

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE REMARKABLE ELLY PETERSON

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, since 1964, the Republican Party of Michigan has had the good fortune of being led by a most energetic and capable State chairman. Many consider it remarkable that our chairman, a woman, has operated effectively in what is considered generally a man's field.

As the first person of her sex in the United States to be elected a Republican State chairman, Elly Peterson faced a massive challenge in the wake of the 1964 elections. Quickly and effectively, she moved to weld together a cohesive team representing all elements of the party.

It is easy to see why Elly has earned the respect and admiration of friends and political foes alike. A part of her success is due to the fact that she is, by nature, a problem solver. She speaks out on the issues and, like many women, she has her own opinions—and the courage to stand by them. Moreover, she combines a businesslike attitude and penetrating wit with a gentleness unusual in the hectic world of politics.

Elly, naturally, has a great deal of respect for womanpower, and has mobilized her troops on countless occasions to turn what might have been a routine activity into an overwhelming success.

Elly first sampled political life when she joined a young Republican club in Oak Park, Ill., when she was 21 years old. The encounter must have been enjoyable, because she has been one of the party's best salesmen ever since.

The knowledge she gained of metropolitan politics also served her well in Michigan. She quickly realized the need for the party to establish itself in the urban areas. She was instrumental in setting up a program in Detroit 2 years ago to help inner city residents with their problems. Called the Metropolitan Action Committee, it is the party's own version of the war on poverty.

Many of the same ideas that made the Detroit venture a success have been injected into Elly's latest effort, called Project Grass Roots, a community action program of social improvement and uplift in cities and towns all over Michigan. Party members are encouraged to volunteer their services on a continuing basis to work with senior citizens and youth groups and to improve the community through beautification projects and other activities.

These are just two of many programs that have kept the Republican Party of Michigan in the forefront of community involvement under the strong leadership of Elly Peterson.

In a few weeks, when Michigan Republicans gather in Grand Rapids for the State convention, Elly will formally step down as chairman. But, happily, she will continue to work for the Republican

cause; at the Republican convention in Miami last August, Elly was elected national committeewoman from Michigan.

Mr. President, as we say in Michigan, "Elly is quite a gal." It is an honor to pay tribute to her as a wonderful American as well as an outstanding Republican leader.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN
CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC
ENERGY ON NUCLEAR WARSHIP
CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1969, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee introduced a bill, H.R. 574, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 Navy shipbuilding program. I have had the joint committee staff put together a comparison of the nuclear warship authorizations proposed in Chairman RIVERS' bill with the nuclear warships proposed in the President's budget submission of January 20. I would like to have this summary included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks for the ready reference of all my colleagues.

A review of the summary which follows will show that Chairman RIVERS' bill proposes a more aggressive nuclear warship construction program than what was sent up to the Congress on January 20. It, for example, first, proposes long-lead funds for one additional high-speed submarine—a total of five in lieu of four; second, proposes advanced procurement of machinery for a third *Nimitz* class nuclear aircraft carrier—this is in addition to the completion of funding of the second *Nimitz* carrier proposed in the January 20 budget proposal; and third, proposes construction of an additional nuclear escort and long-lead procurement for an additional nuclear-powered aircraft carrier escort.

I believe a review of the information which follows will show that the Chairman RIVERS' proposed bill is in line with what has been advocated by the various cognizant committees of Congress for the past several years concerning the construction of nuclear warships:

FISCAL YEAR 1970 ISSUES CONCERNING
NUCLEAR WARSHIPS: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
RIVERS AND ADMINISTRATION BILLS

(Prepared by JCAE Staff, February 6, 1969)

On January 3, 1969 the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee introduced a bill (H.R. 574) to authorize \$3.8 billion to be appropriated for the FY 70 Navy shipbuilding program. Subsequently, the President's budget has been forwarded to the Congress which includes a Department of Defense request for \$2.7 billion new obligatory authority for the Navy FY 70 shipbuilding program.

About \$400 million of the \$1.1 billion difference between H.R. 574 and the Depart-

ment of Defense proposal for FY 70 is for construction of nuclear powered warships in addition to those requested by the Department of Defense. The purpose of this memorandum is to point out the differences between the funds requested for construction of nuclear powered warships in H.R. 574 and the funds requested by the Department of Defense for FY 70.

ATTACK SUBMARINES

Both H.R. 574 and the Department of Defense propose full funding of three attack submarines of the new design high speed type.

The Department of Defense request includes long leadtime funds for four more high speed submarines; whereas, H.R. 574 includes long leadtime funds for five.

ATTACK AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Both H.R. 574 and the Department of Defense propose to complete the funding of the second *Nimitz* class carrier, CVAN69, in FY 70. \$132 million has already been appropriated for this ship in prior years.

Secretary of Defense Clifford in his January 15, 1969 Posture Statement on the Defense Program for FY 70-74 stated that the third *Nimitz* class carrier, CVAN70, will be funded in the FY 71 program as previously planned. However, the DOD budget request does not include any long leadtime funds in FY 70 for this ship.

H.R. 574 includes long leadtime funds for CVAN70 in FY 70. (Without funds in FY 70 to procure long leadtime items, the overall ship construction will be delayed.)

GUIDED MISSILE FRIGATES

Last year Secretary Clifford in letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House dated April 1, 1968 enclosed a Presidential Determination to build DLGN37 and four additional nuclear powered guided missile escorts of a new design called DXGN. These five nuclear escorts, when added to the Long Beach (CGN9), Bainbridge (DLGN25), Truxtun (DLGN35), and the DLGN36 authorized in FY67, would bring the total to nine nuclear escorts—enough for two of the four planned nuclear carriers. The Presidential Determination was based on Secretary Clifford's memorandum to the President of March 25, 1968 which called for two DXGNs to be authorized in FY 70 and two in FY 71.

In the FY 69 budget request, the Department of Defense requested, and the Congress appropriated, 52 million to procure long lead time items for two DXGNs. The Navy is proceeding with the procurement of these nuclear propulsion plant components.

The FY 70 Department of Defense budget request includes one DXGN in lieu of the two previously promised, and includes 68 million for the procurement of long leadtime items for the third and fourth DXGN.

Secretary Clifford in his statement of January 15, 1969 concerning the Defense Program for FY 70-74 stated:

"We have again examined the mix of nuclear-powered and conventionally-powered escorts for the four planned CVANs and have reached the same conclusion as last year, namely, that we should provide nuclear-powered escorts for only two of the CVANs. This would require a total of nine nuclear escorts (eight in operation, one in overhaul), five of which have been funded. If we were to provide nuclear escorts for the third and fourth CVANs, we would have to increase the inventory of nuclear escorts by seven and decrease the inventory of conventional escorts by nine.

"The seven additional nuclear escorts required to equip four (rather than two) all-nuclear task groups would cost about \$1.6

billion to build and operate for 10 years. These would replace nine conventional ships with comparable 10-year systems cost of \$1.1 billion. The difference of \$500 million in favor of conventional escorts would be partially offset by about \$75-\$80 million in logistics savings, leaving a net additional cost of the third and fourth all-nuclear carrier task groups of about \$420-\$425 million. There are also a number of hard-to-measure operational advantages to nuclear power, but these do not appear to be worth the more than \$400 million involved. Accordingly, we do not believe it would be wise to commit ourselves at this time to more than two nuclear-powered carrier task groups.

"The DXGNs are now programmed one a year, FY 1970-73. The first ship is expected to cost \$222 million, and the follow-on ships an average of \$180-\$190 million. Advance procurement funds in the amount of \$52 million were made available in FY 1969 for the first two ships. The FY 1970 Budget includes \$196 million to complete funding of the first DXGN and \$68 million for advance procurement for additional ships. (The \$68 million will complete the funding of nuclear components for all four DXGNs and fire control systems for the first three, thus permitting us to meet the delivery schedules contemplated last year.)"

Thus, it is clear that the Department of Defense is holding to its position of last year that we should provide nuclear escorts for only two nuclear carriers rather than for all nuclear carriers as recommended by the Navy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the cognizant committees of Congress. The Department of Defense justifies its decision not to build nuclear escorts for the third and fourth nuclear carriers on the basis that it would cost an additional \$420-\$425 million of construction and operating costs over a ten-year period, or an average of about \$42 million a year.

Further, the Department of Defense is stretching out the procurement of the four DXGNs they have approved from the program of two in FY '70 and two in FY '71 upon which the Presidential Determination of last year was based, to one ship per year in FY '70-'73.

The cognizant committees of the Congress have repeatedly taken the position that all nuclear escorts should be provided for nuclear carriers despite their somewhat higher cost. These committees have issued numerous statements, hearing records, and reports in support of this position.

(If nuclear escorts are to be provided for the third and fourth nuclear carriers, a decision to proceed must be made as soon as possible since even now the third and fourth nuclear carriers will be at sea many years before nuclear escorts can be made available for them. In fact, the Department of Defense nuclear escort program will not provide all nuclear escorts for the Enterprise until she has been in operation eleven years and for the Nimitz until four years after she goes to sea.)

H.R. 574 takes steps to accelerate and expand the nuclear escort program by providing for two nuclear escorts for FY '70 and funds for procurement of long leadtime components for three more.

In introducing H.R. 574, Congressman Rivers stated on the Floor:

"Since the Navy must have ships able to go into any part of any ocean on a moment's notice, the necessity of having nuclear propulsion in our Navy is greater than ever before. While it may cost more, the necessity of being free from the black oil logistics train is an overwhelming requirement."

SUMMARY

In summary, H.R. 574 provides authorization in FY 70 for construction of all the nuclear powered warships requested by the Department of Defense and, in addition to the DoD request, includes about \$400 million for:

Long lead procurement for one additional high speed submarine.

Long lead procurement for the third Nimitz class aircraft carrier, CVAN70.

Construction of one additional nuclear-powered guided-missile escort.

Long lead procurement for one additional nuclear-powered guided-missile escort.

All of these additions are consistent with the long standing position of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the need to establish and maintain a vigorous and aggressive program to provide the vital advantages of nuclear propulsion in our submarine and surface warships.

TOO LATE THE METROLINER

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, less than a month ago the Penn Central Railroad, with financial assistance from the Department of Transportation, inaugurated high-speed train transportation between Washington, D.C., and New York City. As Tom Wicker stated in his most informative article in the February 6, 1969, New York Times:

It is at once a graphic demonstration that modern America need not be overwhelmed by its problems and a useful reminder that those problems are sizable indeed . . . is a product of a cooperative effort between government and private enterprise to cope with the booming intercity travel that now threatens to clog the Northeast Corridor.

I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Wicker's most astute observation that if this experiment succeeds, it will pave the way for similar rapid rail transportation between New York City and Boston, Los Angeles and San Diego, and outward from Chicago. Not only would such service improve inner city transportation; it would also, as Mr. Wicker so ably states, reduce air pollution caused by automobile exhaust fumes and jet aircraft, relieve our already overcrowded airlines, and at the same time save our cities from strangling on the already overwhelming masses of automobiles which transport many millions of our citizens to and from work each day.

A fully implemented system of high-speed rail service throughout our Nation will not come cheaply. The Penn Central has already spent \$57 million on its New York to Washington run—money which, in my opinion, has been well spent. But much more is needed. Obviously, our Nation's railroads, many of which are in perilous financial difficulties, cannot be expected to share this burden alone. Massive Federal expenditures are necessary if this most worthwhile project which benefits all of our Nation's citizens is to succeed.

So that all Senators may have the benefit of Mr. Wicker's excellent views on rapid rail transportation, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his article be printed in the Record.

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

TOO LATE THE METROLINER

(By Tom Wicker)

Riding the new Metroliner to New York from Washington is both a promising and a sobering experience. It is at once a graphic demonstration that modern America need not be overwhelmed by its problems and a useful reminder that those problems are sizable indeed.

The new "fast train," a gleaming, six-car tube now speeding down to Washington in the morning and back to Manhattan in the afternoon, is a product of a cooperative effort between government and private enterprise to cope with the booming intercity travel that now threatens to clog the Northeast Corridor. Compared to, say, black unemployment, this may not seem one of the major tasks on the American agenda. But since a huge slice of the population lives and travels between New York and Washington, it is by no means a minor one.

If high-speed, short-haul rail transit succeeds on the New York-Washington and next on the New York-Boston line, moreover, the way will have been prepared for fast trains in other heavily traveled areas—Los Angeles to San Diego, for instance, or outward from Chicago in any of several directions. Over-all, the experiment is going to provide clearer answers to such tremendously important questions as these:

Are we going to keep on paving over the landscape in order to pollute the air with exhaust fumes while pouring more and more automobiles into cities already strangling in traffic?

Or, alternatively, are we going to crowd the air lanes with more and more planes, circling longer and longer over airports of increasing inadequacy (some of which are already so far from the cities they serve that getting into town is a bigger problem than crossing the ocean)?

In short, the Metroliner is no small experiment, and a ride on it gave one recent passenger a satisfying sense that in at least this area, and however haltingly, some real efforts are being made; the decision on future intercity travel in America is not being allowed to go entirely by default, as have so many other similar problems for so many years past.

COMPETITIVE WITH AIRLINES

The Metroliner is not the last word in surface transportation, but it is a vast improvement on anything else on rails in this country. Its running time of three hours is roughly competitive with the airlines, as are its fares. The speed is held down, just as passenger comfort is reduced, by the Penn Central's roadbed—improved but basically built for an earlier day. Service aboard is excellent; and for a passenger to be treated like a human being aboard an American train is in itself, something of a miracle.

SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

The Metroliner accelerates with remarkable ease and speed. Seating, food services, lighting, heating, ventilation—all are considerably improved over the usual present-day train accommodations, although those who remember the old days (only a decade or so in the past!) will grieve for the passing of a great American institution, the dining car, and for the substitution of airline-style meals (plastic food on plastic trays).

Ultimately, there will be 22 Metroliners daily on the New York-Washington or New York-Philadelphia runs. An entirely different experimental train (the TurboTrain, which does not require an electrified line) will soon be tried on the New York-Boston run, cutting perhaps an hour off the present schedule of four hours and fifteen minutes.

But if riding the Metroliner gives hope that high-speed rail transit can provide comfortable and decent travel as well as an efficient alternative to ferocious auto traffic

and dangerously overused airlines and airports, it also suggests what a huge task lies ahead. For if the Metroliner or TurboTrain is to realize its full potential in speed, comfort and economy, greatly improved roadbeds will be essential. Between New York and Washington a wholly new one may be needed, at a cost of about \$1 billion, and the problem is said to be worse on the line to Boston.

The Penn Central already has poured \$22 million into 50 Metroliner cars and \$35 million into smoothing its roadbed. All these figures suggest the vast sums required if adequate fast-train service is to be provided in all the areas where it would be useful. A lot of that money obviously must come from taxpayers, and fairly soon at that.

The Metroliner thus is not ahead of but far behind its time, and the price for so long ignoring the need it now serves is going to be high indeed. And so it will be with all the problems this rich and ingenious nation has been so reluctant to face.

CHANCE FOR WISCONSIN

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the decision of Hyde Murray to become a candidate from the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin has been greeted with the approval and best wishes of those in the Congress who have benefited so much and so often from his hard work and wise counsel as a member of the staff of the Committee on Agriculture. I fully share these sentiments and wish to take this opportunity to acknowledge my appreciation and respect for the help that he has always so readily and effectively given on agricultural matters for the past 11 years.

Without intending in any way to cast reflection upon the other candidates, for I am not acquainted with any of them, there can be no question of his qualifications to serve in the Congress. The extent to which Hyde Murray's character and ability have won recognition is evidenced as well by the editorial appearing in the January 30 issue of *Roll Call*, the weekly newspaper of Capitol Hill, and I am pleased to include it in the *RECORD* as a further tribute to this capable young man:

CHANCE FOR WISCONSIN

Wisconsin Governor Warren Knowles has set March 4 for a primary to select candidates for the unexpired term of Rep. Mel Laird. A special election will be held on April 1.

Hyde Murray, young, bright, experienced in the ways of The Hill, has resigned his post on the Agriculture Committee to seek the nomination.

Although not wishing to indulge in district politics, and not wishing to abrogate our policy of not endorsing candidates, we feel compelled to salute Murray for his courageous decision to enter the hurly-burly of elective political life.

There isn't a staff member on The Hill more respected for his thorough knowledge, not only of Agriculture, but myriad other problems. There is not a more astute and concerned student of House procedures and history than Hyde Murray. There is not a non-member of the House who is more prepared, more qualified, more equipped to join

the House membership than Hyde Murray. Without regard to party politics, strictly from observing this "All American Boy" in action—his ability for organization, his unique leadership traits, his gift of articulation, and his willingness to delve deeply into issues that confront him—qualities known to all of us here on The Hill—we see in Hyde the epitome of that specimen which might be pointed to as an ideal Congressman.

We hope these qualities are recognized in the far reaches of his district as they are here on The Hill. As a prime advocate of the greatness of the national legislative body, and without detracting from the merits of his opponents, we think Hyde Murray is uniquely right for the modern House, served so well by his late father and by the departing Rep. Mel Laird.

ISRAEL MEANS WHAT IT SAYS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, when I am home in California, one of the things I most enjoy is listening to the daily television news reports of George Putnam on KTTV, channel 11, Los Angeles.

Three of Mr. Putnam's recent reports deal with Israel and I include these in the Extensions of Remarks, as I believe they deserve wide attention. Incidentally, Mr. Putnam is of the Mormon faith, and so he cannot be accused of having a religious bias in favor of Israel.

The reports follow:

ISRAEL MEANS WHAT IT SAYS

(By George Putnam)

It is this reporter's opinion that the freedom loving people of the world can learn much from the brave Israeli people. The behavior of that nation, its leaders, and its people in the face of overwhelming odds, has gained the awe and respect of all men—and most of all, Israel's enemies.

If Israel is to survive, it will be because of the resolution, the courage, determination, pride, and the will of its people to risk all—including their very lives—to guarantee that survival. After coming into being on the fourteenth of May, 1948, Israel was all but abandoned by the United Nations which helped to give it being.

Israel was left alone to defend itself against the armed forces of six Arab countries. Again and again the borders of Israel were invaded. But Israel was determined to live, and any nation that is determined to live—and will pay the necessary price—will live.

The United Nations, which has stood by silently in the most recent invasion of Czechoslovakia by Communist Russia—apparently has a very short and a very convenient memory. When Israel was attacked in 1948, she forced Egypt to sign an armistice on the twenty-fourth of February, 1949. The cost to Israel was very heavy, but she held her freedom.

Determined enemy neighbors drew a noose of iron and fire tight about Israel's neck. But the people of Israel—survivors of Nazi death camps—unwanted and cast off in other lands—gained increasing strength and they gained increasing courage.

They tilled the soil to which they brought water. They built commerce and they built industry. And out of a brown, a very dismal area of the desert, Israel bloomed green and productive. They tilled the soil, and as they sweated and labored, they carried rifles on their backs against the ever present threat of attack from without.

The year 1956 brought another crisis, in which the Egyptians committed nearly two hundred acts of aggression. There were one hundred six violations of the armistice agreement by Jordan in that summer of 1956.

Egypt, Jordan and Syria created a united military command and declared their intention to make war on Israel and to reverse the defeat of 1948 and 1949. The Israeli forces did not wait to be attacked. They struck swiftly at the Egyptian bases that had been prepared for Israel's destruction. In a hundred hours, it was all over—the Sinai Peninsula demilitarized—the menace to Israel completely eliminated—the Egyptian blockade of the Red Sea completely smashed. Israel could now reach Africa and could reach Asia. And the trade so necessary to Israel's survival at last seemed guaranteed.

But even then, the enemy would not accept Israel as a permanent state. And Gamal Nasser, madman of the Nile, urged on by his Communist cohorts in the Kremlin, threatened the mass extermination—a genocide—of every Israeli man, woman and child. Every Jew was to die in what Nasser chose to call his own holy war. Israel appealed to the world to stop the threat of world war there. None—not a single one—lifted a finger to help.

Moshe Dayan, the one eyed George Washington of Israel, masterminded the 1956 invasion of Egypt. And eleven years later, again led the men and women and children of Israel to glorious victory.

Meanwhile, the nations of the world continued to stand by. In June of 1967, when Israel fought with her back to the wall, our own United States government stated it would remain neutral in thought, word, and deed. Remain neutral at a time like that!

Did Israel give up? Did she lie down in defeat? No. Tiny Israel said she would go it alone—would again fight for her very survival. The rest is glorious history. It is the story of David slaying Goliath. It is the story of Israel's fantastic victory over the Arabs against overwhelming odds.

Those major blows struck in the first few hours go down in history as one of the greatest military achievements of all time. But the point is that Moshe Dayan and his brave troops and the brave people of Israel fought to win—to win through to complete victory. And Israel refused to settle for anything less.

Now I ask you, is it any wonder that tiny Israel, fighting for her air lifeline to the outside world—takes severe reprisals against those who would cut that lifeline to the outside world? Israel says she cannot accept the violation of her air routes. That this action by the enemy must stop. Israel says she will defend herself against aggression wherever it is planned and wherever it is carried out.

The terrorist band that struck and demolished an Israeli plane in Athens, operated out of Beirut. In Beirut is located the organization that carried out that dastardly deed. And from Beirut have come statements proclaiming Lebanon's intention of continuing such actions against the state of Israel.

Is it any wonder that the man on the street in Israel loudly proclaims, "The reprisal against Beirut had to be performed. It had to be done. First, one of our airlines was hijacked to Algeria. Then another was attacked in a foreign airport. I say we had to do it, and to hell with world opinion."

Whatever the outcome of current deliberations at the U.N. Security Council, the fact does remain—tiny Israel, threatened thousands of times since she became a state, has learned she can rely only upon her own people to defend herself against an enemy determined to destroy her. And surely at a moment when the U.N. refuses to condemn Russia for her seizure of Czechoslovakia—at a moment in our history when our own nation's commercial airlines are being hijacked, almost on schedule, and flown to Communist Cuba—at a moment when the crew of the *Pueblo* returns to tell of being

beaten, kicked, and abused by the Communists—at a moment when our troops are bogged down in a no win war, if you please, against the Communists in Vietnam—at a moment such as this, surely one must reach out to embrace and to applaud the efforts of a nation that has the guts and has the determination to say to its enemies, "If you insist on continuing your warlike activities against us, if you continue your acts of violence upon us—then we will answer in kind."

And what is more, the brave Israelis mean exactly what they say. In a world of double-talk and hypocrisy, the Israelis keep their word.

THE MIRACLE OF ISRAEL (By George Putnam)

It is this reporter's opinion that again the Soviet Union—yes, the same bloodthirsty Communists who manipulated Gamal Nasser into an attempted genocide against the men, women and children of Israel—again, these Communists are busy behind the scenes creating dissension and bloodshed in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union pushed Gamal Nasser—the Hitler of the Nile—to the very brink of his own and his nation's complete destruction. And I think it should be apparent to anyone that Nasser, who talked big and fought little, was acting as Moscow's pawn and that Israel was only the first objective in a Communist determination to take over the entire Middle East.

But the Arabs should know now—as the Israelis have known from the start—that Communist Russia has no love for Arab or for the Jew or anybody else. The aim of Communist Russia is—by manipulation, by cloak and dagger operations, or by somebody else's war—to gain complete control of the vast oil resources of that entire region. That's the key word—oil—in the Middle East.

The Russian fleet has not moved into the Mediterranean for a gin rummy tournament. And as long as it remains there, the threat to peace in the Middle East is going to remain there.

Meanwhile, it is America that has continued to vacillate—continued to allow a vacuum to exist. This at a moment when all America need to do to avoid a dangerous confrontation or full scale war in the Middle East is to say that the United States will guarantee the boundaries of Israel against any and all who might be reckless enough to attempt to destroy Israel.

Now, isn't it significant that the Communists, having again created an explosive situation—a situation in which two Middle East nations are at each other's throat—now run to the United Nations Security Council, dominated by the African bloc, and there plead for sanctions against Israel—plead for a ban on all civil air traffic into and out of Israel.

Aha—that's what Russia wants. To cut off Israel from the outside world—to eliminate all civil air traffic—all air commerce to and from Israel. That's what the Communists want.

Now, instead of siding with the enemy, I think it is time the United States, as the most powerful nation on the face of the earth, tell the world that we know exactly who the troublemakers are. It is time the United States tell the world that this present irritation in the Middle East is not a single incident unrelated to the overall and consuming problem—the determination of Soviet Russia to create any kind of a dilemma, any kind of chaos, vacuum, in that area and then to step in and take over.

It is time the United States stand up before the United Nations and speak in terms the bullies of the world will understand—tell them it was not the Israeli who threatened to destroy their neighbors—to commit a genocide upon their neighbors and their

wives and their children. It was not the Israelis who threatened to push their neighbors into the sea. It was not the Israelis who shut off the Gulf of Aqaba to world traffic. It was not the Israelis who threatened to reduce their neighbors' homes and villages to ruins.

No, these were the threats—the continuing, every day threats of Gamal Nasser and his Arab cutthroats, who vowed to destroy every Jew—man, woman, and child. It is Gamal Nasser and his fellow cutthroats who have sworn to never recognize the State of Israel—never—and to never rest until it is wiped from the face of the earth.

It is time the United States speak loud and clear—stand tall and straight—before the United Nations and tell the entire world that we know that the key to the white heat situation in the Middle East rests—not in Tel Aviv or Cairo—or Beirut or Amman—or Damascus—but that the key to the situation rests in the—Kremlin.

It is this reporter's opinion that the world must be reminded again and again that the present trouble in the Middle East is not a single, unrelated incident. No, it is part of the continuing pattern of sabotage, commando raids, guerrilla warfare, and economic war that is constantly being waged against Israel, and I think it is a miracle that the tiny state of Israel has managed to survive for twenty years. It will be a miracle if it is able to survive another twenty years.

But we in the United States—as do the Israelis—have a common belief—it is a fervent belief—in democracy. And we also believe that under a democracy, we can work miracles—and with our help, the miracle of Israel will continue to live.

JUST PLAIN GUTS (By George Putnam)

It is this reporter's opinion that the hypocrites representing the Kremlin at the United Nations in New York, and at the diplomatic bargaining tables around the world, are acting completely true to form, and therefore, we should reveal them for exactly what they are.

We are now provided with an excellent opportunity to expose the Communists as the greatest tyrants of all time—murderers—cutthroats—international gangsters—who have grabbed and swallowed a third of the earth's surface and half a billion freedom loving people.

Right now we have the opportunity to challenge the Communists to truly concern themselves with settling many of the problems they have brought upon the world in which we live—the results of their dabbling in Korea, Hungary, Vietnam—and Berlin and Cuba and South America—and more recently, next door in Czechoslovakia—that it's time to tell Russia to set free the eighteen captive nations of Europe before she shows such concern for the Arabs of the Middle East.

But instead of laying it on the line, and telling the world the Soviet Union couldn't care less about any of these people—least of all the Arabs in the Middle East—instead of pointing out that Russia wants control of the Mediterranean and Middle East oil—instead of showing the world and proving the point that Communism is at the root of most of this world's troubles—and that Russia is constantly fishing in troubled waters—instead of exposing the Russian Communists for prodding and arming Nasser and the warmongers of the Middle East—instead of labeling Russia the world's troublemaker, who will make sure there never will be peace in the world, because she is intent on taking over all of us—yes, instead of putting all these things on the record—instead of branding Communist Russia the world's aggressor—we and the British and our representatives continue to play the Russian

game—Russian roulette—and we are allowing Russia, at this moment, to accuse us of the very things the Communists are planning and scheming and perpetrating.

Today, the Communists accuse our United States Sixth Fleet of inspiring Israeli aggression, meanwhile claiming Soviet naval forces are in the Mediterranean to guard the interests of the Arab countries.

And again, it is the Kremlin that accuses the Israelis of being singularly guilty of aggression. Only the brilliant Israeli statesman-diplomat, Abba Eban, has the intestinal fortitude to stand up and call the Russian peace overtures what they are—out and out phony.

The United States cannot straddle the fence—play both ends against the middle—supply both warring factions with the weapons of war—meanwhile stating that we will maintain strict neutrality in thought, word, and deed.

It is Nasser who has told us to go drink sea water, which is the same as telling us to go to hell. It is Nasser who has thumbed his nose at our government and at our people.

So let's face it. The United States has one friend in the Middle East, and that friend has asked so very little from us. That friend, standing alone, surrounded on all sides by enemies—her back to the sea—that friend is Israel. Her enemies have threatened again and again to push her into the sea and to commit a genocide on every Israeli man, woman and child.

And with Russia's help—with the Communists' help—this could happen if the United States refuses now to take firm, strong action to guarantee the boundaries of Israel—the sanctity of its existence—the perpetration of the brave people of Israel.

Russia must be exposed now as the world's troublemaker. But I ask, where have we been? What have we allowed to happen in the last couple of years? Following the six day war in June, 1967, Soviet prestige suffered a gigantic blow. She could no longer be known as the protector of the so-called National Liberation Front and the movement. She had failed to go to the assistance of Nkrumah, Sukarno, Castro—and Nasser.

Red China, as I recall, had charged Moscow with being a coward. Egypt was in deep economic trouble. She had lost half of her oil holdings. The Arab military machine was crushed. The Sixth Fleet rested as a tremendous force in the Mediterranean. And we boasted as an ally the roughest, the toughest, the bravest nation in the Middle East—if not the world—Israel.

Israel's Abba Eban stood before the United Nations and he charged Russia with going beyond the bounds of human decency in comparing the Jews in the Middle East to the Nazis in Germany. And he reminded Russia's Kosygin that it was the Soviet Union which signed a non-aggression pact with Adolph Hitler. Said Abba Eban to Russia's Kosygin, man to man, face to face, "It is easier to fly to the moon than to reconstruct a broken egg."

This is the kind of posture—these are the kind of words that the Communists understand. How do I know? Kosygin walked out at the U.N. because he just couldn't take it.

But what became of that position? What became of that advantage? What became of that opportunity, won by the brave Israeli troops on the field of battle? What became of that great respect for Israel in the world?

"The more things change," my old professor used to say, "the more they appear to be the same." And too often, we seem to be back where we started.

But I think the Russians understand one word. America once showed it—Israel now has it—it was part of our heritage and our tradition. It may not be a pleasant word, but it's damned meaningful. The word is—guts!

MAURICE CHEVALIER

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, it is appropriate at this time to pay tribute to a remarkable man who at age 80, but still seemingly ageless, has completed one phase of his career. Many, including myself, consider him the best ambassador of good will France has sent to the United States in this century.

Recently featured in many American magazines, Maurice Chevalier is a man who belongs to the whole world as much as to his native France. He is not only a personal friend of mine and many other Americans, more importantly, he is a staunch and abiding friend of America, of which he has so great an understanding. He has, more than any other individual, performed a lasting service to both his own country and ours as an outstanding ambassador of good will—representing the American people in France, humanizing Americans to Frenchmen, easing the tensions of misunderstanding that have occasionally arisen between our respective Governments. His sensitivity to the relationship between France and America has resulted in a diplomatic performance far in excess of that expected of an entertainer, no matter how great his art. His potential as a future interpreter of the American he knows so well promises equally as much as his past endeavors have accomplished. In short, he is a good ambassador, a master of the art which is understanding people.

Indeed, it is the uncommon humanity of Maurice Chevalier that colors not only his career but, more profoundly, his person. He knows, and projects, a pure joy of living that awakens in his audience a feeling of goodness, of spontaneous well-being. His character is imbued with quality, dignity, and taste.

His career has spanned 70 of his 80 years. He is as inseparable from the Paris of which he is the timeless archetype as his "little sister"—the Eiffel Tower. Indeed, he exclaims, the little sister is 6 months younger than he. And yet, like her, he is oblivious to time, seemingly ageless.

To retire is the beginning of death—

He exclaims:

I am an old man who refuses to be an old man.

Thus he will continue to make records, to supervise television shows, to project the spirit of youth to his admirers. And he will, I am certain, assume with increasing effectiveness his role of public service, the humanizing influence which is his hallmark, the badge of his identity. Perhaps an American film producer will see the potential in the story of his remarkable life and his outlook on life.

He is a man who believes that the crime of loving is to forget; and, he explains, "I never forget." Nor is he likely to be forgotten. He has been the spirit of France, the essence of life well lived, far too long for his warmth and vitality

quickly to diminish in the eyes of the world. Nor does his Gallic spirit give evidence of diminishing. For, as he has said:

An artist carries on throughout his life a mysterious, uninterrupted conversation with his public.

That conversation has been an uninterrupted dialog of good will. The mystery lies only in his inability to feel the baser and petty grudges which occasionally plague the best of men.

I am proud of my friendship with Maurice Chevalier; and I anticipate many more years of rapport between the world and one of its greatest and most entertaining and most significant and beloved citizens.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing two far-reaching consumer protection bills. In doing so, it is only proper that I acknowledge an important role played by my good friend and colleague (Mr. ROSENTHAL) in his preparation.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS BILL

During the last several years, the Congress has enacted a large number of important consumer laws but without any consideration of how these laws, in toto, should be administered or by whom. Thirty-three Federal departments and agencies in Government are now administering some 260 consumer protection programs. These programs, proliferated as they are throughout the Government and almost always administered by agencies having overriding interests to protect, provide the American consumer with uneven and weak protection.

The steadily increasing body of consumer laws to be administered by the Federal Government is now beyond the efficient reach of any haphazard combination of agency appendages. This was of urban problems in 1965 when the Department of Housing and Urban Development was established; it was true of transportation problems in 1966 when the Department of Transportation was created; it is true today of consumer problems.

Two recent examples of the organizational weaknesses in the Federal consumer protection apparatus can be found in the administration of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and in title I of the Credit Production Act—Truth-in-Lending. Administration of the Packaging and Labeling Act is divided among three agencies—the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Department of Commerce. Responsibility for the enforcement of the Truth-in-Lending Act is vested in nine separate Federal agencies.

The lesson of public administration in the United States is that inefficient organization inhibits effective policy. If consumer protection at the Federal level is to

be truly effective, if gaps and duplications in consumer programs are to be eliminated, then a single institutional framework for action must be created—a Cabinet-level department devoted exclusively to representing and protecting the consumer interest.

BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF STATE AND LOCAL CONSUMER PROTECTION OFFICES

It has long been evident to me that consumer protection, like so many other areas of great public concern, requires a joint and cooperative effort by Government at the Federal, State, and local levels. Because commerce is frequently interstate in character, it is inevitable that the fortunes of consumers will be affected, for good or for ill, by Federal Consumer programs, practices and procedures.

Nevertheless, it is essential that consumer problems of a State and local nature must be handled effectively at the State and local levels.

There is substantial evidence that consumer protection efforts at the State and local levels are being hampered by weaknesses and inefficiencies in the Federal consumer protection apparatus, and that consumer protection at the Federal level is being hampered by the absence of effective consumer protection at State and local levels. As a result Federal and local agencies assigned with consumer responsibilities are deprived of valuable opportunities to exchange information and ideas relative to fraudulent, deceptive, or unfair practices that disadvantage consumers.

The concept of providing Federal financial assistance to the States and localities for the establishment or strengthening of consumer protection offices is not new. However, the legislation which I propose avoids, I believe, many of the weaknesses of prior bills on this subject.

For example, prior bills:

First. Have vested authority for the administration of the consumer grant program in either the Department of Commerce—an agency devoted to the cause of producers—or the Federal Trade Commission—an agency which can barely administer existing consumer protection laws. My bill vests in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through his new Office of Consumer Services, the responsibility for administering the grant program;

Second. Have provided for a single statewide consumer office only and, thereby, would have effectively blocked progressive local governments from participating in the program. My bill authorizes the participation of both State and local governments.

Third. Have authorized Federal funds on a nationwide basis only thereby raising the possibility that the more aggressive States would monopolize all or most of the funds. My bill sets aside Federal dollars for each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico on an equitable basis until such time as a State or local government within a State chooses not to participate in the plan. This, I believe, will encourage the establishment or strengthening of consumer offices throughout the country in all 50 States and Puerto Rico;

Fourth. Have attempted to define each and every type of action that would constitute a violation of the rights of consumers in the marketplace. My bill, within certain guidelines to be enforced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, provides the States and localities with maximum latitude in deciding what type of act violates the rights of consumers and what type of consumer program is most likely to effectively combat such violations.

Fifth. Have excluded worthy non-profit private organizations from participation in the grant program. My bill authorizes their participation when they are approved by the State or local government.

The summaries of the two consumer protection bills follow:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FEDERAL BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES AND LOCALITIES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF CONSUMER PROTECTION OFFICES—THIS BILL AMENDS THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1968

Sec. 701(a) (1) and (2). This section finds that protection of the consumer interest in America requires cooperation and coordination of and a joint effort by government at the Federal, State and local levels; and states that the purpose of the Act is to strengthen cooperation and coordination in consumer protection by funding Federal financial assistance to the States and localities for consumer offices.

(b) Authorizes the appropriation of the sum of \$5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; and \$7.5 million and \$9 million for the two successive fiscal years.

Sec. 702. Definitions

Sec. 703. Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through his Office of Consumer Services, to make grants pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

Sec. 704. Directs the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, upon request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to perform certain studies and develop information relative to the effectiveness of State and local consumer protection offices and the adequacy of Federal and State cooperation in the consumer protection field.

Sec. 705(a) (1). Allots to each of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for the purpose of establishing or strengthening consumer offices, \$50,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970 and \$75,000 and \$90,000 respectively for the 2 successive fiscal years. Ten thousand dollars is allotted to each possession for each of the three related fiscal years.

(2) From the remainder of the sums appropriated for each of the three stated fiscal years, each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico is authorized to receive an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population of the State and Puerto Rico bears to the population of all the States and Puerto Rico.

(b) Provides that within each of the three named fiscal years, the unused portion of any State's allotment shall be available for reallocation to the other States.

Sec. 706. Provides that a State or local government shall be eligible to receive its Federal allotment if—

(1) the consumer protection office has been established or designated;

(2) the consumer protection office has submitted a Consumer Plan which meets the requirements of Sec. 707;

(3) Federal funds will not supplant State or local funds in those instances when an operating consumer protection office is in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 707(a). Requires that the Consumer Plan, pursuant to which the consumer office shall operate,

(1) be in such form and in such detail as may be required by regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; but affords the States and localities wide latitude in establishing consumer programs and activities;

(2) provides for detailed cooperation between Federal consumer protection agencies and States and local consumer protection offices;

(3) sets forth appropriate fiscal controls and accounting procedures;

(4) prescribes the Federal share of the cost of the consumer office, which shall not exceed 75%.

(c) Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to withdraw or withhold funds from consumer offices which do not substantially comply with the approved Consumer Plan.

Sec. 708. When the total dollar amount necessary to fund the Consumer Plans of more than one applicant within a State exceeds the allotment available to that State, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall select which plan(s) shall be funded in accordance with priorities which he shall establish by regulation.

Sec. 709. Establishes "due process" procedures in those instances in which a proposed Consumer Plan is rejected by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or funds are withdrawn from a Plan previously approved.

Sec. 710. Requirement for annual report from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on administration of the Act.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 6629—A BILL TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Sections 1-4. Title, Establishment, Officers and their duties.

Section 5. Sets forth the broad functions of the Department:

To protect and promote the interests of the people of the United States as consumers of goods and services;

To present the consumer viewpoint before federal departments and agencies in the formulation of policies of the federal government;

To represent the interests of consumers of the United States in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies;

To assemble, evaluate and disseminate information helpful to consumers.

Section 6. Transfers all functions, powers and duties of certain agencies or parts of agencies with major consumer responsibilities to the Department as follows: (1) All functions, powers, and duties vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Secretary of Commerce by the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (PL 89-755; 80 Stat. 1296); and (2) All functions, powers and duties under Title I (Truth-in-Lending Act) of the Credit Protection Act (PL 90-321); (3) Those elements of the Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, which relate to the standardization, grading, or classing of agricultural commodities for consumer consumption; (4) All functions, powers and duties vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act which relate to establishing for any food a reasonable definition and standard of identity, standard of quality, and/or standards of fill of container and the misbranding of food; (5) The division of prices and cost of living at the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor; (6) The Home Economics Research Branch and the Human Nutrition Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Section 7. Authorizes the Department to

appear before any regulatory agency and most courts of the United States on matters or proceedings affecting the interests of consumers within the United States.

Authorizes the Department to appear before any department or independent agency of the United States whenever there is pending any matter the determination of which affects substantially the interests of consumer within the United States.

Section 8. Requires the Department to receive, evaluate and take appropriate action with respect to complaints concerning commercial and trade practices detrimental to the interests of consumers. Action to secure relief for a complainant would be taken by the Department in those instances when the subject matter of the complaint falls within the Department's jurisdiction. Complaints involving the jurisdiction of other departments and agencies would be referred to the appropriate agency.

Similar action would be taken or requested by the Department whenever the Department received information disclosing a probable violation of (1) any law of the United States, (2) any rule or order of any administrative officer or regulatory agency of the United States or (3) any judgments, decree, or order of any court of the United States, relating to the interests of consumers.

Section 9. Establishes within the Department an office of consumer information presided over by an Assistant Secretary. This office would be responsible for providing consumers with information and data concerning (1) the functions and duties of the Department, and (2) problems encountered by consumers generally within the United States, including particular practices which are detrimental to the interests of consumers, (3) information within the possession of the federal government relating to consumer products.

Section 10. Establishes as a semi-autonomous unit within the Department a National Consumer Information Foundation. The Foundation would administer a voluntary program under which manufacturers would submit their products for testing against specified performance characteristics. The comparative results of these tests would be indicated on information tags affixed to the product in order that the consumer might be better able to judge the relative merits of competing products.

Section 11. Establishes within the Department an Office of Consumer Safety headed by an Assistant Secretary. This office shall conduct a continuing study of the safety of household products and shall identify and publish information concerning these products determined to present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public.

Section 12. Establishes an Institute for Consumer Research, the major responsibilities of which are to test products for the Consumer Information Foundation and make recommendations to other agencies of the government as to the need for consumer research of various kinds.

Section 13. Requires the Department to conduct economic surveys and investigations with respect to a wide range of consumer interests.

Sections 14-17. Administrative services, saving provision, definitions and appropriations.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress approxi-

mately 100 Federal revenue-sharing bills were introduced. Several similar measures have already been introduced this session, and I intend to reintroduce my bill within the next few weeks.

I think it appropriate that a resolution introduced in the Tennessee General Assembly calling for enactment of a Federal revenue-sharing proposal be printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

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

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 8

(By Huettel, Dunavant, Weldon, Ashe, and Krieg)

A resolution to petition the President and the Congress of the United States to consider legislation leading to the annual return of a portion of federal tax revenue to the states without conditions or guidelines

Whereas, the fiscal needs of the states have reached such high proportions and are ever increasing; and

Whereas, the high rate of federal taxation on the citizens, businesses, and industries of the states makes further adequate taxation by the states for these needs extremely burdensome; and

Whereas, the priority of needs and the equitable disbursement of funds for each state can best be determined by the legislature of each state; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 86th General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate Concurring, That the President and the Congress of the United States be petitioned to consider legislation leading to the annual return of a portion of federal tax revenue to the states exclusive of conditions or guidelines.

WASHINGTON TO BE FOOTBALL CAPITAL: LOMBARDI

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the advent of Vince Lombardi means a great deal to the thousands of football fans, not only here in the District of Columbia, but throughout the country. Coach Lombardi's "commitment to excellence" offers a note of encouragement to all of us who have waited in vain for something to cheer about on those long Sunday afternoons at the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium.

Martin F. Nolan, the astute national correspondent of the Boston Globe, pointed out that as the "new director of policy planning for offense and defense", Coach Lombardi's regime "would alleviate suffering among the most destitute of 'forgotten Americans'—followers of the Washington Redskins football team."

At this point in the RECORD, I include Mr. Nolan's observations taken from today's Boston Globe:

WASHINGTON TO BE FOOTBALL CAPITAL: LOMBARDI

(By Martin F. Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—The most forceful public figure here since Teddy Roosevelt announced his "get tough" policy yesterday.

Vincent T. Lombardi, new director of the bureau of policy planning for offense and defense, indicated that his regime would alleviate suffering among the most destitute of "forgotten Americans"—followers of the Washington Redskins football team.

The new head coach, general manager and executive vice president of the Redskins romped through his first press conference here, an elfin grin creasing his broad flat face.

Lombardi's left-wing philosophy is generally confined to that side of the won-and-lost column, but yesterday he was as liberal as a Manhattan congressman, freely forecasting that Washington would soon be "the football capital of the world."

He offered one note of conservatism, saying "despite what you may have heard, I can't walk on the Potomac, even when it's frozen."

Freed from his chores at Green Bay, Wis., Lombardi was as blunt as conscience would allow. "There are great and wonderful people at Green Bay and you guys should say that," he said.

Then why had he left? "The East appealed to me. I've been an Easterner all my life. And the city appealed to me. Washington is the Capital."

"Ed Williams appealed to me," he said of the Redskins' president, who sat near Lombardi during the press session at the Chandelier Room of the Sheraton Carlton Hotel.

As a high-powered lawyer, Williams has cowed many a jury; yesterday he seemed as meek as a law student in tow with Clarence Darrow.

What will be the coach's working relationship with the club's president, Lombardi was asked. Williams piped up for the only time: "I asked him if I can have my same season's seats next year." Lombardi added "I now have Mr. Williams' office," thus ending all doubt of Lombardian hegemony.

Lombardi explained why he returned to active coaching: "It was the biggest mistake I ever made, leaving the field. It was stupid." And had Mrs. Lombardi dutifully comforted him during his frustrating year of general managership at Green Bay? "She told me I was a damn fool to give up coaching. She's glad I'm going back to it."

The Wizard of the Packers succeeds Otto Graham, former quarterback of the Cleveland Browns, whose first efforts at pro coaching failed to live up to expectations. Nearly every Monday, Graham would explain the team's loss to "mental errors" on the part of his charges.

Lombardi too is an amateur psychoanalyst, but seems less tolerant of error than Graham. "Being hard nosed isn't physical. It's mental. I mean, when you put on your pants, you should be physically tough to begin with."

Later, Lombardi almost blushed when asked if he were as tough as his reputation. "No, not really. I'm a soft guy at heart."

On his favorite subject, a running game, the former Fordham "block of granite" lapsed enthusiastically. "I get a great deal of pleasure out of coaching a running game. I personally like it. It makes you a little more hard nosed. You know, you don't have to have great runners. You do have to have great blockers."

Among the Packers, Lombardi had such—Forest Gregg, Bob Skoronski and Jerry Kramer, whose "Green Bay Diary" placed him on the best seller list.

The most famous Washington Redskin is Sonny Jurgensen, the former Duke ace, whom Lombardi psychoanalyzed as "a great quarterback, a great passer with great receivers, a quarterback with courage."

In Washington, Jurgensen is noted more for his flamboyant behavior after hours and a waistline of consequent proportions.

In that connection, someone asked Lombardi if there might be more "distractions" in Washington than in Green Bay.

"I know what you mean by distractions" the coach replied. "The city of Washington may have a lot of bars, but Green Bay has 15 times as many. They have one on every corner and two or three in between. We'll handle things all right and have as few rules as we can get away with."

Despite any Redskins' past peccadilloes, he said, "everyone starts fresh. It's the only decent way, it's the only possible way—everyone will be a new face."

Will Vince Lombardi have a new face? The answer from a glowering, halfgrown, half-grin: "I don't think that's necessary."

THE SITUATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA—FEEDING THE FLAMES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, when the Soviets moved into Czechoslovakia last year, many foreign observers felt that traditional Communist suppression would fail. Thus far this view has been upheld, for a new Czech spirit is in evidence.

An editorial published in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., on February 3 points out that the spirit of the Czech people, especially the youth, remains undaunted, and that the public sorrowing for young Jan Palach indicates that the Czech reformers are not through yet.

The editorial further states that, although pleadings by older onlookers to avoid trouble are almost certainly a reflection of the official line, young Czechs, well schooled in the police state mentality, detect an element of sophistry in the argument.

Mr. President, perhaps the most profound statement in this excellent editorial is found in the last sentence, which states:

Freedom, not slavery, is the natural state of man; and the desire to be free burns most passionately where freedom is most passionately suppressed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Feeding the Flames" in the State, February 3, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FEEDING THE FLAMES

When Soviet tanks and troops moved into Czechoslovakia last year, many foreign observers expressed the view that traditional Communist suppression would fail. A new Czech spirit had been born, the reasoning went, and Soviet occupation would serve chiefly to foment even more passionate resentments. So far, events have proved them right.

The Dubcek government, concerned for its life, has made the concessions demanded of it, and the Russian troops have been withdrawn. But the Czech spirit remains, undaunted by Russian bayonets. The self-immolation of young Jan Palach and the public sorrowing in his memory are clear indications that Czech reformers are not through yet.

Even leaders of the "establishment"—university rectors and other notables who owe

their lucrative status to the Communist Party apparatus—have joined in the mourning. Their participation very plainly is intended to moderate anti-Soviet protests, but the protests have occurred anyway and on a scale large enough to suggest that the protest movement will not be so easily controlled.

"Several times Sunday," United Press International reports, "teenagers started heated arguments with police cordoning off the monument of St. Wencelas, which had become a memorial to Palach, and ignored pleas by older onlookers to avoid trouble." Dozens of the demonstrators were arrested, according to a government announcement, but hundreds participated in the action and escaped.

Statements by the "older onlookers" almost certainly were a reflection of the official line, which all along has insisted with some logic that anything short of sheepish submission may result in renewed occupation. Young Czechs, well schooled in the police state mentality, detect an element of sophistry in the argument.

The weekly newspaper *Zitrek* summed up the youthful viewpoint in an article last week. "We are still administered," the paper said, "by frightened bureaucrats, angry, aging politicians who still maintain their influence and, while speaking of democracy, would really prefer to reintroduce the whip."

It is an analysis that may not be dismissed out of hand. The Dubcek regime first introduced reforms at the insistence of restless elements whose number was such that they could not be safely ignored. Then came the Russians, and it became safer to ignore Czech reformers than to anger the Soviets. But the restlessness remains. It grows, in fact. It feeds daily on the hopelessness engendered by Dubcek's accommodation with the Russian Communists.

What remains unanswered is whether the new Czech spirit can be contained short of a complete return to old-fashioned police state methods. And even if the Czechs are beaten into submission, the Communist dilemma will remain. Freedom, not slavery, is the natural state of man; and the desire to be free burns most passionately where freedom is most passionately suppressed.

DEATH OF THOMAS W. DELZELL, RETIRED CHAIRMAN, PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

HON. MARK HATFIELD

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, one of the leaders of the private utility industry of the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Thomas W. Delzell, died recently after many years of service to the Portland General Electric Co. Mr. Delzell was an avid advocate of private enterprise and also cooperated with the Federal Government on hydroelectric projects in the Columbia River Basin.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* editorials about Mr. Delzell published in the *Oregonian* and the *Oregon Journal*.

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

[From the *Oregon Journal*, Jan. 24, 1969]

DELZELL HELPED BUILD REGION

Thomas W. Delzell, former chief executive of Portland General Electric Co. (PGE) was the kind of man who, in his own way, helped rebuild the integrity of the depression-

damaged free enterprise system and prove at the same time that free enterprisers have a sense of social responsibility.

Mr. Delzell's rise to an executive post with the Portland-based private utility followed eight years of service as an independent trustee, appointed, along with R. L. Clark, by the U.S. District Court to reorganize the bankrupt Portland Electric Power Co.

What was then described as one of the most complicated power company reorganizations in the history of the West left PGE, in 1948, free and clear of old scandals and encumbrances but still forced to prove itself at the time of a rising tide of public power.

Along with others in the company, Mr. Delzell, who became chairman of the board and chief executive officer, helped PGE prove itself and it became both a thriving enterprise and a corporate "good citizen."

Not only did the company concern itself with problems relating to the over-all well-being of the community and region. Mr. Delzell himself gave vigorous leadership to civic, educational and social welfare activities.

While he remained thoroughly a private enterprise man, he came to see that ideological conflicts carried to an extreme could damage the region's progress. It was during his tenure that PGE, along with Pacific Power & Light Co., began the steps which have led now to private-public power cooperation on a scale that opens up bright, new vistas for the region.

Mr. Delzell, a product of the depression era, knew what it was to be down as well as up. Friends who remember him through bad times and good say he was always a kindly and decent man in both his business and social relationships.

This quality, along with his obvious talents, is one of the reasons Mr. Delzell, who died the other day, leaves a legacy of both affection and respect, as well as appreciation for the very real contribution he made to the advancement of this community and region.

[From the *Oregonian*, Jan. 22, 1969]

THOMAS W. DELZELL

The death of Thomas W. Delzell, retired chairman of the board of Portland General Electric Co., following closely the death of Paul B. McKee, his counterpart at Pacific Power & Light Co., marks the close of an era of the electric utility industry in Oregon and the Northwest.

The period in which these two executives and vigorous civic leaders thrived was one in which the investor-owned utilities emerged from the Great Depression and the stigma of the "Insull era," fought off the burgeoning public power movement and created competitive, highly efficient and highly profitable businesses under public regulation but private control.

Tom Delzell, who entered the utility business at California-Oregon Power Co., was appointed one of two independent trustees of the failing Portland Electric Power Co. in 1939. The company, renamed Portland General Electric and divested of its streetcars and railroad, survived. Mr. Delzell became board chairman and PGE grew and prospered as it supplied the energy for homes, businesses and industries at rates competitive with those offered by public power in the neighboring state of Washington.

Mr. Delzell fought vigorously to obtain for private utilities a "fair share" of power from the federal dams on the Columbia. Failing to impress Congress with need for a change in the public power preference clause, Mr. Delzell not only increased his company's hydropower generating capacity—moving from the Clackamas and Willamette to the Deschutes River—but joined his company with public, non-federal power agencies in joint financing of great dams on the Columbia.

When Mr. Delzell left the PGE chairmanship in 1965—after the best year to that time in PGE's history, \$57.1 million in gross reve-

nues—the new era of cooperative agreement among private utilities, publicly owned utilities and the federal agencies was already under way. The concept of joint financing and power interchange providing the life blood of regional growth now is being carried much further by such younger leaders as PGE's President Frank Warren and PP&L's President Don Frisbee.

Tom Delzell, like Paul McKee, was a fighter against public ownership and government domination. But he came to see—as did his earlier opponents in the public utility field—that the greatest benefits for his own company and the people of the Northwest lay in cooperation. His own contribution was of great value, not only to business and government, but to the community and state projects and functions to which he gave much of his time.

THE PROPOSED REGULATION OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on the recently proposed regulation of the Federal Communications Commission which would ban all cigarette advertising from the broadcast media.

To my mind, the most unfortunate, and most inherently dangerous aspect of this proposal is the assumption, by the FCC, of the answers to many questions which have as yet not otherwise been adequately answered. And if all of the assumed answers of the Commission should be correct, and I submit that is not likely to be the case, this is not the sound and appropriate approach to solving a major health problem. The obvious inequities and implications of this proposal are too numerous and too patent to discuss them all now. But consider the most significant. I cannot understand the theory of equity and propriety which would sustain the illegality of advertising cigarettes on radio and television only, while leaving it unaffected in the other media. Furthermore, how can any advertising be made illegal while it is not illegal to manufacture, sell, possess, or use cigarettes? This latter assumption is especially difficult to understand when there has been no effort or suggestion that the Federal Government should regulate these aspects of the industry and society.

Consider also that if we permit the FCC's ban on the advertising of cigarettes to stand, would not that agency also be justified in prohibiting altogether the appearance of or mention of smoking in the broadcast media? How far would this have to be extended before we would all call it what it in fact is, Federal censorship?

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt whatever that the FCC is well intentioned in its proposal and that it has the best interest of the Nation uppermost. But if cigarette smoking is as dangerous to health as the Commission implies, then surely there are more effective and more appropriate means of improving and protecting the health of the Nation than censorship.

Mr. Speaker, I am most reliably informed that if only a small fraction of the tax revenue derived from the sale of cigarettes were to be invested in cancer research, a cure, or means for preventing cancer, would be forthcoming in a very short time.

If this is true, imagine the speed with which a breakthrough might be obtained if the Federal Government and the tobacco industry were to jointly sponsor an intensified effort to find a cure for cancer, and to determine if the harmful effects of cigarette smoking, if any, could be eliminated. Certainly this would be an example in the finest tradition of government and industry cooperating to solve problems of mutual concern and of aiding one of the most significant humanitarian endeavors of our time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress, instead of letting the restrictions imposed on the regulatory agencies expire, thereby letting each to independently pursue its own pet plan for solving the Nation's problems, let us maintain and exercise our appropriate responsibility in this most important matter. Let us strongly urge, insist if need be, that the administration and the tobacco industry jointly underwrite immediately a crash research program in cancer to find the cures and the scientific means of preventing cancer, and let us do it without further delay or debate.

NEW CAREERS AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, perhaps one of the most important but as yet unheralded concepts in the field of manpower training and development is that of new careers. Although woven into the fabric of many of our laws, including the Vocational Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it has yet to receive the attention and consideration that is its due. One of the leading experts in the field of new careers is Dr. Russell A. Nixon of the Center for the Study of the Unemployed at the Graduate School of Social Work, New York University.

Last November Dr. Nixon made the keynote speech at the research utilization conference on "Rehabilitation in Poverty Settings" conducted by the Department of Rehabilitation and Special Education of Northeastern University, Boston, Mass., in collaboration with the Social and Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Although broad in scope, the speech sheds considerable light on the field of new careers.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Nixon's speech, entitled "Poverty in the United States—Some Implications for Rehabilitation Research and Action," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES—SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR REHABILITATION RESEARCH AND ACTION

(By Russell A. Nixon, Ph. D., New York University)

This conference which brings together personnel and perspectives of the nation's rehabilitation and anti-poverty programs is very timely and relevant to our most pressing national problems. Its initiators and planners are to be congratulated. We are meeting at a time when, for a variety of reasons, a significant convergence is developing between vocational rehabilitation and the manpower/anti-poverty programs of the country. It is a time of critical over-all evaluation of the effectiveness of national efforts to end poverty and poverty-creating unemployment. This is also a time when a major new Congressional mandate has just been given to the rehabilitation services requiring them to help meet the vocational needs of those disabled by social and economic handicaps—the so-called "hard core"—structural unemployed—and to reach more deeply into the ranks of poverty to serve the traditional target population with physical and mental handicaps.

The continued existence—after 92 months of uninterrupted economic advance—of massive economic privation caused primarily by the lack of good and realistic employment opportunities for everyone is irrevocably high on our national agenda. Election results and variations in official and political commitments cannot really change this emphasis. The dynamite of public and private poverty lies with a thousand fuses under every city. Studying those areas where the fuses were lit in 1967, the bipartisan National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders concluded:

"Pervasive unemployment and underemployment are the most persistent and serious grievances in minority areas. They are inextricably linked to the problem of civil disorder. Despite growing federal expenditures for manpower development and training programs . . . about two million—white and non-white—are permanently unemployed. About ten million are underemployed, of whom 6.5 million work full time for wages below the poverty line . . ." (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March 1, 1968).

For almost a decade the country has been engaged in extensive study, legislative action, program implementation and experimentation aimed at the poverty and manpower problems of the disadvantaged quarter of our population. It was in 1959 that Senator Eugene McCarthy's (D-Minn.) Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems with Dr. Sar Levitan as its Research Director, held wide ranging hearings and recommended national action to combat unemployment. There followed a whole series of legislative enactments: The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act in 1961, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, and a series of civil rights, education, health, urban affairs, and other manpower related laws. During this almost 10 year period many poor persons have received valuable assistance, government and other concerned persons have performed some extraordinary services, much experience has been had and valuable lessons have been learned. But with all this, two grave facts must be confronted:

First—The Poverty Cycle has not been broken. The latest analysis by Mollie Orshansky of the Social Security Board tells us that in 1966 fifty million Americans—25 percent of the total population—were "economically deprived." This income level is described by Miss Orshansky as one that "by no means guarantees that diets will be adequate,

(while) families spending less are more likely to have diets falling below the recommended allowances for some important nutrients." (Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile", *Social Security Bulletin*, Jan. 1965, p. 6.) It includes the categories "poor" and "near poor" with a typical four person family annual income of less than \$4,300. Public assistance recipients in the 50 states now total almost 10 million persons compared with less than 8 million in 1963. For example, in New York City, 1968 welfare costs have become the biggest single budget item taking 23 percent of total City revenue, and soon one million New Yorkers, one of every eight, will be on welfare.

Second—Structural "hard-core" unemployment has not been significantly reduced. Indeed, for major "hard-core" categories such as non-white youth, "there has been a drastic deterioration . . . since the fifties" (R. A. Gordon, "Unemployment Patterns with 'Full Employment,'" *Industrial Relations*, October 1968, p. 62). In the slum areas adult and youth non-white and Puerto Rican sub-employment is at a shocking level, little changed from 1960. (op. cit., pp. 64-66)

The remarkable fact about this stubborn continuation of "hard-core" unemployment is that it has been maintained between 1961 and 1967 while the official unemployment rate fell from 6.7 percent to 3.8 percent, while 9.5 million new jobs were created (civilian and armed forces employment), and while total unemployment declined from 4.7 to 3 million persons.

Since 1960 there have been two stages of development in the overall balance of employment and unemployment: from 1961 to the end of 1965 the official unemployment rate decreased from 6.7 percent to 3.8 percent, a yearly reduction of about .6 of a percentage point; from late 1965 until the present time the unemployment rate leveled off at 3.8 percent, the level for 1966, 1967, and 1968. Thus, for three years now, the economy has been at the level of less than 4% unemployment, generally accepted as at least the first approximation of full employment. At this level, national economic policy has turned to avoiding any general reduction in unemployment achieved through increasing overall economic demand. As the President's Council of Economic Advisors put it in their 1967 Annual Report (page 99):

" . . . the experience of 1966 clearly suggests that expanding demand cannot lower the unemployment rate much below the present level without bringing an unacceptable rate of price increase. Under present conditions, an over-all unemployment rate close to 4 percent appears to be associated with an approximate balance between supply and demand in most labor markets."

Debate continues as to whether economic policy should aim at an even tighter labor market with unemployment totals reduced another percentage point or two, by 700,000-1,500,000 persons, in spite of the inflationary threat this expansion might cause.

The Business Council for example, has recently suggested a rise of unemployment to 5.5 percent, an addition of about 1.5 million unemployed, in order to stabilize the price level. Obviously, how this debate is settled is of great importance to all manpower and vocational rehabilitation efforts.

