster he has created.

Pessimism often has a hollow ring. But where so much is at stake there is more safety in planning to cope with the worst than in idly hoping for the best. The truth is that it is already too late to solve today's greatest problems. We have failed for lack of foresight. Only tomorrow's problems can be solved, and only if we of today agree to be responsible for tomorrow.

JACK LACOVEY WINS EMMY AWARD FOR "COURTS ON TRIAL"

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently the Washington Chapter of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences held its ninth annual awards ceremony during which "Emmy" awards were presented to a number of individuals and programs from the various stations for achievement in their field.

The only winner for WMAL-TV was writer-producer Jack LaCovey for his work on a program entitled "Courts on Trial." The program dealt with the inadequacies of the system of criminal justice in the District of Columbia court of general sessions and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. It described how the system works to the advantage of the criminal and the disadvantage of society.

Although several other awards were made to other deserving individuals and stations, I wanted to take this opportunity to bring special attention to Mr. LaCovey who has recently joined the staff of Administrator of General Services Robert L. Kunzig. The entire Nixon administration can be proud of the high-caliber individuals that Administrator Kunzig has on his staff.

Until early August, when Mr. LaCovey joined GSA, he had been associated with WMAL radio and television since 1961, when he entered the management train-

ing program there. Since then he has served in writing, editing, announcing, producing, and directing positions. He was graduated in 1961 with a bachelor of science degree in radio and television from Ithaca College, Ithaca, N.Y.

THE PILL TRADE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion lately about Federal efforts to impede the illicit traffic in drugs and narcotics.

Some of the most pertinent suggestions were made last week in an editorial by the Los Angeles Times, which believes that far more could be done to restrict shipments of so-called dangerous drugs—a growing menace in their own right to the youth of America.

Most of us are aware of "Operation Intercept" and related efforts to shut off the marijuana supply from Mexico. But dangerous drugs made in the United States present a different sort of challenge, for, as the Times states:

Mexico can hardly be blamed for failure to control the flow of illicit drugs manufactured here.

The editorial, published last Wednesday, October 29, follows:

THE BORDER TRAFFIC IN "PILLS"

ISSUE: Why blame Mexico for the traffic in illicit drugs that originates in the United States and thrives because of weak laws?

Mexican officials have made many Americans bridle with their accusations of hypocrisy in our massive crackdown on the border narcotics traffic.

The United States is actually at fault, goes the argument, for if there were no demand, there would be no smuggling.

But if the charge of hypocrisy is specious when applied to heroin and marijuana, it surely can be justified in the enormous traffic in "pills"—the illicit amphetamines, barbiturates and other drugs made by American firms that are sent to the border for transshipment throughout the country.

The congressional hearings that concluded Monday in San Francisco should leave no doubt as to the enormity of the problem or the incredibly lax federal regulations that have allowed it to grow.

Witness after witness told the House Select Committee on Crime of the ease with which dangerous drugs can be shipped to Tijuana and other Mexican border towns and then diverted for resale at great profit to American users. So minimal are the restrictions that some suppliers do not even bother to have the pills sent across the boundary.

Perhaps the most stunning example of the laxity of federal control was the mail-order purchase of 20,000 secobarbital sodium capsules by Los Angeles Police Department narcotics officers, who had the illicit drugs delivered to the Van Nuys police station—with no questions asked or any check made by the drug company as to the doctor whose name the officers used.

Worst of all, the firm broke no law in its indiscriminate supplying of the \$85 worth of capsules that would have brought \$5,000 on the street.

"It is entirely possible for anyone to make

the same kind of purchase," said Capt. Roger Guindon, commander of the LAPD Narcotics Division. "Eight billion units of dangerous drugs are manufactured in the United States each year by legitimate pharmaceutical firms," he said. "This is more than twice the annual needs of U.S. citizens through legitimate sources."

Last year alone a total of 17 million such illicit drugs were seized in California. And as the House committee hearings showed, major pharmaceutical firms are involved as well as smaller companies.

This wretched dealing in dangerous drugs, however, will surely continue and expand unless Congress and the White House take strong action to control it.

Capt. Guindon, California Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch and many other law enforcement officials repeatedly have urged far more effective licensing of drug manufacturers and restrictions upon their shipments. Bonding requirements should be imposed upon such shipments, which also should be placed under the Export Control Act.

Mexico can hardly be blamed for failure to control the flow of illicit drugs manufactured here. The fault—and responsibility for reform—is our own.

CLEVELAND OFFERS TYPICAL LETTER OF OUTRAGE ON PART OF ORDINARY CITIZEN

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Clarence Bent, D.V.M., wrote me a letter of outrage recently. I think Dr. Bent's letter is a good reflection of the frustrations which infest our country today. I offer it for the RECORD for its representative value:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1969.

DEAR JIM: Somehow I missed your questionnaire this year; so forgive me if I write a letter instead.

Now as an honest, hard-working, patriotic American, I'd like to point out a few grave errors in legislative and legal acts.

1. In Lowell, Massachusetts, are members of an infamous motorcycle group. They have been known to enter a restaurant, eat and leave without paying because owners fear retaliation. If I tried that, I'd be called upon by the police and the courts. Instead those fools in Hollywood make pictures with, and of, them. Who's protected?

2. The leader of this group has, I am told, moved into a \$40,000.00 house in Nashua. Drug sales paid for it. No one touches him. Once I missed, in the confusion of post-war re-establishing, paying \$1.00 for a narcotic stamp on time. I was fined \$10.00. Who's protected?

3. The Police in this city know the name and face of the pusher from Massachusetts selling most of the drugs in town. The kids and many parents know who he is. But the police are so hog-tied, they won't even act—till they have him 100% caught. And in the meantime, more and more kids get hooked. But if a party were held in my house and my house was raided and "grass" were found, even though I didn't know it, I'd be liable. Who's protected?

4. College students take over a building and with arms on at least one occasion (my alma mater). They do damage. The President resigns, the tax payers repair. If I speak too loudly in a Library, I may be asked to leave. Who's protected?

5. Soldiers publish underground newspa-

pers and stockade prisoners can hardly be kept in line by guards. Yet I, as a Lieutenant Colonel, would not dare raise a voice of protest against a cussed General. Who're you protecting?

6. A man broke furniture in a Plymouth, New Hampshire, restaurant and injured customers. The judge gave him a suspended sentence and told the restaurant owner—"After all we couldn't afford to board and room him in a New Hampshire prison." Who's right?

Three boys broke into camps in Campton, New Hampshire. They stole and destroyed property. They even used the center of a dining room table as a toilet. A suspended sentence by a judge because otherwise they'd be in jail with old time criminals. Who's right?

8. Federal Securities and Exchange Commission forces companies thinking of mergers to put all facts before the public to make it fair to all. Some poor little fellow buys and the merger fails to go thru. The little fellow who was to be protected, is severely hurt. Who's helped?

9. You have a law which makes it illegal to cross state lines to incite riots. SDS and other commies are actually photographed crossing lines just before a riot, at the riot, and I suppose even leaving. I have yet to see anyone convicted. Who are you protecting?

10. Liquor is involved in 60-80% of all fatal accidents. Because legislators, big businessmen (and professionals), police commissioners, state safety officers, college leaders, etc. ad infinitum, all love the poison, no one works too hard to save your children or mine from possible death or severe injury. Who's protected?

11. A man, alias Dr. Clive Jordan comes to New Hampshire, poses as a veterinarian, obtains a temporary license to practice. I hire him. The board of Veterinarian examiners and I unearth the fact that he is in fact a fraud against the state of New Hampshire and wanted in at least six other states. The Attorney General's office, the State Police, the city police are all informed. No one takes any action. The big fine of \$25.00 for such a fraud doesn't interest them enough. Canada jails him, England sentences him, Israel has him, Holland, and now he's back in the United States somewhere. Who's protected?

12. Welfare recipients in Massachusetts "know their rights" and demand special clothes for Easter for their children. A party with eight children has too good a welfare income to go to work.

I can't work at my profession after 62 and collect social security which I've paid in because I'll have guts enough to work on; and I'll also have planned for my own security anyway. I started as a farm boy with a mother who was forced to run a poultry farm after less than two years out of the city. Who get help—at whose expense?

13. You pass laws on unemployment, minimum wage, workman's compensation, and illegal withholding which strangle the small business to its death. If for no other reason than hiring of lawyers, accountants and bookkeepers to keep the records. Yet people in your class and mine complain of cost of veterinary services. Who are you protecting?

But you go on spending in Washington. Help South America, help Germany, help Spain, help, help, help. And above all help the criminal by disarming the honest homeowner, and help North Vietnam by doing business with the suppliers so they can help North Vietnam kill more of our boys.

Thanks for listening.

CLARENCE.

P.S.—Sorry, too much—In short: Do you ever consider the fellow at the bottom, the hard-working honest fellow trying? The guy who pays most of the bills?—C.F.B.

PESTICIDES ANYONE?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the November 1968 issue of *Field & Stream* carried an article on the misuse of pesticides by George Laycock entitled, "Pesticides Anyone?" This article was recently called to my attention by a constituent, and so that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

PESTICIDES ANYONE?

(By George Laycock)

The tiny body louse has a lot of things to his discredit but the most spectacular is the universal threat to man and beast posed by modern pesticides. For it was the louse that got the whole thing started. Back during World War II, Government officials became worried because GI's were going into louse-infested areas and would need protection against the little disease carriers. So laboratories were put to work to find a sure louse killer.

In Orlando, Florida, a large number of chemicals were tested in a laboratory of the Department of Agriculture. Eventually the testers got to a compound known as DDT, and they hailed it with delight. It was so effective over long periods that chemists and entomologists could hardly contain their enthusiasm. According to the laboratory director, E. F. Knipping, "DDT was many times more effective than the best of the other materials known at the time. One ounce of a powder containing 10 percent of DDT, dusted on the inside of underwear, killed all lice present . . . and any that hatched from eggs or crawled on the person as long as a month after treatment."

This, obviously, was bad news for lice. What people could not have known then was that is might be bad news for humans too. And DDT is only one of a class of chlorinated hydrocarbons developed by research. These "wonder chemicals" soon became popular weapons in man's age-old fight against pests.

But in time Americans became aware of the potential menace of these so-called hard pesticides. Commonly there are seven of them, sometimes referred to as "the dirty seven": DDT, dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, heptachlor, lindane, and chlordane. Now we know that the chlorinated hydrocarbons are dangerous because they are practically indestructible—time and the elements do not disintegrate them and render them neutral. They may persist in soil for fifteen or more years. And if, during those years, we add more and more of them to even one acre in twenty, we build them up closer to a level that would be lethal for all manner of creatures, including man.

We have been warned. In 1963, the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended that we eliminate the use of them entirely. This was no mild suggestion that we use such chemicals as DDT with care but that we cease their use completely.

The result? Five years later DDT compounds are still being spread freely by farmers. They are being used in aerosols in millions of households. In 1965 our production of DDT alone totaled 141,783,000 pounds. As late as last March, Congressional hearings on pesticides were not concerned with banning their use but whether manufacturers should be compelled to print warnings on their labels.

Dr. Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, testified that "About 130,000 metric tons of pesticides are

being applied on a world basis annually." Some scientists were then anticipating that this would increase to 700,000 metric tons within seventeen years, as part of the effort to double the world's food supply.

Pesticides respect no national boundaries. They can be carried by streams and rivers to the oceans. DDT has even been found in rain, and dust particles carry it through the air. Pesticides have been detected in the tissues of penguins and seals from the Antarctic and in ducks and their eggs from the Arctic. "No one can predict," Dr. Cain said, "whether man and other creatures can adapt biologically to the drastic and rapid changes now being wrought." Another witness told a Congressional hearing, "Someone might develop a wonderful pesticide which completely does the job—but might kill every animal coming into contact with it."

Is the menace universal? Practically all fish and game animals tested for pesticides in recent years carried residues of the poisons, regardless of the part of the world from which they came. The authority for that statement is Dr. E. H. Dustman, Director of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Yet some defenders of the pesticides continue to minimize their danger. At a House hearing, Representative Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi, said, "So far as the fish and wildlife record is concerned, this shows no injury except from improper use." Perhaps the following cases might indicate otherwise.

In New Brunswick, where the spruce budworm is a forest problem, an aerial application was made in 1954 of $\frac{1}{2}$ pound of DDT per acre. Practically the entire annual production of young salmon in the streams perished. Two years later the treatment was repeated, and again the young salmon were killed.

In British Columbia, forests in four watersheds were sprayed with 1 pound of DDT per acre to combat the blackheaded budworm. The pilots were extremely careful not to spray the streams, yet there was nearly a 100 percent kill of cohos.

