

"Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination." 132 F. Supp. 776, 777 (E.D.S.C. 1955).

²⁷ See Bowman, note 35, supra, at 336 ff.

²⁸ Simkins v. Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital, 323 F. 2d 959 (CA 4, 1963).

²⁹ Hawkins v. North Carolina Dental Society, 355 F. 2d 718 (CA 4, 1966).

⁴⁰ Griffin v. Board of Supervisors, 322 F. 2d 332 (CA 4, 1963), reports the decision to abstain. A thoughtful and useful collection of materials on abstention appears in Currie, Federal Courts 500-530 (1968).

⁴¹ England v. Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners, 375 U.S. 411 (1964).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in executive session, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, November 18, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 17, 1969:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albright, James A.	Howard, Sylvester
Armstrong, Russell P.	May, Richard P.
Ash, James B.	Menart, Joseph A.
Bacon, Welles D.	Morgan, Richard C.
Bahr, Wayne D.	Parker, Frederick D.
Beard, Fred W.	Phillips, Hugh F.
Bowman, Charles F.	Randel, Garrett V.
N., Jr.	H., Jr.
Boyd, Joseph S.	Roamer, Richard H.
Brake, Robert L.	Robin, Edmond L.
Brown, Donald R.	Rudolf, Robert M.
Clark, Owen D.	Skinner, Lloyd L.
Edwards, Sidney B.	Smith, Charles L.
Ethington, Riley S.	Smith, Delmer
Hall, John E.	Smith, Lyle W.
Henry, John D.	Sunn, Larry A.

ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Graham W. Watt, of Ohio, to be Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, vice Thomas W. Fletcher.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of commander:

Walter E. Mason, Jr.	Melvin J. Hartman
John R. MacDonald	Harold U. Wilson, Jr.
John N. MacDonald	John F. Dunn
Earle K. Hand	George L. Gordon
Thomas C. Volkle	Royce R. Garrett
Hugh M. McCreery	Benjamin R. Sheaffer
James Napier, Jr.	Kearney L. Yancey, Jr.
Ronald D. Stenzel	John V. A. Thompson
Bobby C. Wilks	Roger V. Millett
Donald E. Hand	Charles S. Wetherell
Gordon H. Dickman	Hugh L. Murphy, Jr.
Albert L. Olsen, Jr.	Richard A. Decors, Jr.
James H. Scott	Mitchell J. Whiting
George P. Asche	John B. Lynn
Paul L. Lamb	John W. Kime
William Senn	Harlan D. Hanson
Milton J. Stewart	Richard J. Green
Delmar F. Smith	James E. Brown, Jr.
Harold E. Geck	George D. Passmore,
John J. Clayton	Jr.
Charles F. Gailey, Jr.	Louis K. Bragaw, Jr.
Bruce S. Little	Richard J. Collins
Bobby G. Burns	Charles S. Niederman
Hodges S. Gallop, Jr.	George P. Vance
Dalton J. Beasley	Ronald R. McClellan
David W. Irons	John C. Wirtz
Mathew Woods	David R. Markey
Leo J. Kelley	Robert A. Johnson
Howard C. Beeler, Jr.	Keith D. Ripley
Gerald C. Hinson	John I. Maloney, Jr.
Calvin F. Langford	

The following-named Reserve officer to be a permanent commissioned officer in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant: Jack K. Stice.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

L. E. "GUS" SHAFER, MERRIAM, KANS., SCULPTOR AND PAINTER

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, unfortunately Kansas is not generally recognized as a foremost proponent and participant in art.

I say unfortunately because, in our State, there is not only a growing awareness and appreciation of art, but also a growing number of men and women who are creating on canvas some rather excellent and significant art works.

One such Kansas is L. E. "Gus" Shafer of Merriam, a sculptor and painter of national acclaim, who translates the life of the Old West into bronze and oils.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include an article about Mr. Shafer from the Johnson County Herald of November 12.

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

L. E. "GUS" SHAFER, KANSAS SCULPTOR AND PAINTER

(By Elizabeth Barnes)

It was not only our pioneer settlers who braved the hazards of an unknown land to build the history of this area.

There are among us many devoted souls who are giving to the community and to the world what will become a precious heritage. These people, though they little realize it, are also making history.

As a rule you do not hear much about these people until some signal honor is dumped at their door. So, if you have not already done so, meet Leonard E. (Gus)

Shafer, 8308 West 61st. St., Merriam, sculptor and painter, who perpetuates in bronze and oils the life of the Old West.

Born on a farm in western Kansas in 1907, Gus early developed a love of the west from his grandfather, who hunted big game with Buffalo Bill. He also learned the ways of animals through his chores about the farm, and of the wild creatures from his excursions through the rugged prairie land about him.

Gus has been painting since early boyhood. He had his first one-man showing when only fifteen years old in an old mortuary near his home. His father purchased one of the paintings exhibited there, an old Dutch windmill, that now hangs in the artist's bedroom.—not an original composition, Gus confesses, but a copy of an illustration in an old school geography.

His interest in clay modeling also began early. He dug the clay from a bank near his home.

Gus was left motherless at the age of ten. Two years later he left home to take a job on a neighboring ranch, tending cattle and choring about. For his first year's pay, in addition to his keep, he received a pony for his very own. The next year bought a fine saddle and bridle for it.

Next he took up selling magazines for the Hearst Publishing Company, and was soon working hard for a scholarship to Grinnell College. Out of 450 applications, Gus was the winner, which entitled him to full expenses. For three semesters he stayed at Grinnell, finally leaving for Kansas State College where he continued to work his way through to graduation.

In 1930 he brought his family to Kansas City where he set up his own office as a commercial artist. Here, as he had time, he continued his paintings of his beloved west, putting on canvas scenes that had been familiar to him. He utilized vacation times to visit the old west, scouring the country side, talking with old timers, and visiting libraries in search of old maps and materials of a bygone era. Nothing was more exciting to him than to drive into a ghost town and round up

somebody who could tell him of its past. Or to drive up to some old ranch home (often a rather dangerous undertaking, for the people in secluded areas were wary of strangers, and like as not Gus would be looking down a gun barrel until he could explain the nature of his visit.)

In his sculpturing, Gus started out with wood carving until an accident with a power saw cost him several fingers about three years ago. Then he turned to fashioning his figures in clay, or rather in an oil residue which serves the purposes better.

In the three short years in which Gus has devoted himself to sculpturing, he has won not only national recognition, but acclaim in other countries, as well.

He now has four foundries where his figures are cast, two in New York City, one in Topeka and one in Carrara, Italy. The Royal Worcester Porcelain Works of London, has also asked permission to cast his figures in porcelain.

There are six agencies and display offices which handle the Gus Shafer pieces—the Kennedy Sales Gallery in New York City, Hall Bros. in Kansas City, Phippens in Topeka, and agencies in Tucson (Arizona) and Aspen (Colorado). A special showing of Shafer's work (probably the largest ever assembled in one place) was at Hall Bros. on the Plaza during the recent American Royal.

To date Gus has completed around 40 pieces for casting in bronze. Of these, only the bust figure of his grandfather is not for sale. Each casting is numbered and is limited in number, ranging from perhaps ten to 25 or 30 castings of each. Prices range from \$450 for a small figure up to \$10,640.00 for a piece in silver. Only the first two castings may be done in silver. Gus reserves No. 3 of each piece for himself.

This limitation on number of castings makes a Gus Shafer piece close to an exclusive. A buyer for investment will try to purchase the lower numbers for the original price put on a piece automatically increases with each succeeding piece, in which the purchase of a No. 1 piece will find his buy worth the most as the years go by.

WIDE ACCLAIM

The originality and perfection of detail of Shafer creations give the artist top rating in the world of art. His western paintings, nationally known, rank along with those of Remington and Russell, reflecting as they do the spirit of the Old West and keeping alive its traditions.

His sculpture, too, depicts in detail and accuracy of form and suggested movement the men and animals of wild west days. As you look at them they seem to come alive and you find yourself listening for the clomp of the horses' hooves, the snarl of bullets, whiz of arrows, and shouts of the riders.

This effect of reality Gus is able to achieve largely by insisting on doing some of the finishing work himself. He makes the bridles, bits and spurs separately, and has them cast separately, fitting them himself to the finished bronze. In some cases the rowels of the spurs actually turn at a touch, something unknown in other work.

To achieve all this intricacy of detail Gus insists, when at home, on a working day of from 9 A.M. to midnight, when he retreats to his working sanctum and is not to be disturbed save for some dire emergency. At such times affairs of the family are attended to by Mrs. Gus his right hand helper, who is also his indispensable partner on trips and at art showings.

In the few brief years the Shafers have been doing such things, they have had showings and exhibits in Oklahoma, in Wyoming, at the Albrecht Galleries in St. Joseph and other places. One of their memorable showings was at the Palm Beach estate of the Huttig family, where before 350 invited guests "Old West" sculpture was shown initially.

They have just returned from their latest showing in Snyder, Texas, staged by the West Texas Ranch Association. They had planned to include in this trip a visit to the estate of their friend, artist Peter Hurd, in Petrocio, New Mexico, where they were to attend a polo match and do some skiing. Rain prevented these activities, so the time was spent in visiting and enjoying the surrounding countryside. Peter Hurd, it may be recalled, is the artist commissioned to do the portrait of Lyndon B. Johnson which the former president did not like. The Shafers are expecting a return visit from Mr. Hurd soon.

The Shafers took along with them a finished wax of Gus's next sculpture, which he calls the "Silent Partner". It portrays the figure of an old prospector panning gold, and holding in his hand a single gold nugget, which he is holding up for the burro's inspection, his silent partner.

On the way back home they stopped at a jeweler friend's shop in Oklahoma where they arranged to have him make a number of tiny gold nuggets, one of which will be used in every finished bronze of the "Silent Partner."

Gus has a hard time trying to designate which one of his pieces is his favorite, because each of them portrays a precious memory for him. If pressed for an answer, it might be "Top Hand," which is the figure of his grandfather. Or it might be "Prayer and a Winchester," or possibly "Dudin Up".

One thing sure the only bronze which Gus refuses to sell is the bust of his grandfather, which is the chief figure in "Top Hand".

**GOLD STAR PARENTS SUPPORT
THE PRESIDENT**

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep emotion that I read the

text of a telegram sent to President Nixon on Veterans Day by Gold Star Parents of Waukesha County. This group of wives and parents of servicemen who have given their lives in Vietnam, met with the Honorable Clair Voss, judge of the circuit court of Waukesha County, himself a wearer of the Purple Heart, as their guest. They expressed a desire to reaffirm their support of, and trust in, the President of the United States. With Judge Voss as scrivener, these patriotic Americans unanimously supported and affixed their signatures to this message from their hearts:

President RICHARD NIXON,
United States of America:

We, wives and parents whose husbands or sons sacrificed their lives in Vietnam in furtherance of the American spirit, for all men, do express our trust in you and support in your generous efforts to conclude the war in Vietnam with honor for America, in justice to our husbands and sons, and with consideration for the men who are yet in the field.

We, the undersigned gold star residents of Waukesha County, Wisconsin, extend to you our prayers and our allegiance.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Van Der Sterren, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Roe, Sr., Edith A. Roe, Mr. and Mrs. Victor Janka, Mr. and Mrs. H. Glueckstein, Mr. and Mrs. Mark A. Nettessheim, Mrs. Raymond Jajtner, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Harteau, and Mrs. Howard Matson.

Mr. and Mrs. Eli Gukich, Mr. and Mrs. T. A. White, Mr. and Mrs. Reuben McCormick, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley A. Jordan, Mrs. Magdalene Sund, Mr. and Mrs. Rudolph C. Radtke, Mrs. Josephine Weeden, and Mr. and Mrs. John Carr.

**NIXON SPEECH ADDRESSED TO HIS
SUPPORTERS—AND HANOI**

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent and thoughtful editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which presents a meaningful analysis of President Nixon's November 3 speech to the Nation on Vietnam policy. The editorial follows:

**NIXON SPEECH ADDRESSED TO HIS SUPPORTERS—
AND HANOI**

President Nixon's long-awaited address to the nation on the war in Vietnam undoubtedly was a disappointment to his critics of both extremes. He didn't promise immediate complete withdrawal of our troops as the doves wanted him to do. Nor did he threaten Hanoi with annihilation as the hawks have proposed.

But the President said he was speaking to the "silent majority" of Americans—that segment of the population that Dr. Gallup has since set at 77 per cent—which believes Mr. Nixon is doing his best to end the war honorably and who support him in his efforts.

If our country wants to enjoy the confidence of the rest of the world it can do no less than honor its commitments. Our presence in Vietnam is one of those commitments. It is probable, as some critics say, that it never was necessary for us to become involved on a scale of such magnitude. This, however, was decided by Mr. Nixon's predecessor. But it has been the judgment of four Presidents, two of each party, that some involvement was necessary to the preservation

of freedom in southeast Asia—a goal to which we are indisputably committed.

For us to withdraw precipitately would be, as Mr. Nixon said Monday night, a disaster of great magnitude, for it would be an accession to the terms of Hanoi, which demands nothing less than abject surrender. Surely a majority of Americans will not be ready to accept such a surrender to such an opponent. The President Monday night was only repeating his pledge made in his inaugural address that the peace he seeks in this war will be an honorable one. That is the only kind this nation has ever accepted. It is the only kind it can accept.

Mr. Nixon's recapitulation of all the efforts at peace that have been made—the secret letter to Ho Chi Minh, the appeal to the United Nations to work out a ceasefire, the talks both public and private in Paris, the visits with individuals close to Hanoi, the gradual reduction of hostilities—was impressive. It should make clear that very little more remains to be done, other than what he plans to do.

That is gradually to "Vietnamize" the war, with withdrawals of American troops to match the progress of this program. He made it quite clear to Hanoi that if North Vietnam steps up hostilities that withdrawal will be accordingly slowed.

This served to say to his American critics, too, that to bind himself to an inflexible timetable of withdrawal would be to say to Hanoi that if it held out long enough it would win. He said that he would like to complete the withdrawal within a year. He made it clear, though, that only a change in the adamant attitude of Hanoi would make this possible. This suggests that those who demand immediate peace might well turn some of the attention upon Hanoi rather than spending all of it on Washington.

Mr. Nixon reminded this nation that the fighting has cooled, that casualties have been lowered, that most of the bombing has been stopped. He reiterated that he has a plan for ending the war, but that it cannot be carried out unilaterally. He left the door open to Hanoi for negotiation when and if it is ready to approach peace in realistic terms rather than talking only to abject surrender.

It takes political courage of a high order to make such a report to a nation that longs so desperately for good news. He might have glossed over the hard facts. He might have appealed his detractors with ambiguous promises that would have cooled the November moratorium. He chose instead to tell the truth, and it is mostly unpalatable.

He repeated the promise of Guam, however, that henceforth we will not step in except to defend those who are willing to attempt to defend themselves and then only with materiel, not manpower. This, when applied to such situations as the Middle East and other trouble spots, is heartening.

Mr. Nixon's attempt in the speech Monday night was to mobilize the patriotism and confidence of the majority of Americans who already support him. In that rather limited but important goal it undoubtedly will succeed.

**THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE
DRAFT**

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, November 14, it was my privilege to address the Parents Club of Catholic Memorial High School, in West Roxbury, Mass. The audience was comprised of the faculty, Parents Club, and junior and senior

students of Catholic Memorial High School. A list of the officers of the Parents Club follows:

President, Joseph F. McCormack; vice president, Ann E. Bean; vice president (alumni), Joseph L. Greaney; corresponding secretary, Louise E. Assaf; recording secretary, Helen A. Norton; treasurer, John G. Goode; assistant treasurer, George L. Beaupre.

Executive board, Frances D. Amato, Florence M. Kane, Thomas F. Meagher, Herbert F. Mulloney, Hilda E. Buttler, Walter T. Greaney, Jr., Helen C. Mansfield, Joseph E. Nland, William T. Greene, Leo F. Hurley, Ruth M. Lang, Louise M. True, Mary E. Carter, Alphonse F. Clifirno, Anne F. Long, Edward L. Englert, Marianne B. Foscaldo (alumni), and John F. Collins (alumni).

Advisory board, Brother William V. Dennehy, Brother Cornelius R. Ryan, Brother Joseph A. Heeran, Mr. Christopher H. Jackson, and Mr. James R. O'Connor.

I thought it would be a good idea at this time to bring my statements to the attention of the U.S. Congress in order to outline some of my views with reference to the Vietnam war and the draft.

My remarks were as follows:

THE VIETNAM WAR

Most people are agreed on one thing . . . ending the war as quickly as possible. Where we disagree is just what is meant by "as quickly as possible". . . How do we end it? It seems to me only logical that if one is concerned over wasting lives, one must be sure we do not do anything in our haste to end the war, to make it obvious that those who have died, have died . . . *in vain*. In other words, we owe it to those brave men who have died to salvage the best settlement possible from around the conference table. That is what the past year or more in Paris is all about and should be about. To walk away from the war—just drop our guns and pull out . . . is worse than cowardice. It is ingratitude to their memory.

Something can be salvaged around the negotiating table. After all the Vietcong do not control the whole of Vietnam by any means. People who have committed themselves to our cause, have risked much in doing so. We must do our utmost to protect them in any post-American situation in Vietnam. To just walk out would be to desert those millions, to leave them to an all-out-massacre.

Right or wrong we did go into Vietnam and we did raise expectations and attract loyalties. If we were wrong to go in without proper preparation and planning, then it does not seem to be right to leave the same way we came in, without preparation or planning. Two wrongs certainly do not amount to the right way here.

And make no mistake about it the days of planned withdrawal have arrived. And responsible persons in Washington are involved in the task. But it must be orderly, and we cannot have diplomacy . . . The most delicate of operations at best, dictated by generals of the streets on the home front. We do not even believe as a nation that the generals on the war front have that right!!!!

Obviously our democracy would be a shallow substance, and an unhealthy body-politic if we could not tolerate free open discussion in the public arena, but as in everything else, Government is best which is not dominated by extremes of either point of view. Too much government is bad, so is too little government. Too much liberty is just as impossible to tolerate. What is the line between liberty gone too far, and anarchy. After all, everything has its bounds. . . . Even personal freedom is to do whatever one wants. We know that from childhood. The fact is that individual freedom is a tenuous thing if your freedom does not interfere with the freedom of others. We are all agreed that other individuals can do everything short of interfer-

ing with the freedom of others. That would only be an oppressive freedom, leading to a common free-for-all. That is one of the main justifications for a system of government in the first place—*Law and order*—with justice a much abused expression today.

Are people going too far when they demonstrate if their demonstration interferes with right to go about your work? . . . sleep in peace at home? . . . Walk the streets free of fear of being caught up in a mob scene? Sitting down in traffic, public buildings, court houses is more than disruptive, it denies freedom of movement to others. Sure, demonstrations have some of the highest motives behind them. They also contain some of the lowest motives. Moderates rarely fare too well in the streets though. The history of revolutionary movements is the history of moderate groups, full of good meaning, starting things off, only to discover they have unleashed an uncontrollable force and end up being swept aside by extremists. Then the awful reaction.

Anyone who takes up civil disobedience better be aware it is a double-edged sword. . . . It can cut both ways. How much is permitted! No guidelines are available. Governments must play it by ear. When the majority begins to feel its safety is threatened it is bound to demand protection from the elected representatives. After all democracy is based on majority rule . . . Not just on minority demands. Democracy would hardly be worth fighting for if it was no more than mob rule!

By all means protest is healthy, providing it does not become unhealthy. It is as difficult as that. There are no simple answers, any more than there are simple solutions. Those who believe in slogans and put all their faith in them are likely to wake up one day to find that ending the war in Vietnam hastily was no panacea after all. . . . Rather it opened up a whole new Pandora's box. In our times, when nuclear weapons have added a new and horrifying dimension to the quest for peace, public officials are beginning to re-evaluate the attitudes toward war. All responsible public officials have rejected total nuclear war.

The common brotherhood of man, the consequences of violence and the necessity for worldwide peace-keeping institutions are of common concern today.

I am hopeful that President Nixon, who promised last fall to end the war, will formulate the necessary measures to alleviate the conflict.

I want to make my position clear in saying that I do not support this war; however, I do support a peaceful and just solution to ending it, and I share in your hopes that we shall see an early end to the conflict.

DRAFT REFORM

The present public controversy over the Selective Service System began most noticeably in 1966. It focused on extending the system which was due to expire June 30, 1967. Many critics opposed the system itself which they contended was highly inequitable. Frequently, however, criticism of the draft is stimulated by and part of the protest against the Vietnam war. To a large extent it is evident that one's personal opinion on the Vietnam War will color one's views on the draft system.

Critics of the draft system are many and their concerns worthy of study. The arguments against the draft system include the following:

By drafting the oldest men first, younger men are never certain about their draft status, especially since on an average, only one man in seven is needed to fill draft requirements. This prolonged period of uncertainty often hinders men in getting jobs and in planning their lives.

Men from privileged families, who can afford to stay in college, often avoid the draft entirely while their less affluent contemporaries are inducted.

Because criteria for deferments are established by local draft boards, standards vary considerably. Critics charge that a man's influence with his local board is often instrumental in obtaining a deferment.

Persons who cannot pass the physical or mental requirements for combat duty are rejected even though they would be fit for noncombat positions.

Conscription is alleged to be a violation of individual liberties because it eliminates a man's freedom of choice.

Finally, many critics are concerned that the young people whose lives may be at stake because of the draft, have no representation in the Selective Service System's decision making process.

With such pressing arguments against the draft system, the Congress began hearings in 1967 on the problem. After House and Senate Armed Services Committee consideration of several methods of amending the Selective Service Act both Houses passed legislation in 1967 to extend the Selective Service Act until July 1, 1971. The major reform in the law was its provision that all men who received undergraduate deferments would be placed, when their deferments ended, in the pool of men most vulnerable to a call-up. Thus theoretically, a person could no longer parlay his undergraduate deferments and subsequent graduate, occupational or parental deferments into a total exemption from military service.

The 1967 passed legislation, however, restricted the President's authority to institute a lottery by Executive Order without specific approval of Congress. This provision was included in the legislation in Conference—not in the legislation as it passed the House and Senate. The law also prohibited the President from ending undergraduate deferments. Also the law states that the President could, but is not required to, propose national standards for all registrants and it made their observance optional with local boards.

The law continued the President's authority to curtail or extend graduate occupational deferments. As you know in conjunction with this provision, President Johnson abolished on February 16, 1968 graduate student deferments except for medical, dental, and divinity students and suspended the lists of essential activities and critical occupations which formed the basis for about half of the occupational deferments.

Many individuals concerned with draft reform were not satisfied with the 1967 legislation. Educators, particularly, were critical of the fact that only medical, dental and divinity students would receive graduate student deferments. They predicted that graduate school enrollments would be cut in half for the 1968-1969 academic year, thus placing a huge financial burden on universities and sharply reducing the number of graduate students serving as undergraduate instructors. According to Harvard University President Nathan M. Pusey, the only persons entering graduate school in September 1968 would be "the lame, the halt, the blind and the female."

Another aspect of the 1967 law brought concern to the three major national service organizations—Peace Corps, VISTA, the Teachers Corps. Each depends to a great extent upon the services of men in the 20 to 25 age bracket—men who are highly vulnerable to the draft. The 1967 law provides that all men who received undergraduate student deferments would be placed when their deferments expired in the pool of those most vulnerable to a draft call-up.

More draftees were called in the first seven months of 1968 than in all of 1967. These demands forced local draft boards to be less generous in granting deferments—which they still had the power to do—for those men serving in the Peace Corps and other service organizations.

The greatest effect is on the Peace Corps

which had only lost seven reclassification cases from 1961 to December 1966. However, from the beginning of 1967 to June 1968, about 115 volunteers were reclassified 1-A. About 100 of these men were already overseas for the Corps. As of June 11, 1968 the Corps estimated it had a total of 490 serious draft problems. The effect of the 1967 draft law has not hurt VISTA or Teachers Corps to such an extent. Most local draft boards are still granting occupational deferments to the majority of volunteers for these two service organizations.

In light of this growing controversy, various proposals for draft reform have been offered. These proposals fall into two general categories: *Revision* of the Selective Service System and *Replacement* of the Selective Service System.

Proposals for revising the system include instituting a lottery induction system and another involves overhauling the administration of the system.

Under a lottery induction system ideas range from a pure lottery eliminating all deferments to a more limited form of lottery simply establishing the sequence of induction calls for men classified 1-A. The latter type of impartial random selection method is called by its proponents the best and most equitable system of inducting draft eligible men. Opponents of the lottery system argue that there is more merit and more equity in using date of birth to determine order since the 1-A pool fluctuates too rapidly to lend itself to a lottery.

Proponents of an overhaul of the administration of the draft laws argue that the present system is based on a rule of discretion, applied locally by more than 4,000 different groups following general guidelines. Its lack of uniformity is a consequence of a deliberate policy of decentralization. Proponents of reforming the administrative procedures say the fairest system must be based on impartial standards uniformly applied throughout the nation. This group presses for more centralized control under a national policy-forming headquarters. Policy would be administered by eight regional offices and followed by some 300 to 500 area offices. Opponents argue that the discretionary authority of local draft boards is essential because maximum flexibility is needed to protect individuals who have special problems and to provide local boards with authority to devote particular attention to such cases. They also say that more centralized control would lessen the confidence of local communities in the draft as any such non-personalized system would reduce the local boards to reporting agencies.

Replacement of the Selective Service System has many adherents. One replacement theory argues in favor of a volunteer army. Supporters claim that it would be a highly trained armed force having greater stability within units and higher morale. Those in favor of such an army would raise the pay to increase the number of volunteers. They also believe a volunteer army would be best equipped to handle the types of wars which this country may face in the future. Opponents say the nation must now, and in the foreseeable future, have a military manpower procurement system which includes the draft. They also predict the additional costs of a volunteer army will range from \$8.3 billion to \$16.7 billion. This group is fearful of a highly trained professional army which could establish itself as separate from civilian control. In addition, opponents contend that a volunteer army would consist primarily of black men and poor men.

Another replacement plan involves a universal military service. Although substantial support does not seem to exist for this proposal in and of itself, there have been a number of plans which combine universal military service with national service. Proponents say this system of service would provide the individual with the choice of mili-

tary or national service. However, it does include a lottery system for the military in the event that the number of volunteers for the armed forces do not meet the needs of the draft calls. Opponents argue that there is no military requirement for universal military training and that since no fair way exists, at least at present, to equate non-military with military service, national service cannot be considered an alternative to the draft. However, both proponents and opponents agree that such plans require further study and evaluation.

Most recent Congressional action relating to the draft focuses on the President's message to Congress on May 13, 1969. The President's proposal advocates six major points:

(1) Change from the oldest first to a youngest first order of call, so that a young man would become less vulnerable to the draft as he grows older.

(2) Reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability—and the uncertainty that accompanies it from 7 years to 1 year—so that a young man would normally enter that status during the time he was 19 years old and leave it during the time he was 20.

(3) Select those who are actually drafted through a random system. A procedure of this sort would distribute the risk of call equally—by lot—among all who are vulnerable during a given year, rather than arbitrarily selecting those whose birthdays happen to fall at a certain time of the year or the month.

(4) Continue the undergraduate student deferment, with the understanding that the year of maximum vulnerability would come whenever the deferment expired.

(5) Allow graduate students to complete, not just one term, but the full academic year during which they are first ordered for induction.

(6) In addition, as a step toward a more consistent policy of deferments and exemptions, the President asks the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to review all guidelines, standards, and procedures in this area and to report to the President their finding and recommendations.

The House Armed Services Committee, the Committee charged with considering these proposals announced that the President in fact already had the statutory authority, as contained in the 1967 draft law, to enable him to implement all the changes proposed by the Executive branch with the single exception of the suggestion to institute a random system of selection of inductees.

Hearings on the draft proposals were conducted by the House Armed Services Committee and the area of specific need for legislation was narrowed down to a single sentence in the Military Selective Service Act of 1967—Section 5(a)(2) of the act which prevents the President from instituting a truly random selection system because it will not permit the reversal of the practice of taking the oldest first in those of the prime age category in the draft pool at any given time.

The House of Representatives on October 30, 1969 passed by a record vote of 382 yeas to 13 nays the repeal of this section thereby permitting the President to establish a lottery system, whereby the risk of call would be distributed equally among all who are vulnerable during a given year.

The Senate now is faced with the passage of President Nixon's draft lottery measure this month. I am sure you have read news accounts relating that the President's proposal seems assured to pass as supporters of broader reform have agreed to wait until next year for further revisions. Faced with an ultimatum from the Senate Armed Services Committee to accept the lottery bill or nothing this year and given the promise of the Committee Chairman, John Stennis, to hold broad reform hearings before February 15,

many draft reformers, led in the Senate by Senator Edward Kennedy—agreed to go along.

Senator Kennedy has introduced legislation, S. 1145 to provide for draft reform. In introducing his legislation Senator Kennedy stated that his measure would "... make the Selective Service Act of our country fair, certain and flexible so that every person is treated equally, to insure that the administration of the Selective Service System will be uniform and predictable, so that every young man may know to the extent that is possible, when he will be called upon to serve in the Armed Forces and to provide a system sufficiently flexible to meet the manpower needs of the Nation. . . ."

More specifically the most significant features of Senator Kennedy's legislation are:

(1) It requires that the youngest—the 19 year olds—be drafted first.

(2) It requires use of random selection to select those young men to be drafted.

(3) It provides for a 3 year transitional period in establishing the random selection system from among the 19 year olds.

(4) It eliminates occupational deferments except where ordered by the President.

(5) It permits students to postpone their exposure to the draft during the course of bona fide study, but does not permit this postponement to become an exemption.

(6) It discontinues this postponement feature whenever casualties in a shooting war reach 10 percent of those drafted in a given month.

(7) It grants conscientious objector status to atheists and agnostics, so long as they are genuine pacifists, as well as to those whose objection is based on conventional religious training and belief.

(8) It requires the adoption of national standards and criteria in the administration of the draft law, and requires their uniform application.

(9) It prohibits use of the draft as a punishment for protest activities by limiting draft delinquency to acts relating to a registrant's own individual status.

(10) It permits judicial review of questions of law regarding classification proceedings, and permits use of habeas corpus proceedings, by those who comply with induction orders.

(11) It restores the role of the Justice Department in reviewing conscientious objector cases.

(12) It gives registrants the right to appear in draft board proceedings affecting them, and to be represented by counsel.

(13) It conforms our draft treatment of aliens to our treaty requirements, as recommended by the State Department.

(14) It limits the term of the Director of the Selective Service System to 6 years.

(15) It prohibits discrimination of any kind in the makeup of any selective service panels which determine an individual's draft status.

(16) It calls for a thorough public study of a National Service Corps, in which individuals seeking nonmilitary service might fulfill their obligation of service to the Nation.

(17) It calls for a thorough public study of all aspects of a volunteer army.

(18) It calls for a thorough public study of military youth opportunity schools, which would offer special educational and physical assistance to those falling below induction standards who desire to volunteer for military duty.

(19) It calls for a thorough public study of the ramifications of granting amnesty to those young men who fled the country rather than face the draft.

(20) It encourages use of civilians to replace military personnel in nonmilitary jobs.

(21) It closes a number of loopholes in the present law.

It can be seen then that Senator Kennedy has offered a comprehensive program for draft reform—a program which has been promised consideration by the Senate in

February. Until that time when more equitable legislation can be enacted, every proponent of draft reform will admit that the lottery system is far more just in its operation than the present system.

I support a thorough analysis of the various proposals. The time and climate of opinion is conducive to reform—I support a comprehensive study of draft proposals because more than any other single factor—the draft has become the symbol of the generation gap—a major source of friction between young people and those over 30.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROGRAM TO IMPROVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I support President Nixon's program for a new and improved system of criminal justice for the District of Columbia.

In this regard, the President has recommended improvements with respect to search warrants, providing for nighttime search warrants in situations where there is reasonable grounds to believe the search warrant cannot be executed otherwise.

For example, if the police in the evening receive information amounting to probable cause that stolen jewelry is in a certain apartment and that the stolen property will be moved before daylight, it is necessary that the police, after obtaining a valid search warrant, be able to execute it forthwith and not have to wait until the stolen property has disappeared.

The present rule in the District is that a search warrant can be executed at night only if the officer requesting the warrant is positive that the property is on the premises. This is an unrealistic test, because unless a police officer actually enters the premises and sees the property, he cannot really be positive the property is there.

The bill also provides authority for a judicial officer to issue a "no knock" search warrant. The judicial officer issuing a search warrant can authorize the police to enter the premises to be searched without giving notice of authority and purpose when there is probable cause to believe that the giving of such notice may endanger the safety of the executing officer or others.

The "no knock" search warrant would be of exceptional value in the District's efforts against organized narcotics traffic and organized gambling. Experience has shown that the time consumed by police officers in announcing their authority and purpose and waiting to be refused admittance is used by the dope peddler to dispose of his narcotics and by the gambler in destroying his work product.

I support the President's proposed procedures for nighttime search warrants and "no knock" search warrants. These provisions balance the individual's rights by requiring prior judicial approval with the need of the community to have efficient law enforcement.

MIGRANT CHILDREN AND TEACHERS LEARN TOGETHER IN OREGON

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, as part of the observance of American Education Week, it seems particularly appropriate to me to commend outstanding efforts being made to educate disadvantaged children.

For this reason, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article from the November issue of American Education written by John Guernsey, the education editor of the Portland Oregonian. Mr. Guernsey's article, "Rise and Shine," tells the story of an unusually successful migrant-teacher-training program being carried out in Oregon and devised by Theodore C. Brown, assistant professor of education at Eastern Oregon College. This program represents dedicated teachers at their finest.

The article follows:

RISE AND SHINE

It's four o'clock in the morning, and eight young teachers of migrant children are already on the job. Still yawning, they stumble out of their plywood huts and start rousing children out of nearby cabins. They help the youngsters get dressed and carry the little ones—still asleep—onto a waiting bus for the ride to school.

All day, these teachers grapple with the unique problems of migrant education. They help Spanish-speaking youngsters learn the English language. They design lessons for classes that have eight students one day and 20 the next. They search for tests that will tell them how to help a child most in the few weeks—or even days—before his family moves on to another work station.

At 10:30 in the evening—a long, hot day later—these teachers are still on the job, knocking on cabin doors and trying to convince a few more cropworker parents to let their very young children go to school and not to the fields. "Sustained fatigue, we call it," quips David Graham, who was more than willing to struggle through 16-hour workdays for the experience of living with the migrant families.

For Graham and seven other young teachers, living in the camp was the climax of an unusual migrant-teacher-training program devised by Theodore C. Brown, assistant professor of education at Eastern Oregon College. "You can't teach and help the migrant child by sitting in a classroom and waiting for someone to bring him or her in to you," he explains.

"You have to live with the migrants, understand their problems, convince parents of the need for school, and see to it that the children get there and then back to the labor camps at the end of the day," Brown stresses. "It is vital that you be there to get the children before their parents leave for the fields in the mornings. Otherwise, the family takes all the kids with them, and those not old enough to pick a berry sit in the dirt or in a hot car all day."

Brown himself spent about seven weeks this summer living with his wife and son in a cabin in the "Little Mexico" picker camp a few miles from North Plains, Ore. He first became interested in the problems of Mexican-Americans during a lengthy stay in Mexico and knows that many migrant-education programs miss their target. Often, there is a tragic communication gap: Too

many migrant teachers do not have a functional knowledge of Spanish and have little or no understanding of the special problems facing the migrant child or his culture. The problems are compounded by the fact that working with migrant children is strictly a summer job for many of the teachers. Such teachers seldom have a deep-rooted interest in the children's problems and their futures.

When Brown came to Eastern Oregon College, he was determined to train teachers who would not suffer from such shortcomings. In the spring of 1968 he developed a plan for a special migrant-education program, which the Federal Government funded with \$72,000 under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The next fall, students began enrolling in the year-long graduate program. A master's degree in education, a \$150 monthly stipend, and a lot of hard work and human understanding were in store for them.

It was not a program for the fainthearted: Brown made that clear from the first. Besides completing 48 hours of graduate study, the would-be migrant teachers were expected to take on inservice field work during the year and, at a moment's notice, do extra assignments like conferences and seminars on migrant education. On top of that, they would have to learn how to make do with bunk beds, hot plates, and outdoor water supplies while they lived in the migrant camp.

"The program was originally conceived," says Brown, "to attract young college graduates. But to our surprise, over 50 percent of the applicants were teachers with nearly 10 years of professional experience." They were people like David Graham, whose several years' experience in teaching migrants had convinced him he still had much to learn. Some were married, like Jim and Verla Holton, a husband-and-wife teaching team intensely interested in migrant education. Others, like Jo Helmick, a recent Portland State University graduate, grew concerned about migrants while tutoring on campus.

The Eastern Oregon program was demanding, even for dedicated volunteers. If the trainees weren't already conversant in Spanish, they had to become so. They had to familiarize themselves with all the latest techniques for teaching English as a second language and for remedial reading instruction. They studied linguistics itself, learning how a society develops patterns of prejudice through its language. "There are at least 100 synonyms for 'black' in English," Brown explains, "and almost all of them have rather sinister connotations. The opposite is true in Africa."

Instead of a master's thesis, each trainee took on an individual study project, defining a problem in migrant education and creating materials to correct it. David Graham, a former music teacher, went through migrant camps collecting Mexican-American folk songs and arranged them for schoolchildren. Gilbert Anzaldúa spent his time developing educational materials that honor manual labor, a source of great pride to most migrant workers. Another trainee worked out a bilingual preschool reading program based on one of the children's favorite tales, the legend of the Virgin of Guadalupe.

But the key to the Oregon program's success may be its emphasis on cultural anthropology. "A teacher of Mexican-Americans, especially migrants," says Brown, "does a great deal more than instruct children a few hours a day. She's bringing these youngsters into a new identification with the dominant culture in this country."

"You will be a bridge between two cultures," Brown tells his trainees. "You must honor the Mexican-American language and customs while introducing the children to new ways." While he doesn't claim to have a foolproof method to prepare teachers for this important and sensitive role, he believes that studying how other cultures—not just

Mexican-Americans—have made cultural transitions will help them a great deal. Courses taught by anthropologist Ed Hosley make up nearly half the graduate program.

Above all, Brown tried to develop in his trainees a real sense of empathy for the Mexican-American migrant. "They work hard to develop that all-important 'silent language,' that unspoken ability to reach a child, gain his confidence, and assure him that you're really in his corner."

But all the study was preliminary to the main event—living for seven weeks with the children and their families in the migrant camps. Brown had already assured the growers' cooperation by promising that his teachers would stay out of political activity while in the camps. Then he arranged for the graduate students to work with the North Plains school system, where superintendent Robert Warner had been running a successful migrant-education program for several years. Brown's trainees were to assist regular teachers in the North Plains schools, supervise recreation, and do chores like seeing that the migrants had transportation to medical, dental and other health care facilities.

The teachers and children arrived daily at school about 5 a.m. They had a fun hour, followed by breakfast. Then it was on with the school day—games, study, lunch, a nap, and more study, mostly practicing language.

There were three adults in each classroom—a North Plains teacher, a graduate student, and a Mexican-American aide. All three pitched in and helped teach, making small-group instruction possible. Verla Holton would work with two or three five-year-olds, repeating names of colors, fruits, foods, numbers, and concepts like over and under. She would read a story in Spanish, then ask them to tell it back in English. "First they've got to understand what they're talking about in Spanish," she explains.

David Graham's music classes were a bright spot each day. Graham brought his guitar, and the children gathered around and sang songs, many in Spanish. "At first they were a little reluctant to sing in Spanish," he recalls. "They didn't associate that language with school. But as soon as they realized it was all right, they enjoyed every one of those songs." Graham also teaches the children songs in the English language on the theory that they will pick up colloquial expressions quickly through singing. "It's the repetition that does it," he explains, "and it's so much more pleasant than drill."

All the time, the teacher trainees were carefully bridging the culture gap between themselves and the migrants. "We'd already learned that you can't judge a culture from the outside," Mrs. Holton explains. "You can't just go in and tell them to hurry, hurry, hurry and get ahead—as we do so often in our own culture."

Late in the afternoon it was back up the dusty road to the labor camp for the children and the trainees. As the old school bus—acquired from an armed services depot for outmoded equipment—rumbled along the road, the children sang "Turtle in the Swamp" or "Patito, Patito, Color de Cafe." Some of them were asleep in their cabins a short time after arrival. But the teachers were still on the job, talking with parents and helping out at the camp.

Brown is unmistakably proud of the job his young teachers did during their summer of "sustained fatigue." And his teachers are sold on the importance of living in camp and the rapport it builds between migrant children and teachers. After all, how can a child stand in awe of a teacher who comes to the door all tousled in the morning, or who tucks him in bed in her own cabin if it's too early to get ready for school?

The teacher trainees don't think the close association cost them the children's respect, either. Says Jo Helmick, "Even though they

knew me as 'Jo' in camp, they seemed to respect the authority I represented in the classroom."

After their summer experience, all the young teachers are more dedicated than ever to the cause of helping migrant children. All are either teaching in schools with migrant populations or have taken other positions where they can apply their new knowledge about migrants.

And the children they taught are better able to perform in the schools they're attending this fall because of their summer teachers. Each child took with him a detailed record of materials he has covered, his strengths and weaknesses, and other background information to help the new teacher pick up where the summer teacher left off.

This fall, Brown is back at Eastern Oregon College training a new crop of teachers to handle migrant education. The first year of the program has convinced him more than ever that although "empathy is an unteachable quality, it is essential for any teacher dealing with the disadvantaged. And traditional teacher training alone, which serves middle-class needs reasonably well, is simply not the pattern for training a teacher of the disadvantaged."

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT
AGNEW AT THE MID-WEST
REGIONAL REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE
MEETING

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is vital, if this Nation is to function in an orderly and progressive manner, that its people be fully and honestly advised of the activities of their Government and their leaders. Much of the responsibility for so informing the public rests with the news media—newspapers and similar publications, radio and television. Nearly all of these agencies take their responsibilities seriously. Not all, unhappily. Last Thursday evening, speaking at the Mid-West Regional Republican Committee meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, Vice President AGNEW commented upon the responsibilities of the Nation's television networks and how he believed they are meeting these responsibilities. I include Vice President AGNEW's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, MID-WEST
REGIONAL REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE MEETING,
DES MOINES, IOWA, NOVEMBER 13, 1969

Tonight I want to discuss the importance of the television news medium to the American people. No nation depends more on the intelligent judgment of its citizens. No medium has a more profound influence over public opinion. Nowhere in our system are there fewer checks on vast power. So, nowhere should there be more conscientious responsibility exercised than by the news media. To question is . . . are we demanding enough of our television news presentations? . . . And, are the men of this medium demanding enough of themselves?

Monday night, a week ago, President Nixon delivered the most important address of his Administration, one of the most important of our decade. His subject was Vietnam. His hope was to rally the American people to see the conflict through to a lasting and just peace in the Pacific. For thirty-two minutes, he reasoned with a nation that has suffered

almost a third of a million casualties in the longest war in its history.

When the President completed his address—an address that he spent weeks in preparing—his words and policies were subjected to instant analysis and querulous criticism. The audience of seventy million Americans—gathered to hear the President of the United States—was inherited by a small band of network commentators and self-appointed analysts, the majority of whom expressed, in one way or another, their hostility to what he had to say.

It was obvious that their minds were made up in advance. Those who recall the fumbling and groping that followed President Johnson's dramatic disclosure of his intention not to seek reelection have seen these men in a genuine state of non-preparedness. This was not it.

One commentator twice contradicted the President's statement about the exchange of correspondence with Ho Chi Minh. Another challenged the President's abilities as a politician. A third asserted that the President was now "following the Pentagon line." Others, by the expressions on their faces, the tone of their questions, and the sarcasm of their responses, made clear their sharp disapproval.

To guarantee in advance that the President's plea for national unity would be challenged, one network trotted out Averell Harriman for the occasion. Throughout the President's address he waited in the wings. When the President concluded, Mr. Harriman recited perfectly. He attacked the Thieu Government as unrepresentative; he criticized the President's speech for various deficiencies; he twice issued a call to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to debate Vietnam once again; he stated his belief that the Viet Cong or North Vietnamese did not really want a military take-over of South Vietnam; he told a little anecdote about a "very, very responsible" fellow he had met in the North Vietnamese delegation.

All in all, Mr. Harriman offered a broad range of gratuitous advice—challenging and contradicting the policies outlined by the President of the United States. Where the President had issued a call for unity, Mr. Harriman was encouraging the country not to listen to him.

A word about Mr. Harriman. For ten months he was America's chief negotiator at the Paris Peace Talks—a period in which the United States swapped some of the greatest military concessions in the history of warfare for an enemy agreement on the shape of a bargaining table. Like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, Mr. Harriman seems to be under some heavy compulsion to justify his failures to anyone who will listen. The networks have shown themselves willing to give him all the air time he desires.

Every American has a right to disagree with the President of the United States, and to express publicly that disagreement.

But the President of the United States has a right to communicate directly with the people who elected him, and the people of this country have the right to make up their own minds and form their own opinions about a Presidential address without having the President's words and thoughts characterized through the prejudices of hostile critics before they can even be digested.

When Winston Churchill rallied public opinion to stay the course against Hitler's Germany, he did not have to contend with a gaggle of commentators raising doubts about whether he was reading public opinion right, or whether Britain had the stamina to see the war through. When President Kennedy rallied the Nation in the Cuban Missile Crisis, his address to the people was not chewed over by a round-table of critics who disparaged the course of action he had asked America to follow.

The purpose of my remarks tonight is to

focus your attention on this little group of men who not only enjoy a right of instant rebuttal to every Presidential address, but more importantly, wield a free hand in selecting, presenting and interpreting the great issues of our Nation.

First, let us define that power. At least forty million Americans each night, it is estimated, watch the network news. Seven million of them view ABC; the remainder being divided between NBC and CBS. According to Harris polls and other studies, for millions of Americans the networks are the sole source of national and world news.

In Will Roger's observation, what you knew was what you read in the newspaper. Today, for growing millions of Americans, it is what they see and hear on their television sets.

How is this network news determined? A small group of men, numbering perhaps no more than a dozen "anchors," commentators and executive producers, settle upon the 20 minutes or so of film and commentary that is to reach the public. This selection is made from the 90 to 180 minutes that may be available. Their powers of choice are broad. They decide what forty to fifty million Americans will learn of the day's events in the Nation and the world.

We cannot measure this power and influence by traditional democratic standards for these men can create national issues overnight. They can make or break—by their coverage and commentary—a Moratorium on the war. They can elevate men from local obscurity to national prominence within a week. They can reward some politicians with national exposure and ignore others. For millions of Americans, the network reporter who covers a continuing issue, like ABM or Civil Rights, becomes in effect, the presiding judge in a national trial by jury.

It must be recognized that the networks have made important contributions to the national knowledge. Through news, documentaries and specials, they have often used their power constructively and creatively to awaken the public conscience to critical problems.

The networks made "hunger" and "black lung" disease national issues overnight. The TV networks have done what no other medium could have done in terms of dramatizing the horrors of war. The networks have tackled our most difficult social problems with a directness and immediacy that is the gift of their medium. They have focused the nation's attention on its environmental abuses. . . . on pollution in the Great Lakes and the threatened ecology of the Everglades.

But it was also the networks that elevated Stokely Carmichael and George Lincoln Rockwell from obscurity to national prominence . . . nor is their power confined to the substantive.

A raised eyebrow, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark dropped in the middle of a broadcast can raise doubts in a million minds about the veracity of a public official or the wisdom of a government policy.

One Federal Communications Commissioner considers the power of the networks to equal that of local, state and federal governments combined. Certainly, it represents a concentration of power over American public opinion unknown in history.

What do Americans know of the men who wield this power? Of the men who produce and direct the network news—the nation knows practically nothing. Of the commentators, most Americans know little, other than that they reflect an urbane and assured presence, seemingly well informed on every important matter.

We do know that, to a man, these commentators and producers live and work in the geographical and intellectual confines of Washington, D.C. or New York City—the latter of which James Reston terms the

"most unrepresentative community in the entire United States." Both communities bask in their own provincialism, their own parochialism. We can deduce that these men thus read the same newspapers, and draw their political and social views from the same sources. Worse, they talk constantly to one another, thereby providing artificial reinforcement to their shared viewpoints.

Do they allow their biases to influence the selection and presentation of the news? David Brinkley states, "objectivity is impossible to normal human behavior." Rather, he says, we should strive for "fairness."

Another anchorman on a network news show contends: "You can't expunge all your private convictions just because you sit in a seat like this and a camera starts to stare at you. . . . I think your program has to reflect what your basic feelings are. I'll plead guilty to that."

Less than a week before the 1968 election, this same commentator charged that President Nixon's campaign commitments were no more durable than campaign balloons. He claimed that, were it not for fear of a hostile reaction, Richard Nixon would be giving into, and I quote the commentator, "His natural instinct to smash the enemy with a club or go after him with a meat axe."

Had this slander been made by one political candidate about another, it would have been discussed by most commentators as a partisan assault. But this attack emanated from the privileged sanctuary of a network studio and therefore had the apparent dignity of an objective statement.

The American people would rightly not tolerate this kind of concentration of power in government. Is it not fair and relevant to question its concentration in the hands of a tiny and closed fraternity of privileged men, elected by no one, and enjoying a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by government?

The views of this fraternity do not represent the views of America. That is why such a great gulf existed between how the nation received the President's address—and how the networks reviewed it.

As with other American institutions, perhaps it is time that the networks were made more responsive to the views of the nation and more responsible to the people they serve.

I am not asking for government censorship or any other kind of censorship. I am asking whether a form of censorship already exists when the news that forty million Americans receive each night is determined by a handful of men responsible only to their corporate employers and filtered through a handful of commentators who admit to their own set of biases.

The questions I am raising here tonight should have been raised by others long ago. They should have been raised by those Americans who have traditionally considered the preservation of freedom of speech and freedom of the press their special provinces of responsibility and concern. They should have been raised by those Americans who share the view of the late Justice Learned Hand that "right conclusions are more likely to be gathered out of a multitude of tongues than through any kind of authoritative selection."

Advocates for the networks have claimed a first amendment right to the same unlimited freedoms held by the great newspapers of America.

The situations are not identical. Where the New York Times reaches 800,000 people, NBC reaches twenty times that number with its evening news. Nor can the tremendous impact of seeing television film and hearing commentary be compared with reading the printed page.

A decade ago, before the network news acquired such dominance over public opinion, Walter Lippman spoke to the issue: "There

is an essential and radical difference," he stated, "between television and printing. . . . The three or four competing television stations control virtually all that can be received over the air by ordinary television sets. But, besides the mass circulation dailies, there are the weeklies, the monthlies, the out-of-town newspapers, and books. If a man does not like his newspaper, he can read another from out of town, or wait for a weekly news magazine. It is not ideal. But it is infinitely better than the situation in television. There, if a man does not like what the networks offer him, all he can do is turn them off, and listen to a phonograph."

"Networks," he stated, "which are few in number, have a virtual monopoly of a whole medium of communication." The newspapers of mass circulation have no monopoly of the medium of print.

"A virtual monopoly of a whole medium of communication" is not something a democratic people should blithely ignore.

And we are not going to cut off our television sets and listen to the phonograph because the air waves do not belong to the networks; they belong to the people.

As Justice Byron White wrote in his landmark opinion six months ago, "It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."

It is argued that this power presents no danger in the hands of those who have used it responsibly.

But as to whether or not the networks have abused the power they enjoy, let us call as our first witnesses, former Vice President Humphrey and the City of Chicago.

According to Theodore H. White, television's intercutting of the film from the streets of Chicago with the "current proceedings on the floor of the convention created the most striking and false political picture of 1968—the nomination of a man for the American Presidency by the brutality and violence of merciless police."

If we are to believe a recent report of the House Commerce Committee, then television's presentation of the violence in the streets worked an injustice on the reputation of the Chicago police.

According to the Committee findings, one network in particular presented "a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protestors." Film of provocations of police that was available never saw the light of day, while the film of the police response which the protestors provoked was shown to millions.

Another network showed virtually the same scene of violence—from three separate angles—without making clear it was the same scene.

While the full report is reticent in drawing conclusions, it is not a document to inspire confidence in the fairness of the network news.

Our knowledge of the impact of network news on the national mind is far from complete. But some early returns are available. Again, we have enough information to raise serious questions about its effect on a democratic society.

Several years ago, Fred Friendly, one of the pioneers of network news, wrote that its missing ingredients were "conviction, controversy and a point of view." The networks have compensated with a vengeance.

And in the networks' endless pursuit of controversy, we should ask what is the end value . . . to enlighten or to profit? What is the end result . . . to inform or to confuse? How does the on-going exploration for more action, more excitement, more drama, serve our national search for internal peace and stability?

Gresham's law seems to be operating in the network news.

Bad news drives out good news. The irrational is more controversial than the ra-

tional. Concurrence can no longer compete with dissent. One minute of Eldridge Cleaver is worth ten minutes of Roy Wilkins. The labor crisis settled at the negotiating table is nothing compared to the confrontation that results in a strike—or, better yet, violence along the picket line. Normality has become the nemesis of the evening news.

The upshot of all this controversy is that a narrow and distorted picture of America often emerges from the televised news. A single dramatic piece of the mosaic becomes, in the minds of millions, the whole picture. The American who relies upon television for his news might conclude that the majority of American students are embittered radicals, that the majority of black Americans feel no regard for their country; that violence and lawlessness are the rule, rather than the exception, on the American campus. None of these conclusions is true.

Television may have destroyed the old stereotypes—but has it not created new ones in their place?

What has this passionate pursuit of "controversy" done to the politics of progress through logical compromise, essential to the functioning of a democratic society?

The members of Congress or the Senate who follow their principles and philosophy quietly in a spirit of compromise are unknown to many Americans—while the loudest and most extreme dissenters on every issue are known to every man in the street.

How many marches and demonstrations would we have if the marchers did not know that the ever-faithful TV cameras would be there to record their antics for the next news show?

We have heard demands that Senators and Congressmen and Judges make known all their financial connections—so that the public will know who and what influences their decisions or votes. Strong arguments can be made for that view. But when a single commentator or producer, night after night, determines for millions of people how much of each side of a great issue they are going to see and hear; should he not first disclose his personal views on the issue as well?

In this search for excitement and controversy, has more than equal time gone to that minority of Americans who specialize in attacking the United States, its institutions and its citizens?

Tonight, I have raised questions. I have made no attempt to suggest answers. These answers must come from the media men. They are challenged to turn their critical powers on themselves. They are challenged to direct their energy, talent and conviction toward improving the quality and objectivity of news presentation. They are challenged to structure their own civic ethics to relate their great freedom with their great responsibility.

And the people of America are challenged too . . . challenged to press for responsible news presentations. The people can let the networks know that they want their news straight and objective. The people can register their complaints on bias through mail to the networks and phone calls to local stations. This is one case where the people must defend themselves . . . where the citizen—not government—must be the reformer . . . where the consumer can be the most effective crusader.