But for the time being, attention can be focused on the residual unemployment remaining when the overall jobless rate is below 4 percent, on the "hard-core" structural unemployed which the economic boom-war economy-antipoverty-manpower syndrome has not been able to dissolve in the past ten years. Vocational rehabilitation has been challenged to join its experience, philosophy, resources and processes in combination with existing manpower-antipoverty programs to meet the problem. That challenge, that obligation, is explicit in the major 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

A NEW ANTI-POVERTY THRUST—VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Congress has added a new and extremely enlarged dimension to vocational rehabilitation. The main features of this new legislative mandate are:

First—Major rehabilitation services are now to be supplied for disadvantaged persons whose employability is impaired by social and economic handicaps;

Second—Vocational rehabilitation is to become more directly involved in general labor market problems and procedures, with enlarged "vocational evaluation and work adjustment" functions, new on-the-job training arrangements with private employers, and increased emphasis on job development.

Third—A strong new emphasis on extending all vocational rehabilitation services into the ghetto, for both urban and rural poor, and to the especially severely handicapped.

Fourth—New Career-nonprofessional job opportunities are to be developed to meet manpower needs of the rehabilitation and other human services, to provide new employment opportunities for the handicapped, and to improve the rehabilitation service delivery system, especially as it relates to the socio-economic disadvantaged.

In an entirely new section, the 1968 Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments provide for "vocational evaluation and work adjustment services . . . to disadvantaged persons" who are defined as "individuals disadvantaged by reason of their youth or advanced age, low educational attainment, ethnic or cultural factors, prison or delinquency records, or other conditions which constitute a barrier to employment."

The services to be provided include both a preliminary and a thorough diagnostic study to determine service needs, and appraisal of the individuals' vocational potential including work sample testing, "any other goods or services necessary to evaluate employability," and finally "outreach, referral, and advocacy."

Two observations can be made regarding this new legislative provision:

First—The definition of disadvantaged persons now included in the vocational rehabilitation legislation is a complete and clear description of what is generally referred to as the "hard-core" unemployed—the residual section of the counted or potential labor force remaining unemployed at a time of general "full employment." It is the employability and employment—the vocational rehabilitation—of this residual group which is the main problem and the main purpose of existing manpower and human resources programs.

Second—The services to be provided—outreach, recruitment, employability and vocational diagnosis, work sample testing, and referral—are the essential and very major initial steps of any manpower program aimed at the "hard-core" unemployed. They prepare the way for training, job development, and placement to complete the manpower process.

Intimately related to this new dimension of rehabilitation service is the New Careers Amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to "make grants to State vocational rehabilitation agencies and other public and private nonprofit agencies to enable them to develop new programs to recruit and train individuals for new career opportunities in order to provide manpower in programs serving handicapped individuals and to upgrade or expand those services." Such grants are also authorized "to recruit and train handicapped individuals to provide them with new career opportunities in the fields of rehabilitation, health, welfare, public safety, and law enforcement, and other appropriate public services employment."

It is essential to recognize that this "New Career" provision has a very special and well

defined meaning—initiated and defined by the Congress itself and by these particular committees in other legislation. "New Careers" is not just an added program of utilization of more numbers of nonprofessional, para-professional, auxiliary, or supportive personnel. "New Careers" is a phrase of art—legislatively validated—which describes a program of major change in the recruitment, training and education, occupational advancement, status and utilization of nonprofessional personnel—it has profound implications for the entire system of service delivery, for the definition and reconstruction of occupations, for the conventional requirements of degrees and licenses as credentials necessary to work, and for change and enhancement of the role of the professional.

The New Career program is responsive to three major aspects of vocational rehabilitation as it becomes increasingly involved in the attack on poverty:

First—It is essential to help meet the enormous manpower shortages in the rehabilitation services. These shortages are well documented and can be expected to become more severe. They have already limited the expansion of rehabilitation and promise—unless drastic action is taken—to gravely curtail work in the future.

Second—The New Careers programs fits into efforts to direct rehabilitation services increasingly into the ghetto, to the non-English speaking population, into the community and neighborhood on a decentralized basis, and to the socio-economically disadvantaged. Dramatic experiences in other human service fields are revealing the enormous capacities represented by "new careerists" and their ability to bring new and unique levels of communication, understanding, and service.

Third—The New Careers program can and should open new vocational opportunities for the physically handicapped and for the socio-economically deprived. We are uncovering great human thrusts of ambition, self-esteem, and mobility when given opportunities for meaningful "New Career" employment.

There are many very difficult problems to be faced before the New Careers amendment can be effectively implemented. Careful research, planning, and experimentation are essential to make sure that "New Careers" enhances human services and validates the role of the professional. But successfully developed, New Careers will prove to be an essential ingredient for the success of vocational rehabilitation efforts to meet its new and expanded service obligations to the disabled and disadvantaged poverty population.

Changes and developments in both the anti-poverty/manpower programs and in rehabilitation have joined to bring these efforts together.

Some basic lessons have been learned from the experience of the anti-poverty/manpower programs. It is clear now that the socio-economic wounds of ghetto, racist, unemployed poverty living are deep wounds, traumatic injuries which cannot simply be wiped away by traditional manpower training, quick refresher courses, and the generally high employment that comes with "national prosperity." As Gunnar Myrdal put it, an important part of American unemployment is "structural," resulting from the fact that poverty, poor training and poor education, plus previous unemployment has "destroyed" a part of the labor force. Five years ago economists debated whether unemployment was structural, or due merely to inadequate demand in a lagging economy. Experience suggests that both views were correct. Much seemingly "hard-core" unemployment did dissolve when washed with opportunity, and doubtless much of today's residual unemployment would disappear with even a tighter labor market. But for an important part of the poverty-unemployed, the "hard-

core," we have yet to discover the solvent formula.

It has also become clear that the "hard-core" jobless have multiple and inter-related wounds. Poverty, physical and mental deficiencies, low education, lack of training, alienation, age and race and cultural problems, are all bound up together.

As a result of these experiences, the "vocational rehabilitation" efforts of the anti-poverty and manpower programs have had to move increasingly toward more intensive and continuing attention to the unemployed on a case by case basis. In the Chicago JOBS program, for example, a "coach" is assigned to each youth in the program, and the close coach-client relationship is maintained from recruitment through all phases of training and placement until months of stable work have been achieved. This "trainer-coach" procedure is being widely adopted, in an obvious parallel to the services long represented by the vocational counselor.

The manpower programs have found it necessary to provide comprehensive services to the jobless, to add a whole array of remedial and supportive services to the traditional activities of training and placement. Health care, counseling, legal aid, family assistance, and social services have been required. These are basic service moves by anti-poverty/manpower programs toward vocational rehabilitation methods and content of services.

During this time, the process of change also has been at work in vocational rehabilitation. Now the need for change in, and addition to, the rehabilitation arsenal of services is greatly accelerated. The sheer growth in the size of vocational rehabilitation, and now the thrust into the poverty problem, require a much more direct concern and relationship with the general labor market. The recommendations of the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation for counselor training curriculum really applies to all phases and levels of the service—the Committee urged "greater emphasis on nature and content of jobs, job families, interrelationships of jobs, structure of industry, techniques of placement, practical aspects of the world of work, how to get labor market information and selective placement techniques."

Job development has been the least attended to and the most intractable problem of the manpower effort, and it has been, in the words of the recent Senate Labor Committee Report *Toward Economic Security For The Poor*, "the weakest link even though it is the most important." Effective and expanded vocational rehabilitation must confront this problem much more directly.

But most importantly, as rehabilitation moves into the area of the socio-economically disadvantaged it confronts new situations where at least some of its traditional tests and therapy will not apply. It becomes necessary to go beyond attention to "individual pathology and personal failure" into consideration of general social, cultural, economic, and even political factors. As the Senate Labor Committee put it in the *Report* just mentioned:

" . . . Community manpower programs must deal with certain social-psychological factors which prevent many of the poor from obtaining and holding jobs. Certain poor people seem to be committed to a particular style of life which prevents them from coming out of their geographical areas of friendship groups if required to do so to obtain employment opportunities. Some even fear success in training programs because they would then enter new job situations which are strange and unsettling and thus a break from the accustomed way of life."

A new emphasis on outreach and recruitment becomes necessary. There is a new level of demand by the poor themselves for participation, decisive participation, in programming their own human reinforcement. Part

of this insistence is based on the rising demands of ethnic minorities to redress their status and role, and part is simply grass roots democracy. In any event we are passing beyond the original OEO "maximum feasible participation" of the poor to new levels of demand for neighborhood and community control. These trends suggest major institutional changes in our human service delivery systems—they suggest *extensive decentralization* and the need for *new types and locations of service facilities* to meet the vocational rehabilitation needs of the poor.

The implications of these developments were outlined by Professor Reuben Margolin and his collaborator Simon Olshansky in a remarkably perceptive article in 1963 titled "Rehabilitation as a Dynamic Interaction of Systems." Posing a contrast with the view of rehabilitation as a "simple transaction between a single counselor and single client," they emphasized . . . "the need for understanding and dealing not only with psychodynamic but also sociodynamic forces. The latter constitute external forces which could conceivably entrap an individual and preclude successful rehabilitation even in those cases where the client is highly motivated" (*Journal of Rehabilitation*, May-June, 1963). These suggestions of five years ago are even more relevant today, and now even imperative for the new mission of rehabilitation.

The new responsibilities assigned by Congress to vocational rehabilitation assume that it will become an increasingly important part of a total human resource and anti-poverty system. As the House Labor Committee Report on the 1968 Amendments stated the legislative intent:

"Disadvantaged people . . . should be able to look to the rehabilitation program as one of the resources available to them and to know that it is ready to serve them whenever possible . . . Broadening our capability to serve all the disadvantaged will make rehabilitation evaluation services available to individuals in several multiagency programs in order to determine a plan of action through vocational rehabilitation or through other programs."

Some rehabilitation linkages with other antipoverty/manpower programs already exist, and since 1967 the Rehabilitation Services Administration has been a signatory to the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). It is obvious that a much greater degree of linkage with other agencies and programs will now be required. Unfortunately, that is not a simple matter, because the existing anti-poverty/manpower complex has been noted for its lack of coordination and its overlapping jurisdictions and programs. As Yale Professor E. Wight Bakke commented, "When we survey the vast dispersion of these tasks that fall logically and necessarily under the employment and manpower umbrella, the first inclination is to throw up our hands in despair at ever achieving any integrated direction and coordination." As it has done on several occasions, the Senate Labor Committee in its latest Report on the anti-poverty/manpower programs complains that a "basic defect" is that the programs "are not effectively linked to form a total manpower system" and that "This lack of an effective system was quite apparent . . . during the course of its examination of the poverty program, for it found widespread evidence that Federal manpower programs are badly fragmented."

It is within this background of much effort, of some progress, but of basic failure so far to solve the problem of "hard-core" unemployment that vocational rehabilitation enters the anti-poverty/manpower program. How can research be developed and utilized to help solve the yet unsolved problems, to guide the more effective choice of alternative policies and programs, as rehabilitation confronts the vocational needs of the disadvantaged? How can the already existing research

resources and processes of rehabilitation be adapted and extended to this additional and different target population of the socio-economic disadvantaged? That, of course, is the concern of this conference. It would be presumptuous of me to think I have the answers to these questions. But let me participate in the discussion by making the following comments.

First—The absolutely priority question is whether there is a sufficient demand to absorb the residual unemployed, and if there is not, how can that demand be created. This question applies on an overall national basis, but more specifically it applies for the ghetto and depressed areas of concentrated unemployment. Unless this "demand" question is settled, efforts on the supply side are doomed to frustration. To some degree this depends on matters not subject to research but to politics and national policy. But research can and must clarify the facts on the demand side of the labor market equation if rational vocational evaluation and employability preparation are to be undertaken.

In 1962 in the *New York Times*, Dr. Howard Rusk complained that the generally high unemployment rate existing then had a grave effect on jobs for the handicapped in spite of progress in the service itself. Margolin and Olshansky in the article already mentioned said that "The major paradox in our society is that much manpower salvageable through rehabilitation is not required. This paradox probably negatively influences clients seeking rehabilitation as well as professionals serving these clients." Significantly and ominously the small rise in overall unemployment during 1967, from 3.7 percent in January to 4.3 percent in October led to a rise in the teenage unemployment rate from 11.1 percent to 14.8 percent.

The Senate Labor Committee has just reported that "Even if all current job openings were filled, there remains a job gap of at least 2.4 million between the number of persons able and willing to work and the total number of jobs." Is this approximately accurate? If so, how can the gap be closed so that job development has a solid chance of success in each labor market area and so vocational evaluation and work adjustment can be realistic? What is the mix of job creating incentives to private industry, public service jobs, "government as the employer of last resort," and even sheltered workshops that is required to make full employment a reality in every community? At what point should we give up the struggle for employability and vocational adjustment and turn to some form of guaranteed income unrelated to work to meet the problem of poverty? How do we relate a handicapped person's limited productive capacity to the hard realities of private enterprise competitive employability?

A second, crucial factor concerns the motivation to work, to apply for work, to take training, and to remain at work. This is closely related to the question of full employment, for it depends to a large extent on the type, quality, and prospects of work opportunities. It is a common view that the poor are largely people who won't work and that vast numbers of available jobs are going begging. Yet experience shows no shortage of applicants when "good" jobs open up. What is the wage, and what are the qualities of the jobs necessary to create and sustain motivation to work on the part of the disadvantaged? How to avoid the destructive effect of work preparation and training without placement, or with placement only to a low paid, menial, dead end job?

Third—much more research is needed to develop tests that will screen the disadvantaged "into" rather than "out" of employment. Work sample testing needs to be perfected and generalized.

Fourth—we do not really know the capacities and level of education needed to per-

form most jobs. Existing job descriptions and hiring standards are a hodge podge which make job restructuring and objective vocational evaluation almost a guessing game. The old categories of "unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled" have been rendered worse than useless and no effective replacements exist. The careful analyses of rehabilitation research relating to the work capacities of the blind, cardinals, and mental retardees need generalization throughout the entire occupational structure and for all the handicapped and disadvantaged.

Fifth—manpower, economic development, and demographic data need to be disaggregated and available on a community level. We are just beginning belatedly to learn something about the facts of economic life in particular slum areas. In general, the labor supply and demand data of the Model Cities proposals, for example, has been scanty and outdated. If rehabilitation is to make effective vocational evaluations in Harlem, or Roxbury, or Newark, or Watts it needs new, better, and continuing information. Above all, the alternative ways and means of decentralization of services must be researched and tested.

Sixth—If the utilization of non-professional New Careers personnel is to be effective, careful research will be necessary to identify the most relevant manpower needs, the methods of structuring New Career positions, the means of assuring upward mobility and in service training, and the effects on the functioning of professionals and the delivery of rehabilitation services.

Finally—our concern about research for rehabilitation in relationship to poverty suggests two simple questions:

What?

So what?

What research should be undertaken? What are the priorities? I have suggested, somewhat in random fashion, some areas of attention. You will suggest others. In the process we should seek, in the language of the times, "To tell it like it is." That's not an easy nor an automatic task, to make our research genuinely "true."

As rehabilitation enlarges its involvement in the poverty area and plans its consequent new areas of research, I would sound a gentle warning "not to rediscover algebra." A large amount of effective and relevant research has been carried on by a variety of anti-poverty manpower programs. Some of this has been disseminated and related to policies and programs. Much of it, perhaps most, has not been so utilized. The first task of Rehabilitation Research Utilization might well be to learn what has been learned, to make sure that research already carried out is not repeated, and to apply existing research results to the design of rehabilitation programs for the poor.

The more demanding question, I believe, is "So What?" What use is the Research? How relevant, and to what?

Above all, research—to be utilizable and utilized—must be *problem oriented*. It must help identify the problems, the "hang-ups," the needs, and the gaps in program and operation. What works, what doesn't work—and why? The linkage of research, and especially follow-up and evaluation research, must be with *change*, with *redesign* of programs and adjustments in methods of operation. Results must be profoundly and objectively recorded and analyzed if research is to be a useful compass in this rolling and troubling sea of human resources development.

I cannot judge how well vocational rehabilitation research has been applied. But I can assure you that much research in the antipoverty/manpower program has not been utilized to help the program planner and operator solve his problems. Much of it has been buried, some of it was buried before it started, and some of it should be buried. Evaluation has been largely a post mortem public relations obituary ritual. Of course,

there are important exceptions to this criticism, but the elementary things we don't know in the manpower-poverty field and the lack of check-up on program results is shocking.

I trust this is not the case in rehabilitation—certainly it cannot be the case if rehabilitation is to operate effectively on the poverty problem.

To move towards effective research utilization requires a clear and sharp dedication to usefulness as the prime requisite for designing, proposing, and funding projects. Perhaps to achieve effectiveness and relevancy in research, it is simply necessary to start at the beginning, to integrate research at the very outset in the design and the operation of every program. Plans to have special staff members who serve as agents of change and research utilization make a lot of sense, and certainly represent a small expenditure to avoid wastage of large research investments. But special agents probably will not be successful unless we have interlocked the research undertaking and the program designers and operators as mutually reinforcing partners for program effectiveness.

But even when good and relevant research is achieved, its utilization is not automatic. Dissemination is not utilization, and much more than "Brief Summaries," announcements of results, and general research conferences are probably required to translate good research products into good program results. A whole new system of research delivery and application needs to be developed. Perhaps we need to have a "do it yourself" kit with every research report. This conference will doubtless guide us in that direction.

The assignment of vocational rehabilitation to the difficult problems of the anti-poverty/manpower effort is both a compliment and a tough challenge. But it is also an opportunity, worthy of our best efforts both as professionals and as concerned citizens in these troubled times.

**PRESIDENT FRANK JOHNSON
OF AUBURN**

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had some rather harsh comments to make about a decision handed down by U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson, of Montgomery, Ala. Judge Johnson ordered Auburn University not only to allow a man convicted of counseling, aiding and abetting young men to avoid the draft, but ordered the school to pay his expenses and honorarium from public funds. The following editorial from the Thursday, February 6, Montgomery Advertiser further expresses my very strong feelings on this matter:

PRESIDENT FRANK JOHNSON OF AUBURN

District Judge Frank M. Johnson's order directing Auburn President Philpott to permit the appearance of Rev. James S. Coffin Feb. 7 is appalling.

No speaker ban law was at issue, since none exists. We have systematically opposed such legislation, as has President Philpott and other presidents. And yet Judge Johnson appears to rely on a line of cases dealing with the invalidity of statutory law, state regulations or other compulsory strictures. He arrogates the authority of a university president.

As we read Johnson's decision, he has said in effect that a President's inherent powers,

when used to prevent any speaker's appearance, is so repugnant to the First Amendment that it is in the nature of state censorship of the kind the courts have held unconstitutional.

Thus a president's judgment (wise judgment in our opinion) is negated by an extension of the law which opens the doors to anybody student-faculty groups would choose to invite.

We might suppose that this could include lectures by such as Timothy Leary, the notorious hophead, on the wonders of LSD.

There is, in fact, no limit to what it might include. Certainly there is no limit to what some students, eager for confrontation, would propose as a part of their lecture program. A list of names and subjects occurs which is frightening, not so much because Auburn students or any Alabama students are criminally inclined, but because the ensuing controversy, the indignation of legislators, trustees and parents paying good money for this sort of thing could very well wreck the best institution.

There is, however, a line of escape and one we never thought we would favor, Judge Johnson said in his decision:

"This court neither thinks nor holds that Auburn was required to allocate funds from student fees or from public monies to pay invited speakers. Having allocated the money, however, and having paid other speakers with no questions asked, Auburn may not in this instance, for no constitutionally acceptable reason, withhold the funds for the Rev. Mr. Coffin as a censorship device."

Thus Auburn and other state institutions may simply close down their lecture programs, permitting neither the orthodox nor the unorthodox, the law-abiding nor the criminal, patriots nor those who preach defiance of laws directly related to national security.

Auburn must, of course, obey Judge Johnson's order. But it and other state institutions will now make an agonizing reappraisal of all lecture programs. Since a president does not have the power of final arbiter, as we think he should, and since the state would accomplish nothing by passing a speaker ban law (which we have steadfastly opposed) because these have been invalidated as unconstitutional, there remains but one solution, barring a reversal of the Johnson decision. That is: all outside speakers could be banned.

When speaker ban laws have been proposed in the past, we argued that the state can trust its college presidents. But they no longer have the authority we thought they did.

Judge Johnson appears to be propounding mutually exclusive propositions when he says:

"Thus, while it can be said that President Philpott has the ultimate power to determine whether a speaker is invited to the campus . . . this determination may not be made for the wrong reasons or for no reason at all."

This is a remarkable nullity: The president has the ultimate power but he had better not use it.

In another section, Johnson makes much of the fact that Dr. Philpott had never exercised the power before. If he had, we are led to believe, it might be all right to veto Coffin.

But it takes no mathematical genius or logician to understand that there must always be a first time. In our judgment, Dr. Philpott picked the right first time to invoke his privilege. In the court's opinion, he did not.

It follows then that Judge Johnson, not Dr. Philpott, may ultimately determine which speakers will be invited and which denied.

The federal court has become many things, but we hadn't expected it to emerge as a speaker's bureau.

We do not fear that Rev. Coffin will subvert Auburn students. He is a relatively unimportant masochist. But the issue of a president's authority is all-important. That authority has now been vitiated.

Judge Johnson says any consideration Dr. Philpott might have given to legislative disfavor, a cut in appropriations or other dire consequences cannot be a defense. But a President's responsibility can best be summed up in an old axiom: the first duty of any institution is to survive.

We can imagine with what a heavy heart Dr. Philpott and the presidents of other state institutions must now face the grim choice before them: to abolish their lecture programs or open the floodgates.

In any student body and in any faculty there are those few who are interested only in shocking the populace, offending the old mossback alumni and even—it must be added—in precipitating disruption.

The decision should be appealed. If the appeal fails, many of our college presidents will envy Dr. Rose, who has announced his liberation.

**GUY GILLETTE, IN EARLY DAYS OF
91ST YEAR, RECALLED AS DOMINANT
PERSONALITY IN SENATE**

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Monday was the 90th birthday of a great American, a distinguished former U.S. Senator, a long-time friend and colleague of mine, and many of us here, the Honorable Guy Mark Gillette, of Iowa.

Guy Gillette and I both entered the House of Representatives in the 73d Congress, in 1932. We served together in the House until his election to the Senate in 1936. We remained friends during his illustrious career as Senator and in the years after.

He stood tall among the Senators of his time—noble, dignified, modest, gracious, handsome, white haired. No Senator took his constitutional duties more seriously, yet he could look upon himself with a delightfully detached sense of humor.

Some time after he had been retired from the Senate, he was approached by representatives of Otto Preminger, the Hollywood producer, about a part in the film version of "Advise and Consent." His comment on this conversation was as follows:

When they phoned to me from Washington about a "spear-carrying" part in the mob scene in the filming of Advise and Consent, they told me it would be just a small part and that there would be little or nothing to learn for a speaking part. That it was probably that all I would have to say would be "aye" or "no" of certain roll calls.

I told them there was no harder job than that. That after twenty years' service in the Congress, I very well knew that to know when to say "aye" or "no" on roll calls was what most Senators, including me, had never thoroughly learned. And it would be a privilege to have someone tell me.

While the history of our times will recall Guy Gillette's great contributions to our Nation's foreign policy, especially his role as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee in the development of the concept of the United Nations, he

was never so preoccupied with world-shaking public questions as to neglect the fundamental interests and needs of his fellow citizens at home.

I recall vividly that in 1944 a presidential directive had been issued canceling the plans for construction of 28 civilian airports in 17 States on the ground that critical materials were needed for the war effort.

Four of those airports were to be in my home State of West Virginia, at Martinsburg, Parkersburg, Wheeling, and Willey Ford. The people in those communities had already begun preparations. One community had moved a church out of the way and razed a schoolhouse. Another had spent \$20,000, a great deal of money in those days, on its share of the cost of building its airport. All this was in jeopardy.

We founded a special committee of House and Senate Members to seek redress at the White House.

When I went down the roster of all the 96 Senators looking for one who could help us have the maximum impact upon the President, my selection was Guy Gillette, of Iowa, then a towering figure in this body. I urged him to head our delegation to the White House. He accepted immediately.

We called on the President in his upstairs study at 8:30 in the evening. He received us before a crackling fireplace and asked us to present our case.

Following Senator Gillette's cogent introduction, each of us presented our arguments for continuing the construction of these 28 civilian airports. President Roosevelt listened attentively throughout the 18 or 20 minutes we counseled with him. He did not interrupt and he did not ask any questions. At the end, he said, in effect:

Gentlemen you have made your case. The order will be reversed tomorrow morning.

It is to that intervention, headed by Guy Gillette, that 28 cities in this country, four of them in West Virginia, owe the fact that they began to benefit from civilian air service even before World War II ended.

Today, our esteemed former colleague lies in a hospital bed in his beloved hometown of Cherokee, Iowa, laid low by a massive stroke and two subsequent heart attacks.

His indomitable will and his unquenchable spirit during months of illness have kept him not only alive but ever keenly interested in our country's affairs. One remarkable achievement of this grand old man is this: At the age of 87, his writing hand paralyzed, he taught himself to write with the other hand. He maintains regular correspondence with friends throughout Iowa and the Nation and advises Iowans in Democratic politics on how best to proceed. May his flame burn on warm and bright.

It is a great pleasure for me to recall associations with Guy Gillette and to wish him well as he enters his 91st year on this earth which has been made better by his presence on it and his service on behalf of his fellow Iowans, his fellow Americans, and all of mankind.

I'VE HAD IT

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House Education Subcommittee on which I serve heard testimony related to the wave of student unrest and riots that has been sweeping our college campuses.

As Americans hear and see reports of these disruptions at our educational institutions, no doubt many of them share the reaction of Mr. Bob Roberts, the former Honolulu radio commentator-writer.

Mr. Roberts gave a commentary on radio station KVI in Seattle, entitled, "I've Had It." Brother I. Patrick, assistant to the president of St. Mary's College, Winona, Minn., brought this to my attention, suggesting it was worthy of wider readership.

The commentary follows:

I'VE HAD IT

There's something that needs to be said about this country. And since no one seems to have the gumption to say it, I guess it's up to me . . .

I have had it up to here with persons who are trying deliberately to tear my country apart. And it's way past time to throw at me that tired old wheeze about being a flag-waver. You're damned right I'm a flag-waver, and I got a right to be one the hard way . . .

I have had it with pubescent punks, wallowing in self-pity, who made a display of deploring their birth into a world which—to use their sissy expression—they didn't make . . .

Well, I didn't make the world I was born in either. And neither did the men who are worthy of respect. They just went about and made something out of it . . .

The men I grew up with were fetched up in a logging camp. They were the immigrant sons of every cast-off race there is. And they didn't have a hell of a lot of knowledge at home to start them off, either . . .

But I can write you a song about the son of a Po Valley coal miner who became a nationally renowned physicist; about doctors, lawyers, teachers, forestry specialists, conservation experts and men of the cloth—in the Seattle-Tacoma area—who came out of that logging camp. And about the son of a Danish mechanic who is one of the best friends I've got . . .

So don't give me your whining, whimpering, self-pitying clap-trap about how this country is letting you down . . .

I have had it with hippies, brainless intellectuals, writers who can't write, painters who can't paint, teachers who can't teach, administrators who can't administrate, entertainers who fancy themselves sociologists, and Negroes who castigate as "Uncle Toms," the very men who have done the most to demonstrate to all of us the most important quality in America—individual enterprise and responsibility . . . Dr. George Washington Carver, Archie Moore, Bert Willis, Booker T. Washington, Roy Wilkins, Justice Thurgood Marshall, Duke Ellington, Count Basie, Nat Cole, the Mills Brothers and their father . . . and many more . . .

I've had it with those cerebral giants who think it's smart to invite drug advocates to lecture in their classrooms, and with teaching curiosities like that one in the Mercer Island School District who invited a Black

Power spokesman to dispense a lecture on flag-burning . . .

I've had it with people who are setting about deliberately to rip up mankind's noblest experiment in decency . . .

And I'm going to tell you something. If you think you're going to tear down my country's flag and destroy the institutions my friends and members of my family have fought and died for, you're going to have to climb over me first . . .

And, buddy, you'd better get up awful early in the morning . . .

THERMAL POLLUTION IN THE PATUXENT RIVER

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works yesterday completed 4 days of hearings on the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969.

While the unfortunate oil spillage disaster in the Santa Barbara Channel dominated the interest in the hearings, there were other segments of the testimony dealing with thermal pollution, a subject about which not nearly enough is known.

Mr. Richard Corrigan yesterday in the Washington Post wrote a long article describing a report of the effects of the Chalk Point Generating Station on the water quality of the Patuxent River in Maryland.

The study revealed a few factors which may be favorable and several which may be harmful.

For the information of those who may not have read it, I ask unanimous consent the full text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HEAT POLLUTION: A DANGER

(By Richard Corrigan)

It's not just fish that are in hot water now because of the thermal pollution issue. This kind of pollution is a problem for expansion-minded electric utility companies, conservation-minded scientists and citizens and government officials responsible for protecting public resources, but who don't agree.

The University of Maryland's Natural Resources Institute has just announced that thermal pollution poses such a danger to the entire Chesapeake Bay region that power companies must be forced to develop better control equipment or be forbidden to build new stations.

The Institute reached this conclusion, in a "final" report issued this week, after six years of field and laboratory experiments involving the Potomac Electric Power Company's Chalk Point generating station.

A top State official has contradicted the Institute's conclusions, saying the situation really isn't that serious.

The crux of the Institute's position is that the State has two choices in dealing with this problem:

"Prevent any further development of expansion in the Bay system by those operations requiring process water," or; "Force these operations to develop a technology that will have no significant destructive effects on the aquatic resources."

Paul McKee, director of the State Department of Natural Resources, said that in his opinion the evidence does not substantiate this view. With a few minor exceptions, McKee said, "There are no demonstrable harmful effects whatsoever on the river or its ecology" because of the Chalk Point station.

He also said, "I wouldn't agree with prohibiting additional power stations. . . I don't think they create that much of a problem."

McKee said studies at Chalk Point have aided in the search for better ways to deal with thermal pollution, and that he agreed with some of the recommendations in the report. But the general tenor of his remarks was that the problem is being controlled.

L. Eugene Cronin, director of the Natural Resources Institute, does not agree. He said the report amounts to "a clear demonstration of some detriment" to the Patuxent—"at the same time we're getting proposals for plants six times this big."

Cronin added that "how he (McKee) chooses to apply" the findings in the report "is his business—it's also the public's business." It is McKee's department that decides whether to issue permits for using water.

A Pepco official, L. W. Cadwallader, said he has not yet seen the report but that the company is taking steps at Chalk Point to reduce thermal pollution. Cadwallader, vice president in charge of power generation, also talked of the company's plans for a new station at Morgantown on the Potomac River, at which new heat-control methods will be used.

Cadwallader said the Morgantown plant will meet State standards on water temperature, although Cronin and the Potomac River Fisheries Commission already have accused Pepco of trying to evade one standard in its Morgantown plant. Cadwallader said the Fisheries Commission is trying to write new standards and is being unrealistic.

The Patuxent River report was written by Joseph Mihursky, chairman of the environmental research department of the Natural Resources Institute. Cronin said he fully endorsed the report's findings and recommendations.

The report was prepared as part of a \$200,000 contract between the Institute and the Department of Natural Resources.

The Institute serves as a research arm for State natural resource agencies, but is not under their direct control. Cronin likes it that way.

"Our job is not to defend" actions by State agencies, he noted. "We have to keep independent, and independence will sometimes bring a difference in emphasis."

A commission on governmental reorganization appointed by Vice President Agnew, then Maryland governor, recommended that a State cabinet-level Department of Natural Resources be established. Cronin indicated he would like to keep the Institute out of any such department, while McKee said he would like to have his department under a cabinet secretary. "It'll make life easier for me" by shifting criticism from his shoulders to someone else's, he said.

Pepco's Chalk Point station, a 730,000 kilowatt coal-burning facility that went into full operation in 1965, uses up to 500,000 gallons of Patuxent River water a minute to cool its condenser units. (The Morgantown plant will use at least 1 million gallons a minute.)

The water that goes back into the river is as much as 23 degrees Fahrenheit hotter in winter than the water coming in, and 11.5 degrees hotter in summer.

Changes in river temperatures caused by the discharge can be found as far as five miles upstream and downstream from the point of discharge, the study said.

The temperature on the discharge water has at times approached 100 degrees, and water within a surrounding three-quarter mile area has been recorded up to 95 degrees, the study said.

Summarizing the effects on the Patuxent caused by this hot water—and by traces of copper found in it—the study said that:

Microscopic plant life in the water that runs through the power station loses up to 94 per cent of its life-giving power of photosynthesis, through which these organisms feed themselves and release oxygen into the water.

Some rooted water plants that provide food for waterfowl have undergone "severe reductions"—while other species seem to grow faster in warmer water.

Microscopic animal life in the water has been reduced in the area, and the power station is "suspected" to be the cause. Some predatory organisms, including sea nettle, also are being killed.

Opossum shrimp, a source of food for young striped bass, were found in greater numbers above the discharge point than just below it—but no data was available on the population of this species before the plant went into operation.

Soft-shell clams died throughout the Patuxent estuary in 1965 and 1966 in massive numbers. The study found no evidence that the station was responsible for this, and no recent effects have been noted.

Oysters have not undergone any significant changes, the study said—"but one phenomenon was definitely associated with S.E.S. (steam electric station) activity. A noticeable increase in green oysters began at the station nearest the effluent (discharge point), and progressively spread downriver. . . ."

"Analysis revealed that this greening was highly coincident with copper increase in oyster tissues."

"Oysters were placed in the intake and effluent canals with the following results: Intake oysters shown no mortality. . . oysters in the effluent eventually suffered 100 per cent mortality and showed 100 per cent greening with a sharp increase in copper concentration. . . ."

The study said the copper apparently came from the corroded tubes, which have been replaced, but that oysters were still turning green, even with new tubes at the plant, when this portion of the study ended.

Fish seem to be drawn to the warm water in winter months, and to retreat from it during summer, the study said. (This is why the discharge area is a popular spot for wintertime anglers.)

The general trend seems to be, however, that there has been a decline in the fish population in the area.

"If this trend is real and continues it can only be interpreted to mean that a general degradation in environmental quality is occurring in the Patuxent River system," the study said.

About 40,000 blue crabs were found dead in the discharge canal area in late 1966. "This mortality is associated with S.E.S. activity and represents a loss of one season's recreational crab catch in the estuarine reach under study. . . . A kill of striped bass occurred in the effluent canal areas in 1967."

(Another report on thermal pollution in the Patuxent has been written by Robert L. Cory of the Department of Interior's Geological Survey. Cory said he found that temperature changes definitely affect aquatic life. For example, he said, marine fouling organisms—such as barnacles—showed an increase in growth in and near the Chalk Point discharge canal.)

The study also said laboratory research on 23 species of aquatic life indicated that 24-hour exposures to water hotter than 90 degrees cause "significant mortalities in a majority of the species tested and some have heavy losses." However, the study said that "rarely if ever" are there continuous exposures to very high temperatures at any one point near the station.

The study said that Maryland's new standard, under which discharge water is not sup-

posed to raise river temperatures above 90 degrees, seems generally adequate.

The study recommended that the State maintain and enforce its current antipollution standards, field test them on a stepped-up basis to see whether they should be stronger, and expand its laboratory studies of the Chesapeake Bay ecology to gain a greater understanding of what changes are occurring.

The study said heat might be put to such useful purposes as stimulating early spawning seasons, attracting fish for sport and commercial catching and eliminating certain organisms such as barnacles. But further research is needed in this area, it said.

To prevent further pollution of the Patuxent, the study recommended that no additional heat loads be allowed in the area, that no exceptions be granted to the 90-degree standard, that water used within the plant should not be heated above 90 degrees, that metallic pollution be eliminated and that chlorine control be improved. McKee said he agreed that chlorine should be controlled and that he already has told Pepco to bring Chalk Point into compliance with the 90-degree standard.

The study noted that the power industry is planning giant generating stations that, under current design techniques, would need up to 6 million gallons of water per minute or 12 times the water that the Chalk Point station uses at full operation.

To cool these plants, the study said, the industry will need more and more water along the Eastern Coast—and the Bay is an obvious target.

"If industrial and domestic operations that require process water are permitted to operate under older technologies it is certain that the Bay environment will be degraded. . . ." the study warned.

The report also told the State to beware of research supplied by power companies. It said that if the State had used only information supplied by the industry and its consultants, "there would have been little or no useful information" on how the power plant would effect the river and the organisms in it.

TOO LATE THE METROLINER

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of effective rail transportation is a particularly important one.

With the advent of the new high speed "Metroliners" the people of the overcrowded northeast corridor should be able to expect some relief. In a most perceptive article in the New York Times yesterday Tom Wicker points out that the Metroliner is not ahead of, but far behind its time.

At this point in the RECORD, I include Mr. Wicker's article:

IN THE NATION: TOO LATE THE METROLINER
(By Tom Wicker)

Riding the new Metroliner to New York from Washington is both a promising and a sobering experience. It is at once a graphic demonstration that modern America need not be overwhelmed by its problems and a useful reminder that those problems are sizable indeed.

The new "fast train," a gleaming, six-car tube now speeding down to Washington in the morning and back to Manhattan in the afternoon, is a product of a cooperative ef-

fort between government and private enterprise to cope with the booming intercity travel that now threatens to clog the Northeast Corridor. Compared to, say, black unemployment, this may not seem one of the major tasks on the American agenda. But since a huge slice of the population lives and travels between New York and Washington, it is by no means a minor one.

If high-speed, short-haul rail transit succeeds on the New York-Washington and next on the New York-Boston line, moreover, the way will have been prepared for fast trains in other heavily traveled areas—Los Angeles to San Diego, for instance, or outward from Chicago in any of several directions. Overall, the experiment is going to provide clearer answers to such tremendously important questions as these:

Are we going to keep on paving over the landscape in order to pollute the air with exhaust fumes while pouring more and more automobiles into cities already strangling in traffic?

Or, alternatively, are we going to crowd the air lanes with more and more planes, circling longer and longer over airports of increasing inadequacy (some of which are already so far from the cities they serve that getting into town is a bigger problem than crossing the ocean)?

In short, the Metroliner is no small experiment, and a ride on it gave one recent passenger a satisfying sense that in at least this area, and however haltingly, some real efforts are being made; the decision on future intercity travel in America is not being allowed to go entirely by default, as have so many other similar problems for so many years past.

COMPETITIVE WITH AIRLINES

The Metroliner is not the last word in surface transportation, but it is a vast improvement on anything else on rails in this country. Its running time of three hours is roughly competitive with the airlines, as are its fares. The speed is held down, just as passenger comfort is reduced, by the Penn Central's roadbed—improved but basically built for an earlier day. Service aboard is excellent; and for a passenger to be treated like a human being aboard an American train is, in itself, something of a miracle.

SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

The Metroliner accelerates with remarkable ease and speed. Seating, food services, lighting, heating, ventilation—all are considerably improved over the usual present-day train accommodations, although those who remember the old days (only a decade or so in the past!) will grieve for the passing of a great American institution, the dining car, and for the substitution of airline-style meals (plastic food on plastic trays).

Ultimately, there will be 22 Metroliners daily on the New York-Washington or New York-Philadelphia runs. An entirely different experimental train (the TurboTrain, which does not require an electrified line) will soon be tried on the New York-Boston run, cutting perhaps an hour off the present schedule of four hours and fifteen minutes.

But if riding the Metroliner gives hope that high-speed rail transit can provide comfortable and decent travel as well as an efficient alternative to ferocious auto traffic and dangerously overused airlines and airports, it also suggests what a huge task lies ahead. For if the Metroliner or TurboTrain is to realize its full potential in speed, comfort and economy, greatly improved roadbeds will be essential. Between New York and Washington a wholly new one may be needed, at a cost of about \$1 billion, and the problem is said to be worse on the line to Boston.

The Penn Central already has poured \$22 million into 50 Metroliner cars and \$35 million into smoothing its roadbed. All these figures suggest the vast sums required if adequate fast-train service is to be provided

in all the areas where it would be useful. A lot of that money obviously must come from taxpayers, and fairly soon at that.

The Metroliner thus is not ahead of but far behind its time, and the price for so long ignoring the need it now serves is going to be high indeed. And so it will be with all the problems this rich and ingenious nation has been so reluctant to face.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF MEMPHIS, TENN.

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Memphis, Tenn., is this year celebrating its sesquicentennial. A notable event for the entire Nation, this celebration is under the capable direction of Mr. Howard Willey, president of Memphis Sesquicentennial, Inc. Mr. Willey has written an interesting article about the celebration for the Delta Review. This delightful publication contains several informal and historical articles about the great city on the Mississippi Bluff.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Willey's article be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF MEMPHIS SESQUICENTENNIAL

(By Howard Willey)

The year 1969 marks the anniversary of a river town born 150 years ago. The history of Memphis includes many colorful figures, and the amateur historian can have a field day harking back over the roster. He can join Andrew Jackson and Isaac Shelby at the treaty negotiations with the Chickasaw Indians or visit at the Bell Tavern with Sam Houston, Davy Crockett and Jim Bowie, on their way to fight in the Texas War of Independence. He can ride with Nathan Bedford Forrest, acknowledged to be the most brilliant tactician to emerge from the War Between the States. He can marvel at the trumpet of W. C. Handy. He can stand alongside Edward Hull Crump as he does battle with utility interests and gamblers.

But there is more to the Memphis story than the colorful heroic figures of her past. Memphis has had possibly more than her share of troubled and trying times. She has emerged victorious not through the efforts of any one hero but rather through the heroic efforts of many plain average citizens. Her very beginning was singularly inauspicious. For the first 22 years Memphis was sporadically overrun by flatboatmen, a completely independent, lawless breed. They recognized no legal authority, refused to pay taxes, and when in town were in complete control of the settlement. During that period Vicksburg and Natchez were growing at a more rapid pace than Memphis, and Randolph, 40 miles to the north on the Second Chickasaw Bluff, was competing on equal terms as a river port. In 1841 two volunteer military companies were formed and succeeded in subduing the flatboatmen and bringing order to the city. Following this crisis business flourished, population increased rapidly, river traffic multiplied, the Memphis and Charleston Railroad was built, and the city was on its way.

Then in 1878 the great yellow fever epidemic struck—probably the most devastating plague in the nation's history. Thousands died, additional thousands fled the city, all business came to a standstill,

and in January, 1879 the city lost its charter, becoming a taxing district of the state. To those citizens who remained fell the gigantic communal job of rebuilding the city. And they were equal to it.

The years 1927 and 1937 saw disastrous floods in neighboring Arkansas and Mississippi. Thousands of refugees converged on Memphis, and to Memphis citizens of those years fell the job of constructing barracks, staffing food kitchens, donating food and clothing, and generally alleviating the calamitous situation of their neighbors.

Throughout the years, Memphis citizens have shown unselfish devotion to the common good, and they are still doing it. The events scheduled and the programs planned for our sesquicentennial year could not be as ambitious as they are were it not for the enthusiastic support and hard work coming from literally thousands of Memphians who are proud of their city. As the work has progressed and as these thousands of volunteers have accepted the challenge to tell the Memphis story, I have come to feel that they themselves, to a large extent, constitute that story. Above all else, it is the people who make a city a meaningful entity. In the people of Memphis is the vital force which made Memphis what it is today and which I feel certain will carry this city on to even greater achievements in the future.

HIS MOTTO WAS WORK

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have read one of the most fitting tributes paid the late Congressman Robert A. "Fats" Everett, and I feel it should be made a permanent testimonial to his memory and accomplishments.

In an editorial in the Daily Messenger from Union City, Tenn., Fats' hometown, Mr. Bill King, an editor with the newspaper, eloquently portrays the exceptional caliber of this great man. His philosophy of hard work and dedication to his people made him one of the finest and most dedicated public servants that Tennessee, and perhaps the country, has every known, and "truly, we shall not see his like again."

The editorial follows:

HIS MOTTO WAS "WORK"

(By Bill King)

There were many thousands of friends he called by name—there were countless other thousands who called him "Fats" and who considered him their friend.

Perhaps this is the best way to remember that unusual and gifted man whose love for people turned him into one of the finest and most dedicated civil servants that Tennessee—and perhaps the country—has ever known.

Robert Ashton "Fats" Everett was a man of simple yet great heritage. He sprang from the fertile soil of Obion County, a soil he carried proudly on his massive shoes the rest of his life.

His booming and infectious laugh, the voice that could be heard for blocks and his native and homey wit enhanced the "country boy" role he enjoyed and never sought to abandon.

But beneath the sometimes brash exterior was an astute and canny politician, a man who quickly earned the deserved reputation as one who knew how to get things done. Red tape was no match for the scissors he wielded

when he sought the cure and the cure of a problem.

The secret of his success was simple and direct—just like the man.

"Let's just go to the head of the stream," he was fond of saying when confronted by a problem involving one of his constituents. This meant going directly to the man, no matter who he was, who would most likely be able to solve the problem. And he knew personally hundreds of such persons.

Those who worked with him soon learned he was no prey for the "city slickers" despite his country boy exterior.

Mr. Everett, if he was anything, was a realist, an earthy but lovable man who saw things like they were. It was this quality that enabled him to accomplish so much during his relatively short life.

He grew up in a county which suffered annually from the ravages of floods and he, like other Obion Countians, heard the oft-repeated promises that something would be done. But it wasn't until he reached the halls of Congress that the red tape surrounding the flood control work was snipped away and the project undertaken.

Because of his membership on the House Public Works Committee he was able to make sure his people in the Eighth Congressional District were not left out when it came to projects for their benefit.

In addition to his flood control projects and the vital role he played in making the Reelfoot-Indian Creek Watershed District project a reality, Mr. Everett helped industries in his district obtain federal contracts, used his influence to help the University of Tennessee at Martin to become a four-year institution, aided farmers in obtaining permission for them to hay and graze restricted land during periods of drought, and obtained federal appropriations for hospitals, nursing homes and libraries throughout the district.

Because he was instrumental in getting the federal government to transfer ownership of the airport to Obion County, its name—Everett-Stewart Airport—has become a monument to his labors. And in Dyer County, a lake created by a drainage project he promoted is called Everett Lake.

These will help to perpetuate the memory of Congressman Everett but the individual things he did for individual persons make it certain he will never be forgotten as long as these people live.

He was never too busy to talk to anyone and it didn't matter if his visitor was dressed in overalls or a business suit. A letter to him often was answered in less than a week. It was a rare occurrence when he couldn't be reached by telephone.

"I will always be as near to you as your telephone or mail-box," he said thousands of times while addressing civic or service clubs and other special groups in the Eighth District. And he meant every word.

Asked by a reporter a few years ago how he managed to handle so many different problems for so many different people, he laughed and said: "If a man don't want to work, he hadn't ought to hire out."

Working for his people was his philosophy in life. Truly, we shall not see his like again.

PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—S. 782

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) deserves our highest commendation for his efforts on be-

half of the rights of our civil servants. More than that, he deserves our full cooperation in the swift enactment of S. 782—S. 1035 in the 90th Congress.

In joining with Senator ERVIN and 52 other Senators in the cosponsorship of his bill, I wrote a letter to Senator ERVIN which may well be of some general interest.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., January 31, 1969.

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am happy to have the opportunity to join you in the sponsorship of S. 1035, a bill to protect the rights of government employees. We have for too long winked at the abuses which your bill is designed to eliminate. You deserve the gratitude of all Americans for your gallant efforts to bring a fuller measure of privacy and dignity to government workers.

We simply cannot permit basic freedoms which are at the heart of our democratic system to be compromised, whether in the name of personnel management, psychological research, technological advancement, or, for that matter, anything else that I can think of.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MIKE GRAVEL.

EDUARDO MONDLANE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, adherents of the cause of African freedom have suffered a staggering blow. The news from Dar es Salaam tells us that Eduardo Mondlane has been assassinated by unknown parties. For we Americans who are committed to the liberation and independence of Africans still suffering from white colonialism, this news is tragic indeed. Eduardo Mondlane, the president of Frelimo, Front for the Liberation of Mozambique, was Africa's outstanding liberation leader in southern Africa. The war which he led against Portuguese oppression was a war for independence which has the support of many Americans who are committed to the independence of the African people.

We regret this severe blow to the liberation struggle. We regret that the cowardly assassin has again struck a blow at those who have struggled to free the black man. Assassins have now claimed the life of Mondlane just as the life of Patrice Lumumba was also claimed by the enemies of black Africa. The death of Mondlane, as with the deaths of President John Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy, and the Reverend Martin Luther King, have brought perverse cheer to all those who have opposed the struggle of black people in both America and Africa.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa in the House Foreign Relations Committee, I want to express the deep regrets of many Americans that this champion of freedom has been assassinated. The freedom of black people everywhere is always weakened when one of our leaders is destroyed.

Eduardo Mondlane was an extraordinary champion of freedom. He returned to Africa in 1962 to take up the leadership of Frelimo. After careful preparation Frelimo was able to launch their first military action against the Portuguese in September 1964. They began their struggle against Portuguese oppression with only 250 trained men in guerrilla groups of five to 12. This army is now fighting in one-third of Mozambique. About one-fifth of the total area of Mozambique is under their virtual control. Their army numbers more than 7,000 under arms at this point. Another 3,000 are serving the guerrilla forces in various capacities. The leadership provided by Mondlane who patiently initiated the struggle against Portuguese colonialism was outstanding.

But the struggle against Portuguese colonialism will continue. The Portuguese Army, which numbers almost 60,000 in Mozambique, is increasingly restricted in their movements. Desertions from the Portuguese Army have begun. The struggle continues and will result in a victory which will be a monument to the efforts of Eduardo Mondlane.

Their efforts have not been restricted to just the military. The Mozambique Institute, established in Dar es Salaam and supported by private funds from the United States, Europe, and Asia, has developed a general education program for Mozambique which is preparing refugee students with various kinds of education. Programs of nurses' training and teacher training have been begun and are sending their trained graduates inside liberated Mozambique. The detailed planning and pragmatic philosophy of Eduardo Mondlane have provided the foundations for a liberation movement which will be able to govern independent Mozambique.

It shall also be noted that Eduardo Mondlane was dedicated to a spirit of nonracialism. His enemy was oppression of any color, wherever it occurred. He welcomed support from any person, organization, and government which was willing to make a commitment to the cause of African independence.

Unfortunately, our Government has never been able to bring itself to support the struggle of the Mozambique freedom fighters. During the early 1960's, when John Kennedy was President, the United States did seem to be moving toward some support for the liberation of Mozambique and Angola. But this agonizing equivocation became, after President Kennedy's death, in the words of Eduardo Mondlane, "equivocation without direction." Today, U.S. policy has reverted to that of support for the status quo. The conscience of the U.S. Government seems not to be aroused by the continuation of Portuguese colonialism in Mozambique and Angola. This has forced the liberation movements, includ-

ing Frelimo, to other countries for support. Much of this support has come from the East, but the accusations that Frelimo is either "pro-East," "pro-Communist" or pro anything besides being pro-Mozambique are specious. Just as the American Revolution sought help from European countries, so has the Mozambique revolution sought help from wherever it was available.

I want to note further, some aspects of the distinguished career of Eduardo Mondlane. He began his schooling at the age of 11 in Mozambique in 1931. By 1949, he was attending the University of Lisbon on a scholarship provided by the Phelps-Stokes Fund of New York. After 1 year in Lisbon, he had his scholarship transferred to an American university and, subsequently, obtained his B.A. from Oberlin College in 1953. He then went on to Northwestern University where he received an M.A. and Ph. D. in sociology. From 1957 to 1961, he worked for the United Nations as a research officer. With the independence of Tanganyika in 1961, he decided that it was time to return to Africa to take a leadership role in the nationalist movement. He resigned from the United Nations and took a teaching position at Syracuse University where he helped to establish a program of East African studies. During this time, he was making preparation for his return in 1962.

Throughout his life and career Eduardo Mondlane impressed everyone with his dynamic personality, magnificent intelligence, and warm sense of humor. We all regret his death, not only because he was a champion of freedom, but because he was also a great human being. We must all commit ourselves to efforts to insure that his death will not have been in vain.

AFRICAN TERRORISTS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recent news reports have told about the assassination of the African terrorist leader Eduardo Mondlane.

Many misguided Americans have been led to believe that Mondlane was a fighter for freedom and a supporter of the Western tradition. Not all Americans have been so misled. An editorial in Wednesday's Charleston News & Courier points out Mondlane's Communist contacts and the training of his terrorist group at revolutionary schools in Peking. The News & Courier says:

Removal of Mondlane by an assassin's bullet is as grave a reverse for the Communists as would have been the death of Fidel Castro when he was a guerrilla leader in Cuba.

The editorial staff of the News & Courier is well versed in African affairs; its writers have made numerous trips to Africa and are well acquainted by firsthand observation of the problems in that area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "African

Terrorist," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AFRICAN TERRORIST

The assassination of Eduardo Mondlane, terrorist leader in Mozambique, is a setback for communism in East Africa.

Since the early 1960s, Mondlane has directed the Mozambique Liberation Front aimed at seizing control of Portugal's huge and potentially rich province on the Indian Ocean. His forces were well supplied with Chinese Communist weapons. Members of the Front were trained at revolutionary schools in Peking.

Removal of Mondlane by an assassin's bomb is as grave a reverse for the communists as would have been the death of Fidel Castro when he was a guerrilla leader in Cuba. In time, the communists may find a new revolutionary chieftain for Mozambique. For the present, however, the threat to a civilized region of Africa has eased.

EEC TARIFF PROPOSALS

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, when the European Economic Community was formed I was among those who hoped that not only would the EEC lead to a more prosperous Europe, but to an expansion of trade that would be mutually beneficial to America and Europe. Unfortunately, we are seeing increasing evidence that Common Market authorities are not concerned with bringing about an expansion of trade through the removal or reduction of tariff or nontariff trade barriers. In fact, we see evidence to the contrary. The most recent example is the EEC's proposal to impose internal user taxes on soybean oil at \$60 per ton and on soybean meal at \$30 per ton. This proposal, if carried out, would have the most serious implications to the soybean industry and to our country's balance of payments. For the last 6 years, soybeans and soybean products have been the largest dollar earner of any single U.S. agricultural commodity.

The justifiable concern of the soybean industry over the EEC proposals is well expressed in a letter I have received from Dale W. McMillen, Jr., president of Central Soya, a major soybean processor, with headquarters in Fort Wayne, Ind. Under unanimous consent I include the letter, with its illuminating comments on the impact of the EEC proposals, in the RECORD:

CENTRAL SOYA,

Fort Wayne, Ind., January 29, 1969.

Hon. E. Ross Adair,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAIR: The United States soybean industry is deeply concerned about the proposed actions of the European Economic Community to establish a tax levy on the importation of soybean oil and soybean meal.

The European Economic Community now has under serious consideration the imposition of internal user taxes on soybean oil at \$60 per ton and of \$30 per ton on soybean meal. These tax levies are designed to raise

the price of the product to deliberately reduce the import demand for high protein feeds. The net effect of these proposed user taxes would reduce the present high level of exports by the United States of soybeans and soybean meal to EEC countries.

During the last marketing year, the European Economic Community purchased about 93,000,000 bushels of soybeans and 1,982,000 soybean meal short tons (equivalent to 87,000,000 bushels of soybeans) from the United States. These sales were for dollars and returned approximately \$450,000,000 in hard currency to the United States economy. During the 1967-68 marketing year, these exports to the EEC equaled 35% of the total soybeans and 68% of the total soybean meal exported from the United States. I am advised by competent economists that these proposed taxes, particularly as they relate to soybean meal, will reduce consumption within the EEC by the equivalent of approximately 50,000,000 bushels of soybeans. These 50,000,000 bushels represent the production of 2,000,000 acres of United States farmland. Obviously, such a loss would have a very serious impact upon the United States soybean farmer and processor.

At this time, United States soybean oil prices are not competitive with other fats and oils available to the Common Market, and therefore, oil does not present the immediate problem existing for soybeans and soybean meal.

The proposed tax is especially serious at this time in view of the anticipated increased carry-over of soybeans. It is expected that by the end of the current marketing year, the United States carry-over of soybeans will approximate 335,000,000 bushels—this represents a carry-over increase tenfold the level at the end of the 1964 marketing year.

I would like to suggest that you urge the Department of Agriculture, the Department of State, and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in the White House to exercise every effort to prevent the imposition of these proposed taxes by the EEC countries. It would appear that it might be productive if the House Agriculture Committee would hold a Hearing on this subject. Such a Hearing would be of value to acquaint Committee Members and the public with the position of the Executive Branch. Also the implications on living costs in the EEC could be reviewed. Finally the Agriculture Committee could take such action as appears advisable and constructive.

If I can provide you any additional information on this important matter, I hope that you will feel at liberty to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

DALE W. McMILLEN, Jr.,
President.

ADDRESS BY FERRIS E. LUCAS,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION, ON JANUARY 24, 1969

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure of reading the address prepared by the Honorable Ferris E. Lucas, the executive director of the National Sheriffs' Association, which was presented to the graduating class of the new Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy.

I believe that each of us would agree with the statement by Mr. Ferris, contained in the body of his remarks:

All that stands between our nation and uncontrolled rioting and criminal activity is a relatively small band of peace officers who are caught in the middle of the struggle between decency and anarchy that seems to be growing more violent every day.

Because I believe so strongly in the continuing efforts of America's peace officers and the unheralded contributions which are made daily by this "thin blue line" of law enforcement, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Lucas be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

ADDRESS BY FERRIS E. LUCAS BEFORE COLORADO LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY, JANUARY 24, 1969

It is a genuine and distinct honor to be here today addressing the first graduating class of the new Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy.

I want to congratulate each one of you for having successfully completed the intense and difficult courses which have confronted you during these past weeks. You have learned much and your careers in law enforcement will be furthered by that knowledge.

Opportunity carries with it a great and grave responsibility. All that stands between our nation and uncontrolled rioting and criminal activity is a relatively small band of peace officers who are caught in the middle of a struggle between decency and anarchy that seems to be growing more violent every day.

The catch-word today seems to be "equality." Suppose we consider that word and that idea . . . but, first, let's remove the letter "e" from the word.

We now have a word which is all too often forgotten . . . quality.

The great American poet Robert Frost wrote concerning this subject . . .

"All men are born free and equal—free at least in their right to be different. Some people want to homogenize society everywhere. I'm against the homogenizers—in art—in politics—in every walk of life. I want the cream to rise."

Obviously, you who are here today are graduating from this course of instruction in law enforcement are superior in knowledge to those who have not been given this advantage. When you return to your individual cities and counties, you'll carry with you knowledge you did not possess before your attendance here.

At the same time, there is no course of instruction so complete . . . so thorough . . . that everyone who attends learns all there is to know about every required duty and responsibility to be performed in law enforcement. The Academy hopes that you have learned . . . and that you have benefitted from this learning. But your instructors hope that above the hard and cold facts which you've absorbed, that they have instilled in you a desire for ever-more knowledge . . . a hunger that will never allow you to be satisfied with either your knowledge or your performance. They hope . . . and I join with them most sincerely in saying that I too hope . . . that each one of you will continue to learn and benefit from the weeks you spent here. In short, the goal of this Academy is secondarily to teach . . . but primarily to instill in its graduates that desire to learn and the realization that if the quality of American law enforcement is to continue to climb upward, each of us must continue to advance with our chosen profession.

Although law enforcement has . . . for many years . . . been on the short end of the stick . . . both in money and citizen support . . . it seems the trend may finally be

reversing. It is most encouraging to all of us that the general public does seem to be awakening to what is happening in these United States. Our citizens seem to be becoming aware that they must support law enforcement and put an end to the unjustified criticisms we've been receiving.

I do not suggest that when we are wrong . . . and we will be occasionally . . . that the public conduct a whitewash campaign for us. We are all human and are subject to human weaknesses and failures. When our colleagues are wrong, it is our responsibility to attempt to straighten them out . . . and if all else fails, to discipline or remove them from the profession.

We must at all times remember though that the only person who never stubs his toe is the person who is not moving forward. President Theodore Roosevelt once remarked, "It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled, or where the doer of a deed could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement; and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who have tasted neither victory nor defeat."

We must then recognize . . . and even more importantly help the general public to recognize . . . that there are very few in law enforcement who deserve censure. The vast majority of American peace officers are by no means "cold and timid souls." The work is often difficult and dangerous . . . the hours are often long . . . the rewards in dollars and cents are often little. It is then a sense of responsibility and dedication that keeps us all going forward. When we stub our toes, we pick ourselves up and keep going ahead.

Let us return for a moment to our discussion of equality versus quality. There are those persons in our society today who would destroy in order to obtain what they feel is theirs. They evidently have carried the concept of equality to the point where they feel that if they don't have something . . . if they won't work to get something . . . that they're justified in burning or destroying what something else has.

Abraham Lincoln cautioned on this same subject. "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently, and build one for himself, thus by example insuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The spreading fires of hatred and violence threaten to consume our nation. Meanwhile we are all overburdened with work and weakened because of a lack of sufficient manpower in most areas. At the same time, our courts cripple our effectiveness with legal doctrines that make it extremely difficult to arrest and convict lawbreakers. All the while, we're criticized and accused of brutality even when we're doing nothing more than attempting to protect ourselves from angry mobs of bottle and rock throwing rabble.

Crimes are becoming even more vicious. Our youths . . . only a small percentage of them, thank God . . . are creating more trouble for us . . . and for the nation.

In the midst of all this, we must walk a tight-rope . . . maintain a balance between ourselves being stepped on, on the one hand . . . or violating a citizen's rights . . . on the other hand.

Those of you here today who are not directly involved in law enforcement also have a vital role to perform in maintaining law

and order. You have an opportunity to carry from here the fact that we in law enforcement are a minority group badly in need of public support. A non-law-enforcement-employed-citizen is one of about 200-million persons in America. We in law enforcement number well below 400-thousand. Yes, law enforcement is a minority group that does want and need your support.

You who are charged with reporting the news are protected in what you say, film, and write. This is, of course, as it should be. But within the ranks of journalism . . . as within the ranks of law enforcement . . . there is always the "bad apple" who makes it more difficult for the rest of us. You of the fourth and fifth estates must be ever vigilant to make sure that in your zeal for reporting the news, you do not jeopardize the very government which grants you the freedoms it does. When you learn of corruption or negligence or incompetence in any branch of government, you have both a duty and a responsibility to report it completely and factually. However, I do not feel that those few journalists who . . . innocently or otherwise . . . prostitute the entire profession by pandering in the name of Freedom of the Press should be encouraged or allowed to continue undermining America. As with the law enforcement profession . . . I believe that you responsible journalists should be the ones to investigate, discipline, and if necessary to expel from your number those who do not have the best interests of your profession and our nation at heart.