In Michigan and Wisconsin, elm trees were sprayed with DDT to control the Dutch elm disease. The poisoned leaves fell to the ground and were devoured by earthworms. Earthworms are fairly resistant to DDT, so they built up sizable concentrations of the poison in their bodies. Robins fed on the worms. They were less resistant, and lawns were littered with dead robins.

Nor do pesticides have to kill directly to decimate an animal population. The President's Advisory Committee has reported that dieldrin "reduces the reproduction of captive quail by decreasing egg production, decreasing the percentage of eggs that hatch, and increasing the mortality of chicks."

By 1966 the U.S. Public Health Service was able to report that the average American had accumulated in his fatty tissue 12 parts per million of DDT. Infants fed with mother's milk now get it complete with DDT—.08 parts per million.

California's Clear Lake, plagued with nuisance midges, was treated with DDT in the ratio of 1 part per million parts of water. Over the months the pesticide concentrated in the tissues of plants and animals. Tests showed plankton carrying 10 ppm, plankton-eating fish with 903 ppm, and 2134 ppm in the tissues of birds that fed on the fish. Most such birds at the end of this food chain perished.

Do you hunt big game? Expect, in some sections of the U.S., to get pesticides in your elk or venison steaks. In South Dakota, tests showed that the dieldrin level in big-game animals exceeded the tolerance for meat animals established by the U.S. Government.

In Montana, forests were sprayed with $\frac{1}{2}$ pound per acre of DDT, and the chemical showed up in grouse two years later at levels in excess of tolerances set by the U.S. Food

and Drug Administration. Michigan's fish hatcheries, in a crash program of producing stocks of young cohos for the state's salmon program, ran into a shocking complication. Hundreds of thousands of fry began spinning crazily, then sinking to the bottom, dead. The fry had hatched from eggs stripped from Lake Michigan salmon, and tests showed lethal concentrations of DDT in them.

When a massive campaign was mounted against the fire ant in the South in 1958, wildlife specialists feared for the welfare of the grouse. In the Gulf states—wintering grounds for most of the country's woodcock population—27 million acres were scheduled to be showered with heptachlor or dieldrin, at the we-mean-business rate of 2 pounds to the acre. Heptachlor would remain effective for at least three years, and it has been known to last nine.

Patuxent Wildlife Research Center set up a test in Louisiana. Woodcock were fed earthworms containing various levels of the pesticides. Practically all the birds died that consumed worms with field-level concentrations. Fortunately, the fireant program was adjusted to smaller dosages and less potent chemicals.

In Georgia, a four-acre experimental plot was treated with 2 pounds per acre of heptachlor. Within forty-seven days, thirty-eight wild animals died, and no living animals were seen or heard on the plot. "That 2 pounds per acre knocks hell out of bobwhites," a biologist said, "and depresses the population for three years."

Scientists worry about the effects when an animal ingests more than one kind of chemical. Synergism may go to work here. Synergism means that two different agencies working together get an effect greater than the total of two independent efforts. In other words, one and one can equal three. When 8 ppm of one insecticide "cooperates" with, say 2 ppm of another, the effect on the animal may be equal to 30 or 40 ppm of either chemical used alone.

Federal researchers began in 1958 to examine the threat to wildlife posed by pesticides. In 1965 the Fish and Wildlife Service was authorized to conduct a study limited to three years. One may surmise that it was pressure groups more interested in agricultural chemicals than wildlife that contrived to force the Service to return to Congress in 1968, hat in hand, or abandon its research and dismiss 100 highly trained technicians.

As mentioned, the Service conducts research at the sprawling Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, among others. Research is also conducted at Denver, and there are pesticides monitoring stations widely scattered across the country. Mere opinion that chlorinated hydrocarbons are lethal does not satisfy the Fish and Wildlife Service. It wants facts—data carefully checked and scrutinized.

Over the years the Service established test populations of captive mallards, pheasants, and bobwhite quail. One of the most revealing programs has been the Patuxent experiment with sparrow hawks, the smallest American branch of the falcon family. Researchers wanted to establish scientifically whether the diminishing populations of duck hawks, eagles, ospreys, and other predatory birds high in nature's food chain were being killed off by pesticides. Or whether doses too small to be lethal were affecting their reproduction. Were pesticides at fault, for example, when the breeding colony of ospreys around Old Lyme, Connecticut, dropped from 100 nesting pairs to eight in the years following 1957?

The sparrow hawk, the choice for Patuxent research, was easily obtained, had been raised in captivity, and was widely distributed; thus the findings would have wide

application. The researchers soon obtained thirty-six pairs of sparrow hawks.

By the end of the 1967 nesting season data had begun to accumulate. The hawks had been paired and housed in flight cages measuring 50 feet long by 20 feet wide by 6 feet high. Each cage has a nest box and a food shelf. Here the captive birds carry on as they would in the wild.

With the hawks divided into three groups of twelve pairs, feeding tests began in March 1966. One group was given pesticides in its diet at the maximum field exposure but still at a level designed to keep the birds alive. A second group was given a lower dosage, approximating that commonly found in the outdoors. The third group, with an identical diet, was not given any of the dieldrin or DDT fed to the other groups.

The control group—the third group—hatched 84 percent of its eggs. The second, or low-dosage, group hatched 61.1 percent. The high-dosage group hatched 58.7 percent. The control group raised 3.7 birds per pair, the low-dosage group 2.7 birds, the high-dosage group 2.5. Another interesting fact developed. Nearly 11 percent of the eggs of the high-dosage birds disappeared before hatching, compared with 7.4 percent for the low-dosage birds, and none at all for the control group.

For many years there has been research to discover why hatching eggs are lost. A pioneer researcher is Scotland's D. A. Ratcliffe, who, by dint of much work, found a most enlightening clue. Delving into old records, Ratcliffe found that investigators between 1904 and 1950 had checked the success of 109 duck-hawk nests. Only three contained broken eggs. But of sixty-eight nests checked between 1960 and 1966, forty-seven contained broken eggs. At about the same time there was a big increase in egg breakage in the nests of golden eagles and sparrow hawks.

Convinced that the new weakness lay in the shells, Ratcliffe began measuring shell thickness of thousands of old eggs in museums, and weighing the empty shells. Up to the year 1946, weights and thicknesses were constant. But as Ratcliffe measured and weighed shells collected between 1946 and 1950, he found that the thickness had decreased sharply in the eggs of both duck hawk and sparrow hawk.

Other scientists soon joined the shell game. They found that what was true of the British Isles was also true over large portions of the world. The sudden decrease in shell thickness occurred about the time that DDT came into wide postwar use as an insecticide. Their conclusion: DDT somehow affects the bodily function that produces calcium.

Here then is a clue to the egg breakage at Patuxent. It is also a clue that probably encompasses a wide range of birds in trouble today. Thus the relatively small amount of money that financed Patuxent and other Fish and Wildlife research produces remarkable dividends.

Is there no alternative to the dirty seven? Of course there is. We already have less-destructive pesticides. One is malathion. Unlike DDT or dieldrin, it does its job, then breaks down rapidly. There is no buildup of poison in wildlife, and thus no threat to every creature in the food chain. But malathion is more costly than DDT, so we go on using DDT, saving pennies and expanding our wildlife.

We know the answer to the problem of the chlorinated hydrocarbons. We knew it back in 1963, when the President's Science Advisory Committee made its recommendations: stop their use. Time after time since then we have heard our leading scientists recommend that we stop polluting our environment with DDT, dieldrin, aldrin, endrin,

heptachlor, lindane, and chlordane. The individual states cannot be expected to put themselves at an economic disadvantage by banning their use. This calls for Federal legislation.

What are you going to do about it?

THE ORDEAL OF ANATOLY KUZNETSOV—CBS INTERVIEW

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, some of our citizens who live in a fantasy world have fallen easy victims to the Moscow party line that the Bolsheviks are mellowing and granting their enslaved peoples some of the basic human rights which they loudly propagandize for others.

At terrible risk and sacrifice, men and women continue to vote with their feet and leave the Communist world for freedom. One of the more recent escapees is the noted author Anatoly Kuznetsov, who escaped from his guard in England on July 30.

CBS News Correspondent Morley Safer performed a valuable public service when he interviewed Mr. Kuznetsov in London, and the 1-hour interview was broadcast for the enlightenment of anyone who might believe that Bolsheviks ever mellow. I insert the interview at this point in my remarks, for the benefit of Members who may not have had the opportunity to analyze this continuing tragedy and terror:

THE ORDEAL OF ANATOLY KUZNETSOV

(As broadcast over the CBS Television Network, Tuesday, Sept. 2, 1969, with CBS News Correspondent Morley Safer)

SAFER. This man's name is Anatoly Kuznetsov. He is forty years old, one of the Soviet Union's leading novelists. On July 30 of this year Anatoly Kuznetsov, on a trip to England, escaped from his Russian guard and defected. In the lining of his coat he had sewn this film, copies of the original manuscripts of his novels.

KUZNETSOV. That there is the whole of my life. These are my real books. Not the ones as they are known to the reader.

SAFER. This is the story of a man who got away. And there are men in this building who would like nothing better than to get their hands on him. This is the Soviet Embassy in London. But Anatoly Kuznetsov will have nothing to do with it.

Kuznetsov spent his adult life in that schizophrenic twilight zone, trying to be both an honest novelist and a Soviet citizen. His best known work in the West is the novel, "Babi Yar," an account of the Nazi massacres in the Ukraine in 1942.

Kuznetsov's story is made of the stuff of classic spy fiction, but it is brutally true. It involves the Soviet Secret Police, the KGB; a shabby hotel in the West End of London, the Apollo, a favorite place for the Soviet Embassy to put up visiting delegations. And sex too, among the seedy strip clubs of Soho. It is a story of escape and betrayal.

Like many good thrillers, a newspaperman is involved, the *London Daily Telegraph's* Soviet affairs editor, David Floyd, the man in the middle. Someone had given Kuznetsov Floyd's name.

Kuznetsov now lives in hiding. He prefers to be called by his first name—Anatoly. Kuznetsov, he says, was the man who wrote what he was told to write and he wants to forget him. But he emerged from hiding to tell his remarkable, sometimes sickening story of life in the Soviet Union. The interpreter is David Floyd, the man who took Kuznetsov in from the cold.

I know that the Soviet Embassy has been very anxious to talk with you and you've flatly refused to do so, even in the presence of British Foreign Office people.

KUZNETSOV. I am afraid of them. Even in the presence of British officials and even at a distance, I am afraid of them.

ANNOUNCER. This is a CBS News Special: "The Ordeal of Anatoly Kuznetsov," with CBS News Correspondent, Morley Safer. (Announcement.)

ANNOUNCER. Now "The Ordeal of Anatoly Kuznetsov," with CBS News Correspondent Morley Safer.

SAFER. Anatoly Kuznetsov, when did you decide to leave the Soviet Union?

KUZNETSOV. The decision to leave I took on the morning of the 21st of August last year.

SAFER. That was when Soviet troops went into Czechoslovakia?

KUZNETSOV. Yes.

SAFER. But there have been many things in the past twenty years or more equally horrible. What was so special about Czechoslovakia?

KUZNETSOV. Well, probably for me personally that was the last drop. After that I really didn't have any faith left, or any hope.

SAFER. All right, there you are a Soviet citizen who decides to leave Russia. What do you do?

KUZNETSOV. Of course, it is very difficult to leave the Soviet Union. Very few people get to travel outside the Soviet Union. First of all, if there is a dossier on you with the police, then you won't get out anyway. You've got to have a very good reputation at work; you've got to have made frequent statements about your political loyalty, your love for the party and the government. You must be psychologically and nervously in good form, fit. If you've consulted a doctor, and especially if you've consulted a psychiatrist, you would never be let out.

And then for five or six months you fill in a mass of different forms. You particularly have to put down what people near to you, close to you, you leave behind in Russia. A bachelor has very little hope of getting out. A man with a family has better chances; then he has children left behind and people related to him. Then you have to go through all sorts of conversations, interviews with people. Sometimes they will tell you to follow the activities of the people who go with you because they very seldom let you out alone. You have to go out in a group. In my case they attached a special personal agent to me.

I had no permission to leave. I once made a journey in 1961 to France and since then—for eight years—they wouldn't let me out. There were foreign publishing houses inviting me out. I was invited to Paris by a French publishing firm, at their expense, for their money. And it looked as though they were going to let me out. But then the Secret Police got in the way and I wasn't released. Then I was invited to New York by the Dial Press publishers. They wrote a long letter; they promised to put up five thousand dollars. Then once again, at the very last moment, they wouldn't let me out.