By way of conclusion, let me say that every elected leader in the United States depends on these men of the media. Whether what I have said to you tonight will be heard and seen at all by the nation is not my decision; it is not your decision; it is their decision.

In tomorrow's edition of the Des Moines Register you will be able to read a news story detailing what I said tonight; editorial comment will be reserved for the editorial page, where it belongs. Should not the same

wall of separation exist between news and comment on the nation's network?

We would never trust such power over public opinion in the hands of an elected government—it is time we questioned it in the hands of a small and un-elected elite. The great networks have dominated America's airwaves for decades; the people are entitled to a full accounting of their stewardship.

GREEN RAPS NIXON POLICIES

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, there are many of us on both sides of the aisle who have diligently worked for decentralization of our Federal Government, with the thought that Government should be close to the people.

We were led to believe that President Nixon would pursue this policy in his administration.

Unfortunately, just the reverse has been the case thus far.

I call your attention to an interview with the Dallas regional director of Health, Education, and Welfare as printed in the Dallas Times-Herald of November 9.

The appointment of this new director, Mr. Charles Green, a man of well-known administrative ability and personal integrity, met with the approval of the entire community.

But in this interview Mr. Green bemoans the fact that all decisions, of whatever nature, come out of Washington and that his office is nothing more than a figurehead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and all Members will read this article in its entirety as I am placing it in the RECORD at this point.

But of what avail is it to attract men of unusual capacity and dedication into Government if all decisions are to be made by a small coterie of brain trusters surrounding the President?

The article follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Nov. 9, 1969]

GREEN RAPS NIXON POLICIES

(By Ron Calhoun)

Charles C. Green has been regional director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for two months now, and he is still trying to figure out what it is he is supposed to direct.

Now he is "deflated."

"There isn't any real role for the regional director. I can't even hire and fire. All the decisions are made in Washington."

Green had never worked in government before. He came to the job from the Dallas business and professional ranks with high hopes of getting something done.

Now he is "deflated."

He is still waiting for the Nixon administration to follow through with its promise to "decentralize" the bureaucracy and give his job some meaning.

To put it plainly, he wants the power to deal with local and state officials who are seeking participation in any one of 300 HEW programs on a decisionmaking basis without having to go through Washington red tape.

It should be the HEW secretary's function

in Washington to set forth policies and guidelines and review the regional directors' decisions, Green said.

When Dallas Mayor Erik Jonsson seeks federal funds, he usually goes straight to the power—in Washington, D.C. Other mayors of major cities do the same, Green points out.

"If I were in their shoes, I would be doing the same thing," Green said. "Washington is where the decisions are made."

Too often, Green said, this leaves the regional director twiddling his thumbs. Too often, this means the regional director is the last to know when major decisions affecting local problems are made.

"In business, I always had the philosophy that the man closest to the problem should be the one to solve it," he said.

A Republican and associate of Nixon-backer Sam Wily, Green, 48, was selected by the President in early September to replace Dallas banker James H. Bond as HEW regional director.

Bond, a Democrat and multimillionaire with a variety of business interests, had been accused in some circles of not devoting enough time to the federal position which he had held since the founding of HEW back in the Eisenhower years.

Green has found out why Bond didn't spend more time around the office.

The office, Green said, could function just as well without any director at all. "He would never be missed."

Green has been too active in the business and professional worlds to sit back and become a figurehead at any job.

The youngest of eight children, he started earning his way early as a janitor in his high school in Neodesha, Kans. He hitch-hiked to college and held down a variety of jobs and served in World War II before gaining his master's degree in business education at Kansas State College.

He taught for four years after graduation and then went to work for Sinclair Oil Co. as a clerk. After five years he had risen to the position of assistant controller.

He left Sinclair for Gulf Oil Co. in Houston as director of economics and costs. Then he came to Dallas as an economist in the research and development for Lone Star Gas Co.

His tenure with Lone Star Gas didn't end on a happy note, but he eventually found the sweet smell of success with Wily, the youthful Dallas computer whiz and GOP stalwart. Green became president of Bonanza Inc., a steakhouse franchising firm, which operated several subsidiary businesses. Wily was the majority stockholder in Bonanza.

"I'm not about to sit behind this desk and do nothing," Green said of his new job.

"Moving the government structure around is a hard, slow process," he said, but added that the President and the HEW secretary, Robert Finch, could change things "with the stroke of a pen" and put into action what Nixon has termed the "new federalism"—cooperation among the federal, state and local governments.

As regional director, he is supposed to administer some 10,000 employees working in HEW offices and on HEW projects in Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana and New Mexico.

The region represents a \$3 billion-per-year business of federal largess and services, ranging from grants to colleges to Headstart programs.

In his office, he has found "a bunch of dedicated, capable career employees" and "a tremendous opportunity for impact."

"I have a great deal of motivation to do something useful," he said. "But unless the decentralization concept gets the full weight of the President and the secretary, there's not a lot I can do—except maybe keep up the morale of the employees."

A FELICITOUS FESTIVAL

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives I would like to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the October 22 issue of the Chief, a civil service weekly newspaper established in 1897 in the city of New York.

The editorial, "A Felicitous Festival," praises Mayor Lindsay's City Hall Festival, a program of lunch hour entertainment for civil service employees and others who work in the city hall area. Staged monthly from June to September in City Hall Plaza, the concerts are attended by thousands of civil service employees who work in Federal, State, and municipal agencies near city hall.

The City Hall Festival was started by the mayor in 1967 of no cost to the taxpayer. The festival enlisted the support of such community-minded business firms in the area as Bankers Trust Co., Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., Chemical Bank, Dun-Bradstreet, Inc., First National City Bank, Irving Trust Co., Modell's-Davega Stores, Serial Federal Savings & Loan Association of New York, and Charles P. Young Co.

The festival is produced by Oscar Kanny who featured such personalities as Duke Ellington, Alan King, Pearl Bailey, Tony Bennett, Richard Rodgers, Ed Sullivan, Dionne Warwick, Jack Carter, Robert Merrill, Regina Resnik, and Ray Bloch, Enoch Light, Tito Puente, and Clark Terry and their orchestras. Mr. Kanny is director of Public Information of the New York City Housing Authority.

The editorial ending with the following suggestion:

This city and, in fact this country needs more public assemblages of this description. We trust that the festival will be continued for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that the program will be noted and emulated by Federal, State, and municipal officials throughout the country for the enjoyment of their dedicated civil service employees.

A FELICITOUS FESTIVAL

Picketing, demonstrations, parades, official receptions, and entertainment programs have become weekly, if not daily occurrences in City Hall Plaza or on City Hall's perimeter in recent years. But one of the healthiest and most worthwhile series of public presentations has been the City Hall Summer Festival of lunchhour musical and dramatic programs for the entertainment of civil service employees and other employed or visiting in lower Manhattan.

This year, the Festival, in its second season, featured tributes to Alan King, Duke Ellington, Tito Puente, and Tony Bennett with each one of these showbusiness luminaries performing his specialty. Endorsed by Mayor Lindsay, who usually attended personally to extend the city's greetings to the

guest performer, the programs provided mid-day pleasure and relaxation to thousands of persons.

More important, they fostered a spirit of goodwill and comradery among civil service employees and other New Yorkers of all races, colors, and creeds as they sat or stood shoulder to shoulder waiting for a chance to applaud and cheer.

Oscar Kanny, Public Information Director of the Housing Authority, who conceived and promoted the idea, deserves the thanks of all those who saw and heard the Festival programs. The Mayor and other city officials, along with the entertainers who gave freely of their time and talents and the downtown business firms who underwrote the series, also deserve plaudits. This city and, in fact, this country needs more public assemblages of this description. We trust the Festival will be continued for many years to come.

PLANNING FOR THE SECOND AMERICA

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, John Fischer in his essay that appears in the November 1969 issue of Harper's magazine discusses the need for wise and comprehensive planning in anticipation of reliable forecast of tremendous growth of population in the United States by the year 2000. Mr. Fischer calls it "Planning for the Second America."

I am particularly impressed by Mr. Fischer's exposition because I have recently returned from an overseas trip in my capacity as chairman of the Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee to view development of "new towns" in the United Kingdom, Finland, West Berlin, West Germany, and Israel. The developments in those countries are remarkable. My judgment is that we could do as well or better in the United States. Mr. Speaker we have been paralyzed by such scare phrases as "planning is socialism" and false warnings that planning is incompatible with our mixed economy. We are now paying the price in the form of our restless and distorted urban areas—and our rural areas, too. I recommend that we all would benefit by reading Mr. Fischer's wise and civilized thoughts. The article follows:

PLANNING FOR THE SECOND AMERICA
(By John Fischer)

If General Electric expected to double its plant capacity and office space within the next thirty years, you can be sure it would assign a platoon of its ablest executives to figure out the best way to do it. In fact, General Electric almost certainly is doing that right now. I have talked to some of its planning officers, who were (for obvious reasons) discrete about their specific projects, but they were candid enough about their job operations in general. Their job is to answer questions about the future. When will a new factory be needed—for radios, refrigerators, or some entirely novel product? What should be its initial capacity, and how much allowance should we make for expansion? How shall we raise the money? Where should it be built—taking into account the location of markets, labor supply, raw materials, rail and highway networks, the quality of local

schools, and dozens of similar considerations? Such inquiries, for example, underlay the company's decision to build a \$250-million manufacturing and distribution center at the new town of Columbia, Maryland; within ten years it is expected to employ 12,000 people.

In such long-range planning, General Electric is not remarkable. It is simply following sound business practice. Every enterprise of any consequence has a professional staff at work on its plans for future growth. Every enterprise, that is, except the United States of America.

Within the next thirty years, this country can expect to double the physical plant of all its cities. To take care of the predicted growth in population, it needs to build a new house, school, and office building for every one that now exists. It will need twice as many parking lots, universities, bus lines, jails, garbage dumps, airports, and bars. For the number of Americans almost certainly will rise from about 200 million to 300 million before the end of the century; and virtually all of the new people will live in cities. Indeed, our long-dwindling rural population probably will shrink still further, as displaced farmers continue to move to the metropolises. This means that we face the job of building a Second America—of duplicating all of our man-made assets—within a single generation. What our forebears did in three hundred years, we have to do in thirty. Such is the inescapable arithmetic of the population explosion.¹

The task probably is not impossible. A nation which can explore the moon ought to be able to tend to its own housekeeping, if it sets its mind to it. The odd thing is that, up until now, we haven't. During the years when we were cheerfully spending \$23 billion on outer space, we spent peanuts on the space we have to live in. Even today thousands of talented people are busy planning what to do on the moon, but no agency of government is planning the Second America. Nowhere in Washington can you find anybody who is responsible for figuring out where those 100 million extra people are going to live, how they will get to work, or who will put roofs over their heads.

Many agencies—indeed, far too many—are fiddling with bits and pieces of the problem; but they work at cross purposes, because they have no common goal. Neither the White House nor Congress has set forth an overall policy to guide them. No one in authority has said, "Here is the blueprint. This is what we want the United States to look like thirty years from now. Every one of you bureaucrats, from the county farm agents to the Atomic Energy Commission, is hereby directed to work to this pattern. Your first responsibility is to make sure that we reach these national goals by the end of the century."

Such a blueprint actually exists. It is traced out, in considerable detail and with hundreds of pages of supporting data, in four recently published books. The goals they set are clear, sensible, and well within the country's capacity. They are proposed by some of the best minds in America, after many months of argument and grinding labor. So far, of course, the plan has not been accepted by either Congress or the President. (I doubt whether Mr. Nixon has even read the books, although Daniel P. Moynihan and some of his other aides certainly have.) Under our habits of government, it cannot be accepted in Washington until it has been

¹ People who enjoy arithmetic can find the detailed figures in two recent publications of the Census Bureau: *Projection of the Population of the United States by Age, Sex, and Color to 1990, with Extensions of Population by Age and Sex to 2015 and Projections of the Population of Metropolitan Areas: 1975.*

thoroughly discussed throughout the country, and has won a considerable degree of public assent. This process has not even started, because the four books are practically unknown to the public at large. So far as I know, not one of them has been reviewed by the *New York Times* or any other major newspaper, though they have had casual mention in a few news stories. But they will not be ignored forever; on the contrary, they are likely to become central texts for the political debate of the coming decade, because they deal with issues which will shape the lives of all of us, and our children.

The books which comprise *The Plan* were produced by a curious, and uniquely American, process. It would be an exaggeration to call them underground publications, but they were created so quietly that they almost look surreptitious.

Until quite recently, the American credo held that planning was just dandy for businessmen, but was forbidden to politicians and civil servants. Public planning was regarded as a sin, indulged in by godless Communists but unthinkable for any right-minded American. This dogma was formally proclaimed some thirty years ago, when President Roosevelt tried to set up a National Resources Planning Board, on the theory that it might be useful to know what assets we had and how they were being used. The elderly conservatives who then dominated Congress promptly denounced the Board as subversive, cut off its money, and drove some of its staff into political exile. This ruthless lesson was enough to make prudent bureaucrats shun the very word "planning" for decades to come.

Nevertheless many people in government realized that some planning was necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business, just as it is for private enterprise. Their problem was how to go about it without attracting the malevolent attention of the Eastlands, Goldwaters, and House Un-American Activities Committee. A customary solution—imperfect, but better than none—is to work behind a political heat shield: a commission.

Almost anybody can set up a commission. Usually it is appointed by the White House, but on occasion it may be created by a Cabinet member, a Congressional committee, a foundation, or by some convocation of mayors or governors. Its chairman is a more-or-less eminent citizen without political ambitions, and therefore not too nervous about criticism; his fellow commissioners ordinarily are obscure characters, vaguely described as "experts." Since it is a quasi-official body, it can be financed with tax money, or in a pinch by foundation grants—usually enough to hire a highly competent staff. Such a commission is directed to study some question—almost always a politically ticklish one—and to come up with recommendations. If these recommendations turn out to be palatable, they can be adopted, with hosannas, by the original sponsor. If not, they can be repudiated or ignored.

Occasionally a commission produces immediate results, as in the case of the Hoover Commission which led in 1949 to a useful overhaul of the executive branch. More often a commission's findings will sound so radical, or expensive, that neither legislators nor executive agencies will dare to touch them right away. Nevertheless the findings—and the thousands of pages of testimony and studies on which they are based—are now in the public domain. With luck, they will attract the attention of academics and maybe a few journalists; they will be referred to in books and Congressional debates; and so their once-startling propositions gradually become familiar. At that point they may be ripe for political action. Thus, for example, President Nixon's recent recommendations for reform of the welfare sys-

tem are the outgrowth of suggestions put forth years earlier in half a dozen commission reports.

So it is with the four books which outline a plan to accommodate the country's next 100 million people. They are reports of commissions (although one calls itself a committee). While these groups worked independently of each other, their ideas are remarkably similar; and the recommendations of each one tend to complement and reinforce the recommendations of all the others. Nobody intended that their reports should thus fit together to form a reasonably coherent scheme of action—but it isn't altogether coincidence, either. You might say that the pieces fell into that pattern because the spirit of the times demands it; or, more prosaically, that when intelligent men stare long enough at the same body of facts, they are likely to arrive at similar conclusions. As usual, most of the politicians who are aware of these conclusions have greeted them with wary, not to say stunned, silence. It will take a little time yet for them to become commonplaces of political discourse.

Only one of the reports is likely to be read in its original form by any substantial number of ordinary people. Entitled *The New City*, it is the product of the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy. It was brought out last August in an attractive format, with plenty of pictures, by a commercial publisher, Praeger (\$12.50), and is available through bookstores; moreover, it was edited by Donald Canty, a professional writer-editor. The other three reports were published by the Government Printing Office in its usual drab style; they have to be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents; and they are written for the most part in the Late American Mandarin dialect which is now standard with bureaucrats and social scientists. Consequently their ideas are not likely to reach many readers, aside from determined urbanologists, until they are available in translation.

All I can attempt in this space is to indicate the main thrust of their argument. Each of the commissions concluded independently that it would be a hideous—and expensive—mistake to force the next 100 million Americans to live in our present cities. Yet that is precisely where they will end up, if present trends are permitted to continue. Already two-thirds of our population is living in some 230-odd metropolitan areas: cities of 50,000 and more, together with their suburbs. According to the Census Bureau projections mentioned earlier, virtually all of the anticipated increase will crowd into those same cities unless we do something to divert it elsewhere. Not because everybody wants to live up that way.² People are being pushed in that direction by government policies of long standing—the farm program, the welfare system, the location of science centers, the obsolete rules for building public housing and insuring home mortgages, the way government contracts are let. None of these policies was meant to shove people into the already clotted-up metropolitan centers. Each of them was originally

² Jane Jacobs does, and a certain number of kindred souls who believe the boondocks begin just west of the Hudson. But a Gallup poll taken last year indicated that 56 per cent of the people questioned would prefer to live, if they could, on farms or in small towns rather than in a metropolis. Moreover, the steady movement from the core cities to the suburbs demonstrates that a considerable additional percentage yearns to get as far away from downtown as possible. Although sociologists, novelists, and urban intellectuals have been excoriating suburbia for the last thirty years, it still looks like the promised land to a growing number of Americans.

devised for an entirely different, and well-intended, purposes. Only belatedly did it become apparent that they are, as an unexpected by-product, influencing the direction of future growth—and that the cumulative result may well be a national disaster.

How this works is explained in two of the reports: one by the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, the other by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The first was a temporary *ad hoc* group appointed by President Johnson; he did not like its findings, presumably because they were critical of measures to which he was committed, such as the oil-depletion allowance and the subsidy of rich farmers. For months of reports (*The People Left Behind*) lay buried in the White House and might never have been released, if it had not leaked inadvertently to the press. The other commission is a permanent body established ten years ago as a joint enterprise of federal, state, and local governments. In its quiet way it has been doing some of the most hard-headed and farsighted planning ever undertaken in this country, and has issued more than forty reports, many of them highly technical.

The most important of these (in my opinion, at least) appeared in 1968 under the title *Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth*. It not only presents a reasoned criticism of the country's present policies—or non-policies—but also sets forth an array of alternatives. That fourth book, *Building the American City*, is better known as the Douglas Report, after Paul H. Douglas, former Senator from Illinois and chairman of the Commission on Urban Problems. It is the longest (more than 500 pages) and offers the most detailed diagnosis of the cities' ills, together with prescriptions for curing them.

Anyone who reads the four reports together quickly realizes that they are revolutionary documents—perhaps as revolutionary as anything published in this country since *The Federalist* papers. They demand nothing less than a reshaping of American institutions—the whole web of local governments, the tax system, the labor unions, the welfare programs, and many another hallowed relic—and they make such a compelling case that the reader is likely to find he has become a revolutionist himself before he reaches the last page.

The most dramatic proposals are those designed to channel our growing population away from Megalopolis. This is a prime goal of all four commissions, although each of them approaches it in a different way.

The New City recommends the building of 110 new communities within the next thirty years, to provide homes and jobs for 20 million people. Ten of them would be cities of at least one million population; the rest would average about 100,000 each. The Rural Poverty Commission in its report, *The People Left Behind*, puts more emphasis on encouraging the growth of existing small towns, especially in those parts of the country such as Appalachia, the South, and the Midwest which have been sending the most migrants to the big cities. Many a shabby and discouraged village of, say, 5,000 people can be converted into a thriving and attractive community of 50,000 to 100,000, if the right steps are taken to bring in new industries.³

Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth endorses both of these strategies. They supplement each other, and both are clearly needed since the proposed new cities would take care of only a fifth of the added population. But this study, like the Douglas Report, also devotes considerable

³ For a case history of such a transformation, see "The Lazarus Twin in Pennsylvania: How Scranton and Wilkes-Barre Are Rising From the Dead" in the November 1968, issue of *Harper's*.

attention to the things which have to be done to make our present big cities livable and governable. All four recommend the setting up of a new and muscular arm of government to handle the detailed planning for future growth, and to see that the plans are carried out. (Mr. Nixon's Council for Urban Affairs, headed by Pat Moynihan, might well evolve into just such an agency.)

My first reaction to this Grand Design was skepticism. It sounds great, all right, but isn't it too grandiose to be practical and how could the country ever pay for it?

As I prodded deeper into the assembled evidence, however, my skepticism began to erode. I ended up convinced not only that the plan is feasible, but that it probably will be achieved in large part before the end of the century. Moreover, this undertaking could turn out to be more exciting than the exploration of space—and far more likely to enlist the enthusiastic commitment of alienated young people.

Cost is not so big an obstacle as it might seem. The new cities should pay for themselves; indeed, they might actually return a profit to the public purse. And in any case, most of the capital would come from private investors rather than the taxpayers.

That is one of the lessons we have learned from Western Europe, where new cities are an old story. Great Britain, for instance, already has built fourteen of them, providing homes and close-at-hand jobs for half a million people. They have proved so successful, both socially and economically, that fourteen more are now in the works. The latest of these, announced only last January, will be the most ambitious new city yet undertaken; eventually it alone will accommodate a half-million people and the total population of the twenty-eight projects should reach three million. The experience of Finland, Sweden, and Holland with similar projects has been equally encouraging.

Our own experience has been encouraging too, although few people realize it. For new communities are also an old story in America—so old it has been largely forgotten. Every schoolchild learns that Washington, D.C., was designed from scratch by Major L'Enfant. But how many know that he also planned Paterson, N.J. in 1791 as a new city sponsored by the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures? Or that Marietta, Ohio, Salt Lake City, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Winston-Salem all originated as new towns, to mention only a sampling out of dozens of such ventures?

Most of these were started before the Civil War, when cheap land was plentiful, by private corporations or religious sects. A few more were built with government money during the Depression years, when private capital was hard to come by: notably Norris, Tennessee, and three so-called "Greenbelt Towns" near Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and Washington, D.C. They served as proving grounds for new ideas in design—the super-block, cluster housing, the separation of auto and pedestrian traffic—which eventually were widely adopted by private developers. At the time, however, they brewed up a storm of irrational emotion, which I had a chance to observe at first hand, because I worked for a couple of years with the Greenbelt Towns project. Real-estate operators denounced it as a socialistic threat to the divine rights of land speculators. And one Congressman, the late John Taber of Auburn, New York, actually believed that the new town north of Washington was designed as a hiding place for arms, in preparation for the day when that madman Roosevelt would dispatch a ravaging mob to sack Capitol Hill. He told me so, and refused my pleas to come see for himself that the Greenbelt toolshed hid nothing more sinister than lawn mowers and baby carriages. If you think some Congressmen are peculiar today, you should have known the prime specimens of the Thirties.

Only in the last decade has big business

started to invest in new communities, on a scale far larger than is generally realized. Fifty-two such projects were under way in 1968, each of them covering at least a thousand acres and offering all the facilities needed for a community of three thousand or more residents.⁴ The most famous are Reston and Columbia, on opposite sides of Washington, D.C., but most of them are located in California, Florida, Arizona, and Colorado. The largest is California City, embracing more than 100,000 acres and designed to accommodate eventually 600,000 people; it is the brainchild of a rich young man named William M. White, Jr., the head of Great Western United Corporation. Other major corporations involved in building new communities are General Electric, Westinghouse, IT&T, Boise Cascade, and the Del E. Webb Company. All of them, and a dozen smaller firms in the same field, obviously expect to earn a profit.

In that case, why shouldn't we depend on private enterprise to build all the new cities we need, with little or no help from government? In theory, this sounds reasonable, because the financial arithmetic is enticing. All you have to do is buy a few thousand acres of farmland at, say, \$500 an acre, build the nucleus of your town, and then sell off the land at perhaps ten times its original price, plus construction costs. The creation of a new population center is all it takes to send land values skyrocketing; witness what has happened in Rockland County, New York, or in the new city of Columbia, Maryland.

In practice, alas, private enterprise can't do the job alone, for two reasons.

First, it is too hard to assemble large tracts of land in places where new communities are needed. Only a genius like James Rouse could have assembled at a reasonable cost the 14,000 acres needed for Columbia, in the fast-growing area between Washington and Baltimore, and he probably could not duplicate the feat today. Several of the new-town builders in the West avoided this problem, because they already owned huge expanses of farming land; examples are the Irvine Ranch and the acreage where Great Western United once raised sugar beets. But few such situations are left.

In the second place, a new town requires a lot of "patient capital" to finance the initial streets, sewers, water supply, and other community facilities. The investment is safe enough, but it cannot be fully repaid until the whole project is completed—which may be twenty or thirty years, or longer. Even the strongest corporations find it hard to raise that kind of capital, especially in a tight money market. That is the reason why Robert Simon, the original developer of Reston, Virginia, got into trouble and had to turn control of the management over to Gulf Oil.

If we are going to get the new cities we need, therefore, some arm of government will have to help out in three ways. (1) It must assemble large blocks of land, without running up the price, by use of its powers of condemnation and eminent domain. (2) It must put up a good part of the "front end money" for building community facilities, in the form of long-term loans. (3) It must take responsibility for the overall planning, which no private corporation is capable of handling; only a public agency can, or should, select the sites for the 110 new communities, set standards for protection of the environment, and arrange inducements, when necessary, to create job opportunities. (This does not mean government subsidy to business; usually all it takes to bring new industries into the desired location is provision of a good highway, a dependable water

⁴A full listing, of possible interest to both home seekers and investors, is given on page 78 of *Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth*.

supply, and perhaps an industrial park, a government installation, or a nearby university. Witness what happened when Route 128 was built as a ring highway around Boston.)

The rest of the job can confidently be left to private enterprise. Experience to date, both here and abroad, indicates that plenty of businessmen will be eager to flesh out the new community with homes and factories, once the skeleton is in place: that is, the basic plan and the infrastructure of streets and utilities.

It makes no sense to calculate the cost of building the Second America according to the four-book plan—or some variant—without also looking at the cost of the alternative. If we simply let our present cities double in size, in the chaotic and heedless way they are now growing, the cost will be infinitely greater. One reason is what economists call "diseconomies of scale." After a city reaches a certain size, the per capita cost of providing services—water, police protection, transport, and all the rest—begins to rise sharply. (Nobody knows for sure what the optimum size might be, because our political scientists have done surprisingly little research on this question; the most plausible estimates I have seen suggest that the desirable population ceiling may lie somewhere between 200,000 and one million.)

Far greater, however, are the social costs of urban elephantiasis, and tax costs which inevitably follow. The events of the last five years have made one thing unmistakably clear: when a city gets too big, it pays an enormous price in crime, drug addiction, spreading slums, decaying schools, and racial turmoil.

If he is interested in saving money, therefore, every true conservative ought to be a passionate advocate of The Plan. So should everybody who simply wants the country to be a decent place to live in. And, after all, why shouldn't we build the Second America in a sensible and humane fashion? If the British and the Finns can do it, why can't we?

\$2½ BILLION GETS US LITTLE BUT INSULTS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thought-provoking editorial from the McPherson, Kans., Sentinel which deals with foreign aid spending. It is a timely editorial since the House will be considering the foreign assistance authorization bill later this week. The editorial follows:

\$2½ BILLION GETS US LITTLE BUT INSULTS

Each year we are spending \$2½ billion to help foreign countries. Shortly after World War II, this big expenditure was most effective in enabling West European nations to defeat communism and establish sound governments friendly to us. Even though our aid was almost essential to the recovery of nations like Germany, England and France, the thanks we got was flimsy indeed. Loans for the most part were not repaid. Thousands of the citizens of these nations resented our charity so strongly that "Yankee Go Home" became the password of these nations.

In more recent years we have been spending the billions on little and weak countries, too often too underdeveloped to govern themselves and their cry of "Yankee Go Home" is even more universal.

Hatred and resentment is not much of a dividend on an investment of \$2½ billion every year.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is proposing to cut almost half a billion from the present budget. That still leaves \$2 billion we spend each year and get little but enemies in return.

Maybe such squandering of our tax money is making the world safe for something or other. Maybe it was all right when West Europe was in danger and we had plenty of money. Now our nation is spending more than we pay in taxes to help doubtful causes. It's no time to borrow \$2½ billion a year to buy such a doubtful investment.

A STRANGER CRIES FOR HOMER RUPLE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the story of last week's march against death is eloquently reported by Haynes Johnson in the Washington Post. I am inserting his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A STRANGER CRIES FOR HOMER RUPLE

(By Haynes Johnson)

The bell was tolling at Arlington yesterday morning when Bob Houston walked inside the yellow-and-white canvas tent pitched alongside the Potomac. On the card tables, stacks of printed signs were piled high. Bob looked for one from New Jersey, his birthplace. He couldn't find any. Then he drew out one from Michigan, his present home.

Homer Ruple, the heavy black stencil read . . .

"He was a quiet boy, not unruly," his mother says.

" . . . one of the wonderful ones . . . We called him, Bill . . . He was blond, about 5 feet 5 or 6. Not much taller than I am—and the identical picture of his father."

Bob tied a string around his neck and walked off, bearing the name of the dead Vietnam soldier he had picked at random. Ahead of him in the line were two priests carrying the names of Clyde Cecil Collins and Jeff Milkey, both of Kentucky. Behind him, two of his friends from Purdue displayed the names Alger White and Gary Russha of Michigan.

"No, there's no way to know about this name," Bob Houston was saying. "No way. I'm honored, that's all."

Bob, 18, with long blond hair, jeans, boots and Navy pea jacket, was no more than one of the thousands of those faces in the crowd yesterday on his march from Arlington through the city, past the White House and on to the Capitol. Like them all, he performed the ritual of turning right, facing the White House, and calling out a name.

"Homer Ruple, Michigan," he said in a soft voice.

He brushed away his tears and walked on.

"The only thing I can say," he remarked, "is it's like the first time I ever cried. That's the general mood. I've been brought up in an environment where I've had very little opportunity to see people and to cry."

"It's just like I've done the middle-class thing, all the way through, and I've been out of touch with reality, and this is the first time I've felt reality."

"I keep thinking, oh, God, my tears. Like I just want to feel 10 times more. People are worth crying for."

"JUST A PERSON"

He was silent a moment, then:

"Homer Ruple. Just a person."

During his march, Bob talked about himself. He was by his own portrait, just another student: sometimes inarticulate, sometimes eloquent; born in New Jersey, father an engineer, moved to Dearborn, Mich., and on to Purdue, sophomore class, thinking of following his father's profession but now doubtful.

"That's where I started, but I have doubts now," he said. "I mean, you work so many formulas and equations. I'd rather do people."

"I mean, I was playing games like everyone else, and now there's a feeling—it's hard to describe. As far as myself, I got into many things because everyone else was doing it, and I got placed in circumstances like that. But I've finally got the feeling of what all these people are trying to say."

DEATH AND BEAUTY

"Like Washington's really nice. The surroundings. From what I've seen, the sights are really great. But it just exemplifies—well, it's just such an extreme thing that such beautiful things deal with death and people's lives in such a matter of fact way. And the place could really be beautiful but at the moment I don't think it ever can be."

He didn't speak of politics, of the President or Agnew or the Pentagon, or even of protests.

"I just hope somebody feels a little bit of what these people feel," he said, glancing down the line of young marchers, each bearing a card with a name. "Just look. They don't have to speak. Just look in their faces."

When he passed the old Munitions Building, paint peeling, flags flying, he noticed the lines of office workers out front silently watching the procession.

"I really want to reach these people who came to watch us," Bob said. "Just to have one of them look in my eyes and become a part of me. I know very little of me is going to become part of them, but it's all of us together all over the country. That's the thing we've been doing."

RAIN AT WHITE HOUSE

By the time he reached the White House, the heavy gray clouds had thickened. It began to rain. It was still raining when he got to the Capitol and deposited his placard with the name of Homer Ruple of Michigan.

Then he left, still uncertain about why he had become, by chance, the proxy for Homer Ruple—or who Homer Ruple was. Bob Houston had completed his personal role in the story of two Americans. Homer Ruple's was harder to determine.

At the Pentagon, Daniel Z. Henkin, the assistant secretary in charge of public affairs, said he couldn't find out about Homer Ruple without a serial number or a more precise identification.

At the Veterans Administration here, the information man was helpful. But the task was immense. He would check and see. He said something about a computer bank with 28 million names of veterans.

On Capitol Hill, an assistant to Sen. Robert Griffin (R-Mich.) said he would look into it.

WOMAN AT PENTAGON

He had the name of a woman at the Pentagon who might be helpful. The senator's office had made contact with her before.

It was difficult, the woman said. But, she called back.

"We have a name," she said, "but of course we can't know if it's the right one. R-u-p-l-e, Homer Alfred Jr. Army. Sp.5. Born 27 July, 1938. Died 2 Feb., 1968. Three Rivers, Mich."

The operator put in a call to Three Rivers. No, there was no Homer Ruple Sr. in the directory, he said. There was, however, a Howard Ruple.

At Howard Ruple's home the woman was confused. Yes, indeed, there is a Homer

Ruple in Three Rivers, she said. He's part of her family. She gave the number.

John Ruple answered the call. Yes, it was his brother who died, he said quietly. "I think you'd like to talk to my mother."

CAREER SOLDIER

"I don't want his name used," Mrs. Ruple said. "Not for that purpose. He was making the Army his career. I do not want his name used in that march."

She wasn't angry, just firm about it. When she understood his name already had been used, she began talking about her son.

"He was a quiet boy, not unruly. I'd be a very poor mother if I didn't say he was one of the wonderful ones. Bill—we called him Bill—presented the Michigan flag at the Pearl Harbor. Oh, what was it? In '66 or '67 it was. Oh, dear. It was on the back of that picture we had, where it was, but we put it in a footlocker with the rest of his things and we still don't want to get some of those things out."

Bill, she said, wasn't married. He was born and raised in Three Rivers and went to school there; then he quit.

"Three Rivers? Oh, we're about 20 miles from the Indiana state line. It's just a lovely town to live in. It's not big, like Kalamazoo. Just a nice big friendly town."

ENLISTED AT 16

"It was when he was 16 when he joined up. The day before he was 17, I think. What did he look like. Oh, my. Well, he was blond. About 5 feet 5 or 6. Not too much taller than I am—and the identical picture of his father."

Ruple Sr., 55, is a truck driver. There are three other children in the family, John, 18, Martin, 16, and Kimble, a girl, 17.

"We were just like all families, I suppose," the mother went on. "We were close. Bill just liked life. He enjoyed it."

"Of course, as he got older, he was like everyone else, and I wrapped my life around him. And then he went from us. You just can't replace him at all."

"We had a pact between us. That whenever he'd do something wrong he'd come and tell me. There wouldn't be any whippings, but there would be punishment. That was the pact between Bill and me."

"Just before Easter a year ago he called from Ft. Lewis (Wash.) and said he was going. I tried to talk him out of it, but, well, if he's going to fight, I think he felt he should fight the right way—instead of all the nonsense going on. In other words, he was proud of his country."

His brother, John, dropped out of school, she said, after Bill was killed. "He took it awfully hard. Now he's talking about going in. You just have to let them find themselves. John's got a little long hair, like all of them do, but he's not rebellious. He's going to be an Army man like his brother."

"As far as these demonstrations go, they're not solving anything. They're not going to end anything. It's not helping the boys over there, for what they are fighting for. And if we have the love and understanding we should have—and that people have to have—we'll find the right way."

"It's been a never-ending war," she said just before hanging up. "But maybe something will be accomplished out of it in the end."

THE WOLF MEN

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, not only must this country preserve the forests and clear streams of its wilder-

ness, but it must take steps to see that the animals which are native to the wilderness do not become prey to encroaching civilization or, worse, to the predatory nature of man. The wolf, some of whose varieties are on the Department of the Interior's list of endangered species, has been systematically hunted until it is virtually extinct in large areas of this country. Whereas the wolf kills only when he is hungry, and only enough to satisfy his hunger, man has pursued the wolf for sport. As the wolf has become more rare and fearful, men have taken to hunting from planes, to assure that those wolves which remain cannot escape.

In the past 5 years, 5,000 wolves have been killed in Alaska, the one State where that animal is relatively plentiful; there are now 5,000 wolves left in the State, and a bounty of \$50 is offered for each wolf which is killed. To reward the worst instincts of man at the expense of the species already pitifully depleted is to forget that when our wilderness was still pristine, it was populated by animals who respected the balance of nature.

To assure the protection of wolves and other wild predatory animals, I introduced a bill on June 24 which would authorize the Government to take steps toward the conservation of such animals. I ask your support for that bill, and I also urge that you make an effort to see an extraordinary film on wolves titled "The Wolf Men" to be presented Tuesday night on NBC. It is a poignant tribute to an animal which can no longer protect itself from man—man must now protect it from himself.

THE BAIL AGENCY BILL

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most crucial problems in the courts of this city is the problem of the accused who is awaiting trial on a criminal charge. No matter how dangerous, he is generally released. It is months before he is tried. No matter what he does in the meantime, he is released again. When he is tried and convicted, his sentence is light and, if there are several crimes involved, the sentence is still concurrent.

Various parts of the President's crime program are designed to deal with each of these matters. I wish to mention only one—the bail agency bill.

Let me just mention three of the most significant provisions of this bill. First of all, it authorizes the bail agency to recommend whether a man should be released. Since few judges seem to consider this, it is important that an agency which has information about the accused and his past record call this to the court's attention. It is pointless to prepare recommendations on how a man should be released, if he should not be released at all.

The bill also directs the agency to supervise those who are released. Presently it has no authority to do so. The bill

would provide that authority and require that supervision.

The bill also directs the agency to report violations of release conditions to the court. Conscientious judges will use such information to place greater restrictions on the man's release or even deny further release. As of now, courts have no way of knowing whether a defendant lives up to the conditions of his release. The bill will take care of this.

The bail agency bill is only one small part of the crime package; it is only part of what is needed. But it is an important part and deserves the attention of this body.

DRAFT REFORM

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, two young men who work on Capitol Hill—ages 16 and 17—wrote a position paper on their views on draft reform. I am presenting this paper in order to close the communication gap between our very young and older citizens:

THE PRESENT DRAFT SYSTEM

At the age of sixteen or seventeen most young men start to think about their future plans: free time, college, and the draft. How does the young American male stand against the present draft system? Most of us can not say, primarily because we do not know or do not understand the draft laws as they stand now.

The Military Selective Service Act of 1967 provides for occupational deferment recommendations by the National Security Council to the Director of the Selective Service System concerning needed professional and scientific personnel and those engaged in or training for critical skills and other essential occupations. The Act also states that the change in the order of induction is prohibited. The President can "under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, provide for deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of persons satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university or similar institution and who request such deferments." The "prime age group" as referred to in this Act means the age group which has been designated by the President as the age group from which selections for induction into the Armed Forces are first to be made after delinquents and volunteers.

The present Selective Service System is based on the discretion of over 4,000 local draft boards following general guidelines of classification criteria set down by the President. The local draft board is directly responsible for issuing deferments. The 1967 Act makes provisions for conscientious objectors stating that they will be assigned to a noncombatant position.

CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM

When one is asked if he is for or against the draft, many times his response will be based on his feelings toward the war. If he is against the war in Vietnam, there is a good chance he might be against the draft. If he has no strong feelings on the war he may be for the draft. Therefore, let us state that this paper is on the draft per se; in no way expressing our feelings in relation to the war.

Before we state changes we would like in the draft, let us say that we definitely believe

a draft system is needed, in peace as well as in war, as opposed to one of the various alternatives. We do not feel a Volunteer Army or a Professional Army would be feasible or practical in our society. A Volunteer Army may be sufficient in peace time but if the possibility of a war did arise, would we be able to call up enough troops in time? We must always expect and be prepared for the unexpected. A professional Army in our opinion would produce troops of super-trained, Hawks, just waiting to fight. This could be of great danger to us and, for example, the chance of border clashes occurring would be more likely. Universal Military Training (UMT), which is now employed in such countries as Sweden and Russia, is a program requiring a young man to go directly into military training upon completion of his high school education. We are against this in the United States. This could be considered taking away some of the man's freedoms which are established under the Democratic principles of our society. UMT interrupts one's education. With our system, a young man can continue his schooling under deferments at least through undergraduate school. With the draft, there is the element of chance involved; all are equally susceptible to being called up, however not every one always is. This depends on the military needs of the time. With UMT you are called for training no matter what the situation is.

On May 13, 1969, the President sent a Message to the United States Congress listing six of his convictions towards the draft. The law as it stands now already gives the President the power to carry out four of these. First the President wants to change from oldest-first to youngest-first the order of call so that a young man becomes less vulnerable to the draft as he grows older. The President has the power, if in the National interest, to order the selection of draftees from certain age groups.

Mr. Nixon would like also to alter the period of prime draft vulnerability to one year instead of the present seven years. This is actually an extension of his first recommendation. Since nothing can prohibit the President from providing for the selection of persons by age group or groups.

The next two convictions brought out by President Nixon cover student deferments. It is his opinion that the undergraduate student's year of maximum vulnerability should begin whenever the deferment has expired. This recommendation is already provided for in the law as it is now. It states that after the student's deferment is up he "be liable for induction as a registrant within the prime age group irrespective of his actual age." As far as undergraduate deferments, President Nixon's recommendation is to allow students to complete not just one term but the full academic year in which they are ordered for induction. The law already states that the President may "provide for deferment . . . persons . . . whose activity in graduate study . . . is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the nation's health, safety, or interest."

One does not pertain to the legislative body; that is, asking the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to review the guidelines, procedures, and standards of the draft system and report the findings to the President. This is purely an administrative action which requires no legislation.

The last of Nixon's six points is the use of the lottery as opposed to the present system of selection. This lottery system has been approved overwhelmingly by the House and is now in Committee in the Senate with proposed debate starting in two weeks.

The lottery system is less complicated and more uniform than the present system. Under the lottery system the days of the coming

year (January 1, January 2, etc.) would be placed in a "hat" and drawn out. The order in which these days are drawn is recorded. These days represent the birthdates of the men in the prime age group. If a man who is in the prime age group has his birthday drawn first, then he is classified "most prime" or in the group most likely to be drafted. The second date selected will be the next to go, then the third and so forth. If a person in the prime age group, say for example nineteen years of age, has a deferment when his date is drawn he retains the position he is assigned. For instance, if a young man's birthday is December 13th and on his nineteenth birthday his date is chosen three-hundredth, but he has a deferment for school, when his deferment expires, he will still be three hundredth—not whatever December 13th was chosen on the year his deferment ended.

We believe this is better than the system now employed. This is only a small change, however, is this not better than no change at all? At least at this present time.

With so many local draft boards (over 4,000), the lack of organization among them is a problem. A system with more centralized control would produce impartial standards uniformly applied throughout the nation. This could be done by setting up regional offices and a fewer amount of area offices. A more centralized system would do away with many of the deferments brought about by a man's "pull" with the local board.

One point that has been made by critics of the draft is that the young men actually have no representation in the Selective Service System's decision making procedures. Ways of combating this, besides lowering the voting age, should include some method by which young men could serve on the local board or possible regional draft boards in some capacity.

RESULTS OF PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have completed another of my polls of public opinion in my congressional district on 12 current issues. My district, the 18th of Pennsylvania, is entirely suburban Pittsburgh. It contains a considerable mixture of ethnic groups. Economically it ranges from the very rich to the very poor with about 80 percent classed in the middle-income group. Along with many bedroom areas we have many heavy industries and a number of coal mines. Here without further comment are the tabulated results of more than 20,000 signed replies:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED SEPTEMBER 1969

1. From what you know of the Tax Reform Bill passed by the House, do you believe it should be passed by the Senate essentially as it is? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.
2. Should the Pennsylvania Turnpike be made a toll-free part of the Interstate Highway System? Yes, 61 percent; no, 39 percent.
3. Do you believe that the military should be given a free rein to force the surrender of North Vietnam? Yes, 57 percent; no, 43 percent.
4. Do you find your postal service to be generally satisfactory? Yes, 87 percent; No, 13 percent.

5. Do you believe that the military budget can be cut 3 to 5 billion dollars without seriously weakening our strength? Yes, 73 percent; no, 27 percent.

6. Would you vote for a Constitutional amendment to provide for the direct popular election of our President? Yes, 86 percent; no, 14 percent.

7. Should the Federal government share some of its revenues with the states to use as they see fit? Yes, 69 percent; no, 31 percent.

8. Do you believe social security benefits and taxes should be raised immediately instead of delaying such action until next year? Yes, 53 percent; no, 47 percent.

9. Should we adopt wage and price controls to stop inflation? Yes, 61 percent; no, 39 percent.

10. Would you favor Federal medical insurance for everyone? Yes, 31 percent; no, 69 percent.

11. Should we stay out of any military involvement in the Arab-Israeli crisis? Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

12. How would you rate President Nixon's conduct of his office? 43 percent good; 46 percent fair; 11 percent bad.

ARMS LIMITATIONS TALKS MUST SUCCEED

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, peace has always been the ideal of mankind. Even though it is rarely achieved, it is always sought.

On November 17, the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union will meet at Helsinki to begin talks on arms limitations.

This will be a start on the road to peace, is the hope of William J. McGarry, editor and publisher of the Appleton Press in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

I would like to share with my colleagues Editor McGarry's thinking on this matter by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his editorial of October 30:

ARMS LIMITATION TALKS MUST SUCCEED

Nov. 17 could be the beginning of one of the greatest events in the history of mankind. On that day representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union will sit down at Helsinki, Finland, to begin talks on arms limitations.

The road to arms limitations will not be either easy or short, but it is a journey that must be undertaken and must be completed if mankind is to survive. Arms experts have estimated that either of the countries now have nuclear warheads sufficient to destroy the entire world a number of times. Even from the standpoint of defense, that's probably overdoing it a bit.

A number of things cloud the issue and make it very difficult to come up with a workable plan. Among those things is the fact that China now has a nuclear capability and is daily expanding it. Neither the Soviet Union or the United States could allow their attack or defense capabilities to drop below that of China. That is, they can't yet. Perhaps at a later date China and other nations with nuclear weapons can be included in the talks.

Another roadblock to the success of the meeting is the manner in which any agree-

ment the two countries reach is going to be enforced. Over the years Russia has built a lot of walls, physical and mental, to keep their people in and other people out. It is doubtful that a great change in their thinking concerning foreigners roaming around their country is going to be easy to achieve.

Yet the success of an arms limitation agreement will depend to a great extent on on-the-spot inspections.

So the talks will start and for a peaceful and fruitful future for man, for man in even the most remote reaches of the world, it is necessary that they are successful.

IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL CANNOT BE

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, most thinking people realize that complete and unconditional withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam would not bring peace. Rather, until such time as South Vietnamese forces are capable of defending their people, American withdrawal would result in a horrible bloodbath. Carl Zimmermann, director of news and public affairs of WITI-TV, channel 6, Milwaukee, recently pinpointed the consequences of the policy the moratorium leaders like to shout about. Mr. Zimmermann makes it clear that morality is not on the side of those who would have us turn our backs on the people of South Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

AS MUCH AS WE DESIRE IT "IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL" CANNOT BE!

When President Nixon spoke to the nation on November 3, 1969, there was disappointment . . . even among the "silent majority". Somehow, many of us had hoped he would come up with a quick, easy solution to end the agony and misery brought on by the longest, costliest war in our history. But, it was not to be. As much as we'd like the "immediate withdrawal" of our troops . . . to do so would set the conditions for mass slaughter of innocent victims of communist terror. We do not believe that most of our people want that to happen.

TV6 believes most of the people who demonstrated for peace in last month's Vietnam Moratorium were reasonable, sincere patriotic individuals. They chose to express their desires for peace through rightful, peaceful protest. Where we differ with them is their demand for "immediate withdrawal". It just cannot be.

As much as we'd like, the war in Vietnam cannot be ended overnight. It would be courting disaster to attempt such a maneuver . . . and . . . it would be morally wrong. We would leave behind a bloodbath that could go far beyond the horror of the genocide of Hitler's Germany.

Protest the war? We all protest and detest war. But, how to end it in Vietnam is a question that cannot be dismissed as simply and as easily as some of our protesters suggest.

The President has accurately and straightforwardly stated the problems. He is determined to end hostilities . . . as determined as anyone. He is also determined to leave "our South Vietnamese allies in a position to defend themselves . . . and to decide what kind of government they want." That is the kind of peace the President wants. It is the kind of peace all of us should desire.

A LEGITIMATE OBJECTION, FROM
ONE SILENT AMERICAN

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in recent months some citizens of the United States have come to the conclusion that the United States should unilaterally withdraw from aiding South Vietnam in its resistance to aggression. They have made their protests at the Government's policies known in a myriad of ways. Even now, Washington, D.C., is bracing itself against the marchers and demonstrators who have scheduled protests for this weekend.

I disagree with the position taken by these individuals—however well motivated the intent might be. The "antis" position is shortsighted, demonstrates fallacious reasoning and is often self-serving.

Most Americans support the position of President Nixon, I believe. Communications to the President following his recent televised report to the Nation have been 11 to 1 favoring the approach being taken. A poll shows a 77-percent favorable response. With approximately 2 days' notice, 15,000 gathered at the Washington Monument on Veterans Day for the express purpose of demonstrating this support. Throughout the Nation, many are participating in observances and shall continue to during the "Week of Unity."

The so-called "Silent American," the majority of Americans, is finally letting his views be known. He objects to those who cannot see the good in the Nation, who decry all of its policies, who derides efforts toward betterment, who are always negative rather than positive. Yes, the "Silent American" is finally speaking out and letting his views be known.

Among the sicker of the antiwar opposition tactics, sometimes used, is the recitation of the names of the brave who died in the service of their country while helping South Vietnam. These men died doing their duty in carrying out the policy of their elected Government.

Legitimately, their loved ones—mothers, fathers, wives, relatives, and friends—complain at this incongruous and inhumane use of the names. Many are taking action to try and halt such unseemly, barbaric uses.

One who has is Mrs. Faye Staley from Arizona. She sent the following letter below and statement to other families who have lost a loved one in this war that reside in Arizona. Between October 19, 1969, and November 2, 1969, more than 100 Arizonans made known their opposition to the antiwar groups' profanation of these dead and the cause for which they died. I commend her action to the attention of all Members of Congress and to all Americans:

ARIZONA,
October 19, 1969.

As you may know, a list of 380 names was read automatically the night of October 15, 1969 at a gathering of Protesters at Arizona State University. These names, given a mo-

ment of time, were the names of our beloved sons, husbands and fathers.

My son, who was a graduate of ASU, was a man who dearly loved our country and enjoyed the freedoms our form of government afforded him and these freedoms he would not want altered nor would he want his name used to promote a cause so alien to everything he held dear. I know my son, and I believe your son also, would not like to have his sacrifice treated so lightly.

If you feel as I do, would you please sign the enclosed statement and we will do everything possible to prevent their names being used, burned, or otherwise desecrated in any public demonstrations planned for the future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. FAYE STALEY.

This is to indicate that we do not want our son's or husband's names read, put on a list that is to be burned, connected with surrender in Vietnam, or used in any way to undercut our American position at the peace table. He gave his life as a supreme sacrifice for the Freedom of All people in this world. We know he would not want his name used in this manner.

The 15th of November will soon be here. Please sign on the above line and return right away.

Mrs. FAYE STALEY.

ON THE DEATH OF MARSHALL DEAN
DAVIS, TAX COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, Marshall Dean Davis, a Commissioner of the Tax Court of the United States, died on November 12, 1969, at the Davis family home in Tennille, Ga. His death resulted from an acute coronary attack. He and Mrs. Davis had arrived several days earlier for their usual fall visit and to spend the Thanksgiving period with relatives in Georgia.

Mr. Davis had served the Tax Court as an attorney since 1927 and as a Commissioner of the court since 1952. He had completed the hearing of an extended trial case at Los Angeles in October.

Mr. Davis was born in Washington County, Ga., on April 11, 1895. He attended Mercer University and George Washington University, receiving the LL.B. degree from the latter in 1926. He was a member of the Georgia State Bar. As a student at George Washington University in 1923, he became a member of Epsilon Chapter, Sigma Chi Fraternity. His marriage to Ethel Reid took place in Gulfport, Miss., on June 2, 1926. They made their home in Arlington, Va.

Mr. Davis' first service with the U.S. Government was in 1917 as a "Riding Page" for the U.S. Senate. In 1918, he enlisted in military service and served in the U.S. Army. In 1920, he reentered the civilian service of the U.S. Government from which he retired in 1956, but continued to give his further service to the Tax Court at its request until his death.

Mr. Davis was widely known among Federal tax practitioners throughout the United States and recognized as an able attorney and jurist. He had presided as a Tax Court commissioner and heard a considerable number of "benchmark" cases in the Federal income tax field. At the time of his death, he was the senior-ranking commissioner of the Tax Court.

Services will be held at Tennille, Ga., Friday morning, November 14, 1969, at 11 a.m. Burial will be in the family plot in Tennille.

In addition to his wife, Ethel, he leaves the following survivors in his immediate family: Two sisters, Mrs. J. Stanley Best and Mrs. Edd A. Holmes, and four brothers, James Porter, Barney, Thomas, and Bryant.

I offer this for the RECORD because the long and faithful service of Mr. Davis should be commemorated by the Congress.

REVISION OF THE PRESENT DIS-
TRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL
AGENCY STATUTE

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been directed to bail problems both in this body and in the press. However, this attention focuses almost entirely on so-called "prevention detention." I urge my colleagues not to overlook an equally important matter—the revision of the present District of Columbia bail agency statute.

The District of Columbia bail agency now collects information on arrested persons and reports to the courts. It can and does recommend nonfinancial conditions of release but it does not recommend whether the person should be released at all. It is clear that this falls far short of protecting the public from crimes committed by those awaiting trial.

The proposed legislation would authorize the agency to recommend whether or not the accused should be released. It would require the agency to keep the defendant notified of his times for court appearance and to notify the courts of a failure to comply with release conditions.

Most importantly, this legislation would direct the agency to supervise all persons released on their own recognizance and to coordinate all of those persons and agencies who agree to serve as third party custodians of persons who are released.

Most of us are aware that under the old bail bondsmen system the bondsman could at least be relied on to keep track of his client even if he did not always keep the client out of trouble. Under this new system of release without money bond it seems clear that no one keeps track of the accused. The bail agency bill is designed to remedy this and for this alone it deserves to be passed and

passed quickly. As long as these people are being released, gentlemen, let us at least keep track of them.

VETERANS DAY CEREMONY

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last week I was honored to participate in a Veterans Day ceremony at the Griswold, Iowa, Community School. I am inserting for the attention of my colleagues two speeches prepared and delivered by Griswold students, Becky Mueller and Rod Jackson. Their message is a tribute to the fine educational leadership of their principal, Gale Eshelman, and superintendent, Orin C. Mann.

The speeches follow:

DEMOCRACY

(By Becky Mueller)

A Virginia lawyer once defined democracy this way in the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Although these words came from one man, the ideas came from many, and many more have defended these ideas. But what makes up a democracy? People who are willing to work in industry, medicine and science, and the many other fields we have today. People who vote in the elections provided. People who are willing to fight for the causes of freedom and the protection of their loved ones.