We . . . all of us . . . law enforcement . . . citizens . . . journalists . . . are concerned with maintaining our nation's security and with building a better tomorrow.

There is within the Bible a warning which we would all do well to heed in America today. It says, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" In place of the word man, let's substitute the word nation.

Unless each of us . . . all of us . . . realizes these problems and responsibilities and takes positive steps to reverse the trend toward anarchy, our nation is indeed in grave danger.

We must never be content with existing conditions but must always seek out new and better ways . . . new and better methods . . . to become ever more proficient in our profession, through education and through dedication.

To you who are graduating this afternoon from the Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy, I leave you with these final thoughts:

The law enforcement officer of today must never be content with the status quo. He must always be looking to the future of his profession. He must always be ready for change . . . for progress.

As the crossbow gave way to the primitive flintlock, which in turn gave way to the six-gun, the tools used by law enforcement today . . . improved many times in efficiency . . . require an ever higher degree of skill and knowledge. Today . . . more than ever before in history . . . law enforcement is faced with complex, moving, and rapid changes . . . in equipment and in attitudes.

The path from Anglo-Saxon England in the early centuries of the Christian era to modern-day America has been a long and difficult one. There have been many detours along the way. Yet we have come to a time of unprecedented prosperity and opportunity. Along that sometimes primitive path, we have overcome many obstacles.

The expressway which leads from today into the undreamed-of tomorrows may offer even more challenges.

I have no doubt however that through education . . . training . . . and perhaps more important . . . self-determination and dedication . . . the titlings, the hundreds, the

free men and women of America . . . with their sheriff at their head . . . will lead the way to tomorrow and all the tomorrows yet to come . . . unafraid and ready for whatever each new day may bring to challenge the domestic tranquility of each county and parish in America.

BRAY REPORTS TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, following are the first six weekly newsletters I have sent to constituents in 1969:

NEWSLETTER No. 1

The beatings . . . were totally brutal, with no mercy of any kind. They were for one purpose, and that was to terrify and terrorize people. . . . Commander Lloyd M. Bucher, Skipper of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

"Vae victis!" "Woe to the vanquished!" The Roman historian Livy's phrase, 2000 years old, has all too frequently been the benchmark for treating those held captive by hostile powers. Vercingetorix, King of the Gauls, was dragged naked in chains behind Julius Caesar's triumphal chariot through the streets of Rome, then cast into a leaky dungeon beneath the Capitol and later strangled. Richard the Lion-Hearted, after the siege of Acre during the Third Crusade, became impatient with Saladin for not delivering the True Cross and 3000 Christian captives in return for 3000 Moslems held by Richard. Richard ordered the Moslems killed; Saladin retaliated by killing all the Christians.

William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, victor over Bonnie Prince Charlie at Culloden in Scotland in 1746, ordered all Scottish prisoners to be put to death. (The flower "Sweet William" was named after the Duke, altho not on account of Culloden; the Scots, to this day, call the same flower Stinking Willie.) Captain Wurz, commandant of the Confederate prison camp at Andersonville, was hanged after the Civil War for alleged mistreatment of Union prisoners. Whether he was guilty or not is still hotly debated. The fate of the Italian soldiers taken prisoner by the Ethiopians after the battle of Adua in 1896 was indeed ghastly and the details do not belong here.

German and Japanese concentration and POW camps in World War II have been described in all their hideous detail. Over 130,000 German soldiers of Field Marshal von Paulus' Sixth Army were captured by the Russians at Stalingrad; less than 5000 of them ever came home. The Korean War gave the American Republic its first horrifying, close-hand example of what could be done to captured soldiers by a clever and utterly ruthless, unprincipled enemy. "Brainwashing"—an invented word, to describe a certain process—has now become firmly rooted in the English language.

Using prisoners of war for propaganda or other purposes seems, curiously enough, to have originated in Asia. Chang Yu, writing around 1000 AD, said "All soldiers taken must be cared for with magnanimity and sincerity so that they may be used by us." There has been no "magnanimity and sincerity" shown American captives in either the Korean or Vietnamese wars, but plenty of attempts to "use" them.

Lord Byron, in his famous poem "The Prisoner of Chillon," has the Prisoner reflect on his eventual state of mind after long captivity:

"It might be months, or years, or days—I kept no count, I took no note; I had no hope my eyes to raise And clear them of their dreary mote; . . . I learned to love despair . . ."

Every American fighting man surely knows, and every one of our citizens must realize, that captivity by the enemies we face today on many fronts is a grim and terrible prospect indeed. They—our enemies—will not refrain one instant from applying the most insidious and sinister techniques yet devised to try and abuse and humiliate a once-proud person to the point where he is a cringing, mindless wretch, a pathetic shadow of his former self.

American fighting men sent into battle or into any situation where the danger of captivity by the enemy is real and present, must be armed with something more than the present "Code of Conduct for Prisoners of War." The Code tells the man what his country expects of him, but does not the man have an equal right to expect something from his country?

First, he has a right not to be needlessly and carelessly exposed to possible attack and captivity, as was the *Pueblo* and its crew. Second, he should not have to enter captivity with the nagging feeling that he has become a casualty in a war that is being fought only with half-measures. Third—generally, in past wars, achieving release of American prisoners was seen as a by-product of victory. However, today, considering the peculiarly hideous nature of POW treatment by the North Vietnamese, and the North Koreans, should not this goal of release become equal among the other major objectives that only a victory can secure?

I do not suggest for a moment that any or all of these three things, put into practice and accepted as articles of faith by our troops, would serve by themselves to steel a man for the ordeal of a Communist prison. But I do believe they might help, in their own small and important way. They would, perhaps, give and help keep alive that extra glimmer of hope, a hope nurtured on the knowledge that as he, the captive, had kept faith with his country, so his country would continue to keep faith with him.

NEWSLETTER No. 2

Then none were for a party, but all were for the State. . . . (Lord Macaulay, "Horatius at the Bridge")

At first glance, and to those who don't know, it might seem to be a major irony of American politics: no matter how bitter our presidential campaigns, no matter how acid the charges and counter-charges, the inaugural ceremonies for the winner become a truly non-partisan, non-political event. They belong to, are avidly watched and shared in by millions of Americans. We seldom consciously realize it, but on reflection it is clear that what we are seeing, perhaps taking part in and enjoying is something that, surprisingly enough, is not all that common in the world today: orderly and peaceful transition of power, with the welfare of the American Republic taking precedence over party, over politics and over personalities.

In the long history of political systems, transfer of power has in a surprisingly large number of cases been marked by strife, violence and bloodshed and until fairly recently, as history goes, peaceful transitions were definitely exceptions to the rule. Imprisonment, exile, banishment, forcible deposition, flight for life or outright murder—these things are woven through the histories of governments and have struck at Caesars, Kings, Czars, Commissars, "strong men," and other heads of state right down to the present day.

A King Farouk is deposed and exiled; a Trujillo is cut down by bullets; a Khrushchev (if the story can be believed) was literally tricked out of power by a diabolically

cally clever strategem that would have set the old master of treachery, Joseph Stalin himself, roaring with laughter and stamping his feet in approval.

The account originated in Yugoslavia, and has come to the West through a German newspaper. It goes like this: Vacationing at the Black Sea in October, 1964, the blunt, earthy peasant was provoked into a screeching fury by a long-distance phone call from Leonid Brezhnev, in which Brezhnev "thanked" Khrushchev for a "letter of resignation" to the Soviet Presidium. Khrushchev, of course, had never written such a letter; it existed only in the fertile imagination of Brezhnev and his accomplices.

Goaded into a howling rage, Khrushchev bellowed threats against the Soviet Presidium and the Central Committee and unwisely used the phrase "I'll have you put against the wall, you damned devils!" With that, Khrushchev slammed down the phone; as we can imagine, foaming to the point of being incoherent, he gave orders to return to Moscow at once.

Brezhnev, however, had been tape recording the entire conversation. He immediately took the tape and played, to the Central Committee, the part containing Khrushchev's threats. Not wishing to be put up against a wall by anyone, and not caring to test their luck in explaining things to Comrade Nikita Sergeievich, who was then approaching Moscow and no doubt getting madder by the minute, the "damned devils" summarily and instantly voted Khrushchev out of power.

The story, if true, is fascinating and it has considerable humor in its own morbid way. The dark and bloody history of Russian power politics over the centuries has never, to the best of my knowledge, ever produced another event that could even remotely be called amusing. Of course it wasn't funny at all to Khrushchev, but when he considers the alternative would have been a firing squad for him, perhaps he takes a philosophic view of it.

American inaugurations have not always been marked by trust and cooperation. The drums of the Civil War were already beginning their faint but ominous roll at Lincoln's First Inaugural. The inaugural procession itself was heavily guarded by grim-faced U.S. cavalrymen, carbines at the ready. Sharpshooters' rifles poked through Capitol windows, and a battery of artillery was standing by. And there is, of course, that truly incredible photograph taken at Lincoln's Second Inaugural. Almost as if staged by the Furies themselves, in a setting that was prelude to the tragedy to come so soon at Ford's Theater, the faces of John Wilkes Booth and his fellow-conspirators are easily identifiable in the crowd in front of the Capitol.

There are those abroad and, sadly enough, within the ranks of our own citizens, who would fasten the American Republic and its people into a hair shirt of guilt and wrap it, and them, with a penitent's chain of shame and contrition. These people would have us behave and act to others much as did a leper of the Middle Ages, who was forced to ring a bell to warn all of his approach and cry "Unclean! Unclean!"

A country, a people, that begins to doubt itself, is a country and people dangerously close to decay, decline and fall. We must at all times keep our vision fixed on those enduring symbols of our strength, and our resolve to use it wisely; our honor, and our vow to keep it bright; and our greatness, and our duty to preserve it.

Let us reflect, then, as we witness this coming inauguration, that it is a quadrennial example and reminder of our heritage as free men, and a symbol of these commitments: the peaceful inauguration of a new President of the United States, and the orderly transition of power in the greatest and most powerful country in history.

NEWSLETTER No. 3

"I shall treat neutrality as equivalent to a declaration of war against me!" (Gustavus Adolphus II of Sweden, Proclamation during the Thirty Years War, 1616-1648)

The spirit of the great Swedish general and statesman is probably frowning in disapproval at the latest action of his countrymen. "Neutral" for the most part since its Baltic supremacy was shattered in the Great Northern War (1700-1721) which also saw the rise of Russia to the position of major European power, Sweden has now capped a long series of irritating and near-provocative anti-American actions by giving recognition to the Government of North Vietnam.

In spite of U.S. protests, Sweden has granted "political asylum" to an estimated 200 American draft-dodgers and deserters from the U.S. military. Sweden was also the site for that peculiar invention of the once-brilliant but now quite probably senile Englishman, Lord Bertrand Russell, the "American war crimes trial." This last was such an open witches' brew of bias and prejudice that even some of the more radical African nations had refused permission to have it in their countries.

The political arm of the Viet Cong, the National Liberation Front, has an information office in Stockholm. That city has also been the scene of numerous virulent anti-American demonstrations, complete with stone-throwing and window-breaking at the U.S. Embassy and trade offices, and one was led by the Swedish Education Minister himself, a man who may be the next Prime Minister. "Education" Minister??

Now, the recognition of Hanoi by Stockholm has not only given the lie to any Swedish pretext of "neutrality" but also illumines the shrieking hypocrisy of those smaller countries which see themselves as mediators in conflicts between other powers.

If a country—such as Sweden—wishes to isolate itself so far as is practical from reality in international power politics, that is its right. It can take its chances in whatever mode it pleases. But isolation does not give it the right to lecture others who are more actively, usefully and knowledgeably involved.

There is very little the United States can do about any of this. The new Administration could refrain from appointing a new Ambassador to Stockholm, and leave our embassy there under a charge d'affaires.

But, at the very least, we should well remember that we owe such a country absolutely no favors of any sort. And the country in question should not expect—nor have the gall to ask for—anything beyond the most stiffly formal and correct treatment that is required in normal diplomatic interchange. If you try to make friends with a dog, yet he continually snaps and snarls at you, there's probably no reason to kick him for it. But there's no reason to throw him any more bones, either.

NEWSLETTER No. 4

Again, perceive not how stones are also conquered by Time?

Not how the lofty towers ruin down, and boulders crumble?—Not how the shrines of gods and idols crack outworn?

Nor how indeed the holy Influence hath yet no power

There to postpone the Terminals of Fate?
(LUCRETIVS CARUS—98 BC—55 BC.)

To us, Lucretius' world was young. But even then, as now, as his brooding and somber lines make clear, men stood in awe and silent wonder before the crumbled ruins and decay of what once was great and grand.

These lines are written on the side of Carthage (Kart-Hadasht, "New Town," in the tongue of the Phoenicians of Tyre) in what is now Tunisia. I am visiting the site for the

first time; the site, not the ruins, for there are no ruins as such. The city that dealt Rome its worst military defeats suffered in turn from Rome destruction so total that archaeologists cannot say for sure where Carthage's walls and buildings once stood.

Rome sought victory; Carthage sought co-existence. Rome fell, too, it is true, but the city survives. Carthage fell; Carthage was obliterated, and practically nothing is left. I draw no specific parallels between their titanic struggle and power politics today. But, standing perhaps on the very spot where the women of Carthage cut off their hair, to make torsion ropes for the catapults during that last grim, hopeless siege, before the end came, I think of the words of the Prophet Isaiah: "Look unto the rock from whence ye are hewn." Just how much does history repeat itself, or try to teach us? What are history's lessons?

By the middle of the 3rd Century BC Rome's expanding political and commercial power crashed into the challenge of Carthage, the richest city in the west. The First Punic War (265-41 BC) was won by Rome; Carthage lost Sicily. But by 220 BC Carthage has regained power in Spain. In 218 BC Hannibal led 40,000 men and 37 elephants across the Pyrenees, with the objective of forcing Rome to agree to co-existing with Carthage.

Moving round the Mediterranean and crossing the Maritime Alps between Little St. Bernard and Mt. Genevre, he entered Cisalpine Gaul (northern Italy) with only 20,000 infantry and 9000 cavalry, having lost the rest since leaving Spain. In December 218 he destroyed two-thirds of a Roman army under Sempronius at Trebia. In April 217, at Lake Trasimene, he deliberately moved between the armies of Servilius and Flaminius, fell upon Flaminius, and Rome lost 15,000 dead and 15,000 prisoners. He then moved south to the Adriatic and swept down on a Roman supply depot at Cannae.

Consuls Paullus and Varro moved against Hannibal with four double legions. Paullus feared the Carthaginian cavalry, but the two commanded on alternate days and Varro took his day of command to order a general Roman advance. On August 2, 216 BC, the Romans had gone too far to withdraw and the battle was joined. Hannibal's cavalry routed the Roman horse, then, as the Roman infantry advanced against his crescent-shaped battle line, the Carthaginian center fell back. The Romans pressed on; Hannibal wheeled his left and right wings inwards onto the Roman flanks; the Carthaginian horse stormed into the Roman rear and, in the words of one leading military writer, "The Roman army was swallowed up as if by an earthquake."

70,000 Romans died; 10,000 (who had not fought at all) were made prisoners; of the Roman cavalry, only 370 escaped. Hannibal lost 5700 men.

In spite of this hideous defeat, the war dragged on and Rome stood fast. In 211 Hannibal did lead his army on Rome itself, and spurred his horse to the walls, to ring his spear against the portals of the Colline Gate. The gesture must have meant a sudden nervous clutching at sword hilts by the watchers on the walls, as the Carthaginian peered up at them in a mixture of contempt, amusement and curiosity.

By 204 BC Hannibal was bottled up in southern Italy and following a Roman invasion of North Africa in 203, Carthage sued for peace and called Hannibal back. At Zama, in 202 BC, just five days march from Carthage, Scipio defeated Hannibal and the Second Punic War was over. Carthage was disarmed and fined a tribute of 10,000 silver talents (about \$20 million).

In spite of all of this, Carthage became prosperous again and by the middle of the 2nd Century BC Roman greed and jealousy (and probably fear) was aroused. Porcius Cato ended his every speech in the Roman Senate, no matter what the topic, with his

famous "Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam!" ("For the rest, it is my opinion that Carthage must be destroyed!")

In 149 BC Rome demanded 300 Carthaginian boys of noble birth as hostages; Carthage agreed. Then Rome ordered surrender of all arms; Carthage gave up 200,000 stands of arms and 2,000 catapults. But the end was not yet: Abandon Carthage and move inland at least ten miles from the sea.

Carthage refused and prepared for war, but it was too late. In 146 BC the final siege was over. All who survived were taken prisoner and sold as slaves by the Romans. The city burned for ten days, then everything still standing was leveled, Roman plows were drawn over the site, a curse was pronounced upon it, and the furrows were filled with salt, as a sign it was to be barren forever.

To Rome, existence meant victory over an adversary. To Carthage, existence meant co-existence and a "limited war" of sorts. Each may draw the lesson he likes from the story:

What are our woes and sufferance; Come and see

The cypress, hear the owl, and plod your way

O'er steps of broken thrones and temples, Ye!

Whose agonies are evils of a day
A world is at our feet as fragile as our clay . . .

NEWSLETTER No. 5

THE LAST FRONTIER OF EARTH

It comprises 70.8 percent of the surface of the globe. Truly unique in existence, it is found on no other planet of the solar system. It has depths that could swallow up the tallest mountain without a trace. 330 million cubic miles in all, each cubic mile has 166 million tons of salt and 38 pounds of gold, to name only two of the many substances found. It is sometimes called "Man's Last Great Storehouse of Wealth," and the wealth of the sea is beyond belief.

Today, for the first time in history, concerted attempts are being made to unlock the secrets of the oceans of the world. My new Committee assignment in addition to my regular work on Armed Services has been to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This new post will bring me into close contact with the fast-growing and vitally important science of oceanography, the study of the seas of the world and their potential use to mankind.

The possibilities are truly incredible. Vision, if you will, getting fresh water from the sea. Not by distillation, but from an iceberg; icebergs are salt-free, being formed from glaciers. Scientists have calculated that three tugboats of the ocean-going type could be hooked to a 10-mile long, half-mile wide iceberg in the Antarctic and in two months time it could be pulled into the Humboldt Current, which runs up the West Coast of South America. Near Peru and Ecuador, the Humboldt slows down; the tugs would then swing the berg into other currents that would take it on a long, looping voyage almost to Hawaii then to Los Angeles. This would take around a year and the iceberg would lose maybe half of its bulk.

When it arrives at Los Angeles, it would be grounded on an offshore shoal and surrounded with a floating dam going about twenty feet below the surface of the water. As the berg melted, the fresh water, being lighter, would stay on top of the salt water, and the dam would keep the fresh water penned in. Los Angeles could pump it out as needed; one such berg would take care of the city's drinking water needs for a month at a cost of about one third of a cent per gallon, counting transportation costs. This is but a fraction of what Los Angeles now pays.

Minerals from the sea? 20 percent of our oil and gas reserves are offshore on the continental shelves and about 40 million

square miles of ocean bottom have enough copper and aluminum to last man for a million years at present rate of consumption.

Food? The newest angle of all; techniques are being worked out to make man more of a harvester than a hunter. Regardless of what is sought, the potentials are vast, and the challenges are great, and I look forward to my additional Congressional Committee duties with a great deal of eagerness and enthusiasm.

NEWSLETTER No. 6

WHAT PRICE NEUTRALITY?

For over 18 years, ever since I have been in the Congress, a constant feature has been my weekly newsletter, blessed (or blasted) by various sources, but reaction to one written two weeks ago was somewhat unusual. I had written critically of Sweden for recognizing Hanoi and suggested the U.S. might not appoint a new Ambassador to Sweden as a means of showing its displeasure for this and other anti-American acts.

One reaction came from Russia. An article appeared on January 28 in *Izvestia*, the official Soviet government newspaper, and another on January 29 in *Red Star*, the Soviet Army newspaper. Both mentioned me by name and were highly critical of my stand.

The second reaction came from Sweden itself. The letter was signed, but the signature is totally illegible and neither name nor address is typed, so I have no idea who the writer is. The full text of his letter follows, verbatim:

"DEAR SIR: Did you know, that in 1783 Sweden was the first European country to recognize the United States? The British reacted exactly the same way as you have reacted today.

"Why not let your electorate know that too?

"Yours sincerely."

Next week I will comment on the Soviet reaction but I wish to address the balance of this newsletter to the unknown writer. Perhaps he will see this, my answer. And I wish to make it perfectly clear that any contention is only between me and those responsible for or giving approval to what are some notoriously anti-American actions. I am certain many Swedes deplore the course their government has taken. My reply follows:

"DEAR SIR: First, to correct your history: Sweden was the third European country (after France and Holland) to recognize the United States. Sweden's recognition was the first that was *unsolicited*. The U.S.-British peace treaty provided that smaller neutral nations could recognize the U.S. without breaking relations with Britain. Sweden was taking no risks in 1783—and knew it—so drop that self-imposed cloak of nobility. It doesn't fit. In addition, I seriously doubt Swedish recognition had been preceded by two or three years of anti-British action.

"If you wish to draw historical parallels, then make sure they are valid. Do you, or does your Government, infer comparability between the U.S. in 1783 and Hanoi in 1969? Do you perhaps compare the Declaration of Independence, for instance, to Hanoi's March 1968 decree of '15 counter-revolutionary crimes'—a decree which, I pointed out at the time, was strikingly similar in many respects to the repressive ones of Nazi Germany?

"Do you see similarities between the Continental Army and the Viet Cong? In January 1969, one month alone, the VC were responsible for the deaths of 400 South Vietnamese civilians—part of the Communist terror tactic—by stabbing, garroting, hanging, being blown up by mines, grenading and shelling. Another 1100 civilians were wounded and 1400 were kidnapped. George Washington never put anything in his orders to his army that read like a recently-captured Viet Cong document's phrase: 'We

should refrain from wantonly arresting and killing people whom we have not yet condemned.'

"I began my newsletter two weeks ago by quoting Sweden's King Gustavus Adolphus II on neutrality. This great statesman and soldier took a very dim view of neutrality; the victor of the battles of Breitenfeld, the River Lech and Lutzen bluntly termed it 'equivalent to a declaration of war against me!'

"I scarcely consider your Government's actions to be declarations of war, but I do find them quite impossible to understand in view of two major factors. First, the clear-cut issue of the Vietnam war: have we not learned from Hitler, and is aggression to go unchecked? But, perhaps, the lesson of World War II was lost on Sweden; considering that your country sat on the sidelines and traded with Hitler, your memories of him are not quite the same as those of some other nations. The second factor is what should be a strong tie between your country and mine that was generated by the thousands of Swedes who emigrated here, to become some of the finest of our Republic's citizens.

"Again, as I said in the other newsletter: if your country wishes to isolate itself from reality in power politics, that is its right. But this isolation does not give you the right to lecture or hinder others more actively and knowledgeably involved. Nor, do I think, do you have the right to pursue a course that obviously only encourages Communist hopes for eventual conquest of South Vietnam and the resultant butchery of thousands. Perhaps neutrality also means a numbing of national conscience, and your Government feels it can live with such a burden. But mine, sir, does not.

"That is why we are in Vietnam and why we strive to assure the safety of one small country against aggression. Not only for South Vietnam, but for any that would ask our help when needed.

"Even Sweden. You wouldn't need an American Ambassador resident in Stockholm to request it. You know we would respond, with never a moment's hesitation nor reflection on the unwarranted and undeserved hostility your Government has shown my country.

"But maybe you wouldn't ask us at all. You might ask Hanoi, since you profess to see no difference between them and us."

MRS. RICHARD GESSFORD, COOS BAY, OREG., FAMILY CIRCLE'S FIRST HOMEMAKER OF THE YEAR

HON. MARK HATFIELD

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, a few days ago I enjoyed the privilege of serving as host for a luncheon here in the Capitol to honor Mrs. Richard Gessford, of Coos Bay, Oreg., winner of the 1968 National Homemaker of the Year Award from Family Circle magazine. Carol Gessford, wife of an architect, mother of two children, and an active civic leader in her community, has brought a fine and deserved distinction to her family and to our State. She was the victor in a contest which drew more than 15,000 competitors from across America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* the text of an article about Mrs. Gessford, published in Family Circle magazine. I think that Carol Gessford's accomplishments will be of interest to Congress. Her achieve-

ments help to make a strong and healthy America.

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

MEET FAMILY CIRCLE'S FIRST HOMEMAKER OF THE YEAR: MRS. RICHARD GESSFORD OF COOS BAY, OREG.

In May of 1968, when we launched our search for Family Circle's first Homemaker of the Year, our hopes were high and, as it proved, justifiably so. Our contest announcement in that issue brought us some 16,000 responses from all over the United States and from Canada.

Our standards in that announcement were as high as our hopes, and it was a pleasure to see how many of the entrants lived up to them—though this did make it tough to narrow the possibilities down to the outstanding few, and to select from those the No. 1 winner. So good were the others, in fact, that we decided to honor an additional 27 regional winners.

Our No. 1 winner is Carol (Mrs. Richard L.) Gessford of Coos Bay, Oregon. The decision that Carol most closely fitted the contest's ideals was made by our Executive Editor, Betty Klarner, on a round of short summer visits with the most likely finalists. But we didn't really get to know the Gessford family (Carol; her architect husband Richard; their 12-year-old daughter Robyn; and son Cary, who is four) until they visited us—in New York, last August. What with interviews, makeup sessions, and such, Carol was kept pretty well hopping (she swears she wore a path between their hotel on Park Avenue and our offices on Madison), but the family managed to work in most of the sights they wanted to see, and a week of memorable meals. "Richard and I took Robyn and Cary to a different foreign restaurant each night," Carol recalls. "The first night, we went to a Japanese steak house where the waiter cooked right at our table with chopsticks. I've never seen those children so excited!"

Which brings us straight to the first criterion of our contest—that the homemaker should be "a woman who gets genuine pleasure from her children." Obviously a conscientious mother, who can be firm when that's called for, Carol openly delights in her youngsters and is pleased when they do well. During our October trip to Oregon to take these pictures, for example, when photographer Doug Kirkland praised them for being fine cooperative subjects, no parent was ever prouder—or happier to share the spotlight.

Carol more than measures up to our second specification—efficient and attractive management of a household. The Gessfords' sense of what a home can and should be goes far back into both their lives, and their tastes and talents harmonize to a remarkable degree. After their wedding, in Idaho (before her marriage Mrs. Gessford was Carol Cheney), and some Army time down in Texas, they agreed that the green grandeur of Oregon was their idea of home, so they headed northwest. Both entered the University of Oregon, at Eugene—he in the School of Architecture and she as an arts major. Surely a propitious beginning for a young couple with definite notions of what they wanted from a house, aesthetically and functionally.

Their Coos Bay home, designed by Richard and the first they have built for themselves, satisfies them on both counts and works well for their kind of life. As for Carol, she "wouldn't change a thing about it," which is high praise indeed from a woman who knows what she likes!

The exterior is most notable for its congenial relationship to its surroundings and for the way it takes advantage of local materials. The wood (Douglas fir) and its staining (a quiet gray-green) suit the locale, and will weather nicely. Oregon's somewhat blus-

tery climate dictated a number of choices, including shapes and exposures of doors and windows (doors facing away from wind directions; southern exposure for maximum sun; bronze-tint window glass to absorb heat). The windows are long and narrow largely for aesthetic reasons—but also because Richard and Carol aren't interested in "bringing the outdoors in," preferring to create their own vistas, often with hanging or potted plants.

More exterior applications of the local principle: The ground cover of wood chips to hold weeds down and keep soil from blowing away in the sometimes wild wind; wheels of tree trunks as "lily pad" stepping-stones at the entrance; local brick outside and inside the entry and around the livingroom fireplace.

In the matter of food, we got more from Carol than we bargained for. She likes to cook and is good at it, is even an avid clipper of recipes, and a frequent and enthusiastic hostess. Oregonians, familiar with the area's unpredictable weather, may be surprised to see Carol entertaining outdoors. Blame that on us; it was a day of rare beauty (and relatively little wind), so we took the liberty of moving the party outside.

As for looks and fashion, naturally we expect any woman to pay some attention to these. Carol was born with good coloring and hair, so her makeup and hairdo needs are simple. She's fortunate, too, when it comes to fashion: She sews well enough to make most of her own clothes and Robyn's, plus a lot of things for her house. She's made shades for all the windows, shower curtains for both baths, and the pillows for Robyn's room.

Carol's beauty rituals are uncomplicated. She likes it that way, and her needs are minimal: Basic makeup is beige-peach foundation; tawny blusher blended on side of face back to ears; light veil of peach powder on moist areas only. To flatten a pronounced bow on upper lip, lips are outlined in light color, filled in with translucent berry tone. For eyes, Carol has learned some new notions: Contouring to lift the fold beneath the brow; to deepen brows, a fine light-brown pencil line along brow top, and blond brow powder below; extra-long dark-brown lashes on upper lid.

Carol's fondness for cooking and her affection for people make her an easy and frequent hostess. Her typical dinner party is likely to be somewhat small—probably two or three other couples—and informal.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS AT 34TH ANNUAL MEETING OF INDIANA STATEWIDE RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., JANUARY 30, 1969

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1969, I had the privilege of delivering an address at the 34th annual meeting of the Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., in Indianapolis.

Under unanimous consent I submit the text of my remarks on this occasion for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA STATEWIDE RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

I'm very pleased to be here at this 34th annual meeting of the Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative.

First, I want to salute all of you as leaders

of rural electric cooperatives here in Indiana. You represent a long and proud tradition in rural America and your work today is part of a continuing movement dedicated to improving the quality of life in our country.

REA: STILL MOVING AHEAD

More than 30 years after President Franklin D. Roosevelt successfully pressed for the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration, rural electrification is still a vital force for progress, the symbol of a better life in rural America.

Three decades ago, only 10 per cent of the farm families of America enjoyed electricity. Today less than 2 per cent are *without* it, and the expansion of rural electrical service continues. Far from having outlived its usefulness, the program is still pioneering new ground, moving steadily toward its goal of low-cost electricity for all farm families.

Over 25 million people now receive the benefits of electrical and telephone service through systems financed by REA. In Indiana alone, there are now 47 REA-financed electric systems, 46 of which are cooperatives, serving over 190,000 rural consumers. Most important, fully 99.5 per cent of the farms in Indiana are now electrified, compared with 11.7 per cent in 1935 when REA was born. Ninety per cent have telephone service provided through REA support.

Two rural electric cooperatives have their headquarters in my own Congressional District. They are both successful private enterprises jointly owned by close to 8,000 member-consumers. These two cooperatives maintain a sizable staff and payroll, and pay their share of taxes—well over \$100,000 in 1967. They are a vital part of the communities they serve.

The rural electrification story is one of the miracles of the modern era. Electricity in rural areas is still a miracle today. Without the efforts of rural electric cooperatives, most farmers would still be in the dark ages of the candle and the kerosene lamp. Yet we tend to take rural electrification for granted now. In these rapidly changing times, we live in a world where miracles are commonplace, and we cease to marvel at what we have created.

Rural electrification was a crusade two and three decades ago, and many members of Congress rallied to its support. Today other issues crowd the Congressional agenda and demand priority attention.

CHANGES IN RURAL AMERICA

I know you are fully aware of the great changes that are taking place in the areas where your electric cooperatives provide service. Nation-wide, the number of farms has been dwindling by more than 100,000 a year. Our total farm population has dropped to less than 7 per cent of the nation's total. The rural areas, where REA was the greatest thing that ever happened, now comprise only a small per cent of the voting strength of the American people.

All rural-oriented organizations face the dilemma of how to use most effectively their diminishing political strength in order to achieve their legitimate legislative goals. Rural electrification, like measures to improve farm income, must have support from Congressmen who have never seen an electric milking machine or an electric pig brooder.

Fortunately, there are Congressmen who, although they have no rural electric systems in their districts, vote regularly for REA appropriations, support Federal multiple purpose power projects, and approve funds for the Federal power marketing agencies. They recognize the contribution that rural electrification makes to the entire economy. They see the importance of upgrading and adding to rural opportunities if America is to achieve a balance in rural-urban growth. They know that the crisis of the cities has its roots in the unsolved problems of rural areas.

Just as Congressmen have had to broaden their interests, so your National Association and other organizations—both rural and urban—have broadened the scope of their concern. Given our highly complex social and economic structure, there is very little legislation proposed today that does not reach well beyond the persons or the areas toward which it is primarily directed.

This is the case with a wide range of legislative considerations generally identified as "consumer protection," about which I want to talk to you this morning. I think this is an area of legislation where rural electric leaders can play an important part, serving the particular interests of rural electricians as well as the broader interests of our society as a whole.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at its annual meeting last year in Dallas, and the Region 4 meeting here in Indianapolis, adopted resolutions supporting bills aimed at strengthening the consumer's position in the marketplace. This is in line with the strong consumer identification throughout the rural electrification program. It gives meaning to your statement that the rural electric cooperatives are consumer-owned.

THE CONSUMER REVOLUTION

And, after all, we are all consumers—all 200 million of us. Fortunately for all of us, we are witnessing in America today something of a consumer revolution. It's a peaceful revolution to be sure, but it's a revolution nonetheless.

The American consumer is much less willing than ever before to accept maltreatment and fraud in the marketplace. He is beginning to assert his rights and is organizing to make his voice heard by both government and business.

Early in 1968, partly as an outgrowth of the Consumer Assembly which has become an annual forum in Washington, a new organization of national scope was created—the Consumer Federation of America. You may be familiar with the Assembly and the Federation, because rural electric leaders have been active in both undertakings.

With all the special interest groups and lobby organizations that have stalked the U.S. Capitol throughout the years, this is the first successful attempt to organize an effective and responsible voice in Washington for the interests of individuals as consumers of goods and services.

RESPONSE OF BUSINESS

The mobilization of consumer interests is having a major impact all across the country, and of course much opposition has been heard from business. But the business community is responding in positive ways too. I noticed last week, for example, that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has set out to close the "communications gap" between sellers and buyers through the establishment of joint business-consumer committees by local Chambers of Commerce. These committees will identify consumer problems and determine priorities for cooperative action at the local level. The Chamber spoke of a need for business to "act positively . . . to demonstrate that it can and will deal effectively with consumer questions and problems."

Congress and the Federal government have also responded, in a variety of ways, to the new consumer awakening. Indeed, more has been achieved in legislation to protect the consumer during the past five years than in any comparable period in our history. The 90th Congress stands as one of the most consumer-conscious Congresses we have ever had, passing 28 consumer protection laws in 1967 and 1968 alone.

Underlying the new legislation is a recognition that today's consumer faces problems he simply cannot handle by himself. Our economy has become so complicated, its

products so complex and its services so vast, that the consumer needs more protection, more information, and more assistance than he has ever needed before.

The individual consumer today is faced with products of such complex chemical or electronic composition that he is often incapable of making knowledgeable purchases. Moreover, the market is flooded with new drugs, synthetics, cosmetics, processed foods and complicated equipment—some of which present real health and safety problems.

TECHNOLOGY BRINGS HAZARDS

In other words, the swift pace of technology, which has brought abundance to the American consumer, has also exposed him to new hazards—car insurance plans that are cancelled for no apparent reason or don't pay off after an accident, misleading warranties and guarantees that leave the purchaser with a worthless product, deceptive and unfair lending and sales practices . . . to name only a few.

The growth and increasing complexity of our economy, therefore, have posed some real dilemmas for the individual consumer.

How can the consumer be confident of his safety when we discover that some types of color television sets and other electronic devices emit dangerous radiation?

How can he be sure he has all the information he needs to know about the products he buys if the labels are misleading or the warranties are vague beyond comprehension?

How can he be sure he isn't being swindled if there are no laws to protect him from unscrupulous creditors or dishonest door-to-door salesmen?

RECORD OF CONSUMER LEGISLATION

To answer these questions and solve some of the problems they pose, Congress has enacted a wide range of legislation. Here are just some of the measures Congress has passed in recent years:

Protection against impure and unhealthy meat and poultry through tighter inspection standards

Curbs on deceptive packaging and labeling
Safety standards for automobiles to stem the carnage on our nation's highways

Regulation of fire-prone fabrics such as baby blankets and household draperies

Protection against fraud and swindling in interstate land sales

Protection of children against hazardous toys and medication

Truth-in-lending

And a long list of others.

Practically every one of us, whether we live in city, suburbs, small town, or open countryside, will benefit from some of these measures passed by recent Congresses. Rural electric cooperatives and their members are consumers, and as such they share a common interest with all Americans, regardless of how they earn a living.

Unfortunately, consumer interests have been sometimes interpreted in rural America as meaning a "cheap food" policy for the benefit of urban America. This is not the goal of consumer protection legislation, nor has any consumer bill resulted in pushing down prices paid to farmers. What consumer protection laws can do is to protect farmers, as well as other people, against abuses practiced by a relatively few dishonest and careless sellers of goods and services—abuses which victimize rural and urban buyers alike.

When consumers make a purchase, they are entitled to assurance that they are getting a fair value for what they pay. They are entitled to have what they purchase stand up under reasonable use and operate under reasonable conditions. They are entitled to reasonable safeguards against hazardous goods. And they are entitled to a voice in how the natural resources of our nation are used.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF CONSUMER PROTECTION

There remains for the 91st Congress a great deal of unfinished business in consumer protection legislation.

Some of the bills which are being introduced early in the present session hold special interest for rural electric cooperatives. There is the issue of electric power reliability—the need to minimize the possibility of massive power blackouts by establishing and enforcing minimum reliability standards, requiring interconnections among neighboring utilities, and by licensing extra-high-voltage transmission lines.

Your NRECA annual meeting last spring went on record with an endorsement of the Electric Power Reliability Act as embodied in the bill (H.R. 12322) introduced by Congressman Moss of California. A revised version of this legislation is being prepared by Congressman Moss, Congressman Ottinger of New York and Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts. I expect to be a co-sponsor of this measure.

Another bill which your national association endorsed last year was introduced by Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, to establish an Office of Utility Consumer Counsel to represent consumer interests before state and Federal regulatory agencies and to make publicly available all information on utility system operation necessary to make such representations effective. This measure will be up for consideration again this year as S. 607 and I was pleased to see that Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., has endorsed it at this annual meeting.

Insuring rural electric cooperatives and other small systems a reasonable opportunity to participate in the benefits of nuclear power development was the purpose of S. 2564, the so-called Kennedy-Aiken Bill. We can look forward to the reintroduction of this proposal in the 91st Congress.

Besides these three consumer-oriented legislative proposals which are so clearly in your interests, there will be many others needing your consideration and support.

We need a bill that will set standards to insure clean and wholesome fish products, similar to the meat and poultry inspection laws passed by the 90th Congress. Millions of pounds of uninspected fish are eaten in this country every year and the conditions under which these products are processed often pose serious health problems.

We also need—vitality need—a law to curb sales racketeering. Most of us have heard countless stories of fast-talking salesmen who travel door-to-door passing off shoddy and unwanted goods at cleverly concealed prices, then slip out of the community before the consumer knows what has been done to him. We need legislation regulating door-to-door selling that would put an end to such abuses.

We need legislation to insure that warranties and guarantees say what they mean and mean what they say, that they are as binding as their language implies, that they can be understood by the average consumer, and that there is service readily available to carry out their provisions.

We very badly need to do something in the way of reforming automobile insurance—to do something about the problems of settlements that are too low and too late, of cancellations and premium increases that are unfair.

We need to pass legislation to require a stronger warning of the health hazards of smoking on all cigarette packages and advertising materials. Just this week I co-sponsored an amendment to the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965 which would achieve this purpose.

And there are many further areas of needed legislation for the consumer which I have not mentioned.

I very much hope that the current Congress will be as energetic as the 90th in es-

tablishing the rights of the consumer and improving the market place. Fortunately, I can report to you that most of the principal House and Senate Members who have taken up the cudgels for the consumer in the past have returned to Congress this year and will undoubtedly be leading the fight for consumer protection this year. I speak of such Members as Congresswoman Lenore Sullivan, who guided the truth in lending bill to passage last year, and in the Senate, Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, Senator Warren Magnuson of Washington, and Senator Philip Hart of Michigan.

Moreover, I hope that the new Administration will put its full weight behind the consumer movement.

Your interest in and recognition of the importance of consumer protection measures are a natural outgrowth of the continuing battles which have characterized the rural electric cooperatives from their very beginnings. The rural electric cooperatives are enterprises where service to the consumer comes first.

RURAL ELECTRICS CAN AMPLIFY VOICE OF CONSUMERS

With the continuing trend to bigness in all aspects of business, especially manufacturing and service, concern for the interest of the individual tends to be minimized. The voice of the individual consumer is too often not heard. Alone it cannot overcome the clamor of the marketplace, the massive advertising campaigns, the selling pressures of the trained salesmen. All of these efforts are designed to sell—too little effort has been and is being made to protect the consumer in the sales transaction.

The rural electric cooperatives, as consumer-owned and consumer-oriented organizations, can and do provide a means to amplify the voice of the consumer. They can and do help to make the consumer's interest and concern heard. It is a difficult and challenging role.

But the rural electric cooperatives have faced up to tough battles before and seen them through to victory. You thrive on challenge. By working together, as we have in the past, we can solve our problems and make this country a better place for all of us.

WASHINGTON WATCH—A PRIVATE NEWSLETTER BY TRISTRAM COFFIN

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a very perspective letter written by Mr. Tristram Coffin, a leading writer in Washington, will, I think, be of interest to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Washington Watch, a private newsletter circulated to members and supporters of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, Jan. 5, 1969]

(By Tristram Coffin)

(NOTE.—The views expressed by Mr. Coffin are his own and Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace does not necessarily endorse them.)

THOUGHTS FOR THE NEW YEAR

"The most pernicious curse of modern times is the archaic habit of violence carried over into an era when it no longer serves an evolutionary or a social purpose. The habit

is now expressed in weapons so outrageous, so disproportionate, so revolutionary, so fundamentally subversive of human institutions and civilizations that they have long ceased to be rational—have indeed become incompatible with human decency and human survival.

"For this reason it is not only a waste but a flagrant abuse of human devotion and talent that so many gifted and vigorous men all over the world, soldiers and scientists, are required to spend their lives multiplying and elaborating arms and armies," Charles W. Yost, Ambassador-designate to the U.N., pages 215, 216, in his book, *"The Insecurity of Nations."*

"More than 14,500 Americans died in Vietnam in 1968, American military spokesman said today. U.S. dead in 1968 almost equalled the figure for the first seven years of the Vietnam war and brought total American combat deaths in Vietnam to about 30,543, the spokesman said, *"Washington Post*, January 3.

"When he takes over as Secretary of Defense in the Administration of President-elect Richard M. Nixon, Rep. Melvin R. Laird will be presented with a set of military spending proposals totaling from \$100-billion to \$110-billion. This is \$20 billion to \$30 billion higher than the present defense budget," *N.Y. Times*, Dec. 19.

"The continued existence of a balance of payments problem raises doubts that the United States is either rich enough or has sufficient determination to maintain the cost of world leadership, the American Bankers Association said in a study released Thursday," *the Associated Press*, Dec. 12.

"Senate Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen says the Nixon Administration will be 'tougher' about the Vietnam war. And that its toughness will bring about 'diminished action' in the conflict. The new administration 'means business about effectively prosecuting the conflict,' the Senator said in a telephone interview. This, he contends, will have a 'sobering effect' on the foe which, in turn, will lead to better results at the conference table," *Christian Science Monitor*, January 2.

WHY CLIFFORD WANTS PEACE IN VIETNAM

"The American peace movement has found its most powerful champion in the unlikely of places—the Pentagon. Clark McAdams Clifford, in charge of that citadel of war, has become as convinced as anyone in Government that the Vietnam war cannot be won and that an 'honorable withdrawal' is the most urgent business facing the country," George C. Wilson, Pentagon correspondent for the *Washington Post*. Wilson reports Clifford is certain the Nixon Administration "will come to share" his views, and that the Thieu-Ky regime in Saigon will do everything it can to keep us fighting.

A contrary report is filed by columnist Joseph Alsop who says Nixon listened sympathetically to General Andrew Goodpasture, the No. 2 man in Vietnam, who argued "that the enemy's military and political situation is now deteriorating rather rapidly. And with certain provisions . . . this deterioration will continue and even accelerate as each month goes by, if the United States only keeps the pressure on." (John Kenneth Galbraith comments on the "Rostow-Alsop-Aesop thesis, which holds that in modern warfare . . . there is nothing like a succession of bad defeats to bring you to the brink of victory.")

Some reasons for the Clifford position are: The avalanche of bombs dropped in Vietnam—2,057,244 tons, or 50 percent more than we dropped in all theaters in World War II—has not materially changed the course of the war. The *Christian Science Monitor* reports, "It seems that North Vietnamese ingenuity and the steady flow of supplies from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe prevented the total destruction of North Vietnam's transportation and supplies." *The Monitor* quotes

two East German Journalists as saying that on September 2, a 1.2 mile long bridge near Hanoi was destroyed, but on the same day 80,000 people still crossed the river. (*The Washington Post* estimates "Marine Corps planes dropped 7 tons of bombs for every soldier claimed killed.") A report of life in Viet Cong territory by *Asahi Shimbun*, Japan's largest newspaper, says, "American strategy does not seem able to secure territory, but only to devastate it . . . They seemed to fire whimsically and in passing even though they were not being shot at from the ground nor could they identify the people as NLF. They did it impulsively for fun, using farmers for targets as if in a hunting mood. They were hunting Asians."

The United States has spread itself too thin militarily and would be unable to respond effectively to new crises. We have mobilized for Vietnam 43 percent of the army, 32 percent of the Marines and 60 percent of the Air Force.

The war is undermining the morale of the armed forces. *The Washington Post's* Ward Just reports he knew in Vietnam "only one GI who was totally enthusiastic in a totally personal way." (He was an anti-Castro Cuban refugee.) Riots, desertions, participation by uniformed personnel in anti-war demonstrations, formal charges of mutiny, and widespread use of anti-war symbols disturb the managers of the military. *The Monitor* reports: "Never in the history of United States warfare, has so personal an act as military desertion been so widely and purposefully publicized as during the Vietnam war. And never before has such an act, regarded as despicable in previous wars, assumed so convincingly the characteristics of morality and righteousness." The article quotes one deserter as saying, "I wasn't about to lay my life on the line for a cause I didn't believe in, and I wasn't about to kill anyone for something I didn't believe in." (December 31.)

"Nearly 200,000 Americans have been killed or wounded . . . Over \$100 billion have been spent. Here were the resources to have fulfilled the promise of American life in our generation; here were the young men to have given leadership to a nation. Here were the energies and labor of a government of dedicated men. Here was progress to dream of, and to work for, and to hand down to our children. Here was an America ready to give leadership to an entire world . . . It was all here, and now it is gone," Senator Edward M. Kennedy.

The widespread use of defoliants, napalm and bombing of civilians and villages has created a sense of guilt in the United States and among its friends. Eleven Protestant bishops, a Catholic bishop and three eminent rabbis asked Dow Chemical to allow its stockholders to vote on whether the company should continue to sell napalm for use against human beings. A Scientists' Committee on Chemical Warfare in Vietnam was organized to "end the use of chemical agents" by our forces there, this at the recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The group charged that a million acres of crop and cover have been sprayed.

GENERAL PUBLIC ALIENATION TO THE WAR

This is only a part of the general intellectual alienation to which the Johnson Administration responded so harshly by its indictments of Dr. Benjamin Spock, Yale chaplain William Sloane Coffin, writer Mitchell Goodman and Harvard graduate student Michael Ferber, and what the *Washington Post* called "a surprising brief" in which the Administration accused poet Robert Lowell, who had angered President Johnson, and writers Dwight MacDonald and Paul Goodman among others of belonging to the "same conspiracy" against the draft.

The war has superheated the U.S. economy. A *Washington Post* item reports "a consumer

now pays \$10.48 for an item that cost \$10 just eleven months ago." The Committee for Economic Development notes that war expenses, a general rise in government spending and a lack of "firm handling of the economy" has created "an unnecessary degree of inflation, an increasingly precarious balance-of-payments position, and finally a sustained attack on the dollar."

American opinion has turned heavily against the U.S. load in the war, and 46 percent in the latest Gallup poll favor our troop withdrawal.

The enemy has shown a greater capacity to fight than the South Vietnamese. *The Monitor* says 12,000 Saigon troops deserted in September, and Hanoi broadcasts regularly claim incidents of mutiny in the Saigon forces. The Japanese newspaper, *Asahi Shimbun*, says two factors keep the VC going. South Vietnamese troops pass on weapons to the VC. At one advanced post visited by the reporter "over 80 percent of their weapons were U.S. army issue. Some were Chinese and French made, but the grenades were 100 percent American made." The widespread devastation has "created what is today the dominant emotion, hatred of Deguoc My (Imperial America). A political staff member told me, 'The American and South Vietnamese Government forces are driving people into the enemy's camp and the longer the war goes on, the more deeply the people will hate them.'"

THE WESTMORELAND-LAIRD POSITION

In the book, "Westmoreland: The Inevitable General," by Ernest B. Furgurson, the General is quoted: "I bet the Russian Army is jealous as hell our troops (in Vietnam) are getting all this experience, we're learning about guerrilla warfare, helicopters, vertical envelopment, close artillery support. Those Russian generals would love to be here . . . Any true professional wants to march to the sound of gunfire." *The Washington Post* reports: "Melvin R. Laird goes into the job of Secretary of Defense with an expressed philosophy close to the military chiefs he is supposed to control." Laird in his own book, *American Strategy Gap*, writes: "While we have the power we must aim at confronting the enemy directly. We can win every such confrontation."

THE U.S. COMMITMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Joseph C. Harsch writes in the *Christian Science Monitor*, "The fact is that the United States, rightly or wrongly, for better or for worse, is a partisan in the Middle East. The survival of Israel as an independent state is a matter of dogma in both American political parties . . . In every Arab-Israel war the United States Navy has covered and protected the Israeli coastline and guaranteed Israel's lines of supply. Israel is under the protecting arm of the United States, and has no reason to doubt that it will continue to be protected."

The Middle East "trembles on the brink of disaster," Ambassador-designate Charles W. Yost writes in the current *Atlantic Monthly*, because of a number of factors—the withdrawal of France and Britain as "trustees" of the area after the ill-fated war in 1956, the enlarged Russian presence as an arms supplier for Arab nations and as a naval power in the Mediterranean, a large body of embittered Arab refugees, Arab guerrilla tactics and the Israeli strategy. This is described by Alfred Friendly in the *Washington Post* as "preemptive deterrence," that is to make guerrilla raids too expensive for the Arab states. The *London Financial Times* adds: "Israel's present strategy is based on escalation. It is offensive to such a degree that Israel is obliged to mount a preemptive attack every time Arab forces, whether conventional or guerrilla, look like gaining any kind of superiority. That, of course, is the danger of the present renewed arms build-up."

... Responsible powers are aware, as the United States is now aware, of the danger of higher confrontations."

A PLAN TO DEFUSE THE MIDDLE EAST

Yost proposes: "a realistic but generous arrangement for the resettlement and reconciliation of the refugees, and a formula embodying in contractual form the status and guarantees for Israel which the U.A.R. and Jordan have accepted in principle by subscribing to the November 1967 (U.N.) resolution." He suggests further that Israel withdraw, at least in part, from Arab territories, and that the U.S. and Russia agree to limit the arms to both sides to those needed "for genuine self-defense." This would rule out Phantoms, Migs and missiles.

MILITARY SPENDING IS NEW TARGET

The first real drive to cut down excessive military spending and investigate waste and profiteering in military contracts is just beginning. Items:

"Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York, warning that America's domestic crisis will give no rest to the new Administration, called on President-elect Richard M. Nixon to change the emphasis of Federal spending from military to civilian needs," *United Press International*.

An upcoming investigation of a Joint Economic Committee sub-group will study "the amount that military commitments and economic assistance contribute to balance of payments deficits."

"U.S. fighting men in South Vietnam have been deprived of up to \$1 billion worth of vital military hardware because of Army negligence in awarding and enforcing defense contracts," according to a confidential report made public by the National Association of Government Employees.

Senator William Proxmire's subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee is planning new hearings on corruption in military spending. Proxmire's group has already heard testimony that the huge C-5A transport plane program is going to cost \$5 billion more than estimated. The witness, A. Ernest Fitzgerald, an Air Force efficiency expert, was then "stripped of the tenure, or Civil Service protection, he had been awarded two months earlier" by his Pentagon superiors.

Another witness, who audited supplies for U.S. operations from Thailand against Vietnam, revealed that "bribery, collusion and Government laxity led to thefts of at least 5.5 million gallons of petroleum products in Thailand during 1967 alone." This witness, too, was disciplined by being transferred out of Thailand. "The thefts were accomplished principally through bribery of U.S. personnel and forgery of receipts—many of them made out to military units that didn't exist." *Washington Post*.

ADVANCED CRITERIA FOR U.N. AMBASSADORIAL APPOINTMENT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the recent change in the important position of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations has signified some recovery in the necessary observance of certain fundamental criteria for appointment to this rank. As many will recall, there was strong private opposition to the appointment of James Russell Wiggins to this post last fall. One who testified publicly against the appointment was Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University.

His personal account of this episode is set forth in the following article titled "James Russell Wiggins: 'I Am in Love,'" which appeared in the autumn 1968 edition of the *Ukrainian Quarterly*:

JAMES RUSSELL WIGGINS: "I AM IN LOVE"

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Wiggins is in love. He is in love with his country, he says. This is not fiction but a true story of a man who was asked why he was interested in taking on the job of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. In Wiggins' judgment the chief qualification for his interest in and acceptance of the President's nomination to this critical post is the passion of love. Now, it can truly be said, every loyal Boy Scout or Girl Scout is well on the road of qualifying for the august position of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Cultivate a love for your country and by all means announce it loudly and dramatically, and you, too, will qualify according to present standards.

The text of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the Wiggins nomination falls far short of conveying the atmosphere in which this spectacle took place. Questions posed by some of the Senators present were totally irrelevant or superficial as concern the qualifications of the nominee. One or two behaved as though the entire procedure was mechanical and the approval of the nomination was a foregone conclusion. As we shall see, they were quite correct. But one had to be in attendance to witness the tragedy and to appreciate the full emotional effect of the proceedings. When the chairman of the committee, Senator Fulbright, asked the witness "Why are you interested in this appointment?" and received the answer "I am interested in it for only one reason—I am in love," the resonance and tonal effect of his "What?" resounding through the large room, could hardly be sensed from any reading of the text.¹

For a full appreciation of this and other comical aspects of the hearing, there could be no substitute for attentive presence.

A FEW ASPECTS OF THE HEARING

Before we evaluate this sorry spectacle in our current diplomacy, let us view a couple more of these aspects. The case of Senator Case and his questioning is one for the books. Throughout he attempted to put words into Wiggins' mouth after it was considerably dried up by Senator Fulbright's persistent, though unsuccessful, interrogation. Concerning our intervention in Vietnam, Senator Case nudged the nominee by saying "you can talk about it anyway you want. I think it would be helpful, because we are not engaged in an investigation of you. You are confirmed already, as far as that goes." "Strange, isn't it? The whole and sole purpose of the hearing was to judge the nominee's qualifications for the U.N. position, and on the basis of the judgment to either confirm or not confirm the nomination. Here we have a frank and doubtlessly blunderous admission that regardless of any evaluation of Wiggins' abilities, the confirmation is rigged.

What is even more disgraceful about the manner in which this hearing was undertaken is the fact that the published record of it omits some meaningful statements made at the hearing. When, for example, Senator Case let it be known that confirmation was already assured, Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut intervened, "Will the Senator yield? I did not hear what you said. Has this action already been taken here?" To which Senator Case replied, "No, no. I was saying this perhaps rhetorically, slightly. But I would guess it is a fair prediction, and in fact I bet it would be unanimous." "Naturally, the bet wasn't accepted. But isn't it odd that this significant exchange does not ap-

pear in the final, published account of the hearing? Its significance lies in the attitude shown toward this particular nomination, by and large uncritical, acquiescent, and even slobbering on the part of a few.

In his documented criticism of Wiggins' character, integrity and ability the writer was under no illusion as to the odds against the rejection of the nomination. Weighted account had been taken of the long Senate fight on the Fortas nomination to Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, of the intense fever in Congress for adjournment, and the general feeling that this political pay-off for journalistic services rendered would cover only a three-month period. At this late stage it would have been a miracle if one or a group of Senators took up the cudgels for another nomination fight. In this circumstance my aim was solely to provide for the public record the patent lack of qualifications on the part of the nominee. Much of the publicity surrounding Wiggins' nomination was false and untrue, particularly about his "integrity" and "objectivity." Those who have had any close encounter with him, wielding a pen behind a safe mahogany desk in *The Washington Post*, know differently, and the public record had to show this.

A number of rationalizations have been advanced in behalf of Wiggins' appointment. Some try to justify it as simply a retirement gift for an editor who cooperated closely with the White House. With greater accuracy others view it as an outright political pay-off for the foreign policy support given by Wiggins to the Administration. Perhaps the most fatuous rationalization is that Wiggins was selected to symbolize the low regard and displeasure held by the United States toward the U.N. at this time. If this were so, what has Secretary of State Dean Rusk been doing there? Actually, regardless of the motivation, the choice made reflects the low state of the Administration and reinforces further the poor image the U.S. possesses today in the world arena. Also, the treatment accorded this matter by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee produces an equally sad commentary on the proper execution of functions by the Senate; here, too regardless of the cited pressures.

Two other important aspects of the hearing were Senator Dodd's insistence on time to permit a reading of sufficient amount of the *Post's* editorials on foreign policy and Senator Fulbright's impatience with the nominee's vague and general responses. On several occasions during the hearing Senator Dodd pointed out the need for reading and examining the *Post's* editorials before a judgment could be made on the nomination. As he put it, "Mr. Wiggins has said very frankly he is not familiar with this problem, the problem of international affairs. He hasn't served in any official capacity. How does one know, then, what he thinks, how he will react, how he could handle his job up there, except by reading the editorials which he tells us generally have met with his approval?" "No one contested this vital point, but the fact is that all fairly well knew that time would not be afforded for this necessary examination and, indeed, it was not. On the very day of the hearing the Administration moved "to push the nomination through the Senate committee and the Senate. . . ." So, in effect the committee approved the nomination of a man who admitted his unfamiliarity with international problems, admitted his personal control over the *Post's* editorials, and remained largely a mystery as to his views and opinions.

Concerning the last point, the grueling questioning pursued by Senator Fulbright revealed the paucity of the nominee's views and opinions. Though the committee chairman concentrated on the subject of Vietnam, the responses vibrated with vague generalities and stock phrases. Sentiment prevailed, including love, but nothing in the way of concrete knowledge and proposed ac-

Footnotes at end of article.

tions seeped through. "I simply do not have a solution for the war in Vietnam" was typical of the simple answers given to other questions as well, such as a U.N. debate, agencies and the like.⁶ Senator Dodd stated what was quite evident to all present when he said "Senator Fulbright asked you this question. He said the United States has suffered great losses in Vietnam, lives, blood, money, just about everything one could think of, including prestige, and as I understood the Senator, he asked, what do we win, and what do we lose? I didn't hear you make any specific response."⁷ The virtual absence of specific responses was the hallmark of Wiggins' testimony. And on the basis of some questionable standards, he was both chosen and confirmed to represent the strongest power on earth in the United Nations.

STANDARDS FOR A RESPECTABLE NATION

The scandalous aspects of the Wiggins spectacle emphasize both the depth of deterioration in U.S. foreign policy management and the need for standards on the part of a still respectable nation. Applied to this highly important post in the top world forum, these standards may be adapted to every other situation where the far-flung Russian threat presents itself. In any such nomination, one requisite is the selection of a well-rounded personality who has consistently shown a balance and fairness of outlook, an objectivity toward especially new and untried ideas, and a proven compassion for the needs and aspirations of all peoples, including the many different nations in the USSR. In the Wiggins case this requisite was scarcely satisfied. This writer, in opposition to his appointment, hammered away at his lack of objectivity and his malice as shown in the *Post's* numerous editorials which arbitrarily sought to "sweep under the rug in the interest of detente all evidences of Russian aggression and tyranny in Eastern Europe."⁸ More detailed evidence below will show the extent of Wiggins' extremism and viciousness.

Another important standard for judging a nominee to the U.N. post is the scope and depth of his knowledge of the Soviet Union, its origin, composition, chief developments and internal conflicts. Whether we wish to admit it or not, the chief sole and serious enemy to the security of our country is the totalitarian Russian base in that ersatz union. Dependence for such knowledge on staff members in the U.S. Delegation to the U.N. is not enough. The Ambassador is expected to show leadership, and this cannot be adequately displayed without independent knowledgeability. This writer was accurately quoted as saying that in this respect the Wiggins nomination is "an appalling one" and that "editorials under Wiggins' supervision showed the nominee lacked sufficient understanding of Soviet intentions and motives . . ."⁹ Here, too, some evidence below will indicate the appalling nature of the nomination.

Surely, an additional and reliable test is the judgment demonstrated by any such nominee as to his assessment of overall developments in Eastern Europe. In the wake of the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia, this standard of evaluation assumes even greater importance at this time. As the writer stressed, if the candidate showed himself to be tragically wrong, then he should not have even been considered in the first place. As revealed in the *Post's* editorials, Wiggins' notions about irritating the bear, the mellowing Bolshevik, and detente with "Russia" are out of this world and something to contemplate. The pro-Russian bias of the *Post*, in the sense of casting aside other peoples so that the empire may remain intact and peace through evolution may be attained, has been conspicuous for the past decade. This writer

knows whereof he speaks, for the battle on these fundamental issues has been a continuous and running one, as the appendix of the hearing publication in part clearly shows.¹⁰ Much to everyone's surprise, the post-Wiggins administration in the *Post* decided to display some objectivity by reporting on the writer's testimony against the nomination. What it reported puts in a nutshell the points registered here: "Dobriansky said he had waged a '10-year ideological conflict' with *The Washington Post* and that the Wiggins nomination, 'in a twilight Administration,' was 'scraping the bottom of the barrel.'"¹¹

In these times, another very important standard of behavior is the courage of one's convictions. In addition to displaying honesty, fairness and objectivity even on the most controversial issues, a candidate for this or any other prominent position of representation should possess the metal of courage and an ability to defend his views in the open, face to face with his opponent. It is one thing to sit behind a desk with a pen in hand, lashing out against faceless adversaries; it is quite another to do this and courageously meet the challenges that ensue. Challenges for debate and open discussion have been offered to Wiggins, but he never had the courage to accept them even on his own home grounds and under rules set by impartial third parties. It can't be too strongly emphasized that at any time, no less the present, we can ill afford a weakling representing the U.S. in the U.N. In this propaganda arena the stakes are too high to entertain the superficial ambitions of a diplomatic nullity. The writer is certain that the Russians couldn't have been more pleased with this weak appointment, particularly in this period of the armed Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia. Could one envision a superficial Wiggins orally contending beyond a text prepared by a staff member with one of the dialectically trained Russian delegates on issues of imperialism, human rights, colonialism and related subjects?