So then I decided to get out at any price. I got ready to try and swim out under water. Of course, it's very difficult. There's tremendous guard on the frontier everywhere. I took a lot of chances and I was very scared. I trained myself to do this. I trained myself to swim under water. I can now, for example,

swim for fifteen hours under water because what I had to do was swim under the water and do it in one night and only if it were bad weather. I just got a letter from another Russian who actually did manage to do it by swimming. He got out to Turkey in the end. There he met up with a Soviet frontier guard who had also got out to Turkey.

And the frontier guard explained to him it was only a miracle that he had got out at all. Lots of people try but they all get caught. The Russian authorities don't only have radar equipment on the surface which are good enough even to detect a child's ball floating on the surface, but they also have hydro-radar locators underneath the water. And they would have caught me. They would have detected me.

SAFER. So you decided against trying to swim out and you made one more attempt to come out legally.

KUZNETSOV. I made my last, my third effort to get out legally so that I would—I decided to try to fit in with what the Secret Police wanted. I knew that if they didn't let me out that time, then I knew I would never get out. Well, I succeeded, but at a very considerable price.

SAFER. What was that price?

KUZNETSOV. As I said, I had to demonstrate in some way my loyalty; not only my loyalty but my anxiety, my willingness to work with the Secret Police. They persecuted me for eight years. They demanded that I should inform upon my friends who were writers—Yevtushenko, Aksyonov, these are all my friends. I refused. So then they developed a great dossier on me. They got people to attach themselves to me, pretending to be friends. They got women to try to become my mistresses. A lot of these people told me what was happening and warned me about it. My telephone was bugged; my letters were opened. I think there were microphones in my room. They knew absolutely everything about me. I had two copies of the magazine *Amerika* and suddenly some completely unknown person rang me up and said, "Why on earth do you keep those foreign magazines in your home? It's already written down in your dossier."

So then in desperation I decided to show them that I had changed my ways, that I would improve, would behave differently. "What you have to do," I said to myself, "is to just pretend to yourself that this is the Gestapo. I must escape from the concentration camp. What do they want in order that they should believe me? That I should inform on my own friends. That will be fine. Let them have their informer."

I composed what was probably the most striking, the most—the finest piece of writing in my life. I said that these writers like Yevtushenko, Aksyonov and a group of others, right down to some actors in the comedy theater, were getting ready to produce and publish a frightful underground magazine. That they've got an underground print shop. That they're gathering manuscripts together and money for the job. Oh, how the Secret Police were pleased with this. It was a pure fiction. I even thought I might put in that they were actually planning to blow up the Kremlin, but then I thought that they'd see through that. But it didn't matter. They have no sense of humor. They took it all seriously.

SAFER. Then what did you do?

KUZNETSOV. I decided to write a really persuasive application. There's a terrific campaign there going on at the moment preparing for the hundredth anniversary of Lenin's birth. If you want to do something in this connection, then everything is possible. I said I wanted to write a novel about Lenin and how he created the Communist party in London and I would just have to go and visit all the places where he'd been in London.

SAFER. You created a kind of phony project in a way?

KUZNETSOV. Yes. And I made it a very detailed plan, too. So then they started to work with me and said that they'd let me go to England and that maybe they would give me some secret task to perform, secret mission. That just before I left from—left Russia I should telephone and I would probably get my secret instructions. You know, I took a chance and I didn't bother to ring up.

SAFER. Anatoly, do you feel any guilt about what you wrote and reported about Yevtushenko and the others?

KUZNETSOV. Of course, I do. It's by no means excluded that they may have had difficulties. I wrote about it immediately, as soon as I was here, in *The Daily Telegraph*, so that the KGB over there should know what I'd done.

SAFER. That it was a false project?

KUZNETSOV. Yes, of course. But it's such an ordinary everyday thing with them that this isn't going to surprise anybody.

SAFER. Yet you know that Yevtushenko was once greatly admired in the West, and many of his poems were against the Soviet system.

KUZNETSOV. Yes, of course.

SAFER. So, perhaps there were some grains of truth in what you reported to the KGB?

KUZNETSOV. No, of course not. He has no plans to start an underground print shop.

SAFER. So there you are, on a plane, with your shadow, and you arrive in London. Then what do you do?

KUZNETSOV. Well, we found a room in a hotel which was booked for us by the Soviet Embassy. All the people who are very close to the Embassy. I don't have the right to choose a hotel myself.

SAFER. Then you have a plan?

KUZNETSOV. We always, when we come on these trips, have several sheets of paper containing the program of what we are to do and a copy of this remains behind in Russia.

SAFER. What I meant was a plan to evade the authorities.

KUZNETSOV. Well, that's a different question, of course.

SAFER. Tell me about that.

KUZNETSOV. My first problem was to get a few hours of freedom when my agent, my watchdog, wasn't with me. I didn't manage to get that for four days. He never took his eyes off me.

SAFER. You must have been a desperate man.

KUZNETSOV. No, no, no. I studied him pretty carefully. I knew his weaknesses.

SAFER. What were they?

KUZNETSOV. We went walking around London and he, like any young man, he was simply amazed at the beautiful women, the pretty girls, the short skirts, the miniskirts. I noticed the effect this had on him and I worked on him with a view to suggest that he should visit the strip tease shows. You had to become a member and he wrote himself in as a Yugoslav citizen. In Russia we are strictly forbidden to visit anything like strip tease or get mixed up with women. We have to sign a paper saying that we shan't do this. And this way both of us, both I and my watchdog, became criminals. So this introduced a certain amount of confidence between the two of us. We agreed with each other not to tell on each other. And when he told me in the evening that he absolutely had to meet certain people, that I should have to sit in the hotel, then I said, "Much better if I were to go and have a look at another strip tease and if it looks all right then we can both go along there another time." He hesitated for a moment and then he agreed. And I said if I don't come back for rather a long time he shouldn't worry. And he went off while I went off to a tele-

phone kiosk, a telephone booth. I telephoned *The Daily Telegraph*. Tried to get in touch with David Floyd, who speaks Russian. I managed to get hold of him and we met.

SAFER. What did you say to him?

KUZNETSOV. I told him that I wanted to stay in London, asked him to help me because I didn't know English. That I wanted to hide away from my watchdog, my KGB man. This was a very dangerous step to take. They've got their agents all over the place, all over the world. They used to tell me with a smile that they had agents in all parts of the world, in the most incredible places. Places you just couldn't imagine. They suggested that I might perhaps go to a police chief and this police chief might in fact be a Soviet agent. This was just theoretically. So I looked for somebody in whom I could be—of whom I could be quite certain. He quickly understood what was the matter and he helped me and I shall be grateful to him for the rest of my life.

SAFER. You know that some Western writers, the American novelist William Styron, have described what you have done as despicable, both in informing and, in fact, in leaving the Soviet Union.

KUZNETSOV. If Mr. Styron thinks that way, well, I'm happy to offer him my flat in Tula. Let him go and try it. They still don't understand just what the Soviet Union is. If Thomas Mann, or Berthold Brecht had been faced with the dilemma of leaving Germany or living under Hitler what would they have said then? They left Germany, after all. If they had had to save themselves at any price to get away from the Gestapo . . . In any case, this is a question which I myself can't decide. I ask myself, after all, what would people say if they learned, say, that, well, Dostoevski, say, had written and informed, even falsely, but had informed on his friends. I don't know what to answer. I can only say that neither Dostoevski nor Tolstoy nor Turgenev, none of them lived in Soviet Russia.

SAFER. Yet Daniel, Sinyavski, Pasternak did live in the Soviet Union.

KUZNETSOV. So you would be advising a Russian writer simply because he's Russian to live in a concentration camp? I have a small hope that not living in a concentration camp I may be able to say more. I don't know.

SAFER. What were your feelings as a Soviet writer during the trials of Daniel and Sinyavsky?

KUZNETSOV. Horror.

SAFER. Did you want to speak out for them?

KUZNETSOV. I didn't have the courage to do that.

SAFER. And where would you be today if you had spoken out?

KUZNETSOV. If I'd done it really actively I should be alongside them now. Or they would certainly not have published me, or I shouldn't have been able to come out of the country.

SAFER. The Soviet authorities said you left for the most tawdry of reasons, that you left a mistress pregnant behind.

KUZNETSOV. Well, I learned about this from the Soviet press. I don't yet know what they're talking about. It was Boris Polevoi who wrote about this and apparently he knows more about this woman than I do.

SAFER. You know, Anatoly, human nature is a very funny thing. No one really likes a turncoat. How do you feel about that?

KUZNETSOV. So what do I have to do? Am I condemned to remain always a coward, a conformist? What can I do? I was born in Russia. I was born in Russia, I lived there forty years and I know no other life. The moment came when I could no longer live that way. What do you advise me to do? Commit suicide? I thought about that.

ANNOUNCER. "The Ordeal of Anatoly Kuznetsov" will continue in a moment.

(Announcement.)

ANNOUNCER. Here again is Anatoly Kuznetsov with CBS News Correspondent Morley Safer.

SAFER. You know, Anatoly, at the very beginning a great many people, people outside the Soviet Union, had great hopes for communism. What went wrong?

KUZNETSOV. Communist doctrine, Communist teaching is very attractive. And it grew out of good convictions and beliefs. But life, it appears, is a good deal more complex than it appeared to the founders of communism and we see ancient history being repeated again. The road to hell is paved with good intentions. Thanks to communism that road has become many miles longer. I only have to mention the name Stalin and you're bound to agree with me. If that's possible, if it's possible to have millions of victims completely senseless, that means that the idea itself is no good.

SAFER. But how is it that the Russian people, with their great sense of nationality, great sense of being Russian, how on earth were they so easily cowed?

KUZNETSOV. Oh, there is in Russia a long, long tradition of tyranny. You see, if you were born in a concentration camp, and your parents were born in a concentration camp, and your grandparents were born in a concentration camp, you see you no longer imagine any other life. First of all, the Czars oppressed Russia. Then came communism. There was that little short period, that intermission in 1917 between February and October that was so small that you can really write it off.

SAFER. There was another brief intermission, a tiny crack of light created by Khrushchev, a few years ago. What went wrong there?

KUZNETSOV. No, no. That was only just a nuance, just a shade. I personally didn't take that seriously. That was really just within that same concentration camp. You just make slightly more human conditions. You're banned from writing letters and receiving parcels, say. And then, for a time, you're allowed to write letters and allowed to receive parcels. You see, some people took it all seriously and thought very soon that the doors were really going to open. No, no, no, the Soviet regime cannot possibly open the doors properly.

It seems to me at the moment when I think about it it's like some nightmare, some frightful dream. It's like—life is like some constant unbroken theatrical production. You never say out loud what you really think, but what you ought to say. There are, of course, some people who do say what they think. But these are just people, not very bright people, who are just using set phrases of official propaganda. But a thinking man finds it very hard there. And it's a terrible system of universal informing, universal following. You cannot trust a single person there. It's quite possible for a son to inform on his father, or a wife on her husband. Not to mention what friends can do to friends.

SAFER. What gave you the idea or the sense that it might be any different in the West?

KUZNETSOV. They isolate us all from foreigners, but we read books. And, sometimes, we're able to travel abroad. In order to know a little bit more about the world I especially learned Polish. You can buy Polish newspapers in Moscow and they tell you more about the world than Russian newspapers do. Then, after all, once I was actually in Paris—nine years ago. But then I also became a criminal. I got away from my group once in Montmartre and got to know an artist who was painting modern pictures. I asked him whether he was allowed to paint pictures like that. He just laughed. I went home with him. He showed me his pictures, said he'd won some prizes for them. I said, "This is just fantastic, this is tremendous happiness." He took me to the window. He lived up in an attic right at the top. He said, "Look, it's all right here. Why the hell do you want to go

back to Russia? Why don't you stay here with me? I'll paint what I like and you can write what you like. And a glass of milk—we'll have enough for a glass of milk."

SAFER. Why didn't you do it then?

KUZNETSOV. It's very frightful for a person who's born in a concentration camp. It's too sudden. I'd left my wife, whom I loved, in Russia and my son, a son who was only just born then. I listened to it as if it were like a fairy tale, something fantastic. You see?

SAFER. Did you brood on that when you got back to Russia?

KUZNETSOV. All thinking people in Russia think about this and brood on it. You see, it's very difficult. We Russians are very fond of our country. Every single emigrant is really suffering from a sort of nostalgia. Then, of course, it's especially frightful for a writer to cut himself off from his people.

SAFER. Yet as a writer in the Soviet Union, you were a member of a very select group of people. What I'm really trying to get at is when you were sitting around in Russia with other writers, thinking men, intellectual people, what on earth did you talk about?

KUZNETSOV. Mostly we complain. It's just one long complaint. One of them says he's written a novel, and so they won't publish it. Or else they publish it in such a frightful form that he's simply desperate.

SAFER. Isn't that dangerous though?

KUZNETSOV. Yes, that's dangerous.

SAFER. Well, just where do you draw the line in these conversations? Can you really ever trust each other?