Today we are being attacked by an aggressor, Communism. Our ideals and beliefs of democracy are being challenged. There are many methods used, to persuade mass groups, and Communism uses many. One of these is through emotional appeals.

Emotionally, humans are unstable. People, when aroused with evil intent, can cause great damage to things. Today we can see this in the demonstrations that turn to mass chaos. Maybe it isn't Communism that changes the peaceful demonstrations to riots, but it could be, and we need to stand firm on our beliefs. People, when aroused with logic and reason, can produce the finest things the world knows today.

The founders of the United States were people who reasoned with logic. What do we know today that is finer than our freedom?

Another way Communism attacks is through violence. Here again are demonstrations that turn to riots and wars. The many we've seen, peaceful means can achieve the same goals. Martin Luther King died for his belief in what peaceful methods will achieve, and who did more for the cause of freedom for the Negroes than King?

There are many other ways that Communism attacks us. Hate, fear, propaganda, hero worship, and infiltration. Although time doesn't permit me to say something about all of these, I'd like to say something about the last, infiltration.

This method is probably the one used most today. Today we are involved in a war in Vietnam to stop Communism from infiltrating closer to our nation. Maybe we aren't doing the right thing by being over there, but I feel it is our responsibility to defend

our democracy. We all want to see peace, but we must protect our homes and families. People in the United States today are doing just what Communism wants. Communism builds propaganda programs on peace. Its objective is to make peaceful countries look corrupt and dissatisfied. They sow seeds of hate toward these countries, so why must we run down our country and defate our boys' ego in that country fighting for us and our freedom?

It is our generation that is getting the blame for demonstrations, riots, drugs, and many other things. I feel it is our duty to ourselves and our country as citizens of the United States to stand up for Democracy and fight, if need be, for our freedom.

Be proud of our country's leaders and their efforts to prevent the loss of our rights, freedom, and the other opportunities we have that Communism doesn't.

Thank you.

VETERANS DAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1969

(By Rod Jackson)

Today, November 11, 1969, is Veterans Day, set aside as a time to honor the men and women who, in times of national crises, doffed their civilian garb and donned the uniforms of our Armed Forces.

There are twenty-seven and one-quarter million living American veterans.

They cover a span from the youngest soldier just back from Vietnam to two old fighters of America's Indian Wars—two left of the 106,000 men who battled in such places as the Little Big Horn.

Both have passed the century mark in age. Both have one thing in common with all the other twenty-seven and one-quarter million veterans—they answered their country's call when the time had come to meet force with force.

From such times have come the hallowed memories of Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, Saratoga, Cowpens, and White Oak Swamp.

World War One and its Verdun, the Forest of the Argonne . . .

World War Two with its Pearl Harbor—Corregidor, Coral Sea, North Africa Beaches and the Beaches of Utah and Omaha, the Bridge at Remagen, the Battle of the Bulge, Korea and its Inchon Landing, Pork Chop Hill, and Heartbreak Ridge.

And now, Vietnam with its Da Nang, Khe Sanh, Hue, and Hamburger Hill.

This is the day we honor the men who made these strange sounding places commonplace names. Hallowed because of the valor and sacrifices of our heroic men in arms.

Today, they are the men who deliver our mail, our doctors, judges, computer experts, the preachers on the pulpits, the brothers in the lodge rooms. They sit on juries and in ball parks. They are the ordinary and the extraordinary. They are Presidents of the United States, Supreme Court Justices, Members of Congress. Yes, they are even Moon Men.

All are veterans who gave up something, made a sacrifice for freedom.

For many thousands the sacrifices were greater. Today the Veterans Administration has more than two and one-quarter million names of veterans and dependents on its service-connected compensation rolls, and every day the VA's 166 hospitals care for nearly 90,000 veteran patients.

They fought to make democracy endure. They earned this day of tribute the hard way.

Today they are citizens of stability, honesty, pride, responsibility. They are good citizens, living in a land they fought to keep free, a land they love.

Their spirit and drive, coupled with a love of freedom and a willingness to sacrifice, is the foundation of our American strength.

Yes, our veterans, both the young and the old, are the strength, the sinew and the heart and pulse of America and her freedom. We honor them today with pride and affection, a tribute not only for them but this Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.

And I am sure that if we have this type of dedication—dedication to attacking America's ills and answering her problems, just as many brave men have done in different context on the field of battle—we will be paying these men the ultimate tribute of their compatriots.

But, further, we will be building an America that meets the needs of the living and those yet to live. A nation blissful in the peace, the plenty, the equality, and the freedom that is and has been our national dream.

And then perhaps we—you and I—will deserve the esteem and the cherished tributes that are now reserved for those whose part it was to pursue those dreams in combat.

Perhaps—to borrow from another Lincoln phrase—the world will long remember.

CONSUMER MESSAGES

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CONSUMER MESSAGE, MARCH 15, 1962

Additional legislative and administrative action is required . . . if the Federal Government is to meet its responsibility to consumers in the exercise of their rights. These rights include:

"(1) The right to safety—to be protected against the marketing of goods which are hazardous to health or life.

"(2) The right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling, or other practices, and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice.

"(3) The right to choose—to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices; and in those industries in which competition is not workable and Government regulation is substituted, an assurance of satisfactory quality and service at fair prices.

"(4) The right to be heard—to be assured that consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of Government policy, and fair and expeditious treatment in its administrative tribunals."

FROM PRESIDENT NIXON'S CONSUMER MESSAGE, OCTOBER 30, 1969

"Consumerism in the America of the 70's means that we have adopted the concept of 'buyer's rights.'

"I believe that the buyer in America today has the right to make an intelligent choice among products and services.

"The buyer has the right to accurate information on which to make his free choice.

"The buyer has the right to expect that his health and safety is taken into account by those who seek his patronage.

"The buyer has the right to register his dissatisfaction, and have his complaint heard and weighed, when his interests are badly served."

NEWSLETTER

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our newsletter for the month of November may be of interest to my colleagues and I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point for their information.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN BILL SCOTT REPORTS

NOVEMBER 1969.

President's talk.—The President appeared in the House of Representatives a short time before this newsletter was prepared to thank more than 300 of us who cosponsored a Resolution supporting his efforts to bring about peace in Vietnam. The greatest applause came when he stated that when young men's lives were involved, we should not be Democrats or Republicans but Americans. I have always thought that patriotism was an integral part of the American fabric which did not need to be openly displayed. Yet, with the present threat presented by radical groups throughout the nation, this position might need to be revised. Apparently, masses of people are now descending upon Washington and some of their leaders openly support the communist cause in Vietnam. The Congressional Record of the last few days is full of names and details of past communist affiliations of these leaders and information regarding their "Autumn Offensive." Of course, honest dissent motivated by the pride of a man's conviction and conducted in a lawful manner is perfectly proper, but oftentimes in recent demonstrations there has been violence and disregard of the law.

No society can endure which tolerates wholesale disobedience to its laws. Therefore, I agree with the President that the silent majority of this country must regain the initiative and believe we should discourage our young people from permitting themselves to be used by the professional dissenters and anarchists who defend violent action wherever it appears. Many of these young people from our colleges are not aware of the background of the people with whom they are associated. In all probability, the vast majority of those who participate are completely loyal to our nation even though they may be misguided. Perhaps the silent majority can convince them that our traditions grew out of years of experience, that we want to continue to improve the society by constitutional processes and that neither violent nor non-violent demonstrations of the type taking place will be of benefit to this country. They may, however, comfort the Hanoi government and prolong the present Vietnam conflict.

Revenue sharing.—Centralized government programs over the years with specific grants for individual programs have imposed rigidity on states' activities and eroded much of the power of state and local governments. Therefore, I was glad to join with 89 other members of the House in again sponsoring a revenue sharing measure which has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The purpose of the bill is to restore balance in the Federal form of government; to encourage local and state officials to exercise leadership in solving their problems; and to provide for sharing of federal tax revenues.

Bank Holding Company Act.—Recently large one-bank corporations have branched out for traditionally non-banking businesses. Travel agencies, insurance companies, accountants and others have complained that such activities result in unfair competition. The House, therefore, has passed a measure prohibiting banks from engaging in non-related activities but allowing a period of

grace for banks now in these fields to disengage themselves from such activity.

Military construction.—The House has passed the appropriations bill for military construction and family housing for the 1970 fiscal year. These funds provide for new construction at military bases in the U.S. and overseas as well as the repair of buildings and utilities systems on these bases. The sum of \$1.45 billion was appropriated. This was \$225 million less than last year and \$467 million below this year's budget request. The amount for 1970 includes no funds for construction in Vietnam but some money was carried over from previous years which is considered sufficient for the time being. \$12.8 million is included for improvements in the North American Air Defense system for the Safeguard Anti Ballistic Missile communications and control center. The appropriation is not as much as requested but it is expected to be sufficient to meet military construction needs and yet not inflate the economy any more than necessary.

Foreign aid.—The Foreign Affairs Committee has recently reported out a Foreign Aid Bill which will be before the House for consideration this coming week. This raises the question as to how far this nation should go in continuing to share its resources with the world when our public debt is over \$57 billions (\$57,081,000,000), more than the combined public debt of all other nations, according to a report by the Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. He also advised that new budget requests made in the first six months of this calendar year totalled more than \$10 billions for foreign assistance in the form of loans, grants and credits; that there were unexpended balances from prior years of more than \$18 billions; that if new requests were approved, the total funds available would be more than \$29 billions and that the net cost of the Foreign Aid Program to this country since World War II is more than \$182 billions. Our balance of payments situation and domestic inflation trend must be altered and the defeat or reduction of this large-scale Foreign Aid Program appears to be a step in the right direction.

Annual questionnaire.—Congress is expected to be in session during most of December. However, many of us will be directing our thoughts toward home activities and I do not plan a December newsletter. We will be developing a questionnaire on issues Congress will be faced with in 1970. Both questionnaire and newsletter will probably reach you early in January.

Coal mine health and safety.—A bill to improve safety in coal mines by requiring higher standards in the equipment installed, safer working conditions, and higher health standards was passed by the House. This bill would help reduce the incidents of large tragedies such as the November 1968 explosion in West Virginia which killed 78 miners. Means would be provided for closing unsafe mines until they meet the required safety standards and certain benefits would be available to miners during the time they are idle because of these unsafe working conditions.

Airports and airways.—The House passed a bill which authorizes expenditures of \$690 million to improve the nation's airports and airways system over the next three years. Funds to do this will be obtained from persons who use air facilities and will be placed in a trust fund out of which money will be appropriated to make our airways more safe and improve air facilities. The measure also directs the Secretary of Transportation to study and recommend a national transportation policy to the Congress and is a portion of a ten-year plan to keep air facilities abreast with the increased use of air transportation and new developments in aircraft.

Over the past 5 years our air carrier fleet has increased from about 2100 piston aircraft to about 26000 aircraft, most of which

are jets. By 1980 it is estimated that our domestic airlines will carry three times as many passengers as during 1969 and that the present fleet of about 125 thousand general aircraft will have doubled with 1,400,000 pilots as compared to about 600,000 today.

Overseas mail.—The Post Office Department advises that it has instituted an automatic mail directory system in San Francisco to handle Christmas mail for military personnel in Vietnam. It is expected to expedite rerouting of mail and to free a large number of postal workers for other duties. Rerouting of mail is necessary because personnel are frequently shifted and delays have been encountered in the past in forwarding mail. The system relies upon the social security number of servicemen and will replace a manual operation that is both time-consuming and costly.

Calendars.—We expect to be furnished a thousand 1970-71 calendars in about two weeks and will send one to any constituent who requests it until our supply is exhausted. If you would like one of these government calendars, please send us your name and address.

Draft bill.—Under a measure recently passed by the House, the President will be able to carry out some desired draft reforms. There will be only one year of prime draft liability, which will usually come during the young man's nineteenth year, and draftees will be chosen during that year on a random selection basis. Many youth under the present system have been uncertain for up to seven years as to whether they will be drafted and this uncertainty has interfered with their obtaining jobs, planning higher education activities, and apparently has affected their general well being. Early Senate action is now anticipated.

Something to ponder.—Self-discipline is the free man's yoke.

RESOLUTIONS SUPPORTING PRESIDENT NIXON'S COURSE IN VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to receive a communication this month from the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware. Delegates to the council, representing more than 8,000 citizens from Polish organizations all over the first State, agreed unanimously to endorse two resolutions supporting the President's course in Vietnam. I would like to insert the text of these two resolutions at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION No. 1

We urge that all members of Congress put aside their various differences for our common good and support of our men in Vietnam. Tell Hanoi they cannot win in the congress of the United States, nor on the American college campuses, and that their appeal to the American public is of no avail.

RESOLUTION No. 2

Whereas, the President of the United States has embarked upon a policy of de-escalation of our country's participation in the Vietnam war, and of establishing peace on a sound and permanent basis for the benefit of all the people of the world; and

Whereas, this policy of the president vitally needs the support of every American, irrespective of his political faith or of his

viewpoint on other public matters, otherwise the war will be unduly prolonged, lives of American lads will be needlessly sacrificed, and the peace of the entire world will be endangered;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Delaware internal security committee, consisting of organizations representing 35,000 law-abiding, patriotic Delawareans, that our Delaware senators and the representative be urged to communicate to the President of the United States their support of his policy to end the war in Vietnam.

NEW YORK CITY: THE AIR POLLUTION CHAMBER OF HORRORS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, New York City has been accurately described as "a chamber of air pollution horrors." It has the dubious distinction of having the highest concentration of air pollution of any city in the United States, exceeding that of even Los Angeles.

Air pollution exerts a tax on the residents of the New York area that amounts to \$800 million a year. This averages \$620 a family. In areas of highest concentration, which includes most of the congressional district I represent, the cost per family is over \$800 a year. This cost comes from material corrosion and erosion: flaking off of brownstone from townhouses, crumbling of marble ornamentation—the city recently spent \$4 million to repair marble erosion on the facade of City Hall—killed or injured vegetation, weathered or dead trees near bus stops.

The cost also comes from sources people would not normally think of: cracked rubber on new tires, reduction in visibility and sunlight which makes travel by land, sea or air more hazardous, and the resulting cost of accidents and the extra lighting bills.

But more important than any material loss is the human cost in terms of increased mortality and disease rates. The effect of air pollution on human lungs has been visibly demonstrated by the literally black coloration of the lung tissue of urban residents. There is also the increased incidence of emphysema, chronic bronchitis, lung cancer, and other diseases which have been directly linked to air pollution. Experiments on mice have shown that injection of particular materials found in urban air greatly increases the frequency of various types of tumors during the adult life of the animal. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently banned cyclamates as a result of experiments on mice. He should move to ban air pollution as well.

Breathing New York air is the equivalent of smoking a pack of cigarettes a day.

Much of this comes from the automobile in New York. The auto, for example, is the source of 9.6 million pounds of carbon monoxide a day to the city.

Air pollution used to be a question that only the people of California were sup-

posed to be worried about. Whether that was ever the case I will not now argue, but it certainly is not true now. New Yorkers are gravely concerned about this problem and want something done about it now.

One example of this concern is found in an extremely well done series of articles by Hope MacLeod in the New York Post. This series entitled "Our Polluted Air" explores the human and material impact of air pollution on New York City. It examines the sources of the problem and discusses the limited actions being taken to combat it. It is an excellent thumbnail sketch of the problem as it exists in the Nation's largest city.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Post, Nov. 10, 1969]

OUR POLLUTED AIR

ARTICLE I: HOW BAD?

(By Hope MacLeod)

Health News, N.Y. State Health Dept. monthly: "An average man can live on four and a half pounds of water a day and four pounds of food. But to stay alive, he needs 30 pounds of air. He can select his food and water; its contamination is often revealed by taste, odor or appearance. But he has no choice about air. He must take it as it comes to him, even though it may be laden with aerial garbage."

City officials claim their three-year battle to clean up the air is showing results.

Indeed they were somewhat chagrined at the lack of fanfare over their announcement Oct. 1 that a new law effective that day would eliminate 450,000 tons of sulphur dioxide a year—half the amount New Yorkers breathed in 1966.

Even such outspoken critics as Eldon R. Clingan, executive director of Citizens for Clean Air, Inc., and now a new City Councilman at large for Manhattan, concede that some progress has been made "although not nearly enough."

But a Manhattan woman who has lived in one West End Av. apartment for three decades says flatly:

"It has never been worse. I used to fling my windows open wide, and the windowsills wouldn't get dirty for a day or two. But now I raise them only a few inches and use filter ventilators and the filth piles up in less than an hour.

"Even when I keep the windows closed, the dirt seeps in. And I look out and see black smoke billowing from a building across the way. It's so discouraging and depressing."

Just how bad is the air around us?

Is it making us ill?

Might our bodies have to start growing gills or extra large noses and lungs full of special filtering devices, as scientists only half-jokingly suggest, in order to adapt to the environment?

The statistics are staggering.

Every 24 hours 592,000 tons of "aerial garbage" spew into the nation's atmosphere.

Apartment buildings, private homes, power plants, factories, incinerators, and a phenomenal 90 million motor vehicles across the land belch forth 100,000 tons of sulphur dioxide, 180,000 tons of carbon monoxide, 33 tons of hydrocarbons, 17,000 tons of nitrogen oxide a day—and these are by no means all the pollutants.

New York City gets more than its share.

Its sootfall alone has been estimated as high as 80 tons a month. Its automobile traffic generates 9.8 million pounds of carbon monoxide a day.

"We're in a race with disaster," says Dr. Irving J. Sellkoff, head of the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine's Environmental Medicine Division and an air-pollution expert particularly noted for his studies linking asbestos to human death.

Less than three years ago the Mayor's Task Force on Air Pollution, headed by Norman Cousins, warned: "New York City could be considered uninhabitable within a decade." But now we apparently have a longer breathing spell. In a new report this month, Cousins said the air is now "cleaner and more breathable" because the city had carried out many of the Task Force's earlier recommendations.

New York, like other large cities, has undertaken a program to rid the air of pollutants, with a target date here of 1972. Whatever the effort so far, the city still hasn't shaken off the tag of being one of the dirtiest urban centers in the country.

Just four years ago National Air Sampling Network studies showed New York had an average of 179 micrograms of solid material per cubic meter of air, compared with a low of 56 in Cheyenne, Wyo.; 147 in Pittsburgh; 123 in Newark; 140 in Chicago.

The Public Health Service's National Center for Air Pollution Control compared the severity of air-pollution problems among the 65 largest metropolitan areas in the country in 1967. New York topped the list. It had the dubious distinction of outdoing Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles-Long Beach, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Boston, Newark, Detroit, St. Louis in that order—all the way down to Wichita, Kan., and High Point-Greensboro, N.C.

The average citizen thinks of air pollution only as the stuff that smarts his eyes, dirties his clothes, creates dreadful orders, and cuts down visibility. But polluting the air is like dropping a pebble into a pool. It causes ripples that reach out and touch many aspects of life.

Take the cost, for example.

Air pollution is called one of the most sizable and needless expenses in the American budget.

It costs Americans \$18 billion a year in medical expenses, cleaning bills and building maintenance, said Charles C. Johnson Jr., administrator of the U.S. Health, Education and Welfare Dept.'s Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service. Other experts put the figure nearer \$20 billion.

Dirty air costs New York City area residents \$800 million a year. The average cost of air pollution is \$620 per family per year in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, according to a study released last June by Harry M. Hovey, Jr., associate director of the state Air Resources Division, and Robert Price, vice president of the Fuel Engineering Co. of New York.

In some parts of New York City, said Hovey, the cost is more than \$850 per family per year—or more than \$200 per person, averaging a family as four persons.

There are costs from air pollution that people wouldn't think of. Oxides make rubber crack, so what is the cost of new tires? Dirty air reduces visibility and sunlight, making travel by land, sea and air more hazardous, so what is the cost of accidents, or even the extra lighting bills?

Air pollution is costly not only in direct expense but in waste. At today's prices, \$300 million worth of sulphur a year, found as an impurity in most fuels, goes up in smoke. Ten billion gallons of gasoline evaporate without moving a vehicle an inch. That's 15 per cent of the amount sold, for an annual waste of \$3 billion.

The fly ash that ends up on the West End Av. woman's window still could be money in the bank if retrieved and processed for construction material. European countries such as Germany have successfully used this windfall to make such items as cinder blocks. Consolidated Edison, which has been catching its fly ash for years, experimented with the idea but could find no market for it. Con Ed still collects the fly ash but hauls it out to sea or gives it to someone like the Port Authority to build runways or landfill, just to get rid of it.

The costliness of air pollution attacks nearly everything: metals, buildings, plants, clothes.

Copper and aluminum corrode five times as fast in a polluted atmosphere as in clear air, iron, four times as fast; brass, eight times as fast; zinc, 15 times as fast; nickel, 25 times as fast; steel, 30 times as fast.

New York City has been described as "a chamber of air-pollution horrors." The 10 percent of the country's pollution squeezed into the Long Island-Westchester-New Jersey-Connecticut commuting area are all busy burning fuels for heat, electricity for everything from air conditioners to carving knives, gasoline for millions of cars, with continually more trains, trucks, buses required to supply their needs.

Air pollution has been called "the fall-out of affluence." Some of its effects "are startling," Edward Edelson and Fred Warchofsky remark in "Poisons in the Air."

"Trees near bus stops wither and die, probably from the fumes of the buses' diesel engines. Church organists find that the delicate sheepskin valves of their instruments, made to last for years, are rotted away in months, due to the sulphur in the city's air . . ."

The National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Assn., long concerned about the air-pollution problem, said in its "Air Pollution Primer" that New York City "is being eaten away" by its atmosphere.

"Its brownstone townhouses are flaking off, its marble ornamentation is crumbling, Cleopatra's Needle has suffered more in the time—less than 100 years—it has spent behind the Metropolitan Museum than it did in 3000 years in the Egyptian desert."

Experts blamed air pollution for contributing to the deterioration of the marble on the facade of City Hall, which had to be replaced a few years ago at a cost of \$4 million.

One of the most widespread effects of polluted air is killed or injured vegetation. National agricultural losses have been estimated at \$500 million a year.

Every county in the Garden State of New Jersey, said the PHS, has suffered vegetation damage from air pollution, and at least 36 crops, including spinach, romaine, endive, beets and chicory, have been affected.

Dr. Michael Treshow, a botanist, has noted that "the lingering decline of whole forests and the alterations of entire agronomic and natural plant populations, caused by air pollutants, is only now beginning to excite attention."

Air pollution not only erodes stone, cracks rubber, corrodes metal and ruins vegetation. It also weakens leather, etches glass, discolors paint, makes paper brittle, disintegrates nylon hose on the legs, and causes cattle to lose teeth and even die.

The real question then becomes: What does it do to man?

[From the New York Post, Nov. 11, 1969]
OUR POLLUTED AIR

ARTICLE II: IS IT KILLING US?

(By Hope MacLeod)

Are we breathing ourselves to death?

The U.S. Public Health Service has identified air pollution as a contributory cause of cancer.

Physicians say it damages sensitive lung and respiratory tissue, irritates the eyes, produces fatigue, cuts down working efficiency and makes people tense.

The National Tuberculosis Assn. says:

"Polluted air can make your eyes water and burn. It can blur your vision. But even worse, it can upset your breathing. You may have to make an effort to breathe. And you may not get all the oxygen your body needs to stay healthy.

"Air pollution has been known to kill, to sicken and to destroy. It is particularly hard on people with serious chest conditions—

chronic lung or heart disease. Such people have to work harder to breathe the impure air."

Dr. Stephen M. Ayres, director of the cardio-pulmonary laboratory of St. Vincent's Hospital, points out that "pathologic studies of human lungs demonstrate the impact of air pollution on man. The lungs of country dwellers and of small children in the city are pink. Carbon particles accumulate in the lungs of city dwellers producing the characteristic 'black lung' seen at autopsy."

More and more studies are showing a link between bad air and bad health, up to and including excess deaths.

While most doctors seem to agree that it's unhealthy to breathe polluted air, actual proof is difficult with what we have so far in documented evidence.

"One source of the difficulty in defining the health effects of air pollution arises from the fact that there is no specific air-pollution disease," says Dr. Norton Nelson, director of the Institute of Environmental Medicine at the New York University Medical Center.

"That is, there is no particular pattern of symptoms that defines itself as having arisen from air pollution. On the contrary, it is apparent that air pollution in its effects on health . . . acts primarily through the exacerbation of existing disease."

But the number of those suffering from respiratory diseases is skyrocketing. The number of deaths from bronchitis and emphysema has been doubling every five years and lung-cancer deaths are rising—to 500,000 a year.

"With every breath we take," according to the Public Health Service, "an increasing percentage of us comes a little closer to a diagnosable diseased condition. These ill are mostly disease of the bronchial tree—from the common cold to lung cancer."

Some pollutants in the air, such as lead, may build up in the body until they reach harmful levels. Others—carbon monoxide is one—are not cumulative in their effects, says the PHS, but can cause temporary disability or even death if concentrations are high enough.

Emphysema, a disease in which lung tissue is progressively destroyed, "today in this country is the fastest growing cause of death," according to the PHS. In 10 years emphysema deaths among American males rose from 1.5 per 100,000 to 8 per 100,000.

"Studies have demonstrated that emphysema patients improves when they are protected from air pollution," the PHS says. "The fact that the incidence of emphysema is greater in our cities than in our rural areas points to air pollution as a contributing factor, as does the fact that deaths from emphysema are twice as high in the city as in the country."

A study by three Canadian pathologists of 300 autopsies in highly polluted St. Louis and an equal number in Winnipeg, with its relatively clean air, showed twice as much emphysema in the St. Louis 20-to-40 age group.

Another rapidly growing respiratory ailment, chronic bronchitis, was found in one study, to exist in 21 per cent of men 40 to 59 years old. Other studies indicate that 13 to 20 per cent of the country's adult males have this disease.

The rise in death rates from emphysema and chronic bronchitis in New York City in the past decade has been described by New York City Tuberculosis Assn. as "monumental"—an increase of over 500 per cent from emphysema and over 200 per cent from chronic bronchitis.

Still another disease, bronchial asthma, is often aggravated by air pollution, although it's difficult to say what role pollution plays because so many stimuli can bring on asthmatic attacks. Studies have long indicated, however, that occupational exposure to certain vapors and dusts can trigger such

attacks. And many of these can be found in substantial amounts in ordinary city air.

Air pollution has even been connected with the common cold.

A study of two groups of Maryland residents, differing only in the amount of particulate matter (solid and liquid particles of smoke, dust, etc.) they were exposed to, revealed that the group in the most polluted section had the most colds.

Probably the most frightening aspect is that lung cancer deaths have been climbing so rapidly in recent years.

"And while many factors are involved," according to the PHS, "the striking difference between the urban and rural mortality rate for lung cancer points to one of them—air pollution. The rate in our large metropolitan areas is twice the rural rate, even after full allowance is made for difference in smoking habits.

"The death rate from lung cancer is apparently directly proportional to city size, and the same can be said, in general, for levels of air pollution . . . In Norway, where there is much less air pollution, the lung cancer rate is half that of the U.S."

The PHS cites laboratory investigations that provide further clues. In one, mice, sensitized with influenza virus and exposed to oxidized gasoline—simulated photochemical smog—developed bronchogenic cancer of the type humans get.

In another study, hamsters were repeatedly exposed to intratracheal doses of hydrocarbon found more often in city than country air, and all developed bronchogenic cancer.

"Air pollution," says the PHS, "contributes to disease and premature death."

Dr. Leonard Greenburg, former Air Pollution Control Commissioner and now professor at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, did a study a few years ago on Staten Island that found the death rate from lung cancer among men living on the north shore, which lies in the path of much aerial filth wafting from New Jersey a few miles across the water, to be 55 per 100,000. On the relatively unpolluted south shore the rate was 40 per 100,000. Among women, those living on the north shore had a lung-cancer death rate twice that of those on the south.

Merril Eisenbud, the city's Environmental Protection Administrator, cautions that one should be careful about drawing conclusions from the Staten Island study because of socio-economic differences in the two areas. You'll almost always find more susceptibility to all diseases in the poorer, less advantaged neighborhoods, he points out.

Dr. Ernest L. Wynder, M.D. working at the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, painted mice with material taken from filters exposed to New York air, and produced cancer.

Although Wynder's work in the epidemiology of lung cancer led him to believe its main cause was cigarette smoking, he did note:

"In view of the fact . . . that tumor-initiators, tumor-producing components, and ciliotoxic agents have been identified in city air, remedial measures must be encouraged to reduce these components.

"As long as a likelihood exists that such pollutants may even to a limited extent contribute to lung cancer and that these substances can be reduced through practical measures, such measures must be undertaken."

Says the American Medical Assn.: "There is now no longer any doubt among medical investigators that air pollution is a medical problem in terms of the millions of persons exposed, the subtlety and variety of its effects, and its tendency is to worsen with increasing urbanization."

A truly alarming aspect of the whole air-pollution problem is what a layman might call "delayed reaction."

Biologist Rene Dubos of Rockefeller University says:

"Since most kinds of environmental pollutants produced by modern technology did not reach significant levels until one or two decades ago, their worse effects are yet to be recognized.

"It is known that injection into newborn mice of particulate materials separated from urban air greatly increases the frequency of various types of tumors during the adult life of these animals.

"If this observation can be extrapolated to human beings, the worst effects of environmental pollution are yet to come, since it is only during the past decade that large numbers of babies have been exposed to high levels of pollutants in urban areas . . ."

Or as Dr. Irving J. Selkoff, head of the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine's Environmental Medicine division, puts it:

"Whatever it is that destroys the lung in emphysema doesn't do it in a year or two but takes a very long time. A kid starts smoking at 16, but the effects may not show until he's 56. Uranium miners don't show lung cancer for 10 or 20 years after they start.

"We don't know what air pollution ultimately will do. We must consider the future. We have a responsibility to future generations.

"If it can happen to birds and animals, it can happen to us. Things don't always turn out for the best. Time doesn't always heal everything . . ."

Says Dr. Richard A. Prindle of the PHS: "One can only conjecture that this rising incidence of disease will continue and that the effect on the health of the nation—and over the technologically expanding world—may be augmented.

"The over-all effect of air pollution on the economy, the health and the welfare of the people may become a disaster."

[From the New York Post, Nov. 12, 1969]

OUR POLLUTED AIR

ARTICLE III: WHAT IS IT?

(By Hope MacLeod)

"If the mass of air pollutants continues to build up, the global capacity of the wind systems to disperse pollutants may be seriously impaired," AFL-CIO economist George Taylor has written.

"Thus modern man in the United States and other industrialized nations has created a menace.

"It lurks in the very air we breathe and takes an increasing toll in lives, health and the economy.

"It is seriously disturbing the delicate balance that has existed in the environment, of which man is becoming a ruthlessly disrupting factor," Taylor adds.

"He worships at the shrine of personal cleanliness, creature comforts and new techniques while surrounding himself with an environment of ugliness, filth and poison."

What is this specter, air pollution, hanging like a pall over mankind?

City air pollution control experts describe it very simply: "contamination of the atmosphere by one or more substances."

The U.S. Public Health Service defines it as a mixture of contaminants—solids, liquids and gases—which are discharged into the atmosphere by nature and by man.

An air pollution "problem" is "the presence in the atmosphere of one or more contaminants in such quantities and of such duration as may be, or tend to be injurious to human, plant, or animal life."

The air we breathe is a mixture—about 78 per cent nitrogen, 21 per cent oxygen, a tiny amount of carbon dioxide (0.03 per cent), less than 1 per cent of argon and traces of other gases plus varying amounts of water—in its so-called pure state.

Our air isn't unlimited. About 95 per cent of the total mass is in a layer about 12 miles thick over the earth.

The lower part of this layer—the tropo-

sphere—is where we dump all our aerial "garbage"—an area no deeper than, say, the skin of an apple to the apple itself. And there the filth stays, until dispersed or diluted by wind and rain.

Air pollution control officials, according to the New York Environmental Protection Administration, classify pollutants by origin, by state of matter and chemical composition.

Classified by origin, pollutants are considered primary, that is, those emitted into the atmosphere directly and in their original form such as carbon monoxide; and secondary, namely those formed by chemical reaction of two or more primary pollutants of natural components of the atmosphere. Examples are nitrogen dioxide, sulphur trioxide and ozone.

Classified by the state of matter, pollutants are in either particulate or gaseous categories. Particulates are finely divided solids or liquids. Very small ones, 0.01 to 0.10 micron size, act almost like gas, remain suspended in air, and are carried by wind currents. Smoke, dust and pollen are among the particulates. Gases include carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide and ammonia, for example.

Classified by chemical composition, pollutants are either organic, containing carbon and hydrogen in combination, such as methane and butane; or inorganic, such as carbon monoxide and sulfur dioxide.

The city's three main pollutants, according to the Air Resources agency, are sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate matter.

More information is being sought on atmospheric concentration of nitrogen dioxide, hydrocarbons, trace metals and asbestos, the department said.

The basic source of air pollution is the imperfect burning of fuel and other materials. As Edward Edelson in a Public Affairs Committee pamphlet "The Battle for Clean Air," put it:

"If we extinguished our fires, we would have no air pollution, but we would also be without most of our electricity, our cars, trucks and buses would stop running and we would be almost buried in our own rubbish." (New York City's trash heap amounts to more than 3 million tons a year).

Sulfur dioxide comes from the combustion of fossil fuel such as oil which contains varying amounts of sulfur. Huge quantities of fossil fuel are required to heat New York City homes and offices and generate power.

Carbon monoxide comes from gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles. Air pollution control experts estimate that New York automotive traffic generates 9,600,000 pounds of carbon monoxide a day.

Particulates spew into the air from combustion of coal, and to a lesser degree, fuel oil, as well as private, public and industrial incinerators, and industrial processes.

All sections of New York City are not subject to the same pollutants in the same amounts. But several factors are, in general, good indicators of the types of pollution problems to be found in different parts of the city.

These are density of housing, density of population, automobile traffic, the amount and type of industry and the native meteorology.

In some residential areas, wind conditions sweep in pollutants from industrial areas. In other areas, the major share comes from traffic and industry.

But it isn't just the types or amounts of contaminants that affect the nature and seriousness of an air pollution problem. Also involved are such variables as wind speed and direction, air temperature, precipitation, topography, sunlight, and even an individual's susceptibility to specific contaminants or combination of them.

That is why it is difficult to say what parts of the city are best and which are worst when it comes to air pollution. "It's not

always the same every day," explains Air Resources Commissioner Heller.

But on the whole, spots such as central Manhattan, with its high density of people and vehicular traffic, and Staten Island, due to dirt drifting over from Jersey, are generally more polluted than, say, a tree-lined residential street on Long Island.

The Public Health Service cites a study that indicates the breathing of the air of an average city is—in terms of a hydrocarbon thought to be a cancer-producing substance in cigaret smoke—the equivalent of smoking seven cigarettes a day.

In the most heavily polluted city, breathing its air would equal smoking a pack a day, the study found.

What effects do New York City's three major pollutants have on humans?

Sulfur dioxide, says the PHS, can irritate the upper respiratory tract, and absorbed on particulate matter, can be carried deep into the lungs to injure delicate tissue. It also can combine in the air with water to form sulfuric acid which, in the right particle size, can also penetrate deep into the lung.

The sulfur oxides appear to aggravate existing respiratory disease and prolonged exposure to relatively low levels of sulfur dioxide has been associated with increased cardiovascular morbidity.

Carbon monoxide, says Dr. Stephen M. Ayres, director of the cardio-pulmonary laboratory of St. Vincent's Hospital, has a totally different effect on the body from those that injure the lining of the tracheo-bronchial tract "and may become the greatest pollution problem of the 20th century."

When carbon monoxide, which comes mainly from motor vehicles, enters the bloodstream, it replaces the oxygen needed to carry on the body's metabolism. "At high concentrations," says the PHS, "it kills quickly; at lower concentrations it brings on headaches and a slowing of physical and mental activity."

Arthur Plutzer, chairman of Manhattan's Action for Clean Air Committee, points out that carbon monoxide slows reflex responses and there's a build-up. "Say a man is doing a mile an hour in the Queens Midtown tunnel in rush hour. By the time he gets to Ravenswood he's doing 60 and he's not himself. He's extra careless."

Or as health experts explain, the body retains the pollutant long after exposure is discontinued. A transient exposure of 500 parts per million in a river tunnel might produce a carboxyhemoglobin level which would persist for several hours.

At approximately 100 parts of carbon monoxide for every million parts of air, most people experience dizziness, headache, lassitude and other symptoms of poisoning.

"Concentrations higher than this occasionally occur in garages, in tunnels or behind automobiles," according to the PHS.

But it varies. On one windy "low pollution" day in New York City not long ago, carbon monoxide concentration at a laboratory sampling location was less than 5 parts per million while at street level in the garment district, it exceeded 100 ppm.

The New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information told a state Joint Legislative Committee on Transportation this spring that "at the present time, the levels of carbon monoxide on midtown streets are so high that they exceed the level recommended by the state all day, every day."

Impairment of circulation, heart disease, anemia, asthma, lung impairment, high temperature, high altitude and high humidity all are conducive to make certain persons particularly vulnerable to carbon monoxide poisoning, according to the PHS. The California Public Health Dept. found that exposure to 30 parts per million for eight hours or to 120 parts per million for one hour may be a serious health risk for sensitive people.

Particulates, solid and occasionally liquid, may be large enough to settle rapidly to the

ground or small enough to remain suspended until removed by rain, wind, and "yes, by people breathing them into their lungs," said the PHS.

"Some particulates are directly harmful—they contain poisonous substances or substances, such as the hydrocarbons . . . which may cause cancer. Others multiply the potential harm of irritant gases."

Among particulates are arsenic, suspected of inducing cancer; asbestos fibers, associated with chronic lung disease and cancer; beryllium, which has produced malignant tumors in monkeys; cadmium, which may contribute to high blood pressure and heart disease; fluorides, which cause severe damage to cattle and vegetation; lead, which can cause brain damage in children and impair the nervous system in adults.

Asbestos pollution is particularly frightening because it is continually filling the air from disintegration of brake linings, floor tiles, roofing, insulation, and its effects may not show up for years after one has been exposed to it.

Radiation from atomic power plants and from use of lasers and microwave technology "presents hazards not yet measured," warned the PHS.

[From the New York Post, Nov 13, 1969]

OUR POLLUTED AIR

ARTICLE IV: WAKING UP

(By Hope MacLeod)

Experts talk of the possibility of an air-pollution disaster killing as many as 10,000 or even 100,000 people. Vulnerable cities they say, include London, Hamburg, Santiago, Los Angeles . . . and New York.

New York City's Environmental Control Administrator Merrill Eisenbud says he believes it could no longer happen here. To which skeptical Eldon Clingan, new City Council member who on Jan. 1 will retire as executive director of Citizens for Clean Air, reports: "I only hope to God it's true."

Last spring, the New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information told a state Joint Legislative Committee on Transportation: "The air over New York has become a soup of toxic gases so vile that people are dying during severe air-pollution episodes for lack of clean air."

The industrial revolution accelerated it, but air pollution is nothing new.

Four hundred years before Christ the Greek physician Hippocrates already had associated the city with air pollution and advised that "when one comes to a city to which he is a stranger, he ought to consider its situation, how it lies as to the winds and the rising of the sun . . ."

Vitruvius, a Roman architect in the reign of Augustus, designed buildings for proper ventilation and recommended tree-lined streets to keep the city's air fresh.

The first smoke-abatement law, in 1273 during the reign of Edward I, forbade the use of soft coal in London as detrimental to health. In 1309 an Englishman who broke the law was hanged.

Shakespeare may have described contemporary conditions in the words of Hamlet: "The most excellent canopy, the air—why it appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours."

Studies of air pollution started in England, France and Germany in the 19th Century.

In this country the city of Brooklyn was among the first to enact legislation against air-pollution with an 1895 ordinance which provided in part: "No factory, engine room or electric station shall use what is known as soft coal for fuel . . . within the radius of four miles of the City Hall," under the penalty of a fine of up to \$100.

It was not until 1930, however, that any urban programs for smoke control were set up. That was the year of the first documented air-pollution "episode" of modern times—in

the industrial Meuse Valley of Belgium. An inversion, in which foul air is trapped for days under another air mass above, took 60 lives.

The tragedy stirred awareness throughout the world of dangers that might befall any industrial area. The first New York City program made smoke control a responsibility of the Health Dept. and consisted of 11 sanitary inspectors to investigate complaints. The special unit, which Mayor Jimmy Walker brought into being with much flourish, was abolished in 1934 for economy reasons, and smoke control became simply one of the regular functions of the Health Dept. engineers.

It was an air-pollution "incident" at Donora, Pa., in 1948, when an inversion killed 20 of the town's 14,000 residents and made half of them ill, that finally scared this country's public-health agencies into action. Since then, programs have been started by the federal government, most states, and many municipal agencies.

Four years after Donora a "killer smog" in London lasted five days and took 4000 lives.

Dr. Leonard Greenburg, New York City's first Air Pollution Control Commissioner and now professor of preventive medicine at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, made studies of local air-pollution incidents. He has calculated that there were approximately 220 excess deaths here from air pollution in 1953, 300-350 in 1963, 186 in 1966.

New York has fairly brisk winds that produce what Manhattan College biologist Dr. Tom Stonier refers to as "scouring action," saving us from incidents we might otherwise have.

Only a few years ago air pollution was thought of chiefly in terms of smoke and soot. Other wastes are now known to be involved; detritus from oil and gasoline, from new industrial and chemical processes, new sources of energy, the increasing complexity of modern urbanization.

A new air-pollution-control unit was formed in the Health Dept. here in 1946, and in 1949 its functions were transferred to a Bureau of Smoke Control in the Dept. of Housing and Buildings.

By 1952 it had become clear that the control of air pollution involved more than mechanical smoke control and this prompted creation of the Air Pollution Control Board and Department.

In the 1940s and '50s, meanwhile, Pittsburgh and St. Louis gained attention for their success in eliminating the heavy smoke that both had always been noted for. Los Angeles, however, was perhaps the first city to come to grips with air pollution in all its complexity, and is waging a continuing battle.

By 1964 the New York City Council, finding that "air contamination has proven dangerous and harmful to the health and safety of the residents," set up a special committee to investigate air pollution, with Councilman Robert A. Low, long interested in the problem, as chairman. The committee reported in December, 1965, that "we have passed the point in modern community life when it must be realized that we can no longer continue to use the air as a convenient dumping ground for waste gases and particles produced by the city's complex activities." The report offered recommendations on fuel usage and waste disposal.

In May, 1966, a Task Force on Air Pollution, set up by Mayor Lindsay and headed by Norman Cousins, came up, after months of study, with recommendations for "adequate corrective measures." The Task Force acknowledged that restoring clean air to the city would be "a mammoth undertaking" but was optimistic it could be done. The program "would not be inexpensive," and city government "must move swiftly, decisively, and effectively."

New York City, the Task Force declared,

"pumps more poisons per square mile into the air than any other major city in the United States. The main reason this condition has not produced widespread disaster in the past is that New York has open topographic surroundings and therefore enjoys the cleansing effects of the prevailing winds . . ."

But, it went on, "all the ingredients now exist for an air-pollution disaster of major proportions. It is a serious error to suppose that the kind of air poisoning that brought tragedy to London, and Donora, Pa., could not happen here . . ."

The Task Force listed the city's main sources of "the poisons and dirt in the air"—hardly any subject to proper control:

The city's 11 municipal refuse disposal stations or incinerators, which were "in almost constant violation" of the city's "own laws against air pollution."

The 2606 incinerators and 2500 furnaces, in the city's Housing Authority projects.

The 10,000 incinerators and 135,000 furnaces of private apartment houses and office buildings.

Approximately 600,000 private one-family and two-family dwellings, most using fuel oil for heat.

Consolidated Edison's 11 power-generating stations within the city; some 8500 industrial manufacturing plants; demolition and construction dirt; ordinary street dirt; 13,000 lunchrooms and restaurants, many emitting smoke and odors at street level.

About 1.5 million automobiles, buses and trucks; friction of automobile tires producing rubber dust and brake linings contributing asbestos dust.

Emanations from 400,000 takeoff or landing operations at New York airports each year; 25,000 steamship operations a year in New York Harbor, and, finally, pollution by "air invasion" especially from New Jersey "with its relatively uncontrolled industrial complexes and incinerators."

The Task Force then listed these "main villains" of the assault on human health, on vegetation, on property, on aviation safety: some 230,000 tons of particulate matter; 597,000 tons of sulfur dioxide; 298,000 tons of the nitrogen oxides; 567,000 tons of hydrocarbons; 1,536,000 tons of carbon monoxide. "Together," said the Task Force, "they produce in one year 730 pounds of pollution for each New Yorker. This means the average New Yorker has to contend with more than five times his weight each year in noxious and obnoxious airborne materials."

The Task Force set forth the terms of "a far-reaching and effective" campaign.

Pressure and energy from an alert, enlightened public.

A comprehensive plan to control all environmental hazards ("the City must begin by cleaning its own house—the City is a major offender and must obey its own laws").

Carefully defined clean-air objectives related to a regular, accurate supply of data on air quality, pollution movements, and their effect on the environment.

Control of fuel input and smoke, dirt, and poisons coming out of stacks.

Scientific measurement of emissions of smoke, dirt, and poisons and administrative penalties for violators.

Tax incentives and vigorous enforcement to help accelerate development of pollution-control equipment.

Use of cleaner fuels and modernized equipment by Con Ed.

The sulfur content of fuel oil or coal for heating in private residents, apartment houses, power-generating stations and public buildings must be carefully governed.

Ban on open burning of refuse; right control of all incinerator operations; consideration of possible alternatives to incineration; reduction of pollution by gasoline and diesel engine; coordination of state, regional, and

federal efforts, with local attempt to get full share of federal and state aid.

Finally the city must seek new, advanced approaches and techniques in the fight.

"The Task Force," said the Task Force, "does not doubt that tough, resolute action on a large scale will be taken. It does, however, raise the questions, will the action come about as the inevitable result of a disaster, or will it come in time to avert one?"

[From the New York Post, Nov. 14, 1969]

OUR POLLUTED AIR

ARTICLE V

(By Hope MacLeod)

President Johnson, upon signing the 1967 Air Quality Act: "Either we stop poisoning our air or we become a nation in gas masks, groping our way through dying cities and a wilderness of ghost towns."

Asked recently what he felt was New York City's most important accomplishment in air-pollution control, Environmental Protection Administrator Merrill Eisenbud replied: "We have a tough air-pollution-control law, which is probably the most fundamental accomplishment. We have citizens awareness, and that wasn't easy to come by. Some of us were hoping for that 15 or 20 years ago, and couldn't get it. And finally, a reduction in sulphur emissions."

And what does he think needs to be done in the immediate future?

"Get the apartment-house incinerators under control," Eisenbud said. "I think most people—when they talk of air pollution—mean they've got a lot of dust on their furniture and windowsills. This comes in part from apartment-house incinerators and in part from apartment-house oil burners that have to be corrected and upgraded."

As for sulfur emissions, we now have a city air pollution-control law requiring all coal and fuel oil to be 99 per cent sulfur free as of this past Oct. 1. And as result of earlier voluntary conversions to low-sulfur fuels, the 1968-69 data of air-monitoring stations in the Bronx and Manhattan show a drop of more than 50 per cent in sulfur-dioxide concentrations from the winter levels of 1964-65.

Said Mayor Lindsay: "So nearly two years ahead of the schedule established in 1966, we've managed to rid the city of the fuel that was responsible for most of the sulfur dioxide that was going into our air. This gas, the most notorious of the pollutants, has been sharply reduced. Though much remains to be done, we can all breathe a little easier."

Lindsay also noted that the city had cut the amount of dirt spewing into the air by 22 per cent or 20,000 tons a year.

Among other "major achievements" since 1966 the city has, according to the Air Resources Dept.:

Developed the nation's first comprehensive strategy for attacking the air-pollution problem with a five-year timetable.

Passed Local Law 14 of 1966, amended in March, 1968, and called the most stringent municipal control law in the nation.

Started operation of a 38-station air-monitoring network and established an alert-warning system to prevent severe building of pollution concentrations under adverse meteorological conditions.

Persuaded Consolidated Edison to accelerate compliance with Local Law 14, with the utility going to 99-per-cent sulfur-free fuel three years ahead of legal requirements and installing electrostatic precipitators on its stacks to cut fumes and fly ash.

Discontinued three of the least efficient of 11 municipal incinerators and a municipal asphalt plant; obtained upgrading (to increase efficiency and thus cut down on pollutants going into the air) of 1,600 of the 30,000 heavy (residual) oil burners required by law to be upgraded.

The city currently is testing six air pollution control devices at a \$500,000 pilot

plant at the Greenpoint incinerator, and the Sanitation Dept. is spending over \$1 million testing three large scale control devices.

Lindsay recently pointed to a new program to limit motor vehicle exhaust pollution which will include testing of essentially pollution-free vehicles—two each run by electric, steam, liquified natural gas, liquified petroleum, and compressed natural gas. It also will try out electric buses.

Eisenbud concedes there have been frustrations.

One involves the municipal incinerators, which, he says, "are an important part" of the problem. "The city committed itself to clean up the existing incinerators by May of this year," he said. "And this turned out to be technically unfeasible for the reason that nobody had ever scrubbed the dust out of the exhaust of those incinerators."

"We couldn't find a manufacturer who was willing to provide us with the warrantees we needed in order to justify spending \$20 million of taxpayer money to buy equipment, so we felt we needed to have some pilot studies . . ."

Critics like Eldon Clingan, executive director of Citizens for Clean Air, have been complaining about the failure of the city to enforce the law on itself—that is the failure of the city to clean up the incinerators in its own Housing Authority projects.

"We're behind there," Eisenbud admits, "and certainly the city ought to set a good example. I don't apologize for it. But the projects have fallen behind for reasons that are understandable. They might not be excusable, but they're understandable."

"If I were grading them I'd give them A for effort. They tried. They had trouble getting the money . . . and technical problems involved. On the other hand, there's a very, very large component of the real-estate industry in the private sector that made no effort. First they said our law was unconstitutional. We had to test that, and it was held to be constitutional."

"I think the principal disappointment was that a large segment of the real-estate industry has chosen to hide behind legal technicalities."

"And there are still some other unresolved questions which the courts are going to have to decide. Until they do, we simply can't expect the kind of compliance with Local Law 14 that I think we're entitled to."

Eisenbud did say that about 10 per cent of the incinerators had been upgraded.

"No question but that we would have liked to have done more than we have, but I think we talked hard. There have been some failures but in general there has been good progress."

The state and federal governments have been moving with increasing vigor into the air pollution problem.

The first federal program, in 1955, authorized the Public Health Service to conduct research and give state and local governments technical help. In a 1960 amendment a special study of motor-vehicle pollution was called for. And the Clean Air Act of 1963 broadened the scope by authorizing federal grants-in-aid directly to state and local air-pollution control agencies and expanded the PHS's role in research, training, and assistance.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 directed the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare to designate air quality control areas crossing state lines and set up the National Center for Air Pollution Control to develop air-quality criteria.

Federal funds for air-pollution-control programs rose from \$2 million in 1955 to \$74 million for fiscal 1969.

The first state law dealing with air pollution was passed 16 years ago by New Jersey but New York has been among the leaders since. The Clean Air Act encourages the formation of interstate compacts. New York,

Connecticut and New Jersey formed one such which is farther along than others.

New York State has also made important progress in the area of carbon monoxide fumes; any car registered in this state and manufactured no earlier than June 30, 1963, must by law be equipped with a crankcase-ventilating system approved by the State Health Commissioner. And every motor vehicle manufactured after June 30, 1967, and registered in the state must be equipped with an air-contamination-emission control system approved by the state.

The problem of air pollution, despite the programs now under way, is far from solved.

Opinions differ, for example, on just how well the battle is going. Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) has accused the federal government of "13 years of inefficiency" in combating air pollution. Congress from 1955 to 1968 appropriated \$121 million for an air-pollution research-and-development program, but Reuss points out it took that long simply to organize the research and development work on sulphur oxides.

Glenn L. Paulson, co-chairman of the New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information, contends that in New York City "the only significant change for the better" so far has been Con Ed's changeover to 99-per cent sulphur-free fuel.

Clingan questions the accuracy of the city's figures on how much reduction of pollutants there's been. Whatever the reduction at the top of a smokestack at 300 feet, he says, "it's a question of what gets down to nose level."

And there are other question marks, such as the possible delayed effects of asbestos particles in the air from disintegration of brake linings, floor tiles, roofing, and insulation. Asbestos has been associated with lung cancer. A study of the problem is now underway here.

"We have to take a certain amount of risk," says Arnold Risman, State Health Dept. associate air-pollution-control engineer, "but take asbestos, where we don't know the risk. For example, we're not going to eliminate the N.Y. State Thruway because of accidents, since we want to travel. On the other hand, if there are too many accidents, we should have research and either shut it down or correct the trouble."

Refuse disposal becomes a bigger headache every year. In 1920 an average of 2.75 pounds of waste was collected daily from each person in the country. Today it has grown to 5.3 pounds and is expected to reach 8 pounds per person by 1980. The alternative to burning it—thus polluting the air—is burying it, and we're running out of space.

Suggested long-range solutions of air pollution include electric cars; the complete banning of private automobiles from large cities, replacing them with adequate mass transportation; new uses of solar heat and atomic energy.

But all the plans and "all the laws from Washington to Albany are not going to mean anything," says Kenneth Kowald, executive secretary of New York State Action for Clean Air, "unless people are concerned. You have to face the realization that most aren't sufficiently concerned about life around them."

There is the cost too. As the Mayor's Task Force pointed out: "No one knows whether this program will cost New York City \$300 million or \$500 million . . . or the American people \$5 or \$10 billion to safeguard their environmental resources (but) . . . the price of neglect is infinitely higher."

Says Charles C. Johnson Jr., administrator of the U.S. Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service: "Unless our nation learns and learns quickly to apply the scientific knowledge we have—and it will always be incomplete—to the problem of the environment, we are courting inevitable disaster."

ELECTORAL COLLEGE FINDS A DEFENDER

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, this House debated legislation for a constitutional amendment to elect a President by the direct popular election method.

At that time I stated that although I was in favor of a change in the method of electing a President, I had reservations concerning the direct popular method because it would open the way to a plethora of parties that could conceivably keep a candidate from getting 40 percent of the vote, thus necessitating a runoff between the two candidates receiving the most votes.

This would leave the candidates open to making deals, coalitions and what have you in support of minor party candidates, not to mention the enormous expense manifest in such a runoff election.

I also pointed out that the recent Supreme Court decision in Williams against Rhodes would have to be taken into consideration, which would seem to me to provide a precedent for a multiparty system endemic in the European countries. Some of my colleagues disagreed with me on this point, but perhaps we should heed the advice of the old sage, Plutarch, when he said:

Be ruled by time, the wisest counsellor of all.