These, then, constitute the standards, criteria, requisites, and tests by which a man should be initially judged for a high nomination and later judged for confirmation. In none of these instances does Wiggins fare well, and his appointment casts a serious shadow over the importance and significance of the U.S. Ambassadorship in the U.N. The record of Wiggins' editorial bias, manipulations, and cowardice is long and goes far beyond what is contained in the appendix of the published hearing. This writer, helped by Senator Dodd's insistence, appealed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine this record carefully, but sheer politics prevailed and the nomination was actually railroaded through the Senate. In light of the standards described above, to which there can be no rational objection, this hasty action certainly does not reflect well on our current processes of government. And the stain will remain for some time to come.

SOME CHOICE POINTS OF EVIDENCE

Objectivity, knowledge, judgment, and courage are the keys for evaluating fairly and with principle the Wiggins nomination. Considering the first in his case, objectivity implies intellectual integrity, a disciplined willingness to observe and examine all aspects of a given object or situation, and a moral fairness toward those with contrary views and opinions. In numerous cases Wiggins has been found wanting on this score. In fact, wielding the means of a powerful newspaper, he manifested all the marks of sharp bias, a malicious bent, narrow-mindedness, and an evident cultural insularity. The best case to support this indictment was his almost personal and neurotic campaign to thwart the Congressional-directed erection of the Taras Shevchenko statue in the nation's capital.

Let it be emphasized at the start, the crucial point here is not the broad ramifications of this event which extended deep into the Kremlin and all parts of the Russian empire, including North Vietnam, but rather the manner in which an editor of a formidable organ treated it, and at that for a period of over six months. Moscow's response to our American action to erect a similar statue in the Red imperial capital, Khrushchev's hasty departure from Scandinavia to unveil their statue before ours in June, 1964, former President Eisenhower's memorable address at the monument, and many other internationally interrelated aspects were completely lost on Wiggins. Setting these intricate events aside, for they are not logically relevant to the issue at hand, let us just concentrate on how this so-called journalist of supposed integrity, honesty, and objectivity managed his erratic opposition.

With a unique cultural insularity, the now U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. waged a campaign of blatant inconsistency and uncertainty as to his knowledge of the issue, and went far beyond all this to indulge in smear and hatred tactics, injecting anti-Semitism, the hyphenated American slur, and fictitious quantities and employing every filthy trick in the journalistic trade to prevent what Congress and the Eisenhower Administration had willed by accepted processes of legislation and execution. As for inconsistency and uncertainty, one need just compare a few passages among many in the editorials written by Wiggins or his directed reporter. In the first one he admits, "Yet, like most Americans, he have never read a line of Mr. Shevchenko's verse, in Ukrainian or otherwise. . ."¹² Later, from one who hasn't read anything of Shevchenko, we read, "as a poet Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans. He is the pet of a small minority, whatever his poetic merit."¹³ This is supposed to be a reflection of intellectual integrity, which has been falsely ascribed to the nominee. As a further example, one need only compare this and other drivel with the highly laudatory article in the *Post* on "A Ukrainian Poet Gets Statue Billing," which in part states "For his poetry, Ukrainians both under and beyond Soviet rule adore him. Two non-Ukrainian Washingtonians familiar with his work speak of him as 'Pushkin and more,' ah, a Shakespeare."¹⁴ Confusing? This is virtually nothing, but the reader can enjoy himself by reading the succession of *Post* editorials and articles as contained in a compact Congressional reprint.¹⁵

Sparse in knowledge of the subject and thus short on objectivity, Wiggins then proceeded to apply the worst conceivable smear technique. These examples should be sufficient to indicate the type of man who was selected for the U.N. Designed for disunity and resurrected Old World hatreds, he wrote, "It is perhaps enough to say that both in the writings of the poet and the efforts to exploit him there are elements which are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox and even Ukrainian background. A statue of Shevchenko would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans."¹⁶ Not one of these groups was foolish enough to fall for this bait, but this didn't deter Wiggins. He kept plugging away with anti-Semitism, anti-Polish sentiments, and the guilt by association argument, this on the part of the *Post* which used to scream over Senator McCarthy's tactics.

Here are some choice examples from an editorial that is really a monument to ignorance. In one place, Wiggins wrote, "It is not just that Shevchenko said many anti-Semitic things that are an affront to the Jewish community of this country . . . It is not just that the poet is the idol of Communist Party members who have caused the Soviet Union to flower with libraries, collec-

Footnotes at end of article.

tive farms, plants, villages, and memorials to his name. It is not just that his very name is, by reason of his flaming nationalism, an affront to members of the Polish minority . . . The larger reason, however, is simply that Shevchenko is neither a universal poet nor a national poet of this country entitled to recognition in the United States."¹⁷ No facts or quoted passages were given for these baseless accusations, only fiction. How absurd all this was can be gleaned from Wiggins' first editorial in which he cried, "Next year will be the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth. That the city has found precious space for the Ukraine's national poet and not yet found room for some comparable token to Shakespeare's genius is really remarkable."¹⁸ Shakespeare, too, contains what some may construe as anti-Semitic passages, but for "integrity" Wiggins the malicious accusation should be reserved only for Shevchenko who, as a poet, likewise had to describe some aspects of life as they were.

Much was written to counteract and refute these scandalous editorials. In part, Wiggins admitted that "Objections of this newspaper to the proposed memorial to the Ukrainian poet, Shevchenko, have inspired a great many letters."¹⁹ The objectivity and fairness of the person and the newspaper can be gleaned from the fact that only a few of these "great many letters" were published in the *Post*. The newspaper has long prided itself for its liberal attitude, its supposed policy of seeing and examining all sides of an issue. This is one substantial case where this claim is hollow pretension. Hundreds of letters poured in to protest the fantasies concocted by Wiggins, but not even one-half of one percent saw publication in the *Post*, while the editor of integrity and objectivity kept rolling along with his campaign in the form of editorials, editorialized reports and articles, politicking on the Hill and with the puppet Soviet Ukrainian delegation to the U.N., and a wide variety of irresponsible journalistic methods aimed at disinformation and distortion. It will now be interesting to observe whether the *Post* will treasure the dubious legacy left by Wiggins or make good its liberal claim.

WIGGINS' KNOWLEDGE OF THE USSR AND COURAGE

The evidence can be cited on and on to prove that Wiggins, the present U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., is a man deficient both in integrity and objectivity. Constituting this evidence, what he suppressed in his paper found its way into a prime source of our Nation's history, the *Congressional Record*. My own book contains two chapters on the historic Shevchenko event and analyzes thoroughly the role played by Wiggins.²⁰ There are so many absurdities in Wiggins' editorials that to show and elaborate upon all of them would require another article. For instance, in his editorial of ignorance, he stated, "If Khrushchev should visit us again, he could lay a wreath on this memorial."²¹ Now, could anyone in his right senses visualize a Khrushchev, who in all his rule rallied year in and year out against the Captive Nations Week Resolution, place a wreath on a memorial dedicated to the liberation and freedom of all the captive nations? The erratic and irresponsible editor of *The Washington Post* thought otherwise. Or take Wiggins' solicitation of the views of the puppet Soviet Ukrainian representative in the U.N. Naively and desperately, Wiggins quoted L. Y. Kizya as supporting the statue but protesting its use "to fan up animosity toward the Soviet Ukraine, and all the more to aggravate the cold war."²² Aside from the impropriety of an American citizen soliciting and injecting a foreigner into a domestic controversy—incidentally, a highly relevant matter that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should

have looked into—Wiggins tried here his guilt by association technique, but it misfired when Kizya protested against the patriotic motives behind the statue's erection.

One can deduce from all this that Wiggins' knowledge of the Soviet Union is at best shaky. Here, too, considerable evidence shows it to be grossly deficient. The fact is that since 1959, when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution, the writer has been in a running and unremitting battle with Wiggins and the *Post* over the fundamental subject of the captive nations. The written record of Wiggins' lack of understanding and outright arrogance on this score could also account for several articles. It is sufficient in this analysis to offer some select examples which adequately substantiate my charge. As in the Shevchenko case, Wiggins deliberately suppressed the publication of numerous rebuttals, but they, too, found their way into the *Congressional Record* and an interested Congress. In fact, just this past July, during the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week, Wiggins resorted to the unheard-of manipulation of extracting a couple of sentences from a National Captive Nations Committee press release and without permission, converting them into a letter-to-the-editor over the writer's signature.²³

Highlighting this case are several editorials. One in July 24, 1959, titled "Irritating the Bear" opposed Congress' resolution because it would displease Moscow. In my reply of July 29, which was the only one published in full during this ten-year period, it was pointed out that patent truths cannot be ignored ostrich-like and that the *Post* was way off base factually in attributing the resolution to the work of some "foreigners" and exile groups, as though that would have been bad. However, how thoroughly lacking Wiggins is in his comprehension of the Soviet Union can be appreciated by the following. In another editorial against the resolution, Wiggins stated "White Ruthenia and Ukraine are political concoctions that describe aspirations more than a national entity."²⁴ The utter silliness of this statement may appear incredible to any cultured and educated person, but the fact is that this is what we have had to deal with. This is the new negative qualification for an appointment to the U.N. The same editorial held that the resolution "also includes 'Cossackia' and 'Idel-Ural' which never have existed as nations except for intervals of German invasion. They are about as much 'captive' of the Soviet Union as Anacostia and Cleveland Park are 'captive' of the District of Columbia."

And there is considerably more of this rubbish. "Ukrainian nationalism," states Wiggins, "is nothing if not anti-Russian."²⁵ Sarcastically, another attacks the resolution because "its list included not only such ancient and recognized lands as White Ruthenia and Turkestan but historic Cossackia and storied Idel-Ural, too."²⁶ One could go on and on with the literary exchange that ensued, but the one thing Wiggins could not show was courage. The poor, little man behind the secure mahogany desk, wielding his powerful pen for the misinformation of the *Post's* readers, shied away from a direct challenge to justify his fictitious views. This writer put it very succinctly: "I challenge you to arrange a discussion meeting in the *Post's* auditorium, which would bring you face-to-face with living victims of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism from Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, and Cossackia . . . Let us see how courageous you are in meeting these people—who you think are ghosts without a national background of independence struggle—before the audience of the *Post's* personnel who, in this setting, would have the opportunity to gauge the level of their editor's understanding of this vital problem."²⁷ The challenge

was repeated several times and, needless to say, was never met.

A DIPLOMATIC OUTRAGE

The appointment of Wiggins to the U.N. is in every respect a diplomatic outrage. It reflects poorly on the White House and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It brings discredit to our nation. It has now virtually made a joke of the institution of the U.S. Ambassadorship to the United Nations. The prudently silent reaction of foreign diplomats to this appalling appointment must be cause for considerable wonderment. When one recalls men of stature who have occupied that post, such as Senator Lodge and Adlai Stevenson, this action is a veritable stain on our national record. Let us hope that it will serve as a lesson for the future.

When the Wiggins type will have passed permanently from the scene, the countless who took to heart the enduring message of former President Eisenhower, will still labor and fight for integrity, objectivity, knowledge, judgment and courage as concerns the most vital of issues in our day. That message, spoken at the foot of the Shevchenko statue, is: "For my hope is that your magnificent march from the shadow of the Washington Monument to the foot of the statue of Taras Shevchenko will here kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men." This world movement for the freedom of all the captive nations has been kindled.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Nomination of James Russell Wiggins, Hearing, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, USGPO, Washington 1968, p. 3.

² Ibid. p. 10.

³ Quotes are from the recorded transcript of the hearing.

⁴ Hearing, p. 30.

⁵ John W. Finney, "Wiggins Defends U.S. Vietnam Policy," *The New York Times*, October 1, 1968.

⁶ AP release, October 1, 1968.

⁷ Hearing, p. 28.

⁸ Finney, Op. cit. *The New York Times*.

⁹ "Fulbright Raps Wiggins Stand On Viet Policy," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1968.

¹⁰ See in particular the editorial "Up With Idel-Ural," p. 58.

¹¹ Warren Unna, "Fulbright Assails Wiggins on War," *The Washington Post*, October 1, 1968, p. 2.

¹² Editorial "Poetic Injustice," *The Washington Post*, September 23, 1963.

¹³ Editorial "The Shevchenko Affair," *The Washington Post*, October 18, 1963.

¹⁴ Stephen S. Rosenfeld, September 29, 1963.

¹⁵ *Shevchenko—A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations*, USGPO 1964.

¹⁶ Editorial "The Shevchenko Affair," *The Washington Post*, October 18, 1963.

¹⁷ Editorial Monument To Ignorance," *The Washington Post*, November 1, 1963.

¹⁸ Editorial Poetic Injustice," *The Washington Post*, September 23, 1963.

¹⁹ Editorial Monument To Ignorance."

²⁰ Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1967, pp. 343-374.

²¹ Editorial "Monument to Ignorance," *The Washington Post*, November 1, 1963.

²² Editorial "Communists Love Shevchenko," *The Washington Post*, December 29, 1963.

²³ Hearing, p. 41.

²⁴ Editorial "Captive Nations," *The Washington Post*, July 11, 1964.

²⁵ Editorial "Captive Congressmen," *The Washington Post*, July 10, 1967.

²⁶ Editorial "Up With Idel-Ural," *The Washington Post*, July 8, 1966.

²⁷ Lev E. Dobriansky, *From Moscow's Izvestia to Washington's Post*, New York, 1967.

THE TASK THAT REMAINS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently the Saturday Review published an editorial entitled, "The Task That Remains." The editorial addresses itself to a tape-recorded conversation between U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe and Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and summarizes a most provocative and informative conversation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the transcript of the conversation, entitled "The Federal Government's Remaining Job in Education," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EDUCATION IN AMERICA: THE TASK THAT REMAINS

As the present Administration prepares to fold its tents and vacate the seats of power, it can take comfort in the fact that no Administration in history has so successfully mobilized the resources of the nation in behalf of education. Recognizing that the task is little more than well begun, however, two influential members of the present Administration, U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe 2d, and Samuel Halperin, deputy assistant secretary for legislation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), sat down recently to chart in informal fashion the directions they felt federal action in education should take in the immediate future. The resulting document, *The Federal Government's Remaining Job in Education*, is instructive.

Among their many recommendations they gave first priority to the "consolidation and coordination" of programs already in operation. The federal role in education has expanded dramatically in recent years and, inevitably, the many disparate programs need to be coordinated and simplified in the interest of efficiency and flexibility.

Closely related to the need for consolidation and coordination of the many new programs and "one of the major tasks for the future," Messrs. Howe and Halperin note, "is an organizational housecleaning and re-ordering of the federal role in education." Individual programs have been lodged in an almost infinite number of different agencies and consequently are not only difficult to administer efficiently, but even more difficult for the intended beneficiaries to use effectively. Many proposals have been made in recent years for restructuring the federal educational establishment. Most consistently supported have been recommendations for raising the education commissioner to the level of under secretary for education in HEW, or to raise education to cabinet rank as a separate department. Howe and Halperin, on the basis of experience, opt for the latter.

But both agree that merely raising the prestige and increasing the power of education in Washington is not the answer. What is required, they believe, is "a broad restructuring of the federal education enterprise in order to get at the problems of individual program improvement and consolidation." This does not mean that all education programs should be brought under one Department of Education umbrella, but rather that the federal government needs to develop a

consistent and coherent policy within which the many and diverse education programs can function in coordinated fashion.

The role of the federal government has expanded greatly in the past five years. President-elect Nixon has, at this writing, given little indication of the policies his Administration will pursue in education. Almost certainly there will be changes—though the hard realities of national welfare may make them less dramatic than some anticipate. In any case, his Administration might well benefit from the valedictory statement of two highly informed men who have taken a long and dispassionate look at the task that remains.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S REMAINING JOB IN EDUCATION

HALPERIN. Looking at the legislative authorities of the U.S. Office of Education as of August 1968 we see that this Federal agency is empowered to spend, if appropriated, some \$8 billion annually under programs covering virtually every area of education. These authorizations affect, in a major way, higher education, educational research, elementary and secondary education, teacher training, vocational education, education of the handicapped, adult education, student financial aid, community services, library programs, and many other areas. Thus, it is no exaggeration to say that, with only slight modifications, the programs now on the statute books could address virtually any education problem in our society.

Except possibly in the education of the handicapped, these Federal undertakings are not what might be called general support programs. Instead they tend to be, in varying degrees, of a categorical nature. That is to say, the Congress has agreed upon particular national educational priorities which call for Federal resources and has enacted programs accordingly.

HOWE. It seems to me that the priority that most clearly reflects the educational thrust of the Johnson Administration has been the focus on disadvantaged people and on using education as the instrument to solve the problems of disadvantaged people. And I think the programs that you have been describing can be seen, in very large proportion, in that context.

The funds that have been appropriated for support of these programs are by no means adequate to do the job, nor has there been adequate time to complete that job. But a very effective start has been made, and it seems to me that there is need now for two major new directions in Federal education programs.

One of these directions can be suggested by the word "consolidation"—some kind of pulling together of existing programs so that they relate better to each other; so that they have more flexibility; so that they are more convenient for the people who use them; so that administrative problems that arise from multiple application forms, filing deadlines, and that kind of thing are simplified. Both administrative and legislative action are needed so that efforts in teacher training, for instance, are related to the efforts of local school districts in educating disadvantaged children and so that curricular reform and other measures by school districts to serve those children are reflected in the teacher training programs of the colleges and universities.

I think there is the possibility of bringing about more efficient combinations of these Federal programs. In saying this I do not mean to suggest that the relative degree of disorder which exists is anybody's fault. It has developed historically, growing out of the mechanisms by which the Congress enacts programs and the manner by which an administration formulates and proposes them. Apparently there are those who imagine that this disorderly picture justifies criticism

of the Congress or the Administration. I don't feel that way about it at all. Rather, it is the natural result of historical development.

The second point I would make in regard to the Federal activities of the future has to do with the organization of the Federal establishment in education itself. The Johnson Administration, in introducing all these new programs, has introduced them across the board in the Federal Government. You find them in the Office of Economic Opportunity, in the Labor Department, in aspects of the Model Cities Program related to education, in the arts and Humanities Endowments, in the National Science Foundations, in the Appalachia programs, in a whole variety of agencies. Whereas the Federal Government has looked at the complexities of transportation and organized a new Department to deal with them or the problems of the cities and organized the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, education has simply mushroomed all over the Government. It seems to me that one of the major tasks for the future is an organizational housecleaning and re-ordering of the Federal role in education.

There are many proposals around, and one of them is that there be a Cabinet-level Department of Education. Another is that the education function in HEW be escalated by the establishment in the Department of an Under Secretary for Education. Personally, I would lean toward the former.

HALPERIN. It seems to me that one can't do a very adequate job on the first problem—without paying attention to the second. You can cut down the number of categorical grant programs, perhaps, and you can simplify forms. But you cannot ordinarily get any consistent, Government-wide policies for, let's say, fellowships or stipends, or for the Federal matching share for the construction of facilities, or for the problems of campus planning, without some rather fundamental changes. University administrators today are beside themselves trying to put together campuses with funds from NIH, the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, NASA, HUD, and so on. Therefore, I put a very high priority on a major reorganization across-the-board—not merely an elevation of the Office of Education, but a broad restructuring of Federal education enterprises in order to get at the problems of individual program improvements and consolidations.

It is important to note that the Federal budget for education has tripled under President Johnson to a current level of over \$12 billion. Only about \$3.7 billion of that sum is administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Therefore, I do not think you can get a really effective Federal policy in the field of education—one which maximizes the benefits of Federal investments for the recipients and for the Nation as a whole—unless you can coordinate both the planning and operations of the thirty or so major Federal agencies that now operate literally hundreds of education programs with little or no collaboration or communication among them.

HOWE. I think this is an important point, and I would add as a footnote that I don't believe you are advocating (nor would I) that all of the programs of all these various agencies be pulled together into a single Department of Education. I would foresee instead the development of an across-the-board planning capability that brings about some interrelationship of these programs; so that when decisions affecting educational institutions are made unilaterally in NASA or the Atomic Energy Commission there is a knowledge about what other agencies are doing about the same matters.

A good example of this point is found in graduate fellowships. Last year several agencies had independent budgets for fellowships and dealt independently with the Bureau of the Budget on the matter. When their deci-

sions were added to the decisions of other agencies acting independently in the same fashion, the result was severe impact on the colleges that none of the individual agencies intended.

HALPERIN. We should add, of course, that Congress legislates in the same relatively isolated and piecemeal fashion. For example, the cuts made by the Space Committee in fellowship and building programs in the educational area were not known to most of the Members of the Congress who preside over the Department of Defense's programs in the field of education, or to the Members of the Education and Labor Committee or the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who legislate in related areas.

Thus, there is a cumulative effect on the Nation's campuses, brought about not with malice and certainly not with forethought—a cumulative and unforeseen effect produced by a lack of knowledge of what other people are doing and lack of overall policy and legislative cohesion.

I certainly do not favor gathering every education-related program together under a common agency. I do advocate a very careful study, followed by relatively swift Executive and Congressional action, of ways to pull together the major programs whose essential function is the strengthening and support of educational institutions, as distinct from the mission-oriented tasks that every Federal agency must necessarily carry out.

In this reorganization that we are both talking about one should look at education broadly. We are looking at manpower and we are looking at training of various types. We are also involved with overall science policy and with the humanities and the arts. We must consider education in a very catholic sense.

I would also add to your two top priority issues for future attention a third. In my mind, it is the third in time as well as in importance, but it needs to be looked at—and planned for.

As I said at the outset, our programs today are of a categorical nature. And while we want some pulling together and some greater simplification and a greater flexibility for these programs, we also have to ask ourselves about the extent to which the Federal role should ultimately be supplemented to include some sort of institutional aid in both higher education and in elementary and secondary education—institutional aid with relatively few Federal priorities, recognizing that educational costs are spiraling, recognizing that there is a limit to the fiscal capacity of the States and local communities that perhaps has not yet been reached but that is an increasing burden in both a political and an economic sense? Should the Federal Government do something in these areas to provide across-the-board aid?

HOWE. It seems to me we ought to address this broad topic you have introduced separately for elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other.

Let's talk for a minute about elementary and secondary education.

Historically, there has been a sort of unsuccessful reach for some form of general aid to elementary and secondary education. A number of Presidents have brought this up. A number of Senators and Congressmen from time to time have proposed bills, some of which have even passed one House of the Congress. But general aid has always foundered either on grounds of fear of Federal control or on anxieties about church-state relations, or both.

HALPERIN. Plus some related issues such as integration and the question of interstate equalization. The timing of any particular program may make a difference, too. Witness the fact that once upon a time you could get a great deal of support for classroom construction *per se*. Today, with the new mili-

tancy in the teaching profession, enthusiasm for general aid differs greatly among different educational groups. A school construction program, once viewed as "general aid" in most people's eyes, is clearly less acceptable today than it was just ten or fifteen years ago.

HOWE. The reason, of course, is simply that the militant teaching profession would want to be sure that any major new funding included the possibility of raising salaries with Federal funds—something which is not supported by existing programs.

But you introduced an idea that needs to be discussed in the context of general aid to elementary and secondary education, and that is the idea of equalization.

There is quite a bit of equalization in existing programs, particularly Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is not a major effect in terms of redressing balances; it just reaches in that direction.

HALPERIN. Nor was it a major intention in that legislation.

HOWE. That is of course true, but I think we still confront the fact that per-pupil support in our more fortunate States—our more industrialized States, our States with higher levels of production and higher levels of employment and higher levels of income—that per-pupil expenditures there are more than double those in the poorer States.

HALPERIN. To be specific, the latest figures we have indicate a per pupil expenditure of \$413 in Mississippi and \$1,125 in New York.

HOWE. Close to triple. Those figures, of course, include existing Federal expenditures in both places. Without Federal funds the disparity would be even greater.

Such a difference by itself creates a lack of equal educational opportunity in places where expenditures are lower. And yet the youngsters in the low-expenditure States are citizens of the United States just as the children from the more affluent States are.

One of the general principles that the Johnson Administration has pushed into the Nation's thinking has been the idea that there should be equality of educational opportunity for citizens of the United States regardless of where they happen to be born and where they happen to live. And this disparity in expenditure denies that equality.

So it seems to me that any general aid program which may emerge has to run the political hazard of not providing much support in some places in order to provide a great deal of support in others. That is what equalization is all about. Obviously some kind of compromise will be necessary in a general aid program—a compromise that brings some support to all places but that redresses, at least in part, the imbalance we have been discussing.

I think also that a Federal program of general aid with an equalization feature in it cannot achieve its objectives if, within the States, Federal money is distributed through traditional channels in such a way as to deny pupils who happen to live in the central city the kind of special and additional compensatory support necessary to make their education successful. The Federal Government must concern itself not just with the distribution of Federal funds among the States but also with the way in which these funds are, in turn, distributed by the States.

HALPERIN. I certainly agree that we need not only inter-State equalization but also intra-State equalization. The Carnegie-funded Syracuse studies and others indicate that existing State equalization programs are woefully inadequate. To use Federal resources in the future merely to compound the injury would be an ironic climax to the excellent progress that has been made in education in recent years.

Besides inter-State equalization and intra-State equalization there is a third con-

sideration I should like to add. It is the notion of somehow designing a Federal program in such a way that it would act as an incentive to greater State and local effort. This, of course, is an idea which has been around a long time. And yet it seems to me that we have to do more about it. The Intergovernmental Advisory Committee on Government Relations indicates that there is untapped fiscal capacity in the States and localities. I would hope we could design a general aid program to act as an incentive to tap these resources in return for larger amounts of relatively unfettered Federal funds.

This whole general aid approach is, of course, fraught not only with the political difficulties you mentioned but, it seems to me, with the possibility that we may have a new outbreak of better church-state conflict. The Johnson Administration, legislating on what some people have called the "child benefit" or the "public trustee" theory—in which all funds have flowed directly only to public schools—has avoided church-state confrontations by the corollary principle that non-public school students were entitled to certain types of benefits. This system of getting Federal funds to all pupils, both public and private, opened a new era of interfaith and inter-school cooperation. But this principle applies most easily to categorical programs directed by the Congress to particular purposes over and above the normal programs which schools provide.

When one talks about "general aid"—and if one wants to avoid religious and inter-community strife—it is politically necessary to find a way to assure that some benefits—even if they are not always proportional or equitable—continue to flow to all the children in the community, regardless of whether the school they attend is public or private.

It is particularly difficult to accomplish this in a general aid bill because under such a program it is not feasible to maintain control over how the funds shall be spent—for books, for instance, or for equipment or for other programs in which non-public school children can participate. If, for example, the bulk of general aid funds flow, as intended, into teachers' salaries, it is difficult to see how private school students' interests can be served or protected.

HOWE. I quite agree, and I think that another qualification that need to be made is that some people see general aid as the only form or the ideal form which Federal support of the schools should take. And it seems to me that this view is wrong—that while general aid should round out the picture of Federal aid, the rest of the picture should also remain. The broad categorical programs which address themselves to a whole variety of particular objectives which may not be met or even approached by the schools unless those categorical programs remain in place are in my view a first priority for Federal support.

So I think that in the future those who are designing general aid need to be very careful not to damage the categorical programs but to continue them at adequate levels and to move to general aid only in a budget which will allow the continuation of the categorical programs as general aid gets started.

HALPERIN. There are other reservations that need to be borne in mind in the design of a general aid program. Certainly we are painfully aware that many people look upon general aid not only as a convenient way to avoid the dictates of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but also as a means to avoid having to come to grips with the problem of racial imbalance, particularly in our northern cities.

I don't really believe that we can design a general aid program that in and of itself does away with racial imbalance. To try to do so would involve a contradiction in terms.

Unless one assumes that the money flowing to the recipients will generally be used for good purposes and good effects one shouldn't go in the direction of a general aid bill at all.

To get at the problems of racial imbalance, desegregation and genuine integration will probably require new types of categorical programs—or at least new provisions in existing categorical programs—which offer an incentive, a bonus or “carrot” if you will, for those school systems and those communities that wish voluntarily to move in the direction of true racial and economic integration.

Howe. In line with this, it seems to me that a program for school construction, which we don't have at the present time except in a very small way through the School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Program, could have an element of general aid in it and yet also contain some of the characteristics you have just outlined.

A program for school construction could apply to all school districts in the country, but include provision for payments to school districts with very special problems, such as those in the big cities or those that are rurally isolated. Similarly, such a new program could also place a premium on cooperation between, or among, several school districts, thereby introducing the possibility of a city cooperating with the suburbs around it to develop certain kinds of specialized facilities. Or as another option, regular school facilities which would have the effect of reducing racial isolation could be given premium levels of Federal support.

This kind of program would be tough to handle politically, but if it had a broad general component of a percentage of payment toward construction costs and then additional percentages of payments where these important public purposes are met, it would at the same time help all school districts and give special help where special needs exist and where there is a willingness to attack the problems the Kerner Commission has identified.

HALPERIN. I'd like to return to an earlier thought. We introduced this general aid discussion as a kind of third priority, or something to be done at a later stage.

In my view, the most important thing this Nation should do in the next several years is to put realistic and substantially greater funding into existing programs at the same time that we make them broader and more flexible and seek to consolidate them.

It seems to me that in the absence of sizable amounts of new money we can expect some erosion of these programs. Many school districts do not benefit substantially from the programs now, and for what they do get they have to go through a great deal of what they call “red tape and bureaucracy.” Such grievances are intolerable when the payoff is relatively small. When these grievances are cumulated, I think there is a very real chance that regardless of the Administration in power, there will be a tendency on the part of the Congress and the political electorate to wipe out such programs and to replace them with some sort of undirected, block-grant or non-criteria-laden program.

Thus, I was particularly glad to hear your point about the necessity for general aid as a supplement to, rather than a replacement of, existing programs. In the short run, this requires a commitment to appropriate much more money, since an essentially *status quo* operation is not politically viable.

Moreover, it isn't viable in an educational sense either. We cannot really expect to reach and teach the disadvantaged, for example, under Title I of ESEA with only a little more than \$100 per-pupil per year, which is about what we are spending today. We cannot really hope to make much of a dent in the high school dropout problem—thirty percent of our youth, a million young people a year—with the less than \$10 million

for an anti-dropout program which was appropriated by the Congress. We cannot really reach many of the young people who need to go to post-secondary education with as few as seventy thousand Educational Opportunity Grants a year.

Everything we have been talking about has to be done on a substantially larger scale, both in order to have integrity in the programs and also to find out if they will truly work. At present we just don't really know. It is going to take time, but it is also going to take a substantially larger investment simultaneously.

Howe. I thoroughly agree with the need for a substantially larger investment. And, being a realist, I am aware that a substantially larger investment in education on the domestic scene is going to be in competition, direct competition, with a whole galaxy of other important domestic causes. People today are expecting a great deal more from their government than they once did. They want greater effort toward control of the environment: conservation, air pollution, water resource management, and the like. They want government help in transportation and in housing and in the replanning and rebuilding of the cities. And they want it in education. And each of these has its own claim on new dollars that the American taxpayer may be willing to give to his government to serve him.

This means that education is going to be in tough competition. I think that education will meet that competition to the degree that it is able to make a strong case for success in what it is doing.

This in turn argues strongly for the investment of funds in research, for effective dissemination of existing knowledge, and for effective evaluation of the programs that we have. And, therefore, as perhaps a first priority in the investment of any new funds, I would seek funds for those activities and for beginning to get a feedback from them. I believe that over time that feedback will build the confidence which will bring additional funds into major areas of service such as those under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

And I believe that right now, by any reasonable measurement, the funding for research and demonstration and evaluation in education by the Federal Government is minimal.

HALPERIN. Educational research and development, dissemination, and evaluation would be among my major priorities, too. I would like to follow up on your first priority in educational research by saying that I think in the years ahead a Federal goal should be stated as a percentage of our education budget.

We have all been talking in recent years—with justification, I think—about insufficient educational research. At the present time of the \$12 billion spent by the Federal Government in education, substantially less than one percent is for educational research and related efforts. Of the Office of Education budget, only about 2.5 percent goes into educational research. I would like to suggest to an incoming Administration that, for the reasons you have stated so well, we ought to set a national goal of ten percent of our education budget for research, development, and evaluation; a goal to be reached in stages over, let's say, five years.

My second suggestion for a priority for investment of new funds is the whole area of teacher training, and inservice training broadly conceived to include the subprofessional aides, the administrators, the school board members, the supervisors, the directors—all of the policy-makers in the field of education. Obviously, people are the core of any system, and this is true in education as well as elsewhere.

The largest single professional group in the United States today is that encompassed by the field of education—almost 3 million

persons. Yet we are training or retraining only a small fraction of these people each year. There is a tremendous turnover because of retirement and new job opportunities outside education. It seems to me that we ought to put a large investment into the teacher training area in the years ahead. And to hazard a goal or a target, I would suggest that we ought to aim at retraining ten percent of our teaching force annually. I think the current training level is about one to two percent through the various Federal programs. States and localities are unable to expand their commitments to the retraining of teachers because of the tremendous pressures for salary increases. But unless there is adequate retraining, the across-the-board salary increases may not be justified. So I think it's a reasonable goal to state specifically on the part of the Federal Government that we aim—through sabbaticals, fellowships, institutes, and other training programs—to provide ten percent of our teaching force with some kind of educational experience each year.

Howe. That makes very good sense. And of course one of the great achievements of the Johnson Administration is the Education Professions Development Act, which provides most of the authority needed to do the job you have described, although one or two amendments might well be added to it. For example, school board members are not now included, contrary to the original suggestion by the Administration. Elements of added flexibility of this kind could advantageously be placed in this Act.

But the basic legislation is excellent. It has a very nice balance in it. It creates a Federal role, it creates a State role, and it addresses itself to a local school district role in the training of people to serve education, a desirable element omitted in previous legislation. A big window has been opened by this legislation, and there are all sorts of opportunities as a result.

I think one of the major administrative responsibilities of the Office of Education in the years ahead will involve making imaginative use of this new authority.

HALPERIN. With regard to your last comment on the imaginative use of that authority, it's interesting to note that most of us are very proud of the Teacher Corps. We feel that it has great promise and that the program should be expanded substantially.

But under the Education Professions Development Act many new kinds of “teachers’ corps” are possible—new types of teacher training and retraining efforts. Thus, I hope that they will be generously funded in the years ahead.

I would like to add a footnote to an earlier point you made about dissemination: I feel very strongly—and many Members of the Congress do as well—that in this huge country of ours, with 21,000 operating school districts and more than 2,000 colleges, many, many things are going on right now that are effective, that are promising, that are adaptable by others. But communications in a country as large as ours are terribly difficult. I would hope that special efforts would be made in the years ahead to disseminate widely to the taxpaying public—to the lay policymakers, as well as to the professionals—the results of programs at all levels of education. We certainly have the authority to do this both in our new legislation and under the general charter establishing the Office of Education in 1867.

Howe. The dissemination function includes a wide variety of activities, and not the least of them are the processes of letting the people know, of developing markets, of demonstration. Education hasn't thought this way enough.

HALPERIN. Possibly there might be an activity somewhat analogous to the system of agricultural experiment stations, and particularly to the work of the county agents. We of course have the regional educational

laboratories, but it may be that we need to look more carefully at dissemination models that would reach all over the country, using non-educators and sub-professionals, as well as the more traditional groups.

Howe. And now to give this conversation a balance I don't think it has at this point, let's have some general discussion about higher education. I think of one or two observations that can be made. First of all, higher education activity is widely dispersed throughout the Federal Government and therefore needs to be examined in the light of our earlier conversation about the need for planning capacity to get at the problem of impact of the many separate Federal programs on individual institutions.

Secondly, I'd say that the types of assistance provided by the Federal Government to higher education tend, to some degree, to be less change-oriented than the types of assistance the Federal Government provides to elementary and secondary education. Our scholarship grants, work-study funds, and similar support measures do help a different type of student to get into the higher educational institution than the traditional college student from the upper economic stratum.

But programs like these, and the programs which build buildings, and those which promote research activity in our educational institutions—and these are the major components of support: buildings, research, and student aid—don't address themselves much at all to institutional change. We can speculate that perhaps it is because neither the Federal Government nor indeed other agencies have thought about this very much—or at least done much about it—that students around the country are themselves seeking institutional change in a variety of ways.

There are some small programs that do reach for change. Title III of the Higher Education Act could be described as addressing itself to improving quality and to bringing about institutional change. But I think the broad generalization still holds.

So I think it would be constructive if those people responsible for the future Federal role in education would explore something analogous to Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for higher education, a foundation-like function addressed to change, addressed to picking up the bright ideas that have surfaced in the world of higher education and giving them some backing from Federal sources.

That type of activity has been carried out in our society more commonly by private sources than by public sources, largely through foundations. And I think there is a promising Federal role here.

Then there is the whole broad question of what should be the shape of any general or operational aid to higher education. Higher education institutions are facing increasing unit costs. It costs more money to educate each student in every college every year. This is largely a function of rising faculty salaries, but other costs as well.

HALPERIN. And obviously enrollments are going to double.

Howe. Enrollments are going up while this increasing cost is impinging on the institutions. And many of them are in deep trouble.

We don't know the exact dimension of this trouble. One of the constructive moves directed by President Johnson is a study to devise a long-range plan for the financing of higher education. None of us knows what will emerge from that. But obviously a major job for a future Administration is that of picking up the results of this study and doing something constructive with them. And I suspect that one of the results of the study may be some suggestion about how the Federal Government could encourage more private and State support for higher education and, at the same time, make a contribution to the operational costs of running a college or university. My own inclination

is to suggest that the Federal Government give a priority to increases in student aid programs so that segments of the society now denied a higher education can have increased hope of receiving one. If the Government does this, then the way to provide operating aid to institutions might be to give an unrestricted grant for every student on a Federally supported scholarship. We do this already for graduate fellowships, and I think it would work in four-year colleges and community colleges.

HALPERIN. The difficulties that beset general aid in the elementary and secondary area, of course, are to be at least some degree also present in the higher education area. To be sure you don't have the church-state issue to the same extent. But there is a tendency on the part of many policy-makers, both in and out of the Congress, to want to control the results of Federal aid. We can't have this. If we believe in the ability and the know-how of the institution, then we just have to go ahead and authorize some general aid at whatever time that is fiscally feasible, regardless of opposition from those who fear that general aid in any form, at any level, means "money down a rat hole," or other pejorative expressions. I do think this notion runs counter to the concept of grants for innovation.

Perhaps in the years ahead we must try to find an increased or new role for the Federal Government that couples the encouragement of innovation with an appropriate response to the increasing outcry of the institutions for operating money.

Howe. I think there is a very good analogy here to what we were saying about elementary and secondary education. We were saying there that the categorical programs should grow and should continue to be supported when general aid comes in. I think we ought to say exactly the same thing about higher education. Student aid programs should grow and continue. The programs that support special research of particular interest to the Federal Government ought to grow and continue. But at the same time, the Federal Government in the future needs to think about the problems of the institution as such.

By and large the Federal Government has tended to look at the institution from the point of view of what purposes it can accomplish for the Government without worrying too much about what happens to the health of the institution while it is serving Federal ends.

Uncle Sam makes it possible for a lot more people in the United States to get a higher education, because that's a significant national objective. And we back a variety of specialties because they are needed either by the Federal Government or by the economy, or by some aspect of public service in the States and localities. But we have not thought enough about the capacity of the institutions to keep its balance while doing all these things to serve important national objectives. It is into that picture that I would put the problem of operating costs of these institutions and the capacity to at least stay alive and healthy while picking up these categorical aid programs that the Federal Government provides.

HALPERIN. While we're talking about what might lie ahead for higher education, I wonder if your priorities and your sense of timing would match mine.

I would say that in the next couple of years, as more funds—hopefully—become available, my own set of priorities would emphasize continuing the thrust of the Johnson Administration to ensure equality of educational opportunity, particularly for minority groups and for the poor, regardless of their race.

I think that this can be stated in a kind of a declaration of rights: that any student of ability should be enabled to go on to the post-secondary institution of his choice, whether a technical institute or a business

school or a college. And I think the goal ought to be stated in terms of some numbers. For example, for an additional one billion dollars a year we can help an additional two million students—the equivalent of some forty percent of those now enrolled in college—to go on to further education after high school.

I think that's the kind of a statement of a goal that we need. That would be my first priority.

Howe. Yes, I fully agree. And, of course, one must take into account the fact that higher education today is, to a degree, a segregated enterprise. Most of our high quality institutions have a relatively small proportion of minority group people in them, and there is an important job to do in somehow achieving throughout the higher education spectrum a better representation of minority group people.

HALPERIN. Speaking further about higher education, I would say that either simultaneously or as the next priority we ought to give attention to more adequate funding of some of our broader categorical programs, for example, the programs to improve college library and instructional resources. This is one way that you get at quality. This is one way you can change the institution. At the same time you exercise some Congressional discretion as to where the funds go.

I also think the Federal Government should do something special for graduate education. This is the fastest growing part of higher learning, and it's also the most expensive part. Here again, we do have on the statute books in a variety of Federal agencies the necessary tools, but we do not now have the funding in institutional aid or institutional development programs or institutional excellence programs—they are called different things in NASA and NSF and NIH. Hopefully, we will have a new program in the Office of Education under the pending Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Particularly through the fellowship programs, with their accompanying cost-of-education allowances, we have an ideal mechanism to help graduate education simply by raising these allowances. Through these two mechanisms it seems to me we can do a great deal to help the graduate schools meet their financial crisis.

Howe. Let me point out that some thinking has already developed about increasing the cost-of-education allowances. Many agencies have had a part in that thinking. It's ready to move. All that is necessary, really, is a planning move by the Bureau of the Budget to standardize these cost-of-education allowances at a higher level. And it could be done in many ways. For example, it could be phased in over a period of three, four, or five years by adding \$500 a year to the allowance, which now runs around \$2,500, and build it up to \$3,500. In this fashion, an institution could get some funds for its own development as it takes in a graduate student but that can happen only if the amount is raised appreciably.

It's pretty important to point out that in the graduate schools, which indeed have the special problems you outline, the cost of education of an individual graduate student may run as high as \$10,000.

HALPERIN. Perhaps five to ten times that of an undergraduate.

Howe. Yes. So when an institution takes in a graduate student with Federal support and gets a \$2,500 cost-of-education allowance, it may be losing as much as \$7,500 on the deal.

Let's turn to other areas and consider the education of the handicapped, and then perhaps vocational education, which I think needs considerable discussion here.

Why don't you start with the handicapped?

HALPERIN. In the area of the handicapped we not only have a host of programs, but one particular program—Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—

which is, it seems to me, almost a true "general aid" program. It provides funds to the States to support the operating costs of virtually any educational service or program for the handicapped. One might therefore conclude that it would be possible to build upon existing authority to design programs that would reach particular target groups—for example, the deaf-blind or the multiply-handicapped.

Here, too, we ought to state an over-all goal for the next five to ten years, for example, that we will reach and teach and provide the necessary ancillary services to all of the handicapped children of the Nation.

One-tenth of all of our children are estimated to be physically or mentally handicapped and to need some sort of special attention. Yet, we are serving only about two million of these children today. Three million are not served at all. And among the two million who are receiving some sort of special service, the adequacy of service obviously leaves much to be desired.

So I would say that here again a useful device for the next Administration would be to set a specific numerical goal. Under the Johnson Administration we made fantastic progress in getting started in each and every one of these areas. Now I think we have to measure our objective and pace ourselves so that we are sure to reach it.

Howe. Yes, not only has the Johnson Administration gotten some very effective legislation in place for the benefit of the handicapped, but it has also moved forward on funding for this legislation in very tight budget years, when money was hard to find because of all sorts of national commitments. There has been a significant move percentage-wise in what has happened in our appropriations for handicapped legislation.

The budget of the Office of Education in moving from Fiscal '68 to '69 has reflected close to a 50 percent increase in the money being made available for education of the handicapped. And although as we approach our Fiscal '70 budget we are not talking about that large an increase, we are nevertheless talking about some increase while the '70 budget for the Office of Education as a whole may remain rather stable or even decrease.

I would mention another point, too, which relates not just to the handicapped but more broadly to our earlier conversation about elementary-secondary education. That is the very great achievement of this Administration in getting the idea of early childhood education generally accepted around the country. The Head Start program supervised by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the focus of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on early childhood education, as well as the Follow Through Program, are all evidence of this.

HALPERIN. And the various Day Care Programs under Social Security and welfare legislation, too.

Howe. Right. These efforts have awakened people and gotten them ready to move. There is now a real opportunity for a much broader program of early childhood education. What we know about children—about the way they grow and develop and achieve success in school—indicates that this is an eminently sensible move.

I bring this up in the context of the handicapped because I think that an effective move in early childhood education may lead to much earlier identification of physical and mental handicaps and a much higher percentage of solutions to those problems. The result in the long haul may be lower levels of investment in the handicapped if early identification and diagnosis and early treatment can be developed through Federal initiative working with States and localities.

I would like early childhood education, first of all, to the disadvantaged population; secondly, to this notion of early identification of handicaps and thirdly, to service of the entire population. I think that future Ad-

ministrations are in a firm position to move in these directions as a result of what has already been accomplished.

Let me add, finally, that adequate services to handicapped children (as well as to the disadvantaged) depend absolutely on categorical programs. There is little likelihood that general aid programs will help these children. Future planners of the education role of the Federal Government must keep this in mind.

HALPERIN. To go on now to a new subject—vocational education—this is the area in which the Federal Government was doing most before the advent of the Johnson Administration. The momentum was continued and, in 1963, important steps were taken to modernize and update vocational education programs. Since 1963 there has been a substantial increase in vocational enrollments. Now, in 1968, the Congress of the United States is about to pass the most far-reaching reworking, expansion and extension of vocational education in our Nation's history.

Nevertheless, I would suggest that by and large we have been something less than completely sympathetic to the needs of our young people in this area.

We have been so strongly oriented to the colleges and to the disadvantaged very young in recent years that we have tended to understate the needs of the four-fifths of our young people who do not graduate from college, and the three-fifths of our young people who never see the inside of a college.

We know that vocational education has been and can be a dumping ground for young people. It can be a dead-end street. The new legislation brought into being under the Johnson Administration, and some of the funding which has begun to flow since 1964, does indeed provide substantial opportunities to make a meaningful bridge between the school and the first job, to bring industry and business into a partnership with the schools so that our young people will have a realistic understanding of the world of work outside of the classroom.

I would hope that using the new legislation, possibly with further developments in the area of guidance and counseling, we would move with more vigor in vocational and technical education. In other areas I have suggested a goal; I will suggest one here, too: We have about 7.5 million people enrolled in vocational education today. I think it is entirely realistic as well as important to suggest that in 1975 or so we should have tripled these enrollments—about 21 or 22 million Americans of all age groups in vocational and occupational education. This is going to require several billion dollars more than we are now putting into the enterprise. But considering the importance of the labor force in the growth of the American economy I can think of few better investments.

Howe. I would like to make several comments on vocational education. I quite agree that the levels of investment need to be very much changed, as you suggest. But as they are changed I am concerned lest the United States develop two entirely separate systems of education, one labeled as vocational and the other labeled as the regular or general system of education.

It seems to me that both in legislation and in administration of the new Act that you cite, efforts have to be made to avoid this separateness. I think there should be an infusion of a major vocational component into the normal high school and junior high school education programs across the country and that the new money that comes into vocational education ought to encourage the pulling together of vocational education with the usual public school system rather than increasing their separateness.

I would also pick up your point about the wider involvement of business and industry and in finding ways to give them an input into the affairs of vocational education. I

think it is really the job of industry and business to define the skills that are needed. That is where the people are going to be employed. And I don't see enough back and forth between industry and business and the world of education.

One of the problems we confront and that future Administrations will confront is that of somehow crossing this gap. Whenever we bring before the Congress proposals for allowing Federal grants to flow to business and industry for purposes of training teachers—for training them right within business and industry so that they will know what they should teach their students that will be pertinent to the jobs youngsters will have available to them—we run into a roadblock.

We find that a number of educational organizations are, as a matter of principle, opposed to Federal grants to private industry for purposes of this training function or for purposes of curriculum development, or really for purposes of any kind of constructive interaction. And I think a future Administration has got to find a way to persuade people that such arrangements are not a threat to the public schools in any sense but rather comprise an added resource to the public schools. The new vocational legislation as now written opens the door between business and education. I hope that it passes and that future administrations make vigorous use of it.

Third, I think we ought to use this conversation about vocational education to register our general concern for the community college and junior college. The fact that such institutions are in part avenues to the later years of college and the baccalaureate degree must be put against the fact you mentioned earlier that only twenty percent of the people are now getting this degree. In short, the community college has open to it a role that goes far beyond being a half-way house to a four-year institution.

The two-year institution is the most rapidly growing component of the higher education spectrum in terms of new institutions being built and of the numbers of students going into post-secondary education.

Yet there are gaps in the Federal support of community colleges. I think the new Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 offer real opportunity to fill those gaps; so it is possible that with adequate funding we may have almost all the legislation we need.

The Higher Education Facilities Act offers opportunities for supporting the construction aspects of those new community colleges.

So far, however, we have neglected the curricular development side and teacher training aspects of community college operations. We have the legislation to do both these things, but we don't have the funds, and we don't have the leadership at the present. It seems to me that additional funds for vocational education over the next five years ought to be so planned and administered that they take account of those gaps and needs.

HALPERIN. I'm glad that you touched on the community college question because I think there is a bridge there to contemporary politics which can help win public acceptance for increased Federal aid to education.

There is at this moment in history what can only be regarded as an unfortunate tendency on the part of many people to reject Federal programs on the grounds that they are allegedly aimed only at the poor or the black or the neglected. And we hear grumbings like, "What do you have to do to get some of your own Federal money back from your Government?" I think Federal support, while it must necessarily give priority to the disadvantaged—regardless of whether that disadvantage is physical or mental or racial or educational or cultural—should also aim at making it clear that the Federal education programs are intended for all of the people of the country.

It seems to me that vocational and technical education, particularly with a community of junior college component, touches a deep-rooted desire of the American people; better education for their youngsters as a path to a better job and a better economic future. If we build a closed alliance between our vocational and technical programs and the junior and community college movement, we will go a long way toward overcoming what I detect as a disaffection on the part of some members of the taxpaying public with programs they feel are not benefiting them. Apparently they either do not see their children as being candidates for the full baccalaureate degree or they do not see their children benefiting from programs addressed to the educationally and culturally disadvantaged. The community college-technical school movement can bridge this gap.

HOWE. I would add that higher levels of literacy are going to become an increasing requirement for vocational education. There is thus some likelihood that the production of those higher levels of literacy will increasingly become the job of the secondary schools and that this will tend to thrust a larger proportion of the vocational education component onto the community colleges.

I hope if that happens that those who are devising the new programs in these colleges, and those who are devising support for them on the Federal side, will keep in mind the need for flexibility. The great thing about the community college now is that it hasn't solidified. It can be all kinds of things at the same time. It can offer six-week courses to develop a very special skill. It can take in a person who needs literacy training and give him that, if he's an adult or if he has finished high school or if he has dropped out of high school. It can offer a specific two-year program leading to an intermediate degree.

There is a tendency among community colleges to see as the basic measurement of excellence the movement of a very high proportion of their graduates into four-year institutions. It seems to me that we need to help the community colleges to develop a concept of excellence in other sorts of services and to take pride in them; so that we avoid the danger that is now so evident among some community colleges of wanting to lose their identity as vocational and technical training places and transform themselves into four-year colleges. I suppose after they were four-year colleges for a period of years they would want a graduate school!

While I think we need well-planned, high-quality, widely-available services at the graduate level, we certainly don't need every community college to follow that course. We are going to need in the years ahead the service of a growing number of community colleges to a major proportion of the population.

I believe that the most recent prognosis I saw was something to the effect that in 1975 about 75 percent of the population would be graduating from high school.

HALPERIN. We're at about 71 percent now.

HOWE. We may be up to 80 or so by 1975. That means a very great demand for these new community colleges. That prospect raises the question of whether in the future the Federal Government won't have to find a more flexible method than it now has for helping institutions to get started.

Most of our legislation today is written to provide aid only to higher education institutions that already exist. This stipulation is, in fact, set in law by the Congress. Institutions either have to have received accreditation or provisional accreditation of some carefully defined kind. In any case, there are relatively few Federal resources to help the people lacking a vocational and technical college to get one established. They have to do it entirely on their own initiative, with their own resources. And frequently

the places where such services are particularly needed have insufficient economic base to do the job.

HALPERIN. That point suggests another to me, namely, that we really do not now have a planning capability or a program that would enable us to know when, for example, support ought to be extended to an emerging new community college or emerging new graduate school because there was a genuine need or when, alternatively, the availability of Federal funds would merely proliferate programs, produce non-economic institutions, and cater to particular community whims which may not be soundly based in educational terms.

We hear a great deal, for example, about the desire of virtually any community of any size to have its own community college for reasons of "civic pride." That may be a caricature and exaggeration, but it is no exaggeration to say that at the present time we have no mechanisms for deciding when scarce Federal funds ought to go to an institution and when they should not.

HOWE. We have reviewed the major aspects of the Federal role in education in our earlier conversation about elementary and secondary education and the relationship of categorical programs to general aid, then in our subsequent conversation about higher education in that same relationship, and then in these special thrusts into vocational education and education of the handicapped. One area we have missed is the very broad one, which, for want of a better phrase, I will call adult education, but which isn't really that. It's the idea that Americans in this complex society will need increasingly to be engaged in education all their lives.

The Federal Government is already involved in the support of a variety of enterprises which contribute to lifelong education opportunity. Contributions now made by the Federal Government include major support to public libraries and support for the development of a new kind of noncommercial or public broadcasting system which will be an education device although not institutionally based.

It occurs to me that the museums of the country are really in this same category, and have not captured major attention from the Federal Government. The President addressed a letter not long ago to the Council for the Arts and Humanities asking that group to advise him on what the Federal role might be in relation to museums. And I think one of the opportunities before the Federal Government in the years immediately ahead is to respond to the report that will be forthcoming shortly about this matter.

There are, of course, some very specific programs directed at adult literacy and the decreasing but still large proportion of adults who don't have adequate basic literacy to undertake vocational or other programs that will get them started.

I think the Federal Government at this point has moved in this area by bits and pieces rather than thinking about it as a total package.

HALPERIN. What might be called an Adult Opportunity Act has been suggested in this connection—something that would tie together the continuing needs for new forms of education, cultural development, recreation, and that would enhance the cultural literacy of our population.

The concept takes in some of the elements you mentioned, with possibly a specific recommendation for some sort of research and development institute that would push information science, communications science, ways to handle the information explosion, better non-commercial television, and library services of all types, particularly library services that would reach into homes and into disadvantaged neighborhoods.

It could also include mid-career development—ways in which the adult could change his job with appropriate training, possibly

under a broadened Manpower Development and Training Act or some other type of adult education.

It could take in specialized needs, such as those of the housewife who has raised her children and wants to return to the labor force (not necessarily into education, where we now have the Education Professions Development Act, but somewhere else), some way that she can get the necessary retraining or continuing adult education; the needs of the retired, of senior citizens, of people who have finished one career as business executives or as Army officers and who need special resources and programs to help with the start of a new career.

Obviously, this is quite a major area. Thus far, we have inched into it. We now need to step up the pace considerably.

Another dimension of this subject occurs to me. We do have the program of adult basic literacy, of course. But to my way of thinking, we have not done what we should have done. We still have 23 million Americans with less than an eighth grade education. We have eleven million functional illiterates with less than a sixth grade education. And we are spending under \$50 million a year on this particular social and economic problem. We ought to expand that commitment many fold.

Ultimately, we ought to look also at the sixty million or so Americans without a high school education. While they may not occupy the same priority as some of the things we've been talking about today, in developing a rounded picture we should ask ourselves whether high school equivalency programs and various other specialized opportunities might not be made available to this population, not only to bring about more gainful employment, but for personal satisfaction, for creative adjustment to society, for more satisfying relationships with their fellow-man.

HOWE. To touch on another point in this look to the future and the job that remains to be done, I would raise the problem of the distribution of educational resources in the U.S.A. Although States are increasingly doing a more effective job of planning for new educational services in places where these are in short supply, it occurs to me that there are opportunities for the Federal Government to be of assistance in a number of different ways.

We know that more and more people are moving toward metropolitan centers and will continue to do so in the years ahead. Yet, the costs of providing such people with adequate educational services are much higher at all levels than are the costs in rural and suburban areas. One typical result is that we are getting more colleges in those places where there are fewer people while we confront a shortage of post-secondary education services in the cities, where land and buildings are expensive and operating costs higher.

Shouldn't the Federal Government devise a program to pay a larger percentage of central city construction costs than the percentage it pays outside the city? Shouldn't the Federal Government find the means to help new institutions get started in the places where the great concentrations of people are to be found?

These concentrations of people do not pose problems just for the States. More and more, the metropolises cut across State boundaries. The economic and social pressures which cause the migrations that in turn create the metropolises are far beyond State control.

There clearly seems to be a need for the Federal role to include a planning and financing component to help meet the educational challenges created by these migrations. Some Federal programs, such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, already have this effect. But more remains to be done at all levels of education.

Finally let me mention a couple of items that have not been a part of our conversation

but that must be kept on the agenda for the future:

(1) Forward funding—The Federal Government's fiscal cycle is badly out of phase with the planning cycle of the schools. As a result, States and school districts do not learn what appropriations they will actually get until long after they have had to make commitments for the use of the appropriations. If someone were to start out to design a system for the maximum inconvenience of the schools, he might well come up with the arrangement we now have. Forward funding, under which the President and Congress would consider funding of Elementary-Secondary programs a full year ahead, would solve this problem. Many higher education programs now have this arrangement. All education programs should have it.

(2) International Education—One of the failures of the past few years has been the inability of the administration to get Congressional backing for the International Education Act. This Act, growing from the President's Smithsonian speech of September 1965, holds great hope for improved training of all sorts of specialists vitally needed by American Government and by business—specialists with knowledge of language, economics, government, health, education, engineering, and a variety of other fields as they apply to the problems of particular parts of the world in which the United States has national interests. The study now underway at the direction of the Appropriations Committee may lead the way to favorable action in the future. The Act must be kept alive, and appropriations for it should be a high priority matter.

(3) Education in special fields—Particularly in health and in conservation, the years ahead will see major new manpower needs. Medical education requires a complete re-study to make it more efficient. New specialties will develop related to control of the environment. The Federal Government must take its share of responsibility in these areas of education.

UDALL ANNOUNCES OVERVIEW

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a description of the exciting endeavor in which former Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and other environmental planners will be involved to help make our world a better place to live in:

UDALL ANNOUNCES OVERVIEW

Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior in the Administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, today announced the formation of the Overview group, a pioneering international consulting firm which will work for governments and industries to create a better environment for man.

Mr. Udall is Chairman of the Board. Lawrence Halprin, whose San Francisco company of environmental planners has completed projects throughout the United States and overseas, is Chairman of The Executive Committee. Henry L. Kimmel, former Commissioner of Commerce of the U.S. Virgin Islands, and more recently, Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, is President and Treasurer.

Overview, Mr. Udall indicated, "... is a logical and natural extension of and expansion upon the total environmental concerns ..." with which he had been involved during his eight years as Secretary. "We will

bring together multi-disciplinary terms possessed by the specialist insights and generalist capacities essential to total planning."

As an integral part of all projects on which it works, Overview will build-in economically, socially, and politically viable action programs. "The emphasis," Mr. Udall said, "will not be on paper plans or futuristic studies, but on the now, on the practical political implementation of concepts, plans and projects."

Advising and assisting the management team at Overview will be a group of twenty-five or more Principal Advisers, including: I. M. Pei, architect (New York City); Teodoro Moscoso, former head of the Alliance For Progress (Puerto Rico); Moshe Safdie, architect, designer of "Habitat" at Expo '67 (Canada); Kenzo Tange, architect (Tokyo); Edmond N. Bacon, Philadelphia's City Planner. Other names will soon be announced.

Henry S. Bloomgarden, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior from 1966 through 1968, is Vice President of Overview. Mrs. Sharon Francis, Conservation and Beautification Assistant to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, is Secretary.

Overview initially has offices in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco.

THE CONCEPT OF THE OVERVIEW GROUP

There is today a world-wide crisis of the environment. It stems from the extraordinary mass migration from rural to urban areas in all regions of the planet. It stems from a too rapid increase in population. It stems from helter-skelter urbanization in both the developed and underdeveloped nations. It stems from the abuse and misuse of the earth's resources.

The Overview Group believes the crisis of the environment is rooted in shortcomings—in failures of design, failures of planning, failures of politics. While many of these failures are not new, in an era of over-rapid urbanization, of exploding productivity and overspecialization, they have become more acute. They have culminated in piecemeal growth, and in an unwillingness of industry and governments to wisely control, guide, and coordinate those actions that determine the actual living standards of nations, regions, cities, and neighborhoods.

The approach to this crisis is defining the habitat of individuals and nations. The approach will shape cities and determine their liveability; it will influence the vitality of regions. The approach will, in short, limit or enlarge the life options of this and future generations on this planet.

There must be overview. Without practical but visionary planning that is both preventive and prescient—default will define the future. This is not a prediction, but a fact: history and our present environmental crisis tell us this with certainty.

It is not enough to have even good architects design handsome buildings for cities of tomorrow: good buildings, however well designed, are no substitute for beautiful, balanced cities.

It is not enough to have even good engineers design the highways of the future: the best located highways are no substitute for sound total systems of mass transportation.

It is not enough ideally to have even enlightened land developers: even the best entrepreneurs cannot by themselves create neighborhoods and communities whose identity and concern are noted for their over-all design and social mobility.

We have learned that assorted specialists, however gifted, cannot produce order—or an end to environmental disorder—by the uncoordinated practice of their respective disciplines. The disciplines must join and master the art of total planning for total environments. This is the conviction that has inspired the formation of The Overview Group—the belief that modern man,

through inter-disciplinary teamwork, has the potential to civilize science and technology, has the capacity and creativity to enhance the environment of which he is a part.

The Overview Group accordingly dedicates itself to the kind of planning—and, more important, follow-through by social, economic, and political implementation—required to produce and sustain a better habitat for man.

The Overview Group will assemble from the world community, teams with the specialist insights and generalist capacities essential to large or small-scale total environmental planning.