KUZNETSOV. A hundred percent you can't trust anybody. You have to carry on your conversation like this: you say, this is very bad and this is bad and this is bad, but these are all mistakes. But altogether we are Communists. We just think that there are little small mistakes committed in Russia.

SAFER. Anatoly, I've read everything you've written and one word keeps coming up in almost every article, the word "cynicism." Could you expand on that?

KUZNETSOV. I am at this moment a very fortunate person. I am for the first time in my life saying what I really think. Many, many people in Russia think exactly the same as I do. I'm responsible for my words. I know what I'm saying. Insofar as we have to live in that theatre, every single person has a sort of collection of phrases which he speaks and says officially, publicly. And a corresponding collection of actions. For a normal human being it is extremely difficult to lead such a double life.

SAFER. What are the rewards for that cynicism?

KUZNETSOV. Well, of course, he gets the possibility of living more richly than others, of being better off than others. He can buy commodities in special shops. He will be allowed to travel and travel abroad. He may receive decorations, official state medals, state prizes.

SAFER. Do you or your colleagues place any real value on these awards?

KUZNETSOV. No. On the whole we're pretty cool towards the sort of rewards you get. My novel, "Babi Yar," was put forward for a state prize. Used to be called Stalin Prizes. But when this was reported in the newspapers a lot of very decent people began to change their attitude towards me for the worse. Fortunately for me, I didn't get the prize.

SAFER. The Soviet authorities were very unhappy with your novel, "Babi Yar." Now I know that book and it's a simple account of how the Nazis slaughtered hundreds of thousands of Jews and Ukrainians in the Ukraine. What on earth did they object to in that?

KUZNETSOV. There were three main objections to the book. In the first place, there is a great deal of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and "Babi Yar" is primarily concerned

with the murder of Jews. The Soviet officials prefer not to talk about this.

Then, my novel went rather further than this. It begins with talking about the beginning of the war and inquiring why there was such a terrible defeat at that time. You see, the truth of the matter is that a great many Soviet citizens, and especially Ukrainians, waited for Hitler as a liberator. Then it turned out that the Germans were offering them the same kind of terrorist regime as Stalin. So the people found themselves between two fires, between the hammer and the anvil. The ordinary citizen preferred his own Russian form of terror.

And the third objection on the part of the censor was purely literary quality. My literary methods. They considered that they knew better than I how I should write. Consequently, they did such an enormous number of cuts and changes that the novel in fact was turned upside down. And all my novels have been treated in the same way. So I'm always faced with a dilemma of printing at least something or publishing nothing at all. But in the end, it became so objectionable to me, what they're going to print, that I simply reject the whole of it.

SAFER. In coming out you didn't really come out alone. You came out with everything you'd ever written out. How did you achieve this?

KUZNETSOV. I'm a bit of an amateur photographer and I took pictures. All my manuscripts, I took—put them onto film. I'll show you some of them. I've got them here. That's roughly—that's the sort of thing, just ordinary film. I managed to get six sheets, typing sheets, onto each exposure. If you brought it all out as actual manuscript, well, it would make something like five or six cases. I squeezed it, wound it up really tight and it didn't take up much more room than that cigarette pack. I hid it inside my jacket. That really was the whole of my possessions, the whole of my property with which I came out of Russia. That there is the whole of my life. These are my real books. Not the ones as they're known to the reader.

SAFER. You've left your homeland. As restricted as it was, it was your home. Do you think you'll be able to find the things you are searching for in the West or will you always be known as Kuznetsov, the man who left?

KUZNETSOV. Of course, I'm making an absolutely desperate effort to turn myself into another person. I don't like it when people call me Kuznetsov. This is a compromised name. Only the future will show whether I can be a real artist and writer and a person.

SAFER. We in the West have all sorts of problems—Vietnam and other things that are tearing our society apart. Have you ever thought about any of these things?

KUZNETSOV. Yes, of course. I consider that the war continues in Vietnam only because of the Soviet Union. As for America, there are a lot of thinking people in Russia who think the same as I do, but rather less as far as Vietnam is concerned.

SAFER. As a thinking man in the Soviet Union, did you regard the United States as a threat to peace, as a threat to yourself?

KUZNETSOV. I've been living too short a time in the West and have too little information. I have no knowledge at all of America.

I very much want to go there. But now and for a long time my personal opinion is that the real aggressor in the modern world is the Soviet Union. They don't conceal their aims. They say that communism's spread over the whole world. But the—after all, the Western world, including America, defends itself.

SAFER. You know, even here in the West one of the great conflicts at the moment for writers is a writer's commitment, a writer's involvement in politics. Do you feel that even here you must engage yourself?

KUZNETSOV. Oh, God! How I am tired of all that! I don't want to have anything to do with politics. You put to me political questions, but my answers are the answers of a dilettante. I really like writing. Writing literature. There I got to the point where I felt I couldn't live there any more. I couldn't do it there. So I'm going to try to do it here. That's all I'm hoping for.

SAFER. You called Russia a concentration camp, yet you've left your own family back in that concentration camp. Do you fear for them?

KUZNETSOV. Very much indeed.

SAFER. And do you think the Soviet authorities will make them pay for your crime?

KUZNETSOV. I have no doubt about that.

SAFER. And so you feel some guilt over that too?

KUZNETSOV. Yes, yes.

SAFER. Even here in the West you're living under strain, under great tension.

KUZNETSOV. Yes.

SAFER. How long can a man go on living like that?

KUZNETSOV. I don't know.

DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE— 1929-69

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 the Daughters of Penelope will celebrate the 40th anniversary of their founding in the city of San Francisco in 1929.

The Daughters of Penelope have, over the years, served humanitarian ideals, preserved their rich heritage of Hellas and enriched our society by their presence and their efforts.

I became aware of this most worthwhile organization through a charming lady, Mrs. Alexandra Apostolides Sonenfeld, who, with the help of the late Dr. Emanuel Apostolides, founded the Daughters of Penelope. This first chapter is now one of over 300 worldwide and bears the designation of "Mother Chapter."

Mrs. Sonenfeld was kind enough to send me the remarks which she, as first grand president, has prepared to note this anniversary. After reading them, I wanted to share the eloquent and thoughtful statement of this fine lady with you.

I am sure my colleagues join with me in extending to the Daughters of Penelope our most heartfelt congratulations on this their 40th anniversary and to wish them ever continued success.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD at this time the text of Mrs. Sonenfeld's remarks:

TO COMMEMORATE THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE: 1929-69

You may be humbly proud of your accomplishments of the past 40 years, because, from a single chapter in San Francisco, California, where the Daughters of Penelope was founded in 1929, you have, at this time, more than 300 chapters, not only in the United States, but also in many parts of the world; and, what is most gratifying a chapter in Athens, Greece.

Your many humanitarian projects have always been for the betterment of others, especially in the fields of scholarships for young people and for young girls to attend the institutions of higher learning. You have given inestimable help, also, to the Greek churches and schools, wherever such are established for the furtherance of the Hellenic ideals (which underly the very basis of American ideals). Your principal aim has always been for the purpose of keeping in mind the greatness of the American educational system which afford the highest standards in the world. Accompanying your specific programs of this nature, you are also co-operating in every way possible in civic, state, and national projects of cultural benefit to all.

For all these things of human endeavor on your part, you have the respect and admiration of all, especially mine.

In previous anniversaries it has been customary to dedicate the occasion to some aspect of American or Hellenic culture; but today, November 16, 1969, it may not be unfitting to dedicate our 40th anniversary of the Daughters of Penelope wholly to America: the America of immigrants, and especially of those like myself, who have been here for 50 years or more, and who have been privileged to avail themselves of the many gifts of America—gifts of a better life, not only for ourselves, but also for our children who have been so fortunate to be born in such a humanitarian country as America.

What have the immigrants observed in the past half century? First of all, we have been awed by this country's bounty and welcome. With time, we came to know its unsung but real worth, and to realize that it has been a very unique nation, for the following reasons:

(1) It is the first nation in recorded history to struggle to liberate freedom from its many forms of past oppression: freedom from ignorance, from hunger, from disease, and from tyranny.

(2) It is the first nation in the world that has contributed (and is still contributing) more to needy peoples in every way humanly possible, to rehabilitate themselves economically and spiritually. It has contributed to their efforts to assert themselves as dignified human beings who are entitled to the basic human rights, but who are in great need of help to become strong enough to attain those rights.

Nothing brings this more clearly to our minds than a communication we received from the Honorable Phillip Burton, Member of the House of Representatives (5th District of California), who was kind enough to solicit information from the State Department for us pertaining to the number of countries to which the United States offers material aid. The following notation shows that in the past 20 years, from April 3, 1948, through June 30, 1968, the United States has given "economic assistance" to 87 countries, and other forms of aid in loans and scientific assistance to more than 107 nations of the world. (For such information, the Daughters of Penelope remain ineffably grateful).

The immigrants have observed that the United States has become the beacon-light to all needing help in the world, giving of its resources to revitalize many parts of this troubled earth that incessant wars throughout history have almost destroyed beyond human recognition, as far as human dignity is concerned.

We have witnessed this because America looks upon human beings as worthy of her care, and not as slaves of a deplorable environment which has been brought about by those who have never cared enough.

It is the first time in history, too, that an entire nation has shown such deep concern for human welfare, enough to try to do something to benefit it as a whole. It is the first time in history that a nation is applying

the philosophy of Socrates—the profound assertion that "an unexamined life is not worth living". America is examining the lives, not only of its own people, but also the peoples of the whole world, to help them in the honest examination of their lives and to make them better. The lives of those who seek refuge from cruelty, inequity, and injustice are of special concern.

But what we have observed, most of all, in America, is that this country has been the greatest exponent and exemplar of the greatest contribution of ancient Greece to civilization: namely, the "assertion of the individual's life and place in society . . . its awakening with human reason by the eternal questioning of the great verities of life and the world," and the fact that "true freedom lies in the application of reason to human affairs." Freedom does not mean licence. Freedom must be earned. It is "recognition and acceptance of life's responsibilities." Freedom means a "free form of government, popular assembly, a common council held for the common good" and not for the specific benefit of any particular group.

It was for the sake of maintaining these human rights and freedom "to think things through with the full freedom of an unbiased mind" that Socrates died.

It for the purpose of maintaining and insisting upon this sort of freedom that America lives, to carry on the contributions to civilization of the ancient Greek mind.

We have observed that America is bringing about this humanitarian state of affairs by a very simple method: by examining the mistakes of the past—including her own short historic past—and determining not to repeat those mistakes that debase human dignity. By being the greatest contributor to the United Nations Organization in its efforts to wipe out the disasters of fumbling, groping peoples of the past, their wars, and discrimination against people because of race, color, or creed. By "putting aside all the evils of the past" and exhorting the nations of the world who seek freedom from oppression to join America in mutual efforts of benevolence and humanity, leading to a future non-violent world, when the rights of all are duly respected.

Finally, we immigrants have observed that America is trying to prove that peoples of the world need never again be slaves of bad governments, but willing builders of good governments, for the benefit of all humanity.

We may well ask ourselves, in considering all that this fantastic America is doing for the sake of the life of true freedom, What are we contributing? How can we further such a magnanimous and unselfish program for a better way of life for all?

Maybe the best thing for us—any of us, all of us—is to remind ourselves often of the ideals of Greece—especially, that part which states, "with wisdom and knowledge, people can govern themselves." By doing work such as you, Daughters of Penelope, are doing, totally unselfish and altruistic. By reminding ourselves often of the ceaseless vigilance of America, so aptly and so wisely expressed by Daniel Webster, at the laying of the corner-stone of the Bunker Hill Monument, in Charlestown, Mass., on June 17, 1825. Those words are inscribed on a marble plaque, on the wall in the House of Representatives, United States Congress, above and just back to the Speaker's chair.

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we, also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered".

Cannot we, too, in our own small but grateful manner, remember these things that two such noble and great peoples have given to the world, as a token or our debt to them?

Can we do less?

THE AGE OF AQUARIUS?
NOT ENTIRELY

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the "under 30" generation, however well motivated, does not hold a monopoly on compassion and concern for the future of our Nation. The hard-hitting new editor of the Evansville Press, Mike Grehl, reminds us that the "over 40's" have some understanding of "what's happening," too. Tempered by the trials of a depression and two other wars, the "now" generation's elders just may have their own contribution to make.

Mr. Grehl's fine editorial follows:

THE AGE OF AQUARIUS? NOT ENTIRELY

(By Michael Grehl)

The Take Charge Generation is not in its teens but in its 40s. That's a fact, not an argument. Debate over the generation gap has obscured it.

The present generation of men and women in their 40s is looking to the future, and is not about to surrender that future to anybody else however loud the demands may be. Tempered and schooled by the past, it is moving faster than many think or admit to take over the board rooms, the city halls and the union halls.