I would like to commend the following article to my colleagues, written by Richard N. Goodwin, who presents arguments similar to mine concerning the pitfalls in rushing to abolish an electoral system that has served us well for 180 years. He cogently discusses the reasons why a direct popular election of the President might spell an end to the two-party system that has helped make the United States the most stable and long-lasting democracy in the history of the world. He argues that we cannot tinker with a well-working electoral system because of some abstract theory of pure democracy. This would denigrate the separation of powers principle laid down by our Founding Fathers.

Laws are the codification of public attitudes, and I am not so sure that we want to open the way to the possibility of Executive tyranny, a branch that must be watched closely if the American people are to retain their liberties. Mr. Goodwin presents arguments for change within the Constitution without upsetting the balance of power between the three branches of Government.

Mr. Goodwin's discourse embodies the essence of Aristotle when he stated more than a thousand years ago:

The law has no power to command obedience except that of habit, which can only be given by time, so that a readiness to change from old to new laws enfeebles the power of the law.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent article by Mr. Goodwin follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 6, 1969]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE FINDS A DEFENDER
(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Nothing could be more startling or instructive than the unanimity with which the Establishment of politics and media is rushing to embrace a constitutional amendment which might unhinge the entire political structure. For there is good reason to believe that direct popular election of the President might end that two-party system which has helped make the United States the most stable and long-lasting democracy in the history of the world.

Coming, as it does, at a time of deepening national division and ideological strife, that result is even more likely. Yet this immense possibility—a likelihood in my judgment—has been barely mentioned in the curiously muted debate over a proposal to change a constitutional system which has worked well for two centuries.

To make this judgment, one must first separate out the very different issues whose casual blending has seriously obscured discussion. First is the electoral principle itself, in which all the votes allotted to a state go to the candidate with the most popular votes. Second is the legal right of an individual elector to defy the popular will and vote for the candidate of his personal choice. Third is the question of what happens if no candidate receives a majority of electoral votes.

The second and third issues raise a very different problem from the legitimacy of the electoral system itself. It is whether a small group of men, acting on their individual opinions and motives, should ever be allowed to select the President. Moreover, this is not just an academic possibility. Electors have gone off on their own, and twice the House of Representatives has chosen as President a man who did not receive a plurality of popular votes. (Jackson and—in a rather sordid way—Tilden were deprived of the presidency by Congress despite popular pluralities.)

Certainly nearly everyone will agree that the modern presidency is too important an office to be filled by private maneuvering, deals and coalitions. Still, these abuses can be forestalled without touching the electoral system itself simply by automatically counting a state's electoral votes for the popular winner and providing that a plurality of electoral votes wins. There could also be a provision for a runoff if the leading candidate fell below a specified percentage.

THE 1888 EXCEPTION

None of this requires eliminating the electoral principle itself, which is an unrelated and far more serious matter. That principle is like many other elements of our constitutional structure. It no longer serves the purpose which the founders intended but has assumed other important and rarely articulated functions.

There is, one must admit, the theoretical possibility that a presidential candidate could receive the most popular votes while his opponent won the most electors. Yet in almost two centuries, this has only happened once—in 1888, when Grover Cleveland lost the election to Benjamin Harrison. Even then, Cleveland's popular edge was only 100,000 votes, hardly an overwhelming popular mandate.

If the system has been accurate for over 80 years, it is even more likely to work in the future. For television and other mass media operate to make an election more than ever an expression of a national mood rather than of differences based on state lines. Thus the direct election proposal violates the single most important rule of constitutional amendment: If something is working, don't change it.

We have never before amended the Constitution in anticipation of possible abuse

or on the basis of abstract theory. Only after an abuse has manifested itself, and usually after considerable public pressure, have we acted, and even then with reluctance. Surely this is one of the reasons why the American Constitution has endured while more volatile republics rose and fell.

We must remember that no one really knows why this curious mixture of pure democracy, sectional power, protected interests and divided governments has lasted so long. That ignorance should give us pause before we begin to tinker with the mechanism of the Republic on the basis of abstract democratic theory.

THIRD PARTY POSSIBILITIES

One must equally admit that it is impossible to be certain of the consequences of the projected change to direct elections. Yet it is a fact that the only third parties which have lasted in this country have been those with a geographical base—those that could carry states. The most noteworthy modern example has been the Southern Party, from the Dixiecrats through Wallace.

The others have proved transient, or have never begun, in important part because they could not hope to carry any states and would thus receive no electoral votes. (In 1948 Strom Thurmond and Henry Wallace received approximately the same popular vote but Wallace got no electoral votes to Thurmond's 39. The Southern Party is still with us and the Progressives passed away.)

Many of those who were tempted by third party movements—and I know this from personal experience in 1968—have been discouraged by the knowledge that their activities would only help swing a state's electoral votes to that candidate who was ideologically furthest from them. With only the popular vote at stake, however, regional roots become irrelevant. Groups united by general conviction or special interest might well think it in their interest to form a new party.

Such a party might bargain with one of the major parties in return for an endorsement or offer to withdraw in the course of a campaign in return for endorsement. It might also run candidates in the hope of forcing a runoff election in which its votes would be eagerly and profitably sought. Based on our historical experience, this could prove an extremely fruitful course.

Fifteen of our Presidents have been elected with less than a majority of the popular votes. Therefore, in almost half of our elections, a third party, at least theoretically, could have held the balance of power. And two of our last three elections have been virtual popular ties.

The experience of some of our largest states demonstrates that this is more than a theoretical possibility. We now have four parties in New York State, with both the Liberal and Conservative parties exercising influence far out of proportion to their strength. Nor is California a stranger to third party politics.

Had direct election been in effect last year, we probably would have had an anti-war party (and I would have joined). The possibilities for the future are limitless. Direct election might well bring us a farmer's party, a senior citizens' party, a black party and other groups coalescing around common interest and belief.

A TIME OF FRAGMENTATION

The possibility of multiparty activity is as much a matter of the psychology of presidential politics as of pure reason, which is probably why it is so little discussed, for relatively few of those involved have had direct experience in presidential campaigns. Yet I believe that our history combines with modern experience to demonstrate that the inability to receive any electoral votes has been a powerful deterrent to third and fourth and fifth party movements.

If this is so, then direct election could not come at a worse time—when the ten-

gency to political fragmentation and ideological division is reaching new heights. This, to me, is the central issue of reform and deserves the most serious consideration. (It will always be possible, of course, for a new major party to merge; that might well happen in 1972, for the first time since the 1850s.)

Other objections to direct election have been rather fully discussed. No great principle is involved in the speculation that it might increase the importance of small states. Purely as a matter of interest, however, I believe that those who anticipate such a consequence would be seriously disappointed.

Most presidential campaigns are directed at a "swing vote" of about 10 to 20 per cent of the electorate. Any candidate in search of those votes must focus his money and efforts on the large states, for that is where the people are and where the most volatile vote is to be found.

In 1968, about half the total vote for the two major candidates came from just seven states. A change of less than 1½ per cent in those states would have canceled out Richard Nixon's entire Southern margin over Hubert Humphrey. No political strategist could wisely advise a candidate to take the slightest risk in the big states in order to pick up a few Southern or border States.

Thus if direct election is approved, the proponents of the "New Federalism" will preside over the dissolution of one of the few remaining levers which less populated sections have on national politics. This may be a healthy thing, but it always helps to be clear about what you are doing when you change the Constitution.

NO PURE DEMOCRACY

The electoral college has not only faithfully reflected the popular will; it has usually strengthened it by giving a candidate with a narrow popular margin a far larger electoral mandate. Against this historical experience is now set the argument that the electoral system offends the theoretical democratic principle of "one man, one vote."

This is certainly so, at least in abstract possibility. We must remember, however, that this is not the uniform principle of our government. The Supreme Court, with its power to overrule President and Congress, is responsible to no electorate. And its insulation from popular will has helped strengthen it to protect popular liberties.

A Senator elected by a few hundred thousand votes in Idaho has as much power over national affairs as a man selected by several million citizens of New York. Yet the Senate has often been a more liberal and principled body than the House. Men like the Secretary of Defense, whose power over our lives far exceeds that of most of our earlier Presidents, are appointed and removed by one man.

Our national government is not a pure democracy, nor does anyone suggest that it should be. None of our institutions of government acts exactly as the Founding Fathers expected. Yet they have managed to evolve some kind of enduring and relatively fruitful harmony.

The system is not perfect, and I believe we need some fundamental changes. But when we are asked to change an institution as basic as the Electoral College, the only relevant questions are practical ones. How is it working? What are its functions? What will be the consequences of change? To act on the basis of rhetoric about pure democracy may have threatening consequences for the future of our actual democracy, and would be in a spirit foreign to the Constitution itself.

For all the influence of mass media and fast planes, we are still a continent, sheltering diverse peoples with very different ways of living. The Electoral College has been one of the institutions tending to strengthen

the curious, irrational and frustrating political system which has held us together. Before embarking on the irrevocable course of abolition, we should be sure that we understand and are willing to risk the possible results.

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING DEDICATED

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 3, 1969, I had the privilege of participating in the dedication of the new Federal building in Louisville, Ky.

I would like to commend Administrator Robert L. Kunzig and the General Services Administration for giving prime consideration to the needs of the handicapped in designing this building. It is of the utmost importance that Federal structures be designed so as not to bar the handicapped from carrying out their business with the Government.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the November 4 edition of the Louisville Courier Journal concerning the dedication of this fine Federal facility:

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING IS DEDICATED

Because the nation's "old priorities" have required huge expenditures for "military adventures about the world," Louisville was a long time getting a new federal building, U.S. Sen. Marlow W. Cook said yesterday.

But the \$12 million structure now stands complete and occupied at Sixth and Chestnut streets, and a standing-room-only crowd, mostly of government employees, braved chilly afternoon winds and rain to see it dedicated.

Cook, who said he has "never before been invited to dedicate any building in all my years of public life," was the main speaker.

The allocation of federal resources, he said, is "the major problem confronting the American people and their government in 1969."

The American policy of spending "up to half our annual budget on military adventures" he labeled "counter-productive," and urged that more of the nation's resources be dedicated to solving domestic problems.

"Americans know where their tax money ought to be going," he said, "because they are breathing polluted air, swimming in polluted water and stuck in insoluble traffic jams going to and from work every day.

"And why do these problems continue and even grow worse? The American people now know the answers. We have a standing army of 3.5 million men, with approximately 1.5 million of these abroad attempting to police the world."

The Republican senator, reaffirming his support of President Nixon's "efforts to end this conflict" in Vietnam, said that such involvements "do not obtain the desired results, sap our most prized resources—our youth—and divert our revenue away from the mounting problems of the cities."

Cook described as "extraordinary" the new 10-story building, which will house 24 federal agencies employing about 2,000 workers.

Jeffrey P. Hillelson, regional administrator from Kansas City, represented the General Services Administration, which directed design and construction of the building. He presented symbolic golden keys to Cook and U.S. Reps. William O. Cowger, who introduced the senator, and M. Gene Snyder.

OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to place into the RECORD "Opportunity in Education for the Disadvantaged Student," a speech delivered by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE. I believe with Senator MUSKIE that a great untapped resource of talent lies in the group labeled "the disadvantaged." The Nation urgently needs their talents and insights.

The speech follows:

OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENT

(Remarks by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE to the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, October 9, 1969)

Some years ago, on the day of my first inauguration as Governor of the State of Maine, a friend asked my father if that was not the proudest day of his life. "No," he answered, "the proudest day of my life was the day my son graduated from Bates College." My father was an immigrant from Poland, who came to this country to find a better life for himself and his children. To him, the key to the promise of America was a college education.

His hopes and his perception of how his hopes could become fact were like the hopes and perceptions of millions of American parents, before and since. His son was one of those lucky ones to whom the way was opened, even in the midst of the depression. I am indebted to teachers who trained and encouraged me, to those who helped me find the money to pay my way, and to that gatekeeper who let me in.

In part, my appearance here is an expression of gratitude for the chance one of your number gave me many years ago. In part, I have come because I think you have a sensitive and critical role in a society suffering from divisions and doubts.

There are parallels between the world today and the world I knew as a poor young man, knocking on the college gates when our economy was staggering. But there are also substantial differences. The numbers of young people who want to go to college are far greater. The pressures for college degrees are more intense. And the differences between the affluent and the poor and disadvantaged are more exaggerated.

We can all see and feel those pressures and differences. We know that a failure to relieve the pressures and reduce the differences between the haves and the have-nots can destroy our society. There is not much time left for us to correct the conditions which threaten us, and, unless we use that time wisely, history may write our epitaph: "Here lies a once-great nation which, in the midst of its affluence, forgot that poverty and the indifference to it are twin cancers which destroy the mighty with the weak."

To whom may one more appropriately turn to remedy some of the contradictions than to the gatekeepers of our nation's colleges and universities? You help determine the life chances of millions of young people, and through them you help shape our society.

Our dilemma stems not from our failure to see the need for expanded educational opportunities. We have, through several actions, recognized, in the late President Kennedy's phrase, that education is "the keystone in the arch of freedom."

In elementary and secondary education, in

particular, our nation has virtually created a new doctrine: that equal educational opportunity can come about only from treating the poor *unequally*. We have created special opportunities and compensatory services under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Teacher Corps, Head Start, and similar programs. Through these and other national commitments we have begun to focus attention—both preventive and remedial—on the nation's forgotten national human resources.

In higher education, we have expanded available student spaces beyond the wildest speculations of those only one or two generations behind us. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that America is moving toward the principle that post-secondary education should be an individual right for all and no longer a privilege of the few.

Our manpower requirements, the desires of parents and the expectations of youth have combined to force increases in financial support for education far beyond expenditures in any other area of public service. In the Congress, a remarkable series of laws passed over the last decade lead me to conclude that debate over whether some form of universal post-secondary educational opportunity is desirable or necessary has been substantially completed. The question was drowned in a flood of rising demands for the enlargement of existing institutions and the creation of many hundreds of new ones.

Forty-two percent of our 18-21 year olds are now enrolled in post-secondary schools. A 50 percent enrollment by the mid-1970's is probable and an 80 percent enrollment is not unthinkable before the end of the century.

Despite the miraculous growth in the size and number of educational institutions, however, American higher education remains largely the preserve of the white and the affluent. With all of our recent concern about the eradication of poverty and discrimination, with all of the commitments voiced by educational leaders, and with all of the public and private programs designed to help the disadvantaged, we have not begun to deliver on our promises.

One recent study of enrollments at the University of California found that students from families of incomes above \$25,000 are four times as likely to be eligible for admission as are students from families of incomes under \$4,000. Among those who are eligible for admission to that great university system, twice as many young people from high-income families attend as do those from low-income families.

Recent studies of the American Council on Education also tell us that the proportion of blacks among entering college freshmen has changed only slightly since 1966. Their representation in college is only about six percent of total enrollments, or one-half of their proportion of the nation's college-age population. When we look at the distribution of black students—not to mention Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, American Indians, and other neglected minorities—we find that nearly one-half of all black freshmen attend Negro colleges, while more than half of all of the institutions in the United States have black enrollments of only one or two percent. At a time when gateways to advancement frequently require the possession of a college degree, only four percent of our black fellow Americans have it. If our national goal is to build one society, one nation, we can't do it on the basis of today's performance.

I am convinced that your profession has the power to open the doors of opportunity to the fifth of our population living in poverty, the fifth who will either make us whole or drag us all to moral bankruptcy.

I have been impressed by the research of Dr. Alexander Astin of the American Council on Education, which was recently reported at the Council's 52nd annual meeting.

I think some of the conclusions of his studies need your most careful consideration. They have serious and far-reaching implications for your admissions policies.

First, Dr. Astin concludes that low representation of blacks and other minority groups among entering college freshmen is attributable, in large part, to admission policies which depend primarily on high school grades and tests of academic ability. These grades and tests, in other words, place a premium on those who have already enjoyed the benefits of social and educational advantage. They say practically nothing about one's ability to grow and to perform at acceptable, if not always brilliant, academic levels.

Moreover, even as predictors of academic success, high school grades and tests are subject to very considerable error. And, as in the case with much of our education system, the customer pays the cost of the system's failures. In this instance the cost is lifetimes warped by lost opportunities.

The most remarkable finding in Dr. Astin's research is the fact that the dropout rate of black students attending white colleges is lower than would be predicted from their high school grades and scores on academic tests. Once admitted, so-called "high-risk" students tend to "make it." They may not be at the top of their classes but they compare favorably with average white students who meet the traditional standards and expectations of the higher education establishment.

Dr. Astin's research concludes that even the highly selective colleges of America can afford to admit much larger numbers of disadvantaged students without substantially increasing their dropout rates or lowering their academic standards. Minority students from disadvantaged backgrounds may tend to achieve at a slightly lower level than their white classmates, but there is ample evidence that many of them actually learn more, change more, grow more in the college process, than their more privileged white colleagues. This should not surprise us if we consider their motivation for achievement.

Astin points out that college admissions policy, as currently practiced, is designed to "pick winners" rather than to identify students who have the most potential for growth and change. Selective admissions, based on conventional tests, are in fact misdirecting the great resources of our institutions of higher learning from those who could profit most from them to those who are in a position to cash in on the advantages of affluence.

If by higher education we mean the development of capacity to realize potential, rather than simply nurturing those who have been prepared for the demands of the institutions, the Astin studies show that there can be enormous payoff in expanding college enrollments from among the disadvantaged.

To put the stark problem again: even if present admissions criteria predicted future academic achievement—and we know they are subject to considerable error—they do not apparently predict the individual's capacity for growth or change. In addition, they perpetuate those racially—and ethnically—related social disparities which represent one of the biggest flaws in our society. They do virtually nothing to close the growing rift of the two Americas—one white and affluent, the other poor and colored.

Unless we turn our attention to fundamental change in college admissions criteria, we shall see little real improvement in educational opportunity for the bottom fifth of our population. We shall see a continuation of the situation in which the more selective schools compete among themselves for the limited pool of minority students who can pass the traditional admissions procedures. We need a massive nationwide effort to increase the size of the pool of minority students going on to post-secondary education.

This, in turn, can happen only when admissions officers look at the potential for individual growth, rather than at academic achievement records in the high schools and at conventional measures of apparent academic aptitude.

Not only Dr. Astin's studies, but the growing experience of many institutions tells us that so-called "high-risk" students can make the grade, even in our more selective institutions. But they won't make the grade unless our admissions policies reflect our urgent commitment to open the doors of opportunity to those who have never experienced it.

Government must do its part. So-called "high-risk" students need massive financial aid, special tutorial services, relevant work-study experiences, and other assistance. All of these aids cost money. Recent Federal actions have begun to recognize these needs and these added costs. But few of us in Washington are content with what we have done. In the years ahead the national commitment to post-secondary education will have to be expanded many-fold through direct Federal assistance. Moreover, if the Congress should enact the welfare reforms and revenue sharing proposals recommended by the President, the States must be held accountable for ensuring that their new-found fiscal resources will be channeled into the needs of higher education and the needs of the disadvantaged.

I did not come here today to place responsibility for bridging the gap between black and white, rich and poor, upon your shoulders alone.

Those of us in public office will have to provide major resources to finance this massive effort. But you can start this nationwide process by telling your community, your alumni, your governing boards and perhaps even your faculty and administrators, that there need not be a conflict between increasing college opportunities for the disadvantaged and the maintenance of sound academic standards. This, it seems to me, is one of the most heartening findings of current social science. It tells us that if we have the will we can make of education what every public opinion poll says that the people want it to be: a genuine gateway to opportunity for all, a basis for enlightened public interest, and an instrument for preparing leaders for a truly democratic society.

"SESAME STREET"

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been complaining loud and long about the caliber of television programming. I have been particularly concerned about the kind of programs which are directed toward our young children who spend many, many hours in front of a television set.

I am pleased, therefore, to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new program which will begin on November 10 on educational channels all over the country, every day during the week. The program which will appear in 44 States, is called "Sesame Street." It is an hour-long show aimed at children from ages 3 to 5, and will be entertaining and educational.

The program will use a popular medium to provide basic preschool education to the public, and for preschool

children. This program may well make an impact on the disadvantaged, particularly where it is seen by headstart children.

I would like to congratulate the Children's TV Workshop and its outstanding executive director, Joan Ganz Cooney for this program, as well as the Carnegie Corp., the Ford Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the National Institute of Child Health and Development, and the National Endowment for the Humanities who are jointly responsible for the Children's TV Workshop and its funding.

This is an excellent example of cooperation between the U.S. Government and its great private charitable foundations.

GRIT QUESTIONS NEED FOR POSTAL CORPORATION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Post Office and Civil Service Committee is continuing its executive sessions aimed at producing the most comprehensive reform of the postal system in history.

The committee has voted to proceed with reform within the present structure of the department, rather than converting to a public corporation.

There are those, including the incumbent President and his Postmaster General, who insist that reform can be accomplished only by a complete substitution of the present Government Department.

Reform certainly is in order and we are going to provide the legislative means, but it does not require starting from scratch with a public corporation.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial on this subject has been published in *Grit*, a national newspaper published weekly at Williamsport, Pa. Following is the text of the October 30 editorial which sees the situation just as I do in approaching this vital problem:

DOES THE UNITED STATES NEED A POSTAL CORPORATION?

Although endorsed by the White House, the proposal to scrap the Post Office Department and replace it with a government-owned corporation has been narrowly rejected by the House Post Office Committee. The committee deserves commendation for handling this two-sided question in such a cautious manner.

Proponents assert the change would eliminate the mounting annual deficits of the department, would provide dependable and reasonably priced mail service, and would give employees the kind of career advantage enjoyed by workers in major industries.

However, it should also be pointed out that there would be drawbacks. The biggest, perhaps, would be a sharp jump in postal rates, for increases would be needed to help the corporation meet its expenses. The plan also would open the possibility of unionization, strikes, and a complete shutdown of postal service. Further, the switch would put an end to the original concept of the Post Office Department—to provide a service and to help keep people in-

formed, even at the price of subsidization by the federal government.

Most Americans will agree that the present department doesn't move the mail as rapidly as it should. However, it has been operating under often archaic conditions in equipment, buildings, and transportation and is subject to strong political influences. Perhaps a modernization program and elimination of politics could put the department on a more solid footing. These steps at least should be considered before complete reorganization is carried out hurriedly.

TEXAS AVIATION INDUSTRY IS BOOMING

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I take considerable pride in the airport and airways bill recently passed by the House. In a short span of time, it may be known as the Magna Carta of the aviation industry. Inculcated in that bill are measures that will help this Nation keep pace with the gigantic technological advances made in commercial and general aviation. We have also given our States the necessary tools to keep in step with the national plan for aviation.

I am concerned that the assistance to general aviation will be weakened in the Senate treatment of this bill. Section 22 of the original bill makes grants to the States for necessary money to expand airports serving noncommercial carriers. If this section is struck, States will be left high and dry. There is a need to establish State aeronautics commissions on a practical and proper basis.

Charles Murphy, director of the Texas Aeronautics Commission says it in succinct fashion:

The Senate must be urged to keep the sections providing money to the states. By levying registration charges and by taxing passenger tickets, the federal government has pre-empted the states' last remaining revenue source. This could be disastrous to aviation during the next decade.

Prior to passage of this bill, however, the aviation industry has been going it alone largely. And they have done an admirable job—particularly in Texas.

The aviation industry takes naturally to the open skies of Texas, the room to grow and the imagination to innovate. Accordingly, I would direct your attention to the following article written by L. A. Wilke for the November issue of *Texas Parade*. The author presents an in-depth perspective of the now and the future of Texas aviation. You will take particular interest in the predicted growth of general aviation—possibly up 87 percent by 1980. And, you will wonder at the accomplishments programed into the new airports such as Houston and the one on the drawing boards for the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

Recognizing the growing aviation industry in Texas, the Civil Aeronautics Board recently took two significant actions regarding Austin—they gave permanent approval to the daily round-trip

flight between Austin and Washington and the CAB recently awarded an east-west flight connecting central Texas with the west coast.

As a member of the Aeronautics and Transportation Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, I find this article a concise wrap-up of Texas potential in the national aviation picture:

WINGS OVER TEXAS

(By L. A. Wilke)

When railroaders drove the Golden Spike connecting the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific at Promontory, Utah, May 10, 1869, they said it marked "the end of physical isolation."

It was just the beginning of the end. Today, a short span of a century later, you can fly from Texas to any place in the free world in a matter of hours. Local distances, say from Houston to Dallas-Fort Worth, have been reduced to minutes.

The aviation industry in Texas—both in flights and the manufacture of aircraft—is growing faster than men can be found to perform the necessary services.

Texas' population is nearing 12 million and just about that many passenger boardings will be recorded this year through the gates of the crowded air terminals.

New transcontinental nonstop flights are offered by a half-dozen of the competing airlines serving Texas. They include New York, Washington, points in Florida; Cleveland, Chicago and Detroit in the middle west; to San Diego, Los Angeles and Seattle on the west coast; and to Denver and Salt Lake City in the Rockies.

These are just continental flights. Direct international flights are available from Texas to the far corners of the world. You now can board a plane in Dallas or Houston and fly non-stop to Hawaii. Enroute you enjoy a first-run movie along with gourmet food and cocktails, served by lovely girls who quick-change their colorful skirts before every serving. Or you can leave Houston via KLM Royal Dutch Airline and be in Europe in 10½ hours.

In its advertising Braniff says: "We streak you to Hawaii so fast you pick up five full hours on the clock. Braniff girls bring you slipper socks, newspapers, menus and then serve you. With Wahine punch, coconut chips. And the Surfboard Bar is open all the way to Hawaii. Tropical fruit and hot scented towels refresh you." And on and on and on until you land. Passengers probably are reluctant to get off.

Braniff's slogan, "If you've got it, flaunt it!", pretty well capsules the high competition extant among the airlines. All of the majors cater to the customer with long-stemmed hostess who heed the Braniff dictate in both dress and manner, service at reduced rates, excursion fares and faster luggage handling.

Most vacation and holiday seats are sold out days ahead. And there's seldom an emplanement anywhere that isn't filled to near capacity. Loads run from six places on some of the smaller feeder routes to 180 passengers on most of the huge jets.

Texas is the home base for two of these important airline systems—Braniff International of Dallas and Texas International of Houston. They've been reorganized from fledgling operations to giant corporations with thousands of employees. They do millions of dollars in business each year.

Besides the commercial planes, a number of military bases in Texas help to keep the sky filled with aircraft of myriad description—from fast fighter training jets to whirlybirds.

Many of these planes that zoom or paddle about in the Texas sky are built within the state. Texas plays a leading role in manufacture of aircraft, both commercial and military. Anywhere you go in the free world,

shadows are cast by the wings of planes built with components produced in Texas factories.

Commercial aviation was a major factor in Texas transportation even before Charles Lindbergh guided the "Spirit of St. Louis" to Paris. It started with the original Texas Air Transport, with Bowen and Southern close behind. Then came airmail contracts. The first of these flights from Texas was on National Air Transport—now a part of United—May 12, 1926. The plane was piloted by Richard Lee Dobie, now deceased, a brother of the late author-historian J. Frank Dobie.

American was the first major airline to come out of Texas. C. R. Smith, a University of Texas graduate, was the top operating officer. The line was promoted by such old-timers as the late Amon G. Carter, publisher of the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* and A. P. Barrett, a former state senator and financier. American now has its headquarters in New York, but its Texas operations still rank near the top in passenger boardings and service.

Braniff got its start in Oklahoma but soon moved to Texas, where it began spreading out and taking over other airlines. Today Braniff services routes in every direction. Its high-flying bright plumaged birds whisk passengers to South America, Hawaii and Japan via Braniff all the way.

Today Harding Lawrence, one of the founders of the old Pioneer Airlines, is board chairman and president of Braniff. (It was Lawrence who okayed the revolutionary concept of painting Braniff's planes in bright colors—an idea conceived by brilliant Texas-born ad woman, Mary Wells, who is now Mrs. Lawrence.) Lawrence returned to Texas in 1965 from California, where he had gone when Continental took over Pioneer. Braniff this year boasts the best ontime performance among all U.S. domestic trunkline airlines.

Since Lawrence assumed the presidency, Braniff has upped its income 168 per cent and 113 per cent in passengers carried. With 5.6 billion passenger miles, that figure has increased 263 per cent. Aviation is big business indeed. For instance, for the first six months this year Braniff alone had operating revenue of \$157 million.

Walter Moore, editor of the *Texas Almanac*, predicts general aviation will increase the number of active planes by 87 per cent to 214,000 between now and 1980. He says total annual passenger emplanements from Dallas-Fort Worth airports will reach 16.5 million as early as 1980.

The current Texas International began as Texas Air Transport. It came into being 21 years ago at the old Avenger Field at Sweetwater with a couple of Douglas DC-3s serving eight Texas cities. Through years of struggle, in which the name changed to Trans-Texas Airways and earned the dubious sobriquet of "Tree Top Airlines," the airline grew to its present imposing fleet of 11 DC-9 Pamper Jets and 25 Prop-jet Convair 600s. Texas International now services an 8,100-mile route linking 66 cities in seven states and Mexico. Last year, the fast-growing airline flew a record 1,958,818 passengers.

Airline growth has been faster than ground facilities. Building a multimillion dollar jet is easier than getting the necessary land for an airport and putting in runways and buildings. Today just about every city in Texas with an airport is suffering under the towering traffic load.

Houston is the major exception. A few months ago, the conditions there at the old W. P. Hobby airport were deplorable. But that all changed this summer with completion of the remarkable new Houston International Airport. There is nothing like it anywhere.

This gleaming ultramodern \$110 million airport is 16 miles north of Houston and sprawls over 7,300 acres between two multi-lane highways connected by the Outer Belt.

More than 10 years passed before Houston's dream of this splendid facility was realized—a fact that should spur any other city that hopes to prepare for the coming onslaught of bigger planes and increasing hordes of passengers. As *Houston* magazine reported recently, "Early in 1957, President Ben C. Belt and other officials of the Chamber of Commerce concluded that by the time any airport site could be selected and the City could get bonds approved for its purchase, it would cease to be available or the price would become prohibitive. The only answer seemed to lie in a 'group of friends,' as Mr. Belt expressed it, buying land for such a site, and then holding it for subsequent resale to the City at its cost to them . . ."

So a group of 18 men quietly went about acquiring lands for the airport site. Ownership of about 3,000 acres was accumulated by the group through a holding company called the "Jet Era Ranch Company." Because of a typographical error the site became known as the "Jetero Airport" and later got its official designation of Houston Intercontinental Airport.

In 1960 the City purchased the land for \$1.9 million, the price the group had paid for it. Additional land brought the site to 7,300 acres.

Today the airport stands as a prototype of what the airport of the future will be. Its runways—the longest 9,400 feet—will easily accommodate the jumbo planes of the 10 lines already operating there. Ultimately two of them will be extended to 12,000 feet to handle planes of the future. Traffic at Houston Intercontinental is estimated at 4½ million passengers annually and is projected to more than double by 1975.

And for once, it looks like the perennial airport parking problem is solved, even if the price is substantial: up to \$4.50 a day for protected space.

Each of the two four-story terminals at the new airport has four parking facilities with none more than 600 feet from the take-off gate. These alone will accommodate 3,000 automobiles. Grade level parking is available for another 1,500 automobiles. Short time parking is nearby and passengers can ride an underground "brain train" that operates every two minutes, from parking to plane. Automatic ticket gates speed the entry and seven pay depots at exits prevent congestion after flight arrivals.

In addition to the major schedule flights, a new mini airline named Metro has been formed to haul passengers from the NASA complex south of Houston. This service is supplied by twin Otters with short takeoff and landing capability. It costs \$10 to fly between the airports, with free parking at the NASA site. Also scores of private planes land and embark each day from the airport for different parts of the state.

It is for these planes that the Texas Aeronautical Commission (TAC) operates as a state agency. The agency has a budget of \$1 million a year to aid towns under 50,000 population. This year 53 small cities are getting aid, either in building a complete new airport or providing additional runways, lights and aprons. Charles Murphy, former state representative from Houston is executive director of TAC. Members of the commission are appointed by the governor. Current members are: Harry P. Whitworth, Austin, chairman; Rex C. Cauble, Denton; Hugh A. Fitzsimmons Jr., Carrizo Springs; Paul M. Fulks, Wolfe City; Lucian Flournoy, Alice; and James Luther, Burnet.

While air travelers to Houston were still looking over the wondrous airport there, construction got underway on the Fort Worth-Dallas regional airport, a facility designated as the "jumbo hub" of the universe. Expected to be completed in 1972, it will be approximately 72 square miles in area and eventually have 14,000-foot runways. The builders anticipate 1975 when the hub's estimated traffic will reach 11 million.

Passengers will walk less than 300 feet in arriving and boarding. Architecturally, a bird's-eye view of the complex will resemble a chain of semi-circles capable of handling 18 giant 747s at a time. There will be room for 500 parked planes and 21,000 parked automobiles. The whole project will cost an estimated \$500 million and 13,000 to 14,000 persons will be employed at the site.

As airports increase in size, so do the planes. Lockheed now is beginning production of its Tristar L-1011 which will carry 345 passengers. Subcontracts have been let in the Dallas-Fort Worth aviation plants for components for this big bird that will have a wing span of 155 feet and weigh, empty, 208,553 pounds. With from 250 to 345 passengers, plus cargo, it will cruise at 600 miles per hour. It will be ready for jet travelers in 1971, according to Lockheed. And expected to be ready next year is the Boeing 747, a four-engine jet that's bigger than a football field and will carry 380 passengers at a speed of 600 miles per hour.

And possibly as early as this month Texans will get a sneak preview of the fabled C-5A, the world's largest transport, when it flies into Kelly Air Force Base at San Antonio. Kelly will provide total maintenance for the C-5A in months to come.

Thomas M. Sullivan, director of the new Dallas-Fort Worth Regional Airport, predicts: "By the year 2000, probably before, we'll be able to fly at speeds of 7,000 or 8,000 miles per hour." In that case, passengers will eat breakfast in New York and get to London way too early for lunch.

Texas also is the home of the Airline Passengers Association, 10-year-old Dallas-based organization of people who fly. Jack Cox, Austin and Dallas business executive, is president.

"Aviation engineers are burning midnight oil in planning ways to handle traffic, cargo, safety, movement, parking, eating and even leisure," says Cox. "The passengers, however, need a watch dog. We try to fill this gap. With much of our membership across the nation flying every day, we get constant reports from them. They offer suggestions on ways to improve the service element of air transportation. We then can clear many of these problems with the industry.

"Everyone knows how crowded the terminals are; the difficulty of getting to and from the airport, getting luggage faster and many other problems. The passenger is in a hurry. He fails to buy insurance . . . or to leave a forwarding address. We are able to help him and the airlines at the same time."

A new business also is generating for the so-called feeder lines, according to Cox. The big lines can't serve the small towns, or even the small cities.

Feeders represent the third level of air transportation. They take up where the trunk and regional airlines cannot go, and their growth has been rapid. "We've heard them called the hottest thing in aviation since wings," Cox says. It is estimated there are some 200 commuter lines now operating in the United States. There were only 12 in 1965. Texas has 10 such lines, certificated by the Texas Aeronautical Commission.

Air Texas now is the largest of the commuter airlines, since merging recently with Tyler-based Fleetway. The merger gives Air Texas a total of six routes, serving nine cities with 226 flights a week.

Cities served are Fort Worth, Austin, Dallas, Gladewater, Houston, Kilgore, Longview, San Antonio and Tyler.

The Sentinel Airlines of West Texas serves Midland-Odessa and Abilene, to Fort Worth and Dallas. There are two flights a day in each direction.

Other TAC certifications: Hood Airline of Killeen, providing service between Killeen and Dallas.

Davis Airlines of Bryan, serving Bryan/College Station and Dallas.

Houston Metro, flying between the NASA complex and the new Houston airport.

King Flight Service between Wichita Falls and Dallas.

Miller Aircraft Inc., McGregor/Waco and Dallas.

Amistad Airlines, Del Rio, two-way route between San Antonio and Del Rio.

Among the major airlines serving Texas are Eastern, Continental, Frontier, Aeromexico, Delta, KLM, Mexican de Aviacion; National, Pan-Am and United with interchange.

These lines also have sales offices in the principal cities of Texas and offer flight schedules to any large city in the world, direct or via interchange.

A large per cent of ticketing on these airlines is through authorized travel agencies, a service without cost to the passenger. In fact, the travel agents—through their constant contact with schedule changes and excursion plans—often can save the passenger money.

Interstate commuter service is coming, too. CAB has granted authority to Ozark Air Lines to operate between St. Louis, Tulsa and Fort Worth-Dallas. According to CAB, Ozark will haul an estimated 100,000 passengers the first year, with profit in excess of \$1 million.

Of equal importance in the sky-high picture is the progress being made by helicopters. Bell Helicopter Co. of Fort Worth is now testing the nation's first twin-engine medium size commercial helicopter, the Model 212. Bell, world's largest whirlybird builder, is sponsoring a series of metro development conferences across the nation, studying community needs and long-range planning in the use of rotary winged aircraft.

The aviation industry looks for helicopters to boom in commercial use—and fast. Some 600 helicopter pilots are turned out every month from Fort Wolters near Mineral Wells, Texas. Helicopters already are being planned in new community complexes. Among the municipalities using helicopters are Fort Worth and Dallas. They've had tremendous usage by oil companies along the coast and large ranches.

There is charter service from practically every airport in the state. Flying clubs, crop dusters and flying farmers buzz around all over Texas.

All the major schools are supplying courses in some form for students who want to get into the booming industry. One college is offering courses in tower control, an ever-growing field.

It might be difficult for the harried driver of an automobile on the public highways to believe so many people fly. But they do, and Texas is the place with the most miles and the best flying weather in the nation. And if you don't believe millions of Texans are flying, just go out to the airport and see for yourself.

LETTER TO A CONSTITUENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a letter written by my colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM L. CLAY, to Mr. Saul L. Cupp:

NOVEMBER 5, 1969.

Mr. SAUL L. CUPP,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. CUPP: I have your letter of October 25 in which you express your desire to leave the United States to escape black people. You may well be able to escape from black people—but the effects of the hatred

from which you suffer will follow you wherever you go.

In accordance with your request for me to furnish you with papers for seeking entrance to Australia, I have made inquiry into their policy. They have advised me to instruct you to write to the Australian Consulate General, Rockefeller Plaza, 5th Avenue, New York City, N.Y. Any person seeking entrance must be personally interviewed by an officer representing the Australian government. His duty is to evaluate your qualifications for contributing to the homogeneous nature of the country which they seek—by virtue of Administrative policy—to maintain.

I am pleased to furnish you with this information. My only hope is that you will somehow manage to pass the Australian criteria for entrance. If you succeed, I hope you will inform me—in which case I may organize a campaign to help all bigots of America leave the country to Americans. Good luck to you!

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. CLAY,
Member of Congress.

DR. JAMES VAN ALLEN SPEAKS ON EDUCATION

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent guest editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat carried excerpts of remarks made by Dr. James Van Allen at a conference on education called by Iowa's Governor, Robert D. Ray.

Dr. Van Allen's accomplishments are legend, and his remarks on education are especially worthy of note:

[From the Davenport-Bettendorf (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Nov. 1, 1969]

"A HORSE THAT ONE CAN RIDE"

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Following are excerpts from remarks by Dr. James Van Allen, renowned University of Iowa physicist, at a governor's education conference in Des Moines. He stresses what he considers dangers of an overcommitment to formal education in this country. He cites the importance of pride in craftsmanship, and points out that this can be attained not only in a classroom but on a job. He does not talk down education, but does talk up the values of work.)

There is a certain blindness in overstraining formal education. First of all, its success depends upon a high level of motivation on the part of both instructors and students. A very small fraction of the human race, perhaps only a few per cent, is composed of true scholars.

For most persons, extended, unbroken periods of formal educational for 15 or 20 years, without responsible work experience, foster boredom, cynicism and indolence.

I personally believe that we in the United States are already overly committed to a traditional process of formal education for the great majority of our citizenry.

Secondly, formal education is expensive and becomes steadily more so. The explicit cost of education is already the most conspicuous item of the budgets of state and local government and it is becoming easily noticeable in the federal budget as well.

Thirdly, the public commitment to formal education carries with it the great hidden cost of lack of economic productivity of millions of young men and women. Any normal person over 17 is clearly capable of a substantial amount of productive work. Those who continue in school under the pressure

of social prestige at a level of passive and indifferent submission to the system do no such work and may moreover suffer an important loss of personal pride and self-esteem.

Few things in life are as important as the pride of craftsmanship, at whatever level it may occur—the pride in a job well done, the feeling of having a horse that one can ride.

Craftsmanship comes only from doing work and from thinking about how to do it better. It does not come from passively hearing about work, or as one student said, "Work fascinates me. I can sit and look at it for hours."

At the present date, the direct, explicit cost of education is about seven per cent of the gross national product and this percentage is growing rapidly. The total cost, both direct and indirect, is much more. More than 60 million persons of our national population of 205 million (that is, about 29 per cent) are doing nothing but going to school or teaching those who are. In Iowa, the corresponding figures are about 800,000 of a total population of 2,800,000 (again about 29 per cent). Another 30 per cent or so are not economically productive for other reasons. . . .

Education may be worth at least as much as we are now spending; perhaps much more. . . . But I believe it has progressed along traditional and socially acceptable lines in a relatively uncritical way for so long and to such a point that it is ripe for searching study. . . .

My own beliefs are that we should try—to break our blind devotion to the idea that extended formal education for everyone is the only route to self-fulfillment and success. . . .

To work toward acceptable sociological substitutes for mere attendance at college, and finally . . .

To foster a wide diversity of vocational, technical, and other specialized forms of education in a work-study context. . . .

The average career officer in the U.S. Navy spends an estimated 25 per cent of his life in school and does so on full pay and allowances. This is judged to be about the minimum required to maintain his competence.

URBAN RENEWAL AT ITS BEST

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the fifties, many of this Nation's great cities embarked on ambitious programs of urban renewal and urban revitalization. I am proud to say that my city, Philadelphia, led the way.

One of Philadelphia's programs which has been an unqualified success was the dismantling of the old Dock Street Market, just blocks from Independence Hall, and the transfer of its marketplace functions to the modern, centralized food distribution center.

This program produced two salutary benefits for my city. First it led to the revitalization of a modern, residential neighborhood, in the heart of my city, Society Hill. Second, it provided a modern, efficient farm-to-market distribution center for the goods which feed the Philadelphia area's 6 million residents.

The food distribution center has been such a success that the planners of

Paris, looking for a modern substitute for that city's ancient market, Les Halles, carefully studied Philadelphia's center before drawing their own plans.

The story of this urban renewal success is now being told in a publication of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. With the consent of my colleagues, I enter in the RECORD a press release from the office of the city representative of Philadelphia, announcing this article:

The story of one of Philadelphia's outstanding urban renewal projects, relocation of the Dock Street Market to the Food Distribution Center, is featured in a new magazine, *Challenge*, being published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The magazine hails the Food Center as "a tribute to the spirit of cooperation and 'self help' between Philadelphia's businessmen, citizens and government." It recalls that the old Dock Street food market had contributed to the false notion that Philadelphia was "over the hill."

The 388-acre, \$100 million Food Distribution Center in South Philadelphia has created an estimated 12,000 new jobs since its first buildings opened in 1959. At the same time the site of the former Dock Street food market has become a showplace of modern high-rise apartment buildings and restored historic homes, known as Society Hill. The City is now registering an annual gain of \$20 million in revenue from the thriving Food Distribution Center and the renewed Society Hill.

The Philadelphia Food Distribution Center has become a model for other cities with similar problems. The City of Paris recently completed a new wholesale food market patterned after the Philadelphia facility.

Copies of "Challenge" magazine may be obtained from the Information Center, Room 1202, HUD, Washington, D.C. 20410.

HAWAII RANKS NO. 2 IN NATION ON MONEY SPENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in my frequent talks to high school graduating classes in the Island State, I have repeatedly stressed to the young men and women that only a wise and educated citizenry can keep our American democratic society a going concern. I have emphasized to the students that as citizens of that society, they should be aware of the duties that accompany the great privilege of citizenship in our Nation.

I have further stressed that they should also realize that if they are to take a meaningful and active part in the political life of our country and State, they must first equip themselves with the necessary tools—the most important of which is higher education.

In this regard, I take pleasure in inviting the attention of my colleagues to a recent news report which reveals that Hawaii is currently spending more on higher education than any State except Washington, on a per capita basis. And

the Island State leads the 50 States in the percentage increase of such spending in the last decade.

The news article takes note also of the figures reported by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* which shows that Hawaii ranks second highest among the States in per capita appropriations of tax funds for operating expenses of higher education.

In order that the Members may read more about Hawaii's efforts to do its part in developing a better educated citizenry, I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "Isles Second in Higher Education," from the November 6, 1969, issue of the *Honolulu Advertiser*:

ISLES SECOND IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Hawaii currently spends more money on higher education than any state except Washington, on a per capita basis.

And the Islands lead the 50 states in the percentage increase of such spending in the last decade.

Figures reported by "The Chronicle of Higher Education" show that Hawaii ranks second highest among the states in per capita appropriations of tax funds for operating expenses of higher education.

The per capita figure for Hawaii for the 1969-70 fiscal year is \$56.69, topped only by Washington's \$57.35.

The states spending least per capita are New Hampshire, with \$14.99, and Massachusetts, with \$15.70. The median is represented by 25th-ranked Delaware's \$31.77 and 26th-ranked Florida's \$31.72.

Hawaii's appropriations of \$41,782,000 in tax funds for operations of colleges and universities during the current fiscal year is a 742 per cent increase over the \$4,958,000 appropriated in 1959-60.

This is the highest 10-year increase in the nation, followed by New York's gain of 696 per cent. The average increase for the 50 states is 337.5 per cent.

HUD SECRETARY GEORGE ROMNEY STRESSES NEED FOR BREAKTHROUGH IN HOUSING UNITS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George Romney, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, emphasized in a recent address before the Mortgage Bankers Association of America the importance of moving forward with housing construction throughout the Nation.

Secretary Romney said that the response to the housing shortage by the building industry could produce a strong impetus to the entire economy.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter of housing for our people, I place Secretary Romney's speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE ROMNEY, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

These are hard times for mortgage bankers. They are hard times for thrift institutions, too—for homebuilders—indeed, for nearly

everyone connected with the mortgage market and the housing industry. They're even hard on the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

These are especially hard times for those Americans who cannot obtain a decent place to live because of our overall housing shortage. In the last four years, housing production has fallen more than one million units short of the volume needed just to keep up with population trends and the loss of deteriorated units.

And yet, as you well know, housing starts this year are down—not up; the housing shortage grows larger—not smaller.

There is no need for me to explain to this group the reasons for this year's decline in housing. You have all been through it too many times before—every time inflation has got out of hand; every time tight monetary policy has been used to bring the inflation back under control.

Neither am I going to offer any promises that the end to your troubles—and my troubles—is in sight.

Yes, the economy finally does seem to be cooling off. Inflation psychology may be on the ebb. Interest rates have retreated somewhat in the last few weeks—at least in the bond markets.

But even if these signs prove accurate, you and I know there is always a long lag before the mortgage market will feel any real benefit. Remember just three years ago! Monetary policy began easing in the fall of 1966. But it was a full year later before housing production fully recovered its previous high.

What I would like to do for a few minutes is review some of the actions we have taken to keep the mortgage market and housing situation from becoming even worse than it is, and some of the additional steps now being considered for the immediate period ahead.

In general, it is fair to say that all the specific actions taken to deal with previous squeezes on the mortgage market and housing production have again been taken or are moving toward fruition. And in several important instances, the actions this time are considerably more extensive than ever in the past.

The Federal National Mortgage Association activity, of course, is a prime illustration. Since January, I have authorized an increase of over \$5 billion in FNMA's borrowing authority.

This has enabled FNMA to make mortgage commitments totaling nearly \$5 billion so far this year. Volume in recent weeks—as you all well know—is up to an annual rate of nearly \$9 billion. By contrast, in all of 1966, FNMA's secondary market purchases totaled only \$2.1 billion.

At its recent commitment rate, FNMA is supporting three-fourths or more of the entire FHA-VA market. The real estate section of any newspaper shows the impact—the ads say, "FHA or VA financing available."

FNMA's activity is obviously the principal reason that housing starts financed under the FHA and VA programs have remained high, in the face of a sharp drop in conventionally financed starts.

Substantial additional support for the mortgage market has come from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

In the past 9½ months, the Home Loan Banks have increased their advances to member savings and loan associations by nearly \$3 billion, and in June an additional \$700 million was released for investment in mortgages by a cut in associations' liquidity requirements. In 1966, advances increased for only four months during the spring and early summer by a total of only \$1.6 billion.

In 1966, ruinous competition among financial institutions for savings deposits was finally brought under control by imposition of interest rate ceilings under Regulation

"Q." These ceilings have been maintained without change throughout this year, in the face of substantial increases in interest rates in the open market.

In late 1966, the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation provisions were temporarily suspended. Early this year, this Administration asked for repeal of the investment tax credit, and the current tax reform bill proposes to remove accelerated depreciation except as a stimulus to newly constructed housing. The sooner both of these provisions are enacted into law, the more real the benefit will be for housing.

Another conscious effort to help housing was President Nixon's September 4 announcement of the 75% cutback in federal construction contracts, and his request that state and local governments consider similar steps.

Vigorous action clearly was needed to help ease the strains evidenced by skyrocketing wages and prices throughout the construction industry. A basic purpose was to release at least some scarce resources from lower priority construction activities for use in homebuilding.

The Cabinet Committee on Construction, which was appointed that same day, and the new Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Commission appointed a few days later, will be working to carry forward on that good beginning.

Despite all these actions to date, there is no escaping the facts that mortgage credit is still scarce and expensive, and that housing production is still down sharply. Housing starts, to be sure, did show a somewhat surprising rebound in September. Most experts seem to believe, however, that this was only a temporary aberration in a continuing downturn.

So the question is: What more can be done to help sustain the mortgage market and housing sector through the period ahead?

One step I know this Association would recommend is an increase in the FHA-VA interest rate ceiling. But as you know, I receive advice on this issue from a number of other sources, and they are not always in agreement.

I did, of course, increase the rate when I first came into office last January. I would do so again if I were convinced that in the present circumstances a higher ceiling would bring in more mortgage funds.

As you know our Department has supported the idea of experimenting with greater freedom for FHA interest rates at an appropriate time. Given the authority and those conditions we will do so. But I do not see such conditions prevailing in the mortgage market at this moment.

Leaving aside the question of the FHA-VA interest ceiling, the starting point of any program to deal with prospective mortgage market conditions is to continue at least the volume of support currently provided by FNMA and the Home Loan Banks.

Both agencies are eager to do this. It will require them to continue their extensive borrowing in the securities markets, but it seems likely that this can be accomplished without undue strain.

Building on this base, I have announced this morning the release of \$650 million of Special Assistance funds for use under a so-called "Tandem Plan."

Under the plan, GNMA will be authorized to make mortgage commitments on multi-family units, with FNMA simultaneously agreeing to take over the mortgages when actual payment must be made—or perhaps earlier if market conditions warrant.

Let me say a word about Special Assistance, since our Department has been criticized so often for a presumed unwillingness to use these funds. The plain fact is that we

have been using a sizable part of the authorized funds right along in purely routine operations which lack only the fanfare that is sometimes attached to spending Special Assistance.

Thus in the first nine months of this year, more than \$500 million of mortgages have been purchased under Special Assistance operations of GNMA. An additional \$600 million or so has been reserved for future purchases. In 1966, by contrast, Special Assistance purchases totaled only \$200 million.

My action this morning releases a sizable share of the remaining Special Assistance funds that are as yet unallocated. I am hopeful that we can soon release still more to provide support for the single-family mortgage market.

One further mechanism we are most eager to bring into operation is the mortgage-backed security. We have nearly completed the final regulations on "pass-through" securities, which are considerably more liberal than provided in the original draft published last August. These should be released shortly.

In addition, we are proceeding with preparation of the regulations for bond-type securities, so that they can be released as market conditions become more favorable for floating long-term debt obligations.

I should acknowledge a debt of gratitude to your Association officers for all of the help they have provided in the preparation of the regulations on mortgage-backed securities. We are now counting on you to make use of the instrument to the fullest extent possible to attract new funds into the mortgage market.

Each of you knows who in your State has money as yet untapped by the mortgage market. Or if you do not know, now is the time to find out. Some of your regular old suppliers of funds may be attracted to the mortgage-backed security too. But the key to overall success, as far as we are concerned, is the amount of new money that can be tapped.

The things I have talked about so far, of course, are essentially short-run steps toward solution of a current problem. None of them yet represents the fundamental change that will be needed to help prevent the mortgage market and housing from becoming the victims of any future financial squeeze.

Our approach is to take one step at a time. Our first priority concern must be to alleviate the present crisis. But this Administration is pledged to initiate an age of reform.

Our search for long-range solutions is underway and moving to the top of our agenda—both within our Department, and through the Cabinet Committee on Construction. We want and need any suggestions you may have.

This Administration is determined to do its full part toward meeting our nation's housing needs. I accept the 26 million housing goal set by Congress last year as a reasonable statement of minimum need—in fact, I think we need more than 26 million.

But we all must recognize that merely citing needs is not enough. We must also organize to meet the need—and beyond that, we must make the people fully aware that the need exists and must be met.

After all, most people in this country are well-housed. It is only the minority of Americans desperate for decent housing who feel the full impact of our housing shortage and high costs. In recent opinion surveys of the public problems most on people's minds, housing is not at the top or near the top of the domestic list. It should be.

This means that our approach to meeting national housing needs must be one capable of making most people realize the tremendous economic and social benefits which a successful effort can produce.

Most people will benefit. The economic benefits can be immense. Housing is the greatest undeveloped market in this country.

Meeting the booming demand in the balance of this century can do for our economy what the railroads did in the last century and what the transportation and electronic industries have done in recent years. Meeting housing needs is a dramatic opportunity for business and labor—particularly minority group workers and those who are now unemployed.

And the social benefits of meeting housing needs can equal the economic benefits. The frustrated and unhappy Americans living in the ghettos are understandably fed up with years of largely empty rhetoric and unkept promises of "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family." They know the need—their need—is great. Action is needed now, not words.

Success in meeting our nation's housing needs unquestionably would do more than any other physical achievement to alleviate the dangerous and divisive tensions of our cities.

If we can break through to arouse public consciousness of the need to meet the housing goal, we will have won at least half our battle. But for full success, there are other barriers we must break through.

We must break through the technological barrier and develop new ways of achieving volume production of decent, low-cost housing.

Prices of new homes sold across the country this past summer averaged over \$25,500, a third more than the average price just four years earlier. Over the same period, per capita disposable income rose by only 26%. The plain fact is that more and more of our families simply cannot afford decent housing.

Our Department, as you know, has begun to tackle this technology problem through our new Operation Breakthrough. Just a month ago, we received some 650 separate prototype proposals developed by almost every major firm in the country.