The management team of Overview will concentrate on the analysis of project requirements, the selection of skills, the transformation of superior individual talent into superlative teamwork. The Overview organization will include an eminent group of twenty-five or more Principal Advisers chosen from the world at large for their breadth of outlook, their demonstrated competence, their social concern. Some are young; all will be young in heart.

Each Principal Adviser will determine the extent of his own involvement in Overview activities. He will continue his regular professional pursuits and will participate in the review and guidance of action and implementation plans; he will conduct reconnaissance studies; he will serve as director of a particular project.

Principal Advisers will also play a primary continuing role in discovering and developing new talent. On a project-by-project basis, Overview will reach into universities, governments, and private firms, to enlist the expertise required for particular assignments. However, Overview will also constantly strive to return this talent to its source. In so doing, that talent—infused with the sense and significance of overview—will nourish new talent. After planning and implementing the design of a new city in an underdeveloped land, Overview will leave behind not merely a completed city, but a cadre of indigenous talent able to develop creative solutions to many local needs, and able to train and inspire others, as well.

Thus, the human association made possible by Overview, will cross-fertilize and renew the institutions and individuals who are its collaborators—and additionally will be a unique adventure in international amity. Each Overview project will produce both an environmental enhancement and a new human potential.

Overview's primary mission is planning and implementation to meet the immediate problems of peoples—their governments and industries—in a rapidly changing world. Overview will tackle large-scale environmental assignments (a new city, a plan for a sick city, the planning of a whole transportation system), and will involve itself in relating some relatively small-scale projects to an over-all framework. Organic planning of the right scope, not mere size, will be the hallmark of Overview work.

The Overview Group will undertake the execution of projects in all parts of the world. Yet, while today's problems are faced, tomorrow's potentials will be stressed. Thus, while developing a pollution control program to deal with what is, Overview will provide environmental counsel on what should—and can—be. Overview will advise on the potential impact on the environment and on man of new goods and services and technologies. Overview will assist its clients to shape, not await, the future.

Overview will educate through the use of the varied media of communication. A project currently being studied is the publication of an environmental journal, tentatively titled "Agenda For Tomorrow". This journal will focus on the world environment, set forth new options, interpret new legisla-

tion; emphasize practical solutions, promising ideas, and successful implementations. Seminars, film, television, and the publication of educational materials for schools and colleges, are areas in which Overview will be involved.

The emphasis of Overview will be on the now. Overview will develop political acumen in its architects and engineers, just as it will seek to inculcate in politicians and sociologists an acute appreciation of the importance of design and the potential inherent in new technologies. Overview planners will insist always that a humane environment for the human race be the ultimate objective of all planning. They will use the computer as a tool, but always with an awareness that no machine is a substitute for those elements of balance, order, and beauty, which can only be created by well-ordered minds.

In invariably emphasizing the importance of the politics of design, in seeking to achieve results, Overview will help its clients develop their own overview, their own fresh and relevant choices—applicable to their own problems and needs. Overview will attempt to show the developing nations how to avoid the environmental mistakes of the industrialized nations, to show the developed nations how to avoid repeating their own environmental errors, to demonstrate to both—to public men and their constituencies—that a humane environment is the best long-term investment any nation or industry can make.

BIOGRAPHIES OF OVERVIEW PRINCIPAL ADVISORS

Edmund N. Bacon, Director Philadelphia City Planning Commission since 1949; author of *Design of Cities* (1967); member President's Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty; B.Arch., Cornell, 1932; born Philadelphia, 1910.

Teodoro Moscoso, Chairman of the Board, Commonwealth Oil and Refining Co.; Ambassador to Venezuela, 1961-1962; U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, 1962-1964; Special Advisor to Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, 1964-; B.S. Michigan, 1932; born Barcelona, Spain, 1910; currently residing San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Teoh Ming Pei, architect; founder of I. M. Pei & Partners, designer of National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, National Airline Terminal, J.F.K. Airport, New York, John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Southwest Washington Redevelopment Plan, and recently appointed master planner for Columbia University; B.Arch., M.I.T., 1939; M.Arch., Harvard, 1946; born, Canton, China, 1917.

Moshé Safdie, architect; designer of masterplan for Expo '67 Montreal; designer of Habitat at Expo '67; currently designing a community in Puerto Rico, a new college union building for San Francisco State College, and a waterfront habitat for New York City; born Israel, 1938; B.Arch., McGill University.

Kenzo Tange, architect; designer of swimming and basketball pavilions for Tokyo Olympics; master planner for site of 1970 World Fair at Osaka; currently architect in association with Lawrence Halprin for site of Yerba Buena Center, 30 acre redevelopment in San Francisco; designer of Skopje, new town in Yugoslavia; born, 1913.

TEARS OF LIBERTY

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, once again, Mr. David Gimbel, the poet laureate of

the 13th Congressional District, wrote a poem so beautiful and timely that I thought my colleagues would like to share my pleasure in reading it.

"Tears of Liberty" by David Gimbel follows:

TEARS OF LIBERTY

(By David Gimbel)

I looked at Lady Liberty and she had tears
in her eyes,
And with the fury of hate around us, 'tis
really no surprise.
This Dowager Queen of Freedom that Americans
love and cherish,
Has beckoned to countless millions, those
who hunger and perish.

Standing in the harbor, midst the wind, cold
and rain,
Holding Freedom's lamp aloft, for those
running from persecution and pain.
Even from creek vessels, they poured in
every dawn,
With their meager, but previous belongings,
their faces tired and drawn.

Now for them the air seemed fresh, away
from the fires of war,
As this Gentle Lady of Compassion just
opened up the door.

Some shall never forget their taste of Dante's
hell,

And now it seemed like music to hear that
freedom bell.

But somehow, times are changing and our
people take things for granted,
And forget that blessed freedom was merely
not invented.

For men laid down their very lives to protect
what we hold dear,

To make America strong and great, so that
we may never tremble or fear.

Yet in this land of plenty, so rich beyond
compare,

There is hunger in many places, because some
don't get their share.

And so, unrest and hate is rolling in, exactly
like the tide,

"Enough, enough, oh how much longer?"
together they all cried.

Now the Blacks against the Whites, yet we
are all one kind,

As children of the Lord, the solution we
must find,

To live and work together for the entire
world to see,

And dry those precious tears of our "Lady
of Liberty."

RESTORATION OF AND INDEMNIFICATION FOR CEMETERIES DESACRATED BY NAZIS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1969, the West German Government is meeting in Bonn with representatives of the World-Center of European Rabbis, to discuss and decide on the question of indemnification for the over 2,000 Jewish cemeteries destroyed by the Nazis in World War II. Discussions on this subject have been going on for more than 12 years through the efforts of Rabbi Moses Joseph Rubin, a revered, learned, and dedicated gentleman, president of the organization

whose headquarters are located in Brooklyn, N.Y. It is the hope of Rabbi Rubin and his organization that the conference will decide to allocate a sum sufficient not alone to restore these cemeteries but to build a memorial in the United States and in Israel to perpetuate the memories of the Jewish martyrs buried in these ravaged cemeteries.

Nazi troops defiled these cemeteries during the war. Since that time, the desecration has proceeded at a gradual pace and under quasi-legal circumstances. In remote pastoral settings, sheep graze quietly over the resting place of Jewish ancestors. In some cities, shopping districts bustle over what was once a traditional Jewish cemetery. Highway construction continues with no regard for human dignity, with no respect for the dead. The desecration of Jewish cemeteries in Europe is an indignity to the Hebrew people.

Further desecration must not be permitted. Enough injustice has been done. The Jewish children of Eastern Europe must not forget their origins because the graves of their ancestors go unmarked. The debt to the Jewish dead will not be paid until Jewish cemeteries are reconstructed. Let us not forget martyrs so brutally annihilated in the concentration camps of Eastern Europe. As a tribute to their courage, let us take up the struggle against the desecration of Jewish cemeteries in Eastern Europe.

A million signatures in support of these claims have been accumulated by the World Center of European Rabbis—clear testimony of the endorsement of the petition submitted to the West German Government.

CAN BLACK AND WHITE ARTISTS STILL WORK TOGETHER?

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include the following in the RECORD:

CAN BLACK AND WHITE ARTISTS STILL WORK TOGETHER?

Can black and white artists still talk together, work together? The belief among some blacks that the political future of their people lies in turning completely away from the white community is inevitably having repercussions on the cultural scene. Black theater—by blacks, for blacks—is growing in metropolitan centers from Harlem to Berkeley. Black performers are being called on to abandon their pursuit of careers in the commercial theater and to bring their strength to the black community.

Yet many black artists still strive to work on Broadway, Off Broadway, Off Off Broadway, in movies and on television, spurred by the rise of opportunities for jobs there—and for self-expression. The increase of productions involving both races suggests that many black and white artists still want to share the creative experience, to learn from each other, to grow together.

Which is the right way for the black artist? The first? The second? Both? The Times put the question to a number of prominent black figures. Their replies follow:

(By Dick Gregory, actor)

To ask if the old refrain "Black and White Together" still has any meaning for the combined efforts of black and white artists seems to me to indicate an obvious answer. Black and white artists are working together as never before in the history of this country. Ask Bill Cosby and Robert Culp that question. Ask Leslie Uggams, or Diana Sands, or Alan Alda. Ask Ivan Dixon or Robert Hooks.

Yet it is true that black artists are now being called upon to turn away, not from the pursuit of careers in the commercial theater, but rather from participating in the support and success of a completely institutionalized racist society. And the theater, or films, or television are thoroughly infected with the disease of racism.

One need look no further than a TV show like "The Dating Game." If one eligible bachelor during a game is black, all of the other contestants must be black. And you can bet there will not be a white girl trying to win a blind date with one of those black bachelors. Even a TV show which will take the giant step of adding color to its programming is not able to take the moral step of color blindness. Black artists are not, and have not been, responsible for setting such standards of programming.

The black artist is not being asked to abandon his pursuit of a career in the commercial theater. Rather he is asked to share his wisdom, talent and experience with the black community. He dare not be trapped by the racist structure of the entertainment industry. Especially at a time when more opportunities are being given to black artists in the established industry. In spite of the growing number of black faces appearing on stage and screen, there is still a vast reservoir of untapped and undeveloped talent in the black ghetto communities. It is the responsibility of the black artist to do his part in developing that talent. He must abandon exclusive pursuit of a career in the commercial theater to help build black institutions and attitudes free of white racism. When that vast reservoir of talent is developed and attains high visibility, the token approach of the entertainment industry to assimilating black artists will topple.

Repercussions on the cultural scene? Yes, there have been repercussions already. We don't have any more Amos 'n' Andy's, or Stepin Fetchits, or Mantan Morelands, perpetuating a myth in the white cultural scene. And there have been repercussions on the black cultural scene. We have lost our singers, our comedians and our writers. More black writers wrote books during 1968 for white publishers than ever before in the history of America.

The white artist has a moral responsibility equal to that of the black artist. He also must try to change the racist structure. A white actor must decide what it means to be a star. More than attaining top billing, he must use his status to refuse to take a role in a play or movie where the Puerto Rican woman is a whore, for example. Or in a production where the Indian is portrayed in the usual degrading manner. The white star must refuse to appear on the set, or on a television show, where minority group workers are not treated with equity and justice.

The black artist may choose, of course, whether he will pursue his career in the commercial theater exclusively or whether he will share his talent with the black community, I am saying he must do both. The artist who does both is the one who will really grow. To teach black kids theater, black arts, or show business is like lighting a light, and that light will cast out darkness uptown or downtown, depending on where you sit in relationship to the lamp.

(By John O'Neal, producing director of The Free Southern Theater)

Your questions are absurd, and if taken seriously they will cause a terrible and dan-

gerous confusion. Because they are absurd questions, there are no proper answers. Only more questions and a comment or two to combat confusion. You ask:

Can black and white artists work together?

And I reply: What is the nature of the conflict between blacks and whites? If one is engaged in conflict, how can he be neutral about it? You presume that blacks and whites have worked together in the past in some way that they don't work together now.

Can soldiers of opposing armies talk to or work with each other? If they can, what good will it do? Where do wars come from? Do soldiers make war or is it the other way around? Who stops wars?

Should black artists work with black audiences as opposed to white audiences?

Is the artist through with his work when people have been entertained, or does he have more to do? I think there's more. What good is simple-minded entertainment? Can blacks entertain whites, amuse them? Is entertainment positive, negative or neutral? What is art all about? Whom does the artist work for? Who can help him most to refine his art? Do black and white people experience the same reality?

Should black artists strive to make money in the commercial Entertainment Industry (as opposed to what?)

I don't agree with the assumption implicit in your question that the Entertainment Industry is synonymous with art. That industry has not more to do with art than the news industry, or the fashion industry, or any number of other business things. Whether one succeeds or fails in the industry has to do with business, not art. The art is, at best, incidental. People who want or need money should pursue that end in the best ways they know how, being prepared to accept the consequences of success or failure. By what standard do we arrive at the question? Why do whites always call on blacks for credentials and justifications?

Q. Can blacks and whites work together?

A. Yes, if they want to.

Q. Can whites define the world for blacks.

A. No, they can only make definitions for themselves.

Q. Can blacks define the world for themselves?

A. Yes, but not without struggle against oppression.

Q. Do I want to work with white artists?

A. No, there's something I want to do with black people.

EXPLORE BLACK EXPERIENCE

(By Julian Mayfield, actor and author)

Many black artists wish to strengthen black cultural institutions without regard to white opinion and white standards. Why should anyone view this development with alarm? Working within black rural and urban communities will give our writers, directors, producers and actors opportunities to explore the entire range of black experience in depth. This is still impossible for those of us who choose to remain in mass media, and even in the integrated theaters, not only because these are white-controlled, but, more important, because the black frame of reference is often so totally different from the white.

The black artist who wants to paint his truth on the screen or the stage very often grows impatient with his white co-worker to whom he must explain what every black child knows. (Hardly any 7-year-old black boy would have had to attend the last Democratic convention in Chicago to learn the basic nature of cops.) But in integrated projects the black artist is seldom the boss, and he usually has to effect some sort of compromise with the reality he knows before the play or picture is produced.

But it is not only ignorance with which the black artist must often contend. Sometimes it is naked arrogance from whites who

tell him that the story he is telling is simply not true because they, the whites, *don't want it to be true*. An example is the fierce reaction of some of the critics to the current movie "Up Tight." In 1937 when John Ford produced his classic "The Informer," most Americans were sympathetic to the Irish revolutionary struggle which, after all, had occurred 17 years before and 3,000 miles away. But, black revolution is here in the national house, and none of us connected with "Up Tight" expected the critics to sing its praises loudly. However, Renata Adler of The Times lost her cool so far as to assert that the central committee of black militants depicted in the film is not true to life! Now, being black does not necessarily qualify Ruby Dee and myself (who wrote the script with Jules Dassin) as authorities, but we know perfectly well that, as a white woman, Miss Adler has never, *never* in her life attended such a meeting and is therefore not competent to comment on what such a meeting would be like.

Many black artists are driven by a terrible sense of urgency not shared by their white friends. The black artist knows that his people have become economically obsolete in a society that feels more and more threatened by their growing demands for liberation. A student of history, the black artist knows what recent societies have done with their obsolete, unwanted minorities, and he believes the United States to be perfectly capable of imposing similar solutions to "the black problem." Writing and playing the currently fashionable Super White Negroes is a welcome relief from the old Amos 'n' Andy days, and profitable to several individuals, but some black artists want to use their crafts to warn their people to keep their powder dry and their finger on the trigger during the dangerous period we are entering.

Actually, there is a hard fact which may make nonsense of our entire discussion. It is that, despite appearances, there still are not nearly enough opportunities for the black artist in either mass media or black communities, and he is truly blessed who can find enough work to keep him in either soul food or Nedick's hot dogs.

"WHO'S GONNA RUN THE SHOW?"

(By Barbara Ann Teer, actress and director)

I'm so tired of people prescribing pills for the symptom instead of cures for the cause. Really! Let's ram right through and get to the heart of the matter because debating whether or not black artists should integrate, separate, or even attempt a combination of them both, is really not the heart of the matter. From where I stand, the important question should be: Is the white way really the right way (and in most cases, the only way)? Or in essence: Who's gonna run the show?

With over 30 million black people in this country, I have yet to see any person of African American descent owning any television station or producing any major network television show, producing or owning any major black movie company, producing any Broadway play or Off Broadway play for that matter. What's the problem?

America is a white country, controlled by white people for the benefit of white people. And these white people have made white machines which make white guns and white money. (Notice I say white money because there are those of us who suffer from the illusion that there is such a thing as green money and/or black money. So for the record: All money is white money.) Now these white guns and this white money is what they call white power. Ah! There's the rub! And it is this white power which has created the necessity for black power and consequently, separation.

Everything white people do, culturally, socially, politically and economically, is designed to perpetuate their white power. Larry

Neal calls this phenomenon "cultural imperialism." I call it "the whites."

The outer appearance of "the whites" can be distinguished by an undue amount of arrogance, gross lack of respect, flagrant paternalism, and goody condescension. Now the people who possess "the whites" have thoroughly convinced themselves that they are culturally superior to black people in particular and red, yellow and brown people in general.

Curiously enough, some black people, through the process of assimilation, have themselves become victims of "the whites" and, as a result, they too are working for white power. We call them negroes. Any time negroes support white power, they are working directly against themselves, their people and consequently, their liberation.

Black/Negro artists are African American people. African American people in this country are oppressed. Therefore all black artists should in one way or another be fighting for their freedom. Once we thoroughly understand this issue, we can work anywhere we choose. In the final analysis, our objective should be to oppose and destroy cultural imperialism wherever we are. The logical solution to the whole problem is therefore to work toward total change. That is the cure for racism.

"THE GOAL IS AUTONOMY"

(By Douglas Turner Ward, artistic director, the Negro Ensemble Company)

It seems to me the goal that black artists must seek—like Negroes in most other walks of life—is autonomy; and there is more than one path open to that achievement. The dominant issue is control of one's own destiny and the option to do whatever one sees fit for one's own self-expression. Even the most empathetic white artist can only comprehend the black experience as a second-hand observer. This is not to suggest that blackness can be expressed only through isolation or separatism. Black experience can be a profoundly fertile expression without isolation.

For example, the Negro Ensemble Company is controlled by black people and oriented toward its black audience, but it does not feel itself compromised when it allows anyone who walks through the door to observe its efforts.

Perhaps it is because I am arrogantly secure in my own black identity, but it amuses me whenever it is suggested that the whole concept of a black-controlled, black-run theater is threatened by the participation of a few whites. If we believe that one white, let's say, among nine controlling blacks can subvert the purity of our blackness, then we are really in trouble. Such an implication means that we Negroes must be so lacking in confidence and ability to know and control what we are involved with, that black is not beautiful, but naturally inferior and inherently vulnerable.

The question of individual black artists working outside a black-directed framework once again finds its answer in autonomy. The problem for the black artist, wherever he works, is to retain his sense of black identity and utilize it in expressing himself. If his self-autonomy is threatened, then he must retain the right to disengage himself rather than compromise his principles as an artist, as a person, and as a black person.

To insist that the only avenue open to black artists must be limited to those black institutions which so far have developed is unrealistic. Even these proliferating groups—hopefully, more to come—cannot provide more than a small percentage of access to black artists. Is the black writer or actor supposed to wait until he is employed by the Negro Ensemble Company or the New Lafayette Theater, which are, at best, limited in their accommodations? If, suddenly and miraculously, 100 black playwrights, of outstanding quality emerge simultaneously, are

they supposed to submit their scripts only to the few black-controlled groups? No, of course not. The best they can strive for is to get the finest presentation of their work, no matter where, and, as much as possible, control the realization of what they set out to accomplish. If the resulting situation turns out to be less than satisfactory, then they also must retain the right to disengage themselves.

Although I, as a writer and performer, have helped create and always will prefer black-controlled, black-oriented projects, it still does not mean that, if time or interest permits, I will not work elsewhere. Such a decision would be based on the specific opportunity, the projected quality of the undertaking and the character of those in control.

As for participation in the mass media: One does it with eyes fully opened. Movies and television, in the main, are controlled securely by a small financial interest. Essentially, I am pessimistic about their interest or ability in reaching a black audience with anything that is meaningful. But I don't think any artist, black or white, looks upon these media as arenas for great, relevant artistic or social expression. Movies are made for the greatest profits. Television dispenses pap, not usually conceived for any higher purpose than to advertise products. The increased presence (momentary?) of black faces upon the screen and tube should not arouse expectations that they intend to serve more solid food to black people—or to whites.

It is my contention that a black artist need not cut himself off from any possibility. He should be free and flexible to pursue whatever avenue is available to his development. But wherever he is, his black commitment cannot be threatened if he retains autonomy over the specifics of his artistic and personal participation.

"THE PRICE MAY BE TOO HIGH"

(By James Baldwin, author)

As so often happens in this time and place, a real question, with important repercussions, is rendered nearly trivial by the terms in which the question is expressed. Beneath the terms, of course, lie the deadly assumptions on which black and white relations in this country have rested for so long. These assumptions are suggested in a famous song: *If you white, all right, if you brown, hang around, but if you black, step back!*

The question is not whether black and white artists can work together—artists need each other, despite all those middlebrow rumors to the contrary. The question is whether or not black and white citizens can work together. Black artists remember how much white artists have stolen from them, and this certainly creates a certain tension; but the rejection by many black artists of white artistic endeavor contains far more than meets the public eye. What black artists are rejecting, when the rejection occurs, is not the possibility of working with white artists. What they are rejecting is that American system which makes pawns of white men and victims of black men and which really, at bottom, considers all artistic effort to be either irrelevant or threatening.

It is very strange to be a black artist in this country—strange and dangerous. He must attempt to reach something of the truth, and to tell it—to use his instrument as truthfully as he knows how. But consider what Sambo's truth means to the Governors of states, the Mayors of cities, the chiefs of Police Departments, the heads of Boards of Education! The country pretends not to know the reasons for Sambo's discontent; but Sambo must deal not only with his public discontent and daily danger but also with the dimensions of his private disaster. How, given the conditions of his life here, is he to distinguish between the two? (There may not be a distinction and that may be the moral of the tale, and not only for poor Sambo.) Assuming he survives the first dues-

paying time and becomes more or less articulate, to whom is he to address himself? Artists are produced by people who need them, because they need them. The black artist has been produced, historically speaking, anyway, by people who are both black and white, by people whose life styles differ so crucially that he is in perpetual danger of lapsing into schizophrenia and can certainly be considered the issue of a divorce. Or a rape.

I will state flatly that the bulk of this country's white population impresses me, and has so impressed me for a very long time, as being beyond any conceivable hope of moral rehabilitation. They have been white, if I may so put it, too long; they have been married to the lie of white supremacy too long; the effect on their personalities, their lives, their grasp of reality, has been as devastating as the lava which so memorably immobilized the citizens of Pompeii. They are unable to conceive that their version of reality, which they want me to accept, is an insult to my history and a parody of theirs and an intolerable violation of myself.

Well, then, for the sake of one's sanity, one simply ceases trying to make them hear. If they think that things are more important than people—and they do—well, let them think so. Let them be destroyed by their things. If they think that I was happy being a slave and am now redeemed by having become—and on their terms, as they think!—the equal of my overseers, well, let them think so. If they think that I am flattered by their generosity in allowing me to become a sharecropper in a system which I know to be criminal—and which is placed squarely on the backs of nonwhite people all over the world—well, let them think so. Let the dead bury their dead. And it is not only the black artist who arrives at this exasperated and merciless turning point. For that matter, it is not even an attitude recently arrived at. If one's ancestors were slaves here, it is an attitude which can be called historical.

The ground on which black and white artists may be able to work together, to learn from each other, is simply not provided by the system under which artists in this country work. The system is the profit system, and the artists and their work are "properties." No single word more aptly sums up the nature of this particular beast. In such a system, it makes perfect sense that Hollywood would turn out so "liberal" an abomination as "If He Hollers Let Him Go," while leaving absolutely unnoticed and untouched such a really fine and truthful study of the black-white madness as, for example, Ernest J. Gaines's "Of Love and Dust." For that matter, it makes perfect sense that Hollywood lifted the title "If He Hollers Let Him Go" from a fine novel by Chester Himes, published about 20 years ago, and has yet to announce my plans to film it, which, all things considered, is probably just as well. What it comes to is that the system under which black and white artists in this country work is geared to the needs of a people who, so far from being able to abandon the doctrine of white supremacy, seem prepared to blow up the globe to maintain it.

And if white people are prepared to blow up the globe in order to maintain that faith of their fathers which placed Sambo in chains then they are certainly willing to allow him his turn on television, stage and screen. It is a small price for white people to pay for the continuance of their domination. But the price of appearing may prove to be too high for black people to pay. The price a black actor pays for playing, in effect, a white role—for being "integrated," say, in some soupy soap opera—is, at best, to minimize and, at worst, to lie about everything that produced him, about everything he knows. White people don't want to hear what he knows, and the system can't afford it. What is being attempted is a way of involving, or incorporating, the black face into the national fantasy

in such a way that the fantasy will be left unchanged and the social structure left untouched. I doubt that even American "know-how" can achieve anything so absurd and so disastrous, but, anyway, I think that we may one day owe a great debt to those who have refused to play this particular ball game. What they are rejecting is not a people, but a doctrine, and their seeming separation may prove to be one of the few hopes of genuine union that we have ever had in this so dangerously divided house.

"TO JOURNEY TO EACH OTHER"

(By Vinnette Carroll, Director, Ghetto Arts Program, New York State Council of the Arts)

In the midst of the Black Revolution, where nerve ends are raw, where feelings are close to the surface, where racial pride as well as hostility are at their height, the artistic community must marshal its forces and use its unique tools to aid in communication and interpretation.

One feels there are great artistic gifts from all segments of the population to be brought into the market place; that art is not an ethnic monopoly, that one is illuminated, enriched, and matured by drawing on the resources of all of the people. An artist cannot fully develop in an apartheid society. Only in peace, in mutual trust, sharing and respect, is the work excellent.

The Black Artist must be free to work, to experiment with new ideas and forms, to make mistakes, to use his anger and his love in ways that are valid for him. The white artist cannot superimpose Anglo-Saxon yardsticks on the works of the "Afro-Saxon" artist. The deprivation imposed by the white community on the Black Artist is not only crippling to the Deprived, but also to the Depriver.

It is incumbent upon the white community to seek out Black Artists; to trust Black Artists' creativity; and to bring Black Artists into the mainstream.

It is incumbent upon the Black Artist to separate racial pride from racist ignorance; to integrate without assimilating; to realize that it is as important to recognize his friends as it is to recognize his enemies; to eliminate race as a peg on which to hang his neuroses and inadequacies and to be ruthless in his pursuit of excellence.

At a time when we can make a journey to the moon, we must find ways to journey to each other here on this earth. Know this olive branch is not a sign of weakness but a powerful endorsement of our artistic community. Artists of America, unite—you have nothing to lose but your fear.

"AMERICA IS MULTI-RACIAL"

(By Harold Cruse, author of "The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual")

"Can black and white artists still talk together, work together?" The question, of course, is not put correctly because the first thing the concerned individual should ask himself is: "How many aspiring black performers can the commercial theater absorb?" Really very few. Where, then, must the aspiring black performer go in search of fulfillment? If it were only a question of performers, the problem would be only half as complex. But the theater is an art form that requires more creative skills than that of the performer; there are dramatists, designers, directors, choreographers, musicians, singers, etc. In addition to having an over-supply of black radicals and civil rights, black people are also very rich in theatrically inclined talent.

But ever since the Civil War (and before) the American theater has been very unkind to black theatrical talents. Historically, the American theater has exploited black theatrical gifts, and has used its cultural and economic prerogatives against black artists in such ways as to prevent them from establishing the kinds of theater institutions more amenable to the cultivation of their talents.

This is not to imply that Negroes themselves have not lent themselves wholeheartedly to this development, but the history of the American theater should be closely examined in regard to its racial practices.

Traditionally, the stage fortunes of black performers have been, for the most part, dependent upon the creative whims (and racial views) of white dramatists. Thus the black playwright, as a type, is one of stunted growth. And one cannot build any kind of a theatrical tradition without good playwrights. Also, the commercial theater is even less congenial to black writers than to black performers. Thus even the present "rise in opportunities" for integrated jobs in the theater cannot rectify the fundamental racial inequalities built into the structure of the American theater as a social, or better, cultural institution. The American theater is, after all, a white institution.

This is not an attack on "white institutions" per se, for there is certainly room in America for white institutions. The problem is that white institutions are culturally and socially predominant. It is time we face the fact that America is multi-racial. The nation's multi-racial makeup demands a total restructuring of American society (if it is to survive), allowing for the creation of other kinds of cultural institutions besides predominant white ones. Only in such a society can there be any real, creative interracial (inter-group) cultural interchange.

Just so long as the white creative artist does not comprehend the basic undemocratic functions of white cultural institutions, as institutions, then no amount of frenetic interracializing of the theater as it exists is going to matter very much. Since around 1900, the Negro has had his ups and downs in the American theater—lean days and "good" days. In fact, he accomplished more between 1890 and World War I in theatrical achievement than he did after 1930 (at least quantitatively). The problem was that blacks were led to try to compete creatively with whites within a white-oriented theater. It could not work. Thus the blacks were pushed toward precarious marginality and held there.

Even presentday integration in the theater is simply another form of ameliorated marginality. It is true that many young black performers mistake this new integration for a great advance, and one cannot blame them for making the most of it. However, this integration cannot solve the underlying dilemma of the black creative artist in white society. What black creative artists basically need in order to develop and achieve real artistic status are black cultural institutions.

Among the several kinds of cultural institutions needed in the black community, the theater is a crucial one and is closely related to the issue of "decentralized," "community controlled" public schools, but on another cultural level of inquiry. Of course, the impact of mass communications media, like television, overrides and qualifies many of the arguments and conclusions emerging from these controversies. Hence, the only way for black and white creative artists to work together is to face these cultural imperatives realistically and work out new programs to deal with them.

"WHAT KIND OF INTEGRATION?"

(By Harry Belafonte, actor)

I have always been a disciple of integration, both on the esthetic as well as the commercial level. I am, however, terribly sensitive about the kind of integration the Negro artist, the black man, is becoming involved with. Is he to be the promulgator of the existing structures and institutions in this country? Is he, through his active participation in the involvement of black and white in all areas of creative endeavor, to further those edifices of emotional idleness that have

undermined our society for generations? Or is he, through this new, meaningful integration to revitalize, to add to and to contribute a new thrust to the existing structure?

I don't want to be part of the integration in which one man helps another into the tottering tower of the Establishment and the palace of pestilence which we know. I want to participate in an integration which brings pride, fulfillment and meaning to all members of all races.

We have talked about, fought for and desperately sought, integration in all communications media, and many people say we've got it. And, perhaps we do, but we have it dishonestly. For "Julia" is certainly not representative of the exchange and the relationship of the black man with his white brother. It is pure gloss, using the black star in the same sophomoric setting that has come to be expected of all the bland shows that may be rating champions but are human losers. In television, we have "Mod Squad," three pretty young people, one of whom is black. But it doesn't delve deeply; it doesn't investigate more thoroughly; it doesn't ask more directly, "Who is the black man in our society?", "How does he fit in?" Again, it's a kind of tired tokenism, and it's sad, because it is an opportunity that could have been used as a bridge to a strong and meaningful future, and instead, has become a circular road leading to placating the "poor black folk."

There are, of course, many divergent opinions within the black community. The integrationists of the established civil rights organizations say "We want in." The Separatists, on the other hand, say "We don't want to be contaminated by you." But surely the truth must lie somewhere in between, in that middle ground of reality, where we can take the best of both races, the black man's spirit coupled with the white man's, and from this, give birth to a true and honest "integration."

I have always been involved with black and white artists together. In order to grow creatively, in order to share experiences, we must learn from each other. But to do this, we must first understand each other, and to understand, we must, most important of all, find each other.

"BUT I DO MY THING"

(By Alice Childress, playwright and actress)

Dialogue stops but communication never ceases. A black theater here and there does not signify "turning away" from commercial television, motion picture and theater markets of the U.S.A. It is one reaction to being turned away. There is a white theater. White theaters do not hang out signs reading "The White Ensemble Company" or "The American White Theater" or "The Anglo-Saxon Players"; but they do present hundreds of plays every year, written, directed, acted, designed, produced and patronized, almost exclusively, by white persons. This white theater is not a plot to establish separatism, it is separatism. This theater functions even though the greater part of what it turns out fails.

Black communities have always had black theaters, if the community had a theater at all. The American Negro Theater Company worked ten years without salary, four nights per week, keeping the same acting company together, until the boot-straps wore out. At the moment, it obviously has been deemed simpler to alleviate a racist situation in the country by providing funds for inner-city than to have hot summers and warm winters. Yes, we do need theaters for African-Americans, we will continue to need them, event when, if ever, this land is free of racism. Theater serves as the mirror of life experience and reflects only what looks into it; everyone yearns to see his own image once in a while. But there are two trick-bags of thought to be avoided concerning the theater within and outside of the black community.

Some believe that any attempt to work within the so-called "mainstream" of Ameri-

can life is an attempt to "be with them," or to be "integrated." This fear of total integration is an illusion. I've never yet met a black person who has been integrated into white society; he may think so, he may hope so, but it just ain't so. If any of us, at this point in time, believe such nonsense, we're suffering from a severe form of hallucination.

The inner-city must also avoid swallowing the hook thrown to the American Indian: "You'll be able to thrive and prosper on your very own reservation, surrounded by us." If we don't learn anything from history, we must relive the past. The time is over for asking or even demanding human rights, in or out of the theater. We no longer ask for manhood or womanhood or dignity; all we can do is express what we have to the degree that we have it. All whites aren't bad or good, the same goes for blacks—but this fact equalizes nothing. The whole racism mess is based upon the action of white supremacist deed and thought.

The theater must reflect, to some degree, that we live in a land where no white man has ever been executed for the murder of a black man, woman, or child, not one. A culture can be no better than the people from whom it springs. There are teachers who have taught for many years in segregated, black neighborhood schools and do not live in that area, or send their children to school there. And they oppose that rejected, hemmed-in community's gaining the power to create something constructive that will rescue children wounded by a century of white-supremacist "education." Their opposition is based upon the premise that self-determination will interfere with the seniority rights of adults who mainly live, work, play, and spend their money elsewhere. There is more drama off-stage than on, in American theater.

Kennedy, King, Kennedy . . . murdered, buried with ceremony, followed by discreet, uncomfortable silence; the message reaches us and we adjust our lives quietly or noisily. There is almost as much injustice in the theater as there is in the rest of the land, but there's no need of begging. Cope! Cope anyhow, anywhere you can, to the best of your ability. When opposed, we must bear in mind that a slave is a human being who lost a battle some place and has to find his way out of the bind. Also remember that whites who are proven brothers, like John Brown, are called "nigger-lovers" or madmen. In the past 40 years only 18 plays by black writers have been presented on Broadway. Soon we may have to read our works on the sidewalks of inner-city and "mainstream" Broadway. Time is up. I've a play to write that may never be seen by any audience anywhere, but I do my thing. Who has ears to hear, hear . . . all others, later.

A CHILDISH ATTACK ON THE ROTC

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I need not observe that the Chicago Tribune has a very spirited and solid editorial philosophy. I thought that the editorial commentary in its issue of Tuesday, February 4, concerning the ROTC activities at Yale and Dartmouth, was very much to the point. The editorial follows:

A CHILDISH ATTACK ON THE ROTC

Other professions may or may not be older, but the soldier's profession must inevitably rank at the top of any list if you consider

honor as well as antiquity. It is little short of inconceivable, therefore, that the faculties of two prominent eastern colleges—Yale and Dartmouth—have taken steps to strip military training of its academic standing and to relegate the Reserve Officers Training Corps to the status of an extracurricular activity.

The chairman of the Yale faculty committee on the curriculum went so far as to say that "R.O.T.C. is like singing in the Wiffenpoofs—a perfectly fine activity but one that we don't think merits any academic standing."

This is an utterly asinine statement and reflects the childish attitude of those who think they can put an end to war by going about picketing recruiting offices and chanting the name of Ho Chi Minh—who, along with Mao Tse-tung is one of the champion exponents of military aggression in the world today. This attitude is wholly unworthy of any professor, let alone the chairman of a faculty committee.

Are we to conclude that in the arrogant opinion of these gentlemen our educational institutions are above such menial and incidental activities as securing the freedom and independence of the United States, or preserving its unity, or defeating the Nazis, or unseating dictators like Napoleon, or, more currently, defending freedom against the manifest designs of the Communists?

How much good would all the liberal arts degrees in the world do if there were not the freedom in which to profess and practice these arts? How would Yale and Dartmouth, with their great reputations for academic freedom, fare in a world which was allowed, by default, to fall under the sway of communism—like Cuba—where there is no truth but the party truth?

We are as eager as anybody to see an end to war; but a glance about the world today should make it quite clear that war is still here and that our security still depends largely on a well trained military force. College R. O. T. C. programs have been of inestimable value in training reserves to supplement the men trained at the military, naval, and air force academies.

By voting to withdraw academic credit from R. O. T. C. courses and to deprive the officers in charge of those courses of their standing as professors, the faculties are yielding to the transient demands of a vociferous minority which is almost sure to forget all about R. O. T. C. as soon as the Viet Nam war is over. The messages on the placards being waved by campus demonstrators are not likely to qualify as eternal verities.

REFORMING THE WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have today cosponsored a bill with the gentlemen from New York (Mr. CAREY and Mr. HALPERN), and a number of my colleagues to begin the urgently needed reform of the Federal welfare system now in use. Our welfare system, as it is now designed, is not working. It satisfies neither those who bear the costs, those who attempt to administer it, or those who are dependent on it for support. This bill is designed to establish national minimum standards of welfare for all States in the Union. It is a first step in the constructive overhaul that is required.

By setting national minimum standards for welfare payments, we will correct a fundamental deficiency in the system as it now stands. Today, there are wide ranges in welfare payments from State to State. The average payment of aid to dependent children in New York State is \$61.70 per month; in Mississippi it is \$8.40. This variation in payments has caused the poor in one State to move to other areas where payments are higher; an understandable desire when we consider the gross inadequacy of a payment of \$8.40 per month for a child.

But, this movement has placed a strain on those States that provide welfare payments in keeping with their social responsibilities. The welfare roles of New York State, Pennsylvania, California, and others have been swollen by the movement of the poor from the South and from rural areas. In New York City this year, the welfare bill is going to increase by \$400 million, to a total of \$1.7 billion. And it is estimated that there will be close to 1 million welfare recipients out of the city's 8 million citizens. This growth is far larger than that which would occur with normal population growth. Part of this migration reflects a genuine desire to improve one's opportunities, to take advantage of better job opportunities in a new location. But there are also cases where welfare recipients are searching for higher levels of welfare payments. This incentive should be removed.

Although the migration of the poor to our urban centers is in the tradition of the search for new frontiers, a home-stead, a new opportunity, the conditions of modern industrial society do not favor this migration. The underskilled and undereducated migrant from a rural area finds that he does not have the talents demanded in the urban job market. He is forced to work in the marginal areas of the employment market where wages are low—too low to keep him and his family alive in a high-cost-of-living area—and where unemployment first makes itself felt. It is no surprise, then, that this migrant winds up on the welfare roles.

The bill that I have cosponsored revises the welfare system to halt this migration. By providing a national minimum standard of welfare, welfare payments will be removed as an artificial inducement to move. This revision has been recommended by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare, President Nixon's task force on public assistance, and has been endorsed in principle by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch.

Going beyond the corrections contained in this legislation however, minor revisions of our welfare system will not be enough. The concept of welfare as we now know it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable because it has created within our society a group of citizens who grow up totally dependent on welfare payments for existence. The young girl whose mother is on welfare grows up knowing no other pattern of life other than having children and collecting welfare checks. The system is designed to break up homes. The young boy grows up without a man in the house; he has no

father who goes to work each day, who can establish a pattern of living which the young boy can emulate.

The system is also unacceptable because it places burdens on other wage earners that are not necessary. If a system can be devised that allows the father or mother to earn as much as they can and still receive public funds that will allow them to maintain a minimum standard of living, welfare costs may be reduced and the cycle of welfare dependency that the present system creates may be broken by reestablishing the family unit.

I am exploring the concepts of negative income tax, family payments, extension of the minimum wage laws to end the situation where an employee works a full week but still doesn't earn enough to support his family. We will need to continue payments to the sick, the aged, the orphaned and others obviously in need. But we must find a better way to prevent the growth of what Gunnar Myrdal has called an "underclass," an undereducated, underemployed group of citizens dependent on welfare for their existence. Our society can do better, it must.

NATIONAL BOY SCOUT WEEK

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 7-13, 1969, is of special significance to the millions of American boys and adults who are affiliated with the Boy Scouts of America. It is Boy Scout Week, the annual commemoration of the founding of the movement in our country, and the 53d anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America by Congress.

In every one of the 50 States, young men from 8 to 18 are celebrating Boy Scout Week with displays and special events in their communities, directing attention to the training and skills developed through one of the free world's greatest youth movements. Under the guidance of their able leaders, these young men are showing and telling the American people about the contributions Scouting is making to the future of our country.

During observances of the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts by Congress, I had the pleasure of preparing a survey of the 89th Congress to determine the influence of Scouting on its Members. I was asked by the Boy Scouts of America to update the survey for the 90th Congress and again for the 91st. I am pleased to report the results of the most recent survey which reveal that 335, or over 60 percent, of the Members of Congress have participated in the Scouting program either as Scouts or as adult volunteer leaders. And although the 11 women Members of Congress have not been counted in the statistics as eligible to participate in Scouting, one has served as a Cub Scout den mother and another has been named an "Honorary Boy Scout."

The Eagle Award, which is the highest rank that can be attained by a Scout, was earned by 28 of the 280 Members who were Scouts. Of the 148 who served in an adult volunteer capacity, eight have been presented the Silver Beaver Award, given for outstanding volunteer service at the local council level. One Member has earned the coveted Silver Buffalo Award for contributions at the national level, and two others have been awarded the Silver Antelope for outstanding service to one of the 12 Scout regions.

Mr. Speaker, that such a large proportion of the Members of Congress have come under the influence of the Scouting program, subscribing to an oath pledging "Duty to God and Country" speaks well not only of Scouting and this Congress, but of the foresight displayed by our predecessors 53 years ago when they granted a charter to the Boy Scouts of America.

Under unanimous consent I make the results of my survey part of the Record in observance of National Boy Scout Week, February 7 through 13, 1969.

TAX REFORM

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have this week cosponsored legislation to double personal income tax exemptions from the present \$600 to \$1,200 per dependent.

This is a long-overdue change which would directly aid the great mass of our Nation's taxpayers—the low- and middle-income worker and the younger people who are struggling to raise families in the face of a constantly increasing cost of living.

The \$600 exemption has been unchanged for 21 years. During that period, the cost of every basic item has risen sharply. Food has nearly doubled, rent and clothing have more than doubled, medical costs have gone up over 90 percent.

It is unrealistic to maintain that today \$600 will even come close to the cost of raising a child or caring for an aging or dependent parent.

This legislation represents a second step in the desperately needed overhaul of our income tax laws. Last week, I cosponsored a bill calling for a 13-point tax reform program, aimed primarily at closing the loopholes which enable large corporations and wealthy persons to avoid paying a fair share of the tax burden.

I was pleased to note in the press this week that the Nixon administration apparently supports the bulk of these overdue tax reforms. Perhaps enough of my Republican colleagues will join with Democrats who have long sought this goal, and we will finally be able to achieve meaningful tax revisions.

A most excellent third step in this direction would be the adoption of legislation to establish a minimum tax for individuals and corporations. This pro-

posal was made in the 89th Congress by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, but it was pigeonholed in committee. I supported the idea then, and I think today it is only fair to set such a minimum tax. I was pleased to see that in his press conference of this week President Nixon has endorsed the principle of a minimum tax for all taxpayers. This type of tax would move toward correction of the unbelievable situation of 155 Americans with adjusted gross incomes of over \$200,000 paying no income tax at all in 1967. Too many wealthy people and big corporations today either pay no tax at all, or pay a ridiculously low amount, because of loopholes and gimmicks in the Internal Revenue Code.

As I told the House last week, the demand for tax reform has grown so loud that the Congress dare ignore it no longer.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, while peace is a major concern of every thoughtful American, our country, lacking direction, has often failed to convert its peacekeeping desires into a peacekeeping reality.

I, therefore, rise today in support of legislation to redirect this Nation's energies toward a lasting peace. Yesterday, together with many of my colleagues, I introduced legislation for the establishment of a Department of Peace and World Order. While no panacea, this new Government function, if adopted, will be given a mandate to discover nonviolent means of resolving the inevitable international conflicts that arise between other nations and our own.

Mr. Speaker, the search for peace within our time has been hampered by some who hold that war is an inevitable product of "human nature". I say this view is false.

As every student of history knows, at various times during the past 7,000 years of human experience, large and complex populations inhabiting vast areas of settlement have lived in peace through many generations.

The world today, however, is at latest count divided into at least 140 sovereign states, each vying for existence. The idea of politically merging each of these separate powers into a single, peaceful world government is just not realistically possible. Compounding the difficulty is the grim threat of nuclear or bacteriological extinction.

The simple truth is, civilized man must place an urgent new priority upon peace. In the free world, and within the United States especially, a new balance must be struck between our spectacular technological advances versus the relatively primitive state of the social and political sciences.

Sanity and survival demand that we divert toward peace at least a portion of the organized, massive resources now committed to the machinery of war. We must begin to seek security through ra-

tional, nonviolent means rather than through ever more sophisticated instruments of death.

It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I join my colleagues in the House in our plea for support of this new legislation to create a Department of Peace.

For the record, let me point to the long precedent for action such as we are proposing. Between the 84th and 90th Congresses, 1955-68, no less than 85 bills were introduced into the House or Senate to create a Department of Peace. In fact, from Revolutionary times forward, various American groups have advanced a similar idea that a Secretary of Peace, at Cabinet level, be created to balance the Secretary of Defense—formerly the Secretary of War.

Despite this long tradition, never have any of these measures been moved from committee or voted upon within the Congress of the United States. Moreover, if reports are correct concerning President Nixon's reaction to this legislation, a vote upon this proposal will be difficult to obtain.

With all due respect to the wisdom of the executive branch, Mr. Speaker, I must maintain that neither the Department of Defense nor the Department of State are charged with the responsibility of using vast resources for researching ways to achieve the peace.

John Foster Dulles, in 1957, indicated that in his view the function of the Department of State is neither to foster peace nor prevent war, but to promote the "national interest." Certainly we cannot maintain that all of the planes, tanks, bombs, and assorted other vehicles of the Department of Defense have brought us any closer to the illusive peace we seek, for it is that agency's responsibility to defend our country at all costs. However, to saddle them with an equally important responsibility would be to dilute both.

And so, in summary, I urge my colleagues to work toward the success of this measure. Peacemaking should be our country's full-time concern. Achievement of this goal would be among the most important enactments of the 91st Congress.

SEX AND SUBVERSION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, little children are denied prayer in school, and in many instances forbidden to salute our flag or repeat the Pledge of Allegiance. Yet, parents are being persuaded to accept as a matter of academic truth that their children can be protected from future psychological disorder by a full exposure in their early years to the mysteries of sex.

Furthermore, we find creeping into their textbooks indoctrination in violence. Any rational individual examining the deterioration of the classroom textbooks can but conclude that the promoters of such programs are either dangerously

sick or are undertaking subversive efforts to destroy the moral fiber of America's future by warping the minds of our youth.

In practice, sensitivity training—or self-criticism—has been used by Communist leadership to reduce the dignity of man in their enslaved countries to subhuman status for pacification and easy control of the masses. Many examples of collective manipulation to maintain power thusly are presently in operation. As recently as Wednesday, January 22, 1969, the Washington Post carried a report from Hong Kong describing the reindoctrination of Teng Hsiao-ping to replace dictator Mao Tse-tung. The article described reports from Peking that Teng has been attending Red confessional meetings to absolve himself of his supposed sins. The report continued:

SEEN AT CONFESSIONAL

Though his return to prominence has not been officially announced, reliable reports reaching here from Peking say that Teng has lately been attending confessional meetings in the Chinese capital in order to absolve himself of his supposed sins.

This practice of "self-criticism" is standard Chinese Communist procedure designed to permit alleged deviationists to correct their errors.

The mothers and fathers of American youth are already incensed at the indecencies and violence purveyed to their children through the television, movies, and even the radio. But the mental manipulators through their ratings and polls have been made aware that mother and dad are turning off television and staying away from the movies to shield their children.

So it became necessary to reach the minds of the children that they launch a new attack—via the classroom and the textbook.

Today we find the classrooms of America have been turned into a battleground to subvert the minds of our youth.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a paper by Gary Allen entitled "Sex Study," from the March, 1969, American Opinion, and releases from the National Enquirer for January 26, and the Washington Post for January 22, 1969, following my remarks:

[From American Opinion, March 1969]

SEX STUDY: PROBLEMS, PROPAGANDA, AND PORNOGRAPHY

(NOTE.—Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*—a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to *American Opinion*. Mr. Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.)

Sex education in the schools is not new. Most high schools have for years conducted courses which teach the biological facts of life. What is new is that these are now sneered at by sex educationists as "plumbing courses," inadequate for "modern social needs." What is needed, we are told, is a jet-age "sex education" which really gets down to the nitty gritty.

And that is just what we are getting.

As the Saturday Evening Post related before its recent demise, the "sex-education"

programs which are now "mushrooming all over the country are newer than the new math. . . . America seems to have suddenly discovered an urgent need for universal sex education—from kindergarten through high school, some enthusiasts insist—and is galloping off in all directions at once to meet it." The Post trumpeted that fifty percent of public and parochial schools are now providing the glories of academic sexuality, and that at the present rate the figure will pass seventy percent within a year.

Nothing happens in a vacuum, and the educationists' sex explosion would not be taking place unless a great deal of influence, organization, and money were being poured into its promotion from somewhere. It is. The organization behind the new "sex education" now sweeping the nation is S.I.E.C.U.S., Sex Information and Education Council of the United States. (Pronounced, seek us.) As the Post noted, "Among the organizations shaping the structure of American sex education, by far the most influential is S.I.E.C.U.S." McCall's puts it this way: "Today's atmosphere in sex education cannot be described without mention of a high-voltage, nonprofit organization called S.I.E.C.U.S., which is without doubt the single most important force in sparking sex education in our schools. . . ." The Wall Street Journal records that "S.I.E.C.U.S. reports fifty to seventy inquiries a week from schools, churches, and other organizations seeking guidance on sex education."

A leaflet distributed by the National Education Association describes S.I.E.C.U.S. as a voluntary health agency founded in New York City, in 1964, to provide "assistance to communities and schools wishing to embark on sex education programs. S.I.E.C.U.S. will act as a clearinghouse for research and education in sex, as a source of information about sex education in the schools, and as a public forum where consideration of various aspects of man's sexuality can be carried out in dignified and objective fashion."

The tax-free S.I.E.C.U.S. organization operates largely from foundation grants—which means that American taxpayers are ultimately footing the bill. Those who write to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning "sex education" are now advised to contact S.I.E.C.U.S. The Department of H.E.W. is also putting your money where its commitment is, and in 1967 granted \$1.5 million to support the new "sex education" programs in thirteen school districts. In addition, officers of the U.S. Office of Education have served, or are serving, on the Board of Directors of S.I.E.C.U.S.

Chief torchbearer for S.I.E.C.U.S. is Dr. Mary Calderone, the organization's Executive Director—referred to by McCall's as the Commander-in-Chief of "sex education" forces. Since the Commander-in-Chief's attitudes must of necessity be reflected in the choice of materials for the S.I.E.C.U.S. program we are all required to subsidize, her views have undergone close scrutiny by concerned parents. Dr. Calderone has, for example, often made clear her commitment to the "New Morality"—as old as Sodom and Gomorrah. In speaking to 320 boys at Blair Academy in New Jersey, S.I.E.C.U.S. Director Calderone commented: "What is sex for? It's for fun . . . for wonderful sensation. . . . Sex is not something you turn off like a faucet. If you do, it's unhealthy." And, she continued: "We need new values to establish when and how we should have sexual experiences."

What sort of "new values"?

According to *Look* magazine, when a student asked: "What is your opinion of premarital sex relations among teenagers?" Mrs. Calderone snapped back: "What's yours? Nobody from on high [God] determines this. You determine it. . . . I don't believe . . . the old 'Thou Shalt Not's' apply any more." She certainly doesn't.

In Seventeen magazine, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director claimed "sex is not the prerogative of Christianity," and the Saturday Evening Post quotes her as declaring that sexual "do's and don'ts" cannot be imposed on the young. After telling her youthful audiences that "there doesn't seem to be any correlation between premarital sex and success in marriage," she regularly leaves the decision of premarital intercourse up to the glands of her young listeners. The Boston Globe of December 5, 1968, quotes her as telling a blushing audience of five hundred high school boys and girls:

"The question goes far beyond 'Will I go to bed?' and it's one you must answer for yourselves. You boys may know a girl is physically ready, but you have to ask yourselves: 'Am I ready to take the responsibility to say, yes, she is ready emotionally and psychologically?'"

Though described by Post as a Joan of Arc for "sex education," Dr. Calderone is more often referred to as "a sweet-faced, silvery-haired grandmother" who shocks audiences by using four-letter words to make her point. Her motto is "tell them everything and tell them early." According to the Saturday Evening Post:

"Contrary to the views of most child psychoanalysts, Dr. Calderone holds that sex education should start in the nursery. Around the age of three the child should assimilate such knowledge, along with the correct terminology such as 'The penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina.' Kindergarten teachers should then impart additional clinical details."

That's right, kindergarten teachers!

As you might expect, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director also has very progressive ideas concerning homosexuality. As she is fond of telling youngsters: "Almost everybody has some attraction to people of the same sex. . . . I cannot condemn it." Every boy in an urban environment, she says, "is going to have a homosexual advance made to him, and therefore he should understand what it is and what his attitude about it and about himself should be."

And what should that attitude be? Concerning homosexuals, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Commander-in-Chief smirks to boys in her lectures: ". . . you owe that person your responsibility and understanding, even if you don't share his conviction." Dr. Calderone adds, sadly, that "it will be some time before homosexuality receives general acceptance." Unless, of course, her "educational" efforts on behalf of S.I.E.C.U.S. are successful.

If Dr. Mary Calderone is the Joan of Arc of the school-sex revolution, Dr. Lester Kirkendall, Professor of Family Life at Oregon State University, and a member of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Directors, is its Pled Piper. Dr. Kirkendall, a prolific author of sex books and magazine articles about every conceivable sexual foible, will never be accused of being an old fuddy-duddy by even the hippest of the pornopoliticians. Still, Kirkendall is referred to by *Reader's Digest* as "without question, one of the most respected authorities in the whole field of sex education and family life." He has, according to the *Digest*, "helped to create today's new generation of sex educators."

Lester Kirkendall says he believes that "if present trends continue, premarital intercourse will almost certainly increase." But, the Professor adds, he doesn't feel this is necessarily bad. He writes in *Sex And Our Society* that if couples "do experiment with sex only to have their relationship flounder, their honest efforts to understand and be responsible to one another may well have been more gain than loss."

Like Mrs. Calderone, S.I.E.C.U.S. director Kirkendall is not "hung up" with the religious and moral foundations of sex. He is, in fact, a past director of the anti-religious

American Humanist Association, and has written in its magazine that morality cannot be found in the context of "supernaturalism or a supernatural deity." Instead, he defines his religion as a "respect for and a belief in people, and a concern for true brotherhood among men." Just as Kirkendall rejects God for "people," he also rejects patriotism, actually going so far as to brand defense of one's country as immoral. In "Searching for the Roots of Moral Decisions," he writes:

A tremendous feeling of national unity, a sense of closeness, good will, and harmony may result from fearing another nation or from the effort of trying to destroy another nation. Such unity . . . is immoral.

Another founder of S.I.E.C.U.S.—and its longtime Treasurer—is Isadore Rubin. He too shares Dr. Kirkendall's rejection of patriotism. Rubin was on May 3, 1955 identified in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party by Mrs. Mildred Blauvelt, an undercover operative within the Communist Party for the New York Police Department. Rubin was subsequently Editor of the New York Teacher News, published by the New York Teachers Union—which was expelled from the A.F.L.-C.I.O. when it was found to be controlled by the Communists. So total was his commitment to the Reds that he even had to be dismissed from his job as a teacher in New York City because of his refusal to deny his membership in the Communist Party.

In addition to his subversive work for S.I.E.C.U.S., Comrade Rubin now edits the notorious Sexology magazine. Although S.I.E.C.U.S. proclaims that one of its purposes is to counter exploitation of sex, its own officers are involved in the wildest sort of sex exploitation. Rubin's pulpy Sexology magazine dwells on sex sensationalism, with lurid pictures of men and women in the most intimate positions, presenting crass articles dealing with the worst sort of perversion. Examples of features in recent issues include: "Can Humans Breed With Animals?," "Witchcraft And Sex—1968," and "The First Sadists," and "Wife Swapping In Naples," and "My Double Sex Life (the story of a bisexual)," and "Gangs That Hunt Down Queers," and "Why I Like Homosexual Men," and "Unusual Sex Demands," ad nauseam. In addition, Sexology also features film reviews of the latest "adult movies," carries advertisements for rank sex books, and has published its own titillating work on Transvestism.

Mr. Rubin's Sexology periodical has for years been available at certain seedy stores around the country (often from behind the counter, with the pages stapled together), but bigger and better things are in store for the magazine. Speaking in December of 1968 to a group of educators at an institute on "sex education" sponsored by the International Business Machines Corporation, S.I.E.C.U.S.'s Lester Kirkendall revealed that Sexology is currently being revised with a different cover and titles so it can be used in the schools.¹

Now, get this: Dr. Lester Kirkendall serves with Communist Isadore Rubin as an Editor of Sexology magazine. Also on the staff of this pornographic sheet are S.I.E.C.U.S. directors William Genné, John Money, and Wardell Pomeroy.

Another of those laboring with Communist

¹ Kirkendall, according to the Anaheim Bulletin of December 19, 1968, ridiculed those at the I.B.M.-sponsored sex institute who noted that Isadore Rubin was identified as a Communist before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. "Rubin," said Kirkendall, "only wrote a paper for the Daily Worker." The sworn testimony of the New York detective who was in the same Red cell as Comrade Rubin contradicts Dr. Kirkendall's claim.

Isadore Rubin and his fellow pornographers on the Board of Directors of S.I.E.C.U.S. is Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, the newly elected President of the million-member National Education Association.² The radically Leftist Mrs. Koontz urges teachers to ". . . organize, agitate, and strike." In paraphrasing the Communist Black Panthers to call for "Teacher Power," she explains: "We cannot teach democracy and ignore what is wrong. . . ." It is thus not surprising that N.E.A. has been in the forefront of promoting S.I.E.C.U.S. throughout the nation, and that Mary Calderone has been a contributor to the N.E.A. Journal.

Earlier we mentioned Sexology staffer William Genné—a director, founder, and officer of S.I.E.C.U.S. who calls himself "Reverend" and is Director of the Commission on Marriage and Family Life of the National Council of Churches. The "Reverend" Genné, who offers the view that those who think "Wherever healing takes place, Christ is present, no matter what the Church says about fornication," has quite a background himself. In addition to his consultation in pornography at Sexology, the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities record that Genné has affiliated himself with such Communist Fronts as the Stockholm Peace Petition, the World Peace Appeal, the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act, the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Then there is S.I.E.C.U.S. director William Masters, who published with Virginia E. Johnson the best-selling *Human Sexual Response*. That incredible volume records Dr. Masters' studies in intercourse and auto-manipulation of 694 persons. Masters had no qualms about employing unmarried subjects to perform before the cameras for this subsequently popularized study of intercourse, and used an artificial plastic phallus which recorded female responses. The S.I.E.C.U.S. director was quoted in *Playboy* (May, 1968) describing the tortuous device as follows:

"The equipment can be adjusted for physical variations in size, weight and vaginal development. The rate and depth of penile thrust is initiated and controlled completely by the responding individual."

The immediate past-President of S.I.E.C.U.S. is sociologist David Mace, who stated his case for the "New Morality" in the April, 1968, issue of *Sexology* as follows:

"The simple fact is that through most of our history in Western Christendom we have based our standards of sexual behavior on premises that are now totally insupportable—on the folklore of the ancient Hebrews and on the musings of medieval monks, concepts that are simply obsolete."

The current President of S.I.E.C.U.S. is Lester Doniger, said to be the former Publisher of *Pulpit Digest*, Director of Pulpit Book Club, and President of the Pulpit Press. Curiously, Doniger's autobiographical note in *Who's Who In World Jewry* does not mention his Protestant publishing business, and he has variously listed his birthplace as Raczk, Poland, and Vienna, Austria. We do know that the *Great Neck* [New York] News of February 14, 1947, carried an article entitled "US-USSR Committee Announces Meeting," which reported that a forum would

² Mrs. Koontz has just been named by President Nixon to head the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

³ S.I.E.C.U.S. director Calderone is also a member of that N.C.C. Commission.

⁴ Listed as sponsors of S.I.E.C.U.S.'s second annual dinner were the notorious Hugh Hefner of *Playboy*, John Cowles of *Look*, Secretary of State and Mrs. Robert Strange McNamara, Leftist Stewart Mott (heir to a G.M. fortune), best-selling author Vance Packard, Steven Rockefeller, and James Warburg of the international banking family.

be held under the auspices of the Great Neck Committee of the Communist National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. Among those scheduled to appear was Jessica Smith, wife of Communist Party attorney John Abt and widow of Communist Hal Ware of the notorious Soviet spy ring called the Ware Cell. Mrs. Abt was editor of *Russia Today*. The article stated that tickets for the Council's affair were obtainable from Mrs. Rita Doniger, wife of S.I.E.C.U.S. President Lester Doniger.

TRAINING FOR ILLEGAL SEX

The philosophy, attitudes, and beliefs of the above officials of S.I.E.C.U.S. have been projected into the curriculum it recommends for our schools. The S.I.E.C.U.S. program is more than just education. After all, it isn't any good to know what, if you don't know how. And how requires training in the required "sex skills." As S.I.E.C.U.S. Study Guide Number 1 states:

"... the time-tested principles accepted in other areas of education must be supplied; to equip youngsters with the skills, knowledge and attitudes that will enable them to make intelligent choices and decisions."

To burden a "sex education" program with folderol about morality would, in the opinion of S.I.E.C.U.S., simply muddy the water in teaching children to express their "sexuality." According to the S.I.E.C.U.S. Study Guide: "Sex education must be thought of as being education—not moral indoctrination. Attempting to indoctrinate young people with a set of rigid rules and ready-made formulas is doomed to failure in a period of transition and conflict." More specifically, when Esther Schultz of S.I.E.C.U.S. listed in Redbook the qualifications for "sex education" teachers, she emphatically noted: "He must not be a moralist."