Members of the generation don't like being lumped in with everyone over 30 any more than the teenagers do. They think they still deserve a chance to make a better world as they see it. They are convinced they have some answers and the right to offer them. And the power.

People now in their 40s didn't sell apples or get pink slips in their final paychecks. But they do remember that allowances were mighty thin and irregular and they remember whispered conversations between their parents when they thought no one was around. They remember long periods when the man of the house was around the house all day and not because he wanted to be. They remember asking for a job before asking what it paid and how generous is your pension.

All this was a normal part of growing up. They are not asking favors because of it and they don't want to inflict anything similar on their kids.

They learned some things in those years and the experiences are part of their thinking now. They're not hitched to the past; in fact they want an entirely different future.

They don't like the war in Vietnam any better than anybody else, but they remember a war for survival that they fought. No amount of debate can convince them that one was unjust or imperialistic. Coming from World War II through Korea to Vietnam—and all the self-examination that implies—they have probably done more questioning and changing than any other age group.

They went to college if they could because that was a way to make a better life not only for themselves but for the kids they expected to provide for. Along the way they encountered a lot of the same issues today's students think they invented. They debated them and worried about them, too. Now they are doing something about them and have been for years.

At a time when they were pretty far down on the economic ladder they moved for change knowing they would have to pay the bills. At the same time they see nothing

immoral about a buck in the bank and something put aside for a color TV.

Right or wrong, they decided to change the system from inside, after they mastered it. They are convinced hard work and learning can pay off. They want to use the system, not destroy it; they want to see the plans before they turn loose the bulldozer.

To them there is nothing wrong with gadgets or devices to make work easier or life better. They don't see anything sinister in all-electric kitchens. They were not born with automatic transmissions, frozen orange juice or civil rights laws so achieving them represents a step forward. So does producing them.

Now they can afford mortgages they can't afford and stereo and time for protesting their taxes and they regard these as justification for the system, not indictments.

They are foremen, department heads, assistants, vice-presidents on the way up and are glad of it. And looking at improvement, not retirement. They are convinced they have more expertise, enterprise and drive than those ahead of them and more experience, maturity and tolerance than those behind them. The status quo upsets them too. In fact, they may be more impatient for change than anybody around. Also better equipped to get the job done.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS COLLEGE
OF PHARMACY LEADS THE NATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, with what I hope you will pardon as justifiable pride, I would direct my colleague's attention to the latest record setting accomplishment by the University of Texas; namely, the college of pharmacy was the leader among colleges of pharmacy in the number of bachelor of science degrees granted during the year ending June 30, 1969. I know from talking with graduates and with the staff that this is not merely a record in numbers—it is a record in quality as well.

In a report published by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, UT Austin's 141 bachelor's degrees topped those granted by the other 78 colleges and universities which are members of the association.

The University of Wisconsin and the University of Georgia colleges of pharmacy share the No. 2 spot with 128 bachelor's degrees granted during the specified time.

With an additional 24 master's and 17 doctoral degrees, Wisconsin had the greatest total number of degrees granted—169.

UT Austin, in addition to its 141 bachelor's degrees, conferred seven master's and three doctorates for a total of 151 degrees in pharmacy. Thus Texas was second to Wisconsin in the total number of degrees granted in pharmacy.

Wisconsin and UT Austin were followed by the University of Georgia in the total number of pharmacy degrees conferred with seven master's and one doctorate, for a total of 136 degrees including bachelor's.

Dr. Joseph B. Sprowls, dean of the UT Austin College of Pharmacy said:

Even though we do have the largest number of graduates in the U.S. we do not feel we are fulfilling the demand for more pharmacists.

Dr. Sprowls said the college is at its peak enrollment—623—now and will not be able to increase enrollment until its facilities have been expanded.

IN FREEDOM'S NAME

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following item by Wallace R. Wirths of Sussex, N.J., which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of October 22, should interest all who are concerned about the abuse of certain fundamental freedom. I am offering this editorial for the RECORD:

It's an unfortunate fact of life that while we have little difficulty interpreting history we often fail utterly to comprehend the significance of current events. I believe this is particularly true of the rapid transition in this country from acceptance of rule by elected representatives to rule by the mob.

Almost daily we see new evidence of assorted groups attempting to gain their objectives or thwart the desire of the majority by taking to the streets. These mobs are invading every facet of our daily lives except our homes (thus far). They are seizing schools and universities, churches, government agencies, Selective Service offices, businesses, courts and state legislatures. They are burning, bombing, looting and shooting. They are armed with helmets, gas masks, gasoline bombs, guns, clubs, chains and rocks. They are injuring, maiming and killing our law enforcement officers. In short, they are substituting anarchy, violence and disorder for order and constitutional government. And they are doing this in most instances with impunity.

There is nothing new or unusual in this pattern. History books are filled with examples of where the very same symptoms preceded the fall of constitutional governments during the centuries. What makes this particular situation so ironic is that we are permitting the destruction of our democratic institutions with the excuse that it would be undemocratic to do anything to stop it.

In the name of "freedom of speech" we permit our officials to be slandered, vilified and cursed; we permit depravity and filth to be printed, acted and broadcast. In the name of "freedom of the press" we permit the dissemination of material aimed at the overthrow of our Government. In the name of "freedom of assembly" we permit gangs of degenerates to roam the streets cursing, burning, beating and destroying. In the name of "academic freedom" we permit individuals who are dedicated to the overthrow of our nation to teach our children.

All this we have done in the name of freedom and in so doing we have all but destroyed the freedom of the majority. We have taken away the freedom of our people to walk the streets unharmed, to pray in their churches unmolested, to attend school or college without interruption, to enjoy entertainment without being offended, to conduct their courts, their legislatures and their official business without obstruction—all this we have done in the name of democracy.

And when the final vestiges of our democracy have vanished, will we look back and exclaim, "It was all worthwhile, we lost our freedom in support of a worthy principle"?

REV. H. W. LINN, S.J., A DEVOTED
PRIEST AND EDUCATOR

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend H. W. Linn, S.J., president of Creighton University, died early Saturday in Omaha.

Father Linn's passing is not only a great personal loss, but takes from Omaha and Creighton the man who has often been described as the savior of the university.

It was through Father Linn's efforts over a 31-year period that Creighton—one of 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States—achieved its greatest heights in the field of education. It is widely known through its distinguished alumni in the fields of medicine, dentistry, the law, and education.

When he became president of Creighton in 1962, he had already logged more than 800,000 miles visiting its graduates and seeking donations.

Mr. Speaker, Father Linn overcame many obstacles to serve his Maker and his university—Creighton. Hardships were common to him as outlined in the following article from the Omaha World-Herald. May he rest in peace:

HARDSHIPS COMMON TO LINN

The Rev. H. W. Linn, S.J., a man whose personal accomplishments as a youth compared favorably with the achievements he would record as a college president, nearly died in a 1952 auto accident near Kilgore, Neb., while on a fund-raising trip.

He suffered 27 rib fractures, although the body has only 24 ribs. A vertebra was fractured and his life hung in the balance for part of the month he was hospitalized.

Associates believed that he was in constant pain since that time. Father Linn rarely discussed his condition except in facetious remarks about his rib cage.

But his friends and associates at Creighton University were aware of Father Linn's frequent hospital stays. Sudden respiratory ailments caused some of them.

THIRD-DEGREE BURNS

A second severe accident hit Father Linn during a 1967 train ride from Chicago to Omaha, when he received third-degree burns on his left arm. He was ready to go to bed in a roomette when somehow he was thrown against steam pipes and pinned there for 2½ hours. The compartment door was locked and he was unable to attract rescuers.

Father Linn died Saturday at the age of 65.

Christened Henry, he preferred to be called Harry by close friends. After his promotion to president, the university usually referred to him as "H.W." in official statements.

"We were very, very poor," Father Linn said about his childhood in a German-American family in St. Louis, Mo.

His father was a low-income bookbinder who became a tubercular invalid and died when the future priest was 19.

Henry started working in the sixth grade and dropped out of school after one month as

a high school sophomore. He arose at 3 a.m. to sort vegetables, had jobs later as a delivery boy for a drugstore and a hat cleaning establishment.

FACTORY WORKER

When a brother and sister also were involved with rheumatic fever, Henry Linn quit school to become a printer, then worked three years in a factory making tires and inner tubes.

This involved so much pulling work that his right shoulder muscles became much stronger than the muscles on his left side.

Henry Linn, who never obtained a high school diploma, took four years of tutoring in Latin and Greek while working to support his family. He also helped a sister buy a house for the family.

Because of his excellence in Latin and Greek, he was admitted to the Florissant, Mo., Jesuit Seminary, on a scholarship despite having only a ninth grade formal education.

The seminary course was 13 years and he was ordained at age 32. Except for two years of teaching classical languages at a Milford, Ohio, seminary, Father Linn's entire professional career was spent at Creighton.

Father Linn was rector, or director of spiritual activities, for the Jesuit community until last January. As rector he was addressed as "the very reverend." Succeeding him as rector was the Very Rev. Robert J. Shanahan, S.J.

WEAK HEART

"He had a bad heart and he knew it," Dr. Ross Horning, associate professor of history and former chairman of the University Faculty Committee and former member of the executive committee, said Saturday.

"But he never let up on himself, realizing that being a university president is an arduous task. He was deeply conscious of human relations, of the problem of bringing faculty and students into good communication."

"He was sensitive and always receptive to the legitimate aspirations of faculty and students," Dr. Horning continued. "He wanted to preserve the best of the past in American education for the future. He was never rigid in his views."

Any student or faculty member could walk into Father Linn's office at almost any time, it was said. He read mystery stories for relaxation, smoked six or seven Italian cigars a day, and took almost no time off from his job.

Father Shanahan, Father Linn's spiritual superior, said: "He was quite sensitive, a good listener, alert educationally."

"I don't doubt that his poverty-stricken youth and his many jobs gave him great empathy with the poor and the struggling."

C.U. "HIS LIFE"

Creighton University "was Father Linn's whole life in his more than 30 years here," said the Rev. Carl M. Reinert, S.J., Father Linn's predecessor as president.

The school's Greater Creighton Development Program, started in 1956, has resulted in 11 new buildings at a cost of \$45 million.

Father Linn played a major role from the start, working as a team with Father Reinert. Since Father Linn's elevation to the presidency, the school has added six buildings and made a total expenditure of \$26.6 million.

This includes \$5 million for research. The faculty was increased from 528 to 667 with a \$2 million increase in salaries. The student body has increased 11 per cent to 4,180. The school has added courses leading to 12 more degrees.

Creighton became a lay-controlled Catholic university in October 1968, after 89 years under the sole control of the Jesuits.

The 21-member board of directors has eight Jesuits. Only three of the 13 laymen are Catholics.

"The university has grown so much in re-

cent years that we need the expertise of outside help," Father Linn said at the time of the change.

Creighton was the second of the nation's 28 Jesuit universities to shift control to a lay-dominated group. The new board has total control of operations and decides all major financial questions and policy matters.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development has made substantial progress in its study of a technology assessment capability for the Congress. By this we mean improved information and analytical inputs to the legislative process so that our management decisions can insure the realization of full benefits from our knowledge and minimize the unwanted, unintended, and unanticipated consequences of applied science.

Since 1966, we have originated staff studies, held hearings, participated in formal and informal professional society meetings, and consulted with our research management advisory panel. Special studies were commissioned from the Legislative Reference Service and the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering; these have now been completed.

The time has come to establish an operating assessment organization for the Congress. There is ample discussion and justification for such action in the records of our subcommittee. But even more important are the many instances in other legislative activities which show concern for the optimum management of the forces and resources at our disposal. In both the House and the Senate, the need for independent objective evaluation of the impacts—both positive and negative—of technology on the natural and social environments is demonstrated daily. Whether our terminology; that is, "technology assessment," is used or some similar phrase, the theme is clear—new and better services are required.

The Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which I chair, will hold hearings to develop organizational specifics beginning November 18. It is expected that some form of institutionalization of technology assessment will evolve from such open discussions. In addition, we expect to receive testimony on suggestions already made to us through the special reports mentioned, on legal problems involved in the technology assessment process, and on some of the areas in immediate need of technology assessment. We have now identified an assessment procedure which has these elements:

First. Setting of priorities among the many current problems of technology, society, environment to take full advantage of existing technology.

Second. Continual alert for early signs of unforeseen consequences or opportunities.

Third. Selection of specific assessments to be made.

Fourth. Contracting with appropriate groups for performance of assessments.

Fifth. Coordination with executive branch assessment efforts.

Sixth. Public—joint congressional—hearings to receive the results of assessments and to provide a forum for commentary by witnesses.