Many of these proposals have drawn on experience gained in Europe in industrial produced housing. I can tell you from personal experience of a visit just a few weeks ago that we can learn something from the Europeans about how to produce attractive housing in a short time at reasonable cost.

After we have decided which of the various prototype proposals seems most appropriate, we should be able to award some production contracts by next spring's building season.

You all know why housing costs so much today. Financing, land, labor and materials are all more expensive. We must have a total breakthrough to get past all of these separate barriers.

We must find lasting ways to break through the financial barrier.

Here, I am looking beyond the time when we finally bring the current inflation under control, and monetary policy is able to ease from its present highly restrictive position. These steps are clearly a prerequisite for any major expansion in the availability of mortgage-financing. As such financing does become available, I am counting on the members of this Association to help assure that the interest rates are down at reasonable levels.

The question, however, is whether these steps alone will be enough. I am sure you have seen the discussion suggesting that we may need to run very large budget surpluses over the next ten years in order to free enough real and financial resources to meet the housing goals.

In the financial sphere, the idea is simply that if the Government uses a budget surplus to pay off some of its outstanding debt, more funds will be available for private uses, including financing of homebuilding.

But will it be possible politically to maintain budget surpluses of the size likely to be needed? And if we do, can we be assured that housing will get the necessary amount of credit at reasonable interest rates?

Some have said that the only solution is to require financial institutions to channel a portion of their assets into mortgages. Others have suggested creating something like a national housing bank. I am sure there are still other ideas.

I think your Association should begin to focus on this question, for it is crucial to our success in meeting the housing goals.

We must also develop some breakthrough in land. Site values now account for more than 20% of the total cost of new FHA-insured single-family homes. Ten years ago, they accounted for only 15%. We must find a way to crack the speculative merry-go-round that simply inflates the price of undeveloped land without adding to its basic utility.

In addition, we must break through the labor barrier. Estimates suggest that we will need more than one million more man-years of on-site labor by 1978 than we have now, if we are to meet the housing goals.

The high cost of a scarce labor supply has been dramatically illustrated this year. As you know, all construction labor contracts signed in the first six months of this year provided a median increase of 15% per year in wages and fringe benefits, and most of these contracts run for three years.

The Cabinet Committee on Construction and the Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Commission are beginning to get into these problems. Clearly, a major job-training effort must be mounted to increase the labor supply. And I would hope we can develop even more immediate ways of bringing these wage increases down to more moderate size—hopefully to non-inflationary levels.

And to help break through the materials barrier, we must find a way to revise or overcome antiquated building codes. Too often they go beyond their legitimate purpose of protecting the safety of the occupants and become protectionist barriers standing in the way of badly-needed cost-cutting innovations in techniques, processes and materials.

It is no little task we have before us. In broad terms, we need to shift about 1% more of our total national output into housing if we are to meet the housing goals. This sounds small, but it would be a 30% increase. To accomplish this, housing must have the right national priority.

Our inspiring success in space has shown us and shown the world how much Americans can accomplish when we set our eyes on a high target and mobilize our resources to achieve it.

It took more than rhetoric to reach the moon. It took a massive national commitment and a top national priority.

I believe that the public interest and indeed our national survival require us to assign our housing and urban goals a high priority in the decade ahead—at least comparable to the priority we gave our space program in the decade just ending.

Let us press forward in space. But let us turn our principal energies, our chief concern, to this great spaceship on which we ride together—to the speedy betterment and ennoblement of the quality of life on planet earth.

We need your help. We need the help of Congress. We need the people's help.

Let us set priorities. Let us set timetables. Let us commit resources. Let us break barriers. Let us reform and innovate.

Let us build homes and cities and a new America.

SENATOR SPESSARD HOLLAND, A GREAT STATESMAN, TO RETIRE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday our colleague in the Senate, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, after 50 years of service to the State of Florida and the Nation, announced his retirement from public life at the end of his present term.

Senator HOLLAND is a statesman's statesman. He was an outstanding Governor and U.S. Senator. But to all who know him, his greatest attributes are his integrity and unflagging sense of justice.

His skill as a legislator is unparalleled, as are his service and dedication to the people of Florida and the Nation. He is held in highest esteem by all whose lives have been touched by him. His leadership has inspired the members of the Florida congressional delegation and his colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

His warm and friendly manner and his moments given to humor cause him to be known and loved by people in all walks of life, regardless of political affiliation or philosophy.

We are all going to miss "the Senator" when he retires from public office and trust that he and his charming wife, Mary, Florida's "first lady," will enjoy their golden years to which they have been looking forward for a long time.

The Miami Herald of Friday, November 14, 1969, contains both an editorial and an outstanding article by Clarence Jones on Senator HOLLAND's career and his retirement. I commend these items to my colleagues:

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 14, 1969]

SENATOR HOLLAND'S LEGACY SHOULD BE A PATTERN

They never go back to Pocatello, say the old Washington hands. But they go back to Bartow. Sen. Spessard S. Holland of Florida will do so, and more's the pity.

Sen. Holland's decision not to run for reelection in 1970 is understandable because it is clear-cut, candid and typical of a man who brooks no nonsense. His health, says Florida's senior statesman, will not stand another term. So he is going back to his law practice in Bartow.

Spessard Holland was the first governor of Florida to go to the United States Senate, a customary procession in many states. In Tallahassee his administration is remembered for its stability during the war years, its tax reforms and its support of public education.

It was a natural step from there to Washington. Although Sen. Holland joined the Southern Democratic-Northern Republican conservative coalition he was always his own man. He was the leader, for instance, in the movement which abolished the discriminatory poll tax.

With Thomas Jefferson, Sen. Holland obviously believes that each generation must lead its own life. In essence he is stepping aside for younger men, as an older man once stepped aside for him.

He could, of course, have been reelected. While he has not always been able to accommodate himself to change, Spessard Holland is no mossback. His point of view has always been tolerant of opinion. Political grudge-bearing left him cold.

With his host of Florida friends The Herald salutes a great gentleman and loyal public servant. "Behold him in the evening time of life . . . By unperceived degrees he wears away. Yet like the sun, seems larger at his setting."

Florida will be hard put to find a successor to Spessard Holland, but we trust that the stature of the man will be gauged according to the qualities of the man about to retire from the Senate.

These qualities include integrity, knowledge of government, largeness of mind and the ability to unite people of all persuasions for the betterment of Florida. This is a part of the Holland legacy. Let it be a pattern.

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 14, 1969]

"LITTLE BOX" HELD AILING HOLLAND'S SECRET (By Clarence Jones)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Spessard Holland reached deep down into the side pocket of his suit coat and pulled out a little metal box.

It was the kind of box cold remedies used to come in. The paint was worn and it had a red rubber band around it.

"My nitroglycerine pills are in there," he said, holding the box between his fingers at eye level, staring at it. "I've been carrying them for eight years now. Nobody knew about it."

With the decision to retire over and out in the open, he could show the box Thursday morning and talk about the angina attacks that helped make the decision for him.

There was a lot he still could not talk about. Although the question was asked in half a dozen different ways, he could not bring himself to describe what he felt Wednesday, here in this same office, when he told a crowd of newsmen he was too old and too ill to chance another six years—that he is, by choice, giving up his power and prestige in the "world's most exclusive club" after another year.

He is now 77. He grew up in a time when men were not supposed to show emotion in public. To dredge up what he felt, even now that it was over, was somehow improper and unfitting.

But he could talk about the angina. The code permitted that.

He was sitting in the green leather swivel chair behind the massive, battered old desk that comes with the biggest suites of offices in the old Senate building that are the special preserve of senators with seniority.

Behind him, head-high, glass-doored bookcases spanned the wall. Above the cases hung pictures frame-to-frame, taken during his public career that began as a prosecuting attorney in Bartow 50 years ago.

The pictures record the aging process, from a young artillery observer with an Army Air Force uniform and a mustache in France in 1918 to the man behind the desk now.

The hair is snow-white and thinning. The eyes are magnified by the special lenses that follow cataract operations. He still holds himself straight, with the shoulders back.

He tells how he shot a turkey last winter with a .22 caliber rifle to prove that he can still shoot as straight as he did when he rode in an open cockpit over France, squinting through the metal machine gun sights that now gather dust on the bookcase shelf.

He fingered the pillbox.

"I've been carrying these nitro pills since 1961 when I first felt the angina," he explained. "The instructions were not to use them."

"The doctors said nature might do its own repair work. That the capillaries might rebuild themselves if I could rough it through the pain."

"It hits you in the chest and down the left arm. I had one on the Senate floor one time. Sometime this year, I was very tired that

night. It was late in the debate and I was exhausted and speaking there on the floor. I was speaking rather loudly. It was something I was concerned about.

"I was about to finish, when I felt it coming on. So I finished hurriedly and took my seat. Nobody ever knew it had happened. In five minutes it was over. I guess until two months ago, I had taken the pills maybe three times.

"Two months ago, they changed the directions about not taking them."

The family knew about the angina attacks. Merrill Winslett, his administrative assistant, and Mrs. Ruth Fisher, his personal secretary, knew. They kept the secret well. The doctors had given Mrs. Fisher some other medicine to keep in her desk in case it got really bad.

Holland had to stop his walks each evening after supper. Walking in the cold pulled too much blood away from his heart.

"Mary (his wife) had also had something to say about my walks. She doesn't want me on the streets any more at night, she doesn't think it's safe. I understand Earl Warren's wife gave him the same instructions," he said.

The Warrens live on the first floor of the hotel where the Hollands have maintained an apartment for 21 years. "I told Earl one time," he recalled with a chuckle, "that some of his decisions might be responsible for ending our walks."

Still, the angina had not hit him hard enough to force the retirement decision until two weeks ago when he returned from a quick trip to Florida—and had the worst attack yet.

He will not say exactly when, during a long day and night of constant pain, that he concluded he could not campaign again. But sometime during that day or night, he knew. He told his wife. She refused to try to influence him in the decision.

After that, he says, it was over and done with. He admitted to a let-down feeling Wednesday night after he had announced the decision.

But he quickly attributed it to the fatigue of a three-hour floor fight that stopped a conservationist move to halt the cross-Florida barge canal and the Central and South Florida Flood Control District next year.

"That fellow (Sen. Gaylord) Nelson (D., Wisc.) is a very persistent, overzealous conservationist, you know. Good people have shibboleths, you know. They get so zealous, they can't see anything else.

"There's a middle road. I think the flood control district is helping Everglades National Park. I think the barge canal is something that has to be done. But nobody is any more concerned about conservation than I am."

He won the fight Wednesday night and then was driven home by one of the secretaries in his office. His wife had not been listening to the radio and had not heard a report of his press conference.

"Well, did you go through with it?" she asked when he came in the door. He told her it was old news—that he had even heard it on the car radio coming home. And that was the end of it.

Holland says he had more offers of financial contributions this year to back a reelection bid than he ever had before. In his entire career, as county judge, state senator, Florida governor, and four campaigns for the U.S. Senate, he never asked anyone to give him money.

"I guess I got used to the other school of thought. When I ran for county judge and state senator in Bartow, we never thought of people contributing. We ran our own show. The state Senate was a highly paid job in those days, you know," he joked. "Six dollars a day during the session and mileage for one round trip home.

"Those years were very expensive years for

me and my family. But I never asked anybody for money. I never wanted to put pressure on anybody.

"I never wanted anybody to be able to say later that I'd begged them for money and now they wanted something in return."

If you could size up the qualities and talents a candidate for public office should have, what would they be, he was asked.

"Integrity," he said, without hesitation. This year in an editorial, the Lakeland Ledger, his home county newspaper, wrote critically of Holland, attacking him as the spokesman for Florida's special interests. The editorial accused him of keeping the faith of a rural, bygone ethic and ignoring the changing needs of an urban society.

"I certainly do strongly represent the agricultural interests," he said. "They're important to Florida. About that editorial, my feeling was that they didn't know me very well. The paper belongs to outside people who don't know Florida as well as I do.

"I just take it as one of those things you have to accept when you have outside ownership of newspapers. They're very liberal. I don't know anything I can do about it, so I haven't let it worry me.

"I've filibustered with my southern colleagues. But I didn't please my southern brethren when I became the first senator to support statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Or when I fought to build the St. Lawrence Seaway."

Holland says he came to the Senate with no intention of making headlines. He was interested in agriculture, forestry and appropriations. He left committees where he was building seniority to get back to his primary concerns.

He led the battle for more than a dozen years to abolish the poll tax that had kept Negroes from voting in many southern states, and he made headlines in the struggle for coastal states to have off-shore mineral rights in the tidelands oil dispute.

Over the years, Holland and his wife have socialized largely within the circles of southern, conservative senators like himself, who are the keys to power in the seniority system that controls Senate committees.

It was this seniority and these friendships that enabled him to increase by \$4 million this week the Senate version of public works spending in Florida for next year. He was able to write \$140,000 into the bill for deepening the Miami Harbor where all other members of the Florida delegation has failed. The bill now goes to a Senate-House conference committee.

It is this power that comes from service and friendship that Florida will lose when Holland leaves after next year.

He refuses to say anything about who his successor might be, or whether Ed Gurney, the Florida Republican senator elected last year, could fill his shoes as senior senator.

"That will depend on many things," Holland said thoughtfully. "If the Republicans should gain a majority, he would be able to do more. I think he will serve with good conscience and ability. I don't know how long the people of Florida will leave him here. I don't know how long his health will permit him to stay here. I think we've voted alike about 95 per cent of the time."

In mid-interview, a secretary came into the office. "George Smathers is on Line One," she announced.

"Hello, George, how do you do?" Holland said with a grin. "You're in Nassau? Well, I hope you catch a big one for me . . . Thank you, George, I felt I should do it . . . this angina thing has gotten a little more serious.

"After all, you know, I'm 21 years older than you are, and I can't look with optimism to the long years of life that you can.

"Which doesn't worry me, it just happens to be one of the facts of life."

INDEPENDENT BANKERS POSITION ON AGRICULTURE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at one of the "Listening Conferences" conducted by Secretary Hardin earlier this year, Mr. Don F. Kirchner presented the position of the Independent Bankers on agriculture. Mr. Kirchner is very highly respected in my district, and his thought-provoking remarks fully justify this respect. His remarks follow:

THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA—POSITION ON AGRICULTURE

There is an urgent need for effective action to end the discrimination against the American farmer and rancher. This need prompted the Independent Bankers Association of America to form its Agriculture-Rural America Committee in 1961. The goal of the committee has been to study the problems of rural America and to convince others of the plight of the rural people and the rural economy.

Our committee has found during its eight years of study that credit has been used as a substitute for profits in agriculture for many years. Our profit starved rural economy has been dependent upon massive doses of credit every year since 1953. Some day this borrowed money must be repaid, and when that time comes our country will be deprived of the tremendous buying power that has been made available through the injection of credit into the rural economy.

We have found the American farmer and rancher to be financially hard pressed. He has borrowed heavily for the past 16 years in anticipation of future profits, which have failed to materialize. Often the borrowed funds have been repaid from the liquidation of assets.

By 1967 farm prices had fallen to their lowest level since parity figures were started in 1937. Farm prices have been controlled and administered by our federal government for many years. Farm prices have been intentionally lowered by our government in order to provide the consumers of this country with more funds to spend for manufactured goods. This action has subsidized both our consumers and our industries at the expense of our rural people and the rural economy, and is becoming commonly referred to as the "cheap food policy" of our federal government.

Due to our governmental "Cheap Food Policy" the human and financial resources of rural America are being depleted at an alarming rate. During the past 15 years the number of people employed on our nation's farms has dropped from over 10 million to about 5 million, an out migration of one-half of our farm workers. During these same 15 years the number of farmers has dropped from 8.5 million to about 3 million. Farm operating loans have deteriorated due to the lack of profits in agriculture. Loans that started out to be short term loans have turned into long term loans with workout problems. The solution for many farmers and ranchers has been to sell out and quit farming or ranching.

We feel that the roots of the urban problems, the unemployed, the indigents, grow from a rural America that is not able to attain sufficient profits from the production of its products to retain its people. As our rural people have migrated from the farm to the city in search of a better place to live

and the opportunity to make a better living, they have been forced, or have forced others, into the slums and the ghettos.

Many of our nation's farm economists favor the elimination of many more of our nation's farmers and ranchers. Some of these economists feel that as few as 500,000 farmers and ranchers could produce all of our nation's farm products. They would like to see another 2,500,000 farmers and ranchers forced from the land. The economists have advanced the idea that fewer and fewer farmers are necessary for so many years that it has become a matter of public policy to see that their ideas become a reality. Our federal government has spent untold millions of dollars over the past 40 years to develop the technology necessary to force the farmer from the land. The continuing, and fostered, exodus of more and more people from the farms and ranches of our country will put more and more industrially untrained rural migrants into the slums and ghettos of our nation's cities. Yet, the farm economist will continue to sit in his ivory tower, isolated from the ways of the world and unaffected by the repercussions of the adoption of his theories, as he continues to draw his sustenance from the public coffers at an ever alarming pace.

Our nation's farm organizations, up until this time, have failed to attain either sufficient size or scope to control the prices that farmers and ranchers receive for their products or to control the production of their products sufficiently to control price.

Our committee feels that farm problems will continue to plague our rural people and the rural economy because there is no long range program for agriculture. Agricultural programs are adopted and they are administered for the short range only. It seems to be the intention of our government to continue to use the farm segment of our economy as a "scapegoat" for the other segments which have prospered for many years. Our government is continuing the cheap food policies which have led to the present situation. We feel that we can only have temporary prosperity in our total economy as long as other economic segments are feeding upon our agricultural economy.

The Agriculture-Rural America Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America feels that to solve the problems of rural America our government must give top priority to the raising of farm prices. The levels of these prices must be sufficient for our farmers and ranchers to attain a standard of living that is commensurate with the rest of our nation's people. Farm prices must be high enough to provide the profits that are necessary to allow for capital investment in agriculture, exclusive of inflationary gains. Farm prices must be sufficient to provide the profits necessary to service the operating debts that already have been accumulated.

Long range programs must be adopted that will attain and maintain a continuing parity of income for agriculture, an income sufficient to attract long range capital to be invested in agriculture.

Finally, farmers and ranchers should not be asked to increase the production of agricultural products unless and until the government can guarantee that the extra production can be used and marketed at parity price levels without causing future drops in prices.

At a meeting of our committee on May 26-27, 1969 the following position were taken in regard to present and proposed legislation involving the American farmer and rancher:

1. Realizing that the intent of the Acreage Reserve program is to get sufficient land out of production to eliminate the farm surplus problem and that the program must be ad-

ministered so that the intent is not destroyed, and thus the large land owners play a useful role in preventing a collapse of farm prices due to overproduction, and realizing that care must be taken to assure that the purpose of the program is not undermined through removal of large land owners, our committee passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved, that the IBAA Agriculture-Rural America Committee position be in favor of the establishment of a ceiling, or a sliding scale limitation of farm payments, providing such limitation or ceiling will not destroy the effectiveness of the program.

2. Due to the inability of the American family farmer and rancher to compete on an equal basis with those who are in farming and ranching to take advantage of the tax laws of our country, our committee passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved, that the IBAA Agriculture-Rural America Committee believes that a need exists for legislation to control tax loss farming and ranching.

3. Realizing that care must be taken in defining corporation farms and corporation farming, so that family corporations which are in fact family farms are not confused with other corporation farming operations, the following resolution was passed by our committee:

Be it resolved, that the IBAA Agriculture-Rural America Committee opposes the concept of corporation farming, except for family corporations and lands controlled for research and educational purposes.

4. Realizing the need for repeal of the Investment Tax Credit in order for the Federal Government to help control inflation, the following resolution was passed:

Be it resolved, that the IBAA Agriculture-Rural America Committee supports the retention of an Investment Tax Credit on not less than \$15,000.00 of purchases per year for small businesses and farmers if the Investment Tax Credit bill is repealed.

5. Our Committee supports the position of the American National Cattlemen's Association in regard to Beef Import Controls, which is as follows:

1. Move the Import Quota base back one year.

2. Eliminate the 10 percent overdrive provision which allows for a 10 percent expansion of the average imports before restrictions are imposed.

3. Include cooked meats as well as military purchases in the import quota, and subject cooked meats to the same sanitary standards as uncooked meats.

4. Adjust the quota imports on a quarterly basis rather than on the present annual basis. While imports are presently reported on a quarterly basis, annual import quotas are not imposed until the end of the year, permitting a tremendous amount of imports to come in during one quarter, which might be disruptive to our domestic markets.

6. Our committee has discussed the proposed "whole farm retirement system". It is our position that the proposal for a "whole farm retirement system", as a means to restrict the production of farm commodities has some merit only if it is used with discretion as to the amount of land that is allowed to be retired in any given area. Due to the possible detrimental side effects of such a program extreme caution must be used in its implementation so that our rural towns and cities are not damaged due to the loss of markets for their products and the outmigration of people when their farms are retired to the government.

We appreciate the opportunity that you have given us to present the views of the Independent Banker in regard to the problems of Rural America.

Thank You.

RECLAMATION: ASPIRATIONS VERSUS ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have known Dr. Paul Taylor. His dedication to the cause of conservation is unsurpassed. Dr. Taylor is a noted scholar who has specialized in the area of land reclamation. I recommend to the readers of this RECORD his latest article on this subject:

RECLAMATION: ASPIRATIONS VERSUS ACHIEVEMENTS

Congress created the Bureau of Reclamation in 1902 to be the public agency for fulfilling aspirations with achievements. But the history of western reclamation has been one of deep divisions from the start, raising in historical perspective the questions: Whose aspirations? Whose achievements? For a century water development in the western states has been permeated by a contest between the many and the few over the billion-dollar benefits that flow continuously from applying water to thirsty lands.

Legislators have inscribed guidelines in statutes which judges have interpreted. In the interest of the many, statutes limited the gift of public waters to any individual to an amount sufficient to irrigate 160 acres of land.¹ The Supreme Court has explained how the limitation assures that the fruits of reclamation, intended to "benefit people, not land," "will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holdings."² But government is divided into three branches, not two, and the administrators of reclamation work under heavy pressures from interests opposed to the Congressional guideline.³ As a result, all too often they subvert the statute while professing adherence.⁴

In the beginning a United States Commission set the stage and forecast the divisions that still permeate reclamation. Concluding in 1874 that irrigation of California's Central Valley was feasible, the Commission prophesied that land having previously "no value, except for pasturage, during part of the year . . . if irrigated . . . would be increased many folds" in value. In anticipation, farsighted men lost no time acquiring dry but irrigable lands. The San Francisco Chronicle of the day described the process as "absorption of the land of the nation by a few wealthy and unscrupulous capitalists, aided by corrupt officials and perjured locators . . . depriving the poor man of small means of the opportunity of obtaining homes, and . . . laborers generally of all chance of securing work at fair wages. . . ."⁵

Engrossing dry lands to capture incremental values was one thing. Finding money to meet the huge cost of dams and canals to bring the increment-creating water to those same lands was another. The U.S. Commission evaluated three possible sources. It rejected at once the practicability of major construction by farmers, then said that "enterprises of this character, if built at all, must be built by the State or by private capital." Immediately the Commission ruled out the latter alternative: "There is no reason to suppose that for a long time capital will look upon this kind of investment with favor."⁶ That left a sole possibility, the public treasury.

On the ground, both interests and observ-

Footnotes at end of article.

ers took this prospect into account. "Purchasers are not lacking who would add . . . to their already extensive dry domain," the Visalia Delta commented in 1877, then prophesied that "the people . . . will find themselves confronted by an array of force and talent to secure to capital the ownership of the water as well as the land, and the people will have it at last to pay for."⁷

Seventeen years passed before concerned western citizens organized an Irrigation Congress, and began to agitate for public financing of reclamation. Beginning in 1891 they assembled annually, seeking national help "to make the desert blossom as the rose." All westerners were united on this objective, but on another question, To whom should go the "many fold" increase in land values the coming of water would produce? they divided sharply.

The overwhelming majority of the delegates registered their answer clearly and repeatedly in formal actions by the Irrigation Congresses. Resolution after resolution insisted that deliveries of public water to private individuals be sharply limited, in order that the many might have access to the benefits of reclamation. Spokesmen of great landholdings were at the Irrigation Congresses, but made no audible protest against the majority.⁸ They allowed nothing to interfere with the prime task upon which all delegates were agreed, viz., opening the doors of the public treasury and starting the flow of public waters.

This task was formidable. Success depended upon winning the support of an eastern President and the consent of an eastern- and southern-controlled Congress. Besides, the question whether the Nation would put up money, although difficult, was not the only consideration. There was also the question, if money were to be granted, what conditions would President and Congress attach to the grant? As the day of decision neared, it became evident that both would deny money if monopolization of public waters were to be allowed to reinforce and perpetuate the prevailing monopolization of arid lands.

Speaking for Congressional opponents of the Reclamation Bill in 1902, Congressman George W. Ray, of New York, drew the issue. Clearly he was unconvinced of the probable effectiveness of the 160-acre limitation in the bill. "And so we find behind this scheme," he said, "egging it on, encouraging it, the great railroad interests of the West, who own millions of acres of these arid lands, now useless, and the very moment that we, at the public expense, establish or construct these irrigation works and reservoirs, you will find multiplied by ten, and in some instances by twenty, the value of now worthless land owned by those railroad companies the title to which they obtained through grants from the Government. . . ."⁹

No one responded that large landowners, railroads or others, should be allowed to receive unrestricted benefits. On the contrary, western spokesmen took great pains to reassure eastern skeptics that monopolization of water could not possibly occur. As conclusive answer to eastern fears they pointed to the 160-acre limitation. This precaution was stringent, they declared, and would "guard against land monopoly" by achieving the "breaking up of any large land holdings . . . in the vicinity of government works. . . ."¹⁰ With these assurances the proponents overcame the skeptics, won the vote of Congress and signature of President Theodore Roosevelt, and opened the flow of the Nation's money and water to western lands.

With one foot thus firmly planted in the door of the National treasury, barely three years elapsed until the large landowners revealed their own previously concealed aspira-

tion. Like all members of the Irrigation Congress, they had wanted the water and the money, but unlike the rest, they were opposed to the conditions governing these gifts. At the Portland, Oregon, convention of the Irrigation Congress in 1905, an attempt was made to endorse repeal of the acreage limitation. The plea was couched in disarming terms: the limitation was unjust because it would "deny to the pioneer the fruits of his years and years of toil." A delegate promptly exposed its speciousness, pointing out that "If the man who has 640 acres in eastern Oregon has ample water for it, he will not be interfered with." Another delegate, Judge John E. Raker, of California, reminded the nearly 600 delegates that "The committee of seventeen that originally planned and arranged the adoption of the National Irrigation Law secured its adoption solely and entirely upon the question that the great land monopolies in the United States would be prohibited from getting the benefit of it." With these pros and cons before them the delegates defeated repeal by voice vote "amid great applause."¹¹

For nearly forty years no further open and direct attack upon acreage limitation was repeated. Indeed, large landowners on Orland project in the Sacramento Valley of California voluntarily accepted a 40-acre limitation to attract Federal funds and water to the aid of their lands.¹² This cooperation with reclamation law was to prove exceptional, however, and unacceptable to giant landowners. Though slumbering, their aspiration to escape the controls of acreage limitation while obtaining both water and money, survived.

Since open attack under the light of publicity had proved vulnerable, piecemeal assaults now began under cover. The Salt River project in Arizona soon gave the clue that circumvention of the law could be achieved with circumspection. On that project reclamation administrators accepted a shadow interpretation of the law robbing it of substance. There a landowner receives water for all his lands no matter how extensive, but in the water users' association he casts votes for no more than 160 acres.¹³ The circumvention survives to the present day. Similarly in the Imperial Valley of California, Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur decided in the closing weeks of the Hoover Administration not to apply acreage limitation to lands served by the All-American Canal. (In 1961, however, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall ruled that the limitation does apply, and the case is in Federal court.)¹⁴

Beginning furtively in 1938, one project at a time, legislative erosion of the acreage limitation joined administrative erosion. An exemption was slipped through Congress first for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, and two years later for the Nevada Truckee and Humboldt project. The methods and arguments employed were similar. Public hearings were avoided, or at least none were printed. The arguments for exemption avoided attack upon the principle of acreage limitation, sought to portray the project as a special and distinct case, and generally were specious. Interior Department reports raising no objections to the proposed exemptions were signed by Acting Secretaries and forwarded to Congress when Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, a staunch defender of acreage limitation, was out of town. The tactics were successful.¹⁵

Emboldened by these successes, further attempts to widen exemptions were made in 1944, 1947, and 1959-60, aimed at the Central Valley project in California. In 1944, with the flow of funds to the project well started, an exemption "rider" to the rivers and harbors bill was slipped quickly through the House. Nowhere during extensive hearings on the bill, including its Central Valley fea-

tures, was the intention to seek exemption revealed. At the last moment, as a committee amendment without warning, the exemption came to the floor and was slid through the House. In the Senate publicity could no longer be avoided. Hearings were held. When Secretary Ickes for the Administration and spokesmen for many citizens' organizations appeared in opposition to the exemption, it was killed. But that was not the end of the battle, for the House insisted on retaining the exemption in conference. In the face of Senate opposition now led by Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., the adherence of the House to the exemption resulted in dragging the entire "gravity train" rivers and harbors bill down to defeat. Minus the dead weight of the exemption rider, it passed Congress at the opening of the succeeding session.¹⁶

A reinforced drive was made in the 80th Congress. The six Senators from California, Texas and Colorado joined in the same bill to seek exemptions for a project in each of their respective states. The Interior Department under Secretary J. A. Krug opposed, as well as many spokesmen for citizens' organizations. Among those represented in opposition were farmers, veterans and church groups. The Farm Bureau favored exemption. The Senate Public Lands Subcommittee took thirteen hundred pages of testimony; the bill did not leave committee.¹⁷

The next moves against acreage limitation were planned carefully in the fifties. Congressman (later Senator) Clair Engle, of California, struck the tactical keynote—circumvention. "I grant you," he said to his Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation in 1955, "you start kicking the 160-acre limitation and it is like inspecting the rear end of a mule: You want to do it from a safe distance because you might get kicked through the side of the barn. But it can be done with circumspection, and I hope we can exercise circumspection."¹⁸

His first device, deadly effective and known as the Engle formula, was pushed through Congress in a bill applying only to small reclamation projects. It terminated antimonopoly policy, allowing owners of lands however extensive to purchase their escape from the law by refunding a portion of the generous subsidy given them.

Tactics employed during the bill's passage through Congress reflected the familiar care to avoid public discussion in open hearings. The Senate rejected the Engle formula, replacing it with the standard 160-acre clause, but in conference this was dropped. Senator Paul Douglas asked to be notified when the bill returned to the Senate floor in order to speak against this omission of his amendment. He was not notified, and the bill slid through. Senator Wayne Morse commented that "The bill (had) remained in conference almost 1 year. . . . In the confusion of the closing days of the session the 160-acre provision was lost in the shuffle. Public supporters of the antimonopoly provision had little opportunity to mobilize."¹⁹

Senator George Murphy, of California, and five other Republican Senators revived this line of attack on acreage limitation in the 91st Congress, proposing to extend the Engle circumvention formula to all reclamation projects.²⁰

Faced with continuing resistance in Congress to outright exemption from acreage limitation, a new tactic appeared. It took the form in California of a State Water Project, created to receive as much Federal water and money as possible and, at the same time, to gain exemption from Federal acreage limitation. The plea for exemption was made that Federal law ought not to apply, since the State was putting up money for its own project. The "catch" was the fact that the State project was obliged to

Footnotes at end of article.

use Federal facilities, to which acreage limitation applies. The Senate rejected this maneuver for exemption after four days of debate, and the House did likewise after two.

Notwithstanding these rejections, the Interior Department approved a contract with the State omitting acreage limitation. Congress had the right to review this contract, but at this stage the balance of political power was reversed. Initially, supporters of the project had to accept acreage limitation or lose the entire project. With the project once authorized, they were free to shrug off the omission of acreage limitation from the contract if they could. This they were strong enough to do, blocking all legislative efforts to force the Interior Department to include acreage limitation in the contract.²¹

Omission of acreage limitation from the California State Water project contract exposed for all to see the vulnerability of the Interior Department to pressures against enforcement of the law. Its willingness to circumvent the law was revealed increasingly, and was facilitated by obstacles in the way of judicial correction.²² The persons most injured were dispersed, remote and uninformed. Suits were costly to them, and standing in court was difficult to attain for persons not immediately affected.²³

Thus unchecked by either Congress or the courts, apparently it was easy for officials to give lip service to the principles of the law that they were ignoring while charged with its enforcement.²⁴

Measured by investment for construction, acreage irrigated, and value of crops produced on reclaimed land, achievements of the Bureau of Reclamation are impressive. Between 1902 and 1958 projects costing \$8 billion were authorized by Congress. Since 1958 an additional \$2 billion for construction has been authorized, mainly in the Colorado Basin and California's Central Valley. By 1958 Federal reclamation was responsible for 6.5 million acres of the 25.3 million irrigated acres in the 17 western states, and this ratio of one to four has continued into the mid-sixties. Crop values on Federally reclaimed acres were \$928 million in 1957; the cumulative crop value during the half-century 1906-1957 reached \$13.3 billion. A single decade later, by 1967, both annual and cumulative crop values had doubled.

A reflection of western development less directly attributable to reclamation is the increase of population in 17 western states between 1900 and 1968 from 11.2 million to 50.1 million, or from approximately 15 percent to 25 percent, one-quarter of the national total. In 1957 about one-fifth of the \$80 billion collected by Federal internal revenue came from the 17 western states. Between 1940 and 1957 western personal income increased from 19 to over 24 percent of the national total.²⁵

These achievements have not served to still public controversy over reclamation. Whose aspirations? and Whose achievements? remain questions as vital as they were in the beginning.

The National Reclamation Act of 1902 was an innovation, the first great twentieth century step toward conservation of a public resource, and toward public planning of the environment. But project construction and material accomplishment do not of themselves achieve these twin goals. The first Governors' Conference on Conservation, held in 1908, understood this, and emphasized the necessity to place public aims above private benefit. Gifford Pinchot, reciting the Governors' resolutions, wrote: "And the Declaration added this pregnant sentence: 'We agree that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the People, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated.'" ²⁶

In giving effect to this principle reclama-

tion has stumbled. Paul Wallace Gates, historian of western lands, has identified the obstacle: "The seemingly never-ending and insoluble controversies over the 160-acre water limitation of the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the long sustained bickering over various features of the Central Valley development largely stem from the concentration of land ownership the nineteenth century bequeathed to later generations."²⁷

Under these pressures the potentials of reclamation for public benefit, instead of flowering, have been stunted. There are, for example, no water grants for education while the Nation gives away its money and its waters. The precedent furnished by land grants for education when the Nation gave away its public lands has been ignored. Public planning to preserve agricultural greenbelts and open spaces against urban sprawl and slurb has been frustrated by failure—mainly administrative—to observe the excess land law.

The effectiveness of reclamation as a true instrument for conservation and public benefit could have been enhanced greatly by a simple, sympathetic amendment. Present law requires owners of excess lands to empower the Secretary of the Interior to sell these at pre-water prices, but he lacks authority to buy them. If Congress had given him that authority, agricultural greenbelts could be preserved and the Federal Government could shoulder its proper responsibility for planning the quality of the environment it was creating. The same grant of authority could also provide revenue for the national conservation fund and for education. Its source would be the incremental values arising from the public's own investment in water development. The idea that the Secretary of the Interior might buy excess lands for the Government is not hindsight. It was recommended by the Governor of Montana in the early 1890's, was repeated by the landmark Fact Finders Report of the Coolidge era, and has been reiterated since by varied organizations of citizens.²⁸

The antagonistic forces for conservation and for private monopoly, respectively, of land and water, remain balanced one against the other as from the beginning. Suspended today without action, on one hand, is Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall's 1964 recommendation that the Government purchase the lands divested by private owners under the excess land law. On the other hand, likewise suspended, is the threat of perpetuated private monopoly through circumvention or destruction of the excess land law. Nonenforcement allows extensive circumvention. The "Engle formula", offering escape from the excess land law in return for a token payment, is intended to destroy finally the Nation's historic land and water policy.²⁹

Reclamation always has had to justify its cost. This issue rang throughout the Congressional debates of 1902, and it echoes during every struggle for project authorization or appropriation. Criticism has appeared outside as well as within the halls of Congress. An historian commented in 1951 on "reclamation's shaky economic basis" and expressed "wonder at a program that spent millions to bring new land under cultivation, then spends further millions to absorb production on that same land."³⁰

More recently, in 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty raised a fresh criticism. It concluded that without "production on publicly subsidized irrigated lands in the West, much of the South could have stronger agricultural and rural economics, with fewer poverty-stricken people." The Commission recommended that "no more public money be invested in developing privately owned farmland until the nation needs more land" for producing food and fiber. Noting the flimsy observance of the

law by the executive branch of Government, the Commission recommended flatly "that the Department of the Interior enforce the 160-acre limitation on the current irrigation project areas . . ."³¹

The lengths to which reclamationists have gone to raise construction money have drawn attack recently from environmentalists. When the Bureau of Reclamation proposed a reservoir to generate and sell electric power, a protesting article bore the scornful title: "In search of a subsidy machine: or Why the Grand Canyon must be dammed."³²

Criticism of reclamation was mounting during the sixties, aimed from high and diverse quarters, and deep-seated. In 1966 the chairman of the Committee on Water of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences objected to the customary criteria for water development. Water resources, he said, "should center upon the needs of people rather than upon water *per se*." His committee amplified and reinforced him: "A different dimension, too long neglected as a matter of systematic analysis, has to do with the distribution of benefits among persons and among areas."³³

The twisted and tortured contest between aspirations and achievements in western reclamation has not reached its end. It stands on a new threshold with gigantic plans, but facing in the future the same old questions. As the Chief of the Corps of Engineers stated bluntly in 1968: "Is a man entitled to buy up, settle or promote a chunk of desert and then demand that his government bring water to him from the general direction of the North Pole?"³⁴

FOOTNOTES

¹ Paul S. Taylor, Professor of Economics, Emeritus, University of California, Berkeley. Maurice Schwartz assisted in preparation of this paper. The ample footnotes are designed not only to support the present article but also to facilitate further historical research on this many-faceted subject:

² 43 USC 431.

³ *Ivanhoe Irrigation District v. McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275, 297.

⁴ Taylor, Excess land law: execution of a public policy, 64 *Yale Law J.* 477, 501 (1958), and Excess land law: pressure vs. principle, 47 *California Law Rev.* 499 (1959).

⁵ For example, Taylor, Excess land law: calculated circumvention, 52 *California Law Rev.* 978 (1964); Statement for record by Taylor, Hearing before House government operations subcommittee on conservation and natural resources, 91 Cong., 1 sess., 229-237 (1969). See also fn. 24.

⁶ *Irrigation of the San Joaquin, Tulare and Sacramento Valleys, California*. House Ex. Doc. No. 290, 43 Cong., 1 sess., 80. *Chronicle*, May 31, 1877. See also Taylor, Water, land and people, *American West*, V, No. 2, 24-29, 68-72 (March 1968); 160-acre law, 114 *Cong. Rec.* S9742-49, daily ed., July 30, 1968.

⁷ *Irrigation of the San Joaquin . . .*, op. cit., 78, 80.

⁸ May 5, 1877.

⁹ E., Official report of the Irrigation Congress held in Salt Lake, Utah . . . 1891, 39, 102-114.

¹⁰ 35 *Cong. Rec.*, 6685 (1902).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 6374, 6678.

¹² Proceedings of thirteenth national Irrigation Congress held at Portland, Oregon, 61 (1905). Statement of Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug, Hearings before Senate public lands subcommittee, 80 Cong., 1 sess., on S. 912, 991-2 (1947). Taylor, Central Valley project, water and land, *Western Pol. Q.*, II, 241.

¹³ Taylor, Excess land law: legislative erosion of public policy, 30 *Rocky Mt. Law Rev.* 1, 5 (1958).

¹⁴ 95 *Cong. Rec.* 10126 ff. (1949). Statement of Klaus G. Loewald, Hearings before Senate irrigation and reclamation subcommittee, 85 Cong., 2 sess., on S. 1425, S. 2541, and

S. 3448, 230-238 (1958) Edwin C. Pendleton, History of labor in Arizona irrigated agriculture, 34-6 (Univ. Calif. doctoral dissertation, 1950).

¹⁷ Interior Decisions 496. Excess land laws: Imperial Irrigation District, M-36675 (Dec. 31, 1964).

¹⁸ 30 Rocky Mt. Law Rev. 1, 6-11 (1958).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 11-13.

²⁰ Hearings on S. 912, supra. Piecemeal attacks continued. On San Luis Valley, Colorado, project, the limit was raised in 1952 from 160 to 480 acres, after sustaining a veto of the initial bill by President Harry S. Truman. In 1954 Owl Creek, Wyoming, project was exempted, carrying the stipulation that it was "in no way to be considered a precedent." Exemption was granted on Santa Maria project, California, in 1954, on the specious pretext that after the dam was built there would be no way to enforce compliance by limiting water deliveries to excess lands, since these were not by surface but underground. No one mentioned 43 U.S.C. 418 which requires compliance "before any contract" is let or work begun for the construction of any reclamation project." Congressman John F. Shelley said that this exemption was "in no way compromising a cornerstone of national policy," although of course it was, since only the public project made possible the groundwater deliveries. 30 Rocky Mt. Law Rev. 1, 15-18. The California Supreme Court temporarily weakened the acreage limitation law's effectiveness in 1957, but was overruled the following year by the U.S. Supreme Court. *Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. All parties*, 47 Cal. 2d 597; *Ivanhoe v. McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275.

²¹ Hearing before House subcommittee on irrigation and reclamation, 84 Con., 1 sess., on H.R. 104, H.R. 304 and H.R. 3817, 70 (1955).

²² 30 Rocky Mt. Law Rev. 1, 20-29. Similar evasive tactics were employed in 1966 during a revision of the California Constitution that resulted in dropping Art. XVII, sec. 2 that declared "the holding of large tracts of land" is "against the public interest." The Constitutional Revision Commission's background paper supporting deletion treated the existence of great landownerships as the problem of a bygone age, describing the section as "born of that colorful era of legendary land barons and octopus-like super-corporations." The commentary implied it would be absurd to assume that today "there were a Legislature willing to comply with (this) edict" of the Constitution. Although the California Supreme Court gave its approval to section 2 as State policy, the Commission's estimate of the Legislature's unwillingness to give effect to it was realistic. Faced in 1959 with a proposal to adopt a 160-acre provision applying to the State Water Project, the Legislature declined. In explanation, Assemblyman Jesse M. Unruh said that "At times we have to rise above principle." (*Fulton v. Brannan*, 88 Cal. 454; *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 18, 1959, 15.) The survival of the Engle formula in Senator George Murphy's 1969 bill (S. 1631) testifies further to the contemporary pressure from large-scale corporate landownership to enrich and perpetuate itself. (California Constitutional Revision Commission, Background study no. 4, Article XVII, Landownership, 6, October 1966, mimeo.)

²³ S. 1631, supra, fn. 19, embodies the recommendations of Governor Ronald Reagan's Task Force on the Acreage Limitation Problem favoring the Engle formula. This would terminate historic antimonopoly policy, allowing perpetuation of such concentrated landownerships as in the southern and western San Joaquin Valley where 34 landholders, mostly corporate, own three-quarters of a million acres. (Hearings on S. 912, supra, 864.) For a critical review see Acreage limitation, *CONG. REC.*, vol. 114, pt. 6, p. 7420, March 22, 1968. When the Engle formula was first broached in 1955 Congressman William

A. Dawson of Utah, pointed out that it would encourage greater concentration of land-ownership, saying: ". . . to say that these large landowners are going to pay interest on their excess and therefore, it is going to result in breaking up the large ownerships just is not true. . . . That could even be encouragement for people to get into big ownerships and to take on more acreage, because the other benefits are so great that it could encourage them." (Hearing on H.R. 104 et al, supra, 70.)

²⁴ 108 Cong. Rec. 5687-5725, 6237-6240, 7809-7814. (1962)

²⁵ At Westlands (San Luis unit, CVP) several statutes are ignored, viz., (1) 43 USC 418, requiring compliance by owners of excess lands prior to construction; (2) 43 USC 423e, requiring compliance prior to water deliveries, which are being made to ineligible lands via groundwaters; and (3) 43 USC 431, requiring a landowner to be a "bona fide resident on such land, or occupant thereof, residing in the neighborhood."

In 1964 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall confessed that "both Congress and the executive branch have on occasion exhibited a degree of concern for the excess-land owner which may be difficult to reconcile with the policies embraced by the excess land laws." The confession was not followed by improved observance of the law. Acreage limitation policy: study prepared by the Department of the Interior pursuant to a resolution of the Senate committee on interior and insular affairs, 88 Cong., 2 sess., xiii. See also USDI, Office of the Secretary, Excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws and the payment of charges, in two parts, Washington, 1956, prepared for House Government operations subcommittee on public works and resources. Proc.

²⁶ Louis L. Jaffe, Standing to secure judicial review: public actions, 74 *Harvard Law Rev.* 1265 (1961); 52 *California Law Rev.* 478, 1004-08. (1964).

²⁷ Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dornay said to the Mississippi Valley Association: "I am proud that our basic principles remain essentially unchanged in concept. . . . We are today, as we always have been, fully committed to the conviction that the family farm is a national asset of fundamental importance." USDI For release to PM's Feb. 3, 1964. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holm said to the National Reclamation Association, referring to the "anti-monopoly" excess land provisions: "We follow these principles scrupulously because we believe in them and because we know that failing to do so would cost the program public and congressional support." USDI For release to PM's Nov. 11, 1964.

²⁸ Data through 1958 are taken from Theodore M. Schad and John Kerr Rose, Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service Report, Reclamation—Accomplishments and contributions, printed for the use of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 86 Cong., 1 sess., 19, 30, 20, 40, 28, Washington, 1959. Data through 1968 are taken from USDI Summary report of the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, and statistical appendix, parts I-III, 101, 201, 200, 202.

²⁹ Breaking new ground, 351. (1947)

³⁰ California's agricultural college lands, *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, 104. (May 1961)

³¹ Julian Ralph, *Montana: the treasure state*, Harpers, Vol. 85, 93, 95; Federal reclamation by irrigation. Report submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by a committee of special advisors on reclamation. S. Doc. 92, 68 Cong., 1 sess. Among organizations that at one time or another have endorsed Government purchase are Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, California Labor Federation, National AFL-CIO, Sierra Club, Northern California Council of Churches.

³² Acreage limitation policy, supra, vii.

³³ Stanley R. Davison, Leadership of the reclamation movement, 1875-1902. Doctoral dissertation, U.C. Berkeley, 14, 15. (1951)

³⁴ The People Left Behind, 138, 139.

³⁵ Laurence I. Moss, *Bull. Atomic Scientists*, XXIII, No. 6, 25. (June 1967.)

³⁶ National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, Alternatives in water management, preface, 29. (1966) See also *Ibid.*, Water and choice: an example of alternatives in water management. (1968.)

³⁷ Major General Jackson Graham, quoted in Wildlife Management Institute, Outdoor news bulletin, May 24, 1968, 2.

THAT GREATEST OF FALLACIES:
THAT LAWS AND REGULATIONS
CAN TAKE THE PLACE OF A
SINCERE AND HUMAN DESIRE TO
DO WELL

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, some of the last words spoken by a great American, Dr. Lawrence Lockley, pointed up a great fallacy: "That laws and regulations can take the place of a sincere and human desire to do well."

Dr. Lockley, professor in the Graduate School of Business at the University of Santa Clara and former dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Southern California, was a good friend to me and many thousands of other Americans. Throughout his amazing productive life he dispensed sound advice to his students and associates and achieved justifiable respect as a teacher, thinker, and a great exponent of the principles of American free enterprise.

During the period that I was privileged to know Dr. Lockley, I received his Economic Letter, which was sent periodically from his desk at the school of business at the University of Santa Clara. I always looked forward to reviewing this letter because of its scholarly approach to economics and governmental philosophy. His writings were filled with the information and thoughts of a scholar, but always they were packaged and entwined in basic commonsense. I have never known a man who could more effectively present a strong case for free enterprise and individualism than Dr. Lockley. His writings were the product of deep moral beliefs, his profound knowledge, and his basic American philosophy.

In his last Economic Letter Dr. Lockley discussed the trend which has basically changed our inherited freedoms, the American way of life and our American sense of values. I believe his last newsletter, written while he knew death approached, is something which should be read by every American. I therefore am proud to insert the last and final edition of Dr. Lawrence Lockley's Economic Letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The slogans which motivated us a score of years ago seem to have disappeared from our language. *Our inherited freedoms, the American way of life, and even reliance on the discipline of the price system, and free*

enterprise capitalism are absent from our news stories and our analytic writing, and find little place in patriotic oratory. Yet these statements were the reasons put before young men to justify their going into combat in the Second World War and in the Korean Police Action. Were we deluding ourselves, or has there been a basic change in the political and moral philosophy of the American people in a single generation?

During just the last two or three years, these statements of acceptance of free enterprise capitalism have begun to seem less relevant in our own country. We have seen groups of persons who now call themselves "street people" demanding buildings, pieces of ground, assembly facilities. All of these forms of property have been bought by valid, existent organizations, yet the "street people" demand that these assets be turned over to them. We have seen groups of caustics of one kind or another seeking to dominate and control the meetings of influential and serious groups. The American Sociological Association, an entirely respectable and honest academic organization, had to sit through a physical struggle for possession of the microphone on the speakers' platform. A recent international organization of management people, meeting in San Francisco for the first time, had their way to their assembly point blocked by pickets advocating policies which the association had nothing to do with. Shortly after the middle of September, our Secretary of Commerce, speaking before a small management group, was shouted down by a group of activists who had nothing to do with the group holding the meeting.

Throughout the world, governments are becoming increasingly sensitive to small groups of activists. (It just occurs to me as I write that a very few years ago, I'd have said "to small groups of socialists!")

Less and less is business being left in the hands of business men. In the United States, in England, and in Germany, which have been the traditional strongholds of economic individualism, we see great inroads on the authority and scope of management. Everywhere else, social authority supersedes, increasingly, the authority of ownership. In the Latin countries, largely in our own hemisphere; in Italy; in France; in Spain; in the Scandinavian countries; and in other industrial countries which are democratic in political organization, public control of industry, based on other criteria than a consideration of private property and the incentive of profits, is increasing. In the communist bloc, of course, private initiative is almost non-existent.

At first glance, it would seem that the example of at least the United States, and Germany, where production is high and where the standard of living leads the world, would be influential. Probably it would if the basis for the world-wide drive toward some forms of socialism were economic. Rather, this drive is political. As the difference between the haves and the have-nots becomes greater, the have-nots put more and more political pressure toward a non-economic leveling of purchasing power.

In the period before, say, 1910, the difference between the haves and the have-nots was less conspicuous. It used to be said that the winter was the rich man's friend, because he could afford warm clothes and household heating, whereas the summer was the great leveler, since all people had to sweat in the sun. Actually, most people lived without central heat, using stoves in kitchens and in one or two other rooms. Servants were rare. It was before the popularization of the automobile, and a relatively small number of people had horses and buggies. Physicians did, people whose work required mobility did. But the number of people who kept horses as a luxury was very small. The well-to-do did have refrigerators, and the daily call of the ice man was what kept refrigerators in the luxury class. The well-to-do bought new

clothes every year, and many of them owned their own homes. They ate much the same food that the less-well-to-do ate, but they were sure of eating it when they were hungry. Spring and summer saw an abundance of fresh garden produce, fruits, eggs, and an increased supply of milk. During the winter, meat, corn meal, wheat flour, and the root crops were available.

It is true that some of the eastern seaboard cities offered crowded slum conditions, particularly to immigrants who did not know the ways of our land and who did not speak our language. The negro, primarily in the south, and the "poor whites" who were also share-croppers, lived lives of deprivation.

Throughout the greater part of our country, some sort of elementary education was available universally. There was the widespread belief that profligacy, drunkenness, or sheer indolence were the only real bars to individual progress. To a great extent, this belief was defensible, because the difference between the prosperous middle class and the less prosperous poor was really a narrow gap which could be, and often was, stepped over by many people.

Now there were wealthy families which owned steam yachts and had winter homes on Orange Grove Avenue in Pasadena. But they were so few that they did not seem to constitute a canker in the mouths of the poor. Aside from these few hundred wealthy families, everyone was poor by today's standards, and some were poorer than that!

Today's comfortable standard of living, at least for many people, entails home ownership (even though it may be only an equity ownership) two cars, considerable leisure, with hobby equipment, such as a boat on a trailer, photographic equipment, a home workshop, equipment for working on rocks and agates of various kinds, a collection of guns, or coins, or stamps, or whatever hobby the individual may fancy. The household is likely to have a number of radios, at least one television receiver, with an increasing number of houses now having two; an automatic dishwasher, clothes washers, driers, and a really formidable collection of other household appliances. High-priced cuts of meat sell readily, particularly in neighborhoods near industrial plants where daily wage workers may be expected to live. The *per capita* expenditure on alcoholic beverages is impressive. Clothing is purchased frequently, with more regard to style changes than with regard to the condition of the clothing being replaced. Education—of whatever quality it may be for any groups—is ubiquitous. A large majority of our children can go through the elementary grades, through high school, and through the first two years of collegiate level work without leaving home and without more out-of-pocket expense than for books and entertainment.

It is true that many people suffer from ailments brought on by dietary deficiencies, but when we investigate, most of such instances turn out to be the result of poor judgment rather than lack of available foods or the money to buy them. It is true that many people make wrong judgments in their choices of consumer products to buy. More and more public funds are being spent to "educate" housewives on how to buy, and how to concentrate their money on the most important elements in the consumers' cornucopia of merchandise.

I think there is produced in the United States an adequate quantity and assortment of consumers' goods to allow all families to live on a wholesome but modest level of living. There is certainly not enough produced to allow all families to live on a luxury level. It is true that our standards tend, spontaneously, to inch themselves up. I was in my mid-thirties before I thought I had money enough to buy a mechanical refrigerator. Now the merchandise, as it comes from the supermarket, must be kept at a temper-

ature so low that a mechanical refrigerator is necessary. A man used to have his shoes re-soled several times before the shoes were ready to be discarded. Now the cost of cobbling is so high that it costs less to buy cheap shoes and throw them away when they need the services of a shoe repair shop.

As the costs of living are thus inched up, the concept of a wholesome but modest level of living becomes hard to define, and harder to buy in the country's retail stores. The expenditures a family must make now will be determined by political rather than economic pressures. Gradually, we have moved large parts of our population to public support, where the availability of luxuries comes clearly from political pressures rather than from economic pressures. Our economic storehouse of consumers' goods is so vast and the mechanism for filling and for emptying it is so intricate that the relationship between the opportunity to consume to having produced is harder and harder to see.