Not tolerating moralists, S.I.E.C.U.S. naturally makes no judgments on perversion. And from the point of view of the Leftist S.I.E.C.U.S. propagandists, why should it? As one of the S.I.E.C.U.S. informational brochures states: "It is not the job of any voluntary health organization, which S.I.E.C.U.S. is, to make moral judgments; S.I.E.C.U.S. can be neither for nor against illegitimacy, homosexuality, premarital sex—nor any other manifestation of human sexual phenomena." When little George asks about homosexuality, or little Betty inquires about having children out of wedlock, you just know that you want their teacher to follow S.I.E.C.U.S. procedures and remain neutral. We wouldn't want any "moral" judgments, after all. Such judgments might warp the little psyches of our children!

A guiding theme throughout S.I.E.C.U.S. material seems to be to release students from any inhibitions, or feelings of guilt or conscience, about illicit sexual activity. The S.I.E.C.U.S. Study Guide Number 5 begins: "The best way to gain insight into premarital sexual standards today is to start with the realization that among young people abstinence is not the only nor in some cases the dominant standard." This pamphlet draws attention to the fact that there are four premarital standards in use today: total abstinence; the double standard; affection-centered relations; and, permissiveness without affection. Naturally, S.I.E.C.U.S. doesn't take sides. Instead, the Guide tells your children: "The choice of a premarital sexual standard is a personal moral choice, and no amount of facts or trends can 'prove' scientifically that one ought to choose a particular standard. Thus, the individual is in a sense

'free,'—to make up his own morality on the spot.

In discussing such consequences of permissiveness as venereal disease, promiscuity, and illegitimacy, Study Guide Number 5 drags out the old shell game and assigns the blame to parents:

"The difficulties of doing anything about the consequences of greater permissiveness become apparent when one realizes that our type of courtship inevitably involves a certain amount of such consequences. The same parents who decry the consequences favor a free courtship system—a system that encourages permissiveness. Even more paradoxical is the stress parents place on love as the basis for marriage and happiness. The research findings on female permissiveness indicate that love is a key factor promoting sexual intercourse. Thus, the more parents stress love the more their daughters will engage in coitus."

Got that, parents? Stress permissiveness and your children will find themselves in trouble, or stress an abiding love and things will be even worse. Either way, you are to simply surrender your children to the indoctrination and "skill" provided in the schools by Comrade Rubin and the Leftist pornographers of S.I.E.C.U.S.

Many parents have concluded that the S.I.E.C.U.S. stand on masturbation verges on advocacy of it as a salutary pastime. Dr. Warren Johnson of Sexology fame, informs seventh-graders in the S.I.E.C.U.S. Study Guide Number 3:

"Most students have some experience with this activity [masturbation], sometimes before puberty, although many of them are unfamiliar with the word: masturbation. They hear it called _____ It is an almost universal practice among healthy boys and is also a common, but not so frequent habit in girls. . . . From the medical point of view it is necessary to emphasize the fact that the commonly quoted medical consequences of masturbation are almost entirely fictitious. . . . Any harm resulting from masturbation, according to the best medical authorities, is likely to be caused by worry or a sense of guilt due to misinformation."

Dr. Johnson even tells us who the bad guys are in our society causing all of these feelings of guilt. Ready? It is the churches.

Who says so? Why, the authorities at S.I.E.C.U.S. say so. The Study Guide relates:

"Moreover, it should be recognized that in our society most religious groups are strongly opposed to this practice [masturbation], and it is quite difficult for boys and girls to practice it and not feel some sense of guilt or fear."

Got that? "Guilt and fear" are a product of the churches, and masturbation is "universal" and "healthy."

In the past, young people were encouraged to work off their nervous energy through athletics, study, dancing, and other wholesome activities. Now we have the Leftists of S.I.E.C.U.S. working in the schools to tell our teachers that masturbation is a healthier outlet. Page eighteen of Study Guide Number 3 maintains:

"As a general rule, parents and adults concerned with youth are best advised to disregard evidence of private masturbation in juveniles, not to look for it nor to try to prevent it directly or even indirectly by attempting to divert the youngster's attention to other activities. In adulthood, as well as in childhood, masturbation by individuals in private is coming more and more to be regarded as an acceptable means of releasing sexual tension."

According to S.I.E.C.U.S., not only is this practice not harmful, it actually performs a positive function of building manly self-confidence. The Study Guide remarks, "During adolescence, masturbation and its attendant fantasies may not only be a means

of releasing sex tensions, but often serve as part of the adolescent struggle to achieve a sense of identity and a sexual self-image."

In addition to preparing study guides, S.I.E.C.U.S. publishes a quarterly newsletter expounding its philosophy and recommending films, books, and articles in the field of sexology; it reprints articles that it judges particularly valuable; and, it issues new reading lists of sex books. Included in the reprints are articles from Communist Isadore Rubin's grisly Sexology magazine. And, among the books recommended are such erotica as *Prostitution in Europe and The Americas*, *Unmarried Love*, *Women's Prisons*, and *Sex And The Social Structure*.

One of the most controversial educational tools being used in "sex education" courses is a slide-film called *How Babies Are Made*, prepared with the aid of S.I.E.C.U.S. This film, which is recommended for grades kindergarten through six, uses papier-mâché models to teach sexual reproduction. While the children watch the film the teacher reads the narrative which describes what is happening in adult, medically accurate terms.

One slide, which shows two dogs copulating, carries this dialogue: "When a father dog wants to send his sperm into a mother dog, he climbs on her back. . . ." The film then shows human male and female anatomy, indicates how a baby is produced, and ends with an optional slide showing a man and woman in bed with the narrative: "You have already learned how a father's sperm meets and fertilizes a mother's egg to create a new baby. To do this, they lie down facing each other. . . ."

One such film set, used in a Westchester County elementary school, shows dogs copulating—followed by a human couple under bed sheets—as a recorded voice explains: "Mummy and Daddy are doing the same things the dogs do."

As part of its educational program S.I.E.C.U.S. cooperates with a number of other Leftist efforts in the sexology field. For example, S.I.E.C.U.S. lists Barney Rosset of the notorious Grove Press as a source of information. Rosset has been in court many times over his publication of pornography and was the subject of an article in the January 25, 1969 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post*, entitled "How to Publish 'Dirty' Books for Fun and Profit." The *Post* revealed that Mr. Rosset relinquished his "fiery pacifism" when Hitler broke his pact with Stalin and attacked Russia. With Mother Russia in trouble, Barney joined the Army. (Yes, ours.)

Besides pornography, Rosset also specializes in books glorifying Communism—such as *Reminiscences by Ernesto "Che" Guevara*, *Edgar Snow's Red Star Over China*, and *Communist Kim Philby's My Silent War*. Not surprisingly, S.I.E.C.U.S. has even run advertisements in Rosset's *lewd Evergreen Review*.

The S.I.E.C.U.S. organization has also run its ads in the disgusting *Nude Living* magazine, published by the Elysium Institute. Although S.I.E.C.U.S. proclaims itself against "sexual exploitation," and claims it wishes to "dignify human sexuality," it has picked another strange bedfellow in the Elysium Institute—whose specialty is perversion and pornography dressed up as "health" fadism and "scientific inquiry." Elysium's magazines are composed mostly of photographs of nude men and women in sickening sexual positions, photographed from angles clearly designed to attract the pervert. They promote everything from necrophilia to nude Satanism and are frankly beyond description by a normal human being.

Of course, those magazines published by Elysium contain a page which lists the Institute's connection with S.I.E.C.U.S. and others of the "growing number of organizations in this country which are concerned as is the Institute, with seeking means to man's physical, emotional and intellectual

*This organization is described by the federal government's *Guide To Subversive Organizations* as being "created by the Communist Party in 1943." It is cited on the U.S. Attorney General's list of subversive organizations as "subversive and Communist."

development in an environment of openness, understanding and tolerance."

Among the books recommended by S.I.E.C.U.S. as source material is *Situation Ethics—The New Morality* by Dr. Joseph Fletcher. Fletcher has been a member of thirty organizations cited by the federal government as Communist Fronts. Herbert Philbrick, former undercover operative for the F.B.I., testified that "Joe Fletcher worked with us on Communist Party projects and on an enormous number of tasks." Needless to say, Dr. Fletcher thinks the "New Morality" is simply glorious.

The recordings and books of Dr. Albert Ellis are also recommended by S.I.E.C.U.S. Ellis, a much-married former used-car salesman who obtained his Ph.D. late in life, is another "New Moralist." He is quoted in *Life* magazine as observing: "I certainly agree that if we are ever to become at all rational about our system of dating and marriage, the double standard will have to go. However, it seems to me that one of the main ways of getting rid of the standard is to encourage premarital sex relations today. During the 1930s Ellis translated *Das Kapital* for the lay reader. In his book, *The Case Against Religion*, he writes: "The religious person sells his soul, surrenders his own basic urges and pleasure so that he may feel comfortable with this heavenly helper that he himself has invented. Religion, then, is needless inhibition."

In a S.I.E.C.U.S.-recommended book, *The American Sexual Tragedy*, Ellis castigates "men who cannot be satisfied with any form of sex activity but coitus" as "probably fetishistically attached to this idea." The effect of the efforts of Dr. Ellis on our children can only be called calculated and sick.

Anthropologist Ashley Montagu, a member of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Consultants, is another whose materials are recommended to schools by S.I.E.C.U.S. Writing in the *Phi Delta Kappan*, Montagu visualizes a future in which:

"Young unmarried individuals who are sufficiently responsible will be able, in the new dispensation, to enter into responsible sexual relationships in a perfectly healthy and morally acceptable and reciprocally beneficial manner, which will help the participants to become more fully developed human beings than they would otherwise have stood a chance of becoming."

As a S.I.E.C.U.S. authority, Montagu even views the de-masculinization of American men with forthright approval: "The short-sighted 'viewers with alarm' will be relegated to their proper places when what they so wrongheadedly deplore, namely, the alleged feminization of men and the alleged masculinization of women, are discovered to be advances in the right rather than in the wrong direction."

HERE IT COMES

The S.I.E.C.U.S. program which has been described by the national press as the model effort in community "sex education" is being committed in the schools of Anaheim, California. The *Saturday Evening Post* called it a S.I.E.C.U.S. show window. In Anaheim, 32,000 students from seventh through twelfth grades get six weeks of coeducational "sex education" yearly.

"Some of those wildly Leftist efforts with which Elysium exchanges information (in addition to S.I.E.C.U.S.) are the University of Humanism, Institute of Rational Living, Institute for Sex Research, Pacifica Foundation, Joan Baez' Institute for the Study of Non-Violence, Sexual Freedom League, and the Underground Press Syndicate.

Because the elementary school is a separate system and has not yet adopted the program, children in the kindergarten through sixth grade have thus far been deprived of S.I.E.C.U.S. sex in Anaheim.

Sally Williams, who supervises the Family Life and Sex Education program at Anaheim is on the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Directors, and Dr. Esther Schultz of S.I.E.C.U.S. helped to develop the Anaheim program, which relies heavily on S.I.E.C.U.S. materials. Yet, strangely, both S.I.E.C.U.S. and the School District, headed by Superintendent Paul W. Cook, steadfastly maintain that Anaheim has nothing to do with S.I.E.C.U.S. Apparently it is felt that the Leftists and pornographers of S.I.E.C.U.S. are vulnerable to criticism and that it is best to provide the program while doing everything possible to avoid the label. Certainly the *Saturday Evening Post* wasn't fooled about who is running the show—nor is anyone else.

The Anaheim scheme has stimulated opposition in the form of a Citizens' Committee formed by Mrs. Janet Townsend, Mrs. Eleanor Howe, now a committed activist, is typical of the Committee members. She became upset at what was going on in her son's eleventh grade "sex education" class when she learned that the teacher asked young Howe what he would do if he discovered his son masturbating. That was a little too much for this courageous youngster, and he walked out of the class. Mrs. Howe told me:

"You wouldn't believe some of the reports we get from parents about these classes. One young man became so upset at the thought that he might be a homosexual, after the way the subject was treated in his eighth grade class, that his parents had to send him to a psychiatrist to calm his fears. He was simply a normal adolescent, but the sex program proved too much for him."

In addition to the Citizens' Committee, the Anaheim program has also provoked opposition from the local newspaper, the *Anaheim Bulletin*, which has an old-fashioned Editor by the name of Sam Campbell who, along with the reporter John Steinbacher, has not been afraid to challenge the educational power structure. The Bulletin has published literally scores of letters from distraught parents. Such parental objection is mushrooming, and far from confined to Anaheim. Here, for example, is a letter of November 27, 1968, from a Mrs. Erwin Handel to the Phoenix American:

"We just received our Nov. 6 . . . issue of 'The American.' I noted the article on the front page about sex education—which might better and more accurately be termed 'obscenity education' in the Phoenix schools."

"We just moved from Phoenix—and for that reason. We have a 12-year-old son who was taught this smut last spring, and about 9 weeks thereafter we had a near disaster in our home."

"I walked in and caught him sexually molesting our 4-year-old daughter. He had been taught all about intercourse at school and wanted to 'try it out' on his sister. (I caught him before he actually committed the act.)"

"Now, teaching young kids this in school is nonsense. . . . It's like giving someone a recipe to discourage cooking. It won't discourage, but rather encourage, experimentation."

"We hope that you might publish this—so some other parents might realize just what this 'education' is doing to our children before they actually suffer a disaster—just as we nearly did."

You think it can't be that bad? Tell it to Mrs. Handel. Or, take a look at some of the supplementary books used in the \$375,000 per year program to push sex at the children of Anaheim. A typical example is Kenneth Barnes' *He and She*. The theme that "America is a repressed Puritanical society," constantly proclaimed by the Leftists and "New Moralists," is emphasized by Barnes on page eighty:

"The sad result of the way the world upsets the attitudes of young people is that it encourages a divided feeling about sex and

about people. It ought to be possible for a young man to see a girl naked and to enjoy her nakedness without any sense of guilt, accepting it not just as the nakedness of a female body, but as something that is part of her personality and that arouses respect for her as a whole person. There are countries in which the taboo on nakedness is not so strong as here."

Barnes also informs the students of Anaheim that God-centered religion is passé. In advocating a new-style religion, he writes: "This religion must have a person at its centre; nothing less will do, no dogmas or rules or pseudoscientific notions will suffice, for these are all thoughts produced by persons and therefore less than persons. Nothing less than a living person can give us the complete truth about humanity."

Since the Anaheim program has been part of the curriculum for over three years, many residents have been trying to get the School Board to assess the results. Unfortunately, the School District absolutely refuses to release any statistics concerning the subsequent increase in venereal disease and illegitimate births. However, the Orange County Health Department says that venereal disease in the area is "out of control." And Richard Taylor, Vice President of the Orange County branch of the Florence Crittenton Society, which operates homes for unwed mothers, reports of this matter in the area: "The 'new morality' is leaving a broad trail of heartbreak in Orange County."

There can be no doubt about it. When newspaper reporter John Steinbacher asked a young Marine why so many servicemen congregated in Anaheim every weekend, the reply was: "Man, everybody knows that the high school girls here are 'available.'" The comment, Steinbacher found, was typical.

Although the retardation of venereal disease and illegitimacy are promoted as reasons why local school districts must adopt sexuality training, even S.I.E.C.U.S. officials confess that the program will not ease these problems. Lester Kirkendall of S.I.E.C.U.S. and Sexology magazine admitted in the June 1968 Reader's Digest:

"Most people have the vague hope that it [sex education] will somehow cure half of the world's ills—reduce casual sex experience, cut down on illegitimate births, and eliminate venereal disease. To be perfectly blunt about it, we have no way of knowing that sex education will solve any such problems."

Identified Communist and Treasurer of S.I.E.C.U.S., Isadore Rubin, stated at a symposium on Sex And The Teenager: "For the community to ask the sex educator to take on the responsibility of cutting down on illegitimacy or on venereal disease is to ask him to undertake a task that is foredoomed to failure." With S.I.E.C.U.S. in charge, there can be no doubt of that! What else could be expected with morality thrown out the window?

The fact that many parents are aware of the efforts of the sex educationists to divorce the teaching of sex from morality has created growing resistance to the S.I.E.C.U.S.-style programs. It seems that every "expert" and sexologist associated with the S.I.E.C.U.S. program rejects traditional Judeo-Christian concepts of sexual morality. Again and again we hear from its proponents that S.I.E.C.U.S. maintains sex education "must not be moral indoctrination," and that "it is not the job of S.I.E.C.U.S. to make moral judgments; S.I.E.C.U.S. can be neither for nor against premarital sex." Many of us find it ironic that our youngsters can be given instruction in our schools on various positions for sexual intercourse—or, as McCall's noted, shown how to apply "a contraceptive to a life-sized plastic phallus"—but a student saying a prayer in that same school would be violating the law.

Even so, Anaheim School Superintendent Cook advocates presenting a sexual smorgas-

bord and letting the teenager take his choice. Cook told an audience at Chapman College recently:

"We give the kids the whole picture—we lay all the facts out on the table for them and we tell them they are going to hear different ideas and attitudes than in their churches. We tell them that after all they do have to make up their own minds, and they're the only ones that can choose their own level of morality."

No prayers, you understand. No firm moral code. None of those "different" ideas from home and church! Listen to Comrade Rubin. Listen to the pornographers of Sexology.

The advocates of S.I.E.C.U.S. go farther. They attempt to picture all opposition as that of ignorant reactionaries and religious fanatics. Not only do the concerned taxpayer-parents resent this characterization as grossly unfair, but they point to the fact that their objection to sex instruction for the "New Morality" is supported by many medical authorities. Dr. Max Levin, in strenuously objecting to the amorality of the S.I.E.C.U.S. position on "sex education," writes:

"I speak not as a clergyman but as a psychiatrist. There cannot be emotional health in the absence of high moral standards and a sense of human and social responsibility. I know that today morality is a 'dirty word,' but we must help our youth to see that moral codes have meaning beyond theology; they have psychological and sociological meaning. Even the atheist, who rejects religion, should be able to understand this."

You don't have to be a psychiatrist like Dr. Levin to realize that today's teenagers already have more sophistication about the mechanics of sex than they have the maturity to handle. Telling teenagers to choose their own level of morality, while emphasizing that premarital intercourse might be desirable, can only lead to tragic consequences. Teach biology and physiology, yes. But let's get the anti-moral, Leftist, sex-pushers out of our schools! They are an embarrassment to the professions which they trumpet and an out-and-out danger to our children.

Look at the truth. The preponderance of both scientific and practical support for traditional morality is simply ignored by the permissive S.I.E.C.U.S. programs and the frantic school sexologists. As psychiatrist Graham Blaine writes: "The steps necessary to take in following unplanned pregnancy—adoption of the child, abortion, or premature marriage—are clearly unfortunate ones, and their increasingly frequency would seem to be a cogent argument for holding the line against permissiveness . . ."

Indeed!

Dr. Paul Gebhard has recently conducted surveys of twelve hundred college students which also support traditional views of sexual morality. He found that the first step was likely to be decisive in the case of a girl. If she once crossed the "Rubicon," it was not easy for her to subsequently avoid such sexual activity thereafter. In such a case, he noted, she was jeopardizing her own prospects of a good marriage in the future, as well as running other risks. As sociologist Robert Blood Jr. points out:

"Premarital intercourse is associated more closely with broken relationships than with strengthened ones; twice as many engagements are broken among couples who have intercourse as among those who did not; the more frequent the intercourse, the greater the number of rings returned; both divorce and adultery are more common among those couples who indulge in premarital intercourse, and that even among those who do not separate, the incidence of marital unhappiness is greater."

New York psychiatrist Max Levin comments on S.I.E.C.U.S. activist Warren Johnson's contention that "an increasingly safe and potentially wholesome sex life is said to be becoming available to the married and the

unmarried who desire it; and there seems to be a growing feeling that this is a decision to be made by individual women and is not the business of society at all." Dr. Levin writes: "The young unmarried woman who has a sexual affair is harming herself emotionally. She cheapens herself when she yields to a seducer. There can be no mental health without a measure of self-respect."

With teenagers being steeped in boggling sexual stimuli from the mass media, our schools should be bolstering those who are moral and promoting self-control rather than providing rationalization for promiscuity. According to Dr. Melvin Anshell, the only justification for the S.I.E.C.U.S.-style program is "the misconceived notion that if you can't beat them, join 'em." Many sex education courses turn out to be only an exercise in destroying the conscience. Is it surprising that after hearing sexual intercourse discussed in class, and shown in classroom movies, the reserves of young people are broken down and they are stimulated to experiment?" As Dr. Anshell observes:

"The sexuality instinct is one of the strongest that we human beings have, and if we have a conscience associated with that sexuality then we cannot express it like amoebas. But the desensitization program is taking away the conscience and making the sex act a raw instinct."

The way homosexuality is treated in S.I.E.C.U.S. sex education is also destructive. According to psychiatrist Anshell:

"I'll be frank with you. I haven't had a pervert yet that I have cured, but I don't know anyone else who has either. The answer is in the prevention. And [this sort of] sex education, paradoxically, doesn't prevent it, but is causing it."

Today's teenagers have been sold by the Left on the idea that they discovered sex and that sex is "in." When has it ever been out? It's been "in" since Adam and Eve. But, teenagers are not the only target of the Leftist S.I.E.C.U.S. operators. As I have noted, they want to start by selling their amoral sexuality to kindergartners. The fact is that most reputable psychiatrists believe that presenting such information to young children can cause drastic psychological problems. Psychiatrist William McGrath explains in this way:

"There is a phase of personality development, called the latency period, during which the healthy child is not interested in sex. In this interval, from about age five until adolescence, a boy learns how to get along with other boys. And he can dream of becoming a man among men, a hero."

"This latency period is not just a cultural or moral intervention. It serves a very important biological purpose. It affords the child an opportunity to develop his own resources, his beginning physical and mental strength. Later, when he is ready, he can take on other responsibilities. . . ."

"Sophomoric and supercilious persons, who are without learning in philosophy or in science, fail to realize the significance of the latency period. When we plead that it should remain inviolate, they scoff and accuse us of narrow-minded prudishness. . . ."

"Premature interest in sex is unnatural and will arrest or distort the development of the personality. Sex education should not be foisted on children; should not begin in the grade schools."

"Anyone who would deliberately arouse the child's curiosity or stimulate his unready mind to troubled sexual preoccupations ought to have a millstone tied around his neck and be cast into the sea."

"A letter asks: Isn't sex the source of most psychological problems? No; not in a man who has been allowed to develop character before his introduction to sex. Sexual problems are almost always secondary, or symptomatic of a deeper immaturity."

"To be first and above all a man among men is what one begins to learn in the lat-

ency period. This is sacred territory. A plague on those who trespass."

Psychiatrist Rhoda Lorand, after viewing the type of sex material now being used in the elementary schools, puts it this way: "It is overwhelming, disturbing and embarrassing, upsetting and exciting and very likely to lead to sex difficulties later in life." Author of *Love, Sex And The Teenager*, she is a long way from being a blue-nose on this subject. Psychiatrist Anshell agrees, noting:

"The one thing [this sort of] sex education is supposed to do for us—that is, help our children become mature adults—it actually destroys. It does it by interfering with the normal instinctual growth of the child. It catapults the child into advance sexual information; it perverts the child. . . . If you turn into an obstetrician at eight years of age, you have developed a fixation. . . . I think it is creating more pervers than were ever created before, and more-diversified pervers."

Indicative of the fact that elementary school children do not have the maturity to handle the material being thrown at them is that many children, after having seen the S.I.E.C.U.S.-prepared "How Babies Are Made," have come home and asked to watch mommy and daddy plant the seed. This has already prompted a lawsuit against the school system by a local committee in San Luis Obispo, California. No doubt further legal action is on the way.

Frankly, the program is proving downright dangerous. Even S.I.E.C.U.S.'s Dr. Kirkendall admits: "There's no way that you can proceed without some risk (to the students). You have to admit that there are people teaching in schools who have sexual problems of their own they haven't worked through." The subject would obviously have an overwhelming attraction for instructors with voyeur tendencies. Dr. Anshell, himself the author of a fine book on sexual adjustment, warns:

"Many of the so-called sex experts are no more qualified to be involved with this problem than a used-car salesman would be. Many are misguided disciples of Freud who call themselves psychiatrists. Many are social workers. Many are teachers who don't know anything about the subject. These people have set themselves up as experts. What they have been attempting to do is promulgate the sexuality instinct into that of an instinct related to a bodily function such as eating, breathing or going to the bathroom. But it really isn't . . . you could do all these other things alone, but sexuality takes two."

Danger or no danger, however, Anaheim Superintendent Cook has admitted that what he is involved in is "changing attitudes." That, alas, is precisely the problem.

THE SCANDINAVIAN MODEL

The S.I.E.C.U.S. style of "education" is too new in this country to draw any statistically-based conclusions as to what its cumulative effects will be. We do, however, have a model at which we can look for a glimpse of the future. The Scandinavians have had compulsory "sex education" of the type S.I.E.C.U.S. is promoting for two decades. In fact, Professor Ira Reiss of S.I.E.C.U.S. maintains, "Where Sweden is today is where we're going to be in ten years. Sweden has a culture that accepts 'permissiveness with affection' standards."*

The S.I.E.C.U.S. Study Guide Number 5 says: "The Scandinavian countries have developed even further than we a type of affection-centered premarital sexual permissiveness. We seem to be heading toward a Scandinavian type of sexuality." Promoting

*What is happening in America, according to Professor Reiss, is "not a sexual revolution but the evolution of a system which has replaced the prostitute with the girl next door."

this "trend," S.I.E.C.U.S. recommends the book "Sex And Society In Sweden" as part of its curriculum, explaining: "Because it is a book that is open, honest, and reliable regarding the real situation in Sweden, it should prove of unusual value and interest to parents and educators everywhere." Dr. Kirkendall, in praising Denmark's "sex education" program, states:

"The consequences for young Danes seem to be far less damaging than here. . . . Hence guilt and conflict over premarital sex are minimal. . . . They may even let the child be born before they marry, since there is little stigma on illegitimacy."

Perhaps local citizens will want to look at the "real situation" and the "minimal" negative consequences of "sex education" in Scandinavia before embarking on a S.I.E.C.U.S.-type program. A third of the brides in Denmark kneel at the altar pregnant. In twenty years the number of brides aged fifteen to seventeen has swelled by four hundred percent. One legal, and four to five illegal, abortions are now performed for every twenty births. In Sweden the increase in venereal disease is described by officials as "catastrophic." According to U.S. News & World Report of February 7, 1966:

"Physicians say that gonorrhea and syphilis are more widespread in Sweden today than in any other civilized country in the world. A recent inquiry revealed the startling fact that about half of all boys who had become infected with venereal disease admitted having sexual relations with at least forty different girls—and ten percent said that they had had relations with as many as two hundred."

The Swedish education system has been accused by a highly-respected group of 140 eminent Swedish doctors and teachers, including the King's physician, Dr. Ulf Nordwall, of producing sex obsession among adolescents because, as they put it:

"It has bombarded school children with sexual instruction for which their immaturity ill fits them and the result has been an unnatural over-sexualization of the rising generation [in which] . . . the young have confused instruction in method with encouragement to practice."

As for the S.I.E.C.U.S. contention that while sex education will not lower venereal disease or illegitimacy, it will produce healthy, happy, well-adjusted young men and women, the results in Sweden prove the contrary. An article in the issue of Reader's Digest for August 1966 relates:

"There is a significant report from Sweden, which for so long prided itself on the removal of moral restraints and what amounts to the encouragement of sexual freedom, even in the schools. Yet the human toll has been so great that we now read of a growing movement, headed by the country's leading doctors, to put an end to sexual laxity. But note: The doctors . . . observe that, for all their sexual freedom 'young people in Sweden are not happy today,' and urge the schools to spend more time on moral and religious leadership and instruction which will help the children know 'what is right and wrong' in terms of their own ultimate well-being."

What has been the effect of the efforts of the sex educationists on the family in Sweden? Psychiatrist Graham Blaine writes:

"In Scandinavian countries extra-marital affairs have increased. It would seem logical to assume that family environment which includes a philandering father or a promiscuous mother, or both, would be less healthy

for children than one in which fidelity prevailed."

The inevitable results of adopting the Scandinavian attitudes pushed by S.I.E.C.U.S.? As Professor Russell Kirk notes: "In another generation or so, American church communicants may be as scarce as they are in Denmark or Sweden today—that is, one to five percent of the population, or even fewer."

LEFTIST HARASSMENT

Still, parents who rebel at having the public school lead their children into the pit which proved so disastrous for the Scandinavians are astonished to find that they have run into a veritable Leftist buzz-saw. The S.I.E.C.U.S. proponents even hold seminars in how to deal with their conservative opponents. At one of these seminars, Dr. Lester Kirkendall characterized all such opponents as "a fringe group of dissidents who don't think rationally." He maintains that those who oppose the program to "change America's sexual attitudes have hangups about sex." To skirt these "sick" people, Kirkendall recommends:

"Just sneak it [the sex program] in as an experimental course. . . . Go to your P.T.A. and get support. That's where the power lies. . . . Don't say that you are going to start a sex education course. Always move forward. Say that you are going to enrich, expand, and make it better. The opposition can't stop something that you have already started."

This strategy puts the opponents in a position of being "aginnners" who are "out to destroy our modern, progressive Family Life course."

Another strategy used by the Leftist sex educationists is to form a committee of civic leaders including doctors, clergymen, and businessmen to endorse the introduction of the program into the local school. Many, if not most, of these men are not aware of just what they are endorsing, but feel that sex education is generally a good idea. Once having committed themselves, pride and ego require them to defend their stand even as the educationists turn a presumed course in physiology into out-and-out indoctrination for premarital sex and amorality.

The educationists, as usual, want complete autonomy—free from the "interference" of those who pay the bills. Citizens' groups have found that once the program is begun their letters are not answered and that it is almost impossible to get school boards to give specific answers to questions about these sex programs. Complaints are met with educationese and mumbo-jumbo.

SO WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Is the alternative to a S.I.E.C.U.S.-type program to keep teenagers in total ignorance about sex, as has been charged by some? The question is not whether "sex education" should be provided, but what kind, where, and by whom. There is a significant minority, if not a majority, of parents who believe that sex cannot be divorced from morality—and who are convinced that sex education is the province of the home and not of the State. Are their civil rights to be trampled by arrogant behavioral scientists, social anthropologists, and educationists? It is argued that some homes will abrogate their responsibility in this field. And, this is true. But, critics ask: Does this justify putting the sexual morality of all children at the mercy of the atheists and pornographers and Communists who are supporting and directing S.I.E.C.U.S.?

Many concerned parents believe that just as all that glitters is not buried in Fort Knox, all that is called "sex education" is not really education. They know that the S.I.E.C.U.S. effort has turned out to be indoctrination in promiscuity.

WHAT'S REALLY HAPPENING

As terrible as are the personal tragedies produced by the S.I.E.C.U.S. programs, let us

pause here in conclusion to note the broader effect on our national life which may well be the real object of these programs aimed at our sons and daughters—and, through them, at the health of our nation.

We have already noted the ties of S.I.E.C.U.S. directors to the Communists. We note now in passing that the motivation of the S.I.E.C.U.S.-style efforts directly parallels the various "mental health" programs promoted by the World Health Organization. Instrumental in the founding of W.H.O. was Soviet spy Alger Hiss, who declared that "health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." Selected to lead the creation of this "social well-being" was the notorious pro-Communist Canadian, Brock Chisholm, who spelled out the foundations for the "New Morality" when he wrote in the February, 1946, issue of Psychiatry (with an introduction by Abe Fortas):

"The re-interpretation and eventual eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainties of the old people, these are the belated objectives of practically all effective psychotherapy. Would they not be legitimate objectives of original education. . . . Freedom from morality means freedom to observe, to think and behave sensibly . . . free from outmoded types of loyalties. . . . This is a new kind of world and there is no ethical or moral system that is intended for anyone in this world."

Chisholm's chief administrator at W.H.O. was Dr. Frank Calderone, husband of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Commander-in-Chief, Mary Calderone.

Everywhere one turns with these people the reins lead back to the Far Left. Why? Clearly because it is in the interest of the Communists to promote programs like S.I.E.C.U.S. for destroying American sexual morality, and enervating the moral fiber of our nation's youth.

Nationally syndicated columnist Henry J. Taylor, playing Devil's Advocate, delineated a sixteen-point program for the destruction of the United States. One of these points reads: "Preach 'permissiveness.' If 'anything goes' then, of course, everything goes. Every internal and external enemy knows the advantages of destroying a nation's standards. The rewards are as old as the Trojan horse."

As far back as May of 1919, Allied forces in Dusseldorf, Germany, first captured a Communist document entitled Rules For Revolution. Number One on that list of objectives was: "Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness." Again, in the early 1950s, Florida State Attorney George A. Brantigan confirmed that "the above 'Rules for Revolution' were secured by the State Attorney's Office from a known member of the Communist Party, who acknowledged it to be still a part of the Communist program for overthrowing our Government."

The Sacramento Union has recently editorialized:

"Diabolical as it may seem, it has been a common tool of Communism for many years to undermine values and substitute their opposites. The Communist Conspiracy has always used the weak to infect the strong. In fact history shows that often the strong have been betrayed into surrendering to the weak. It would not be too difficult . . . to gain control of the minds of the young and the weak. It can be done by systematically denigrating all that a person has been taught to be worthy of respect. It would be done very cleverly with an appeal to the reasonableness of each argument, the use of half-truth. . . . It would be necessary to attack belief in Americanism, morality, and personal

* The trend is indicated by the recent recommendation of a Stockholm teacher that: "What every good high school needs is a sex room where teenage lovers can seek respite from the rigors of reading, writing, and arithmetic. . . ."

integrity. These will be replaced by un-Americanism, immorality and personal anonymity. Perhaps this begins to sound shockingly familiar. If what we presently see and hear on the American scene is any indication, the process is well under way . . .

"It would test our credulity to propose that our schools and other influential institutions are deliberately aiding this hideous process. It is possible, however, to believe that such institutions are being used by conspirators to accomplish the aims of the world-wide Communist movement."

It might also be pointed out that fanatical Marxist Stuart Chase noted in his book, *The Proper Study of Mankind*: "Theoretically, a society could be completely made over in something like fifteen years, the time it takes to inculcate a new culture into a rising group of youngsters."

Do you doubt that it can happen?

Historically, the destruction of morality has often been used as a technique to ready a country for Communist revolution. Nowhere was this more evident than in Spain where five percent of the nation's inhabitants were slaughtered in a bloody civil war. Before the revolution, kiosks sprung up on nearly every corner of the major cities peddling the most lurid pornography, and the cry "long live free love" was a regular part of student demonstrations. The Red Domination in Spain, an official report of the Spanish government, states with regard to this degeneracy:

"The moral corruption and disintegration of family and social ties reigning throughout the Marxist zone of Spain during the civil war were a direct consequence of communism . . . Degradation amongst children during pre-revolutionary days [led to] . . . degradation of spiritual life and morals."

The same was true in Russia with the Nihilists, in Greece when the Communists sought to take power, in post-Kuhn Hungary, and in a dozen other places where the Communists have moved. Surely the vast majority of those promoting S.I.E.C.U.S.-style "sex education" are perfectly loyal, if misguided, Americans. However, it is impossible to deny that there is Communist influence within any parent organization which contains an identified Communist as its Treasurer and has such a number of its directors who have been active in officially cited Communist Fronts. It would seem only logical that their motives and/or judgment should be subjected to the closest scrutiny. Their target, after all, is our own children—and America's future.

One remembers a recent comment by my colleague George S. Schuyler, which seems to provide the only proper conclusion here. Writing in the *January American Opinion*, Mr. Schuyler noted:

"When General William F. Dean was released from a Korean Communist prison camp, the young Chinese psychologists who had been trying to break him said: 'General, don't feel bad about leaving us. You know, we will soon be with you. We are going to capture your country.' Asked how, they replied: 'We are going to destroy the moral character of a generation of your young Americans, and when we have finished you will have nothing with which to really defend yourselves against us.'"

Those are powerful words to remember. And they provide, beyond doubt, the single best explanation of What's Really Happening.

AMERICAN OPINION.

[From the *National Enquirer*, Jan. 26, 1969]

ROB RIOT REVENUE: THE THREE NEW R'S IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Joseph Cassidy)

Five million children in public schools from coast to coast are being taught to read with picture books of violence—and a young Florida mother is waging a one-woman crusade against the program.

Called Project Read, it is based on a theory

that children learn faster and better if they relate to something familiar—and darts, guns, clubs, cops, robbers, fighting, war and prisons are considered in the course as familiar to the kids.

If they aren't, they will be after the years of instruction from kindergarten through 12th grade. Here are some examples:

"Ned's last dart hit Art in the arm" and

"He thinks that he will have to get a gun."

"A man can rob" and "Bob can rob a man."

"These men are at war" and "At the end of the truce the men go back to war."

"This cop grips a club in his hand" and

"Pat plans to grab Nell's bag" and "Pat grabs the bag" and "Nell slaps Pat" and "Pat runs as fast as he can" and "The cop grabs Pat."

The education in violence was exposed by Mrs. Elizabeth Bettner, mother of Heather, 9, and Cindy, 8, when Heather arrived home in tears from Coconut Grove Elementary School in Miami one day last October.

Heather, a fourth grader who reads at sixth grade level, complained about using the Project Read books, weeping that she had done poorly in a reading test.

Mrs. Bettner read Heather's book and went to Timothy Herring, the school principal, and protested. That was the beginning of a controversy that resulted in temporary withdrawal of Project Read in Dade County. Now it's back with some revisions. But children in the rest of the country are studying violence in the raw.

Mrs. Bettner explained to *The Enquirer*: "There's enough violence in this country. I think it's wonderful to teach children to read phonetically but I fear what else it may be teaching them."

"It's brutal. Persons are hitting and slapping each other throughout the books. A sensitive child naturally becomes upset because it is contradictory to everything taught at home."

"But because I won't go along with the system, I've been accused of being a nut, a kook and I've even been called a witch hunter."

Project Read was developed at the Behavioral Research Laboratories in Palo Alto, Calif., by Dr. M. William Sullivan, a linguist and authority on reading skills, and Dr. Allen D. Calvin, a learning theorist.

The program was introduced first in 1968 in schools in selected areas, most of them poverty pockets, in New York City; San Francisco and Ravenswood, Calif.; Miami-Dade County and Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; St. Paul, Minn.; Detroit and Flint, Mich.; New Haven, Conn.; Vicksburg, Miss., and Akron, Ohio.

There are 24 workshops in the teaching series, each with about 100 pages, each page containing eight illustrations. In addition, there are 28 reading books. Students complete the workbooks in a series of five and then are ready for a storybook.

Sullivan and Calvin began development of their reading program in 1958 with a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. The course allows a student to progress at a pace equal to his ability to understand words.

New York City paid \$600,000 for the series for 40,000 pupils. Dade County paid \$40,000 to instruct 4,000.

Mrs. Bettner received no satisfaction when she complained to Herring, the school principal, about the violence in the books and such things as the U.S. flag being associated with a rag.

But Mrs. Bettner stirred up a storm. And Mrs. Ellen Morphonios, chief of the criminal division in the Florida State's Attorney office, sided with her in strong terms:

"It's terrible. Illustrations depict masked robbers holding people at gunpoint, even a bank robbery. The question is asked, for example, 'Did Red rob a man?' In the book the correct answer is 'yes.' A child who answers 'no' is graded wrong."

"If this isn't subversive and deliberately done as part of a master plan, only a sick mind could have produced it."

Behavioral Research Laboratories sent George H. Stern, its executive vice-president, to Miami to defend the program but, after conferring with school officials, he agreed some changes should be made. Yet he said:

"I don't think the violence is extreme. It's available at every turn in life. This series is something the child has heard, seen or can identify with clearly."

The war of words, out in the open through local news media, finally commanded the attention of the Florida Textbook Inquiry Commission, which called a public hearing in Miami.

It developed at the investigation that almost nobody except the children had bothered to read the workbooks after they came from the publishers.

They were not on the approved list of the state commission which is supposed to review all textbooks.

Dade County School Superintendent E. L. Whigman testified he hadn't read them.

Members of the Dade County School Board acknowledged they had not.

Dr. Tod Mikuriya, dispatched from San Francisco by the laboratories to speak for the books, told the commission he had only "skimmed through" a few and had not seen most. He admitted that the "dart-gun" pictures might be harmful to some children.

In a public statement Richard White, director of special reading services for Dade County school system, said:

"The material is designed to give students a picture image that will cause a memory implant. These are the types of things they see on television, read in newspapers and see in cartoons. They are references they can latch on to."

But Mrs. Bettner explained to *The Enquirer*: "None of the parents I talked to at first seemed aware of the books. After they were aware, some did not oppose them, saying that violence is an everyday occurrence and a fact of life seen daily on television and in comic books."

"I say you can control those things. You can turn off a television set but you can't control what goes on in school."

"I can't see why they put this type of thing in books."

"The revisions that were made are totally inadequate."

"Nobody, but nobody in our school system looked at or questioned these books."

"They just took them into the schools. I'd like to find out how this happened."

But last September 10, before Heather's tears let loose her mother's tempest of protest, Representative Claude Pepper, Florida Democrat, told the House that "one-third of our citizens may be functionally illiterate" and that Project Read was a corrective program.

He said: "I am personally pleased that my own locale of Miami-Dade County has taken a dramatic step toward alleviating this problem. Our school system is implementing new materials and methods of teaching some 4,000 disadvantaged students to read."

In announcing introduction of Project Read to 40,000 schoolchildren in New York City, Superintendent of Schools Bernard E. Donovan said:

"The innovative aspects of the programmed linguistic materials have special appeal to the underachiever since the materials have a built-in 'success' factor that gives the pupils confidence in their ability to succeed and contribute to their self-image."

Mrs. Bettner is not persuaded. She wants Project Read eliminated in schools throughout the country. She speaks at women's clubs and church groups to recruit support of parents. Some believing as she does have written letters to school boards, PTAs and friends in other cities to complain about the books.

Mrs. Bettner hopes that, in Florida, Governor Claude R. Kirk Jr. will act to exclude the program.

She said: "I would hate to see what kind of generation of children we would have if they learn from these books."

Dade County Executive Assistant State's Attorney Alphonse Sepe examined Project Read for grounds for legal proceedings. He said: "I can find no basis for official action but that doesn't change my personal opinion."

"As a father, I would definitely object to my children learning to read with this series."

A congressional committee has been inquiring into the problem of violence on television. A prominent journalist commented that parents worried about violence in the evening programs on TV had better take a good look at the so-called "kiddie shows" (grossly misnamed "comics" or "funnies") to which children are glued every Saturday morning. And indeed—this "entertainment" for children features an orgy of shootings, knifings, stranglings, drownings, clubbings and other forms of killing.

But while you just might be able to control your children's television fare, it is much more difficult to do anything about the situation when the classroom becomes the offender, as the enclosed article demonstrates. Please study carefully the illustrations accompanying the story. One wonders which is worse: That such an incredible method of teaching children to read should have invaded the American public school system? Or that a justly concerned mother like Mrs. Bettner, because of her objections, should have to defend herself against name-calling, and should receive so little assistance from other parents?

There are only two possible explanations for this outrage: Either the originators and promoters of this reading system are dangerously sick; or we are dealing here with one more subversive effort to destroy the moral fibre of America by warping the minds of our youth.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1969]
 INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE REFERENCES ORDERED
 CUT FROM CITY TEXTBOOKS
 (By Herbert H. Denton)

Washington's school superintendent has ordered high school principals to scissor out two passages of a health text book because they discourage inter-racial and inter-faith marriage.

Superintendent William R. Manning said he took the action because he found the passages "objectionable in this time in history."

Earlier, parents had complained to school officials about the book, "Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living" by Judson and Mary Landis. School Board member John A. Sessions asked Manning to investigate the book.

Manning sent a directive to principals, dated Jan. 9, ordering the deletion by the end of the month by physically cutting them from the book.

"To delete or remove the pages listed, it is suggested that they be cut out, leaving a one-inch margin from the binding on each page to insure that the other pages will remain secure and in their proper sequence," the superintendent's letter said.

School Board member Julius Hobson denounced the action as "destruction of government property" during a meeting Wednesday night.

Manning said yesterday, "I wasn't destroying the textbooks; I was deleting from them." He said he found particularly objectionable a question at the end of one passage in the book that asked students to discuss the statement, "Interracial marriages may not be illegal but they are unwise."

The other deleted passage dealt, in a similar tone, with interfaith marriage. Manning estimated the book had been used in the school for about 10 years.

One high school principal said yesterday that, he had "stalled as long as I could, hoping to get some reaction" but that the snipping was almost complete at his school.

One physical education department head commented that the "first thing these girls are going to ask (when they are handed the book) is what came out of here."

AUTO LITTER AND A BEAUTIFUL AMERICA, A SUGGESTION

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the more provocative thinkers in my congressional district is Mr. Laurence Dawson of Los Altos, Calif. He is definitely a public-spirited citizen, an ardent conservationist, and one who is always striving to contribute to the intelligent formulation of public policy. He recently wrote a short paper entitled, "Auto Litter and a Beautiful America—A Suggestion." Since the defacement of our highways is becoming a serious national problem, I believe Mr. Dawson's suggestion should be brought to the attention of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The paper follows:

AUTO LITTER AND A BEAUTIFUL AMERICA, A SUGGESTION

(By Laurence Dawson)

While millions of dollars are spent to clean up after the great American Litterbug, the environmental pollution problem continues to grow and America threatens to drown in its own debris. The Navy had a word for it, the deep six; to get rid of it, chuck it over the side! And that is what millions of people riding in millions of cars do all the time. America the Beautiful? Ugh! My own small stretch of not heavily-traveled country road will accumulate a 100 lb. feed sack full of litter every few months even without help from those charmers who use the area to avoid the necessity of allowing a trash man to earn his living.

One of the reasons, it seems to me, that this sad state of affairs continues to deteriorate is simply that the deep six is so much easier than disposing of litter inside the car. All of the presently available litter disposal units, assuming you even want to carry a litter bag in the car, are either of inadequate size, can only be installed in inconvenient locations, or as an accessory are clumsy and unattractive, or all three.

Certainly, given the inherent laziness of people, the litter situation won't improve until improvement is the line of least resistance. Is this possible? Maybe. What would it take?

First, a place for litter would have to be provided at a point in the car which would be more convenient to reach than opening a window.

Second, the place would have to be big enough. If it won't take a few pop bottles, over the side they go, or if they fill the space, litter that comes later gets the deep six.

Third, some easy means must be provided for regularly emptying the litter, or, again, once the space gets full, the deep six, and some more litter beautifies our roadsides!

Can these criteria be met? Again, the answer has to be "maybe"! If, . . . If enough people cooperate. If three major American industries could be persuaded to work together in the public interest. If people really don't want to drown in their own debris.

Suppose the following three elements could be brought together!

1. A disposal area: Suppose that a standards agency, such as the Society of Automotive Engineers, were to establish a standardized design for a disposal area for automobiles. Ready access and adequate volume would be important. The area should probably be located in the center of the dashboard over "the hump," convenient to driver and passengers; its volume perhaps about a cubic foot. (Newer stereo sound systems and transistorized radios make this location less necessary for radio or speakers.)

2. A disposal container: Suppose that a coordinating body of the paper industry were to work with the automotive agency to specify a disposable container, probably some sort of inexpensive plastic lined paper bag to fit into the disposal area.

3. A disposal routine: Suppose that the petroleum retailing industry were to undertake the actual disposal task by providing new paper liners as a "free gift" and taking the old filled bag as the first step in the routine of servicing a customer.

Suppose all this were to happen, then at least adequate capacity and routine emptying would be met. Could we actually do it? Well, let's see "What's in it for me!"

What's in it for the American people?

1. A more beautiful environment, plus
 2. A tax saving from lowered litter removal costs.

What's in it for the Automotive industry?

1. As citizens, the advantages which would accrue to the public, plus
 2. Substantial public relations benefit from an exploitation of this contribution to the betterment of our country, at a design and manufacture cost which should be easily absorbed in vehicle pricing.

What's in it for the Paper industry?

1. As citizens, the advantages which would accrue to the public, plus
 2. The profits to be expected from a new product use with a high volume of demand.

What's in it for the Petroleum industry?

1. As citizens, the advantages which would accrue to the public, plus
 2. The same public relations benefit as for the auto industry, at a modest cost for the liners, plus
 3. The opportunity to exploit an effective point-of-sale advertising device by printed messages on the replacement liners.

Nice thought, isn't it? But it takes a lot of supposing—and I suppose we'd rather not—or would we?

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the legislation of the recent Congress a rising concern for adequate protection of the consumer. Truth in lending, flammable fabrics, clean meat and clean poultry, the Air Quality Act—all are designed to safeguard the consumer's interests and to protect his health and welfare.

With the enactment of these laws, significant progress was made. Those of us who have joined the Honorable BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL to cosponsor the bill creating a Department of Consumer Affairs are now proposing to consolidate these gains by coordinating the administration of consumer legislation.

The constant development of goods and services has stimulated a concurrent

burgeoning of administrative programs to handle the numerous kinds of consumer protection laws, ranging from the food we eat, to the air we breathe, to the clothes and goods we buy. Congressman ROSENTHAL has noted that 33 Federal departments and agencies now administer over 260 consumer-related programs. The protection afforded the consumer is in fact minimized by its diffusion.

To overcome this deficiency and the inevitable conflicts of interest that arise from competing and often unrelated Federal bureaucracies, the Department of Consumer Affairs will bring together, under one roof, those scattered programs which aim to protect the consumer from fraud and misrepresentation.

In the past, we have known a lone champion of consumer rights—Ralph Nader—who was primarily responsible for the improved safety standards for automobiles. The time is long past due that, just as we established a Department of Transportation and a Department of Housing and Urban Development, we should create a Department of Consumer Affairs to implement the goals of this one man and to function as a government for the people.

THE LATE HOWARD C. BOERNER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently Howard C. Boerner, of Sands Point, N.Y. died suddenly. Mr. Boerner was a constituent of mine and I am privileged to be able to say that he was also a friend.

But it is truly Howard Boerner's active, productive, and selfless life that causes me to stand before you today, not his death. I feel deeply that it is good to pause and reflect on the service performed by persons such as Howard Boerner for he was the kind of American who receives too little credit for making our country great.

We can learn from the life of a man who found time in a hectic business schedule to serve voluntarily for many years as treasurer and trustee of a large hospital. North Shore Hospital, located in Manhasset, N.Y., and all the people who ever had cause to avail themselves of the hospital's services benefited from Howard Boerner's devotion to the common good.

It was the same kind of interest in others that caused him to also serve Abilities, Inc., of Albertson, N.Y., which is devoted to the rehabilitation of handicapped persons. Again Howard Boerner placed public service first.

I would hope that the good he did will be remembered, just as I hope others like Howard Boerner throughout this country will continue the great practice of public service. It has made our country great and can help make it greater.

Mr. Boerner's family and friends can have the pleasure of knowing that in his life Howard Boerner did a great deal for others and his contributions will be re-

membered. And in paying tribute to the deeds Howard Boerner performed in his life perhaps we can learn a lesson about the value and meaning of service.

WHEN INTERESTS MEET

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 4 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

Entitled "When Interests Meet," it discusses areas of possible agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union and presents an assessment as to what agreements might be in our interest and what would not be.

The Journal's discussion of this important subject will, I believe, be of interest to the Congress and the public generally. The editorial follows:

WHEN INTERESTS MEET

With so much current talk of negotiating with the Soviets, it may be useful to try to make some distinctions about what areas of possible agreement might be in the U.S. interest and what areas would not be.

First a word about the whole idea of negotiating with the Soviets. The cardinal consideration must remain a realization on Washington's part that they will not enter agreements simply for the sake of abstract peace or, for that matter, for anything except what they conceive to be a specific interest of their own. Keeping this in mind is a good way for the U.S. to avoid getting tricked.

Actually we don't know that they are interested in serious negotiations, despite repeated hints to that effect. Neo-Stalinism is plainly on the loose in the Kremlin, with the repression of emerging freedoms in Czechoslovakia and crackdowns inside Russia; it could presage fiercer cold war rather than a negotiating mood vis-a-vis the U.S. On the other hand, the Soviet leaders' fear of growing dissent in their own bailiwick might make them want to ease external tensions.

In any event, we think that when the Soviets do commit a wrong like the invasion of Czechoslovakia the U.S. should express its disapproval loud and clear (assuming it felt powerless to prevent the invasion in the first place). It should suspend cultural exchanges and perhaps trade and take other appropriate steps. Cultural and economic agreements are relatively insignificant from the viewpoint of making the world safer, but at least their suspension can convey a nation's sense of outrage.

It was fitting, therefore, that the Senate put off ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty as a symbol of disapproval of the invasion of Czechoslovakia. But this treaty also happens to be fairly meaningless, since two of the nuclear powers—France and Red China—won't sign it and since it is almost impossible to prevent other nations from developing nuclear arsenals if they really want to. It is in the category of arrangements involving the Soviets that do nothing very positive for U.S. interests.

Yet the U.S. cannot afford to let anger at an event like the crushing of Czech freedom deter it from the search for potentially profitable areas of agreement with the Soviets. However rottenly they behave and however

much they hate us, they unquestionably could benefit from certain kinds of understandings with the U.S. The U.S. could benefit too. Therein lies such realistic hope as there may be.

One possibility is a joint U.S.-Soviet effort to enforce peace in the Middle East, but it is exceedingly anomalous. The Soviets have had considerable success in penetrating the area, so why should they want to join this country in anything that might tend to neutralize their influence? An answer could be that conditions in the Middle East have grown too explosive; the Soviets might fear getting dragged into a wasting war. As for the U.S., it obviously wants a stable peace there.

Another possibility is the conclusion of a safe agreement to curb the missile race, a matter engaging the attention of both sides. The Soviet interest is clear—the missile race is getting so unbelievably costly that it is keeping the Russian leaders from doing more to develop their economy. The U.S. interest is also cost, as well as the hope that an agreement might make for a more peaceful atmosphere.

The U.S. is already beginning a "thin" antiballistic missile system (although the Nixon Administration is reviewing it). It's expensive enough, but if we go on to a thick system the cost could be \$40 billion or, by some reckonings, far more than that.

True, a Soviet insistence on proceeding with such monstrosities—the Russians reportedly are having second thoughts—would presumably require the U.S. to do the same for its own safety. Still, it is a form of insanity both sides could well eschew, always on the assumption that the U.S. would be able to guard against Soviet duplicity.

In a rational world the same considerations would argue for a mutual reduction in armaments in general. But there's no sense in looking for miracles; an acceptable missile-limiting arrangement would be welcome enough. If it did happen, other instances of coinciding interest might conceivably be found.

The main thing is for the U.S. to thoroughly understand what its interests are, distinguishing the major from the minor, and to pursue them in a flexible but hard-headed fashion.

THE GREAT AMERICAN PLAN

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1969, Mr. James D. Winans, president of the New Jersey Division of the United Nations Association during 1967 and 1968, spoke before the Montclair, N.J., evening group of the American Association of University Women.

Mr. Winans is chairman of the board of the C. G. Winans Co. since 1965, and in 1956 was a delegate at large from New Jersey to the Democratic National Convention.

I was very much impressed with the subject which Mr. Winans chose as his topic for the evening's presentation and I felt that it was aptly presented.

The issues he has raised in his presentation are well thought out and deserve reflection and careful consideration by all of us.

I commend these remarks to the attention of my colleagues and am pleased to

insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they may be made available to all those who were not fortunate to be present at the meeting at which these remarks were made.

The remarks follow:

THE GREAT AMERICAN PLAN

A speaker has to make assumptions about his audience in advance. Your present one has indulged in some speculation, with a few tentative conclusions.

The first is that you are pretty well informed on current affairs and spend an evening like this one only to have your thoughts stimulated, your mind provoked and, maybe, your feelings outraged.

My second assumption is that you subscribe to the Golden Rule, however you put it: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you," or "Love thy neighbor as thyself". The neighbors are not merely the ladies next door, but also the people on the other side of the track, the blacks living in Harlem and in South Africa, and the peons of Latin America.

If you don't subscribe to this thesis, you might as well go home now, because what I have to say about various gaps cannot possibly interest you.

I could have looked up figures and could have told you statistically about the growing gap between the rich people and the poor people around the United States. While many of the poor people are better off than they used to be, they are not as much better off as you and I are. Reduced to its simplest terms, this situation is what makes riots in Watts and in Newark, among other cities.

I did not look up the figures on this phenomenon because you are familiar with them at least in a cursory way and, if you want more details, you can look them up yourself. All work and no play makes a dull boy; all figures and no plan makes a dull speech.

Although it's one of our nation's most important problems, tonight I want to make only passing reference to this widening gap in our cities. The question of education in the Newark schools, living conditions in the Newark ghetto and the like, would be enough for a whole evening itself. And I only make this passing reference because my subject is GAP.

John Steinbeck died recently. He was an old man, almost exactly my age. Many of his critics were certain that he was a Communist for writing "The Grapes of Wrath" and it was banned as subversive by a number of libraries.

(A short parenthetical note in passing: If the Russians prohibit publication of certain books and of entire newspapers, they are abrogating free speech—no question about it. Should so-called "public libraries" in the United States exercise censorship?)

The book itself, published in 1939, depicted the desperate struggle of Okies and other migrants in the California camps, as most of you undoubtedly know. There is some reason to believe that migrant farm labor in South Jersey was only a little better off in 1968, although our state government is at least talking of doing something about the situation.

To quote a recent editorial in the New York Times, "Today's battle for industrial democracy and a measure of human decency by striking California grape workers is one measure of how little progress has been made since Steinbeck's cry to conscience."

In each of your minds, just underline those words: "a measure of human decency." If they don't suggest a gap, I don't know one when I see it.

Also, I could have looked up figures and could have told you statistically about the growing gap between the rich nations and the poor nations around the world. While many of the poor nations have raised their gross national product, they have not raised it pro-

portionately as much as countries like the United States. Reduced to its simplest terms, this situation is what makes Communist regimes in Cuba and in Guinea, among others.

Here again, I did not look up the figures on this phenomenon because you are familiar with them, too, at least in a cursory way, and, if you want more details, you can look them up yourself. My speech is purposely without a lot of figures.

Because it's one of our world's most important problems, tonight I must make some reference later to this widening gap between the developed nations and what are euphemistically called the "developing nations". However, the question of birth control, the concentration on exportable crops and the like, would be enough itself for another whole evening. And so you will learn in due time that, although my subject is GAP, I have something else in mind.

The United Nations is the best organization available to improve the lot of mankind. Therefore, I'd like to see the United States stop working unilaterally and increase its working through the United Nations. I refer both to war efforts and to non-war efforts.

As to war efforts, we have been doing most of the fighting in support of South Vietnam. It's not a United Nations effort; it's to all intents and purposes, a United States' effort. But what makes it worse is it's an effort to uphold a man whom Senator McGovern aptly calls a "tin-horn dictator", a man who puts in jail the fellow who came in second in the election because he was a peace candidate! At the moment in the Senator's words, "Ky is playing around in the plush spots of Paris and haggling over whether he is going to sit at a round table or a rectangular table, while American men are dying to prop up his corrupt regime back home". James Reston says, "The young men die in Vietnam while the old men wrangle in Paris".

Our unilateral non-war efforts, into which many billions of dollars have been poured, have had the effect of propping up equally corrupt regimes in Latin America, as I shall show you. The persons opposing these regimes are Nationalists, people dedicated to doing what's best for their countries. If this means taking over a factory or an oil well belonging to an American company because Americans are getting 50 to 80% of the profits, does this make them Communists? In the eyes of Dean Rusk, I'm afraid the answer is "Yes". To show how this notion pervades our thinking, let me quote headlines from the New York Times of December 16, 1968: "Nationalism Hurts Ecuador's Chances of Oil Development—Ecuador Blocks Rich U.S. Venture". My question is: rich for whom?

Corruption is common in these Latin American countries. Courts never condemn the rich. Union leaders who complain are considered traitors. A 1960 study prepared by Harvard's Center for International Affairs stated, "It is not at all farfetched in view of Latin American history that the state has been traditionally little more than an instrument of class oppression". John Gerassi, in his book "The Great Fear in Latin America", states that a United States loan of \$7.5 million at 3 percent to Peru for low-cost housing projects is used by the country's premier, who owns the Housing Institute, to reloan to high-cost constructors at 12 percent.

Most taxes don't get collected in Latin America. The reason? The governments are run, directly or indirectly, by the richest, biggest and most corrupt tax dodgers around—that is, by the oligarchies. The oligarchies are supported by the armies, which, in turn, are trained, equipped and oriented by the United States.

Many liberals, who see the vicious circle clearly enough, insist that Latin Americans are responsible for it. To me, that is like blaming the negroes of the deep south for the poor education of their children, when the whites won't let the kids go to decent schools.

There are some loaded questions. Who is to blame when United Fruit obtains a give-away concession. United Fruit, whose business is to make money, or those giving away, whose purpose should be to protect their country's interests? Who is to blame, the United States, which sees danger whenever a Nationalist regime takes over a Latin American country and therefore tries to have the regime condemned, or the other Latin American countries that do condemn it and therefore help destroy it? Who is to blame, the Pentagon, which thinks it's a good thing to arm Latin America, or Latin Americans who beg for and avidly accept the military aid with which they are dominated and repressed?

Elections are meaningless. Whenever popular candidates win, the military tosses them out. Never has any freely elected candidate from right, center or left who showed himself the least bit independent of United States policies been able to last out his whole term. Always the forces that threw him out have been trained and equipped by, and sometimes in, the United States. Away back in 1829, Bolivar said, "The United States appear to be destined by Providence to plague America with misery in the name of liberty".

In spite of the Monroe Doctrine, aimed at preventing other powers from interfering in Latin America and keeping it our sphere of influence, we did nothing when England invaded Guatemala in 1836. Then, in 1839, when England took over the island of Roatan off Honduras, instead of moving against England, we moved against Mexico.

Shortly after Mexico obtained its independence, United States landseekers swarmed over its borders, carrying negro slaves with them. When Mexico objected because it had already outlawed slavery, the newcomers proclaimed their own republic, calling it Texas. As soon as Mexico moved to put down the rebellion, we annexed Texas and, as a result of the Mexican War, we seized the whole region to the California coast. In its first generation, Mexico lost half of its territory, by far the richest part.