Seventh. Staff analysis of assessment results and public hearings.

Eighth. Further study and hearings to resolve controversies.

Ninth. Referral of findings to the appropriate standing committees of the Congress for action.

Hopefully, the hearings will produce a recommendation for legislative action to establish a congressional format and staff service to carry out these steps—as well as possible corresponding mechanisms for the executive branch.

OTTAWA WILL REDUCE USE OF DDT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn today that Canada has joined a growing list of nations, individual States in our country, and Provinces in her own, which have recognized the hazards of DDT and acted to curb the abuse to our environment and human life brought about by its use.

According to reports in this morning's New York Times, Canada is significantly reducing the number of plants on which DDT can be used, and in addition, is reducing the tolerance levels in various foods.

Mr. Speaker, as a number of Members of the House wrote to the President yesterday, the potential dangers from the continued use of DDT to both man and animal are clearly menacing. This Nation ought to follow the fine lead of our northern neighbor regarding DDT.

Instead of using DDT until we prove that it is dangerous, we ought to institute a moratorium on its use until it is proven safe.

The New York Times article follows:

OTTAWA WILL REDUCE USE OF DDT BY 90 PERCENT NEXT YEAR

OTTAWA, November 3.—Canada announced measures today to reduce the use of the pesticide DDT by 90 percent next year.

The number of cultivated food plants on which it may be used will be reduced from 62 to 12 beginning Jan. 1. Also, the tolerance levels in various foodstuffs are to be substantially reduced.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, making the announcement in the House of Commons, said the Government was acting on the basis of studies showing effects of DDT on birds and fish. Long-term effects of the pesticide on human life are still unknown, he said. He emphasized that the Government had no evidence of injury to human beings.

The Prime Minister noted that the Canadian diet contained on the average only one-fifth of the maximum daily intake of

DDT (0.7 milligrams) accepted as safe by the World Health Organization.

In recent months several Canadian provinces have curbed the use of the pesticide, whose effects have been found harmful in a number of studies in the United States. Ontario announced a general ban on DDT six weeks ago.

Mr. Trudeau today commended the provincial governments for the initiatives they had taken to control the use of DDT, but he said more comprehensive action was needed.

The new regulations, to be enforced through the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, provide that in 1970, DDT will not be registered for control of insects in outdoor areas except under emergency situations.

The Government will reduce the permissible level of DDT in common vegetables and fruits from 7 parts per million to 1 part per million. For apples, pears and celery, the level is to be reduced to 3.5 parts per million.

There will be no change in regulations forbidding any DDT in potatoes, eggs, fish, milk, butter, cheese, ice cream and other dairy products.

In the United States, the Department of Agriculture and a number of state agencies have taken similar steps to reduce the use of DDT.

ARIZONANS PUSH FOR FEDERAL TIMBER BILL

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, today the House Committee on Agriculture, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) takes up consideration of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Supply Act of 1969.

I joined with the chairman of the Forests Subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), in introducing this important legislation and am confident that this bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration by the full committee and by the House.

In this connection, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor summarizing the remarks of Mr. Robert N. Sternberger, vice president of Southwest Forest Industries, Phoenix, before the Arizona Watershed Symposium.

The article follows:

ARIZONANS PUSH FOR FEDERAL TIMBER BILL

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—Arizona lumbermen are winning strong public support for the proposed National Timber Supply Act of 1969, now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Adoption of that measure would make approximately \$200 million a year available for intensified management of the national forests, and improvements that would greatly increase their timber production.

Those improvements would also cause more usable water to run off the forests. This is a main reason why Robert M. Sternberger gained so many influential allies when he addressed the annual Arizona Watershed Symposium. For Arizona is a state desperately short of water, and with potentialities for a lumber industry of far greater proportions than at present.

Mr. Sternberger is vice-president of Southwest Lumber Mills, Arizona's principal lumber producer, and a leader in the current effort to publicize the timber supply bill.

Each year the Forest Service sells about \$300 million worth of timber. One-fourth of that goes to the counties where the timber originates; the rest goes into the federal treasury. The service operates on direct appropriations from Congress.

GAP POINTED UP

Those appropriations, according to Mr. Sternberger and others, far from meet the nation's need for more forest products and, in cases like Arizona's, more water.

If the timber supply bill becomes law, 65 percent of stumpage sale receipts will go into a special fund for timber management according to principles already developed by experience. A prime need, Mr. Sternberger says, is 400,000 miles of roads and trails to make mature timber accessible, and result in logging operations that will leave room for more trees to grow. Growth can be accelerated by selective thinning and spacing, and waste prevented through orderly salvage operations.

STRONG PLEA MADE

"All these things are being done on private forest lands," Mr. Sternberger adds. "They should be done on all forest lands so that there need never be a timber shortage in the United States, and at the same time our water supplies can be augmented."

As evidence that a severe shortage already exists he mentioned skyrocketing prices for lumber and plywood. There is capacity production only from private forests, which represent a mere 17 per cent of the 97 million acres of commercial forests in the United States. The national forests have 54 percent of the total inventory of softwood sawtimber but "produce only one-third of the output necessary to meet our housing, construction and other needs."

Those needs will be even more acute, Mr. Sternberger points out, if this country ever meets its goal of 2,000,000 housing units a year. Because of high mortgage interest rates, lumber prices, and building costs, only 1.3 to 1.4 million units will go up this year.

A TIME FOR UNITY

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, Monday night, President Nixon spoke to the American people about the war in Vietnam and the chances for peace. It was a quiet, thoughtful speech and it clearly laid out the course we must follow if we are to achieve a lasting peace instead of a disastrous surrender in Southeast Asia.

The training and modernization of the South Vietnamese Army; the gradual withdrawal of American combat troops; and the continuation of diplomatic efforts to reach a negotiated settlement—all of these principles are ones which the American people can unite behind, and must unite behind. For, make no mistake about it, the President was right when he said:

North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that.

If this quest for peace fails—if this bloody war drags on far longer than it

should—it will be because a reckless, vocal minority—often goaded on by irresponsible politicians—has encouraged a ruthless enemy to fight on until America's will and courage fail.

I believe that the vast majority of Americans will never let this happen. Today more than ever before, our prayers are with the President as he sincerely attempts to lead our country to an honorable and lasting peace.

THE RUSSIANS DID IT

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a statement released by the Honorable Charles J. Conrad, speaker pro tempore of the California Assembly. Mr. Conrad has made a commonsense, down-to-earth analysis of some of the scare stories which have been directed at the testing and transportation of chemical and biological weapons. His analysis contains information which has been largely ignored by the U.S. press. Consequently, I feel that it should be called to the attention of the Congress, and I am very glad to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Conrad's statement is entitled "The Russians Did It," and it was dated Tuesday, October 21, 1969.

The statement follows:

THE RUSSIANS DID IT (AND WHERE WAS EVERYBODY)

Assemblyman Charles J. Conrad, Speaker pro tempore of the California Assembly today charged that a scare story was released from Copenhagen on the day before the United States Senate voted strong restrictions on the testing and transporting of chemical and biological weapons. Conrad said the article was an attempt to influence the Senate vote, and called for a Congressional investigation of this type of propaganda.

The story which Conrad termed "sensationalized and inaccurate" claimed that lethal mustard gas leaked from a British underwater wartime dump had injured six fishermen, and brought panic to the vacation resorts in Southern Sweden and in the Danish Island of Bornholm. The article said holidaymakers had deserted the beaches and that thousands of tons of fish were being boycotted.

"The fact is," said Conrad, "the munitions were captured German chemical warfare materials of World War II which were dumped, not by the British, but by the Russians. When the British news media called attention to the fact that the Russians were the guilty party the story was immediately dropped.

"Where was New York Congressman Richard D. McCarthy and his colleagues who have been denouncing the United States Chemical Warfare Service for so many months? Where was the group of international experts who prepared a report on chemical and biological warfare for the United Nations General Assembly at the request of Secretary-General U Thant? Where was the Polish delegate at Geneva, Antoni Czarkowski, who attacked the United States for what he called

'recent mishaps with chemical munitions? Where were the Japanese who demonstrated against the United States maintaining chemical warfare material on Okinawa?

"Why is it that not one voice, national or international, has been raised in criticism when the Russians are guilty of criminal negligence by disposing of dangerous chemicals in water shallow enough to constitute a hazard?

"Our disposal operations, which some Congressmen raised such a hue and cry about, were to have been made in 7,200 feet of water. The British have followed similar precautions, their disposal being a considerable distance from Bornholm.

"Evidence that this exaggerated story was released to influence a vote in the United States Senate is seen in the fact that it has long been known that quantities of mustard gas were dumped by the Russians in 1947. Incidents of fishermen being burned by mustard have been reported routinely in the press for many years, since some fishermen, although well aware of the danger, are willing to take the risk in order to get a good catch.

"Far from being deserted Bornholm has enjoyed one of its best tourist seasons, and the fish market, as far as Denmark is concerned, has not been affected.

"No real hazard to bathers is considered to exist unless for some reason a leaky bomb were dropped by fishermen in the bathing area. There has been no reported incident of anyone becoming ill or contaminated as a result of eating or handling fish in the area.

"This is just one more example of the need for honest and factual debate on the subject of chemical and biological warfare.

"I strongly urge that the Congress of the United States conduct an investigation to ascertain who was behind the release of such a story at that particular time, and why the subject was hushed up. I also call upon the United Nations General Assembly to condemn the Soviet Union for creating a hazard to human life as well as damage to a rich fishing ground," said Conrad.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary will hold hearings on November 5, 1969, at 10 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

Representatives of the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers will testify on the subjects of the temporary admission of executives and specialist personnel, the temporary admission of aliens to perform services or labor when the U.S. labor market is unable to supply such persons, and the temporary admission of finances and finances of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens. Witnesses will also testify concerning the administration of the labor certification provisions by the Department of Labor.

Officials of the National Foreign Trade Council and representative U.S. corporations will testify on November 12 and 13 and officials of the AFL-CIO on November 19.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's Washington Post carried what seems to me to be a rather well-balanced editorial analysis of some of the current problems pertaining to legislative aspects of the appropriations business of the session. Especially does it question the wisdom of undertaking to use the continuing resolution as a vehicle to make decisions on what the appropriations for the whole year should be.

Mr. Speaker, the architect of provisions of continuing resolutions is long trial and experience. They are a growth, not a scheme. They are works of art. The first rule is that they be noncontroversial so as to secure prompt enactment and thus assure orderly continuation of the vast array of Government functions on some rationally minimum basis until the final decisions on appropriations are made through the regular processes.

The wisdom of this rule comes sharply into focus when we consider that late last June the House and the Congress, in adopting the July 1 continuing resolution, provided for orderly continuation of a \$200 billion enterprise—and did so through a simple unanimous-consent request proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted earlier today, I include the Washington Post editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1969]
APPROPRIATIONS LOGJAM

The vote of the House to raise federal spending for education by \$1 billion immediately was a gesture of disgust with present funding procedures. Members who sponsored this short-cut proposal were deeply conscious of the fact that the House had approved more generous outlays for education in July long before the beginning of the school year. Now, long after the school year has begun, the bill is still awaiting action in the Senate. There is good reason for dismay on the part of conscientious legislators.

The outcry from the House coincides with an appeal from the President for a speedup in the appropriating process. He is right in saying that the situation "is fast becoming intolerable." Only two out of 13 regular appropriations bills have reached his desk. There was good reason for the President to avoid controversy over the cause for growing chaos in the country's fiscal affairs, for his revision of the budget last spring set the appropriating process back about three months. But the important thing, as he noted, is not to allocate the blame but to find a remedy.

The action by the House is not, of course, an appropriate remedy. The House adopted a "continuing resolution" designed to allow the departments and agencies to operate during the remainder of the congressional session or until their appropriations for fiscal 1970 are passed. The educational rider attached to this resolution was in effect an attempt to appropriate funds in advance of the enactment of an appropriations bill. Even if the Senate should acquiesce in this extraordinary gesture, the President could be expected to veto it or simply withhold the funds until the appropriations bill has been passed.

What is needed is a speedup of the appropriating process—not special spending concessions attached to “continuing resolutions.” Any attempt to make general use of “continuing resolutions” in this fashion would defeat its own purpose by arousing controversy over the resolutions themselves, thus complicating a process that is already bordering on chaos.

Senate Majority Leader Mansfield and others have suggested changing the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year so that Congress will have more time to enact appropriation bills before actual spending under them is scheduled to begin. No doubt this would be a big improvement, although it would presumably increase the lag between the formulation of a budget and initiation of the programs covered by it. Maybe this is inevitable, but some experts believe that Congress could go a long way toward clearing the appropriations bills in the six months now allotted to that business if it settled down to work in an earnest and systematic manner. Minority Leader Ford's call for a five-day week on Capitol Hill (or preferably a six-day week) should not go unheeded.