Let's turn the coin over and read what is on the other side of it.

Wherever local customs and laws allow men to build industrial enterprises and profit from doing so, the standard of living increases and the people—including those who bring nothing but their labor power to the market—prosper. As industrialization develops, prosperity develops and the level of living is raised. Where stringent limits are put on the freedom of management and when limits are put on the rewards of entrepreneurial and managerial activity, production decreases, and the people suffer.

During the period between the close of the Civil War and the beginning of the Great Depression, the United States had that freedom. The foundation was laid for a bountiful society. With the coming of the Great Depression, we started to try to improve the lot of the less well-to-do by means of direct government intervention. Through the institution of minimum wage laws, through the institution of what were called equal rights laws, through the encouragement of, and legal strengthening of, labor unions, and through the institution of various pension and welfare payments, we have reached a point at which there is a disguised but real limitation put on the scope of managers of business activity.

Just what do we mean by managerial freedom? It is a question which can be answered simply, and needs to be, because more and more people are forgetting what it means. Managerial freedom allows entrepreneurs to enter or to leave businesses as they see fit, though the businesses they wish to enter must not be adverse to public health or public morals. It means that managers may hire only those people who are prepared to do the work they need done—in other words, that the costs of early education must not be passed on to management above management's normal share of taxes. It means that managers may have a proprietary interest in the brands they put on products they make, and that they may sell in free markets at open prices. It means that managers may not be required to perform social reforms that the government has not been able to perform. It means, and this is the most difficult of the managerial freedoms, that management may take advantage of its own ingenuity, its own skill, and its own foresight. Because some business men lack ability, they must not constitute the template on which all management should be graded.

When we talk about managerial freedom, we do not hold back a bit from the requirement that merchandise must be wholesome, must be safe, and must be clearly and fairly labeled. We do not hold back a bit on our condemnation of deceptive business tactics. We do not hedge a bit on our requirement that competition must be fair, but let us remember that it must be fair both ways—fair to the large as well as to the small.

We feel that we are in a period of unprecedented prosperity, prosperity so ebullient that it cannot be damped even by federal fiscal policy. While it may seem so, there are two negative trends which have been set in motion. The first is the undermining of our standard of living through inflation. At the rate we now go, half the dollar values we hold will be lost in eight years! For a considerable period of time, we thought the annual increase in prices was so small that it was a trifling price to pay for greater ease, even insouciance, of doing business. But now that inflation takes a bite of 6% or a little more each year, it is no longer trifling in importance. But every one knows about inflation, or should, after so much has been written and said about it. The second point is more subtle.

The second trend is toward the elimination from our cornucopia of consumers' goods of all products which cannot be mass-produced by mechanized or automated equipment.

The things we have lost from our standard of living have dropped out one by one, and without our noticing the going of very many of them. Let's see just a few of the areas of loss. In many cities, we can rarely induce a physician to make a house visit any more, and less and less are we able to reach medical help during week ends. Merchant tailors are harder and harder to find. If men want tailor-made suits, they must hunt for tailors, and be willing to pay a high price as compared with the prices of well-known brands of ready made suits. House painters have become so scarce and so expensive that a substantial majority of the interior paint jobs done in American homes are done by householders, and well over half the exterior paint jobs are done by householders. Many of our foods have been modified genetically or treated so that they can more easily be marketed. Bananas are treated with sulphur dioxide, so that they turn yellow (and hence, more readily marketable) while they are still green and firm. Cheese is pasteurized so that it will keep for long periods of time, even though it has been made less palatable. Many of our melons are developed to the point at which they will keep for very long periods of time but will not become as succulent or as flavorful as they used to. Potatoes are developed for shipping and keeping, and do not bake as well as they did. Many kinds of apples have had the snap and tart flavor bred out of them. Any number of smaller fruits have been genetically modified so that they can be picked by machine.

We can consider the large number of personal service workers—shoe repair men, watch makers, competent short hand writers, automobile mechanics, and many others—who are clearly not in adequate supply. Or we can consider other craft workers whose hourly wages have been moved up to the point at which fewer and fewer "machine operatives and kindred workers" can afford them.

In general, we may feel that a custom-made world, in which consumers could have their individual wants catered to, is less and less available. We seem bound to make what we can make with a minimum of individual attention, preferably through automatic processes. We seem to have to modify our manufactured and our natural products so that they can be marketed with a minimum of any one's personal attention. In fact, we have finally reached the turning point at which we are receiving a slightly smaller output from workers regardless of monetary and non-monetary incentives.

In the days in which we think we remember a more personalized standard of living, job security and personal advancement depended on the alacrity with which one tried to do one's work well. Poor workmanship, indifferent attention to the job at hand—these were personal faults which brought a quick penalty. The lazy, inattentive worker was fired. Then he had no job.

And there was no bureaucracy poised to save him from his failures. The fired worker had to hunt until he could find another job, and a surprisingly large proportion of them learned to do better work. The penalty of failure was very personal!

In a period in which personal responsibility appears to be declining, in which interest in craftsmanship appears to dwindle, the inherited freedoms will necessarily mean less, because they were the rights which protected us as we tried to do well by society and well by ourselves. I think it is not a socialistic bent which leads us astray, but that greatest of fallacies: that laws and regulations can take the place of a sincere and human desire to do well.

IT IS TIME FOR A CEASE-FIRE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's emphasis on the silent majority has stimulated spirited debate across the country and has inspired much commentary on the views which might be expressed heretofore by silent but substantial Americans.

One of the most objective and certainly timely articles was carried in the Thursday, November 6, *Suburban Life of La Grange Park, Ill.*, written by staff writer Bob Faje. The article, which is directed to every thinking American, follows:

IT IS TIME FOR A CEASE-FIRE

(By Bob Faje)

As one of the "silent majority" I've become more than slightly disturbed at the state of affairs in this nation.

We're living in the world of the super-critics, and as one reader of this newspaper stated in a letter to the editor last week, most practice the art of destructive criticism.

Constructive criticism is a most necessary part of any group, but that practice is hard to find these days.

There are some who lead you to believe that our governmental system should be ripped apart. I don't care to go into my feelings in regard to those who wish to destroy this system, but what bothers me is all too many "nonthinkers" are ready to follow the lead.

I'm square enough to feel our system has many more strong points than weak links. Is there room for improvement? There definitely are areas that could be improved. But to tear down this system would be a bit too much.

I've also been square enough to write to my senators and representatives telling them how I feel on certain issues. I've also exercised my right to vote. I wonder how many of the super-critics have lowered themselves to such action.

There are self-proclaimed leaders in many "movements" and the trouble is that many of these leaders are using the younger group to "pad the ranks."

I'm not saying that the college crowd is a "non-thinking" group, but there are large numbers who will follow the crowd. And there are just too many being used by the leaders of too many "movements."

Most protest groups tell us what is wrong with the world, but few have any constructive answers as how to improve things.

We've become so tied up in criticizing the next guy we can't see things straight anymore.

While some propose a cease-fire in Vietnam and others call for support for the war moratorium, I propose another type of moratorium, that in the long haul may be more meaningful than the other type.

While I cannot support a unilateral cease-fire or the war moratorium as presented, I would call for another type of cease-fire.

I propose that each American, on his next day off, take some time to think about the state of things in his country. We can find fault with anything if we try hard enough, but isn't it about time we look for and encourage the strong points of our neighbors.

It's about time we stopped shouting long enough to hear what others are saying. More important, it's about time we communicate with each other.

We have to stop shouting long enough to look at things in a constructive manner. We also have to sift through the "movements" that are unworthy of recognition, accept the "movements" that are worthy, and build and improve from there. But let's not destroy.

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS IS UNITY—NOT DIVISIVE PARTISANSHIP

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the old days many charged that Richard Nixon was a first-rate mudslinger himself.

These days this job has evidently been turned over to those who work for him.

Now Attorney General Mitchell is the latest member of the administration to take a hand at it.

For some reason the Nixon administration keeps flailing away at the administration of Lyndon B. Johnson—which has been out of office almost a year.

Nixon is not running for anything. So maybe the answer is—they want to keep people from remembering that they have been in for almost a year—and nothing has happened. The Attorney General blames President Johnson for the Nation's problems because he says Johnson made empty promises.

He does not specify, so we do not know, what promises he thinks were empty—or who found them so.

It is not likely that the Attorney General has talked to any of the 11,000 Americans who once were considered poor and now are not—because of the war on poverty that was waged during the Johnson years.

How about 800,000 black citizens who could not cast a ballot 5 years ago because of their color and are now registered voters?

Mr. Mitchell is a man of the law. Has he spoken to any of the law enforcement officers in any of the States about the crime fighting help they are finally getting for the first time because of the previous administration's Safe Streets Act?

What about families who are able to enjoy the millions of acres of parks and beaches and other land put aside for the people during the Johnson period?

Has he talked to consumers who now have the protection of the law with them against shoddy and dangerous marketing practices?

If Mr. Mitchell—or anyone else in the Nixon administration—is trying to point out that there are still Americans who need help, they are dead right. There is a lot of work to be done—but the Nixon White House, after a year in office, prides itself most on being a place of quiet and calm.

Attorney General Mitchell said:

We do not want to offer more than we can realistically deliver.

Fair enough. All the American people are going to ask is that they offer something.

It is really not very constructive to attack the Johnson administration. Pretty soon the American people will begin comparing the accomplishments of both administrations. And the record so far would indicate that any comparison would leave the Republicans exposed and wanting.

GOVERNOR REAGAN IS RUNNING CALIFORNIA WELL

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the second largest and most difficult executive position is the Governor of the largest State in the United States.

California was in serious disarray when Ronald Reagan decided to run for Governor. He displayed outstanding organizational ability and political awareness to be elected Governor.

He is turning California—although large, diverse, and dynamic—into a well run State.

We Californians know him as an extraordinary person with talent, integrity, judgment, understanding, and commitment. Because Governor Reagan continues to astound people throughout our Nation, I ask unanimous consent to insert an article about Governor Reagan from the November 1969 issue of Government Executive magazine. It tells a little about Governor Reagan's astonishing performance as Governor of California.

IS CALIFORNIA A WELL-RUN STATE?

Out in the stone high atop the Grecian-style State of California office building number one (there are two) is a request: "Bring me men to match my mountains."

Is Governor Ronald Wilson Reagan one of those men or is he, as bitter, coercive elements of the state, and jaded politicians (particularly Democrats across the country) describe him, simply "a small town boy from Illinois who got into broadcasting and then motion pictures and made a success of all that and then eventually drifted into politics and really doesn't know what's going on, especially outside his own state?"

Reagan's having once been a popular movie-TV star is a convenient handle many people grab. LBJ has one image, Goldwater another. Once this image is generally accepted by the public, it takes an awful lot to jar it loose from the people's minds.

The Reagan image still carries that kind of aura and probably always will, to some extent: the idea that all movie stars tend to be made up of superficial tinsel with little

substance. Thus, there is a tendency, particularly in the rest of the nation, to look for the speech writer or idea man—the man who really thought it up—whenever Reagan says something publicly.

In fact, as a rapidly growing number of Californians are beginning to enthusiastically believe, Reagan is not only his own man, but he's a very bright one, on top of it. Democratic political professionals in the state are beginning to say such things as, "Well, he's entirely politically motivated and his programs will have no end reward, but right now he just can't be beat."

But among people of the state—the cab drivers, the ditch diggers, the cocktail waitresses, the homeowners, the voters—he is doing or trying to do just exactly what they want seen done in the running of the most populous state in the union.

In sum, what they're saying about him is that he's made a lot of mistakes, mostly political, but "you've got to give him credit. He's an honest man, which is something rare in government, and he's doing everything he told us he was going to do—which is almost as rare."

In effect, what Reagan is and what he has done since being elected 33rd governor of the state in November 1966 are startlingly different from what is often assumed to be the political "in" way for politicians to behave.

Sums up Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs, Reagan's special assistant for education (see Education section, this issue), "Once you've got an interpretation in mind, it's very tough to shake. My only fear of saying it exactly as I see it is that you'll think I'm unobjective. But this guy Reagan continues to astound me, in that he really doesn't need a hell of a lot of help from his staff—except for the sheer physical problem that you can only do so many things at a time."

Notes another aide who deals with him daily: "For instance, he writes the best speeches. Somebody gives him a lousy speech to deliver, he throws it away and does his own and it becomes the speech of the month. It really does. It's the one that's most quoted and the one for which we get the most requests. And that kind of thing happens in most areas."

Notes another staffer: "Here we have this delicate suggestion put to him on tax reform. Where are the holes? he asks. We're sitting there in a staff meeting, batting our gums and he's sitting there thinking a little bit and suddenly he comes out and puts his finger right on it—it's not because everybody becomes different because 'God has spoken,' it's that he really has the ability to get to the heart of the matter. I'm convinced of it."

Adds another of his top assistants, Gordon Luce, Secretary of Business and Transportation in Reagan's cabinet, "His mind is about as quick as a mind can be. He reads everything. And in spite of the fact that his enemies say all his decisions are politically motivated, he never mentions politics in our business meetings. For that matter, if you point out, after a decision has been made, that's going to be a good political move, too, that tends to sour the decision."

Reagan's takeover of California government in 1966 had about it a good many similarities to the way John F. Kennedy took over the Federal Government in 1961. Reagan shopped around for all the best brains he could find in business, in government and career civil servants, to populate his staff—and still does that.

He set up task forces of bright people to analyze various problems of the state and to come up with recommended solutions—as Kennedy did in 1960-61. He walked into the state capitol and faced immediately a government of people who had gotten discouraged or complacent, or set in their ways, and announced he was going to change all that, and announced just as clearly that if anyone didn't like it, they had best get out now.

Politicians don't do that, noted one career state government employee, but statesmen do. Today, it is obvious around the state house in Sacramento that Reagan has a whole team running in his direction and, more importantly, doing it not just under orders, but because they are enthusiastic about what he wants done.

INFLATION'S CAUSE

What is going on in the State of California today amounts, in many areas, to setting a standard of excellence which other state governments—and even the Federal Government—could well emulate.

Sherriffs, who is a Doctor of Psychology and an academician, says he really can't say what it is in Reagan's background that makes Reagan the man he is. His small town heritage, the fact that he had to struggle like any other citizen to get ahead, his involvement with the unions during his motion picture days, "plus a terribly high I.Q., which he obviously has," have been factors. "But," says Sherriffs, "there's nothing small town about this man, except that he does understand people—and people in big towns usually don't understand them very well."

Noted another staff type: "I've been the number two man in a lot of organizations and I know you always worry when the boss goes to a meeting, that he may say something that gets you or him or both of you in trouble. I don't worry at all if I can't make something Reagan's going to. He's the easiest guy to brief I ever knew."

Thus, the key to understanding what is going on in California can be found in Reagan's personal philosophies, coupled with the fact that when he spells out his principles, he really means it. He's not just saying these things because they make political hay. His convictions are not so shallow that a pressure point from anywhere can get him to move off his stand; indeed, on the basics, he won't budge at all. As cornball as it may sound, it really amounts to ultimate faith in the democratic principles on which this country is founded. Probably nowhere else is this more clear than in what he and his key staff people say in the field of education. Reagan, himself, ranks education a prime state concern. Last March he told the U.S. Congress:

CONSTANT TURMOIL

"Since 1964, the tempo of disruption has rapidly increased until there is rarely a day that a campus somewhere in California is not in difficulty. Two campuses have seen constant turmoil: the Berkeley campus of the University of California, and, during the past few years, San Francisco State College.

"Certain trends are evident. There has been a shift of tactics from nonviolence to planned and announced violence. There has been a shift from mass confrontation to guerrilla tactics with beatings, the disruption of classrooms, shootings, bombings, arson and general vandalism and destruction . . .

"It may seem incomprehensible that a portion of our population—including some students, some faculty members, and outsiders—are attempting to overthrow our democratic way of life. It is equally incomprehensible in a democratic society—which is the pinnacle of man's dream for self-government and dignity—to find so many of its citizens standing mute and helpless while their basic values and processes are assaulted."

Reagan is adamant, but in a common sense way, about solutions to the problems of equal opportunity and fair employment suffered by most states.

"At the very outset of our administration," he notes, "we instructed the heads of our agencies and departments that equal opportunity and fair employment laws would be fully enforced and applied . . . enforced all along the line, in both hiring practices and contract policies. We have adhered to and enforced this policy."

"Nondiscrimination is the policy of the State of California—both in principle and practice. We found we had to do more, though, than just announce a policy. . . . One diehard down the line can block policy and it takes a constant checking and reminding and sometimes head-banging to keep things rolling.

"We reviewed the requirements for various state job categories and rescinded those requirements which were overly rigid and unrealistic—such as demanding a high school diploma or its equivalent as a qualification for employment in jobs when no such educational requirement was called for.

"Where rules and common sense are in conflict, common sense must prevail."

Reagan tabs the major cause of inflation to be government spending. "Yet," he said, "every time we call for cuts and economies, there are those in government—both elected politicians and career employees—who complain of what they term our neanderthal proclivities. Call it neanderthal if you will, but unless we cut the cost of government so that it begins to live within the means of our taxpayers, we will, in fact, find ourselves in a very dark age—an ice age with dinosaurs of debt, depression and despair."

The taxpayer in California is refreshed when he hears Reagan in their defense. "Those in and out of government who refuse to understand the plight of the wage-earning, tax-paying citizen are irresponsible or just unable to hear the voices of those angry citizens who are carrying too great a tax burden—and too often an unfair share—because of the high cost of government.

"Millions of Californians—blue collars and white collars—find they have to run like crazy just to stay even with last year, or the year before; find it impossible to make ends meet; and are up to their eyeballs in debt because their earnings simply won't cover the normal costs of living. They deserve relief. And this administration is determined to provide it for them."

Casper W. Weinberger, whom Reagan appointed Director of Finance, observed: "Reagan instituted a new trend in government spending—the trend to reduce the rate and volume of government spending and at the same time provide the same quality services the government had been providing before. And that," he continued, "is a tough thing to tackle in a state with the population growing at the rate of 500,000 a year, and with a budget only one-third under his control."

COMPETITIVE CONTRACTS

In line with the "new" technique of program budgeting, Reagan gave each functional agency of the state an allocation, insisting these agencies establish priorities at the lowest level. If the agencies could not abide by the allocation and still deliver essential services, they could come back for supplementary funding. This surfaced agency problems, forced a soul-searching of "what are really essential programs."

Reagan is insistent upon reducing taxes. "There is only one way to reduce taxes," he said, "and that is to reduce government spending. One is impossible without the other, especially under a state constitution which prohibits deficit spending.

"At present, federal, state and local taxes take \$1,350 for every man, woman and child in California. That is \$5,400 a year for a family of four, and of that more than \$3,400 goes to Washington. That is ridiculous."

Part of the solution, and an effective one, was the persuasion of Major General Andrew R. Lolli, retired Army missile expert, to direct the state's General Services administration. Lolli sold Reagan on turning exclusively to competitive advertised contracts instead of the "tried and true" negotiated contracts used widely by the Federal Government and other states.

"The experts told us it wouldn't work," Reagan said. "They said we were taking a

step backwards in purchasing. Well, we stepped backwards all right, we quit buying goods at the standard Federal GSA rates, we consolidated state purchasing, drew up specifications, advertised our needs and awarded contracts to the lowest bidders meeting specifications. As a result, we were able to buy goods ranging from fluorescent lamps and floor wax to guinea pigs and gasoline for ten to 40 percent cheaper than the Federal Government, even though we were buying in many cases, identical products from identical distributors in far less volume."

The state expects to save more than \$80 million by the end of this year as a result of the new purchasing program begun in 1967. Now, according to officials in Sacramento, the Federal Government, several foreign countries, and numerous states are studying California's General Service methods to see if they can copy this success. The General Accounting Office in Washington, for instance, compared the Federal system of procuring light bulbs and tubes and discovered that, using the California system, a savings of at least 12.4 percent could be realized. GAO reported this to Congress. (Because of the successes experienced in California procurement policies, *Government Executive* will examine them in greater detail in a future issue.)

"The challenge of the Reagan administration," observed Gordon C. Luce, Secretary of Business and Transportation on Reagan's cabinet, "has been to bring about economy and efficiency in government through creative thinking and innovative programs. A common sense business approach to government can accomplish this goal provided there are people in government and the private sector who jointly contribute their energies and thinking." But savings have not come at the expense of progress.

During the Reagan administration, 1,250 major highway projects have been advanced or supplemented over and above the planned budgeted projects, for a total value of \$380.2 million. Said Luce: "For the first time in its history, the public works department passed a total of \$1 billion in construction under way, representing a 22 percent program growth since January 1967—yet the department has reduced its in-house payroll. Much of this acceleration has come from savings due to contractor's lower bids, economies and efficiencies in the department, and better money management.

Only about one-third of California's annual budget is subject to annual review by the governor and the legislature; the other two-thirds is controlled by continuing appropriations set in the statutes or the state constitution. Approximately one-half of the one-third of the budget subject to Reagan's review is administered by agencies not accountable to him.

In spite of that lack of control, the budget going into this fiscal year "controllable" by the governor, has been reduced by .34 percent over the expenditure planned for last year—while the budget in those areas not under his control increased by 18 percent.

It has been an astonishing performance, the Reagan administration—what he calls the Creative Society. The economies in the state are increasing, as are the efficiencies. Both are being observed closely by other state governments as well as the Federal. And the tone of government has taken a refreshing change. Said Reagan recently: "The government has no right to keep a single penny beyond that amount absolutely essential for the operation of a prudent government." One payoff: he has announced that for the first time in the history of California there would be a rebate (of \$87 million) on state income taxes next year.

BROTHER'S BROTHER

Reagan is fighting for a tax reform and is meeting resistance. He told Californians

last September: "Tax reform is dependent upon politics, the process by which we govern ourselves—and politics is not a spectator sport. It is the lot of those who are spectators of politics to be mastered by those who take an active part in politics.

"People do not always get the kind of government they deserve, but they do, without fail, get the kind of government they resemble."

He is for less government at the state level and increased responsibility at the local level. If it is possible to remove responsibility from the state arena to the local, he will work in that direction. It brings, he believes, government closer to the people, forcing them to participate to a greater extent.

Reagan's basic political philosophy seems to be summed up in a statement he made to the Fair Employment Practice Commission last September. Said he: "It is time to stop acting like our brother's keeper, and start acting like our brother's brother."

HOW TO DESTROY THE CHURCHES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, over the years the churches in Communist countries have suffered from a frontal attack on religion: the jailing of clergy, the elimination of seminaries, the restrictions of religious publications, and other forms of repression. In the United States recently confrontations with the churches spearheaded by the black manifesto issue have split congregations where church leaders have acquiesced to "reparations" demands.

The ultimate to date in disruptive tactics was reported by the New York Times in its November 8 issue. St. Mark's in the Bowery Episcopal Church has been confronted by a militant caucus which demanded that the congregation not only turn over a large part of its budget to poor people but that it make basic changes in the way it practices its religion, a new departure from the basic financial pitch. Furthermore, according to the Times account, the membership has welcomed the demands in wholehearted agreement, although the church remains seriously divided.

The reasons for the dissension are not hard to find. The church's minister, Rev. J. C. Michael Allen, has done away with his Sunday sermons and thrown out half of the pews in the sanctuary. The congregation now sits in a circle and has a debate instead. The Rev. David Garcia, the assistant minister, was quoted in the article as saying:

My role in the revolution is to "dehonkify" the theology. Religion is revolution. You can see Christ as a political prisoner.

The American flag has been removed from the chancel and has been replaced by a flag reading "Liberation." This is the same flag that was removed by the police from the site of the proposed State office building in Harlem. Four members of the militant caucus were seated on the 11-member vestry, and the vestry then voted \$30,000 from the church endow-

ment to be used at the discretion of the caucus.

I submit the article, "Nonwhite Caucuses Alters a Church," appearing in the New York Times of November 8, 1969, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

NONWHITE CAUCUS ALTERS A CHURCH—"RELIGION IS REVOLUTION" SAYS MINISTER AT ST. MARK'S

Expanding on a now-familiar pattern, a militant caucus at St. Mark's in the Bowery Episcopal Church has demanded that the congregation not only turn over a large part of its budget to poor people but that it make basic changes in the way it practices its religion as well.

And breaking from an equally familiar pattern of response, the membership of the historic church at Second Avenue and 10th Street has welcomed the demands in wholehearted agreement.

Since the nonwhite caucus presented its 12-point program on a hectic Sunday last month at the 170-year-old church, normal worship has been virtually halted.

The Rev. J. C. Michael Allen, the church's bearded minister, has done away with his Sunday sermons and thrown out half the pews in the sanctuary. Now the congregation sits in a circle, just over the graves of Peter Stuyvesant and his family, and has a debate instead.

"Good as we have been, we have been asleep at the switch," said Mr. Allen, who in his 10 years at the church presided over the opening there of one of the city's first Off Broadway theaters. "We have been very much hung-up on middleclass problems."

NONWHITES LEFT OUT

The church had experimented with new forms of worship, developing what Mr. Allen called "the best expression of a solid white Christian approach to life." The trouble, he said, was that the quarter of the congregation that is nonwhite was left out of the liturgy.

The job confronting the church now, according to the minister, is the development of Christian worship that also reflects the cultural experience of the black and Spanish-background members.

"My role in the revolution is to 'de-honkify' the theology," said the Rev. David Garcia, the part-Mexican, part-Indian assistant minister who is himself a member of the 13-member caucus, which is made up primarily of blacks and Puerto Ricans.

AMERICAN FLAG REPLACED

"We are saying that the blacks and the Puerto Ricans are the essence of Christianity in the 20th century," he declared. "Religion is revolution. You can see Christ as a political prisoner."

The first demand agreed to by the congregation was to remove the American flag from the chancel. It was replaced by a silky red, black and green flag "Liberation"—the same one that was hauled down by the police from the site of the proposed state office building in Harlem.

The flag hangs behind a big wooden cross made of floor beams "procured" by Mr. Allen from a tenement that was being remodeled on 13th Street. It is flanked by two banners calling for liberation of the oppressed. "Uhura Sasa" says one—meaning "Freedom Now!" in Swahili.

In answer to a further demand, the church seated four members of the caucus on its 11-member vestry, or board of directors. The vestry then voted \$30,000 from the church endowment to be used at the discretion of the caucus.

A program on the arts of black people, is also being established alongside the church's "Theater Genesis," its dramatic program, and the vestry rewriting the bylaws.

The church remains seriously divided,

however. The senior vestryman, George Buckhout, for example, resigned in protest against the changes.

But Mr. Allen said: "We've gone from confrontation, to disaster, to the beginning of an attempt to rebuild."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening developments of this session of Congress is the widespread attempt to be more precise and thorough in the handling of Department of Defense expenditures.

These efforts of many Members of both bodies has added a dimension of analysis to the Department of Defense budget that has long been missing. Even though many constructive amendments were defeated, I take heart in the new and more objective way many Members are analyzing the previously sacrosanct military budget.

Now many of us are not only asking about the technical features of weapons systems but are in increasing numbers beginning to question the underlying policy assumptions of the need for these systems and our worldwide military obligations. This is a welcome change from the environment I faced during my lonely dissent against the ABM in 1967.

Recently I read an article that forwards the attempt to rationally allocate our defense budget. It is written by the former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Paul C. Warnke. To me, it demonstrates the type of thought processes that should guide our defense and strategic planning efforts. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From Washington Monthly, October 1969]

NATIONAL SECURITY: ARE WE ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS?

(By Paul C. Warnke)

In the area of national security, it is probably a good deal easier to raise questions than to supply answers. Anyone who has ever tried the latter can only hope that his successors will be better at it. But he may also find himself hoping that he, and the American public generally, can begin to do a better job of asking the right questions. Until we do, there is little purpose and even less justice in railing about the size of our defense budget. The military-industrial complex, with the soaring cost of its care and feeding and its dire consequences for the quality of American life, is the inevitable answer to the questions we have asked and the demands we have made in the name of national security. Our military-industrial complex exists because we have asked for it.

We can never cut it back to size and free up a fair share of our budget dollars for competing and compelling causes until we begin asking the right questions—about how our defense effort squares with the real world and with our genuine national security. Without the right questions directed to the right people we can never get answers that will permit us to design, or even to recognize,

a defense budget commensurate with our over-all interests and objectives.

In not too oversimplified terms, the concept of security we evolved after World War II was to make sure that non-Communist countries stayed that way. During the years when "Who lost China?" was the popular security question, nobody in the national-security business, at least, craved identification as one who had "lost" some other strayed member of the non-Communist community.

The Eisenhower Administration pursued the concept of security by adhering to the doctrine of "massive retaliation." As the answer to the question of how we could prevent Communist take-overs, we could point to our nuclear striking force. But this answer became less and less plausible as our monopoly in intercontinental missiles dissipated. Neither we nor our potential adversaries could continue to believe that the United States would react to any and every Communist provocation by initiating a nuclear exchange in which our own society would be devastated.

Nor could we accept an "all-or-nothing" doctrine of defense that would leave us bereft of any ability to respond with conventional force to conventional attacks on friendly nations. So "massive retaliation" gave way to the more common-sense notion of a "flexible response" adequate to counter, and hopefully to deter, instances of aggression for which we would be unwilling to risk a nuclear holocaust.

But the cost of the capability to respond flexibly can be immense if an American military response must be contemplated whenever an international development disfavors our national interests. And this expense can be infinite if the adequacy of that capability must be measured in terms of a clear superiority in every aspect of armed might.

In a world in which we are not the single "great power," any such total military versatility and invincibility is clearly unprocurable—at any price. Until we begin to refine our questions and direct them toward realistic and realizable security goals, we will continue to ask the impossible and get answers that are unacceptable.

In the broadest sense, we now ask our government: make us safe from any attack by any foe. The answer is a defense budget in the neighborhood of \$80 billion a year. It is an answer that is increasingly unsatisfactory. It certainly does not satisfy the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who recognize that this amount is inadequate to buy the American people anything like full protection. The Armed Services Committees of Congress can prove that a lower budget means less over-all military strength and less capacity to do things by military force, for a defense budget of \$80 billion obviously provides the capability to meet contingencies that a budget of \$50 billion must ignore. But before concluding that the \$50 billion budget will leave us weaker and in greater danger, we need political judgments as to what unmet contingencies are apt to occur—and if they do occur and if they are unmet—what vital national interests may be adversely affected. We need the further political judgment of whether the \$30 billion thus freed can be spent on problems of greater risk to our national security and in areas of greater benefit to the over-all quality of American life. We need the answers that will put in perspective any incremental gain in physical security.

In the age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, we cannot now, with any amount of money, buy physical safety from a Soviet attack of indescribable devastation. But the real pressures for a ballistic-missile defense—and perhaps even its lulling designation as the "Safeguard" system—derive from our unwillingness to accept emotionally what we have every factual reason to comprehend.

Nor can we curb the infinite expansion of the military-industrial complex by continuing to demand margins of superiority over our potential adversaries all across the spectrum of military armament. We should ask, instead, which leads are meaningful in terms of security or political advantage, and which are not. "Superiority" in nuclear missiles, for example, is too expensive if all it gives us is a status symbol. And "inferiority" is no cause for alarm or even embarrassment if what we have is enough to deter any Soviet effort at a pre-emptive strike.

We should keep in mind that what the Soviets themselves are doing may not always provide a useful measure of the appropriateness of our own defense expenditures. We sometimes seem to proceed on the assumption that we are not doing enough unless we more than match what the Soviets spend in every area of armed might. We rarely inquire whether the Soviets are spending too much. Instead, when there is criticism of our ABM deployment, we accept as valid the answer that, after all, the Soviets have already deployed an ABM of their own. Maybe we should ask whether theirs is a poor investment. While vaunting our superior sophistication in other things, both economic and social, we at times come perilously close to adopting Soviet answers when it comes to the allocation of our defense dollars on strategic weapons systems.

In the area of conventional forces, we waste the time and the talents of our military leaders when we leave them to prepare their budget requests on the basis of assumptions devoid of political validity. Our military planners, in fact, are major victims of our defective interrogatory technique. The problem is not that their advice is too often ignored. It is that their answers frequently don't matter because we've asked them the wrong questions. It's neither fair nor fruitful to ask them to develop a military machine that will help achieve a set of foreign-policy objectives which haven't been articulated—and which, when developed, can prove impervious to military solution.

In order to obtain the proper weapons systems—in the proper quantities and supporting the proper number of military personnel—we need a much clearer idea of the circumstances under which we will be willing to use them. The Systems-Analysis group within the Office of the Secretary of Defense serves an essential function in developing the most effective means of performing the various military missions. These civilian experts constantly discuss issues of relative cost effectiveness with the different Armed Services. But neither the civilian nor the military personnel of the Pentagon should be asked to speculate on the nature and number of instances in which they'll be asked to provide military force in furtherance of national objectives. Our current force posture—designed to fight two wars while handling another contingency somewhere else in the world—is the product of such speculation.

This "two-and-a-half war" concept did not arise from an informed prediction of international developments. It derived, during the last decade, from what Pentagon planners saw as the need to buttress conventional military forces neglected during our years of reliance on a nuclear strategy of "massive retaliation." But we lacked then, as we lack now, an accepted perception of our national-security interests; we had no measure for the adequacy of our conventional military capability. As a consequence, our forces are not shaped to fit a policy—and the risk always exists that the policy itself may be influenced by the military forces on hand. We need not conclude that our analyses of force requirements in the early '60s were wrong. But we do need to ask if, in today's world, our national scale

of priorities justifies the expense of preparing to fight the Soviets in Europe, while we simultaneously fend off Chinese aggression in Asia and deal elsewhere with some lesser adversary.

It may be that I unduly discount the risk that Russia and China may resolve their differences to the point where they could even consider concurrently engaging us in large-scale conventional warfare. But it is difficult to imagine that either nation would deem the nuclear threshold sufficiently high to block an early resort to strategic forces. Before we commit ourselves to further funding against such an eventuality, we should ask the National Security Council to consider the likelihood of this kind of dispersed Armageddon, and to shun a policy that might make it thinkable.

A bumper sticker of the recent past read: "Support Mental Health or I'll Kill You." Sanity in foreign policy compels the recognition that we can't use military means to make the world behave the way we'd like it to behave. We can't use it to compel a country to be free and democratic. And we're aware, at least tacitly, that however we may deplore aggression and strife anywhere in the world, most of it cannot affect our national security and most of it does not call for an American military response. But I don't think we've told those who originate our defense planning enough to permit their reasoned response to our basic questions about how national security can best be assured.

When we ask them to define the necessary dimensions of our military forces, referring them to our existing treaty commitments is not enough. No treaty negates our right to determine the character of our reaction on the basis of our perception of the national interest. Our one absolute commitment is to the preservation of our own independence. And we might fairly ask whether that independence does, in fact, turn on the viability of every international basket case with anti-Communist credentials.

To accept the facts of modern life, we need not adopt the extreme position that no defense effort is availing and that no measure of security can be obtained through expenditures for weapons systems. What is required is that debate about the level of defense expenditures—and about the kinds or quantities of armaments that we can prudently purchase—focus on the real risks and on the means realistically available to meet them. In national defense, as in our personal finances, we can afford to carry just so much insurance—particularly against the rarer tropical diseases. Our present preoccupation with physical security may be anachronistic when only two nations in the world can pose a physical threat and when neither could carry it out except at the cost of its own existence as a modern society.

In posing new questions about our national security, we need not repudiate the expert witnesses on whom we have relied in the past. Granted, the results achieved have not been uniformly satisfactory. But we should resist the temptation to blame our Vietnam troubles, for example, on the advice of our military men. In my view, we've consistently been asking them the wrong questions about Vietnam. Such issues as measuring the pace and permanence of pacification involve political judgments that only an objective Vietnamese politician could make, if one could be found. Our commanders are probably right in thinking that a virtual U.S. military occupation is the best way to control an insurgency, but it does little to advance our announced political goal of self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

It has been suggested—by Candidate Goldwater in 1964 and by Senators on both sides of the aisle in years since—that victory in Vietnam requires only that we tell our military leaders that we have decided to win and then leave the war to them. This ignores, I

think, our lack of an agreed definition of victory and our unwillingness to go all-out to achieve military conquest. Indeed, no satisfactory answer can be given to the question why we are in Vietnam, because we never asked the question in time. In late 1967, Secretary Rusk explained our presence as necessary to contain a projected one billion Chinese armed with nuclear weapons. But if the original purpose of American participation in Vietnam was to contain China, we never asked whether adoption of an attrition route to victory was consistent with that purpose. Certainly there are more promising avenues to the close-in control of China than by killing off the nationalistic North Vietnamese.

Much of the failure to examine the underlying political rationale stems from a fear of proaching on military preserves. But, in the absence of all-out war, our military means surely must be kept consistent with our political objectives. They can't be and they won't be unless we insist that our policymakers articulate these objectives.

Perhaps the first step toward useful answers in the realm of national security would be to abandon the partisan prose. "Missile gap" allegations from the 1960 campaign, like the outlandish charge of a "security gap" in 1968, have only made it more difficult for incoming administrations to pose the relevant questions. What should worry us is a "question gap" that leaves us without meaningful answers, both on national-security policy and on how it should be translated into military capability. In making decisions on defense planning we're constantly in danger of putting the hardware before the horse sense.

There are growing signs of a healthy willingness to question some of the items in the defense budget. But the absence of an overall policy from which these individual items derive makes the debate revolve largely around tangential issues.

For example, in examining the request for additional attack carriers, it is sensible to ask whether one nuclear-powered carrier is preferable to the two that could be built with conventional power for the same price. It's important to note the age of some carriers in our fleet and the alternative possibility of land-based aircraft. But the real questions remain unanswered. They concern the relationship between our tactical air power and our security interests. Fifteen nuclear attack carriers will indeed permit the flexible application of that power anywhere in the world. But where in the world, and against whom, will we want to apply it, and what should we pay for this capacity?

Without an updated justification for our carrier fleet, we can make no value judgments on the need for new fleet defense aircraft. The mission intended for the F-111B (the Navy version of the TFX) was to stand well off from the fleet for hours with a highly sophisticated missile capable of shooting down hordes of enemy bombers at great range. But debate about the F-111B focused on its weight, its expense, and whether Boeing might have done better. The Navy succeeded in substituting the F-14A, which on paper provides a superior dog-fighter but continues with the basic mission of fleet defense. The case for continuing this multi-billion-dollar program should not rest on the merits of the airplane. The question we should ask is: what are the chances that our fleet will be sent to sea when there is a real risk of the kind of mass air attack that only the Soviets could mount? Perhaps we should be persuaded that this is plausible, but I think those responsible for our foreign policy should be asked to convince us.

The Senate, by almost a two-to-one margin, recently approved going ahead with the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA). Supporters of a new nuclear bomber, while granting its redundancy, refer to the risk that our intercontinental ballistic mis-

siles may work imperfectly. But no new bomber can provide the ability to destroy the Soviet missile forces and thus prevent nuclear retaliation. Nor, we are told, do we aim at any such "first-strike" capability. Our strategic forces are intended to deter and thus, in an age of sophisticated air defense, strategic missiles must remain our primary deterrent. How, we might ask, is that deterrent affected by a decision to proceed with a new manned aircraft on the premise that it is needed because the nuclear missiles may not work? Moreover, our continued expenditures for anti-bomber defense are rationalized as serving to discourage the Soviet Union from developing a new supersonic bomber. Do we expect our bomber to be that much better, the Soviet air defense that much poorer, or the Soviets that much smarter in deciding that manned bombers are obsolete?

Sound defense decisions outside the procurement area are equally impossible until we acquire a better sense of policy direction. In the military assistance field, continuation of our military advisors in Latin America obviously preserves a degree of United States influence. But shouldn't we ask, on a country-by-country basis, whom we are influencing, toward what ends, and how this serves our national interest?

As a military matter, reversion of Okinawa to Japanese administrative control primarily involves the question of our unrestricted freedom to use it as a military base. But politically we should ask whether there may ever be circumstances in which we will want to use Okinawa for military operations which the Japanese are unwilling to support. In situations where the Japanese conclude that such use is not in their security interests, can it be essential to ours?

British withdrawal from East of Suez will leave a "great-power" vacuum in the Indian Ocean. Do we need bases and boats to fill it or can we count on nature's abhorrence, and the people of the area, to do that job? The considerations that led to British colonialism in the Nineteenth Century, when empire was profitable, can't justify an American military presence in this century if it means little more than a bigger defense bill. The White House and State Department assert that we will not replace the British. But unless we tell our military planners to forget it, we may find ourselves continuing to pay for that possibility.

The asserted unavailability of a "peace and growth dividend" will be a self-fulfilling prophecy if we use the peace to catch up on every item of our defense arsenal stunted by Vietnam priority needs. Before we can fit our defense program to our national interest, we must decide when and where we may seek to advance those interests by the application of military force. If our national security in fact demands a kind of Western Hemisphere "Brezhnev doctrine," we need the means to enforce a non-Communist orthodoxy. If we plan to support regimes in Southeast Asia against overthrow by their internal political rivals, we have to face up to the budgetary consequences. And if we must conclude that our security requires us to resist and repel external aggression wherever it appears in the world, then our present defense budget is indeed too little and too late.

But I doubt that these are the premises on which our foreign policy will proceed in practice. And I think that the theory underlying our defense budget should be consistent with what we plan in practice to do. This violates, I recognize, the principle of ambiguity in the conduct of foreign policy. There are admitted disadvantages in tipping off a hostile power as to the circumstances under which we may go to war. A degree of uncertainty is undeniably a valuable factor in deterring aggression. But the gray area should not be so large as to delude those who, if under attack, would have our best

wishes but might expect our armed support. A coherent defense program can never be constructed if we continue to leave the architects confused about the purposes we want it to serve.

SPACE PROGRAM

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, as the Apollo 12 craft races toward the moon, many are questioning the value of public investment into further space programs. There has been criticism of the Government devoting funds toward the conquest of outer space when more pressing priorities are here on earth.

As I have continually pointed out, much of the money that goes into the space program is not burnt up in a singular goal of reaching another planet. There are many spinoffs from space technology that benefit domestic problems. Already there have been applications of space technology into the fields of medicine, consumer goods, pollution problems, and a host of other areas.

A particularly sound discussion of the benefits that accrue to domestic areas comes from Mr. Hugh Downs of the NBC "Today" show. The speech was given before the Iowa Bankers Convention in Des Moines, Iowa, October 22, 1969.

I think my colleagues would be interested in his remarks on the benefits of the space program.

Mr. Speaker, I include his speech in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HUGH DOWNS, IOWA BANKERS CONVENTION, DES MOINES, IOWA, OCTOBER 22, 1969

On the 16th of last month the Space Task Group submitted to President Nixon its recommendations for future U.S. space activities.

The recommendations detail the different paths the president may elect to follow in implementing a national space program, and it offers a broad spectrum of choices.

Coming at a time of intense domestic strife and a national agony over the quagmire of our involvement in Vietnam, not to mention concern about the increase of environment pollution and ecological imbalance, many questions are raised about what ought to be done in space, if anything.

Should we continue missions to the moon and/or should we embark on manned missions to Mars, and if so, when?

Or should we call a halt, ground our space equipment, put it in moth balls and let some future generation take up the challenge?

Behind a great deal of the uncertainty, of course, is the pressure on the budget and the order of national priorities. The needs of man here on earth are many and pressing, and call for high priority. There are people who believe we cannot continue a space effort without neglecting these problems. There are others who believe we can do both.

And there are still others who believe and argue cogently that doing both is the best course for progress in each. That's what I'd like to explore.

Maybe someone, or some parade of guests on the Today program in the near future can persuade me that a national space program is detrimental to national social and political soundness, but it seems unlikely in

light of the arguments so far on both sides by previous guests, and the authorities whose views I've read or heard or talked to about.

On balance it has seemed to me this nation needs a space program—a well planned series of steps that will carry us into the next century. Certainly we will not solve any of our crucial problems by attempting to stay out of the next century. These steps, in the long run, can make this planet a better place to live on. Not knowing of any alternative place to live, I enthusiastically endorse the goal of making it a better place.

Space activities in this sense are not competing with programs of ecological improvement or social betterment. They are rather complementing them.

Our earth environment is deteriorating in many ways, and at a terrifying rate. With air and water pollution, congested cities, with population explosion and the threat of still increased world hunger, one wonders if it might be too late.

When one learns that in the 1930's, to take an example, concrete boxes containing enough arsenic to kill three times the world's population were sunk in the Baltic Sea, and that a few weeks ago divers reported the boxes to be crumbling—when one reads that the effects of kerosene exhaust from jets crisscrossing the skies of the American Southwest are producing a "greenhouse" effect—obscuring the clear sunshine just enough that meteorologists anticipate that in less than thirty years the humidity will rise enough to change the climate and destroy the Sonora Desert—one winces. I wince from the patio of my Arizona home, because I chose that beautiful desert to build in, and I have private contingency plans for living another thirty years.

In matters of social strife it also seems we might have gone past the point of no return. Particularly when progress appears to breed over greater discontent.

A historian has observed that if Marie Antoinette, in the gathering momentum of the French Revolution, had at that point when she said, on hearing the masses were crying for bread, "Let 'em eat cake!"—instead of saying "Let 'em eat cake" if she had instantly met every demand and brought into being every needed reform—would still have had her head chopped off by the guillotine. It was simply too late.

The irony is that many of today's problems are caused by yesterday's technical solutions. Triumphs in health and sanitation and nutrition have contributed to over-population. Triumphs in communication have brought an almost unmanageable mass of information, and have shown the underprivileged all the goodies enjoyed by the over-privileged.

Every projection we encounter is pessimistic about the future if we don't move fast to eliminate injustice, and if we don't find a way to clean the water we drink and the air we breathe. Every new baby born into the world is a reminder that we must find a way to convert useless land into crop acreage or recover more food from the sea. And every new baby is a reminder that we must eventually develop the social and political (and perhaps cultural) technique for leveling off the population.

Our ability to look at our planet as an environmental system is woefully inadequate. We have upset the balance of nature by forgetting the side effects of our advances and by failing to view the planet as a closed life-support system.

Robert Anderson, of North American Rockwell Corp., says, "As a result of that inadequacy . . . it is absolutely necessary for us to continue space exploration. Only there can we fully observe the interaction of man, nature and technology."

We must make use of the extraordinary new tools that space exploration has placed

within our grasp. Not merely technical tools, but logical tools—tools of memory and recall, computation, feedback, rapid assessment—all those cybernetic techniques that amplify the god-given mental processes of man.

Perhaps the most obvious advantage of space work is that it gives us a platform for overseeing the Earth. Physically and philosophically, we are beginning to see our problems more clearly; we will soon be able to measure the severity of the problems and bring a public awareness of those evaluations; and we will be better able to control them. Pollution, food supply, and cloud cover data will come under global surveillance. We will be able to manage our environment in eras to come. And this is needed, or the social tools will never develop. The first glimpse of the whole earth given us by Borman, Lovell and Anders showed us a curious absence of national boundaries. All the fictions of boundary and ideology for which men have killed each other throughout historic times are seen for the first time to be non-existent. This is bound to have an effect, when masses of people, through mass communication, have access to this view.

The scope of space technology will be felt in plans for the purification of our waters and the desalting of seas. It will have a bearing on the revitalization of our earth transportation system, and it will have a still greater influence in the field of medicine.

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

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

Some of these words, like "military research" and "nuclear energy" conjure up bogeymen in the public mind. Admittedly, with reason, I'm glad the public is suspicious and hope that it remains alert. The discovery of fire must have resulted in much awe and some harm to prehistoric humans. But it was not bad in itself. I submit there is a parallel here. Nuclear fission and fusion in themselves are neither good nor evil. Inappropriate use of them bears on good and evil. And there's one aspect of today's forward surge of science that holds a key to helping man avoid evil uses of his knowledge.

Today's economists point to a reversal of an economic fact of life that was consistent roughly up through the two world wars: A wartime economy is no longer as stable as a peacetime economy. We're apparently beginning to realize that nobody wins a war.

Milton Mayer recently said, "It took the winners of World War I fifteen years to realize they had lost it. It took the winners of World War II only five years." And now we are finally realizing that wars are only political and economic. That if the politico-economic situation deteriorates to the level of shooting and bombing, the very deterioration is evidence of loss of the war.

The emergence of genuine heroes such as the astronauts, who are not killers, shows in a small way the nature of the new era. A generation ago, with war plants booming, a "peace scare" could rock the market. Now a few days ago, when peace threatened (the day of the moratorium) the market went up sharply. Today is not a century ago, or a generation ago.

Dr. George Mueller of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration puts the case for space research and development in these words: "Our space program is forcing technological innovation which leads to new

processes, new products and, in fact, whole new industries. This space program is the focal point of our industrial growth."

Technical advances are now the seeds of increasing productivity and the foundation for new products and services. And all of them applicable to times of peace. They have enabled our economy to grow to the point where we can seriously and practically move on eliminating poverty, transforming our cities into habitable areas again, and planning massive changes to improve our transportation and education systems.

Here is an example of educational potential: Among many large companies pouring money into programs for upgrading and employing the hardcore unemployables—people who have suffered social, economic or educational deprivation—Thiokol Chemical reports on a learning center project that they have been involved in for three years. The people they helped were not only uneducated but largely unmotivated. They have now placed more than 6,000 of these unemployables in jobs. Robert Marquardt, a vice president of Thiokol says, "We have reason to believe that most of them . . . will acquire the habit of working and that this will replace the previous habit of not working. Now if you assume the minimum starting wage rate of \$1.80 an hour, each working individual will earn over \$3700 a year. If these 6000 trainees remain at the starting wage level to age 65, their income will be approximately \$1 billion. The alternative welfare payments of \$60,000 to \$100,000 per person to age 65 for these 6000 people that would add up to \$420 million of welfare . . . Our brief experience in this field has made us confident," Marquardt says, "that systems approaches can break through conventional educational and motivational barriers. We are betting thousands of dollars on it. Since the first of this year we have been operating the Clearfield Job Corps Center on an incentive contract, the first ever written for the educational program. We guaranteed performance."

If that term sounds familiar, it ought to. Incentive contracts are borrowed directly from the aerospace industry. The idea of quantifying educational results has revolutionary implications for the entire knowledge industry. There are some disinterested educators who strongly feel that the education field can borrow tricks from the systems approach to the betterment of motivation and quality.

Those vast infusions of research and development can continue with a well-planned space program, more so now than through the military.

The alternative to continuing the space program would be (as one space contractor said) like "building a huge factory, turning out one automobile, then shaking hands all around and going home while the factory gathers dust."

But more important, there's a different direction to the space effort now. Up to this time it's been largely a research and development effort. Only a short time ago medicals thought that prolonged weightlessness might cause a man's bones to disintegrate. Scientists weren't sure how different metals would stand up under the alternate extremes of heat and cold in space or withstand constant exposure to radiation. It was a question how far into the powder on the moon's surface a man or machine might sink. Now the answers are known. And space technology is in the operational phase.

And in what a short time! I'd like briefly to trace the development up to the present through a subjective personal odyssey.

When I was five years old my father told me the moon was 238,000 miles away. Although I hadn't any idea how far 238,000 miles stretched, I was so flattered at being given an adult answer that I never forgot

it. And on the nucleus of that morsel of knowledge I built a lifelong interest in astronomy. When I was nine, I began reading the brand new comic strip "Buck Rogers," which the authors Nowland and Calkins, set in the 25th century. In that same year, Neal Armstrong was born just 16 miles south of where I lived and went to school. Neal's father, reminiscing with me the night of the White House dinner for the astronauts of Apollo 11, remembered the iron foundry my grandfather worked in, and told me Neal had worked there as a boy one summer running errands. I thought, and I'm sure most people in Wapakoneta, Ohio would have thought that it would be 500 years, as Buck Rogers' timetable implied, before anyone set foot on the moon. And who among them would have guessed that their own Neal Armstrong, student and part time employee of a local metal casting firm, would be the first man to do so? (Story of Ohio farmers watching an airplane from a field outside Dayton a few months after the Wright Bros. achieved powered flight "Can't be done," said one. The other: "And if it ever is done, no damn fool from Dayton will do it.")

In 1956 I interviewed John Glenn, another Ohioan, who, as a Marine jet pilot had broken the transcontinental air record. Space was something barely on the drawing boards.

During the International Geophysical Year I talked with Dr. Nathan Kaplan, head of the National Science Foundation about U.S. plans to orbit an instrument package about the size of a grapefruit, and marveled at the power of the Vanguard rocket, built to boost it into space.

Then Sputnik, like a big, silver beach ball, stunned us all with the advanced state of Soviet rocketry.

When President Kennedy said, "We choose to go to the moon" and committed us to get there before the end of this decade, I decided to be on the site of that launching when it took place. I was.

Two years earlier, I went on assignment for NBC to Cape Kennedy and was taken through the platform and launch tower for a Saturn V booster. The overwhelming size of that machinery made me realize at last that man was seriously on his way to the moon. (Describe.)

(Escape tower in Apollo assembly more powerful than main booster that put Alan Shepherd in orbit.)

(Launching of Apollo 11.)

(Orlando Hertz girls 52 ml. distant & Columbia U. sound detect.)

(Asbestos-clad figure with wrench.)

It is more than mere coincidence that the Space Age and the Age of Communication were born at the same time. The fact that half a billion people could see Neal Armstrong take that first step onto the moon a quarter of a million miles away is not merely a fortunate confluence of data transmission techniques and a highly sophisticated mode of travel.

The emergence of overlapping disciplines, the explosion of technology, the logarithmic increase of scientific knowhow are all parts of an immense phenomenon which has an inevitability about it. The same inevitable quality that characterized the birth of the organic cell, or the crawling of life out of the sea onto land, in primordial times, or in historic times, the scattering of explorers on land and sea until every cranny of the globe was mapped.

This phenomenon and its inevitability is the cosmic increase of organization. At the same time, the second law of thermodynamics imposes entropy on the universe—makes it move from order to chaos, winding down to a death of universal equilibrium—a counterforce represented by life moves from chaos to order—by some anti-entropic technique it raises the level of organization into more and more subtle and complex systems. Evolu-

tion is part of that mysterious force. Man's technology is part of that evolution.

Now, Consciousness and rational thought have given man the opportunity to control evolution. The same processes that have developed from man's ingenuity, enabling him to go to the moon, now make it possible for him to solve each and all of his problems on earth.

What signs are there that this will happen? Is there anything about the Space Age at this moment that hints at a turning point? That implies we have a chance of closing a widening gap between proliferation and solution of problems? Any clue that we might be facing in a new direction?

I believe there is. In the perspective of the vast reaches of cosmic space and time it is perhaps a feeble sign, but at the dawn of the Space Age on a troubled planet, it is a blatant one:

It is this: We are out of the research, development and test stage—the steps leading up to the first manned landing on the moon. These steps have been traversed. Space has entered the phase of operational activities. And here is where the concept of systems is likely to proliferate into the sophisticated tool we'll need to apply human problem-solving to those thorny social and political puzzles.

Long-term moderate cost operational space programs that will have as their central theme the maximum benefit for man on earth are now possible.

Enormous costs are about to become moderate.

"The key to economy," says one engineer, "will be re-usable space shuttles, spacecraft that journey out to orbit then return intact on their own power and land, just like an airplane. We're rapidly coming to the end of the period where we toss a hundred million dollars' worth of hardware into the sky, then let it drop back into the Atlantic Ocean after its one-time-only task as a booster is 'finished.'"

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

That's earth orbit. There are more dramatic savings in the offing in trans-lunar activity. It's been costing \$100,000 a pound to move material from the earth's surface to the moon's surface and return. The goal of the Space Administration is to drop the cost to \$200 a pound. That reduction automatically creates an earth-moon transportation system.

"What does it mean to us here on earth?"

For one thing, it is almost certain that the missions planned for this coming decade and beyond will improve the material living circumstances of every human on earth.

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

And that \$2 billion savings is partly in the face of another projection. Earth Resources Technology Satellites will become operational in a few years. Scientists are deep into the study program phase of the effort.

Congressman Joe Karth of Minnesota, second ranking majority member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, and an authority on that particular project estimates that the economic benefits from this one satellite alone—in weather forecasting

and increased food production, and in uncovering new resources of the ocean and new mineral and water resources—could add more than \$6 billion a year to the economy of America alone.

Another unmanned satellite example: The new communications satellites that will soon be on station in space will represent an incredible advance in the state of the art. With them, truly "every call will be a local call."

Those satellites will enable even the most primitive of emerging nations to leapfrog a century of development efforts such as we have seen in this country—from the first Western Union telegraph pole to today's automatic nationwide dial system. The new nations, they say, will literally "space talk" themselves right into the 21st century. (Telephone poles and wires in New York in 1890—unforseen advances.)

The experience and confidence are at hand now to move the complex high-cost equipment into the comparatively gentle environment of space, and use simple and low-cost terminals here on earth.

A communications expert says: "Global communications systems, based in space, will permit the international use of giant computer complexes. They could be a means of revolutionizing world trade, because every substantial financial transaction throughout the world could be in the data bank, ready for instant recall. Better yet, the smallest and the poorest of nations could tap into the space-oriented computer complex on a shared-time basis and gain incalculable help in solving problems of health, education, science and trade." So says a paper delivered to the engineering society of Detroit last month.

Scientists are convinced that we can and must use men and machines in space to cope with the problems and fulfill the expectations of the 1980's.

We know where we're going in space for the next three years, for the hardware has already been allotted. Although the money allocated has been painfully cut back. The budget is described as "austere". (It's 35% less than its budget of four years ago.) Although we haven't heard loud noises from NASA, it must feel wounded. I can't help feeling the public outcry at similar curtailment would be clarion. Kenneth Delano, a scientist-priest with a diocese at Fall River, Mass., comments on this. "Can those Americans who are quick to deplore money being spent on the space program give any indication that they, in the interest of poverty and disease, have equaled NASA in accepting curtailments in their desires? On the contrary, the American people in general have not undertaken any self-imposed cutback whatsoever in the amount of money spent on entertainments and on luxury items.

"For example, no sacrificial cuts have been made over the past several years in the \$20 billion we spend on four of life's little pleasures: tobacco, liquor, cosmetics and toiletries. But that does not stop many of us from self-righteously deploring the expenditure of money on a space program instead of applying that money to the war on poverty or medical research."

I would add that our use of \$20 billion worth of smoke and drink and cosmetics is much less likely to create new industries and jobs than a space program. (Let it be recorded that I'm not by implication crusading against tobacco or alcohol—or even cosmetics: the disappearance of cosmetics would likely cause the female psyche to boggle and we'd all be in trouble.)

In the 1960's the space program was determined by one single goal—land a man on the moon and get him safely back to earth. Space technology today has matured to the point where no single spectacular goal will serve as did the Apollo program.

Multiple goals, driven by requirements for low operational costs, will tie in directly to what we do and need on earth. Advanced space stations are being designed now by G.E. and other companies. North American Rockwell is in a competition to design a national laboratory in space, a laboratory to operate continuously for ten years, manned by scientists, engineers, and astronomers, all spending several months in orbit just as they now spend time as visiting researchers at labs or on research ships sailing the earth's oceans.

Space has already contributed to the burgeoning economy we have today. And as noted before, it is an economy stronger in peace than war. This surely is an important step toward the solution of human problems.

Launch vehicles and spacecraft may soon be as one. Boosters will be re-used 100 times or more. They will have to be operational in the same sense as the jet airliner. Instead of the current two months of checkout and countdown, they must operate with the post flight inspection, refuelling and takeoff procedures of jet airliners coupled with progressive maintenance and overhaul procedures—a true "spacelines" operation.

From the basis of this operations concept, the challenge of manned expeditions to Mars and other planets (particularly if launched from orbiting stations) are not so formidable.

Such a balanced national space program is a logical sequence to the years of preparation leading up to the moon landing.

The material enhancement of life on earth is one side of it. The cultural, social and political improvements and potential are admittedly a little harder to trace to the contribution of space work. But let me try:

First let's dispose of the myth that abandonment of a space program would automatically abolish poverty and injustice. I doubt anyone seriously believes this. Money is needed to fight poverty and injustice and space efforts cost money. If money alone could solve the problems and fill these crying human needs, and if no other money but what's being spent on space were available, I can't think we could justify continuing the exploration of space until domestic difficulties were overcome.

But first, there are other sources for these funds. A thorough scrutiny of waste in defense spending alone might yield considerable amounts.

Increasing Congressional and public concern over why Russia has been able to match our \$30 billion a year in South Vietnam with about \$1 billion to North Vietnam and come out even, is already forcing policy changes that may free us of an enormous drain. We may, in other words, convert some pride and humiliation into cash and human lives. Many think now that we'll have more rights to national pride after we've taken that sensible step.

Secondly, money spent on space projects is not money gone from the national economy. Unlike ordnance detonated halfway around the world or drained off in black markets, space funds filter back into the community in the form of jobs and wages, contracts, and an expanded economy.

But there is another even more important factor in what space is contributing to society.

Socio-political problems need knowledge as well as funds for solution—new techniques, new modes of thought even—and the new proliferation of organized efforts being developed by or resulting from, a space program is giving birth to these new modes. We aren't merely multiplying a flow of physical facts. We are, through the concept of systems (particularly information systems) amplifying human mental processes in the direction

of increased organization. We are beginning to organize problem-solving around the processes of change rather than around static assumptions. We are groping for (and I think on the verge of finding) a rapport between an increasingly enlightened public and the resources its scientists and planners command.

The president of the American Stock Exchange, Ralph Saul, commenting on a study undertaken by the Information Systems Division of Autonetics for updating stock market operations, said, "Their systems people have clarified in a brief period of time and perhaps for the first time, how work moves (and sometimes doesn't move) through the system in brokerage firms, banks and exchanges. Their insights, based on their disciplined examination—can lead to recommendations for solving major problems sooner than we had anticipated."

The concept of bits of information being organized so that their totality is greater than the sum of the parts is not new. What's new is that we are at the threshold now of an era of using knowledge in a highly synergistic way.

A crude illustration of what organization adds to value is found if I ask you to determine the market value for your house, and then knock it down to building materials and see if you can get that much for it. Something about your house has value above the substance of which it is made.

Now take the total benefits of a space program and there is something of value beyond those total benefits. I don't have the imagination to guess at that value. But I get a hint of it in what Dr. Glenn Seaborg, chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has said: "We are experiencing the birth shock of being born into a new world. There is no turning back."

MACHINEGUN NESTS ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's spokesman, Mr. Klein, noted on television yesterday that the weekend's mobilization "again proves that this is a country which allows people to express themselves in any way they want."

Unfortunately, Mr. Klein and his boss do not seem to act in the same way they speak. For me, the administration's permissiveness was more sadly demonstrated by its placing of machinegun nests upon the Capitol Grounds.

I abhor violence, and I support steps taken to prevent unneeded violence, but I think this sort of deliberate flaunting of power serves to provoke disruption from militants rather than to cool things down.

I cannot believe that orders would have been given to open fire on militants if they came too near the Capitol Building. Would sticks and stones be answered by machineguns? I hope not.

There just is no rational reason for there being machinegun crews on these grounds. I find such tactics reprehensible, if not stupid, and I would urge the powers that be to exhibit more common-sense when and if future mass rallies are held.

THE DEFENSE INDUSTRY AGAINST THE PUBLIC

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems that for the first time, the American people and their representatives are aware of the tremendous and varied impact the military-industrial complex has on our society. This was reflected in the more-than-6-week Senate debate on this year's military procurement bill and the growing concern that defense spending no longer be labeled as sacrosanct but made to conform to a rational system of national priorities.

John Kenneth Galbraith, our former Ambassador to India and current professor of economics at Harvard, reflects this concern in an interesting and provocative article in the New York Times Magazine. His proposals for nationalization of the largest defense firms are well worth exploration and serious consideration, and I commend Professor Galbraith's article to the attention of my colleagues:

THE BIG DEFENSE FIRMS ARE REALLY PUBLIC FIRMS AND SHOULD BE NATIONALIZED

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

Last June, in testimony before a subcommittee headed by Senator William Proxmire that had been looking into the economics of the defense industry, I suggested that we recognize the reality of things, which is that the large, specialized defense contractors are really public firms. This is most obviously true of such companies as General Dynamics, Lockheed or Thiokol, which do all but a small fraction of their business with the Government. And it is equally true of the defense subsidiaries of the conglomerates—the Aerospace Corporation of Ling-Temco-Vought or the Bell Aerospace Corporation of Textron. Such firms do the bulk of the business. Even the defense divisions of such predominantly civilian firms as General Electric and Western Electric have a markedly public aspect, although—for practical, if not strictly logical reasons—I exclude them from the present discussion.

The process of converting the defense firms from *de facto* to *de jure* public enterprises would not be especially complicated. The defense industry is highly concentrated. If a company or subsidiary exceeded a certain size and degree of specialization in the weapons business, its common stock would be valued at market rates well antedating the takeover and the stock and the debt would be assumed by the Treasury in exchange for Government bonds. Stockholders would thus be protected from any loss resulting from the conversion of these firms to *de jure* public ownership. Directors would henceforth be designated by the Government and the firms, subject to any needed reorganization and consolidation, would function thereafter as publicly owned, nonprofit corporations. There would be no real increase in public debt or liability. The present value of the stock and the present security of the indebtedness of these firms lies entirely in the expectation (supported by a considerable moral commitment) that the Government will keep them busy, solvent and profitable.

I thought my proposal would attract attention, and I was not entirely disappointed. The big defense firms themselves were mostly silent, hoping, one imagines, that this logical but inconvenient idea would not take, although one of them, North American Rock-

well—perhaps only by coincidence—has since been running a series of advertisements citing its overwhelming commitment to civilian enterprise plus space exploration: "We built airplanes, luxury yachts, tested a nuclear reactor, produced heavy-duty axles, machined industrial gears, programmed airborne computers, equipped a textile plant and worked on Apollo spacecraft." Not much here about dangerous weapons. Last year 25 per cent of the North American Rockwell gross was from the Defense Department, and it was ninth largest on the department's list of contractors for fiscal 1968. (It was largest on the NASA list.)

Conservative newspapers did react to my plan. Nobody but nobody, they averred, could be talking about socialism in this day and age. The Richmond Times-Dispatch was appalled at the millions of people who would be added to the Government payroll and the billions in taxes that would be lost. Such was its indignation that it omitted to reflect that all of these millions are now employed by the Government and that the taxes the firms pay come out of the public purse. Time magazine forgetting for the moment all of its recent resolutions to be liberal-minded, judicious and thoughtful, said simply that the suggestion was fantastic.

The Pentagon was not pleased; an unidentified spokesman wondered if I knew about inefficiency in the arsenals. Paul Nitze, a former Deputy Secretary of Defense, sought me out—more in sorrow than in anger, I thought—to ask if I were aware of the row that developed whenever they reduced spending in the shipyards. I am, and I'm not enchanted by liberals who decry military spending but become very inflamed when a reduction occurs in their own backyards. I hope that at the next election voters will take a sour view of this differential indignation. Dean Acheson, who was cited with approval by The Armed Forces Journal, thought my proposal was somehow inspired by the young. Well, I must admit that it wasn't inspired by being a Washington lawyer.

But there was another reaction which tempered even my limited feeling of martyrdom. That was a considerable flow of letters, some approving, some enthusiastic and the most outspoken from people somehow associated with the big defense firms. Said one: "I have been personally involved in the management of some of the major programs. The waste and misuse of the nation's resources is fantastic." Said another: "I have been connected in the past with four major military contractors—prime awards. Blunders and inefficiency [were] shocking." So said others. The letters were hard to reconcile with the editorials, warning of the waste and inefficiency in public enterprise. They were easier to square with the recent celebration of large cost over-runs in military contracts, with the bad technical performance of many of the recent weapons systems and with the suppression of information and of Mr. A. E. Fitzgerald (the inconveniently indignant Defense Department official whose job, as this goes to press, seems to have been eliminated) to keep Lockheed stock from looking bad. In fact, conservatives should think twice before they make the big defense contractors part of their case for private enterprise. Better let the public sector have the blame; that's where it belongs. The surprising thing is that we have been so slow in recognizing the public character of this part of the economy.

One reason for our tardiness is that for 20 years or more liberals, once the proponents of public ownership, have been busy proving their respectability, and some inevitably have been even more concerned with establishing their right to a respectable share in the rewards of respectability. Respectability has required three things: first, one must be kind to the rich, especially as regards taxes; second, one must be as certain as Dean Acheson and Dean Rusk that all social policy is subordinated to the struggle with inter-

national Communism, and third, one must forswear any interest in anything that could be called socialism. Meanwhile, there were other things—notably Keynesian economic policy and the welfare state—on which one could prove the depth of his liberal commitment without personal damage.

This was a great blessing for the big, specialized defense contractors. Burgeoning in the cold-war years, they were able to combine all the comforts, including all the classic inefficiencies, of socialism with all the rewards and immunities of private enterprise. And, given the liberal caution of the times, no one mentioned it. One is certainly in no danger of being called a socialist if he opposes the socialization of already extensively socialized industries.

It is, as I have said, a very compact industry. In 1968 two-thirds—67.4 per cent—of the defense business was being done by the 100 largest contractors, and a dozen of these had a third of it. Among the largest, as I have noted, were a few—A.T.&T., G.E., G.M. and Standard Oil of New Jersey—which are essentially civilian firms. Their defense business, though big in the aggregate, is small in relation to their total sales. The rest are either heavily specialized in defense work or have subsidiaries that are so specialized.

By no known definition of private enterprise can these specialized firms or subsidiaries be classified as private corporations. The most commonplace feature of private enterprise is that capital is privately owned. Private ownership of capital is what, anciently, has made private capitalism private capitalism. A very large part of the fixed capital of these firms is owned by the Government of the United States. In 1968 the large defense contractors were using an estimated \$13.3-billion worth of already nationalized plant and equipment. The often-pictured plant in Marietta, Ga., where Lockheed is turning out the C-5 Galaxy is owned by the people of the United States. So it is elsewhere. There is a marked uneasiness when you ask these firms about this Government plant. One said that only a very tedious inventory could tell how much it had.

Under private enterprise, working capital as well as fixed capital is privately obtained or owned. It is also often hard to come by and expensive these days. But the defense firms use Government working capital, indeed are encouraged to do so. This comes interest-free in the form of progress payments on contracts, the payments depending, broadly speaking, on the need for the capital, not the progress toward completion of the contract. Last June, the defense plants were using \$9.5-billion of such public working capital, nearly \$2-billion more than two years ago.

Another much-featured feature of private enterprise is competition. This also is excluded for the defense firms—and more scrupulously, in fact, than under modern Eastern European socialism. In fiscal 1968 only about one-tenth of all defense contracts were subject to competitive bidding. A shade under 60 per cent went by negotiation to contractors which were the only source of supply. Here there was no chance whatever that another firm could horn in on the business. There was, indeed, no market between the firm and the Government. One public bureaucracy simply sat down and worked things out with another public bureaucracy.

A private firm succeeds or fails in accordance with how competently it plans its operations, influences its consumers and adjusts to market requirements; this the friends of the system say with pride. In contrast, a bureaucracy continues, however incompetent it is, as the conservative orators have anciently warned. The defense firms conform to the bureaucratic model. For, since they are the sole sources of supply, the Government is as much dependent on them as they are on the Government. Therefore the Government

cannot and does not let them down. As amply shown in recent months, this means there is little incentive to keep costs down. The Government pays.

Recognizing tacitly the public character of these firms, the Government extensively instructs them on their management. It tells them what costs are billable to the Government and what are not and advises them on what work is to be subcontracted and what is not, what components may be imported and what may not, what minimum and average wages they may pay, what overtime may be authorized, what plant safety procedures to follow, what security procedures to respect. The Armed Services Procurement Regulation to which these firms are subject says that while the Government "does not expect to participate in every management decision [my italics] it may reserve the right to review the contractor's management efforts."

Finally, there is the matter of public policy-making. A private firm supplying the Government in a purely private role is told of the public need and is given specifications. A public firm, being part of the bureaucracy, will share in the task of defining or inventing public need and in forming the policy that creates the requirement. The defense contractors participate in such public policy-making as a matter of course. Some are asked formally to define missions for the armed services and come up with needs. Asked or not, they make proposals for new weapons and weapons systems. They then persuade the Pentagon as to the need. And having persuaded the Pentagon they develop or help develop the specifications, which they then fill. And they have strong views on the foreign policy requiring the weapons. John W. Bessire, general manager for prices of General Dynamics, said in a recent interview with *The Washington Post*: "We try to foresee the requirements the military is going to have three years off. We work with their requirements people and therefore get new business." Samuel F. Downer, vice president of Ling-Temco-Vought, formulated in somewhat less scholarly fashion the underlying foreign policy: "We're going to increase defense budgets as long as those bastards in Russia are ahead of us."

The defense contractors and the Department of Defense are, in fact, complementary bureaucracies. It is logical, accordingly, that there should be a large movement of personnel between the two. And so there is. On reaching retirement, or sometimes before, those concerned with procurement go easily into the employ of the specialized defense contractor. And others come from among the contractors to help guide the operation in Washington. In February, 1969, 2,072 former officers of the rank of Navy captain, Army colonel or better were working for defense contractors, and a very large number of these—210 at Lockheed, 141 at McDonnell-Douglas, 113 at General Dynamics, 104 at North American Rockwell—were with the specialized defense contractors. Meanwhile, men from the industry (of whom the most notable in the present Administration is the former chairman of the Hewlett-Packard Company, David Packard, the Deputy Secretary of Defense) go to Washington to man that end of the combined operation.

In holding that the large defense firms are extensions of the public bureaucracy, I am not being especially original. Murray L. Weidenbaum of Washington University, the leading academic authority on the economics of weapons procurement, concluded nearly two years ago that in this industry, "to a substantial degree, the Government is taking on the traditional role of the private entrepreneur while the companies are becoming less like other corporations and acquiring much of the characteristics of a Government agency or arsenal," that this "branch of industry . . . increasingly develops the char-

acteristics and mentality of a Government arsenal." He suggests that "an added and unexpected benefit of arms reduction or disarmament would be the opportunity to reduce if not eliminate this 'seminationalized' branch of the American economy."¹

Professor Weidenbaum is now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Affairs.

To make the specialized defense contractors *de jure* what they are in fact would not solve the problems of control of the military establishment. After assuming for a generation or more that bureaucracy was the peculiar hang-up of conservatives, liberals of my generation have seen the stubborn commitment of the military establishment and its diplomatic retainers to the Vietnam misadventure, to the missile-antimissile race, to the Communist-world-plot mythology, which led to our disasters at the Bay of Pigs and in the Dominican Republic, and to the frozen bureaucratic traditionalism which has controlled our policy on China, Spanish bases, arms aid to South America and to the Greek colonels. We now understand better the nature of bureaucratic power. There is a doctrine that the Pentagon is a puppet of its suppliers. This is not true; it is a powerful force in its own right. But it is a great deal more powerful if it can keep one part of itself, the defense contractors, out of public view. The only thing stronger than a bureaucracy we can see is one we cannot see.

By pretending that these essentially public firms are really private enterprises, we leave them free to engage in a good deal of lobbying and other political activity on behalf of weapons expenditures. Executives can urge the foreign policy and the weapons systems that serve their needs; they can sponsor or sign advertising to this effect; they can make substantial campaign contributions to favorably disposed legislators; they can support the Air Force Association and other custodians of weapons culture, and they can engage in numerous other activities that would be entirely inappropriate for an officer of a public corporation. They can even study the Pentagon as ostensibly independent experts, for several are on Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's "blue ribbon" panel set up for this purpose. It is an arrangement, in effect, licensing a great deal of irregular lobbying, political and other activity by men who, for all practical purposes, are public employees.

By making these firms full public corporations, one would substantially civilize their incentive structure. Under present circumstances a defense contractor is judged by its earnings, sales and prospects for growth. (These, not efficiency, are the prime tests of success.) This compels its executives to fight for business in Washington, and one of the central strategies, of course, is proposing and winning adoption of new procurement, including new weapons systems. There is something uniquely obscene about competition to promote weapons of mass destruction for purposes of improving the stockmarket position of a corporation. Public firms would not be judged by growth or stock-market prospects.

Also, the knowledge that the specialized contractors are subject to becoming full public corporations would be a powerful inducement to diversification, with a resulting reduction in dependence on defense business. This means, in turn, that the economic resistance to arms agreements and disarmament would be reduced, as would the resistance to budget cutting.

Finally, it is possible that fully responsible public firms would be more efficient. Not being judged by their efficiency. But perhaps it is enough to contend that things could not be worse. Here is a recent summary by Senator Proxmire of Budget Bureau data on how we manage under the present system to get the worst of both worlds:

... in the procurement of some two dozen major weapons systems costing tens of billions of dollars during the nineteen-fifties and sixties, the performance standards of the electronic systems of these weapons seldom met the specifications established for them . . . Of 11 major weapons systems begun during the nineteen-sixties, only two electronic components performed up to expected standard. One performed at a 75 per cent level and two at a 50 per cent level. But six—a majority—performed at a level of 25 per cent or less than the standards and specifications set for them. . . . These systems typically cost 200 to 300 per cent more than the Pentagon estimated.

"The after-tax profits of the aerospace industry, of which these contractors were the major companies, were 12.5 per cent higher than for American industry as a whole. Those firms with the worst records appeared to receive the highest profits. One firm, with failures on five of seven systems, earned 40 per cent more than the rest of the aerospace industry and 50 per cent more than industry as a whole."²

Clearly, there would be formidable advantage in taking over these firms. But there is another. There is political and economic mischief in pretending that public firms are really private. But what is worse, it is nonsense. We are a mature people and we should not fool ourselves with fairy tales. The truth is a good thing for its own sake, as a younger generation of political activists rightly insists.

But what, everyone will ask, are the chances? My own instinct in politics has always been for the possible; I am weak on lost causes. And I am not so imaginative as to suppose that the Nixon Administration is likely soon to send up legislation affirming the public character of the specialized defense contractors. But all good ideas initially look unrealizable. Discussions makes them plausible. Nothing seemed more impractical in 1965 or 1966 than an effort to turn public opinion around on the Vietnam War. Yet it was accomplished. The important thing is that an idea make sense. To give these firms full public status makes sense. Liberals are now looking for ways of proving that they are relevant and have a certain minimum of courage. And come 1972, Democrats, as usual, will be needing to prove they have an idea or two. If this one can be got into the platform, it will then, of course, be no longer a good idea but a basic human right.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Weidenbaum, Murray, "Arms and the American Economy: A Domestic Convergence Hypothesis," *American Economic Review*, May, 1969.

² "National Priorities," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C. 1969, Pp. 126-127.

APOLLO 12 MOON AIMING POINT CHANGE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, NASA has announced a change in the moon landing plans for the astronaut crew of Apollo 12.

Apollo 12 lunar module guidance system targeting for the site 7 landing point in the Ocean of Storms has been changed to the location of the Surveyor 3 spacecraft.

The previously planned aiming point was 1,118 feet northeast of where Surveyor rests on the inner slope of a crater.

Coordinates of the Surveyor III location are 2.990 south latitude by 23.403 west longitude; the original Apollo 12 aiming point was 2.982 south latitude by 23.392 west longitude.

The retargeting has been accomplished to improve the crew's ability to observe the planned landing point during the latter portion of the descent.

The visibility benefits of the retargeting were first developed analytically and then verified by the crew in the lunar module simulator. It does not change any crew onboard procedures.

Surveyor 3 softlanded on the lunar surface April 19, 1967.

CONSERVATION AND YOU

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 22-24 the Railway Tie Association held its 51st annual convention at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa.

Prominent speakers from conservation and industry organizations throughout the Nation were on the program.

My good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, an outstanding Member of this body and a great conservationist, from Johnstown, Pa., gave a key address at the opening session. His speech "Conservation and You" carries a message that should be heard by everyone in America who is concerned about the welfare of our natural resources and the pollution of our environment.

The speech follows:

CONSERVATION AND YOU

(Speech of Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR)

Ladies and gentlemen:

Thank you, Mr. Devine, for those very kind and generous remarks. I am happy to be here. We have heard it said that the first thing a speaker should do is to tell a little joke designed to relax the audience and establish a friendly, warm rapport with the listener. However, I am going to break that cardinal rule today because the subject of my remarks is far too serious and can result in such dire consequences unless vigorous action is taken immediately, that I think it would be inappropriate to begin with levity—or even a warm, friendly rapport between us.

I want to talk to you about an endangered species of wildlife.

Much has been written in magazines and newspapers, and said on radio and television about various endangered species of wildlife in North and South America, in Africa, in India—in fact—all over the world. The plight of some of these wild animals or birds has captured the imagination of conservationists and the general public to such an extent that the trend toward extinction has been, or is being, reversed in some cases. Efforts to save the whooping crane, the bald eagle, the key deer, the brown pelican, or the California condor have become celebrated causes with beneficial results.

A classic example is the whooping crane. Last year, a record forty-eight whoopers landed at Aransas National Wildlife Refuge

in Texas for the winter. The comings and goings, births and deaths, or any untoward incident concerning these rare birds become a national news story. This public awareness can explain—at least in part—why the Sunray D X Oil Company voluntarily shut down two of its gas wells some two and a half miles north of Aransas last year when the whoopers arrived there ahead of schedule. The company hung huge signs on the gas wells saying—closed until May fifteenth. This place is for the birds.

As important and significant as these stories of endangered species are, there is another species that must be mentioned which is also in danger of extinction unless serious actions are taken immediately to reverse the current trend.

While most of these other forms of wildlife are facing declining life because of conditions over which they have no control, this other species, strangely enough, is primarily responsible for the conditions which are endangering it. No other living creature in nature's universe so fouls its own nest or destroys its own food source or corrupts its own water as does this species. This animal, which now faces extinction unless the current trends are reversed, is scientifically known as the genus homo sapien—commonly known to you and me as mankind. Man is truly, in every sense of the word, an endangered species.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am dead serious—and, if we do not all get very serious, we may all be dead!

This process by which man has been destroying his natural resources and polluting his water is not new. It has been going on continually from the beginning of time. As the early inhabitants of the United States, however, used up their natural resources, there was always abundant supplies of new resources just over the hill in the new untapped territories. As the forests were ravaged to satisfy the almost insatiable appetite for wood, the loggers would leave the desolation and move on to another virgin stand. These same practices were followed by other early extractors of natural resources and left in their wake huge, ugly scars on the beautiful face of the earth.

I have not lost sight of the fact, however, that one of the bright spots in this bleak picture was the realization by those in the forest products industries that the practice of destroying and moving on had to be stopped and the forests had to be reseeded for future generations. As a result, the present practices of timber management would serve as an inspiration for all of us who are concerned with resources and environment.

As I was saying, the despoliation of our continent is not new. But, the thing which makes it of imminent danger is the increasing speed at which the despoliation is occurring, and there is no safety valve of virgin lands, clean air, and clear water.

There are two primary factors adversely affecting man and his environment—overpopulation and uncontrolled technical development—both of which are self-induced. Man has the capacity and must make the decision to master himself, his tools, and his environment, or his tools may master man and cause his extinction. The choice is ours. Uncontrolled technology has caused air pollution to such an extent that many human deaths have been recorded in major cities as a direct result of breathing these pollutants in the air.

Air pollution also is not really new; but, rather, it began when the caveman first discovered fire and learned how to use it for heat and cooking. With the growth of cities and the burning of coal, the problem was accentuated. The industrial revolution brought into being the steam engine, and with the steam engine came more smoke, fumes, and soot.

Within the past thirty years, exhaust gases

from internal combustion automobile engines have put more contaminants in the air than all previous factors combined. In Los Angeles, three and a half million motor vehicles pump their exhaust gases laden with unburned hydrocarbons from gasoline and oil into a relatively small coastal plain, surrounded on three sides by mountains. These gases and other contaminants interacting with sunlight produce still another pollutant—smog. Smog is so bad on some days out there that the children are warned not to play strenuous games. But Los Angeles is not alone—far from it. Denver, Phoenix, Cleveland, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Washington, and Detroit are all victims of smog, to mention a few. And the list grows steadily.

In some places air pollution is already a matter of life and death. For example, a study conducted by Dr. Leonard Greenberg of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine has revealed that the noxious smog enveloping the city of New York during the 1966 Thanksgiving Holiday season was responsible for one hundred and sixty-eight deaths. For those of you who live in rural areas or less congested suburban areas, it may be difficult to realize that in certain congested areas Americans are literally dying from breathing polluted air. It is even more difficult to realize that air pollution could bring death to one hundred and sixty-eight people in one city in one week.

Air is vital to continued human existence, but so is water. Water—clear, cool, and clean—has stirred man's imagination since the dawn of time. The beauty and force of water in all its forms can be found described in lyric refrains. The still waters of the psalmist, the fountains of Rome, the fierce falls of Niagara, the pounding drums of the surf have inspired music, art, and poetry through the ages. But, this is only one side of the picture—the bright side. The true picture of water utilization might be more accurately compared with the picture of Dorian Gray. You may recall this story where the painted portrait of Dorian Gray became horribly ugly as the sins of the man increased. With his death, the picture became beautiful and the corpse became ugly.

Of all the natural resources available to man, undoubtedly the most abused has been his water. So long as the nation's streams, rivers, and lakes seemed to be able to cope with the ever-increasing loads of pollution and waste, many people were complacent and content to let them struggle along. But now, many of these same people suddenly realize the load has been too much. They can see—and often smell—the evidence all around.

In the East, the Merrimack River is a filthy brown, bubbling with nauseous gas. Some of the rivers and streams of the Appalachian region are putrid with acid mine drainage from abandoned coal mines.

In Lake Michigan and the lower Mississippi River, millions of fish die from pollution, contributing a vast stench for miles around.

The Hudson River has become an open sewer.

Parts of the Missouri River flow red with blood and offal from slaughter houses.

In the industrial Middle West, the waters are rusty with pickle-liquor from steel mills.

Detergent foam flows from taps in many cities.

The Potomac River winds its slimy way past the Nation's Capital, corroding and despoiling waterside structures and boats.

The mighty Mississippi carries five hundred million tons of mud into the delta every year.

In fact, almost every major river system in America is now polluted.

As with air pollution, the pollution of rivers, lakes, streams, and estuaries has been going on for centuries. But, acceleration of the pollution rate has increased astronomically—especially in this century. A dramatic case in point is Lake Erie. It lies still and flat between Lake Michigan and Lake Huron reflecting the sky with a dull, silver sheen. Its waters have been described as being murky green, choked with algae and tiny organisms. Patches of oil, chemicals, trash, and sewage float on its surface. Every day more than eighteen thousand tons of sewage, chemicals, and fertilizers are pumped into the lake. It is estimated that Lake Erie is dosed daily with one hundred and fifty thousand pounds of phosphate. At this rate, unless something is done, Lake Erie will be a new dead sea. To clear up Lake Erie, researchers estimate the cost would run into billions of dollars. Even if all rivers flowing into the lake were freed of contaminating materials, it would still take twenty years to flush it clean. And unless action is taken soon, the other great lakes will follow the same plight.

These are a few of the signs of our times; and in many parts of the country, these problems are approaching crisis proportions. We can, and must, find better ways to protect and restore the total environment in which we live. Otherwise, we may soon die from the poison of our own waste. World health authorities estimate that even now more than ten million persons die every year because of water-borne diseases. Think of it—ten million deaths a year from water pollution!

Yes, some of these environmental problems, such as over-population, technological proliferation, air pollution, and water pollution may affect the very survival of mankind. However, there is another point which I think is also important, this has to do with the quality of life in the future.

As a people, we have come a long way toward using technology to shorten the length of time one must work to produce the goods and services necessary for the national economy and to provide the basic requirements for ourselves and our families. But, technology is a two-edged sword—on the one edge, life is made better; but, on the other edge, technology has contributed to the problems we have been discussing for the past few minutes. Let us look now at this edge relating to the betterment of life. We have been increasing leisure time which we can use to renew the needs of what some have called the innerman. It was Henry David Thoreau who said, in wilderness is the preservation of the world. In his book, *Walden*, he also said:

We need the tonic of wildness, to wade sometimes in the marshes where the bittern and the meadow-hen lurk, and hear the booming of the snipe. . . .

We must be refreshed by the sight of inexhaustible vigor, vast and titanic features, the sea-coast with its wrecks, and the wilderness with its living and its decaying trees.

From men such as Thoreau and John Muir, in the middle of the past century, to the leaders of today, there has been a continuing tradition of love for the great outdoors and unending efforts to conserve its limitless values. Decade by decade, the expanding population has achieved more leisure time, more money to spend, and better travel facilities. These improvements have brought more and better opportunities to enjoy the recreation and restorative tonic of outdoors. John Muir spoke for the mountaineers and wilderness with such a missionary zeal that he moved many people to constructive action. Theodore Roosevelt may have been an advocate of the soft voice in international relations, but he spoke in thunderous terms about the disappearance and abuse of natural resources. Carl Schurz, the German-American Civil War general and interior Secretary, began efforts to halt the uncontrolled exploitation of Federally-owned forests and paved a way for Gifford Pinchot to carve out the National Forest System.

Throughout the years there has been a long list of other outstanding conservation leaders who have kept alive the warning that the American people cannot wander too far from nature and the great outdoors, without losing character, strength, roots, and orientation.

In the future, the exploding population will create skyrocketing demands for open space and outdoor recreation. It has been estimated that by 1975, water-based recreation needs will increase by one hundred and seventy percent over what they were in 1960, and by four hundred by the year 2000.

The demand for hunting lands will increase by one hundred and twenty-five percent by 1975, and up to two hundred percent by the year 2000—and ninety percent of this activity will be on private land.

Most people seeking outdoor recreation want water—to sit by, to swim and fish in, to ski across to dive under, and to run their boats over. Swimming is one of the most popular outdoor activities and will probably become the most popular by the year 2000. Boating and fishing are among the top ten activities. Camping, picnicking, and hiking, also high on the list, are more pleasurable near water sites.

But, here again, the waters must be unpolluted to be enjoyed. Today, there are a mere handful of free-flowing rivers which remain unpolluted by man. Some are wild streams dropping swiftly through wilderness areas, while others flow silently through glimmering forests and shady swamps. As remnants of the scenic beauty once available broadly in this country, these few remaining free-flowing rivers deserve protection for future generations in their natural, or near natural state. To accomplish that worthwhile goal, some of my colleagues and I introduced legislation to provide for a national wild and scenic rivers system. The legislation was enacted in 1968 and is now in the process of being implemented.

For example, an agreement was submitted to the Congress early this month between the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin and the Northern States Power Company to create the Saint Croix and Namekagon Wild River System. Northern States Power Company was a party to this agreement because it owned twenty-nine thousand acres of the upper Saint Croix waterfront. The company agreed to donate twenty-five thousand of those acres to the government for the future enjoyment of the people. On September 30, I commented in the House of Representatives on this agreement saying:

There may be some cynics who are wondering why a company such as Northern States Power Company—with its profit-making responsibility—should donate twenty-five thousand acres of riverfront land to the people. I think President Nixon answered this query partly when he said, private industry must take an active role in protecting the environment, providing recreational facilities, and conserving natural resources. Clean air, clean water, and unpolluted countrysides are more easily attainable through preventative measures than restoration. With a coordinated program of prevention, private industry can help lead the way to a better America.

The Saint Croix Scenic River System is only one of many systems which will be developed for the benefit and enjoyment of the citizens of the Nation. This new development will make available many new campsites.

Camping is one of our most popular forms of outdoor recreation, but right now the operators of our campgrounds in all parts of the country are in a quandary. Both public and private campgrounds are already overflowing. For example, in 1968, more than one hundred and sixty million persons visited our national parks as compared with one hundred and three million in 1963. Recreation use of the national forests was

equally heavy. The demand for camping areas will increase by at least one hundred and sixty percent by 1975 and by two hundred and fifty percent by the year 2000. More and more of these visitors come to the parks with camping on their minds. Wall to wall overflow camping in almost every park has damaged and destroyed natural features, severely overtaxed existing facilities, and placed a heavy strain on park personnel.

The camping explosion is built around complex and sophisticated equipment. Sophistication has filled the woods with a new breed of bedroom campers, including hundreds of thousands of comfort-loving people in their retirement years.

People no longer go camping with simply a car and a tent. Now the campers bring all the comforts of modern living—even including the kitchen sink. Only about one-fourth still camp in tents. The rest of the campers occupy apartments on wheels called recreational vehicles turned out by a booming industry which projects the sale of five hundred thousand new units this year. All these campers roam the country in search of campsites.

These campers are making constructive use of their increased leisure time, but there are endless millions of other Americans who must also find use and have opportunities for enjoying recreational experiences. The basic function of recreation is the re-creating of human vitality. Dormant or latent energy is tapped in the mind, body, and spirit and the imagination works on fresh material. When these things happen, the individual returns to his work with a sense of renewal. To assure our citizens of the opportunity to enjoy such revitalization, I have worked in the Congress for enactment of the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Outdoor Recreation Act, and the establishment of numerous national parks and national forests.

We, in Congress, however, have only scratched the surface in solving some of the problems that exist as far as conservation and our environment are concerned. Perhaps one of the next things that should be done is to clarify and consolidate our own congressional structure for consideration of these environmental problems.

At the present time, there is confusion and over-lapping concerning committee jurisdiction over environmental problems in the Congress. For example, during the last Congress, nine of the sixteen standing committees of the Senate considered bills which were directly or indirectly relating to natural resources or the environment. In the House of Representatives, bills of this nature were considered by twelve of the eighteen standing committees. Recently the question arose in the House whether the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee or the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee should have considered a bill to establish an environmental quality policy.

The Washington Post, on September 29th, carried a front page news story concerning two of the Senate's most powerful senior democrats who were also feuding over their respective authority in creating a national environmental policy. The disputants were Washington's Henry Jackson, Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, and Maine's Edmund Muskie, Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. The controversy centered on the issue of which Senate unit should have jurisdiction over environmental questions. These situations in the House and Senate give rise in my mind to a comparison with the Emperor Nero, who fiddled while Rome burned.

We, as a Nation, must stop this fiddling around and settle down to the serious business of survival. On this point of survival, I recently read a very significant speech by Edward Crafts, who was the first director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The thrust

of his remarks was to outline the steps necessary to reverse the trend of environmental retrogression. He praised the legislation in force and bills contemplated to do the job, but he pulled no punches when he cited the shortcomings of what has been done or has been proposed. Perhaps the single most important point of his speech, with which I am in complete accord, was that he laid the burden of leadership responsibility directly at the Capitol steps.

I believe there is much wishful thinking on the part of other legislators that engineers, systems analysts and scientists will somehow solve these environmental problems we face. Dr. Crafts noted that the politicians and other policy officials in all walks become the ultimate key. Heretofore, leadership has come from outside the Congress. The American people are light years ahead of Members of Congress as to an awareness of our environmental decline. In Congress, we see the dotted "I's" and the crossed "T's" of legislation. You, the public, sees the bulldozer slashing away at the wilderness; you live amidst urban sprawl; you taste and feel the string of pollutants; and you clasp your ears as the jet rattles your dinnerware.

The public support is out there for a massive congressional drive against further erosion in the quality of our lives, if only all of us in the Congress will bite the hot bullet and respond.

This, my friends, is where you come in. Perhaps you have been saying quietly to yourselves, well, that is all very interesting, Mr. Congressman, but what can—I as a single individual—do about it.

The answer to that question comes from the Christopher Society's motto: It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness.

There is much you can do about it; and, first, maybe, the most important of these things is to become truly concerned and express your concern at every opportunity. You, more so than most members of the great American public, are already deeply committed to good conservation and rational environmental planning. The history of your association is a testimony to far-sighted conservation planning. In fact, where would your industry be today if your association's fifty-one presidents and the scores of firms which are or have been members, not constantly looked to the future?

No one could ever accuse this group of overlooking the forest for the trees, but I am saying that there is a bigger forest to contend with—the total environment—and that you should become part of the leadership group that wakes this country up to the dangers to our future without sound environmental planning.

I know—what I am asking is for you to become involved in one more task—one more drain on your time—perhaps even one more night a week when you have to provide your brains and talent free of charge to some group, organized or not, which is struggling to convince fellow citizens that the total environment is the real concern. Such groups, and thousands of courageous individuals, are fighting time, lack of funds, official lethargy, and rapacious profit-seekers day in and day out. Heretofore, theirs has been a lonely struggle. The public support I mentioned a while back is out there all right, but it is men like you who have the experience and talent to provide the leadership that is needed in the coming years.

If you are inclined to think that these things I suggest are too demanding, then you might remember what Maurice Chevalier said when someone asked him how it felt to be seventy-five years old. He replied, when I contemplate the alternative, it feels wonderful.

My friends and fellow members of the genus homo sapiens, when being asked to become concerned about improving the environment, just contemplate the alternative.

CONFRONTATION MUST COME,
SOONER OR LATER, IF VIOLENCE
CONTINUES

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if violence is to be the pattern of any future "moralatoriums" or what-have-you demonstrations, there must be square confrontation of it by our society if we are to remain free. As Joseph Alsop writes of Israel's Golda Meir's message to President Nixon:

We Americans because of our great good fortune, have always tended to forget the basic lesson that history is a harsh, remorseless process, in which few nations get a second chance.

The free men of any nation must occasionally stand up for freedom when it is under challenge. In this great land of ours not only is our flag under direct attack, but also the very foundation of an orderly society by bearded storm troopers of the "new left." Violence by such as these can no longer be left to pass unchallenged by turning the other cheek.

It is the continuing responsibility of those in charge of our Government to protect and preserve the public peace. Let Government make it clear that this Nation will no longer tolerate violence. Concerned citizens look to their Government for this protection and they are entitled to it.

Mr. Alsop's column deserves thoughtful review in this connection:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1969]

SALUTE TO NIXON BY GOLDA MEIR MAKES
"KID" MARCH HEARTACHE

(By Joseph Alsop)

It was heartbreaking, somehow, to see "the kids" in Washington, and then to learn of the latest, least expected support for President Nixon's Vietnamese policy.

That mother in Israel, Golda Meir, seems to have walked, in sensible, arch-supporting shoes, straight out of one of the heroic epochs of the Bible story. But as Prime Minister of a small, infinitely brave and viciously beleaguered nation, Golda Meir must be alert to all that passes in the present.

She heard and studied President Nixon's remarkable Vietnam speech. Whereupon quite spontaneously, without solicitation, to the vast surprise of the White House, Mrs. Meir sat down and sent the President a message of warm congratulation and strong moral support.

Among other things, she saluted the President for "encouraging and strengthening small nations the world over, striving to maintain their independent existence, who look to that great democracy, the United States of America." The highest Israeli sources state, without hesitation, that this was an indirect but emphatic reference to an obvious danger that Mrs. Meir now fears.

The fact is that Israel's peril will be much increased by the worldwide repercussions of the kind of American defeat that "the kids" clamored for here in Washington. It is very strange indeed, therefore, that this purposefully significant message to the President should have received no attention to date, despite its high origin and easy public availability.

This reporter learned of Mrs. Meir's message by sheerest accident over the weekend days after its White House release, and just

after escaping from a huge sidewalk eddy of "the kids." It was heart-breaking, simply because it so sharply pointed out the contrast between Mrs. Meir and the people she leads and the new breed of Americans those "kids" represent.

The word is put in quotations because it is time to protest the degrading sentimentality, the mush-headed permissiveness that lies behind this novel usage. In the Second World War, silly people used to call our troops "American boys" in the same manner. Yet they were not boys; they were American men, bravely fighting for their country, thank God and them, as men are sometimes called upon to do.

Today, it is far worse. A bearded, unwashed, 25-year-old Trotskyite is not a "kid." Neither is a lank-haired 24-year-old harridan of the same persuasion. Male and female storm troopers of the new left, perhaps; but "kids," no! And if you collect the facts about the brutality some of these alleged kids have actually resorted to, in the current New Left assault upon academic freedom, for instance, storm trooper seems a quite justifiable appellation.

Here, to be sure, we are speaking of a small though very influential minority. Idealism, ignorance and innocence, wallowing self-pity and simple fashion no doubt animated the great majority of the young people who marched in Washington at the weekend. But even the most empty-headed 18-year-olds were not "kids," they were at least proto-adults, with a duty to begin facing the world and the facts in a fully adult manner.

It is this refusal to face the world and the facts as adult Americans that mainly characterizes "the kids." It is also this refusal, one supposes, that their admirers have in mind when they call them "kids." And it is this refusal, once again, which sets these young Americans so far apart from the most beardless boy, from the most barely nubile girl among Mrs. Meir's people.

A kindly Providence has never called upon the American people to show the heroism, the hardihood, the unfailing will and resolution of Mrs. Meir's people. The Civil War, over a hundred years ago, was the nearest we ever came to a comparable test, and in the hard cold harbor-time, Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant were among the few Americans who had not begun to lose heart.

The truth is that we Americans, because of our great good fortune, have always tended to forget the basic lesson that history is a harsh, remorseless process, in which few nations get a second chance. That is the lesson that has been cruelly rubbed in upon Mrs. Meir and her people, by over two millennia of dire experience with history's harshness.

To the convinced pacifists, fighting for your country is always wrong—even if the end result is to condemn men like Noam Chomsky to the fate of Yuri Daniel and Alexander Solzhenitsyn. And this would surely be the end result, and for independent-minded Americans of every kind.

But unless the storm-trooper doings of the New Left minority provoke even worse reactions on the right, we can still count upon escaping that fate, providing we learn just a little from Mrs. Meir and her people.

LETTER FROM LEDYARD, CONN.,
REPUBLICAN TOWN COMMITTEE

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a letter which I have received from the chairman

of the Republican Town Committee of Ledyard, Conn., in my congressional district. The gentleman requested that I insert his letter into the RECORD. It is as follows:

REPUBLICAN TOWN COMMITTEE,
Ledyard, Conn., November 8, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The victory of our party candidates Tuesday was another repeat of the National Election in 1968. We wish your decisions in Vietnam could be as easy and successful.

At the monthly meeting of our Town Committee on November 6, 1969, we unanimously voted to forward this letter to you.

"We, the members of the Ledyard Republican Town Committee, support your policies in Vietnam. Although we all desire peace, we do not want peace at any price."

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. BIXLER,
Chairman, Ledyard
Republican Town Committee.

OCCURRENCES OF THE LAST FEW
DAYS IN WASHINGTON

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important for those of us in the legislative branch to review the occurrences of the last few days and to reflect upon them.

I was gratified with the orderly and sincere manner in which the vast majority of young people who came to our Nation's Capital expressed themselves on disengagement from Vietnam. I personally met with a large number from my district at an open meeting on Friday. Although there was some direct disagreement among us on specific issues, we shared a common concern of finding peace in Vietnam, of developing responsible and responsive government in South Vietnam, and of rebuilding a nation torn apart by the war. It was a wholesome atmosphere in which the young people were given an opportunity to communicate directly with their Representative and petition their Government. In many cases I found their comments to be extremely perceptive, well informed, and helpful. Such dialog is the essence of democracy.

However, I was greatly disturbed and disappointed in the events which followed. There were some who came to Washington not to discuss but to disrupt, not to petition but to confront. Both the attack on the South Vietnamese Embassy and the Justice Department, with the destruction of flags and the carrying of banners of the North Vietnamese are repulsive to the American conscience and are disruptive to the cause for which so many came. The violence and destruction which ensued were destructive not only to property but to the goals of peace to which the demonstrations had been directed. To use violence in this country to end violence in another country is without logic. That violence should be condemned not only by those in positions

of public office, but by the hundreds and thousands who traveled to Washington to express their views peacefully and nonviolently as well.

The cause of legitimate dissent is imperiled if we do not take explicit action against those who broke the law—those who were determined that this demonstration would be a confrontation rather than an exchange of views. I have expressed strongly my support for the law-enforcement officials of the city of Washington for their intelligent and expeditious handling of this difficult situation.

But we must not stop there. If there are groups in this country whose avowed purpose is the violent disruption of our society, and there is growing evidence to indicate that there may be, then we must insist that there be strict enforcement of the laws against conspiracy by both the executive and judicial branches.

Our democratic processes were on trial here in Washington over the weekend. Those who purposely and wantonly destroyed property and disrupted the peace expressed quite openly their contempt for those processes. They must be dealt with, with the full power of the law.

PRESIDENT ZALMAN SHAZAR'S 80TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Day-Jewish Journal, largest Yiddish daily in the United States hails the 80th birthday of Israel's President Zalman Shazar which occurred on November 11.

President Shazar has the traditional title of "Nasi," which means a prince of the Jewish people.

The Day-Jewish Journal is proud that President Shazar, as well as David Ben Gurion, have been regular contributors to the paper for the last 15 years.

I am pleased to submit a summary of the feature article giving tribute to Nasi Shazar:

PRESIDENT ZALMAN SHAZAR'S 80TH BIRTHDAY

When President Zalman Shazar was elected unanimously six years ago to the highest position in Israel, he declared that his aim in holding the office will be the establishment of a spiritual center not only for Israel but for the Jews the world over.

On his 80th birthday he still continues to the present day his task of perpetuating the Jewish cultural values for the generations to come.

Performing this noble and significant function of perpetuating the spiritual values of the Jewish people, he is in constant personal communication with Israelis and visiting Jews from abroad, who inspire him to carry on this significant and valuable function. The President's house is open to all.

The prophetic and wise Moshe Sharet who was his closest collaborator and friend saw in him the man of great spirit and mind who was destined to play a historic part in the upbuilding of the Jewish homeland and enhancing its spiritual values as well.

When Prime Minister David Ben Gurion asked him to accept the great office of President, Zalman Shazar being a modest scholar, was so overwhelmed he asked for several days to think it over.

Moshe Sharet, who was visiting Argentina at that time, called him on the phone and pleaded with him to accept the Presidency, saying the following prophetic words: "Zalman, history is calling you, your duty is to listen to it" and thus Zalman Shazar, bowing to history, accepted the office.

On his 80th birthday he stands at the helm of his government and his noble and lofty spirit permeates the Jewish homeland and the Jews abroad.

Long may he live, and may God give him strength to continue his noble aspirations to uphold the Jewish cultural and spiritual heritage.

AUSTRALIAN ADVENTURES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Anne Clark, the wife of former Ambassador Ed Clark, has saved a bit of history and compiled it in book form. During her tenure as the second-ranking member of the U.S. delegation to Australia, Anne had the foresight to keep a delightful collection of letters to relatives and friends in America. These letters constitute an intriguing historical record that generates humor and warmth, reflective of this unique Texas couple. The Clarks were the only noncareer members of the Canberra diplomatic corps and a lesser couple would have been cast adrift amid the protocol and pomp.

The book, "Australian Adventures: Letters From an Ambassador's Wife," recreates the 2½ years of the Clark mission in Australia. More than just a travelog, this book dishes up a slice of life from the land down under that gives fresh insights to the lives of our Australian friends. It is also a reflection of the high esteem the Aussies held for the Clarks. For example, one of the first official acts of the Ambassador was to pull up the "no trespassing" and "private" signs that were staked over the lawn and driveways of the Embassy.

The letters are laced with the twinkling humor of Anne Clark, the daughter of a pioneer Texas family of Metcalfe. I heartily recommend this book as must reading—it is rated "G," for general audiences.

There have been a great number of reviews on this book from such newspapers as the Houston Chronicle, the Austin American-Statesman, the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and the Dallas Morning News. I would like to include here one from the Dallas Morning News which is indicative of what has been written about this delightful book:

A genuinely delightful discovery is the volume of letters written back home by "Mrs. Ambassador" Edward Clark, while her famous husband was representing the United States in Australia, 1965-1968. Anne Clark is a born letter-writer, though when she found time to write during this assignment staggers the imagination. Ambassadors' wives must work as hard as their husbands; and from a dozen on-the-spot chances to observe, we'd say the American Embassies abroad work at a pace rarely seen at home.

The University of Texas Press, which publishes Anne Clark's "Australian Adventure"

this week, provides a pleasure for the reading public far beyond the confines of Texas. Mrs. Clark has a fresh and shrewd eye, a quick wit, a sharp pen. She offers interesting and useful information—new for most of us—on a very exciting land. Her report is not studied or calculated; she simply shares with her family and friends to whom she writes her own impressions. But it is the quality of these impressions that counts, neither stereotyped nor self-conscious, but always charming.

A further bonus, of course, is the revelation of Ed Clark's "Texan-style" ambassadorship—the warm, free-wheeling, unorthodox and individual style one would expect from this colorful Austin couple. When they left Washington, President Johnson told them simply to "be themselves." The policy paid off handsomely. The Appendix of the volume incorporates the text of talks made to Australian audiences by Mrs. Clark and by her husband, plus extremely interesting "Sample Schedules of Official Visits," replete with protocol plans that must have bemused these two informal Texans.

Several of Mrs. Clark's best letters are to Dallas friends, including W. W. Lynch and the late Allen Duckworth, one of the glories of the Dallas News and a much-prized friend of the Clarks (as he was of all who knew him well).

Famous names go by in this book like telephone poles; nearly everybody important managed to visit Australia while the Clarks were there. "One of America's most-loved ambassadors" says Dame Zara Holt, widow of the late prime minister, in her brief Foreword to the book. Our State Department might consider this record of success required reading for all personnel.

SP4C. RUSSELL F. SMITH IS MORTAR CASUALTY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Russell F. Smith, a fine young man from Maryland was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to honor his memory and to commend his courage by including the following article in the Record:

CROWNSVILLE GI DIES IN VIETNAM—SP4C. RUSSELL F. SMITH IS MORTAR CASUALTY

The Defense Department announced yesterday the combat death of a 21-year-old Anne Arundel county man in Vietnam.

He was Spec. 4 Russell F. Smith, of Crownsville, a soldier with the 101st Airborne Division, stationed near the North-South border zone in South Vietnam.