One of the major difficulties is the delay in passing authorization bills, which must be on the books before appropriations can be properly voted. Congress has fallen into the time-wasting habit of passing new authorizations for some programs every year. A vast amount of wear and tear could be saved by authorizing continuing programs for three years or longer periods. Control can always be exercised through appropriations. In our view, the two houses would do well to set up a commission of experts who would study the whole complex process and come up with recommendations for modernization of the machinery which now appears to be close to a breakdown.

PEEKSKILL, N.Y., ROTARY OBSERVES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 18, the Rotary Club of Peekskill, N.Y., celebrated its 50th anniversary. This outstanding service organization has a long record of contributions to Peekskill and its citizens. The club's current president, William W. “Bill” McDonald is continuing five decades of commitment to civic and social progress. As an example of a group of Americans helping their fellow citizen, the Peekskill Rotary Club deserves our highest commendation.

I am proud to present for inclusion in the RECORD a history of the Rotary Club as it appeared in the 50th anniversary journal:

TURNING THE SYMBOLIC ROTARY WHEEL—PEEKSKILL ROTARY IN RETROSPECT

Peekskill's Rotary Club is 50 years old—a time in the life of the organization when a celebration is not only expected but also warranted.

We celebrate our Golden Anniversary recalling the glories of a useful past and the achievements of the present day. More importantly, we remain alert to the problems of the future and are planning for brighter tomorrows.

Five decades passed since that summer of 1919 when nine members of the New York Club journeyed northward and explained to

eleven community leaders here what a Rotary Club was and what opportunities it offered the business and professional men of the then Village of Peekskill which had just celebrated the return of the doughboys of World War I.

It was, of course, a different Peekskill than today; it was more of an industrial community with stove foundries exporting their products around the world, the hat industry was in full bloom and Fleischmann's main product was yeast. The population was about 16,000, about 2,500 less than that of today. The surrounding area consisted largely of farms.

The club, organized in August, but receiving its charter from Rotary International in October, had 22 original members. Meetings were held every two weeks and it was not until January 1922 when the meetings were on a once-weekly schedule.

Only one Rotary Club, that of Mt. Vernon had been organized in Westchester County by the end of 1918, with White Plains, New Rochelle and Peekskill starting in 1919.

Rotary International which now has over 13,900 clubs and a membership of about 657,600 in 146 countries and geographical regions, was only 14 years old at the time. It had been started in Chicago in 1905 by a few lonesome men yearning for companionship in a large city. The first meeting in the Windy City were held in the offices of members. Rotary is not established in all parts of the world, except behind the Iron Curtain of Communism which frowns on such organizations.

The charter members of the Peekskill Rotary Club were active and influential citizens. They led the campaign to merge the two school districts, separated since before Civil War days, and participated in the moving of the Field Library “uptown.” Before the club was 10 years old, it had organized a boys' band and provided instruments and uniforms.

Ever since, Rotarians, imbued with an ideal of public service, have been serving on boards directing the Peekskill Hospital, Field Library, churches, school-related groups, Board of Education, the Salvation Army, Y.W.C.A. fire companies, fraternal and kindred organizations.

It has been said, and not contradicted, that any group that is moving here today has a Rotarian pushing it.

The creation of a picnic area in Depew Park, known as Rotary Knolls, was a contribution to the public welfare in 1940. During World War II, substantial support was given the Service Men's Auxiliary which published the Peekskill Home News sent to local and area men and women in the armed forces.

The Student Loan, or Scholarship Fund, was established in 1935 and, over the decades since, loans were made to many students unable to complete their college education without such help. More recently, monetary grants have been made to needy students.

Peekskill Rotary, since its inception, has provided substantial support for Boy Scout work and has for many years sponsored Troop 42, an outstanding unit. For sometime the club conducted the annual Hollowe'en parades and parties.

Members of the Peekskill Hospital Board of Directors have been saying since as long ago as 1930 that “we have a friend in Rotary.” Contributions to the operating funds, children's ward and building funds have been made over the years with the donations probably exceeding \$15,000. Club members rendered an outstanding service in moving most of the hospital equipment and records to the new hospital from Franklin Street to Crompond Road.

Like the missionaries of old, Peekskill Rotary has spread the gospel of Rotary, carrying its messages to nearby places. We fathered three clubs, Croton in 1929, Mahopac-Carmel in 1932 (now two separate clubs) and Yorktown in 1950.

More recently the club's list of charities has been expanded and with substantial contributions made to the Peekskill Volunteer Ambulance Corps and the Peekskill War Memorial Fund.

Last year an Interact Club, a Rotary-sponsored organization for students, was formed at St. Peter's School. The students displayed considerable interest in the opportunity for service to the community.

A fruitful partnership with the Super Bowl champion New York Jets established in 1963 and during the professional football team's five formative years in training here at the Peekskill Military Academy. The club sponsored the 1963 inter-squad game and annual community Peekskill Days with the Jets at the Polo Grounds and then Shea Stadium, accommodating upwards of 1,000 fans each time.

It is no accident that those pioneers who founded Rotary selected a wheel with mounted gears as the insignia. It is not a wheel that simply rolls as it waves. Selected was a wheel geared to mesh with the power generated by the members of a club. The Peekskill club has never pulled the switch on the power needed to promote its ideals of service to the individual, the community, the nation and world.

Peekskill Rotary is proud of the role it has played in Peekskill's progress, but seeks no accolades. Even as we live, the present has become the past, and whether we like it or not, we must think of the future, for that is where we will spend the rest of our lives.

Peekskill Rotary is alert for a future that it faces with confidence, ready for all opportunities to render “Service Above Self.”

YALE CONFRONTS URBAN TRAUMA

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an article from the Roche Medical Image and Commentary which dramatically underscores the fact that an urban community can implement and operate an effective emergency services program. Of particular note, which I recommend that my colleagues read, is the first paragraph.

The situation in New Haven, Conn., is not unlike our District of Columbia. Here, as in New Haven, there are medical school faculties and university hospitals. In fact, we have three such institutions in the District, yet we have no such program. Here again is another example of what a community can do when it utilizes its resources to save lives.

Under my bill which would create a separate ambulance corps for the District of Columbia, it would be easier to initiate constructive innovations. I submit the article for your information:

YALE CONFRONTS URBAN TRAUMA

“I'd rather sustain a major wound in Vietnam—where a battlefield casualty is in the hospital within 35 minutes—than on the streets of any American city,” declares Dr. Kristaps J. Keggi, Assistant Clinical Professor of Orthopedic Surgery at Yale University School of Medicine. “There would be a far better chance of surviving. For although our U.S. hospitals may be well equipped and our doctors well trained, emergency care at the community level is completely inadequate for the rising number of accidents that punctuate our daily lives.”

Dr. Kegg's statement (admittedly "phrased for maximum impact") is well grounded: As a military surgeon in Vietnam for over a year and the prime mover of a community-wide antitrauma program centered at the Yale University School of Medicine, he has had ample opportunity to examine the problems of emergency medical care confronting American physicians today.

"The hub of our program—Yale-New Haven Hospital—serves as the major intake area for the ghetto population of New Haven and is located near the crossroads of two dangerous highways (Interstate 91 and 95)," says Dr. Kegg. "To meet this situation, Yale-New Haven—which fulfills the threefold function of a teaching, a municipal, and a community hospital—has for years given considerable emphasis to the staffing and facilities of its emergency room. Unfortunately, this was not enough; as most large hospitals around the country, we have had deplorably poor control over the critical outside factors of emergency care—communications, first aid, transportation—that are operative before a patient is admitted to the E.R."

When he began his tour of duty in Vietnam in the summer of 1965 with the 173rd Airborne Brigade's third surgical hospital, Dr. Kegg was immediately impressed by the Army's "tremendously competent" system for evacuating battlefield casualties to field hospitals. This system—based on daily computerized predictions of the number of combat casualties and the number of helicopters and hospital beds that would be needed—has been largely credited with reducing the death rate for wounded reaching a hospital to 1 percent, as against 3 percent in Korea and 8 percent in World War II.

"It was a triumph of organization," recalls Dr. Kegg, "built around the concept of staged emergency care—a chain of priorities stretching all the way from the combat-line medical corpsmen and the battalion aid station to the hospital for definitive surgical care back in the States.

"I was convinced that the basic principle of trauma management in Vietnam—to integrate and deploy all evacuation and treatment facilities according to an established system of priorities—would have to be developed at the community level before our cities could hope to resolve the tragic and costly hodgepodge of emergency-care services."

In 1967, soon after joining the medical faculty at Yale, Dr. Kegg undertook to implement these ideas by organizing a broad trauma-prevention and emergency-care program—a project made possible by the strong support of Dr. Jack Cole, chairman of the department of surgery, John D. Thompson, associate dean of the medical school, and other members of the faculty. Beginning with this small but dedicated nucleus of workers, the program in a short time has expanded to embrace Yale University, the Yale University School of Medicine, the Yale-New Haven Hospital, the New Haven police and fire departments, the ambulance companies, as well as the Connecticut Regional Medical Program.

"The first step was to obtain hard, objective data on communications, transportation, and medical care in our emergency system," says Dr. Kegg. "It was apparent to all that before we could plan improvements, we would have to clearly determine the existing patterns of operation." To accomplish this, a trauma registry was set up for collecting as complete data as possible on all patients with injuries seen in a 30-day period (November 16 to December 15, 1967) in the Yale-New Haven Emergency Service.

During this period, 1,123 patients were examined and interviewed by registered nurses and physicians (for patients requiring hospitalization), who covered all day and night admissions to the service. The data reflected not only the presenting condition of the pa-

tient but also the surrounding operational events, from the onset of trauma until delivery to the emergency room; supplementary information on these events was also solicited from the investigating police officers and the ambulance drivers.

Preliminary analysis of the data failed to reveal any significantly new causal or situational factors of trauma but sharply illuminated the lag in communications and transportation, as well as some inadequacies in first aid, that may result in the death or permanent disability of an accident victim.

"Although the implications of our findings are still being weighed," says Dr. Kegg, "they have made it abundantly clear that any emergency medical care system, to be effective, must be organized on a total community-wide basis.

"No community can afford to maintain a system—or nonsystem—in which commercial ambulance companies or morticians compete for the transportation of the trauma victim, and the police and the fire departments compete in rendering first aid, while none of these agencies has been properly trained or equipped for such vital work."

The urgent need for an improvement in ambulance services has been well documented by Arnold Nadler, who is investigating patterns of emergency care in the U.S. under the joint sponsorship of the Yale School of Medicine and the Connecticut Regional Medical Program. Mr. Nadler's study indicates that the time between onset of trauma and the rendering of first aid is more significant than the time spent transporting the injured individual from the scene of the accident to the hospital.

This problem, Dr. Kegg believes, can be significantly alleviated by the broad use, after appropriate field trials, of the Yale Index of Injury Severity. "This simple device," he maintains, "can be of enormous importance in raising the standards of emergency workers. By routinely using the index to check physical distress signs, the policeman, fireman, or ambulance attendant will tend to make a more thoughtful, systematic evaluation of the patient's condition; by the same token, he will become more conscious of the things that should not be done, such as moving a patient with multiple fractures onto the back seat of a car."

In cases of critical injury, Dr. Kegg points out, the Index of Injury Severity could be a prime factor in the summoning of prompt medical attention: "Consider two typical situations: The first—a two-car collision—occurs in a crowded urban community that is notoriously short of ambulances. Two men have been injured. A policeman, using the Index, finds that one shows signs of a moderate injury level of 7 (moderately severe). He sends out an emergency communication, 'ambulance needed, patient injury 7'—an indication that the ambulance should use a siren (8 and above might mean that a physician should accompany the ambulance). The second situation—a highway collision in Nebraska—takes place 50 miles from the nearest hospital. A state trooper feeds the message 'Here's a patient with an index of 9' into the emergency communications system. To the dispatcher, 9 and above would signify injuries so severe that instead of an ambulance, a helicopter should be called."

The Yale group hopes that after final revision, the Index will correlate favorably with the abbreviated injury scale that is being developed by the A.M.A. Committee on the Medical Aspects of Automotive Safety. This consists of a uniform severity rating system (to be completed by physicians) for classifying injuries. Dr. Kegg is eager to see how closely New Haven emergency crews can approximate the medical diagnoses.

One of the most promising innovations of the Yale trauma program has been a pilot study of closed-circuit television in emergency care situations. A portable TV camera and taping unit is now being used to test the feasibility of establishing direct audiovisual communication between the first-aid crew at the scene of an accident and the medical staff at the hospital.

"Our field trials indicate that television can be of tremendous practical and educational value in a total emergency care program," says Dr. Kegg. "TV cameras at the scene of an accident make it possible for the physician in the hospital to view the trauma patient and monitor the operations of the first-aid crew. With instantaneous microwave TV transmission, which we hope eventually to install, the doctor will, in effect, become a participant—he will be able to advise, 'Keep his head to the left . . . no, don't use oxygen . . . Now, be careful moving him.'"

"From an educational and training standpoint, TV is already working for us. Videotape recordings taken at the site of an accident are now being used in trauma courses which we have introduced into the medical school curriculum. They are also being used in first-aid training courses for firemen and other emergency personnel—an urgently needed teaching function in which some of our trauma-oriented medical students have been most helpful."

Introducing the subject of emergency medical care into the curriculum at the Yale school of medicine has been a primary concern of Dr. Kegg. "How can physicians be expected to meet their responsibilities in the control and management of trauma," he asks, "when they learn virtually nothing about it at school? The graduating M.D. at most schools has absorbed a creditable amount of basic sciences and medicine but knows less about routine first-aid procedures than a conscientious boy scout!"

At the Yale School of Medicine, exposure to emergency care teaching begins early. Most first-year students taking preclinical subjects attend a short trauma management course given by Dr. Kegg in the spring, at which videotapes of accidents are viewed. Gross views of injuries are used, with dramatic effectiveness, to illustrate tissue structures in anatomy classes. Students in their junior and senior years, who have the option to take courses in a preferred field, may now choose emergency medical care as their area of specialization.

One student who has done so is Michael Klein, who last summer completed a voluntary tour of duty with the New Haven Fire Department—arranged with the help of Dr. Kegg—in preparation for a Master's degree in public health. In his new role, he has gained much valuable firsthand knowledge of the functions—and malfunctions—of emergency care agencies. He was surprised to observe, for example, that firemen—who have a primary responsibility for rendering first aid—in many cases were unclear as to how to administer oxygen or use suctioning devices on premature infants.

To help overcome such shortcomings, Mr. Klein, representing the Yale trauma program, has collaborated with the police and fire departments in setting up weekly videotape sessions for emergency crews, during which they have the opportunity to witness and critically evaluate their own activities at the scene of an accident. The results have been so good that a TV training program has been set up, by which firemen can make their own televised record of emergency operations for periodic review.

Side by side with their efforts to raise the level of emergency medical care, the members of the Yale group are carrying out numerous studies aimed at the prevention of trauma. Home accidents, accounting for 42

per cent of all injuries recorded in the Yale trauma registry, are under intensive study by Eric W. Mood, Associate Professor of Public Health at the Yale School of Medicine.

Mr. Mood, who is also a professional engineer and a member of the WHO Expert Advisory Committee on Environmental Health, has been active locally and nationally in the movement to alter current housing regulations, which, he insists, "must be changed before anything significant can happen." He is cochairman of a joint effort by the American Public Health Association and the U.S. Public Health Association and the U.S. Public Health Service to strengthen housing codes affecting health and safety.

Locally, Mr. Mood has proposed several additions to the New Haven housing code that, he believes, "may be unique, but could easily set the standard for housing everywhere." His first recommendation is the mandatory provision in every home of "a safe 'child-proof' place for storing household drugs and chemicals." Another proposal, of perhaps equal importance, is for a regulation requiring landlords to provide a stove as standard kitchen equipment. "In virtually all codes," he explains, "the kitchen must be provided with a source of cooking power—gas or electric inputs—but the only appliance that is required is the kitchen sink. Yet accident statistics show hundredfold proof that flame-using stoves and space heaters improperly attached by the tenant are a leading cause of death by fire or asphyxiation."

ROLE OF SMOG IN ACCIDENTS

Physicians participating in the Yale trauma program vigorously support stronger legislation and stricter enforcement of existing laws on air pollution, which in certain industrialized areas can create smog banks that obscure drivers' vision. "This phenomenon can easily occur as a result of auto exhaust clouds at heavily congested traffic junctions, especially under weather conditions that cause a sudden temperature inversion," says Samuel Webb, Jr., an instructor in public health who is doing research in the field of automotive safety. "Impairment of vision may also result from smoke or chemical waste products that are ejected into the atmosphere by manufacturing plants. When all three factors—auto exhaust fumes, temperature inversion, and industrial air pollutants—are present simultaneously, the driver may suddenly find himself enveloped in a veritable man-made fog bank."

A prime example of such conditions cited by Mr. Webb is the heavily traveled Quinnipiac River bridge, which on the New Haven side serves as an interchange between Interstate highways 91 and 95. "Given the factors I have just described," he points out, "it is small wonder that this bridge area has one of the highest accident rates in the state."

Mr. Webb's studies have convinced him that stricter laws must be passed to cope with the problem of the drinking driver. "The National Highway Safety Bureau reports that from 47 to 67 per cent of all drivers who died in accidents had been drinking," he pointed out. "Yet the maximum acceptable blood alcohol level is far too high in most states, where to qualify as a drunken driver a 150-pound man must show a minimum blood alcohol concentration of 0.15 per cent—a level that requires the consumption of six to eight martinis in one hour! Only one state in the U.S.—Utah—has a limit of 0.08 per cent, which is the generally accepted level throughout Europe."

Mr. Webb hopes that concerted effort by the agencies and individuals in the trauma program may bring sufficient pressure on state legislators to lower the acceptable blood alcohol level for drivers in Connecticut to a maximum of 0.10 percent. He also would like to see legislation passed that would authorize a patrolman to stop suspected violators and

demand that they submit to a blood alcohol test. This system, Mr. Webb maintains, is working extremely well in Great Britain and in Scandinavia.

Despite the increase in the number of driving safety devices, Mr. Webb reports, trauma registry data and other surveys show that a large number of injuries are caused by failure to use such devices. He believes this problem could be alleviated by the development of an ignition mechanism that would make it impossible to start a vehicle before all safety devices were secured.

The problem of highway design—an important but poorly publicized factor of automotive accidents—has attracted increasing interest among trauma program investigators. A common and universally disregarded example of bad designing, they point out is the failure to allow a large enough margin of safety between the highway and such lethal-impact hazards as concrete embankments, trees, or poles. Yale engineers are considering the feasibility of shielding such danger points with sandbags or other soft materials.

"When all else fails, those who oppose necessary change can always trot out the bugaboo of prohibitive costs," says Dr. Keggi. "Highway designers are concerned with the cost of concrete. Yet, if we could find out how much it costs annually to treat each highway accident victim, and the cost of lives lost in such accidents, we might be able to convince legislators to give some priority to the improvement of our highway systems."

As the per capita use of power appliances—from rotary mowers to gas-driven tree saws—continues to rise and automobile traffic passes reasonable dimensions, the accident rate may be expected to climb accordingly, warns Dr. Keggi. Much will depend, he maintains, on how well the public is made aware of such dangers. But he is especially vehement on the responsibilities of the medical profession in this situation:

"The doctor should be in the forefront, alerting the community to hazards in the home and on the highway. He should carry an emergency kit with him at all times and urge his colleagues to do so. He should lend his support to an aggressive accident prevention program utilizing the media, public forums, and the schools. As an influential member of the community, he is in an excellent position to demand efficient ambulance service, new highway and housing legislation, and an end to air pollution. If he cannot do this, no one can."

IN MEMORIAM: "ROBBIE"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there was nothing at the top center of the editorial page of the November 1, 1969, Indianapolis News but a large blank space, surrounded by a black border, in touching, silent tribute and memory to "Robbie" Robinson, editorial cartoonist for the News for 21 years.

A talented, skillful, perceptive man whose great abilities guided his pen, he brought to the field of editorial cartooning a fund of humor and insight that is seldom if ever matched by his contemporaries.

The following, from the Indianapolis News and the Indianapolis Star, reflect the esteem and affection which all who were privileged to know him, as I was, held for him:

[From the Indianapolis News, Oct. 31, 1969]

CARTOONIST ROBINSON DIES AT 61

William Busby Robinson, 61, editorial cartoonist for The News the last 21 years, died today at St. Vincent's Hospital.

"Robbie," of 946 Tulip Drive, who was born in Belfast, Ireland, had won numerous national cartoon awards, which included six Freedoms Foundation Awards, National Safety Council Award, Community Service Award and the Junior Chamber of Commerce Award.

He was a past president of the Indianapolis Press Club, and a member of Sigma Delta Chi and the American Editorial Cartoonists Association, of which he was a director.

Robinson attended Butler University and the Herron School of Art. He was a graduate of Tech High School.

He was the creator of "Josephine," a comic panel cartoon nationally syndicated for 12 years in 75 metropolitan newspapers.

Robinson's cartoons were reprinted in newspapers from coast to coast and in six foreign countries.

Presidents Richard Nixon, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson requested originals of his editorial cartoons. Permanent collections of Robinson's cartoons are in the State Historical Society of Missouri, the University of Southern Mississippi and the University of Syracuse.

He began his newspaper career in the advertising department of The Star in 1934 and transferred to The News advertising department in 1940.

In 1948 he accepted the editorial cartoonist position.

Robinson was an original member of the Indianapolis Symphony Choir and was tenor soloist for 14 years in the famous men and boys choir at Christ Church Episcopal Cathedral on Monument Circle.

"Robbie" won first place in a state music contest when he attended Tech High School in 1926.

Survivors—wife Jeannette; daughters Mrs. Molly Stratton and Mrs. Peggy Haven; sister Mrs. Frederick Weber; brother Norman Robinson.

[From the Indianapolis News, Nov. 1, 1969]

ROBBIE ROBINSON

The death of William B. "Robbie" Robinson, cartoonist for The News, has shocked and saddened his colleagues. We know our sense of loss will be shared by the rest of the community.

Robbie was famous throughout our city and state, and the nation as well, for his editorial cartoons. His enormous talent was repeatedly recognized by national awards panels as well as by countless newspapers and magazines which reprinted him. He was one of the best caricaturists in the business, and all the presidents from Truman to Nixon had at one time or another requested originals of his drawings.

His ability as a draftsman, however, was but the first of the qualities Robbie brought to his work. He had as well the gift of humor and an enduring sanity which helped make sense of a sometimes incomprehensible world. He could say more about a complex issue in one cartoon than his struggling coworkers could say in a week's editorials.

The Robbie visible to the public in the drawings he produced over a span of 21 years was the expression of a private man whose unflinching kindness and balance were a daily example to his friends. He was immensely popular in the newspaper fraternity, as was indicated by his selection as president of the Indianapolis Press Club. No man was better liked.

With his other qualities, Robbie united a deep concern for the well-being of his community and his nation. He cared about what

happened to people, and he cared about what happened to the United States. His generous nature was also equipped with the power to cut through fraud or pomposity and to expose things he believed were harmful to American society. He loved his country and he battled for it.

To say that Robbie will be missed around here is only to suggest the emptiness that afflicts us. Mere words cannot convey it. Only Robbie himself, with one of his marvelous drawings, could have said for us the things which need to be said. And now we shall somehow have to learn to go on without him.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Nov. 1, 1969]

"ROBBIE"

The Indianapolis Star shares with its colleagues on The Indianapolis News the untimely loss of William B. "Robbie" Robinson, editorial cartoonist for The News for nearly a quarter of a century.

An ancient Chinese saying declares that "one picture is worth a thousand words" which, in essence, sums up the work of the editorial cartoonist who takes the issues of the day and from his imagination and talent draws a picture that says more than words alone.

"Robbie" had a friendly word for everyone and accepted graciously both the brickbats and the accolades of those who commented on what he drew.

A cartoonist, whether he lambasts or praises, often is able to cut through the mist that surrounds an issue and penetrate to the heart of the matter in a way that makes the truth crystal clear.

"Robbie" Robinson was a master of that ability.

The News has lost a devoted colleague. We at The Star have lost a friend and respected adversary.

SENATE—Wednesday, November 5, 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:

O God, amid many voices we would now hear Thy voice calling us to duty and service to the Nation in this House.

Direct those who speak where many listen and write where many read. Save the people who read and see and hear from merely reading and seeing and hearing. Give them understanding minds. Deliver them from that darkness which comprehends not what is Thy will and purpose. Shed the light of Thy truth upon the crucial concerns of our times. Guide all men that they may communicate so as to espouse idealism and not idolatry, to express love and not hate, to promote unity and not discord.

Grant that all who lead the Nation may speak so as to make the mind of the people wise, its heart sound, its will righteous.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 4, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On October 30, 1969:

S. 74. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota;

S. 775. An act to declare that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; and

S. 921. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation.

On October 31, 1969:

S.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With-

out objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The bill clerk read the nomination of Paul J. O'Neill, of Florida, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 499, House Joint Resolution 910.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 910) to declare a national day of prayer and concern for American servicemen being held prisoner in North Vietnam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.