Specialist Smith was killed when his unit came under mortar attack October 22. He died four days after his 21st birthday.

His father, Russell P. Smith, of Arden-on-the-Severn, said that his son did not have strong feelings about the war in Vietnam. "He just didn't want to be there," Mr. Smith said.

ARUNDEL GRADUATE

Specialist Smith was born in Washington, October 18, 1948. For the five years before his enlistment in March, 1968, he lived in Crownsville. He graduated from Arundel High School in Odenton, where he played on the school football team.

In addition to his father, survivors include his mother, Mrs. Dorothy S. Soares, of McLean, Va.; two half-brothers, Angelo Soares and John Soares, of McLean, and two half-sisters, Jacqueline Soares, of McLean, and Mrs. Elaine Jarrell, of Crownsville.

Funeral services will be held Monday, at 10 A.M. at Our Lady of the Fields Catholic Church in Millersville. Military burial will be held at the church cemetery.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Buffalo Courier-Express; the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle; the Observer-Dispatch, the Courier Express; the Buffalo Evening News; the Long Island Press; and the Wellsville, N.Y., Reporter, in the State of New York. The editorials follow: [From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Aug. 3, 1969]

U.S. BILL THREATENS TO OPEN WNY TO "ROLLING MONSTERS"; AUTO CLUBS SEE DANGER IN LOSING ROAD GIANTS

(By Modesto Argenio)

Rumbling trucks pulling two or three trailers could be free to thunder over Western New York highways in greater numbers if a federal bill becomes law.

The proposed law could expose interstate highways and other roads to the pounding of larger, heavier trucks and tractor-trailers.

If enacted, a Courier-Express review found, the bill could:

Upset New York State limits on truck sizes and weights, limits already among the most liberal in the country.

Result in the diversion of some of the flow of heavy truck traffic from the New York State Thruway to other state and local roads.

HEARING NEARS IN WASHINGTON

It would virtually ignore a six-month-old state report which blamed huge trucks for increasing safety hazards to motorists and damage to roadbeds.

The Nixon administration is to give its opinions of the bill at a hearing in Washington Tuesday before a House Public Works subcommittee.

So far, debate over the bill pits two powerful automotive lobbies—the trucking interests, represented by the American Trucking Assn., and the passenger automobile interests, led by the American Automobile Assn.—in a conflict.

The trucking interests, naturally, favor the larger trucks, freight loads and profits which would result from the bill. The automobile clubs fear the measure would increase traffic hazards and chew up roads.

108,500-POUND ROLLING BEHEMOTHS

Key facets of the proposed law are aimed at increasing the weight and lengths limits placed on trucks using interstate highways under 1956 federal highway laws.

The maximum loaded weight of a truck would be increased from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds. And, although the bill would allow trucks up to 70 feet long to roam the highways, some interpretations of the legislative fine print indicate it could open highways to triple-tandem trucks as long as 105 feet.

The bill, sponsored by two Midwest congressmen, died in the House last year under a storm of protests. The revised version is billed as permissive legislation because it would leave adoption of the extended truck standards up to individual states.

ANY RESISTANCE SEEN FRAGILE

Critics insist, however, that most states would refuse to buck the powerful trucking

interests and, instead, readily accept the federal endorsement of larger trucks.

In this event, the Automobile Club of Buffalo warned recently, it would merely be a matter of time before the bulkier trucks are flocking over state and local roads.

Currently, New York State restrictions pretty much limit oversized trucks to regular use of the Thruway.

The mammoth trucks and combines are allowed on other state highways and roads only through a system of special hauling permits.

CURRENT PERMITS DEFINE LIMITS

The Dept. of Motor Vehicles has set the basic truck dimensions at a maximum length of 55 feet and a maximum weight of 71,000 pounds. Normally, these limits would exclude such truck combinations as double-tandem tractor-trailers.

Larger trucks and combines, however, can be permitted on virtually all state highways if granted special hauling waivers by the state Dept. of Transportation.

A department spokesman told The Courier-Express that the waivers generally are extended to trucks up to 85 feet long and weighing a maximum of 110,000 pounds.

The permits, however, are issued on a trip-by-trip basis. Escort vehicles normally are required for the large trucks, and use of routes with dangerous curves, grades or bridge limitations are prohibited, the spokesman said.

IT DEPENDS ON THE CARGO

Furthermore, freight loads must be indivisible before special permits are granted. Thus, if a load can be "broken down" and shipped on two or more trucks, permits are not granted, he explained. The department issued 51,869 special permits in 1968.

By contrast, the Thruway has encouraged tandem tractor-trailer traffic since 1959 and currently allows trucks larger than those permitted under the federal bill to travel the superhighway.

A Thruway Authority spokesman told The Courier-Express that tandems weighing up to 127,400 pounds and 108 feet long can travel on its system.

The Thruway Authority also is about to conclude a year-long experiment allowing triple-tandems, with a maximum 108-foot length, to use the superhighway.

"If the bill is enacted, we'd expect to lose some of our truck business," the Thruway spokesman acknowledged.

POUNDED PAVEMENT, STRESS ON BRIDGES

The State Automobile Assn. has denounced the Thruway triple-tandem tests as safety hazards and claimed that the truck combines are difficult to control.

The Courier-Express reported Saturday that the accident rate involving double-tandems has outpaced increases in the truck mileage rate on the Thruway.

Opponents of the bigger-truck bill contend that today's highways simply cannot handle the assaults of larger trucks.

G. Thomas Ganim, secretary-manager of the Automobile Club of Buffalo, asserted recently that "heavier vehicles will prematurely pound to pieces the pavement of highways and dangerously overstress many of the nation's bridges."

"DRAMATIC" RISE IN HEAVYWEIGHTS

Two members of the House Public Works Committee, Rep. Richard D. McCarthy, Buffalo Democrat, and Rep. Fred Schwengel, Iowa Republican, heartily agree. They have estimated it would cost billions of dollars to maintain and repair highways used by heavier trucks.

Yet, the trend toward heavier trucks and heavier freight loads is growing.

The group predicted today's nationwide truck fleet would grow from 15 million vehicles to 20 million within six years, and close to 25 million in the next decade.

"TAKING ONE'S LIFE IN HIS HANDS"

It also observed that, "In the past decade, the average payload of trucks increased 33 per cent, from 19,200 pounds to 25,500 pounds."

Truck travel, in terms of ton-miles, also is expected to soar from the current 380 billion truck-miles annually to 728 billion annually within 10 years.

In the face of this, the Automobile Club of Buffalo complained that "attempting to overtake and pass a 70-foot truck-train on anything less than a four-lane road will mean taking one's life in his hands."

The Automobile Club's position was bolstered last February when a committee appointed by Gov. Rockefeller recommended that existing state restrictions on the weight and length of trucks be retained.

The committee noted that the restrictions were imposed to insure safety and protect roads surfaces against damaging weight. It reported that further liberalizing of state limits would demand extensive reconstruction of roads.

[From the Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester (N.Y.), Sept. 16, 1969]

ARE WE SITTING DUCKS FOR MASSIVE TRUCKS?

The federal highway administrator indulges in debatable logic when, in favoring a bill to permit heavier, wider and longer trucks, he says the government lacks sufficiently reliable data to say whether these behemoths would pose additional safety hazards.

Wouldn't it be smarter to find out first if they would?

Once the larger dimensions are allowed, it would be most difficult, in view of the powerful trucking lobby, to have them reduced.

One can understand why our trucking industry, vital in today's economy, wants to persuade the Congress to approve even larger vehicles on the interstate highways. Bigger transports mean fewer trips for trucking firms, enabling them to make more money.

In this controversy, the larger issue of public safety concerns us more.

Actually, if the House Public Works Committee wants to pursue them, there are available studies bearing on the point. One such survey showed that collisions between autos and big highway trucks produce far more deaths than collisions between cars and small pickup trucks. A simple law of physics should make this conclusion obvious. It is reported that the Federal Highway Administration possesses safety studies on giant trucks. If so they should be made public.

The American Automobile Association, speaking in the interests of millions of U.S. motorists, regards this proposal to let individual states boost truck sizes and weights on interstate highways as a tragic imposition upon the traveling public.

The question of whether the larger vehicles would further imperil public safety should supersede every other consideration.

[From the Utica (N.Y.) Observer-Dispatch, Sept. 13, 1969]

BIG TRUCK LOBBY FULL SPEED AHEAD

Earlier in the year it seemed that the big truck lobby was not going to get federal permission to put even bigger juggernauts on the road. But failure of the administration to come out flatly against enlarged vehicles and continued propaganda that ordinary drivers aren't bothered to the point of danger by them indicates the fight is not over.

What they're talking of turning loose on the highways, believe it or not, are trucks up to 70 feet long and increased to 8.6 feet in width. Along with this, the bill of Rep. John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill., would permit more weight in the vehicle and its load.

The wear and tear on today's badly abused roads is important when more weight is added at high speeds, but most important is

the prospect of larger trucks. Already mechanical monsters zip by passenger cars with a draught that can blow machines off the lane or suck them into a trailing vacuum. In either case the motorist can lose control. To pass one of these big vehicles or be passed by it in a rain storm is to risk obscure vision in a cloud of water tossed up by giant wheels.

The administration should not leave the decision on this bill exclusively to Congress, as it promises, but should fight it with all its political weight. Surely this is the will of the people and a necessary part of a war for safety on the highways.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.), Courier-Express, Sept. 5, 1969]

TRUCKS NEED GREATER SAFETY DEVICES

The spectacular, tragic smashup of a gasoline truck in the Village of Warsaw last Wednesday points up the vital need for additional safety mechanism on heavy trucks, particularly those carrying highly volatile materials. It also emphasizes the lack of response by the state to pleas by communities to eliminate proved life-claiming road hazards.

The fact that only one life was lost in the crash and holocaust which resulted was due solely to chance; had it happened when the highway was crowded with Sunday traffic or at night when residents of the village were asleep, the number of casualties might have been very high.

In the interest of highway safety, all heavy trucks and tandems should be required to have auxiliary braking systems which automatically would take over when the car brakes fail. Experts in the field of safety say they can find no such requirements in either federal or state regulations governing the manufacture or operation of trucks. This is particularly dazzling since laws covering safety insures on automobiles require "fail safe" braking systems, seat belts for all passengers, improved door locks and many other features designed to make automobile operation and highway travel as safe as possible.

Certainly American automotive engineers are capable of designing a fool-proof braking system for heavy trucks which not only will stop them in an emergency but also will prevent them from jackknifing when braked to a sudden stop. One automobile manufacturer already has produced brakes which will prevent skidding on slippery roads. There seems to be no reason why the same principle cannot be applied to trucks.

Only a few weeks ago, Congress and an irate public berated the Army for shipping phosgene gas across the country by railroad while providing minimum precautions, yet truck shipments of highly volatile materials over our crowded highways are far more hazardous and move without much more than passing notice by Congress or the public. A canvass of state and federal officials by The Courier-Express disclosed that none showed real concern about the Warsaw accident and all quite skillfully shifted the responsibility for regulating such shipments to someone else or to some other agency.

National statistics disclose that last year some four billion gallons of highly inflammable liquid petroleum gas was carried by truck over the nation's highways. Certainly shipments of this type pose far greater hazards every single day than does the shipment of phosgene gas by railroad. A crash on a heavily traveled section of a road such as the Thruway, as it passes through a city, could cause widespread death and destruction.

The Warsaw accident should alert state and federal authorities to the need for "fail safe" devices on trucks plying the country's highways carrying explosive, inflammable materials. Admittedly, we can't do without these products but we can insist that all feasible life-saving, precautions be taken in their shipment.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Sept. 5, 1969]

DODGING SAFETY ISSUE

The compromise position of the Department of Transportation on the controversial issue of oversized trucks on the interstate highways looks all too much like an effort to appease the economic interests of the trucking lobby at the expense of safety considerations.

The economic benefits of relaxed size and weight limitations, says Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner, "would outweigh the economic costs to the public in terms of wear and tear on the highway network . . ."

But even if this is so—and even if these assurances satisfied the public concern about the additional wear and tear on local connecting roads—the administration's posture is a dismally inadequate response to opposition arguments on the score of safety hazards to motorists.

Mr. Turner recommends that if Congress relaxes present restrictions, it delay the effective date pending the adoption of amended regulations to strengthen safety and road repair provisions.

While these certainly will be in order if bigger trucks get a green light, it is just begging the basic safety question to confess that transportation officialdom doesn't have enough "sufficiently reliable evidence" for a judgment.

If pinning down the validity of safety objections isn't their job, whose is it? Mr. Turner acknowledges that, while larger trucks are not involved more frequently in accidents, those mishaps that do occur more often result in fatalities. And as to the psychological impact of larger trucks on many motorists, it is doubtful, he says, "that many motorists could detect the incremental change in truck dimension or weight" permitted by the bill.

Sorry, but that kind of double talk won't do. Motorists who have had behemoths cut in on them, or play tag down the middle of the Thruway or other federal interstate links, need no tape measures or scales to calculate their psychological sense of defenselessness against highway Queen Marys. Their fears should be warning enough before Congress subordinates compelling safety considerations to pressures for still bigger road giants on already crowded highways.

[From the Jamaica (N.Y.) Long Island Press, Aug. 25, 1969]

LOOK WHAT'S COME BACK

The battle against federal approval of mammoth trucks on our highways is on again. Last year, a "big-truck bill" was buried after angry public criticism. Now it has been resurrected as H.R. 11870 with little change, except that it now includes a 70-foot length limit.

Such a length would encourage the use of two-trailer combinations—of a length outlawed in 46 states except by special permit.

The American Automobile Association compares 7.1 fatal injuries per 100 persons in collisions between a passenger car and a single tractor-trailer, with an alarming 13.3 fatal injuries when a tractor-two-trailer combination is involved. An AAA official aptly called H.R. 11870 an "anti-safety bill."

Besides endangering human life, such gargantuan trucks shorten the lives of highways and bridges, at a cost of billions of tax dollars, and require construction of more costly future roads to support the tremendous tonnage.

The Press warned last year, "Taxpayers already are subsidizing the truck industry," because truckers' taxes are "not equal to the highway maintenance costs, and those

costs will skyrocket" if these behemoths are allowed to pound the highways to pieces.

The lives and property of over 100 million drivers are involved in the decision Congress will make, hopefully after careful study of the large vehicles' accident hazards.

Thorough research is needed to determine the effects of windshield splash from big trucks and vacuum pressures on lighter vehicles. And to name a few of the other touchy points, research must determine the big haulers' ability to stop, their stability, and drivers' sight lines.

Like its predecessor, this year's reincarnated big-truck bill should die a quick death in committee.

[From the Wellsville (N.Y.) Reporter, Aug. 23, 1969]

HIGHWAY GIANTS

The trucking industry is back before Congress this year with a bill to permit the operation of heavier and bigger trucks on the nation's interstate highway system. Congress, as it did with a similar measure last year, should reject the proposed changes.

Foremost among the opponents of the legislation is the American Automobile Association, whose executives testified recently before the House Public Works Committee. The AAA's opposition is based on two points. The first is that bigger trucks will constitute a hazard on the highways because their bulk diminishes the visibility of other drivers and their length makes passing more risky.

The second point the AAA stresses is that the increased weight of tractor-trailers and tractor-two trailers will punish pavements and bridges and increase not only the costs of upkeep but also the construction of new roads built to withstand the heavier loads.

Highway costs warrant concern, but the argument Congress should find most persuasive is the likelihood of greater danger on the nation's already unsafe roads. A 70-foot truck, more than eight feet wide and weighing as much as 15 tons, is an intimidating object. To allow such snorting behemoths on the public roads is not in the public interest.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, shortly, the Ways and Means Committee will begin consideration of the Social Security Amendments of 1969 in executive session. I have introduced three bills to amend the Social Security Act which I hope the committee will incorporate into the legislation which it sends to the floor.

The first, H.R. 5542, would provide a 13-percent increase in benefits across the board. The second, H.R. 5543, provides for increases in benefits to be linked automatically to the cost of living, much like that proposed by President Nixon. And the third, H.R. 6252, would remove the earnings limitation on the amount of outside earnings which an individual may earn while receiving benefits.

I believe these changes in the Social Security Act are necessary.

On Friday, I submitted a brief statement to the Ways and Means Committee in support of the changes I have recommended in the Social Security Act. I have also taken this opportunity to express my support for President Nixon's dra-

matic and exciting welfare reform proposal, the family assistance plan.

Included at this time is the statement which I submitted to the committee outlining my recommendations for amending the Social Security Act:

STATEMENT ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1969

(By Hon. THOMAS J. MESKILL)

Mr. Chairman, early in the session I introduced three Social Security bills which I would like to bring to your attention in your consideration of the President's proposal for amending our Social Security System. H.R. 5542 would provide a 13 percent increase in benefits across the board. H.R. 5543 adds a provision for an automatic cost of living increase much like that contained in the President's proposal. And H.R. 6252 would remove the earnings limitation on the amount of outside earnings which an individual may earn while receiving benefits.

No one can be oblivious of the steep increases in the cost of living. Nor can we delay any longer in up-grading those benefits by at least 13 percent for we know that cost-of-living increases bear most heavily on people with fixed incomes.

Currently the average monthly benefit for a retired worker is just about \$100, and studies have shown that for most social security beneficiaries this is the primary source of income—sometimes the only source. Today's dollar is generally held to have the purchasing power of 35 cents as compared with the 1940 dollar. The January 1968 dollar is now worth about 91 cents. And prices continue to rise. The September 1969 consumer price index rose to a record 6 percent annual rate. Many retirees have planned carefully for their older years, but even the most careful plans can be disrupted by change and rising costs.

The total average payment for an aged couple is an even more inadequate \$168 per month, or \$2,016 per year. That is a little over \$5 a day—or \$2.50 each for husband and wife. On this meager amount many retired couples with no other income must buy food, clothing, and shelter, and any medical supplies they may need. Some people don't hesitate to spend that much for lunch. These senior citizens are the people who built our great industrial complex and have during their working lives produced the abundance the rest of us enjoy.

In addition to the 13 percent benefit increase, my bill would increase the minimum benefit from \$55 to \$62.20 and the lump-sum death payment from \$255 to \$290. Payments for those people past 72 who have little or no social security credits would likewise be increased from \$40 to \$45 for an individual and from \$60 to \$67.50 for a couple.

With this change I would also like to see enacted the automatic cost of living adjustment contained in the President's plan and in my bill H.R. 5543. Under this proposal, benefits will be adjusted to the cost of living without having to wait for the Congress to act, thereby shortening the period that people must wait for Congressional action. And people would know what to expect. Such a device would take social security out of politics. Over three years ago, back in June, 1966, the Republican Coordinating Committee made such a recommendation. In their view, between sporadic increases ranging from 5 to 13 percent:

"There has usually been a time lag of several years during which the pensioners have suffered from a drop in their purchasing power. For example, from 1958 through 1964 just before the 7 percent increase in pensions was legislated, inflation cost Social Security pensioners approximately \$1.4 billion in loss of purchasing power."

When he appeared before this Committee,

Robert H. Finch, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pointed out that in 1968 the platform of both political parties had recognized the need for such a change. He added:

"Such an automatic adjustment system would increase the security of one out of every 8 people in the country who now receive monthly social security cash benefits. The automatic provisions would also adjust the benefits for the millions of future beneficiaries whose major source of income could well be their social insurance payments under social security. Because of the time lags that have occurred between past cost of living adjustment of benefits, the purchasing power of the benefits has been seriously decreased between benefit increases. With automatic adjustments, the changes necessary to restore purchasing power will be on a more current basis."

I heartily agree with him that this is very necessary legislation, and I hope the Committee will find it possible to include such a provision in the bill when it is voted out and presented to the House for action.

The Administration bill makes some changes in the earnings limitation by eliminating the two-step increase above the present \$1,680 which is exempted entirely. To further eliminate work disincentives in the retirement test, the bill exempts all earnings up to \$1,800 and provides for a \$1 for \$2 adjustment above this amount.

This is an improvement over existing law, but I would go a step further and eliminate the earnings test entirely, as provided in my bill H.R. 6252. Under existing law, with its cumbersome step increases, it is almost impossible for an individual to tell how much he can earn over the \$1,680 base, without paying a penalty in the form of repayment to the Social Security fund for benefits he has already received but must pay back because of faulty arithmetic.

Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that it is wrong to allow people to pay into the fund during their working life, and then, if they are well enough and ambitious enough to continue working beyond retirement age, be penalized for working. His neighbor, with an identical wage record, can get full benefits for the rest of his life without lifting a finger if he decides not to work. The man or woman who is working must also continue to pay social security taxes on the very earnings which can deprive him of at least part of his benefit payments.

In closing, I would like to endorse the President's new Family Assistance Program. I particularly approve of the new national minimum for welfare payments—in effect, a fixed, basic income for every poor family, including the working poor. I approve of the fact that, coupled with this would be a requirement that all able-bodied men and women on welfare excepting some mothers with young children, receive work training and must take the jobs that are found for them. I approve of the provision that dependent families receiving such income be given good reason for going to work by making the first \$60 a month they earn completely their own with no deductions from their benefits because of earnings. I approve of the revenue sharing scheme to turn back about \$1 billion in Federal taxes to State and local governments. I like the expanded Federal manpower training program. I agree with the President that "the present welfare system has failed us—it has fostered family breakup; has provided very little help in many States and has even deepened dependency by all too often making it more attractive to go on welfare than to go to work."

I hope the Committee will include the recommendations I have suggested in the amendments it proposes to the Social Security Act.

ASSESSING THE U.N.

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, The Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, Samuel De Palma, recently made a clear and persuasive case for better understanding and support of the United Nations in a speech "What the United Nations Means to America—Now."

Mr. De Palma, in this talk, refers explicitly to the hope, which I have long cherished, that the United Nations may eventually develop an effective peace-keeping force.

I commend Mr. De Palma's talk, which follows, to my colleagues:

WHAT THE UNITED NATIONS MEANS TO AMERICA—NOW

(By Samuel De Palma)

The United Nations is passing through a crisis of confidence. Editorial writers and experts are pessimistic about its capacity to act effectively and gloomy about its future.

Much of what you hear about the U.N.'s shortcomings is accurate, but most of it is not very important. Nor is it relevant for an understanding of the real world in which it operates.

To berate the U.N. for failing to behave like a world government, which it is not, or for not being able to cure the ills of its member countries is to miss the point. The significant question is whether and how the U.N. can serve as a reliable vehicle for helping nations deal with concrete issues confronting the world today, in particular whether the U.N. can provide the means for international sharing of the responsibilities and costs of peacekeeping and development.

First of all, let us face the U.N.'s shortcomings. With the expansion of its membership to 126 countries, it has become more difficult for the nations which possess economic and military power to exert a commensurate influence in the organization. Too many unrealistic resolutions are adopted by steamroller majorities. U.N. procedures are cumbersome, and its discussions are debased by loquacity and emotionalism. Deep differences exist over its proper role in respect to colonial and racial issues. There is concern about ever-rising budgets in some U.N. agencies. There are serious questions about efficiency and effectiveness in certain operations. And the U.N.'s finances are in precarious shape.

Above all, it is cause for concern that the U.N. has not acquired the influence or prestige to act decisively to maintain peace. The U.N. does not offer effective means for dealing with issues that engage the vital interests of the major power unless they are in agreement, although it can help insulate trouble spots from their confrontation.

Clearly U.N. institutions and procedures need to be reformed to ensure effective functioning. The answer does not lie primarily in structural change. There is no likelihood of agreement now on a new grand design, although important procedural improvements are possible and we are working at them.

For example, a problem which must be solved is that of accommodating the micro-states nearing independence. About 65 small entities are potential candidates for U.N. membership. With a combined population of only about 4,600,000 they would, if admitted to full voting membership, strain beyond credulity the U.N. concept of one nation, one

vote. We believe the best solution is to create a new status of "associate member," carrying the benefits and privileges of membership but not the right to vote. The Security Council has referred the question to a committee of experts, and we hope this matter will at last be given the urgent attention it needs.

Despite its shortcomings, the U.N. has scored achievements which cannot be downgraded and which point to possibilities for future improvements. The U.N. helped to contain small wars and avert others. It assisted in the orderly and, to a remarkable degree, nonviolent liquidation of vast colonial areas and the emergence of many new nations to independence. It launched economic and social programs to help these new nations get on their feet. It made a beginning in fashioning international machinery to deal with the new technology. It has provided a unique arena for quiet diplomatic exchanges and negotiations, most of which go unreported. And, we believe, it can provide machinery to help implement settlements in the Middle East or Viet-Nam once such settlements are achieved.

With this experience, what role can we project for the U.N. in the coming years? I can foresee at least three promising areas of increased U.N. activity:

First is the U.N.'s role in helping avoid or contain local conflicts;

Second is the U.N.'s role in helping the orderly processes of modernization in the third world—the familiar problem of economic and social development;

Third is the U.N.'s role in helping the world come to terms with the physical environment as affected by the new technologies.

CONTROLLING ARMS—AND LOCAL CONFLICTS

The U.N. has long been preoccupied with promoting arms control and disarmament and has helped spur negotiation on measures to restrain the arms race. Progress has been slow because effective arms control agreements must be based on balanced obligations and provide adequate assurance of compliance. Such agreements are exceedingly difficult to negotiate, but we have succeeded in banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in agreeing to explore and exploit the Antarctic and outer space for peaceful purposes only, and in drafting a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

At Geneva we and the Russians have just agreed on a draft treaty to prevent the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the seabed. We hope that the Geneva Disarmament Committee will be able to forward it for final action to the present session of the General Assembly.

We anticipate that the General Assembly will also show great interest in controlling chemical and biological weapons. As you know, within our own Government we are presently reviewing our policy on the production and use of such weapons. This may well emerge as the next important area for arms control negotiations.

We need to renew the search for more effective ways to contain and alleviate political crises and to strengthen means for keeping or restoring the peace in conflict situations. The U.N. has had valuable experience in such places as the Congo, Cyprus, and the Middle East. It has demonstrated a capacity—though still limited and rudimentary—to take emergency action to halt fighting, to keep outbreaks of violence in check, and to promote peaceful settlement.

We believe the time is ripe for a new effort to strengthen U.N. peacekeeping. For years negotiations in the U.N. on arrangements for peacekeeping made no headway because of the rigid Soviet insistence that the Security Council control every aspect of peacekeeping and decide how it was to be financed. That would mean the veto could be used to curtail an operation at almost every stage.

Recently, however, we have seen the first

signs of Soviet willingness to discuss these problems in more practical and realistic terms. We are interested in seeking a practical solution which recognizes the primary role of the Security Council. We are not interested in some rigid or doctrinaire formula, but we do attach importance to effective procedures which will assure that U.N. peacekeeping forces can be made available quickly when needed and that they can be adapted to the unique and evolving circumstances of each case.

THE U.N. AND THE IMPOVERISHED TWO-THIRDS

The second broad task in which the U.N. must play a larger role is the orderly accommodation into a stable world order of the impoverished two-thirds of the world's population. There is no direct relationship between disaffection and poverty or between world stability and the satisfaction of rising expectations. Yet, apart from the conscience of the rich, clearly the demands of the impoverished and underprivileged cannot be ignored if we are to build a tolerable world order.

Orderly political development in the third world is threatened by resentment among the poor countries because they are being left behind in this era of rapid technological advances and because the economic disparity between rich and poor is growing.

At the initiative of the United States, the U.N. proclaimed the decade of the sixties as the First Development Decade. During the past 10 years considerable progress was made in organizing multinational efforts in aid and trade, in technical assistance and preinvestment surveys, in industrial development, in agricultural production and improvement of health standards, and in rising standards of education. Few are aware that some 85 percent of the U.N.'s staff and finances is devoted to economic and social development. But impressive as this achievement is, the U.N. has not been able to keep pace with the needs of the developing countries.

The U.N. is now planning for the Second Development Decade, in the midst of growing impatience with the slow pace of development.

The U.N. Development Program, directed by Paul Hoffman, in 1968 operated 3,400 projects in 134 countries and territories, spending nearly \$200 million and generating, through the input of local money and efforts, a development "output" that is worth many times that amount. President Robert McNamara of the World Bank recently noted that World Bank loans arising directly out of UNDP preinvestment projects have amounted to \$700 million. National governments and private industry have done even more.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the two main international development institutions are headed by men who were leading executives in our automobile industries. This serves as a reminder that much international development is the result of private investments abroad. It also points up how much public development institutions can learn from private industry about using low-trained workers in advanced-technology industries. They might also learn much from the multinational corporation about dynamic adaptation to varying political, economic, and social conditions.

An advantage of the U.N. Development Program is that it avoids some of the political problems which often hamper U.S. bilateral aid programs. Equally important is the fact that it serves to enlist financial support from other donor nations because our contribution is limited to 40 percent of what is contributed by others.

For these reasons and because of the solid record of achievement by the U.N. Development Program during the past decade, President Nixon last May asked Congress for a

U.S. contribution of up to \$100 million for 1970 to this program, a 43-percent increase over our current contribution.

The need for deciding on an increased contribution to the Second Development Decade confronts us at a time when we are about to launch a basic reappraisal of our entire foreign aid policy. This reappraisal will have to take into account our urgent and competing domestic needs. Both needs appear insatiable. Many will find it easy to urge that we shirk our international responsibility as a means of diverting resources to domestic programs. But that would be folly. We can no more ignore poverty and social tensions abroad than we can at home.

But more than money and flexible trade policies is needed. The best financed scheme of economic development can be frustrated unless coordinated gains are made in food production and in checking population growth. While the Malthusian warning of hungry mouths outstripping available food supplies seems less likely in an era of agricultural production miracles, the fact remains that at the present rate of world population growth, the earth will contain over 7 billion people by the end of this century, as compared with 3 billion in 1969. After that, the next billion would be added in only 5 years and additional billions in shorter and shorter periods thereafter.

As President Nixon put it in his speech to the U.N. General Assembly:

"If in the course of that Second Development Decade we can make both significant gains in food production and significant reductions in the rate of population growth, we shall have opened the way to a new era of splendid prosperity. If we do only one without the other, we shall be standing still; and if we fail in both, great areas of the world will face human disaster."

That is why the United States has taken the lead in stimulating the provision of family planning services through the U.N. and its affiliated agencies. We have contributed \$3 million to date and plan to contribute more in the future. While a number of nations have outstripped us recently in their relative contributions to U.N. development programs, few have made commensurate contributions to family planning activities. We are urging them to join us in this vital effort.

THE NEW TECHNOLOGY AND THE U.N.

The third broad task for the U.N. is to help us come to terms with the new technologies by drafting legal rules and creating institutions for international cooperation. The U.N. is helping to develop an international common law for the orderly regulation of new areas in man's use of his environment. But new technologies and the changed environment are not unmixed blessings. They hold dangers as well as promises. As technology shrinks time and distance, social and political stresses both within and between nations could become inflamed. The world is also faced with the "ecological conflict" which man has introduced into nature—the depletion of natural resources and pollution of the natural environment.

We try through the U.N. to make sure that the technological benefits are equitably distributed and the perils countered:

From the beginning of the space age the U.N. has organized for international cooperation in this vast frontier. Its Outer Space Committee prepared the way for the treaty banning weapons of mass destruction in outer space and is now drafting a convention defining liability for damages caused by outer space objects.

On September 18 before the General Assembly, President Nixon described the enormous potential of space technology for the whole world and promised to share its benefits. He noted that we are developing earth resource survey satellites capable of yielding

data which could assist in as widely varied tasks as locating mineral deposits and schools of fish or providing data on the health of crops. We are considering ways to make available the data acquired by such satellites to the world community through international arrangements worked out under U.N. auspices.

Numerous international agencies are concerned with oceanography and the seabed. We are cooperating in efforts to write principles governing the exploration and use of the deep ocean floor, including the principle of reservation of the deep seabed exclusively for peaceful purposes, and to ensure that the exploitation of its resources will be for the benefit of all mankind. It is already clear that there is a need to establish international machinery for the area of the seabed beyond national jurisdiction to avoid conflict because of competing claims and to ensure orderly development of its resources.

Finally, humanity literally has a vital interest in maintaining a healthful coexistence with our environment, in preserving the resources and the beauties of the planet.

The U.N. has scheduled an international conference on the environment in Stockholm in 1972. Our aim must be not only to prevent damage to the air and water and other life-giving elements of our environment but to undertake a systematic effort to ensure the rational use and conservation of the world's resources.

With these three great assignments in its future—peacekeeping, development, and cooperation in technology—no informed student of world affairs can write off the U.N. as obsolete.

Probably the main difference in our national outlook today and 24 years ago when the U.N. was established is that we define our national interest in less restrictive and parochial terms. We find it more difficult to disentangle our security and our national interests from those of other nations—at the same time that we are more and more concerned about limiting our commitments abroad. If we give the U.N. the support which it deserves, it can in time acquire the strength and prestige it needs to take over many of our foreign economic and military burdens. The United States thus has a vital stake in the U.N.'s future not only because its activities are beneficial to us and all mankind but because it is becoming more relevant to the modern world.

We can no longer, in our own interest, adopt the attitude of the visitor to the village church as described by the French philosopher Henri Bergson. This outsider sat impassively through a moving religious service and inspiring sermon. Asked by his neighbor how he could remain unmoved while the others were so touched, he replied: "But, monsieur, I do not belong to this parish."

We all belong to this parish.

AGNEW AND TV ON OPINION OR NEWS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an editorial in the November 16, Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel concerning the remarks of Vice President AGNEW on television news coverage. I feel that this analysis is most objective and worthy of consideration:

AGNEW AND TV ON OPINION AND NEWS

The TV networks have been under heavy attack for alleged lack of fairness in their

news reporting ever since the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

Frankly, we think television news reporting and commenting has improved since that time—whether a result of the criticism or something else. Anyway, it seems to us that the network reporters and commentators have been trying harder to present both sides.

Now comes Vice President Spiro Agnew with another major blast at the TV news-folks. And we suspect this criticism too will have a beneficial effect. All concerned will try harder.

The nub of what the Vice President wants is "a wall of separation" between news and comments on the nation's TV networks. (He thinks of the news story on the front page of a newspaper and of editorial comment on the editorial page.)

We do not know how the "wall of separation" can be created on TV and certainly do not believe the networks should stop their commentary or criticism.

But also, as in the case of the comment they offered immediately after the recent Vietnam speech by the President, the network should clearly label as "personal" the opinions of their analysts. If not, the comments actually become the editorial opinion of the network to this largely captive audience, whether the network realizes this or not.

And, of course, as the network executives as well as those of newspapers and magazines well know, the qualifications of the man selected to comment are most important. We still view with amazement the selection by one major TV station of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy's former press secretary, Frank Mankiewicz, to comment on Sen. Edward F. Kennedy's Chappaquiddick speech. The commentator was not identified for the uninformed listener and neither, as one could guess, were his remarks critical.

And we can understand Agnew's adverse reaction to the selection of Democrat Averell Harriman by one of the networks for "instant" comment on President Nixon's Vietnam speech.

Agnew (and we believe him) said he was not calling for any kind of Government censorship.

He was simply exercising the free speech right to say what he thought and show his bias to a group he regards as biased. The outpouring of telegrams and telephone calls in support of his remarks shows many agree with him.

We do not believe the television news industry, which has made such great strides and has such major impact on public life, will go namby-pamby as a result of Agnew's criticism. It's a cinch to try harder to do a fair and objective job.

That never hurt anyone, newspapers included.

ISRAEL—A VITAL LINK TO THE SURVIVAL OF THE FREE WORLD

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, nothing has happened in the Middle East with the progression of time to relieve the plight of the State of Israel which remains in serious danger.

In fact, the Arabs have brought their unconscionable effort to destroy Israel to an unprecedented level within the last several months. In doing that, they placed before the world a moral issue of the gravest consequence.

The issue is extremely clear. It is simply this: Will an enlightened world con-

tinue to watch idly as kings and rulers of states purporting to be members of our civilized family of nations persist in their efforts to destroy Israel?

I hope history gives worthy recognition to Israel. With less than the population of New York City's Queens County, this tiny outpost of democracy has earned profound admiration for the limitless courage of her people to survive the aggression of nations with populations of tens of millions.

In spite of the overwhelming odds, Israel—thank goodness—has managed to thwart the powerful aggressors who seek to destroy her and deprive her people of a homeland.

It is imperative that we recognize that the valiant people of Israel have endured untold suffering only for the right to exist as a community in the free world. For that very purpose—for an objective so basically and overwhelmingly right—her people have spilled their blood and have vowed to sustain their struggle to preserve their homeland.

It is my unbending belief that Israel must survive if world war three and the end of civilization itself, perhaps, is to be averted. To believe otherwise, would be to disregard the evidence that confronts us. It is evidence which clearly illustrates that tyrannical powers are seeking to overthrow democratic governments who are striving for nothing more than the right to live in peace in the free world.

To her oppressors, Israel is the last remaining bastion of democracy in the Middle East. She is, in a broader sense, regarded as a symbol of the free world and its cherished system of democracy. For that very reason, they are trying to vanquish her.

If Israel should ever fall—and let us pray we never see that day—the cauldron of conflict will boil over and set off a chain reaction that will jeopardize the entire free world. It is tragic that Israel must continue to pay such a terrible price for the right to develop her resources for a peaceful existence when her enemies are really our enemies as well.

In spite of her struggle to survive, Israel has turned the desert into gardens and the progress of her people is almost a modern miracle. How can anyone fail to admire and respect this wonderful nation?

As a Member of this Congress, I ask that we reaffirm with all possible strength our support of Israel and her right to exist in peace in the free world. Her survival is the assurance of our own survival.

CONGRESSMEN URGE IMMEDIATE AGREEMENT ON MIRV

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to count myself among 21 Congressmen who are urging the President to seek immediate agreement at the preliminary conference on

strategic weapons, to end testing of the MIRV missile system.

There should not be any need to explain in this body how important the MIRV weapon is. It is even more so than the ABM. Nor should there be any need to explain again the well-known reasons for immediate suspension of MIRV tests.

We have written to the President in order to reemphasize the urgency of this matter, and also to remind the American public that something must be done to reduce the menace of MIRV.

Since writing to the President, we have received expressions of support from two more of our colleagues, Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts, and Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of California, both of whom want to be associated with our letter. Text of the letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The opening of preliminary talks on strategic arms limitations with the Soviet Union is one of the most significant occurrences of this decade. We approve of the U.S. initiatives to get these talks started and hope that their results will reassure a world deeply anxious about the nuclear menace.

Our concern for their success impels us to offer some words of heartfelt advice.

We urge that the Multiple Independently-targetable Reentry Vehicle (MIRV), and the Multiple Reentry Vehicle (MRV), be the first order of business and that at the preliminary negotiations we seek to achieve agreement with the Soviet Union to immediately suspend testing of both MIRV and MRV weapons.

It is widely understood that the impending or actual completion of MIRV tests by the United States and the Soviet Union may be a point-of-no-return for agreement about these weapons. For when MIRV reaches the production stage, its deployment cannot be ascertained by present means of detection, thereby aggravating distrust among the nuclear nations. Authorities hold that testing of these weapons, if not the configuration of such tests, can be detected.

The agreement to suspend testing should contain provisions to protect against covert evasion or violation of the suspension agreement. Although attainment of such agreement may prove to be a major effort, still it is so critical that it ought to be concluded at the preliminary talks.

We want to support you, Mr. President, in your fullest efforts to achieve meaningful agreement at the forthcoming strategic arms negotiations.

Faithfully yours,

Louis Stokes, William F. Ryan, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Bertram L. Podell, Richard L. Ottinger, David R. Obey, Patsy T. Mink, Abner J. Mikva, Edward I. Koch, Robert W. Kastenmeier, Henry Helstoski, William D. Hathaway, Michael J. Harrington, James G. Fulton, Donald M. Fraser, Don Edwards, Bob Eckhardt, John Conyers, Jr., Daniel E. Burton, Phillip Burton, George E. Brown, Jr.

SUPPORT OF OUR PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to reaffirm my continued

and unequivocal support of our President's policy with respect to seeking a just peace in Vietnam. The demonstrations which have been mounted to protest our continued involvement in Vietnam have attempted to reduce the decisionmaking process as to a determination of a course of action to a counting of the pros and cons. The President is certainly right in discounting this approach in the conduct of policy of the gravest national importance.

It is apparent that the demonstrators have contrived their notion of peace to be the termination of killing of American troops on the battlefield by their total, unconditional, and immediate withdrawal. Certainly, the President is equally fervent in his desire to stop the killing but not at the expense of an assured ruthless Communist takeover in the face of an untimely withdrawal of the American contingent of combat troops. It is seriously doubted that the antiwar protesters in the United States fully appreciate the fact that the freedoms which they are exercising are the result of a history of armed conflicts that have been necessary to protect them from the onslaught of hostile elements. In fact, it is perhaps the abuse of these freedoms that is more a threat to their survival than some external force.

Despite any number of demonstrators who protest the war in principle, I give more credence to the views of one who has experienced the significance of the life and death struggle for peace on the battlefield. Such an individual is one of my constituents, Army Capt. Charles F. Currier. In a recent letter to the Woodbury Daily Times, he makes a very timely and pertinent plea to which we should all pay heed. Given the undisputed fact that the President's policy in Vietnam will not be altered in substance by the activities of those who have taken their cause to the streets, Captain Currier says:

"I wish some of the people spending so much time demonstrating and parading would devote a little of their energy to help the unfortunate of the war."

Three organizations whose international assistance efforts are well known and through which individual contributions can be directed are:

American Red Cross, 18th and D Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Salvation Army, 120 W. 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011.

CARE, 660 First Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

Captain Currier's letter follows at this point in my remarks:

[From the Woodbury Daily Times, Nov. 14, 1969]

After reading the news articles about the Oct. 15 "Moratorium" and the letters to the editor in the Woodbury Times I felt I should write and express my feelings which by the way are the sentiment of many others over here.

I have only been in Vietnam nine months. I say only nine months because for anyone to learn enough about this country to be able to offer constructive solutions to the many problems would require a number of years of study.

I consider myself fortunate in that I have been to a number of areas in the northern part of South Vietnam: Da Nang, Hue, Quang Tri, Dong Ha, Hhe Sanh and other places the

names of which people in the U.S. would not recognize. I have spoken (through interpreters not provided by the government) to as many people as I could—fishermen, laborers, soldiers, children, Vietnamese Catholic priests and Protestant ministers, Buddhist monks and nuns and a very dedicated American missionary, Dr. Thomas Stebbens. He has been in Vietnam since 1956 and truly understands the Vietnamese people.

I know that I do not have the solutions to all the problems faced by the Vietnamese. I am also sure that a great many people who say they know the correct solution could not possibly have a solution because they do not even know what the problem is.

One thing I am sure of is that if the U.S. removes its forces too rapidly and the VC and North Vietnamese (NVA) take over, many innocent people will die. Being here in the vicinity of Hue, I have been able to see the impact of the atrocities the VC and NVA inflicted on the civilians of this area during the TET of 1968. The extent of the mass murder of civilians is still being uncovered with the discovery of more and more mass graves.

How anyone can believe that an organization which will slaughter thousands of innocent civilians by mass murder which the VC and NVA did to the civilians of the Hue area, would provide a good government for the people is beyond my comprehension. The present Saigon government has faults I am sure, but a government run by the VC and NVA would be many times worse. I mean worse from the standpoint of the Vietnamese people as well as from the standpoint of the U.S.

I have talked to people who had members of their families murdered in front of their eyes by the VC and NVA. I don't mean accidentally killed in a fire fight between opposing forces. When the VC enters a home at night and deliberately slit a father's throat in front of his children, that is murder. Or when they tie a mother to a pole in her village and then slowly bayonet her to death because she had a son who was a member of a Region Defense force in another village, that is also murder. Others killed at night because they were urging people to vote, not to vote for a certain candidate but just go and vote.

These are but a few of the many cases that have occurred since I have been here. Thank God they are not as frequent now because the VC are being driven into the mountains.

Some people are critical of the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN). They do not recall that during the Korean War these same complaints were made about the Korean troops. It took time to build the Korean Army into an effective fighting force. Their combat record here in Vietnam proves that the Koreans have one of the finest armies in the world. The ARVN needs time to train and develop leadership at the lower levels of command. Progress is being made.

The civilians are gaining more confidence in the ability of the government to protect them and their homes. This is borne out by the increasing number of cases in which civilians voluntarily report the presence of VC in their hamlets or villages. This information has greatly aided the ARVN in their efforts against the VC. I am proudly aware of this situation here in northern I Corps and from reports I have seen it is true in other areas.

It dismays me that there is such a large number of U.S. military personnel who do not have an opportunity to get to know the Vietnamese people. I believe this is the reason some troops are critical of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

I wish some of the people spending so much time demonstrating and parading would devote a little of their energy to help the unfortunate of the war. There are many orphans in Vietnam that need help.

I have been receiving gifts from my family and friends in New Jersey which I have delivered to a Buddhist Orphanage in Hue. If any of the demonstrators (or anyone for that matter) would care to help these children they could send some of the things in need. Clothing (sizes for ages 1 to 15 years, not very large) towels, light blankets, school supplies, pillows, dungarees for boys ages 10 to 14 (for boys taking vocational training), and small plastic toys for the smaller children. There are a number of orphanages in the area and if anyone would prefer their gift to go to a Catholic or Protestant orphanage it could easily be arranged.

Forgive me for writing such a long letter but the situation here can not be described in just a few words. There is no easy solution and I believe we should give our President a chance to solve this complex problem.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MOBILIZATION—THE NON-AMERICANS RE-GROUP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the mobilization demonstrations of disloyalty and the riots in our National Capital have accomplished one certain result, they have polarized our people into the loyal and disloyal factions and they have positively identified, for the decent, hard-working American taxpayer the leaders and participants in the upcoming move to "take over" our country by violence if need be.

The majority of the fifth column participants could be easily identified as the same activists who destroyed the National Democratic Party at Chicago, the dissidents who so violently opposed President Johnson, and aborted their own Peace Party movement during the last election. The best that can be said about them is that they are an exploited bunch of youth who are following a group of radical demagogues who have rejected any semblance of democratic processes. Their real motto is "rule or ruin." They are neither informed nor mature enough to convince anyone that their views have merit; and to show their resentment they now carry what they call political action into the street thinking that they can take over the country and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat.

The latest publicity is their trial balloon plans to create a new national party. New York's minority mayor, Lindsay, and Minnesota's lame duck Senator are the natural figureheads for such doings. The mobilization political action announcement was almost simultaneous with the formation of a so-called town meeting organization by the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policies sponsored by such repudiated internationalists as Arthur Goldberg, Walter Reuther, and Roswell Gilpatric.

The United Front against Constitutional Government and Free Enterprise apparently feels that it again needs the assistance of the news media to confuse Americans by projecting an image of political respectability.

When American fighting men are in

combat, there are no neutrals. Those who do not aid our men aid the enemy. Recognition by Americans of this simple patriotic truth—a situation attack as "polarization" by the leftists—cannot be altered by another political ploy.

Several news articles follow my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1969]
ANTIWAR MOVEMENT GROPE FOR NEW COURSE
TO FOLLOW

(By Haynes Johnson)

As always, the aftermath is an anticlimax. The protesters have gone, for now, leaving behind litter and memories of their march, but the problems they demonstrated against remain unresolved.

The marchers are finding out something not so surprising: It is easier to express opposition than to create the conditions that bring genuine change.

"We just can't let all those people who came here go down," said a woman yesterday. "We just have to capitalize on the importance of what happened Saturday."

She was speaking at a conference called to plan a new political party—and the questions she raised were being asked all over Washington.

At American University, some 650 members of the Students for a Democratic Society met for hours on the future strategy. At St. Stephen and the Incarnation Church, groups conferred about the draft and resistance plans. In hotels, other organizations wrestled with the same questions.

Simply put, they all wanted to know the same thing: Where is the peace movement going now?

There were a hundred different suggestions, much discussion and more rhetoric—but no answers.

After all the emotion of Saturday's massive march, the peace movement stands where it was before. It is loosely structured, divided ideologically into a number of factions and lacking any central direction.

Take, for example, the meeting to discuss plans for creating a new national party at the Continental Hotel yesterday. It was time, one man suggested, to bring about "a radical change in the country."

Someone else said it was time for "a new image."

Another remarked on "the new spirit."

Others spoke in the rhetoric of the organizer and the jargon of the day.

"It's very relevant to us."

"... get programmatic ideas that have currency."

"We've got to be very demonstration-oriented."

"Now we get down to the nitty-gritty."

There was talk of old politics and new politics, of the black problem, the oriental problem, the Appalachian problem, the urban problem, the rural problem, the migrant problem, the pollution problem. Of problems and steering committees, of new structures and "making a big deal in the press," of John Lindsay and Eugene McCarthy.

There was discussion about a name. Should it be the New Party, the New Radical Party, the New World Party? Should it have a genuine philosophy?

The same diversity—or prolixity, if you will—was present at the SDS meeting. Among the literature the members passed out was a paper that expressed an opinion about the peace movement's direction.

It read:

"The antiwar movement must now push the liberals as far as they will go toward ending the war. But the liberals have no intention of dismantling the war machine, only stopping its growth and using present taxes and future larger taxes to provide still more pork-barrels in the cities, still more fat contracts and business subsidies.

"These policies can only scratch the surface of the problems of life facing the working and poor people of this country, while not really coping with mounting job insecurity, urban rot and falling real wages.

"At least one out of nine American workers is employed directly or indirectly by the military machine. If the antiwar movement merely proposes to stop some of the military spending associated with Vietnam, the workers will correctly see the antiwar movement as a threat to their jobs. This is why the masses of American workers are not in the movement."

The students discussed whether SDS should now adopt "a national line." Some suggested an attempt to expand student strikes against the war into the general labor movement and the creation of an independent workers' party.

Again, no conclusions were reached.

What emerged from yesterday's aftermath sessions was not so much a sense of the force the peace movement represents in America, but its present formlessness. The divisions along political and ideological lines are deep.

On Saturday radicals, revolutionaries, reformers, liberals and moderates came together in common cause. Today, they are divided again.

As the events of 1968 demonstrated so clearly, peace as a political issue can be a decisive force. But it requires a national leader and a true national platform and purpose—such a purpose as electing, or toppling, a President. The peace movement lacks that purpose now.

Sidney Lens, one of the organizers of Saturday's demonstration, the greatest political gathering in American history, put that event in perhaps its best perspective. Standing in the lobby of the New Mobilization headquarters yesterday, Lens merely remarked:

"Symbolically, it was important."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 16, 1969]
TOWN MEETING FIGHT ON WAR COSTS
ASKED

A private group yesterday urged the communities of the nation to hold old-fashioned town meetings Dec. 13 and 14 to contrast their needs against the government's military spending.

The suggestion was made by the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy, with the bipartisan support of former government officials and individuals prominent in business, civic and religious affairs and other fields.

Announcing the project in a statement, the coalition said: "The United States the wealthiest nation in the world, has developed the military power to destroy any combination of foes from abroad. But, has the United States demonstrated the will to enhance the quality of life at home?"

The organization's chairman, former Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) said, "the purpose of the town meetings is to focus attention on the urgent needs of communities all across the country, and to develop grassroots citizen pressure and support for Congress to reorder the nation's priorities—human development, rather than weapons development."

In the call for town meetings, the organization proposed that the responses of the participants be submitted to Congress next session.

Four questions were proposed for examination at the community sessions to be patterned after the old New England town meetings:

"How much income tax have the residents of this city paid to the federal government in the year ending April 15, 1969?"

"How much money have the taxpayers of this city sent to finance military activities?"

"How much federal money has come back

to the community in the past fiscal year? In social programs? In defense contracts? For highways?"

"What are the unmet needs of the city in housing, health, education, transportation, pollution control, sanitation, recreation, etc.? How much would it cost to meet these needs?"

Other sponsors of the town-meeting move included Roswell Gilpatrick, former Deputy Defense Secretary; Arthur J. Goldberg, former Supreme Court justice and Ambassador to the United Nations, and President Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers.

CONTINUED OPERATION OF URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANTS BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President recently announced a plan whereby the gaseous diffusion-uranium enrichment plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio, would ultimately be sold to private interests, a proposal which I do not consider in the public interest.

Private interests have long sought to obtain these facilities which cost the taxpayers \$2.3 billion.

In this connection I place in the Record herewith an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean calling for a reconsideration of this proposal and plan, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter.

The editorial follows:

MR. NIXON'S AEC PLAN A MONOPOLIST'S DREAM

President Nixon has proposed selling to private industry the government's three gaseous diffusion plants at Oak Ridge, Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio. These plants—which have cost the taxpayers a total of \$2.3 billion—were built to produce nuclear weapons. But now they are a rich source of energy for electric power production and the private power industry can't wait to get its hands on them.

The President's proposal comes as no surprise. It is in keeping with Mr. Nixon's long record of hostility to TVA and the public power industry. Also, it has been reported for several months that the President would recommend sale of the plants in spite of the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission—which operates the plants—has advised against the step as not being in the public interest. As far as Mr. Nixon is concerned, however, it seems that the public interest always coincides with the financial interests of the private power industry.

Sale of the gaseous diffusion plants would not only be a gigantic giveaway of unprecedented proportions, but it would also be a devastating blow to the future of low-cost public power in this country. It would turn over to private power the vital foundation apparatus for the production of nuclear power for years to come. This would enable the private power industry to determine who is to get nuclear materials for power production—and under what terms and conditions.

At the same time TVA and other power agencies would be dependent upon private power for their supplies of nuclear materials. This undoubtedly would result in higher

November 17, 1969

prices of electric power and destruction of TVA's "yardstick" of production costs—which is the real objective of private power. In the end, the private power monopoly would have the sole authority to determine how much all American consumers pay for electricity.

A proposal for such misuse of public facilities—paid for by the taxpayers—for the enrichment of a private industry shows a total disregard for the public interest. For all his talk about protecting the interests of the consumer and winning favor in the South, the President has shown that his sympathies—as always—are still on the side of the private industrial giants.

The proposal does not mean the gaseous diffusion plants will be turned over to private industry. Congress has the final say. But the threat is grave unless the Tennessee valley delegation—and the advocates of public power elsewhere—join forces to create a plan for public operation of the nuclear facilities.

Sen. Albert Gore and Rep. Joe Ewins of Tennessee have already spoken out in opposition to the President's proposal. Surprisingly Rep. William Brock said he was not sufficiently informed on the matter—an issue of paramount importance to his district and state—to comment on Mr. Nixon's proposal.

However, the question is not one of merely regional or state interest—as vital as Oak

Ridge is to Tennessee and the valley. But the main concern—which should be shared by congressmen from all regions—is for the consumers of electricity everywhere should private power gain control of nuclear production facilities.

Sale of the gaseous diffusion plants should be blocked. The "yardstick" for low-cost electric power production has been built up with great care and effort in the Tennessee Valley over the past 36 years. These gains are too dear to the region—and too valuable to the rest of the nation—to see them snatched away now by a private power monopoly greedy for more profits.