This infamous story could go on and on. In 1854, we settled a minor argument with Nicaragua by sending a warship to bombard San Juan del Norte. Skipping to 1904, we find Teddy Roosevelt decreeing that weakness or misbehavior by a Latin American government "which results in general loosening of the ties of civilized society... requires intervention by some civilized nation". This Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine became famous as "Dollar Diplomacy".

Between 1904 and 1933, we intervened sixty times in the affairs and territories of Latin America. Sixty times in less than thirty years, is an average of more than two interventions a year. These interventions were never for the purpose of bringing a better life to our neighbors; always for economic or territorial gain, sometimes as the strong-arm agents for wealthy companies.

One witness has often been quoted: "I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenue in. . . I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras 'right' for American fruit companies in 1903. . . ." That statement, harsh as it is, is quoted from a much-decorated United States patriot, Major General Smedley D. Butler of the United States Marine Corps.

In the words of Tom Lehrer, mathematics instructor at Harvard and M.I.T., sometime night-club ballad singer:

"When someone makes a move
Of which we don't approve,
Who is it that always intervenes?
UN and OAS, they have their place I guess,
But first send the marines. . . ."

For might makes right.
Until they see the light,
They've got to be protected,
All their right respected,
Until someone we like gets elected. . . .
When in doubt, send the marines".

This ballad brings a laugh and so do about a dozen others on this iconoclastic recording. However, if you think times have changed, let me refer you to a column in the Sunday New York Times of December 22nd last, which Benjamin Welles entitled "The Latin Military: A Dilemma for Washington". Maybe you read it. When I did, I just had to lengthen this speech to quote from it, as follows: "In the last 90 days military groups have seized supreme power in three key Latin-American nations, Peru, Panama and Brazil. . . . the new coups have reopened the unanswered question: Should the United States continue to train large numbers of Latin military officers and non-coms in military schools when such training apparently helps them impose dictatorships on their own people?"

I can answer that, even if Washington cannot. And I call your attention to what might be called "History Brought Up to Date". A little while ago I was talking about 100 years ago, then 50 years ago, then 25. Now we are talking about the last three months of 1968!

You can't find out about things like this from the State Department, which may have a million reasons for dissembling—all of them *quote* for the good of the United States *unquote*. When we do find the truth, we are apt to find that our good is not always being served.

Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish scholar, recently said, "There is no country on earth which has more of a common, explicit ideology—more of a common explicit morality . . . the old ideal, dignity of human individual, justice between people, liberty, equality of opportunity and brotherhood . . . You could write an American history which was just a history of violence, corruption, of evilness. That type of American history is now becoming quite popular in the rest of the world because of the Vietnam War and other things. But American history . . . is that, in spite of serious setbacks, the trend is toward a gradual, ever-better fulfillment of these ideals".

It's nice to have something like this said about us when we have the Credibility Gap. You know what I mean. In 1967 General Westmoreland said that, with another 25,000 troops we'd win the war by Christmas. In 1968, it's signing one thing and saying another about the Pueblo incident. And again I say, this is still not the gap I have chosen to concentrate on.

There is a book which gives the most persuasive argument I have seen for my earlier statement that the United Nations is the best organization available to improve the lot of mankind. The book is entitled "The Good War" and is by Marian Maury. You will find between its covers what the U.N. is doing about food production, health improvement, commerce and international justice.

The gap between knowledge and wisdom must be closed. The human race is producing offspring at a pace outstripping its efforts to forestall man's starvation. The era of Adam Smith is past, and the application of scientific controls in economics and finance have made stability and growth a national objective. The "Good War" is, and I quote, "the great contemporary struggle being waged to free this planet from the blight of poverty, disease, and ignorance. . . ." (unquote) The United Nations is the answer to peoples' demands, and the large powers have accepted the principle that the strengthening of the weaker countries will increase their own resources.

What is the United Nations doing? It has established or is working on the establish-

ment of the following world agencies, and please underline in your thinking those words "world agencies":

EPTA—Expanded Program of Technological Assistance.

SF—Special Fund for Large-scale Projects.

UNDP—A Combination of the Two Foreign Agencies.

UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

FAO—Food and Agriculture Organization.

WHO—World Health Organization.

UNICEF—United Nations Children's Fund.

ILO—International Labor Organization.

UPU—Universal Postal Union (Maybe it would be good if this agency took over our own postal service).

ITU—International Telecommunications Union.

WMO—World Meteorological Organization.

ICAO—International Civil Aviation Organization.

IMCO—International Maritime Consultative Organization.

IAEA—International Atomic Energy Agency.

IBRD—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

IDA—International Development Association.

IFC—International Finance Corporation.

IMF—International Monetary Fund.

GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The United Nations has taken up the cause of countries having no access to ports.

The United Nations agencies advise developing countries on financial matters and help them obtain advantageous credit terms.

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights—I could talk about that forever.

Let me close this part of my speech, the part devoted to United Nations activities in areas other than war prevention, by quoting again from "The Good War": "The capitalist revolution that multiplied the earth's bounty for a third of mankind was bought at the price of the labor of children and the abandonment of millions of wage earners to the pitfalls of unemployment. The Communist revolutions that dissolved the intolerable inequities of czarist Russia and old China . . . were bought at an ideological market place where personal freedom was exchanged for regimentation . . . How soon the dawn will break depends on many factors—human, technological, social and political—but most of all it depends on the willingness of both the developed and the underdeveloped worlds to pay the price of survival as a global community".

This, in summary, is what multilateral aid is doing. It leaves no doubt in my mind that through the United Nations our country can help narrow this well-nigh universal gap between knowledge and wisdom, another very important gap but not the gap of my thesis.

The president-elect has finally made an appointment that I like. I am not too pleased with his cabinet appointments and can't understand why Mr. Nixon didn't consult me before announcing them. Maybe he knows that I didn't vote for him.

Seriously, no matter how you ladies feel about the political situation, you certainly approve of Mr. Yost's appointment as our U.N. ambassador. His first words are the clue: "I have always said we should strengthen our effort in the United Nations and now I am being given a chance to do something about it." He has even written a book entitled "The Insecurity of Nations", the closing paragraph of which was quoted in the New York Times praiseworthy editorial as follows:

"The revival and re-enforcement of the United Nations no doubt seems, and at the moment may be, Utopian. The point to be made again and again, to be hammered unmercifully into our proud, hard, silly heads, is that the attempt to achieve the security

of nations by national means under modern circumstances is still more Utopian. Even assuming uncommon sense or, more likely, some tragic demonstrations of calamity, the invigoration of the United Nations will take a number of years. The passing of powers from old to new, from parochial to ecumenical, from states separating peoples to institutions uniting them, will not be accomplished quickly or easily. Still, it seems high time to begin."

It has been said that the United States should recognize any government as soon as it has a foothold, not a toehold but a foothold; maybe I should say, in relation to a lot of them, a stranglehold. There would be two advantages to this kind of diplomacy. In the first place, our recognition would no longer be an accolade, a stamp of approval, a sign to the world that we think the government is legitimate and will work miracles for its people. In the second place, we should no longer need contrivance to negotiate prisoner exchange with, say, Ho Chi Minh, having our ambassador to some third government meet with Ho's similar ambassador in a back room provided by this third government, not fooling anybody but perhaps the John Birch Society. Such recognition of a fait accompli gets the State Department out of the role of the monkey whose hands over his eyes make him see no evil.

Complete free trade among the family of nations would prevent future wars. Let me repeat that statement in different words: if we should have in all the world no tariff barriers, no import restrictions, no tax concessions on exports, we should quickly reach the position where war would be impossible. It would make no difference whether we liked another country or not, or whether they liked us or not; no war between the two would be possible.

State Department sources said recently that, after negotiations with Japan's steel industry and the six European Common Market countries, voluntary curbs will be imposed on shipments of foreign steel into this country. Let me ask you: who benefits by that? Why, the steel producers, of course. It means higher prices that you and I will have to pay for automobiles, gas stoves, lawn mowers, anything made even partially of steel.

Let's assume instead that, if Japan is the most efficient producer of steel, so efficient that their steel can be shipped all the way across the Pacific Ocean and all the way across the United States, and still sell for less in Pittsburgh, if that should be true, let's have all the United States and all the rest of the world buy its steel from Japan. Then let's assume that our automobile industry is so efficient, we can outsell all other countries on trucks, tanks, half-tracks, etc. At the same time, Germany is dominating the world's munitions industry, England is furnishing the world's wool textiles, Russia the world's wheat, Holland the world's dairy products, Italy the world's shoes, and maybe France the world's wines and perfumes.

Now, under those conditions, we can't have war. If we fight with Japan, we get no steel. If we fight with Italy, we get no shoes. If we fight with Russia, we get no wheat.

Admittedly, my example is oversimplified. I've left out meat, vegetables, medicine and TV sets. However, I think you will understand the principle envisaged. And don't think our workers will be harmed; they will be better paid in dollars for working in a concentrated endeavor at which we are the most efficient, and each dollar will buy more because it will be purchasing products likewise made with the greatest efficiency.

Please don't get me wrong; I'm not downgrading the efficiency or the ethics of any United States companies or industries. What I am doing, is making a hypothetical world division of both industry and farming which division could conceivably be arranged in any number of other ways.

This kind of division is the goal of economics; the greatest good to the greatest number of people. Let's do it on a worldwide basis to raise everyone's standard of living and get complete elimination of war as a by-product.

The elimination of war and of many other evils, however, would best be accomplished by an unconventional gap. My thesis is an acronym for the Great American Plan. You probably agree with me to a greater or less extent as to the importance of all the gaps I have mentioned earlier. You probably agree with me to some extent about the probable causes of these gaps and, by osmosis, about the probable solutions. By contrast, you never heard of the Great American Plan and you're not even sure you should have sat here so long to hear one voice suggest something which, when I get through, you will label "Mission Impossible".

The United Nations has its defects. Please note that I said twice earlier that it is the best organization available, not the best possible organization. Two immediate recognizable defects are the veto power of one country in the Security Council and, in the General Assembly, the one vote accorded each member regardless of size, about as far as possible from our Supreme Court dictum of one man, one vote.

Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, so says the Declaration of Independence. When Hawaii and Alaska became states, this country made a long step forward, taking to its bosom their heterogeneous populations, including Orientals and American Indians, without any regard whatever to race, creed or color. When the Philippines opted for independence, this country lost an opportunity. When Puerto Rico votes the next time, there's a good possibility we may have our fifty-first state.

By this time, you are probably ahead of me. I say we have what has proved to be the best government ever invented. Let's add to it rather than inventing something else. I have mentioned the defects of the United Nations. The principal trouble with the World Federalists is that, not only does the idea have to be sold worldwide, but all the tools have to be invented and agreed upon.

Let's take off from where we are. Samuel Eliot Morrison, the great historian, said: "The genius of our democracy is its room for compromise, our ability to balance liberty with authority. And I am convinced that we will strike a new balance this time and achieve, in the process, a new awareness of human relationships among our people". Continuing our thinking from there, I am convinced we can do it on a global basis. Why not have, instead of a United States of America, a United States of the World? Why not have as individual states South Vietnam, South Korea, all the provinces of Canada, any and all who vote to apply, each with two Senators and proportionate representation in the lower house? Why not?

Let me sum up for you what I have been trying to say about GAP.

There is a gap between different elements, different cultures in our country, both in the cities and in the vineyards. Much as this gap needs remedying, I did not come here to discuss it tonight.

There is also a gap between different nations, different peoples on this earth. Much as this also demands attention, I have not been specific about the needs tonight.

There is a gap between what we are doing and what we are saying in Vietnam. Much as this credibility gap reflects on our national honor, I merely call your attention to the obvious.

There is a gap between United States promise and United States performance in foreign lands. I have shown you this gap, running almost continuously from the early nineteenth century to the second half of the

twentieth century, to show the folly if not the downright chicanery of unilateral action.

In spite of the many accomplishments mentioned earlier, and even more which could be documented, I have shown the gap between what we expected the United Nations to do and what it has so far been able to do.

All of this has led me, past even the World Federalist ideal, to a new conception, eventual unity in the world through unlimited enlargement of the United States.

Maybe the United States of the World wouldn't bring Utopia overnight. It would, however, eliminate problems of balance of trade; whoever worries about how much New Jersey sells to Pennsylvania, and vice versa? By the same token, it would eliminate currency problems; a dollar is a dollar no matter where, in the United States. It would eliminate tax havens, dictatorships and wars in one fell swoop. In the words of a former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, "I was brought up in the belief that this nation of ours was not merely a self-serving society but founded with a mission to help build a world where liberty and justice would prevail".

In closing, I hope you will pardon a play on words, for here has been presented to you GAP—GEE AI PEE—The Great American Plan.

IMPOTENT SUPERPOWERS

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, referring to my comments of Tuesday concerning an article appearing in the Washington Post, taken from the book by Peter Drucker entitled "The Age of Discontinuity," I now include a second portion of this article.

For those who may not have seen the first installment of the article, and my comments, they may be found in the Extensions of Remarks to the RECORD of Thursday, February 6.

The increment of this interesting discussion of the problem of bureaucracy and ineffective government, which I include today, begins with a section entitled:

IMPOTENT SUPERPOWERS

At the other end of the scale, we have the "superpowers," whose very size and power debar them from having a national policy. They are concerned with everything, engaged everywhere, affected by every single political event, no matter how remote or petty. But policy is choice and selection. If one cannot choose not to be engaged, one cannot have a policy—and neither the United States nor Russia can, in effect, say: "We are not interested."

The superpowers are the international version of the welfare state—and, like the welfare state, incapable of priorities or of accomplishments. The superpowers, therefore, invariably overreact—as Russia has done in the satellite countries and as the United States has done in the Congo, in Santo Domingo and perhaps in Vietnam. Yet they underachieve. Their might, although great enough to annihilate each other—and the rest of us into the bargain—is inappropriate to the political task.

This means that decisions in the international sphere can no longer be made in an orderly and systematic fashion. It is no longer possible for any decision to be arrived at by negotiation, consultation, agreement.

It can only be arrived at by dictation or by exhaustion. Although force has, therefore, become infinitely more important in the international system, it has become infinitely less decisive—unless it be the ultimate force of a nuclear war that might destroy mankind.

Decisions are also no longer effective. No longer can they be expected to be carried out. In the international sphere, we have the same divorce of policy from execution that characterizes domestic government.

We get more and more governments. But all this does is to increase costs. For each of these sovereignties has to have its own foreign service, its own armed forces and so on. And no government, whether its territory spans the continents or is smaller than one city block, can any longer discharge the first duty of government: protection from, and defense against, attack from outside.

It is perfectly true that most of the new "ministates" are political absurdities, defenseless against the threat of instant annihilation. But so are the superpowers in this age of nuclear "overkill." With nuclear weapons being easy to make and, in effect, available to the smallest and weakest country, there is no "defense." There is only—questionably—"deterrence" by the threat of retaliation. But if government cannot defend its people, the first reason for the very existence of government has gone.

This may be regarded as gross exaggeration. It certainly is not the picture the older generation still sees. But it is, increasingly, the reality. It is the situation to which we react. And the young people, who are not, as we older ones are, influenced by the memories of our love affair with government, see the monstrosity of government, its disorganization, its lack of performance and its impotence rather than the illusions the older generation still cherishes and still teaches in the class room.

IMMOVABLE OBJECTS

Certain things are inherently difficult for government. Being by design a protective institution, it is not good at innovation. It cannot really abandon anything. The moment government undertakes anything, it becomes entrenched and permanent. Better administration will not alter this. Its inability to innovate is grounded in government's legitimate and necessary function as society's protective and conserving organ.

A government activity, a government installation and government employment become immediately built into the political process itself. This holds true whether we talk of a declining industry—such as the nationalized British coal mines or the government-owned railroads of Europe and Japan. It holds equally true in Communist countries. No matter how bankrupt, for instance, the Stalinist economic policies have become in Czechoslovakia, Hungary or Poland, any attempt to change them immediately runs into concern for the least productive industries, which, of course, always have the most, the lowest-paid and the least-skilled—and, therefore, the most "deserving"—workers.

The inability of government to abandon anything is not limited to the economic sphere. We have known for well over a decade, for instance, that the military draft that served the United States well in a total war is immoral and demoralizing in a cold war or "limited war" period. No one defends our present system—yet we extend it year after year on a "temporary" basis.

The same inability to abandon applies to research projects supported by government. It holds true as soon as government supports the arts. Every beneficiary of a government program immediately becomes a "constituent." He immediately organizes himself for effective political action and for pressure on the decision-maker.

All institutions, of course, find it hard to abandon yesterday's tasks and to stop doing

the unproductive. All of man's institutions—and for that matter, all men—are committed to what they are used to and reluctant to accept that it no longer needs doing or that it does not produce results. But government is under far greater pressure to cling to yesterday than any other institution. Indeed, the typical response of government to the failure of an activity is to double its budget and staff.

Nothing in history, for instance, can compare in futility with those prize activities of the American Government, its welfare policies and its farm policies. Both policies are largely responsible for the disease they are supposed to cure. We have known this for quite some time—in the case of the farm program since before World War II; in the case of the welfare program certainly since 1950.

The problem of the urban poor is undoubtedly vast. No city in history has ever been able to absorb an influx of such magnitude as the American cities have had to absorb since the end of World War II. Wherever it happened in the past, there was the same collapse of family, community and local government—in the cities of England in the late 18th century when the Irish came in; in the cities of North America around 1840, again with the coming of the Irish; in the cities of continental Europe later on, as for instance when the Czechs started to migrate in large numbers into the Vienna of the Hapsburgs in the closing years of the 19th century.

The influx of almost two million rural Negroes and Puerto Ricans into New York City alone in less than a 15-year period exceeded any of these earlier migrations. It is unprecedented in the history of cities. But we certainly could not have done worse if we had done nothing at all. In fact, the 19th century cities that did nothing, did better. And so, these last 20 years, has Sao Paulo in Brazil, which, inundated by similar floods of rural, illiterate Negroes fresh from serfdom, did nothing—and is in better shape than New York City.

Our welfare policies were not designed to meet this problem. They were perfectly rational—and quite effective—as measures for the temporary relief of competent people who were unemployed only because of the catastrophe of the Great Depression. Enacted in the mid-1930s, the relief policies had essentially finished their job by 1940. But being government programs, they could not be abandoned. Far too massive a bureaucracy had been built. The emotional investment in these programs and in their slogan had become far too great. They had become "symbols" of the New Deal.

Small wonder, then, that we reached for them when the entirely different problems of the 1950s arose, that is, when the rural Negro moved into the core city in large numbers. And small wonder that these programs did not work, that instead they aggravated the problem and increased the helplessness, the dependence, the despair of the Negro masses. But all we could do when relief failed to relieve was to double the budget and to double the number of people engaged in filling out forms.

AN OPPOSITE RESULT

The farm program tells the same story. It was designed—also in the 1930s—to save the family farmer and to restore his economic and social health. Instead it has subsidized his replacement by large, heavily capitalized and highly productive "industrial farms." This may well be a more desirable result than the one the farm program was meant—and is still meant—to produce. But it was an abysmal failure in terms of the program's announced objectives. Yet the program goes on, with an increased budget and increasingly perverse consequences.

Lest this be read as a criticism of the American Government, let me add that this experience knows no distinction of race, creed or nationality. The depressed-areas

policy in Great Britain dates back to the 1920s. In all that time, it has not restored to economic health one single "depressed area." But it has effectively penalized the shift of labor to areas of higher productivity, higher wages and better jobs. It thereby has slowed growth in the healthy regions. Yet whenever it is realized that the "depressed areas" are still depressed, the budget goes up.

Government is a poor manager. It is of necessity, concerned with procedure, just as it is also, of necessity, large and cumbersome. Government is properly conscious that it administers public funds and must account for every penny. It has no choice but to be "bureaucratic"—in the common usage of the term.

Every government is, by definition, a "government of paper forms." This means inevitably high cost. For "control" of the last 10 per cent of any phenomenon always costs more than the first 90 per cent. If control tries to account for everything, it becomes prohibitively expensive. Yet this is what government is always expected to do.

And the reason is not just "bureaucracy" and red tape; it is a much sounder one. A "little dishonesty" in government is a corrosive disease. It rapidly spreads to infect the whole body politic. Yet the temptation to dishonesty is always great. People of modest means and dependent on a salary handle very large public sums. People of modest position dispose of power and award contracts and privileges of tremendous importance to other people—construction jobs, radio channels, air routes, zoning laws, building codes and so on.

To fear corruption in government is not irrational. This means, however, that government "bureaucracy"—and its consequent high costs—cannot be eliminated. Any government that is not a "government of paper forms" degenerates rapidly into a mutual looting society.

POLITICS LOOKS ELSEWHERE

The generation that was in love with the state 30 and 40 years ago believed fondly that government would be economical. Eliminating the "profit motive" was thought to reduce costs. This was poor economics, to begin with. It is worse public administration.

The politician's attention does not go to the 90 per cent of money and effort that is devoted to existing programs and activities. They are left to their own devices and to the tender mercies of mediocrity. Politics—rightly—is primarily concerned with "new programs." It is focused on crisis and problems and issues. It is not focused on doing a job. Politics, whatever the form of government, is not congenial to managerial organization and makes government defective in managerial performance.

We have built elaborate safeguards to protect the administrative structure within government against the political process. This is the purpose of every civil service. But although this protects the going machinery from the distortions and pressures of politics, it also protects the incumbents in the agencies from the demands of performance.

Of course, we maintain officially that civil service tenure is compatible with excellence. But if we had to choose, we would probably say that mediocrity in the civil service is a lesser evil than "politics." As far as the judiciary is concerned—where we first created "independence"—this is certainly true. How far it is true in administrative agencies is debatable. A good many people have come to believe that we need some way of rewarding performance and of penalizing nonperformance, even within civil service.

Still, the premium within government will be on not "rocking the boat" in existing agencies, that is, on no innovation, no initiative, but rather on doing with proper procedures what has been done before. Within the political process, attention will certainly not be paid to the on-going routine work unless

there is the publicized malfunction of a "scandal."

As a result, management of the daily work of government will remain neglected, or be considered a matter of following "procedure" and of filling out forms. By excelling as a manager, no one in politics will get to the top unless at the same time he builds his own political machine, his own political following, his own faction.

We can—and must—greatly improve the efficiency of government. There is little reason these days to insist on "100 per cent audit," for instance. Modern sampling methods based on probability mathematics actually give us better control by inspecting a small percentage of the events. But we need something much more urgently: the clear definition of the results a policy is expected to produce, and the ruthless examination of results against these expectations.

This, in turn, demands that we spell out in considerable detail what results are expected rather than content ourselves with promises and manifestos. In the last century, the auditor general became a central organ of every government. We learned that we needed an independent agency to control the daily process of government and to make sure that money appropriated was spent for what it was intended for, and spent honestly. Now we may have to develop an independent government agency that compares the results of policies against expectations and that, independent of pressures from the executive as well as from the legislature, reports to the public any program that does not deliver.

AUTOMATIC CUTOFF

We may even go further—though only a gross optimist would expect this today. We may build into government an automatic abandonment process. Instead of starting with the assumption that any program, any agency and any activity is likely to be eternal, we might start out with the opposite assumption: that each is short-lived and temporary.

We might, from the beginning, assume that it will come to an end within five or ten years unless specifically renewed. And we may discipline ourselves not to renew any program unless it has the results that it promised when first started. We may, let us hope, eventually build into government the capacity to appraise results and systematically to abandon yesterday's tasks.

Yet such measures will still not convert government into a "doer." They will not alter the main lesson of the last 50 years: government is not a "doer."

The purpose of government is to make fundamental decisions and to make them effectively. The purpose of government is to focus the political energies of society. It is to present fundamental choices. The purpose of government, in other words, is to govern. This, as we have learned in other institutions, is incompatible with "doing." Any attempt to combine government with "doing" on a large scale paralyzes the decision-making capacity.

There is reason today why soldiers, civil servants and hospital administrators look to business management for concepts, principles and practices. For business, during the last 30 years, has had to face, on a much smaller scale, the problem that government now faces: the incompatibility between "governing" and "doing." Business management learned that the two have to be separated, and that the top organ, the decision-maker, has to be detached from "doing." Otherwise he does not make decisions, and the "doing" does not get done, either.

In business, this goes by the name of "decentralization." The term is misleading. It implies a weakening of the central organ, the top management of a business. The true purpose of decentralization, however, is to make the center, the top management of business, strong and capable of performing

the central, the top-management, task. The purpose is to make it possible for top management to concentrate on decision-making and direction, to slough off the "doing" to operating managements, each with its own mission and goals and with its own sphere of action and autonomy.

If this lesson were applied to government, the other institutions of society would then rightly become the "doers." "Decentralization" applied to government would not be just another form of "federalism" in which local rather than central government discharges the "doing" tasks. It would rather be a systematic policy of using the other, the nongovernmental, institutions of the society—the hospital as well as the university, business as well as labor unions—for the actual "doing," i.e., for performance, operations, execution.

LEARNING FROM "PUEBLO"

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Comdr. Lloyd Bucher and the crew of the *Pueblo* has touched all of us in this country deeply. The many questions arising from the capture of the *Pueblo*, the treatment of Commander Bucher and his crew by North Korea, and their subsequent release disturbs the conscience of our Nation.

While we cannot undo the circumstances of this national tragedy, I think there are lessons to be learned. I present for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial that states in commonsense words what so many of us feel. The editorial was printed in the February 5, 1969, edition of the Norristown Times Herald, a daily newspaper published in Norristown, Pa. The editorial states:

LEARNING FROM "PUEBLO"

Things would be so much simpler if this were an either-or world—if people were always either all good or all evil, either all right or all wrong, either all wise or all stupid.

The impression emerging from the *Pueblo* is that there is no one villain responsible for the loss of the ship, and perhaps no villain at all.

Based on past experience, the Navy was not acting from deliberate stupidity in having "on call" rescue forces that existed on paper only.

According to Rear Adm. Frank L. Johnson, who commanded U.S. naval forces in Japan at the time of the *Pueblo* seizure, 16 spy runs were made off the coasts of Red China, Russia and North Korea during his tenure. While there had been numerous acts of harassment of U.S. ships by the Russians and Chinese, the North Koreans had never bothered them.

Apparently, an unwritten law of this particular espionage game makes it permissible to make things as miserable as possible for your opponent, but not cricket to employ outright violence. Until North Korea changed the rules, that is.

Anyway, said Johnson, he had little or no authority to take rescue action.

As for the *Pueblo* being armed with only two .50 caliber machine guns, Comdr. Charles R. Clark, former skipper of the USS *Banner*, sister spy ship of the *Pueblo*, testified that he did not want even these aboard his ship. He felt they were not only useless but provocative.

Still unexplained, of course, is why the *Pueblo* was not provided with the wherewithal to enable her crew to destroy the ship's electronic gear and other secret cargo. Common sense would seem to dictate that not just enemy attack but any number of chance events, such as being blown aground on a hostile shore, might make such action necessary.

No one is being done proud by the revelations coming from the *Pueblo* inquiry. But while the Navy brass are busy passing the buck among themselves, the man in the street fervently hopes that someone in the Pentagon has learned and is applying the lessons that have been taught by the sorry incident.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE NATIONAL MINIMUM WELFARE STANDARDS AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that would amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for aid and assistance.

The welfare situation in our major cities has, indeed, reached the critical stage. Other services, such as police, fire, sanitation, education, and transit have been and are being shortchanged because of the burgeoning welfare costs. It is now time for the Federal Government to act before the situation becomes totally unmanageable and the local tax base is eroded even further.

We have long recognized that needy persons, particularly dependent children, are a national responsibility. Nevertheless, the new budget request of the New York City welfare commissioner is \$1.7 billion, an increase of \$400 million over the current level and the largest single item in the expense budget. Much of this can be attributed to the disparity between the level of welfare payments in our city and those in the nonurban areas. The average monthly payment for aid to dependent children in New York City, for example, is \$61.70 per month as compared to only \$8.40 in Mississippi.

An editorial in the January 3 issue of the New York Times, entitled "Welfare Quagmire" sets forth some of the welfare problems confronting our metropolitan areas. I include the full text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

WELFARE QUAGMIRE

The necessity for a basic shift in welfare policy is painfully underscored by the request of the Department of Social Services for a monumental \$1.7 billion to finance aid to New York City's needy in the fiscal year beginning July 1. This represents a rise of nearly \$400 million over the budget the department originally requested for this year; it is four times the budget for 1964-65, the last full year of the Wagner administration.

What makes the astronomical upswing in the city's outlay for the relief of human misery doubly dismaying is that it occurs in a period of unparalleled general prosperity. As Mayor

Lindsay noted in a cheery New Year statement, the over-all level of unemployment in the five boroughs declined last year to 3.2 per cent—a rate he described as "the lowest in the city's history."

It becomes increasingly clear that the welfare rolls have a life of their own detached from the metropolitan job market. Twenty years ago there were a quarter-million people on relief in this city. By 1965 the number had risen to a half-million. Now it is just short of a million, and it is expected to go a quarter-million higher in the next fiscal year.

The most tragic statistic of all is that the rolls include nearly 600,000 children, growing up in homes bereft of hope. The great bulk of the rest in this roster of social casualties are mothers, the aged and the disabled. Apart from 25,000 receiving wages so low they require supplementary aid, the rolls contain only 42,000 men listed as employables—among them alcoholics, addicts and others with physical or emotional infirmities.

A great part of the increased caseload in this city results from the technological revolution in agriculture that has uprooted millions of Southern Negroes and sent them cascading into Northern cities in search of jobs. The first need in a new welfare policy is acceptance by the Federal Government of responsibility for the full cost of this exported misery.

National welfare standards are an essential part of such a shift so that people would be encouraged to seek new lives in their own home states instead of coming to strange cities without skills, schooling or friends. The New York State average payment for aid to dependent children is \$61.70 a month, as against \$8.40 a month in Mississippi.

But no restructuring of the welfare system will eliminate all the demeaning features that lead to a cycle of inherited dependency and withdrawal from a work-oriented society. That means a priority matter for the new Administration in Washington must be the development of a new system of income maintenance, through some such device as a negative income tax or universal children's allowances, that will bring the welfare population back into the mainstream of American society and provide incentives for their restoration to self-support.

Mr. Speaker, in the legislation I have introduced today, which is being co-sponsored by many of our colleagues, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be given the power to set minimum standards and uniform criteria for all States, subject, of course, to congressional review. This policy was recommended in 1966 by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare in its report to the Secretary. More recently the task force organized by President Nixon to study public assistance made a similar recommendation and last week, Secretary Finch endorsed the concept.

This measure, therefore, represents an important and long overdue step by the Federal Government in its recognition of the welfare situation throughout the Nation. It would attack the problem in two fundamental ways: First, by establishing a uniform system in all the States, the current migration of needy persons from rural to urban areas would be greatly abated. Second, by setting uniform acceptance standards whereby persons are declared eligible for benefits, the present State-by-State shopping for the most liberal requirements would be curtailed.

Expert knowledge indicates that better education, training, housing, and employment opportunities can be made avail-

able on a more equitable basis in non-urban areas. If the Federal Government will act now to reform the system, it will be much easier to assist the poor in their present environment than try to provide for them in our large cities where it is becoming increasingly difficult to afford the programs they require.

The enactment of this legislation will not have an adverse or regressive effect on the present level of assistance in any State. In States with low levels of per capita income, Federal support grants will make it possible for them to attain the national minimum standard while keeping the present State and local effort requirements.

I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will give early attention to this legislation and that action can be secured in the present session in order that steps can be taken to reverse the trend toward ever-increasing welfare costs.

BACKGROUND ON THE FATAH

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Israel continues to be harassed by Arab terrorist groups. Because these raids occur with such tragic frequency, many Americans have become blunted to these incursions and threats to Israel's existence.

The following description of El Fatah activities appears in the January 1969 edition of the Middle East Information Series and vividly documents the frequent attacks of terrorist bands on Israel communities—a reminder to all of us of the daily loss of lives in the Middle East:

BACKGROUND ON THE FATAH

Since the end of the Six Day War some 236 Israelis have lost their lives and 870 have been wounded as a result of "border incidents".* The terrorists make no distinction between civilians, soldiers, Jews, Druse or Arabs.

In September alone, for example:

On September 4, hand grenades set off in the crowded Central Bus Station in Tel Aviv killed one 65 year old man and injured 51 others, both Jews and Arabs.

On September 9, an explosive charge set off under a truck in the market place in Gaza, wounded the Israeli Arab driver and 15 other people.

On September 13, three Druse watchmen were murdered by a marauding band in the Negev.

Innocent bystanders are not the only targets in the campaign. The shelling of the string of settlements in the Jordan and Beit-shan valleys has become so frequent that in some kibbutzim (communal farm settlements) the younger children sleep in underground shelters. Farmers working in their fields are fired on, dirt roads are mined nightly and frontier patrols come under bazooka and mortar attack.

Almost daily the news headlines carry stories of soldiers killed or wounded, either on routine patrols or in unexpected artillery duels. Although the incidents may be provoked by one of the terrorist groups, it is the

regular Jordanian Army, according to on the spot observers, which provides covering fire for the retreating saboteurs and sets up the heavy artillery barrages.

Until recently, terrorist activity operated exclusively from bases in Jordan and Syria. However, recent incidents along the Suez Canal—implanted mines, ambushing of Israeli soldiers, sniping and shelling—indicate the opening up of a "new front" in the operations.

WAR BY OTHER MEANS

Official statements of the Arab Governments and speeches delivered at the United Nations term the terrorists' activities a direct consequence of the June War and the Israeli occupation of Arab territory. However, for internal consumption, consistency is abandoned and a different purpose and goal of the campaign is generally conceded. For instance, the Egyptian government paper "Al Com-houriya" stated, on November 17:

"These events are not a result of the aggression of June 5 and of Israel's conquest of part of the Arab lands. Almost three years ago and more, several Palestinian organizations began armed operations within occupied Palestine; their activity was merely stepped up after the aggression."

Even more explicit is the editorial of the Saudi Arabian paper "Al-Bilad" of March 18:

"The Arab Fedayeen activities are simply the preparatory groundwork for the next Arab round and the launching of the victory campaign."

In other words, terrorism is to be used as a "softening up" stage to demoralize Israel and weaken its economy until such time as the Arab States can reach a level of military competence that will enable them to undertake the final liquidation.

RESISTANCE OR TERROR?

The employment of these methods is no new feature in the area. They were used as far back as the 1920's and 1930's, both against Jewish settlers and those Arabs who opposed the policies of their leadership. But in those days the terrorists did not call upon the ghost of Che Guevara; their leader and source of inspiration was the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj el-Husseini, ally of Hitler and friend of the Balkan fascist leaders. His support derived from the ultra-nationalistic elements who opposed all forms of Jewish-Arab cooperation and rejected a peaceful solution to the conflict based on coexistence. Despite the invocation of the name of Che and other "freedom fighters", the policy of the existing terrorist groups has changed little. They still cling to their former slogans and appeal for "another round".

To compare the activities of the Fatah and similar groups with those of the national resistance movements of the past, is to make a transparently false analogy. Successful resistance movements, whether in Ireland, Cyprus, Cuba or Algeria, were always based on the mass support of the people, seeking to liberate themselves.

This is far removed from the situation which exists in the Israeli occupied areas today. The success of the Vietcong is based on the support it receives from the local population—often undertaken at great personal risk. The Fatah has failed to make any substantial headway in achieving this basic prerequisite.

Part of this failure can be credited to the two-pronged policy of the Israel Army. Minor frictions are avoided and the edge is taken off hostility by a policy of giving the local inhabitants a free hand in the running of their own affairs. There are today less than 300 Israeli officials engaged in the total administration of the occupied areas. The lifting of travel restrictions and permitting a certain amount of trade between the East and West Banks of the Jordan have also served as stabilizing factors.

Terrorism is countered by tough measures and those caught harboring active Fatah elements face the prospect of having their houses blown up. Capital punishment, however, is not invoked, since it has been abolished under Israeli law. Collective punishment is not meted out to a community, as was practiced by the British in pre-1948 Palestine. Not only have the terrorists failed to bring about a popular uprising but the local population of the West Bank and Gaza have clearly demonstrated their reluctance to provide either shelter or support for the operations of the saboteur bands. Much of the information which has led to the capture of saboteurs has been supplied to the army by local citizens.

The Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza want an end to the Israeli occupation but, from all available evidence, the majority looks neither to total war nor to terrorist activities to achieve this goal. The people appear to be willing to come to terms with the reality of Israel's existence, and to seek some form of political accommodation and settlement.

While this applies to the majority, there remains a part of the population that undoubtedly sympathizes with the terrorists and from these circles are recruited the small groups of militants who form the terrorist cells operating in East Jerusalem, Gaza, Hebron and Nablus. But one indication of the extent to which they have to go in recruitment was the announcement by Fatah on May, 1968, that its ranks are now open to "non-Palestinians". Even the Vietcong—whose name is often invoked—has never been obliged to resort to foreign volunteers, and the FLN was never dependent on recruits from other Arab countries.

BASES OUTSIDE PALESTINE

Faced with inadequate support from the local Palestinian population, the terrorists have been compelled to depend on bases across the borders. From these centers they can infiltrate at night, lay their mines and return by daybreak.

Prior to June 1967, the terrorists' headquarters were based in Syria, with Jordan providing a transition point. Today the operations are conducted from camps in Jordan. No longer absolute master in his Kingdom, it is doubtful whether King Hussein could control the Fatah, even should he wish to do so. The result could well be the downfall of the regime, an eventuality which neither Egypt nor Syria would view with regret. One direct consequence of the Fatah operations from bases in the Jordan valley has been the abandonment of the villages in the area by the local population, resulting in a substantial loss, which the Jordanian economy can ill-afford.

Not only has the base of operations changed in the past year, but a radical transformation has taken place in the training and composition of the saboteur bands and in their relationship to the Arab States.

Frustrated by political stalemate, internal disaffection and military weakness, the Arab governments have turned to open support and encouragement of terrorism as part of their overall strategy against Israel—the "old" war is being conducted by other means.

Speaking at El-Mansura (Radio Cairo, April 18, 1968), President Nasser stated:

"We recognize the terrorist movement . . . we will support and give aid to this movement . . . the activities of the Asifa commandos and the Fatah are a positive element in our campaign."

In support of this policy, funds, arms, training facilities, shelter and covering fire when required are all being provided directly by the Arab Governments. Although most of the rank and file terrorists—among whom the casualty rate has been about 90%—are Palestinians, many of the officers are Syrian, Egyptian, Iraqi and Jordanian.

*As of September, 1968. These figures have risen sharply within the last two months.

CENTERS OF TERRORIST OPERATIONS
Jordan

Complete freedom of movement, activity and recruitment is permitted to the terrorist groups in Jordan. Their bases and camps exist openly along the cease-fire lines. In some areas they are in complete control—as was shown by documents captured during the Israel raid on Karamah, where the Fatah in this town have their own police force and jails.

Iraq

The Iraqi task force stationed in the Mifraq area of Jordan supplies the saboteurs with arms and equipment, including Russian 120 mm mortars.

Officers and men of the 421st Palestine Commando Battalion, part of the regular Iraqi Army, lead units infiltrating into Israel. Many members of this battalion were killed and others captured during the Karamah raid.

A fixed allocation has been made in the Government budget for "strengthening the movement of the armed struggle."

Syria

Until several months ago the major bases and headquarters of the infiltrator bands were located in Syria. On the eve of the Karamah operation, several hundred officers and men were transferred to Jordan, to join the terrorist organizations in that country.

A number of captured terrorists have said, in open court, that they had undergone military training in Syria. Others have proved to be officers in the regular Syrian Army.

Egypt

In January, 1968, senior Fatah officers visited Cairo and reached an agreement for the training of saboteurs in regular Egyptian army camps. According to documents captured at Karamah, more than 100 have already received such training.

On April 25, a unit of infiltrators intercepted near Beer-Ora carried documents issued by the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. They had completed a special sabotage course in a military camp near Cairo and were then transferred to Jordan.

In recent weeks the same pattern of ambush, sabotage and shelling has been initiated by units of the regular Egyptian Army on the bank of the Suez Canal.

HOPE FOR PEACE IS THE VICTIM

Although the campaign of terror has borne some fruit in the mounting toll of dead and wounded Israeli Jews and Arabs, it has proved totally futile in its primary purpose. It has not, at any level, affected the administration of the occupied areas, nor does it pose a threat to the survival of Israel. The danger of a major conflict still constitutes the basic problem for those who are concerned with the maintenance of peace in the area. But it is worth noting that the wars of 1956 and 1967 came as the culmination points of a deliberately escalated policy of terrorist warfare.

The past year has proved that terrorists from across the border can be contained and prevented from establishing a foothold among Arabs in the occupied areas. Counter measures against marauders have so far resulted in almost 900 terrorists dead and 800 wounded, with several thousand more serving prison terms in Israeli jails.* The casualty figures for the period from August 1 to October 10, 1968, amounted to 109 killed and 206 wounded.

In one area, however, the effects should not be minimized. Recent attacks on citizens in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv provoked spontaneous outbursts against Arabs who were near the scene, and pressure on the Government to review its liberal policy in the administered areas was increased. Although the Government has strongly resisted any

such change, a continuation of such incidents can only work to weaken and destroy the contact and daily intercourse which has developed between Israelis and Palestinians, in Jerusalem and in the other areas.

END NAVAL INQUIRY OF CAPTURE
OF U.S.S. "PUEBLO"

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the capture and detention of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew by North Korea and the action of the U.S. Government to obtain the crew's release, raises many serious questions. I have been particularly concerned with the prospect that Captain Bucher and his men might be subject to prosecution and punishment for alleged violations of the Code of Military Conduct and other Navy regulations governing the behavior of military men in combat or encounters with hostile forces. On the basis of what has appeared to date, I feel strongly that for several reasons Captain Bucher and his men should not be subject to prosecution. First, the Code of Military Conduct is quite new in American law, and its applicability to situations of warfare and international tension is untested. Second, the code was issued by Presidential decree, and has never been passed upon by the people through their elected Representatives in Congress, as I believe it should be.

I am particularly disturbed with the effects of the provision in the code that American soldiers held by hostile governments can give no more information than "name, rank, and service number." I have outlined why I feel this provision is unfair and unwise, and what I think should be done about it, in a letter to President Nixon urging him to change it as soon as possible.

I have received such a large volume of correspondence, from my own constituents and people across the country, expressing interest in the proposal set out in my letter to President Nixon that I feel it useful to insert the letter at this point for the readers of the RECORD:

TEXT OF LETTER BY CONGRESSMAN BINGHAM TO PRESIDENT NIXON CALLING FOR REVISED MILITARY CODE OF CONDUCT

JANUARY 27, 1969.

MR. PRESIDENT: The mental and emotional torture suffered by Commander Lloyd M. Bucher and members of the crew of the USS *Pueblo* at the hands of their North Korean captors shows (in addition to the inhumanity of the current government of North Korea) the shameful and ludicrous inadequacy of the Code of Conduct for Military personnel. The rule that requires American prisoners, under threat of court martial, to give their captors nothing more than "name, rank, and service number" must be drastically revised.

The mistreatment American prisoners are forced to undergo to avoid signing false "statements" and "confessions" does not prevent their captors from using such statements for propaganda purposes. If death or sheer stamina under torture permits an American prisoner to resist making or signing statements dictated by his captors, it is easy enough for them to use similar treatment on other prisoners until someone sub-

mits. Even if no prisoner can be forced to make or sign trumped-up statements, hostile captors can forge prisoner's signatures, or simply issue whatever propaganda statements they wish to promulgate without a prisoner's submission.

In short, American prisoners are forced, by the "name, rank, and service number" limitation, to trade severe mental and physical mistreatment, and sometimes their very lives, without in any way frustrating the enemy's goals—to suffer and often to die for nothing.

The probability that American prisoners would be subjected to this kind of severe mental and physical torture could be greatly reduced if the following steps were taken immediately:

1. Revise the "name, rank and service number" provision of the Code of Military Conduct to permit any American soldier imprisoned or detained by a hostile government to sign or make any statement or confession which does not contain any factual information that would be useful to the hostile power and that, to the best of the prisoner's knowledge, is not already known to the hostile government.

2. Announce through all available diplomatic and public channels, including the United Nations, that American military personnel have been so instructed, and that no statement or confession signed by any American military person held or detained by a hostile government can be believed.

These changes would be consistent with our international commitments under the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. American captives would not be allowed to give any real assistance or factual information to hostile governments, any more than they are permitted to do so under the current Code. What these changes would do is remove one of the major excuses used by hostile captors to torture and kill American military men, reduce the probability that American soldiers would have to suffer such torture and death, and reduce the propaganda usefulness of false enemy statements and confessions attributed to American captives.

I strongly urge you, as President of the United States, to make these changes in the Code of Military Conduct by Executive Order before any more American military men are forced to suffer and perhaps die under the senseless "name, rank, and service number" rule.

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

Public response to this statement has been nearly unanimously favorable. A few examples of the many letters I have received are included below:

LONGPORT, N.J.,
January 27, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BINGHAM: I was very much interested to read in the Atlantic City Press this morning your proposal to President Nixon on the Code of Military Conduct. These have been my thoughts for some time. I have wanted to express them to someone who could remedy this situation which I feel would beat the communists at their own game. I have never written to a Congressman or Senator before but after following the case of the *Pueblo* and Cmdr. Bucher, I feel that I must speak out. I have written to my state senator, Senator Clifford Case and asked him to support your proposal. This is of great concern to me as I have three young sons. Two of them will probably be in the service in a few years. As I told Senator Case, I don't want them to be traitors to their country, but I don't expect the impossible from them either. I feel this is the case with Cmdr. Bucher and other American prisoners. It is impossible to endure this inhumane suffering

*September, 1968.

over a period of time. I wish you every success in your endeavors.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARGUERITE PACENTRILLI.

ROCHESTER, MINN.,

February 1, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM: Thank you for your interest in the plight of the military man, beholden to say only "name, rank, and serial number" to an unreasonable captor.

The Navy, with which I have had recent acquaintance, makes no effort to prepare its men for imprisonment by a hostile power; no preparation for interrogation or "brain-washing".

Why can't we learn from our experiences in Korea? Is the military incapable of preparing its soldiers for an eventuality as real as combat?

Someone with interest, understanding, and compassion should review this difficult area with the Armed Services.

Sincerely,

DONALD SWITZ.

THE GEORGE W. HENRY

FOUNDATION, INC.,

New York, N.Y., January 26, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I hope you will not consider it presumptuous for me to write to express wholehearted agreement with your proposal to amend the rules relating to the conduct of members of the Armed Forces who may have been taken prisoner. I am greatly and gravely concerned by the circumstances that necessitated your introduction of such a Bill. This concern arises out of the circumstances surrounding the Naval inquiry into the loss of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, from which it might appear that the Navy is primarily in search of a scapegoat to bear responsibility for the ship's loss. Certainly others than Commander Bucher, especially after hearing his testimony that he besought the Navy to provide him with electrical equipment that would speedily destroy the secret paraphernalia over which there is so much pother, must bear this burden. Someone, seemingly, was penny wise and pound foolish. Hence I think the Bill might profitably include provision that Commander Bucher and his crew, now, according to report, threatened with court martial, should be held blameless for the ship's capture or their conduct under trying conditions.

The rule that a man need give only his name, rank and serial number is little more than the proverbial scrap of paper. Certainly in our wars with civilized (?) Germany and Japan, enemy interrogators sought to find out much more than that; and we are told that their efforts to obtain information were accompanied by both physical and psychological pressures—not too different from the police "third degree". Were our and your Allied interrogators altogether blameless?

You are wise in suggesting that our Government should make proclamation that prisoners may feel free to sign anything, from a statement that the moon is made of green cheese, up or down, to be left unmolested. As to the turncoats, I feel each case should be investigated on its own merits. Young people are not superhuman. Only the Lord knows how much pressure they can stand; and a great deal of mercy should be available even to a repentant defector who was tortured or "brain washed" into telling more than his prayers.

With regard to Commander Bucher and the *Pueblo* crew, I believe that, instead of their being court-martialed, they should be welcomed in the words of the old gospel hymn:

"Home again, home again,

From a foreign shore.

And, oh, it makes our hearts rejoice,

To see our friends once more."

Instead of a court martial, they would seem deserving of Purple Hearts, and even some sort of commendatory medal, as their country's evidence of appreciation of their ordeal.

We are told in the scriptures to make unto ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. Does it not follow that, in dealing with an unscrupulous enemy, the Marquis of Queensbury rules must be subject to a great deal of interpretation?

In hope that your Bill will speedily become law, I am,

Your obedient servant,

ALFRED A. GROSS,
Executive Director.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 26, 1969.

CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN BINGHAM: Congratulations on your asking Nixon to intervene in Bucher situation. Have gotten 100 signatures on letter which you will get copy of soon.

HARRY J. UFLAND.

MCALLEN, TEX.,
January 29, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I am enclosing a clipping from The Dallas News of a day or two ago, telling of your letter to President Nixon proposing a revision of the military code of conduct to allow captured servicemen to confess to "anything so long as the confession 'does not contain factual information that would be useful to the hostile power'."

May I commend you on this!

About two years ago, when the very first American soldier to ever escape from the Viet Cong was given great publicity and I learned of the things they tortured him for because he would not admit to things or sign things, I had the great thought that every American soldier should be instructed to sign anything, say anything. Thus, what a laughing stock it would make of any enemy, flaunting "signed statements" . . . when all the world would know that U.S. soldiers had been instructed to sign or say anything! (any idiot knows that he would not be fighting for his country if he felt "that way" about it!) Thus, he could say he hated his country, he could say he loved Communism, he could say he thought "we" in the wrong . . . and sign the paper—and all would automatically be discounted—not only by us, but by the world!

Suddenly I realized, "Why haven't the people who know military not thought of this before!" I had a great urge to "take pen in hand" and write Johnson, or the Defense head, or a senator or representative, or somebody! My husband said, "If you feel this strongly about this, by all means, write!"

But—I thought—"who am I, a mere housewife, to enter into things military!" . . . also, I just didn't put in motion my fine thought.

And now you have come up with this great idea . . . and, my thanks to you!

Remember, if a gunman held you at bay and said he'd kill you if you didn't say you hated your wife, or your children, or your country . . . you'd say it! (Not that that would mean you did! . . . it's as simple as that!)

Sincerely,

Mrs. GORDON KETHLEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 27, 1969.

CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN BINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to note in the news this weekend the position you have taken

with regard to the amendment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In fact, I was about to write to you to ask that you take some action in that regard. It is quite inequitable to permit diplomats to sign confessions and disclaim their validity while denying the men in the military the same privilege. It is particularly ludicrous in view of the fact that the latter rather than the former are most likely to be in the most immediate physical and psychological peril.

I am therefore in complete agreement with you, and if possible, I would like to see the proposal that you have made.

Sincerely yours,

CAROLYN GENTILE, Esq.

JESSUP, MD.,

January 27, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
U.S. Representative,
New York.

SIR: Congratulations on recommending a revised code of conduct for captured servicemen.

We should, in my opinion, announce to the world that we are instructing our servicemen to, should they become captive, tell any tale (true or false) that pops into their mind. Then, the enemy would never know whether they were receiving reliable information or not.

It is completely unrealistic to expect captured servicemen to remain silent (or to give only their name, rank, and serial number) while being tortured or threatened with torture. Any "brave" politician or other critic who expects this should volunteer to trade places with the captive.

I wish you well with your recommendation.

Sincerely,

KENNETH A. STEVENS.

SIDNEY, KY.,

January 31, 1969.

Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Democrat,
New York.

DEAR SIR: Support you in your support concerning Commander Lloyd M. Bucher, *Pueblo* Skipper.

Please stop persecution immediately. He is to be honored for bravery in my opinion. Respectfully,

Mr. & Mrs. WALTER M. ARROWOOD.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.,

January 30, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I was delighted to see in the Los Angeles Times last Monday a report that you have urged a change in the code of military conduct "to allow American prisoners to make meaningless confessions, and that such confessions be branded as false by the government . . . (to the effect) that no statement or confession signed by any American military person held or detained by a hostile government can be believed."

In "Modern" warfare as practiced by our Communist enemies, torture and starvation of prisoners held by them indeed makes the present code a desertion of our armed forces by their government.

I trust you have made your recommendation a resolution.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAINE L. POINDEXTER.

RESEDA, CALIF.,

January 30, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: According to the information printed in a recent newspaper—a copy of which is attached—you have written to President Nixon urging him to change

the Code of Military Conduct to, "... allow American prisoners (of war) to make meaningless confessions and that such confessions be branded false in advance by the government."

In effect, you are suggesting that we teach our fighting men to lie in certain situations, i.e., when they are prisoners of war. When does the lying stop? Are we to stop teaching the men the meaning of honorable conduct—under any circumstances? Who is to teach them right from wrong—for each "situation."

It would be much better if our leaders—and I presume you come under this category in some dubious fashion—would set good examples of honorable conduct in our daily lives—under all circumstances. Do not teach our fighting men to "give up" and lie and cheat their way out of a tight spot.

For your information, I served in the U.S. Navy—submarine service—during World War II and the Korean War; and, I have a draft-eligible son who has not been taught—either by precept or example—to lie or cheat, under any circumstances. I expect him to live by the "right" and "wrong" attitudes I have taught him.

Stop running down the moral fibre of our youth by such suggestions you have voiced to the President.

Yours truly,

ANTHONY PAOLANTONIO.

Mr. Speaker, the current hearing at which Commander Bucher and his men are being required to appear is not a formal trial. It is a preliminary investigation to find out what happened and whether there is any cause to prosecute Bucher, or any of his crew. As I have indicated, and as my letter to President Nixon implies, I do not believe that these men should be brought to trial.

It is unfortunate that the men of the *Pueblo* must suffer the anguish and strain of a full-scale inquiry, but I feel that a full disclosure of all the facts is necessary, and can bring nothing but desirable results. I believe that the facts will justify the actions taken by Commander Bucher and his men. Furthermore, and no less important, a complete airing of all the facts should make it clear to our military and political leaders, and to the public, that major and drastic changes must be made in the Code of Military Conduct, and that the content of the code must be determined not by Presidential decree but by the Congress.

The first several sessions of the inquiry conducted by the Navy in California confirmed what many observers suspected before the inquiry opened—that more was at issue in the *Pueblo* case than merely the behavior of Commander Bucher and his crew. It is now clear that the behavior of high Navy officials and the structure of the Navy command are also at issue. It is an elementary rule both of law and commonsense that it is unjust for any person or organization to stand in judgment of the facts of a matter in which that person or organization is itself involved. But that is exactly the position in which the Navy finds itself. The Navy, in its inquiry on the *Pueblo* incident, is in a position to pass judgment on its own case.

For that reason, and because I feel the men of the *Pueblo* should not have to endure more than one full-scale investigation, I have called upon Secretary of Defense Laird and Secretary of the Navy Chafee to cancel the Navy inquiry until such time as a joint congressional com-

mittee can be appointed to resume and conclude the inquiry which the Navy began, but is not now in a fair position to continue.

I have also urged the chairmen of several congressional committees which have indicated interest in conducting investigatory hearings into the *Pueblo* incident to consolidate their investigatory efforts by supporting a resolution to appoint a joint congressional committee to carry on the *Pueblo* inquiry. My letters to Secretary of Defense Laird, Secretary of the Navy Chafee, and the chairman of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, and the House Armed Services Committee, follow:

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense.

HON. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Secretary of the Navy.

GENTLEMEN: I respectfully urge that you cancel the current Naval inquiry into the capture of the USS *Pueblo* by North Korea. It has become clear, as the Navy inquiry has progressed, that the Navy is in the position of adjudicating what may turn out to be a case against itself. The behavior—the action or inaction—of the Navy Command now seem to be as much at issue as the behavior of Commander Bucher and his crew. Since this is so, to permit the Navy to continue this investigation at this time would be improper.

The inquiry now being conducted in California by the Navy should be cancelled, to be resumed and completed by a more impartial and representative body. The men of the *Pueblo* should not have to endure more than one full-scale investigation.

Several Congressional Committees have indicated an interest in convening *Pueblo* investigatory hearings after the Navy inquiry is over. I am calling on the Chairmen of these committees to consolidate their efforts, and to support a resolution calling for formation of a joint Congressional investigatory committee to conduct the inquiry hastily and, I believe, ill-advisedly begun by the Navy.

Cordially yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

HON. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, House Committee on Armed Services.

GENTLEMEN: The men of the *Pueblo* should not have to endure more than one full-scale inquiry. Such an inquiry is already being conducted by the Navy, but it is now clear that the behavior of high Navy officials and the very structure of the Navy Command are at issue. This puts the Navy in the position of passing judgment on the facts of a case in which it is itself deeply implicated. For these reasons, I have today called upon Secretary of Defense Laird to terminate immediately the Naval inquiry currently in progress.

Your Committee, among others, has expressed interest in conducting investigatory hearings on the *Pueblo* incident. I wish to enlist your support for the consolidation of Congressional investigatory efforts by the formation of a single, joint Congressional investigatory committee to resume and complete the inquiry begun by the Navy. I will introduce a resolution to provide for the selection of such a joint committee when the House reconvenes on February 17, and I hope that my resolution—or a similar one—will have your support.

Cordially yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

PRIORITIES FOR PROGRESS OF CHICAGO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday more than 2,000 leaders of industry, government, science, education, and commerce attended the 65th annual meeting of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry at which was unveiled an imposing program of priorities for progress for Chicago.

The president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Mr. M. P. Venema, outlined the progress made by Chicago to date and outlined a breathtaking program of priorities destined to make Chicago the most imposing and impressive metropolis in the entire world.

Mayor Richard J. Daley of the city of Chicago acknowledged the huge opportunities that lie ahead for Chicago in the next decade and pledged his effort toward those goals.

I am today placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire statement of Mr. Venema; Mayor Daley; George W. Dunne, president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, and Mr. George L. Dement, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority.

I think it is important for the Nation to see the impressive progress which has been made in Chicago and equally important for our friends throughout the country and the world to see what exciting plans lie ahead in the continued growth of metropolitan Chicago.

The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry is to be congratulated for the leadership it has provided in working with all levels of government toward a better Chicago.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention particularly to the acknowledgment Mayor Daley gave to the Federal programs and assistance which have made a great deal of the progress so meaningful.

Mayor Daley and all of those attending the meeting yesterday joined Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie in expressing a united dedication to the fact that government at all levels and industry working together can solve the great crises of America's urban areas.

I am also including the list of the leaders of Chicago who have worked so closely together toward the common growth of our city.

This is the kind of team that is determined to make Chicago the greatest industrial complex in the entire world.

The impressive speeches follow:

THE 65TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY—PRIORITIES FOR PROGRESS—WHO WILL PAY?

SPEAKERS TABLE

W. Stanhaus, Chairman and President, Spector Freight System, Inc.; New Director, CACI.

Sidney Epstein, President, A. Epstein and Sons, Inc.; New Director, CACI.

Otto L. Preisler, President, Home Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago; New Director, CACI.

Stanley E. G. Hillman, Senior Vice President—Planning and Administration, Illinois Central Industries; New Director, CACI.

Errett Van Nice, Senior Vice President, Harris Trust & Savings Bank; New Director, CACI.

Daniel C. Searle, President, G. D. Searle & Co.; New Director, CACI.

Edward Thiele, President, Leo Burnett Co., Inc.; New Director, CACI.

Harvey G. Foster, Vice President, American Airlines, Inc.; New Director, CACI.

James B. Conlisk, Jr., Superintendent of Police, Chicago Police Department.

R. L. Collins, Plant Manager, Automotive Assembly Division, Ford Motor Company, New Director, CACI.

Brigadier General Robert M. Tarbox, Division Engineer in Charge of North Central Division of the U.S. Army Engineers.

Lester Crown, Executive Vice President, Henry Crown & Co.; New Director, CACI.

George S. Harris, President, Chicago Metropolitan Mutual Assurance Company; New General Secretary, CACI.

Donald Erickson, Partner in Charge, Chicago Office, Arthur Andersen & Co.; New Director, CACI.

Honorable Eugen C. Betz, Dean of the Consular Corps, and Consul General of Germany in Chicago.

Nelson C. White, President, International Minerals & Chemical Corp.; Vice President for World Trade, CACI.

William W. Tongue, Professor of Economics and Finance, University of Illinois; Vice President for Research and Statistics, CACI.

George W. Dunne, President, Cook County Board of Commissioners.

Rudolph E. Palluck, Vice President, The First National Bank of Chicago; New General Treasurer, CACI.

Dr. James F. Redmond, Superintendent, Chicago Public School System.

Robert M. Dreys, Executive Vice President, Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co.; Vice President for Urban Development, CACI.

Vinton W. Bacon, General Superintendent, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Donald O'Toole, Chairman and President, Pullman Banking Group; Vice President for Industrial Development, CACI.

George Dement, Chairman, Chicago Transit Authority.

Thomas H. Coulter, Chief Executive Officer, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

George Jones, Vice President, Joe Louis Milk Co., Inc.; New Director, CACI.

Vernon Herndon, Senior Vice President, Hilton Hotels Corporation; New Director, CACI.

Robert Lemon, Vice President, National Broadcasting Company, and General Manager, WMAQ-TV; New Director, CACI.

David L. Duensing, President, Armour-Dial, Inc., and Executive Vice President, Armour & Co.; New Director, CACI.

Lester B. Knight, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Lester B. Knight & Associates, Inc.; New Director, CACI.

John D. Gray, President, Hart Schaffner & Marx; New Director, CACI.

John Sheldon, President, Chas. A. Stevens & Co.; New Director, CACI.

Edwin L. Morris, Executive Vice President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton; New Vice President for Management Training & Communications, CACI.

Armin F. Fick, Vice President-Manufacturing, Western Electric Company, Inc.; New Vice President for Health & Welfare, CACI.

Major General E. C. R. Lasher, United States Army (Retired), President and Chief Executive Officer, North American Car Corporation; New Vice President for Transportation, CACI.

T. C. Kammholz, Partner, Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz; Vice President for Governmental Affairs, CACI.

William A. Lee, President, Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union Council.

L. W. Moore, President, American Oil Company; New Vice President for Merit Employment, Manpower & Training, CACI.

John E. Egan, President, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Rear Admiral Henry A. Renken, Commandant, Ninth Naval District, United States Navy, Great Lakes.

Charles W. Folds, Vice President, Marshall Field & Company; New Vice President for Commercial Development, CACI.

Frank Whiston, President, Chicago Board of Education.

James E. Rutherford, Business Consultant; Past President, CACI—1961.

Honorable Paul Powell, Secretary of State, State of Illinois.

Thomas B. Freeman, Retired; Past President, CACI—1945-46.

Honorable W. Russell Arrington, President Pro Tem, Illinois State Senate.

The Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor, City of Chicago.

Lieutenant General Vernon P. Mock, Commanding General, Fifth United States Army, Fort Sheridan.

The Honorable Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor, State of Illinois.

M. P. Venema, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Universal Oil Products Co.; President, CACI.

ASSOCIATION LEADERSHIP FOR 1969

Officers

Chief Executive Officer: Thomas H. Coulter, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

President: M. P. Venema, Chairman and C.E.O., Universal Oil Products Co.

V. P. Con'l Development: Charles W. Folds, Vice President, Marshall Field & Company.

V. P. Government Affairs: T. C. Kammholz, Partner, Vedder, Price, Kaufman, and Kammholz.

V. P. Health & Welfare: Armin F. Fick, V.P. Manufacturing, Western Electric Co., Inc.

V. P. Indus. Development: Donald O'Toole, Chairman and President, Pullman Banking Group.

V. P. Management Training and Communications:

Edwin L. Morris, Exec. Vice President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton.

V. P. Merit Employment, Manpower & Training: L. W. Moore, President, American Oil Co.

V. P. Public Relations and Promotion: Edward S. Donnell, President, Montgomery Ward & Co.

V. P. Res. & Statistics: William W. Tongue, Prof. of Economics and Finance, University of Illinois.

V. P. Revenue & Membership: Donald M. Graham, Chairman, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co.

V. P. Transportation: Maj. Gen. E. C. R. Lasher, United States Army (Ret.), President and C.E.O. North American Car Corp.

V. P. Urban Development: Robert M. Dreys, Exec. V.P., Peoples Gas, Light & Coke Co.

V. P. Visitors Bureau: Clinton E. Frank, Chairman Exec. Committee, Clinton E. Frank, Inc.

V. P. World Trade: Nelson C. White, President, International Minerals and Chemical Corporation.

General Secretary: George S. Harris, President, Chicago Metropolitan Mutual Assurance Co.

General Treasurer: Rudolph E. Palluck, Vice President, The First National Bank of Chicago.

Directors

Russell Baker, Senior Partner, Baker & McKenzie.

Stuart S. Ball, Partner, Sidley & Austin.

Gregson Barker, President, Uarco, Inc.

John A. Barr, Dean, Grad. School of Business, Northwestern Univ.

Harry G. Beckner, President, Jewel Food Stores.

C. M. Blumenschein, Sr. V.P. Finance, Container Corp. of America, V.P. and Controller, Marcor, Inc.

Boyd B. Brownell, Vice President, General Motors Corp. and General Manager, Electro Motive Div.

A. C. Buehler, Chairman, Victor Comptometer Corp.

G. L. Clements, Chairman of the Board, Jewel Companies, Inc.

R. L. Collins, Plant Manager, Automotive Assembly Div., Ford Motor Company.

James W. Coultrap, Chairman, Miehle-Goss-Dexter, Inc.

Lester Crown, Exec. V.P., Henry Crown & Co.

Milton F. Darr, Jr., Chairman & C. E. O., LaSalle National Bank.

Matthew L. Devine, Director, The Bunker-Ramo Corp.

G. H. Dovenmuehle, Chairman, Dovenmuehle, Inc.

James C. Downs, Jr., Chairman, Real Estate Research Corp.

David L. Duensing, President, Armour-Dial, Inc.

E. S. Enlund, President, First Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Sidney Epstein, President, A. Epstein and Sons, Inc.

Donald Erickson, Partner in Charge, Chicago Office, Arthur Andersen & Co.

Harvey G. Foster, Vice President, American Airlines, Inc.

C. J. Gauthier, Exec. Vice President, Northern Illinois Gas Co.

John D. Gray, President, Hart Schaffner & Marx.

Robert J. Gressens, President, Automatic Electric Co.

Wm. E. Hartmann, General Partner, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill.

Vernon Herndon, Senior Vice President, Hilton Hotels Corporation.

Stanley Hillman, Sr. V.P.—Planning and Administration, Illinois Central Railroad.

James D. Hinchliff, Sr. Vice President, The Northern Trust Co.

William Howlett, Chairman & C.E.O., Consolidated Foods Corp.

R. S. Ingersoll, Chairman, Borg-Warner Corporation.

H. P. Isham, Jr., President, Clearing Industrial District, Inc.

Frederick G. Jaicks, President, Inland Steel Company.

John H. Johnson, President & Editor, Johnson Publishing Co., Inc.

George Jones, Vice President, Joe Louis Milk Co., Inc.

William G. Karnes, President and C.E.O., Beatrice Foods Co.

George E. Keck, President, United Air Lines, Inc.

Alan R. Kidd, Sr. Vice-President-Retired, The Northern Trust Co.

Lester B. Knight, Chairman and C.E.O., Lester B. Knight & Associates, Inc.

Robert Lemon, V.P., NBC, Gen. Mgr., WMAQ-TV.

Frank E. Lindquist, Executive Vice President, National Tea Company.

Alvin Long, Sr. Vice President, Chicago Title & Trust Co.

Paul M. Lund, Vice President-Public Relations, Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

E. A. Manlove, Exec. Vice President, Peoples Gas, Light & Coke Co.

C. Virgil Martin, President, Carson Pirie Scott & Co.

F. A. Mechling, Exec. V. P. & Treasurer, A. L. Mechling Barge Lines, Inc.

W. Eric Miller, Partner, Lord, Bissell and Brook.

R. E. Moore, V.P., Int'l. Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

Albert A. Morey, Chairman, Marsh & McLennan, Inc.

Peter G. Peterson, Chairman and C.E.O., Bell & Howell Co.

James M. Phelan, President, A. T. Kearney & Co., Inc.

Otto L. Preisler, President, Home Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chgo.

W. J. Quinn, President & Director, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R.R.

Daniel C. Searle, President, G. D. Searle & Co.

John Sheldon, President, Chas. A. Stevens & Co.

W. Stanhaus, Chairman & President, Spector Freight System, Inc.

E. A. Stuebner, President, Kidder, Peabody & Co., Inc.

Allen P. Stults, President, American National Bank & Trust Co.

O. Everett Swain, President, Kraft Foods, Div. of Nat'l Dairy Products Corp.

Edward Thiele, President, Leo Burnett Co., Inc.

T. M. Thompson, Chairman, General American Transportation Corp.

Peter Van Cleave, Vice President, James S. Kemper Agency, Inc.

Errett Van Nice, Senior Vice President, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

Omer G. Voss, Executive Vice President, International Harvester Co.

C. R. Walgreen, Jr., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Walgreen Company.

H. F. Werhane, President, Culligan, Inc.

Howard L. Willett, President, The Willett Company.

Christopher W. Wilson, Executive Vice Pres. First Nat'l Bank of Chicago.

Walker Winter, Partner, Ross, Hardies, O'Keefe, Babcock McDugald & Parsons.

Senior council

1967-1966 President: Thomas G. Ayers, President, Commonwealth Edison Co.

1967 General Secretary: Arthur Rubloff, Chairman, Arthur Rubloff & Co.

1965-1964 President: H. V. Prochnow, President-Retired, The First National Bank of Chicago.

1965-63 Director: Simeon E. Leland, Dean, College of Lib. Arts, Retired, Northwestern University.

1964-1959 Director: Bert R. Prall, Chairman, The Chicago-Tokyo Bank.

1963-1962 President: E. C. Logel, Vice President, United States Steel Corp.

1963-1961 Director: Harold A. Smith, Partner, Winston, Strawn, Smith & Patterson.

1962-1957 Director: Frank F. Kolbe, Director, Clark Equipment Co.

1961 President: J. E. Rutherford, Business Consultant.

1960-1959 President: P. W. Goodrich, Chairman of the Board & President, Chicago Title & Trust Company.

1958-1957 President: Joseph L. Block, Chairman, Exec. Committee, Inland Steel Company.

1956-1955 President: John W. Evers, Chairman, Metropolitan Fair & Exposition Authority.

1950-1949 President: Harvey G. Ellerd, Former V. P.-Retired, Armour & Company.

1946-1945 President: T. B. Freeman, Former, President, Butler Brothers.

SPEECH OF M. P. VENEMA, PRESIDENT, CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, ANNUAL MEETING, 1969

Good Afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. Today's meeting addresses itself to the theme, "Priorities for Progress—Who Will Pay?" Several thousand Association members recently prepared a list of "Priorities for Progress" the results of which I will reveal today. They will provide the objectives for our program of work this year. First, let us review the accomplishments and strengths of Metropolitan Chicago, the area served primarily by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Chicago continued to break records in 1968. Gross Metropolitan Product for the

Area climbed 9% to \$45.2 billions and increased its share of the Gross National Product to 5.28%.

This was the fifth consecutive year our economic growth ran ahead of the nation. Wages and Salaries jumped a record \$1.9 billions. Corporate profits were up \$1 billion. Depreciation Allowances increased \$800 millions. Excluding the United States there are only nine nations in the world which produced more than Metropolitan Chicago.

Much of our wealth is generated from the record Commercial and Industrial Construction in the Area. Commercial building in the eight county Metropolitan Area set a new record of \$494 millions in 1968.

Industrial Construction amounted to \$720 millions, chiefly for land and buildings, just \$60 millions short of 1967's all time record. The number of commercial projects rose from 598 in 1960 to 1121 this past year. Industrial projects climbed from 367 to 646 in the same period.

Some of these new monuments to progress are; the 50 story IBM building; the 30 story structure at 111 E. Wacker; the 32 story Time and Life building; the 27 story building at 625 N. Michigan; the 33 story building at 150 S. Wacker; the 30 story Gateway No. 3 building over the union station; the 30 story building at 200 W. Jackson; the projected \$100 million Standard Oil building; the 26 story Hartford building; the 27 story telephone building; and the DuSable Place complex on West Madison Street.

The Chicago Area leads the nation in both new construction and plant equipment spending by manufacturers. Over a period 1954-1966, plant and equipment spending totalled \$9.8 billions in Metropolitan Chicago compared to \$8.3 billions in New York, \$5.3 billions in Detroit, \$4.9 billions in Los Angeles, and \$4.2 billions in Philadelphia.

This record capital investment has had a great impact upon the payrolls in our area. Total employment in the eight county area has increased 450,000 during the last five years, and 40,000 during 1968. Association surveys show that job openings in the area have exceeded unemployment figures for the last four years.

Our labor force is growing at a faster rate than our population. Last year a record 47.4% of our total population worked compared to 43.2% in 1963. An amazing feature of our growth is the increasing number of women in the labor force. During 1968, 40,000 additional women—God bless them—entered our labor force. I don't know what we would have done without them. 48.1% of all our women over the age of 14 now have a job, compared to 40% throughout the country. Chicago has the highest percentage of population employed of any major area.

As a consequence the per capita personal income of our citizens soared to an estimated \$4,410 in 1968 compared to \$3,090 in 1963—an increase of \$1,320.

The comparable increase in national per capita personal income only \$920 or \$380 less per person. Family income in the Chicago area averaged \$14,150 last year, another record. Right now, Metropolitan Chicago must be the most prosperous major area in the world.

As a result of this amazing economic growth, what are our major strengths at this time? Our prowess as a metal working manufacturer is proverbial. Chicago industries produce more than \$5.6 billions of primary metals annually to lead the nation and the world. Our Fabricated Metal industries lead with shipments of more than \$2.8 billions. Non-electrical machinery is tops with \$3.0 billions. Chicago passed New York as the biggest producer of Electrical Machinery with \$4.1 billions in 1968.

Chicago is the biggest producer of manufactured exports, passing up New York in 1966 with a total volume of almost \$800 millions.

Chicago registered 167,000 new automobiles in 1968, more than any other metropolitan area. It is the biggest market for automobiles in the country. Our area buys more clothing and footwear per household than any other. Our mall order houses enjoy six times the sales volume of any other area.

Chicago is pre-eminent in the field of Transportation. We ship twice as many tons by truck and rail as does our nearest competitor. O'Hare airport is the busiest in the world. Our trucking industry has shown the biggest increase in employment in the country. It grew by 6,300 employees while New York's trucking industry reduced employment. Chicago's transportation companies boast greater assets than those of any other metropolises.

While we are the most prosperous community in the nation, we do have serious problems affecting our future growth and well being. Several thousand members of the Association of Commerce and Industry—the same captains of industry who are responsible for the strengths just cited—have recently indicated their fifteen priorities for progress. Here they are:

First is respect for Law and Order, Control of Civil Disorders and Crime Prevention. Happily, our crime rate per 100,000 population was sixteenth among 23 major metropolitan areas a year ago. We believe we are making real progress in this area thanks to our fine police force. Next is Air and Water pollution control. Then comes Mass Transportation and Commuter services which hold the key to area wide employment opportunities.

A critical priority is major airport expansion. This association has advocated a third major airport, preferably in the lake and urges immediate action on airport expansion. We compliment Mayor Daley for his vision on this vital project and offer our help to accelerate completion of feasibility studies. Next is modernization and consolidation of state and local governments which are numerous in this area. Manpower Development and Training for the most efficient use of our manpower resources has high priority. Most timely now is Economics and Priorities in State and Local governments. The theme of this meeting underlies the importance of this choice. Next is state and local revenue problems, the major theme of our meeting—who will pay? Of growing concern is labor legislation and strikes by public employees.

A continuing problem is Federal Taxation and Spending which has such a profound effect upon State and Local Spending and Taxation. Public Education including financing, administration, facilities and vocational training will be reported here today. Another priority, Housing and Neighborhood redevelopment to improve living and working in the city are essential if our economy is to continue to prosper. Participation of government in business is of growing concern as our sharing of views today exemplifies. Transportation to and from our airports is strangling our efficiency and must be cured by new highway construction and improvements in mass transportation.

These fifteen priorities for Progress were selected by Association members out of thirty possible choices. Their importance relates to the continued economic growth of the Area. Without such growth, new public expenditures for welfare, police and fire protection, education, hospitals, transportation and pollution control cannot justify nor conceive financial support through taxation.

Can we afford these fifteen priorities? A look into the future assures us that the Area can have the economic base to pay for them.

Here is a ten year forecast of economic growth and change for Metropolitan Chicago. Gross Metropolitan Product should double by 1978 and achieve a level of \$90 billions. Personal Income can attain a level of \$70 billions.

The area's population should be 8.6 million in 1978. Per capita personal income will soar to \$8,200—more than double the average for 1967.

Effective Disposable Income—or cash income after taxes—will exceed \$18,000 per household in Chicago by 1978. Taxes will increase in terms of real money taken out of cash income. An average family head in 1978 will pay more than a day's work each week to federal income taxes, half a day's work to federal social insurance and a fourth of a day's work to state and local income taxes.

Prices will increase 30 to 40%. Most of the increase will be due to services. Prices of Housing may level off as a result of massive introduction of pre-fabricated housing.

Most consumers in 1978 will make purchases with credit cards and pay debts with debit notifications to their banks rather than the traditional personal checking account.

All citizens will have a *personal* registration number to be used for auto license, social security, military service, credit card, income tax, etc. A census could be taken every year in response to computerization of registration number records. *Post office* mail will carry a code number for every address in the U.S., and will be handled by a computer. *Phonovision* will make its appearances in businesses and high income homes.

53% of the resident population will have jobs and 60% of all resident females over 14 years of age will be working. *Nurseries* will be common in places of employment and day nurseries will become an important service industry.

Non-white employment which constituted only 3% of the suburban work force last year will comprise 10% of suburban payrolls in 1978 or 200,000 workers. There will be a complete metropolitan high speed mass transit rail system by 1978 encompassing both public and private rights of way, and allowing any resident to work anywhere in the area.

Pipelines will be greatly expanded in order to slurry a wide variety of bulky products, waste and even packaged goods in and out of the area.

In 1978 *Chicago* will boast a third major airport, hopefully in Lake Michigan. There will be a new *Sports Arena* complex to accommodate 100,000 fans.

Chicago will be the most desirable headquarters city in the nation and the leading international gateway for America.

Expressways in the area will be partially covered by industrial plants, commercial buildings, magnet schools and park and ride facilities. These will help the city make up for real estate taxes and jobs lost when the expressways were built.

Air pollution will be measurably less in 1978 because of atomic power plants, auto exhaust devices, electric autos and new technologies developed to control pollutants. Water pollution will still be a serious problem although most industries will have effected controls of their liquid effluents. Human and agricultural waste will still be a major problem. Despite all this, the abundance of edible game fish in Lake Michigan will set new records.

Vocational schools for students and adults will be more abundant in 1978. Federal academies for military and other protective services including civilian police may be making their appearance. Federal medical and nursing schools will be in process of establishment, primarily to afford the military and public health services with staffing. Medicare may be extended to include all public aid and unemployment compensation recipients. Public aid will probably be handled as an adjunct to unemployment compensation. Taxes for unemployment compensation will increase many fold as a result.

Four day weeks will be common. Moon-lighting will extend to daylight hours. Nervous tensions will have increased.

40% of the nation's Psychiatrists will continue to practice in New York City. We predict no change in this.

By now you may think we have made a twenty year projection and are calling it a ten year forecast. We don't think so. The rate of progress and the rate of change has quickened in this country and especially in the Chicago area. The drive of our citizens assures that the rate of progress will be accelerated.

One year ago today, this Association announced its support of a flat rate income tax for Illinois not to exceed 3% as a means of meeting our financial needs. Today, we are faced with a financial crisis at the State and Local levels of government which will require further reliance on our outmoded and inequitable revenue system, if new funds are to be made available.

Had we been successful in securing the adoption of a flat rate income tax in the last general assembly we would now know of its constitutionality and would have a more equitable means of obtaining money to meet our present problems. This state cannot long continue its reliance on our present tax revenues—property taxes for the local governments and sales taxes for the State. A broad based equitable tax system must be established. Therefore, until our outmoded revenue article can be revised, we must secure passage of a flat rate income tax and determine its constitutionality.

The needs of our times are great. We need more. We demand more. We will pay more. But how are we going to do it? We are joined at this meeting with heads of government. Their job is to serve the people. Business too, serves the people but has to make a profit.

If there is no profit, there is no revenue for taxes and there is nothing left for government. Business needs government and government needs those who pay for government.

The state government has a vital role in helping the Metropolitan Area solve its problems, almost all of which relate to revenue. Unless new sources of revenue are found, our State faces a deficit of over one billion dollars in the next two years. Local governments are turning to the state for relief from their financial problems as demands for government services increase. Economy in government can help cut spending but economies deal with millions and demands for new spending deal in hundreds of millions.

The property tax load has reached such a high point that it cannot be considered as a major source for the additional funds needed.

If the needed revenues do not come from the local area, they must come from the state or federal government. State and local governments have historically been the principal source of money for schools, mental hospitals and welfare programs of every type.

Commerce and industry recognize that payment must be made for progress—but we must do so under a system that is fair and equitable. The General Assembly can determine what source of income to use—but, it must do so within the framework of the present revenue article which creates vast inequities and encourages tax evasion.

There are two main ways of meeting our revenue problems. First, development of an equitable tax system through an appropriate flat rate income tax. Second, development of new sources of revenue through accelerated economic growth. They must go together. An equitable tax system stimulates growth, which in turn provides the necessary added revenue to do the things discussed here today.

Metropolitan Chicago has the greatest concentration of industries of any comparable area. Why? Because of the economics of an outstanding geographical location, natural

resources, and a government that has provided a desirable climate for business.

We ask the state legislature to recognize the problems of Metropolitan Chicago—just as we recognize the problems of downstate Illinois. We do not seek favors. As businessmen we do seek opportunity to operate on a basis that is equitable in recognition of the fact that only through a prosperous state economy can we continue to progress.

You will now hear from five heads of government and agencies who are dealing with the problems of change, both social and economic, which reflect the things I have described before. They will tell us about these problems and how we can help solve and pay for them. The first speaker is Chicago's distinguished mayor, Richard J. Daley.

ADDRESS OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY

Mr. Venema, Governor Ogilvie, fellow public officials, distinguished guests, members and friends of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, all of us, every resident of Chicago and the metropolitan area, must share a genuine feeling of pride, in the economic and civic accomplishments and the potential growth of our city so well described by Mr. Venema.

I believe there would be agreement by most people concerning the fifteen priorities recommended by the members of this association. There probably would be differences of opinion as to the order of their rank, with the exception of the first priority cited. We must, we will, have a society based on order. It is only through an orderly society that all of us can enjoy the rights of free speech, free press, of petition and of assembly. It is only through an orderly society that we can correct injustices.

Of course, all of the priorities are important, some are critical. None of them can be attained quickly. Some of them are unending in the sense that human beings always strive for something better.

Some objectives we can attain in a measurable time. For example: Chicago will build a new subway. It will maintain its leadership in air transportation with a third airport. It will complete the physical aspects of the Crosstown Expressway.

Our priorities can be achieved only by the cooperation and involvement of the entire metropolitan area. There can be no real progress or solutions to housing, transportation, air and water pollution and unemployment without this direct involvement.

Underlying all these priorities is the urgency of rising expectations.

Just think of it—the average family income in the Chicago area was more than \$14,000 last year. We are probably the most prosperous area in the most prosperous nation in the world. It is natural that those who cannot share in this prosperity, even in a minimum way, are frustrated and angry. And those of us who are the beneficiaries of affluence cannot close our eyes to the needs of the less fortunate, for we live in an urban society that has become increasingly interdependent. Like the human body, injury or disease in one part affects the entire system. In a sense, this is our greatest priority, to meet the rising expectations of our citizens.

There is a national awareness of this urgent priority. It cuts through all political lines. All of us—regardless of our political beliefs and our special interests—have a responsibility to support President Nixon and Governor Ogilvie in their efforts to cope with these problems of great magnitude.

The growing national recognition of the needs of those who do not share in the general prosperity is evidenced in the support for the Poverty Program, Head Start, Manpower Training, health services and other projects.

We learned from these programs that there must be coordination—an overall policy and direction—if we are to realize maxi-

mum results in the shortest possible time. This experience resulted in passage of the Model Cities legislation by the Congress. Under this Act, \$38 million dollars has been reserved for Model Cities Programs in Chicago.

It must be thoroughly understood that all of these proposals are the result of community participation, and every program must be approved by the Model Area Planning Council, before it is presented to the City Council and the federal government for funding. Wherever possible the community will be used in carrying out these programs. I am pleased that we have with us this afternoon the four chairmen of the Model Cities Neighborhood Councils.

More is involved in the Model Cities Program than the \$38 million reserved by the federal government. Many programs are now underway with federal, state and city financing in the fields of employment, education, housing, and health. For example, the city already has received more than six million dollars for the establishment of a skill center, which is one of the programs included in Model Cities.

Many of the proposals call for extension of programs which have proved their merit in the city, and in the very communities in which Model Cities function. These communities are Lawndale on the West Side, Uptown on the North, the Grand Boulevard area and Woodlawn on the South Sides.

In these four communities will be concentrated a total effort by federal, state, county and city agencies and by private groups as well. When the first year's program is completed, it is estimated that \$38 million dollars will generate a total investment of \$100 million dollars from other federal agencies and private sources. This includes ongoing city programs upon which Model Cities will build.

Here is what the city is proposing to do in the first year of the Model Cities program.

Housing is high on your list of priorities. Chicago is making a breakthrough in housing with a \$2 million dollar program for construction of high quality prefabricated homes for low and moderate income families.

The Model Cities Program will invest a half million dollars in the development of a land bank—so land can be held for future use. Further investment will include a million dollars in programs to develop a technology for quick housing construction—\$400 thousand dollars for equity money available to not-for-profit developers—and \$300 thousand dollars for a neighborhood maintenance corporation operated by residents of the community.

Model Cities places education high on its priority list—and nine million dollars will be allocated to the development of community-oriented schools—open every day in the week, an additional six hours a day, 48 weeks a year. Hot breakfasts and lunches will be served to thousands of students who have difficulty learning simply because they come to school hungry. In-service training for teachers will be vastly expanded, and opportunity will be offered for parental participation.

Model Cities will expand existing city neighborhood health centers and six million dollars will go for expansion. In the first year a new health center will be constructed in the Grand Boulevard area.

Model Cities will train local residents to staff these health centers at a cost of \$200 thousand dollars during the first year. The program will allocate \$400 thousand dollars to help improve services at Cook County Hospital.

One million dollars will be spent initially to provide urgently needed child day care centers.

Five million dollars has been set aside for the Manpower Training Program in the four areas.

In the area of public safety, four hundred local residents will be employed by the police in their neighborhoods, to perform non-arrest functions aimed at improving police-community relations and crime prevention.

Model Cities will establish homes for young people who are in trouble with the law but not seriously enough to be institutionalized.

Model Cities proposes a massive program of community improvement, including stepped up refuse collection, increased street cleaning, bulky trash removal and street and parkway beautification. Six million dollars has been allocated for this purpose.

Economic development is essential in each of the Model Cities areas. It is proposed to establish a one and a half million dollar revolving fund to make equity capital available to local residents. An additional \$100 thousand dollars will be spent to expand consumer fraud enforcement.

These are some of the primary proposals in the Model Cities Program.

In addition to Model Cities almost \$39 million dollars has been appropriated by the federal government—matched by the city's share of \$18 million dollars from the 1966 Bond Funds for community improvement. The city now will be able to move forward quickly in programs of rehabilitation, conservation and renewal—both for residential and commercial development—in twenty-four neighborhoods located throughout the city.

These are ambitious, far-reaching programs. But they will not solve all our problems this year, or the next.

But we have commitments—commitments which are set out in your priorities—which must be met—met by performance.

It is not a question of who will pay, but how equitably the method of payment will be.

The cities of the nation will not be rebuilt and revitalized without the financial assistance of the federal government. The only reason Chicago is able to carry on the Model Cities program and the community improvement program is because it is receiving federal grants of \$80 million dollars. We also must realize that until peace is restored, and money now spent for defense is made available for the rebuilding of the cities, we will be unable to move as fast as we should.

I sincerely believe that Chicago and the metropolitan area are going to lead the nation in meeting the great challenge of the future.

We have tremendous economic wealth, great resources, know how, and the spirit of the people of Chicago. Behind all of our vast progress is the continued confidence in our city which has shown itself so dramatically in the last fifteen years.

The city has undertaken tremendous programs while maintaining the lowest per capita bonded debt of any city of 500 thousand population.

There is much talk of the establishment—whatever that is. But I suppose that there is no better representation of the establishment than the men and women in this room. And it is my belief that there is no establishment anywhere that is as liberal and progressive as in Chicago. With your help, and with the greatest resource Chicago has—its people—we will continually move toward the goal of a Model City.

SPEECH OF HON. GEORGE W. DUNNE, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, COOK COUNTY

It is a privilege to be here at this time with so many public officials and private citizens sincerely interested in the vital civic affairs of our community.

Historic circumstances far beyond our control and rapidly changing events in the political and governmental scene made a playing manager out of me, and believe me, the role of President of the County Board as well as Member of the County Board is a humbling yet extremely challenging one.

Every one of us here today is keenly aware of the confusions, perplexities and pressures that dominate our society. It is the task of the people through their duly elected representatives to bring solutions to these conditions in order that our representative democracy may ultimately effectuate a better life for all of our citizens.

The county government itself is a comparatively small tax-spending unit, yet its responsibilities to the people reach far and wide: the weak—the ill—the poor—the unfortunate—are our major demanding responsibilities.

The manner in which we respond to the need of the less fortunate is the highest indication of our civilized attitude and progress.

The County Board cannot do this alone. It will point the way—as government must—and you must help, as good citizens should.

So, what does that mean? How do we establish which needs are most demanding? How do we answer the theme of your meeting, "Priorities for Progress! Who Will Pay?"

Elementary, Doctor Watson; the people pay—through various means of tax revenue. Government can only spend in behalf of the people whose trust it holds the money that government receives through taxes paid by the people.

The people have a right to expect that government will be animated by a desire to serve—that it will be dedicated to fulfillment of obligations with the highest degree of integrity—it will be as economical as possible and yet bring about the things that people require in order to live as dignified human beings.

So, we on the County Board must look around us. What should have priority? The cry of human distress has always been the call for rescue. This is our America today, and it is reflected everywhere, and especially in the metropolitan areas.

We establish a priority at Cook County Hospital in order to meet the requirements of the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation and to answer the immediate human need.

The Cook County Hospital is the largest hospital in one single area in the world! We have twenty-one buildings within a 30-acre area. It is a 2500-bed hospital dedicated to healing and helping the less fortunate.

This past year 286,495 out-patient visits were recorded in the Fantus Clinic. In the Emergency Service every conceivable problem in medicine was presented. The Hospital provided in-patient care for 75,682 people. In all, the hospital service provided care for 362,177 patients!

As progress in the medical world is made we must make it in the specific area where we are charged with responsibility. Accordingly, we are planning improvements at the County Hospital for the benefit of our people, and we—the people—must pay for these things.

In the main building we propose to remove the skylights and air-condition the operating rooms and to construct a ramp to link the 8th floor of the main building with the 8th floor of the Children's Hospital which has at the present time four modern air-conditioned surgical rooms which could then be made available for surgery for adults as well.

We plan to air-condition the obstetrical wards on the 4th and 5th floors and we propose to construct an intensive care unit, a diagnostic X-ray unit, and we shall also remodel and air-condition the basement and the first floor in Bldg. A. In the Fantus Clinic—we intend to install X-ray units and laboratories in the basement, and in the Children's Hospital we intend to expand all X-ray facilities.

We shall fill in an open well on the second floor, using that space for the construction of offices and other ancillary services.

Provisions are also being made for additional parking for 480 cars.

The over-all cost of improving the Cook County Hospital to meet these pressing needs will be in the vicinity of six million dollars. Fortunately, however, the funds are available through bonds that have heretofore been authorized.

We establish priority at *Oak Forest Hospital*, which is a county-operated institution for the care, treatment and re-habilitation of those suffering from long term illnesses.

With more than 2400 beds, it is the largest geriatric hospital in the world, and it operates at 97% capacity. Bond issue funds heretofore allocated are available for essential improvements at *Oak Forest* as recommended by the State Licensing group, such as the relocation of the hospital operating rooms, the installation of new equipment and air-conditioning of the Administration Building and the Department of Physical Medicine—all at an estimated total cost of \$650,000.

We do have under consideration the construction of another building for patients with a capacity of approximately 250 beds—and a new laboratory building.

We have a priority for the construction of a new *Audy Home for Children* and a *Juvenile Court* facility. The County Board has requested the Public Building Commission to undertake the construction of these new facilities at a cost of approximately 23 million dollars, and it will be financed by the Public Building Commission which will take over the title. The county will then pay rent out of funds obtained through general taxation. It will be located adjacent to the present *Audy Home* structure on a greatly enlarged area.

The new home will provide accommodations for delinquent children. This is an important social step. There will no longer be any dependent children in this facility. Provisions for dependent, neglected and abused children awaiting disposition by the *Juvenile Court* are furnished by the 72-acre installation at *Herrick House* at *Bartlett, Illinois*.

In addition, the *Juvenile Court* facility will provide approximately ten court rooms plus accommodations for the State's Attorney's office, Public Defender, *Juvenile Probation* and all other essential court agencies for juvenile care.

Our plans for these institutions—*County Hospital—Oak Forest*—and the *Audy Home* represent part of the answer of this community to the need of the unfortunate.

A study of data processing is being made at a cost of approximately \$200,000. It is our hope that out of this will evolve a sizeable, appropriate and truly centralized data processing center.

In the *County Building*, work is in progress on the initial two million dollar contract for renovation. Four floors of the *County Building* are being renovated at the present time, and in the near future renovation will begin on one additional floor and probably several other floors later in the year.

The renovation of this building has as its objective the bringing of the structure into line with modern office standards, providing adequate lighting, air-conditioning, and expanded room for the various public offices in the building. The needs of the public are the ultimate determining factor in the size of our public offices.

There are many other facets to our county government—the *Forest Preserve District* is one of our most priceless public possessions for the welfare and happiness of our people.

The *Forest Preserve District* is not only concerned with the acquisition and preservation of the open spaces, but the protection and preservation of the flora, fauna and scenic beauties as well. The District is vitally concerned with the restoration and restocking of its holdings and providing the facilities and services for the recreation, education

and relaxation of the public. This requires careful planning and evaluation of the population needs not only now, but for the future as well.

It is a playground, a picnic place, a fishing pond, a golf course, a place for winter sports and nature studies of every kind. The *Forest Preserve District* operates the largest and most diversified outdoor education program in the world! This notable success has been due to a splendid cooperative arrangement between the *Forest Preserve District* and the county, city and parochial school systems. The cultural use of the *Forest Preserves* is an important investment.

The *Forest Preserve District* is planning and developing more water-oriented landscapes. The lakes presently available for public use are among the most heavily fished waters in the country. Funds will be provided in our 1969 levy to improve these and add new sites for fishing, boat launching and canoeing on the streams of our area.

Our present mobile society focuses attention upon our *Cook County Highway Department*.

From the beginning of time, man has always been concerned with how to get to some place and how to return as quickly and as safely as possible. We are still occupied with that problem. The county's Highway Department cooperates closely with other public works agencies including the *Federal Bureau of Public Roads*, the *Illinois Division of Highways*, and, of course, *Chicago's Department of Public Works*. It is responsible for the improvement and maintenance of some 600 miles of highways.

In the year ahead, the Department will schedule and let 40 million dollars in highway improvements. Much of this money will be funded through *Motor Vehicle Tax* funds, together with funds made available by the *U.S. Bureau of Public Roads*.

We hope to complete two major projects this year. One is the *North Lake Shore Drive* reconstruction and paving improvement between *Irving Park Blvd.* and *Carmen Avenue* at a cost of \$6,400,000. The other is a major section of the *West Branch of the Dan Ryan Expressway* from *127th Street* to *147th Street*—at a cost of ten million.

Presently, its top professional echelon is involved in the plans of the *Crosstown Expressway*, cooperating with the City's Department of Public Works and *Crosstown Associates*—the consulting design team.

Progress in our established priorities will be commensurate with the skill and diligence of our employees. In the competitive labor market of today we must compete with industry in order to attract qualified people.

The theme of your meeting—"Priorities for Progress: Who Will Pay?"—should reach deeply into the hearts and conscience of everyone. It is true that it also reaches into our pockets, but we must determine what our way of life is worth.

You are dated if you remember the old phrase that was used to pass the buck—"Let George do it." I stand before you and in all honesty say, *George cannot do it alone*—the *County Board* cannot do it alone—only we, the people, acting together in orderly fashion through our duly elected representatives on every level of government can find the answers to the troublesome questions of this day.

The needs of our times transcend political motivation. I am confident the new governor of our State has a true understanding of our needs. I know the federal government is more and more concerned with the immediacy of the problems involved in human welfare.

In the final analysis, every branch of government is but the servant of the people.

I could go on all day about the conditions which we are striving to ameliorate. The answers lie with people—with government—and with the question that you so wisely propounded as part of the theme of this meeting—"Who Will Pay?"

Our needs are endless; our funds are limited. *Tom Coulter*, your very able Chief Executive Officer, in his communication proposed that spending programs must either be curtailed or new sources of tax revenue be developed by local, State or federal governments. He has said it will, and all of us are truly on the painful twin horns of an unending dilemma:

Where do we stop helping?

Where do we get more money?

We, the people, must answer.

SPEECH OF GEORGE L. DEMENT, CHAIRMAN,
CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY

The year 1969 will be an exciting and challenging year for *Chicago Transit Authority*. Our new rapid transit extensions—to *Ashland Avenue* on the *Englewood* route, in the median of the *Kennedy* expressway—being constructed by the City of *Chicago*, will open this year.

The extension of the *Englewood* route will eliminate an antiquated and inadequate station at *Loomis Boulevard* and be replaced with a new station, off-street bus terminal and park 'n' ride facilities. Construction is well on the way.

The *Dan Ryan* route will be 9.8 miles long from this 95th street station to its connection with the existing elevated structure at *18th Street* and *Wabash Avenue*.

An exclusive bus bridge and covered waiting areas have been provided at the terminal for interchange of CTA and suburban bus riders.

Nine stations are being built along the route. These views show construction is progressing rapidly.

Some of the stations will have entrances from both sides of the street, and the 69th street station will have a bridge for exclusive use of buses.

The track being laid for the extensions is welded rails on concrete ties. This is the first application of this kind for a rapid transit system. The rails are laid in 858 foot lengths.

The *Kennedy* rapid transit project will serve the northwest sector of the city by extending the present *West-Northwest* route five miles beyond the existing *Logan Square* terminal. Six stations, including the terminal station at *Jefferson Park*, will be located along the route.

The CTA terminal station at *Jefferson Park* will have a direct connection to the adjoining *North Western Railway* station and a bus terminal for CTA and suburban buses.

One hundred and fifty new stainless steel, air-conditioned cars are being purchased for the lines.

The cost of these major improvements are being borne by the City of *Chicago* and the Federal government. The contracts are being let and supervised by city departments. Once completed, the facilities will be turned over to CTA for operation and it will be our responsibility to meet all operating expenses from CTA revenues.

The *Kennedy* extension will benefit about 70,000 passengers daily and the *Dan Ryan* route will be used by about 95,000 daily passengers. These will not all be new riders. Many of them will be diverted from other CTA bus and "L" routes. In time, we anticipate that new riders will be drawn to these services because of their convenience, speed and modern, attractive facilities.

Just this morning *Chicago Transit Board* approved ordinances revising some 40 bus routes to serve the new stations on the *Englewood*, *Kennedy* and *Dan Ryan* extensions.

Bus Lines in the vicinity of the stations are to be routed directly to the stations where a convenient transfer may be made to continue trips via rapid transit.

As an example, at *Jefferson Park* nine CTA bus lines will serve the station. Riders will save 30 minutes or more in traveling to and from their destinations.

In most cases buses will pull up at the station off-street area where there will be under-cover protection and then escalators will carry people to and from the train platform.

Some bus routes, such as serve the 95th street station, will cut in two to serve the station, thus minimizing bus delays which occur on long bus lines.

All this is being done for the convenience of riders to speed their trips to all parts of the city.

This year, CTA will receive delivery of 67 new buses to complete an order for 176 buses placed in 1968. This will bring the total of "New Look" buses purchased since 1961 to 1,377—almost one-half of our fleet of buses being replaced in eight years.

In my opening statement, I said that this will also be a challenging year for CTA. Yes, challenging because we are being forced to find additional sources of income. We have just increased our fares and we feel that we cannot raise them again.

We recently have adopted a deficit budget for 1969 of \$15 million. We will not have this \$15 million which is necessary by trust agreement for deposit into the depreciation reserve fund for keeping our facilities up-to-date.

What are some of the reasons for CTA's present financial condition? They are—wages and cost-of-living inflation in general—the same things that are affecting all businesses these days.

In the past twelve years the number of employees have been cut substantially and yet our total payroll costs have skyrocketed.

Our chart here shows that in 1968, 76.6c of our revenue dollar went for operating labor costs. This leaves very little for other cost of operation.

Since World War II, CTA riding has been on the downgrade. This is understandable because of the availability of automobiles after the war, the building of Chicago's excellent system of expressways and super-highways, and now the popularity of two-car and even three-car families. In 1960, there were 62 million automobiles in the United States and now we have 83 million automobiles. The chart shows the decline during the past twelve years.

However, even with our financial problems, we are going ahead with some of the plans that we have been studying for some time. One of these is a reduced fare for senior citizens that we intend to institute about April 1 on a trial basis for several months. If there is a loss of revenue, then some social agency should be responsible for that loss if the community feels a one-half fare for senior citizens is necessary.

We had originally set up a desired capital budget of \$31 million and this has been pared to \$15 million. You will note that even in our \$15 million deficit budget we did not include much needed new equipment, renovation of "L" stations with escalators and modern conveniences, or brand new facilities.

Chicago is fortunate to have an established and comprehensive mass transit system. It is one of the best in the country because we have both bus and rapid transit. We cannot let it deteriorate. The movement of people is as essential as police and fire protection, water and sanitation and other vital services. We know that it has to grow because of our expanding population and we also know that it has to be improved and modernized. And this cannot be done through the fare box alone. And we cannot keep increasing fares to meet our needs.

CTA is essential to our Central Business District, to outlying areas and our community in general. It is necessary for carrying people to work and school, for shoppers and for recreation. Our streets and expressways cannot possibly do the entire job.

We realize that we must do all we can to keep our present riders and attract new

riders because public transportation is essential and must flourish in our city and metropolitan area. We are going to enter into an extensive marketing campaign conducted by a citizens' Marketing Advisory Committee of experts from agencies and business. Their function will be to advise Chicago Transit Authority on ideas and suggestions for marketing CTA services. I am happy to announce that Mr. Carl Guldager, vice president of Sales Promotion, of Marshall Field and Company, will head the committee.

In addition, we are forming a citizens' Customer Relations Committee composed of agency, business and transportation experts who will advise on matters of improving service and ways of pleasing our riders. Mr. Warren Logelin, vice president, of AMSTED Industries, will be chairman of this committee. These committees will certainly be a great asset to us.

But from where will the money come to meet our financial needs. This year we are going to the state legislature with a program for financial assistance.

We will need your support.

TOWARD GREATER EQUALITY FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE DANUBE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, all those who believe in the equality of man, and for the right of every man to have equal representation in his government, must be heartened by recent trends toward federal forms of government which will hopefully bring greater liberalization for the people of the Danube.

Prof. Stephen Borsody, professor of history at Chatham College, in my congressional district, addressed himself to this matter in a very fine letter which appeared in the New York Times recently.

Under unanimous consent I include his remarks for the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

DANUBIAN NATION-STATES

To the Editor:

Czechoslovakia's federalization into two republics—one Czech, the other Slovak—is another step in the slow and painful process of adjusting the Danubian nation-state system to the demands of national equality. It is another move toward correcting the generic shortcomings of the new order that the so-called Wilsonian principle of national self-determination has created, over the ruins of the Habsburg empire, fifty years ago.

Czechoslovakia is the second country under Communist rule undergoing federalization in the Danube area. The first one was Yugoslavia. Right after World War II, Tito federalized it—on the Soviet Russian model, in the spirit of the so-called Marxist-Leninist nationality policy.

According to Alvin Shuster's report from Prague (The Times, Jan. 1), the Russians are now having misgivings about Czechoslovakia's federalization, lest "greater autonomy given to the regions here could reach Soviet national regions, such as the Ukraine, and arouse demands for similar changes."

The spread of Danubian federalism may strengthen the demands for more genuine federalism within the Soviet Union. But a more likely response to Czechoslovakia's federalization should be expected from within the Danube region, in particular in the form of Hungarian demands for greater autonomy.

It should be borne in mind that almost every fourth Hungarian in Central Europe is relegated to the status of minority and exposed to different degrees of national discrimination.

Hungary's boundaries, drawn by the "bourgeois imperialists" fifty years ago, had been confirmed by the "Grand Alliance" after World War II. As a result, Soviet Russia herself (as heiress to formerly Czech-held Ruthenia) gained mastery over 150,000 Hungarians. But they are not the worst treated minority of the Danube region. That sorry distinction belongs to the almost two million Hungarians of Transylvania—a multinational territory treated by the Rumanians as an integral part of their nation-state.

Yugoslavia's half-million Hungarians are benefiting from the federal structure of the country, but are still far from enjoying full equality. In Czechoslovakia, in the spirit of last year's liberalization, the nearly three-quarters of a million Hungarians have raised demands for autonomy.

It may be a long time before all the inequities among the Danubian nationalities are ironed out. It should be remembered, however, that it was the nation-state pattern of Western peacemaking fifty years ago that left this region in a state of bitter conflict.

Ever since Habsburg times, federation has been regarded as the only conceivable solution of the Danubian problem. The Danubian Communists are making some progress toward federalization. We should give credit to them for that—and, for a change, wish them well.

STEPHEN BORSODY,

Professor of History, Chatham College.
PITTSBURGH, January 3, 1969.

MAJ. GEN. WALTER B. PUTNAM,
U.S. AIR FORCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, more than 20 of my colleagues and I are members of the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, the official U.S. Air Force auxiliary. The Congressional Squadron is but one small part of a large organization that reaches into each of the 50 States and includes both senior and cadet programs.

Recently the Civil Air Patrol was honored to have Maj. Gen. Walter B. Putnam chosen as national commander, CAP. General Putnam is a veteran of more than 30 years of service and brings to his new assignment exciting qualifications as an Air Force officer.

Prior to his appointment as national commander of the Civil Air Patrol, General Putnam commanded the southern regions of the North American Air Defense Command and the Continental Air Defense Command.

General Putnam received his pilot wings in June 1938, and since then has flown a long list of aircraft. This includes several hundred missions during World War II.

I know that my colleagues who are members of the Civil Air Patrol are as pleased as I am at General Putnam's appointment and join me in looking forward to a constructive, cooperative association with the general.

AFTER THE MOON LANDING

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there is concern as to where we should go after we land on the moon. This concern involves not only the tremendous costs of our space program, but also the possible future practicable applications of what is largely pure research.

In this connection, I think it is appropriate to bring to the attention of the House an article by Ralph E. Lapp which appeared in the New York Times magazine on February 2, 1969, as follows:

"AFTER THE MOON LANDING," SAYS A SCIENTIST, "SEND COMPUTERS, NOT MEN, INTO DEEP SPACE"

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

When, if all goes well, the two American astronauts touch down on the lunar surface some time this summer or fall, it will be eight years since President Kennedy's decision to land men on the moon by the decade's end. People may debate the wisdom of the undertaking, but at this point such debate is academic. What we need to debate now is where we go in space after we land men on the moon.

President Kennedy left little room for effective debate about the moon exploration at the time he asked Congress on May 25, 1961, to appropriate money for it. Congress sensed that his motives were more political and personal than scientific—the moon project would tend to offset some of the embarrassment rising up from the Bay of Pigs fiasco. The Congressmen sympathized with the youthful President and promptly voted the funds for the project, dubbed Apollo.

Science and scientists played a very small part in the decision to set up Project Apollo. In fact, the decision came as a surprise to most of the scientific community, since Kennedy's own science adviser, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, had headed up a pre-inaugural study group which had found little value in manned space flight, and had said so.

Kennedy re-examined the moon goal in September, 1962, when he toured space facilities in the Gulf States. In a speech delivered on a sweltering Texas day, he asked: "Why choose this as our goal?" and answered himself with, in effect: Why climb the highest mountain? In addition, he cited the practical value of space travel, its meaning for national security, its importance of peace, and to this Texas hatful of reasons he added a final one. He noted that the space effort "has already created a great number of new companies, and tens of thousands of new jobs." (In fact, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (N.A.S.A.) proceeded to spend over \$4-billion on space facilities, concentrating on a golden arc of installations stretching from Florida to Texas.) Kennedy was always highly conscious of the political economics of the space program; in Houston a year later he referred to the success of a U.S. rocket in firing "the largest payroll" into space, then corrected this to "payload."

So there was really no single reason for going to the moon. The very fact that it became technically possible for man to scale the earth's gravity hill and reach the satellite was compelling in itself. And now the successful trajectory of Apollo 8 has convinced many that men aboard Apollo 11, conceivably Apollo 10, will descend from a lunar orbit in a lunar module, explore the lunar environs, take off in the module and rendezvous with its orbiting parent for a safe return to earth. But a bad landing, a fuel leak, a faulty valve or a control malfunction could strand the

astronauts in a hopeless situation. N.A.S.A. has no back-up capability for rescuing stranded Apollo men. The 1967 Apollo tragedy in which three astronauts lost their lives should remind us that our technology is far from perfect. However, assuming N.A.S.A.'s technology does not falter, we may anticipate that we will win the race to the moon this year.

Actually it's already rather late to decide where we go in space after the moon. If N.A.S.A.'s establishment were to be given ambitious new goals, it would have to reassemble much of the work force that made the Apollo flights possible. To fulfill the Kennedy goal of landing men on the moon before 1970 N.A.S.A. built up its force to more than 300,000 persons in 1965-66. Now the figure is below 200,000 and dropping sharply. Lacking follow-on projects after Apollo, N.A.S.A. had to violate an old Government tradition that Federal agencies never get smaller.

N.A.S.A. never thought of itself as self-liquidating. It pressed both the White House and the Congress for approval of post-Apollo projects. It ran into budgetary problems made acute by spending for Vietnam. But apart from that it was handicapped by the high costs of space probing, by the fact that remaining space goals are few and by the fact that it couldn't promise anything more spectacular than the moon landing itself. To amplify:

(1) By the time men land on the moon N.A.S.A. expenditures will run to a nine-year total of \$35-billion, the largest part of it for manned space flight.

(2) What can N.A.S.A. aim for in the foreseeable future after it lands men on the moon? It can plan for a lunar colony; it can make the big jump and try selling a manned trip to Mars, or it can put space stations in orbit about the earth.

(3) The climactic nature of the lunar landing puts N.A.S.A. in the position of Sir Edmund Hillary after conquering Mt. Everest. What can be done for a sequel? Space goals after men land on the moon will have to shift away from the spectacular and become more exclusively scientific in nature and manner. Many scientists have been waiting for this shift. Dr. James A. Van Allen told a Congressional committee last year that when Apollo succeeds, "We will be free for the first time in nearly a decade to develop a more rational, though doubtless less dramatic, program in space exploration." Van Allen, whose pygmy payload of instruments aboard a 1958 satellite signaled the discovery of the earth's radiation belts, added: "Such a program should, in my judgment, involve manned flight only insofar as it is justified by a competitive assessment of the costs and effectiveness of various possible means for accomplishing an agreed purpose." Van Allen's prescription adds up to a large dose of bureaucratic poison for N.A.S.A. empire builders who want to push its budget up to the nearly \$6-billion peak it once enjoyed. There is little doubt that when men and instruments are compared on a cost-effectiveness yardstick, instruments win out.

At the point that American astronauts had logged almost 2,000 man-hours in orbit, Dr. Philip Abelson, editor of Science, wrote: "The unmanned missions have had a cost-effectiveness for scientific achievement perhaps 100 times that for manned flights." Now that Apollo men have added 1,200 man-hours to the previous total, there is little reason to revise Abelson's estimate. In fact, as man has pushed out from earth orbit to the moon, the cost of space flight has rocketed upward with them.

Long before Apollo 8 orbited the moon, a number of automated spacecraft were lofted toward the moon. Some of these, Ranger 7 for instance, took photographs and relayed them to earth before crashing into the moon. Lunar orbiters weighing 850 pounds circled the moon and scanned its surface for likely landing sites. On June 2, 1966, Surveyor 1

was soft-landed on the lunar surface and dispatched 11,150 photos. In many cases these mooncraft were a hundred times lighter than the 47-ton Apollo craft.

Pound-for-pound, instruments have many advantages over men as rocket passengers. Through the use of solid-state circuitry and molecular electronics, an immense amount of sensing and data storage equipment can be crammed into a tiny payload. Space gadgets require only small amounts of power, can tolerate extremes of temperature and, being expendable, can be sent on one-way missions.

In contrast, man is a bulky oxygen-breathing, food-consuming spacefarer whose long habitation to the earth's biospheric rim imposes high demands on space capsule design. Man's mobility, his vision, dexterity and reasoning powers are valuable assets which could allow him to outpoint instruments in special instances, as for example, in sampling lunar rocks and substratum. Man's brain, a wondrously fashioned three-pound computer, possesses unique capabilities, but the care and feeding of man in space must focus on the 50-fold larger mass of his body.

Man's metabolic needs in space may be reckoned as about two tons of "consumables" per year. Prolonged journeys in space would require that members of the crew collect their urine, chemically process it and "recycle" it as fresh water. Thus, in the deep penetration of space, that is, to the planets, instruments are much better adapted than men. A 1968 report of a special study group assembled by the National Academy of Sciences made this clear. Set up to recommend space mission priorities for the 1968-1975 period, the task force pinpointed a 700-day mission to Mars and concluded: "We were unable to identify a need in planetary exploration, in the foreseeable future, for the unique abilities of man."

Few Washington observers feel that Nixon's Administration would look favorably on a manned Martian project. Such a program would commit the nation to \$5- to \$10-billion N.A.S.A. expenditures each year throughout the nineteen-seventies and well into the eighties. It would probably require the development of a nuclear-powered rocket with an earth-orbit weight of 1-2,000,000 pounds. The nuclear power would simply supply heat energy to a stream of liquid hydrogen, converting this into a superhot gas jet. This nuclear engine would supply brief bursts of power, the two-year flight itself would be accomplished by Newtonian coasting throughout almost 700 million miles of trajectory. (The space trail to Mars was broken by Mariner 4, a 575-pound device, which flew by the planet on July 14, 1965, and took 22 pictures of the cratered surface.)

After comparing astronauts and instruments, may we not then confine the missions of post-Apollo manned flights to earth orbits or to lunar exploration? Assuming that Apollo 11 lands men on the moon, what then? Asked this question last month, Nobel-Prizewinner Harold C. Urey replied: "I do not think it's a good idea to start something and not finish it. It is my expectation that the moon's surface will be a very monotonous place, but I think we ought to keep an open mind, see what's on the moon and then make a decision." Urey first became scientifically interested in the moon shortly after World War II. On a train ride to Wisconsin he read Ralph Baldwin's book about the lunar surface, and when he returned to the University of Chicago he began pasting up his own map of the moon. His interest has continued unabated for over two decades.

Urey is aware that N.A.S.A. has four more Saturn-Apollo vehicles in the works, so he's not proposing special construction of new moonships but rather finding some use for those in production. The chemist-physicist, who according to a colleague has "one of the finest full-spectrum minds of the 20th century," wants to know if the earth-moon sys-

tem has a common origin. "I want to know if rocks on the moon are 4.5 billion years old like those on earth." But Urey does not foresee any need to explore much of the moon's surface—"It's not like needing to know the earth's geography . . . we live here"—nor does he see any real need to establish colonies on the moon in the near future.

If a voyage to Mars is out and a sequence of four or five manned lunar flights is unprofitable, then about the only place left for man in space is the area close to earth. The rocket that hurled the 47-ton Apollo craft around the moon is capable of lofting a 140-ton payload into an earth orbit. N.A.S.A. (under its Apollo Applications Program—A.A.P.) has a plan to orbit an adaptation of the third stage of the Saturn V rocket—to be called the Saturn V Workshop. This third stage of Saturn V is a cylinder 21 feet 8 inches in diameter and 58 feet 5 inches in length. As used in an Apollo moon flight, it would contain almost 100,000 gallons of fuel and liquid oxygen. N.A.S.A. envisages this tank as a manned space station with scientific, civil and military applications.

Scientists, especially those deeply involved with basic research, are not very happy about N.A.S.A.'s promotion of the big space station. They would rather put their bets on unmanned space devices. N.A.S.A. is also getting opposition from the U.S. Air Force, which has its own Manned Orbiting Laboratory program (M.O.L.), to which it is committing over \$3-billion. The Air Force plans to fly its first M.O.L. in 1971, with a 2-man crew. This program, although not tied to any specific military application, will probably get a boost from Soviet emphasis on orbital operations—viz., the Soyuz 4-5 flights last month. M.O.L. will be injected into orbit by an Air Force Titan III-class rocket. Either the N.A.S.A. or the Air Force space station should be eliminated, but as matters now stand it appears that the Air Force will win out over N.A.S.A. when the elimination comes.

A number of scientists would support the use of Saturn V to send an automated spacecraft into orbit around Mars and then release a soft-lander to probe the nature of the planet's atmosphere and to sense for rudimentary life forms. The search for life elsewhere in our solar system has great scientific—and general—interest. However, its dramatic appeal does not approach that of man landing on the moon. This is really the nub of the difficulty the U.S. space agency faces as it seeks to chart its course in the post-Apollo period. Will the Congress fully support a science-based program after having been conditioned to technological extravaganzas? In view of the fact that Federal agencies will spend over \$16-billion for research and development this fiscal year, the question might seem a bit curious. But we need to look at how these funds are allocated by agency:

	Billion
Department of Defense	\$8.0
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	4.3
Atomic Energy Commission	1.7
Health, Education and Welfare	1.2
National Science Foundation	0.3
Interior, Commerce and other agencies	0.9
Total	\$16.4

Quite clearly, Federal R. & D. funds go primarily to satisfy defense-prestige goals. The great bulk of the money goes into development, testing and engineering rather than into fundamental research. The last accounts for roughly \$2-billion per year; N.A.S.A. funds in this category add up to \$645-million.

In the new budget just submitted to the Congress, R. & D. funds for Defense and Atomic Energy amount to \$10.3-billion. These funds are essentially "off limits" to budget cutters—leaving a sum of about \$6.4-billion for N.A.S.A. and all other R. & D. programs.

The total allocated to manned space flight is \$2.3-billion. It is in this sector that legislators can effect a sharp cutback in funding by curtailing the senseless four to five lunar flights that N.A.S.A. proposes to carry out in the next year. Even if one writes off \$25-billion as the cost of the first lunar landing, each follow-on flight to the moon's surface will add up to almost \$500-million. That's more money than Congress grudgingly bestows upon the National Science Foundation each year for the support of all basic research in the United States. Given a choice between \$500-million for all basic research and the same amount to bring back a second bagful of rocks from the moon, only a lunatic scientist would take more than a microsecond of decision-time.

As a self-appointed committee of one, I would urge that we alter the U.S. space program as follows:

First, make a firm decision to terminate the manned space program soon after the initial lunar landing. Using the Urey formula, one might authorize an additional Apollo flight or two to wind up the lunar exploration. I would reserve the remaining Apollo craft for future unmanned missions to the planets and I would mothball the single-purpose manned space flight facilities. At the same time, I would continue a N.A.S.A. program of long-range space development aimed at advanced modes of propulsion, compact energy sources and improved long-distance communication. High priority would be assigned to the development of nuclear energy both for propulsion and for on-board power.

Second, greatly expand N.A.S.A.'s present program for exploiting applications of space science and technology. The potential of satellites for communications is far from being realized and needs to be enhanced by the development of new techniques. It should not be too difficult to develop orbital systems for the control of intercontinental air traffic. Perhaps the greatest benefits from satellites are to be expected in the survey and evaluation of earth resources, such as underground water, mineral deposits and plant-forest cover.

Dr. L. M. Sharpe of the Washington-based Center for Resource Development believes that N.A.S.A. technology can be adapted to yank U.S. mine safety practices out of the 19th into the 20th century.

Third, establish a high priority within N.A.S.A. for fundamental research using unmanned space vehicles. This program should be 10 to 20 years in duration and should be aimed at finding out more about our planet, the sun and the rest of the solar system. The most expensive—and probably the most dramatic—of these projects would be the planetary probes designed to fly by, orbit or land on the nearby planets.

(The line-up of these planets only occasionally favors probing. For example, 1971 is an ideal year for earth-to-Mars flights; it will be 1986 before the two planets are in such favorable relative positions again. The 1977-78 period is a one-in-a-century opportunity to send a spacecraft on a grand tour of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune. A N.A.S.A. proposal to use Saturn V as a Voyager spacecraft booster designed to drop a 3-ton lander on Mars was rejected by Congress. A scaled-down experiment using an Air Force booster was approved for 1973. I would urge the diversion of two Saturn V rockets for planetary missions. One of these could answer the question: "Is there life on Mars?") The N.A.S.A. program I have outlined could be adequately funded in 1971 with a budget of under \$2-billion.

After our astronauts land this year on what Shakespeare called "the cold fruitless moon," we must make the switchover from a space project that provides spectacles to one that serves science. It will not be easy. Manned space flights sell themselves, whereas data-collecting flying computers do not. It will be N.A.S.A.'s job to keep the value

of scientific space findings before the public.

Our epic journey to the moon begins a new chapter in man's history. At the very least it offers us a chance to look back vicariously at our planet earth. We may see an uneven society that conquers gravity but is laid low by the flu. Our astronauts glide through space at 25,000 m.p.h. while our streets are choked with bumper-to-bumper traffic. We shoot ultra-clever space probes to sample the atmosphere of Mars and Venus while our cities are enveloped in polluted air. Spacemen nibble on expensively developed diets while Biafran children die from malnutrition.

Reorienting the U.S. space program won't remedy the planet's ills, but it can serve as a beginning. There is nothing wrong with man reaching for the stars; indeed, it is a noble stretch. But the Swiss philosopher-physician Paracelsus reminds us: "Man carries the stars within himself."

DANGER: MOONDUST

If the moon turns out to be as lifeless as it seems, then earthlings are in no danger when Apollo astronauts return from their lunar landing. But can we be sure that microscopic bits of plant life have not survived long journeys through space to lodge in the lunar dust? If so, could these plant bits germinate on earth when imported by the astronauts?

Some scientists are deeply troubled about the risk of extraterrestrial contamination of our planet. They fear Mars more than the moon, but their immediate worry is this year's lunar landing. One top-ranking biologist told me: "It's possible that a biologically active plant spore from the moon could destroy all plant life on earth." Extreme precautions are consequently being taken by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to keep potential lunar contaminants from reaching the earth's biosphere. The agency has built an \$8-million Lunar Receiving Laboratory (L.R.L.) as part of its Texas Manned Spaceflight Center. At the moment the L.R.L. is struggling with staffing problems and with technical procedures for identifying biohazards in lunar samples.

The plan for planetary protection against lunar spores is best described by the words "biological isolation." Once the returning Apollo capsule splashes down in the Pacific it will be treated as though it harbored bubonic plague—or worse. The astronauts and anyone who comes in contact with them or the capsule's contents will be cocooned in plastic all the way from the point of splashdown to Texas. And once inside the L.R.L., they will be quarantined for 21 days.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE NICK GALIFIANAKIS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED REGULATION OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ON THE ADVERTISING OF CIGARETTES

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on the recently proposed regulation of the Federal Communications Commission which would ban all cigarette advertising from the broadcast media.

To my mind, the most unfortunate, and most inherently dangerous aspect of this proposal is the assumption, by the FCC, of the answers to many questions which have as yet not otherwise been

adequately answered. And if all of the assumed answers of the Commission should be correct, and I submit that is not likely to be the case, this is not the sound and appropriate approach to solving a major health problem. The obvious inequities and implications of this proposal are too numerous and too patent to discuss them all now. But consider the most significant. I cannot understand the theory of equity and propriety which would sustain the illegality of advertising cigarettes on radio and television only, while leaving it unaffected in the other media. Furthermore, how can any advertising be made illegal while it is not illegal to manufacture, sell, possess, or use cigarettes? This latter assumption is especially difficult to understand when there has been no effort or suggestion that the Federal Government should regulate these aspects of the industry and society.

Consider also that if we permit the FCC's ban on the advertising of cigarettes to stand, would not that agency also be justified in prohibiting altogether the appearance or mention of smoking in the broadcast media? How far would this have to be extended before we would all call it what it in fact is, Federal censorship?

There can be no doubt that proposals such as this one of the FCC are aimed at elimination of the assumed relationship between cancer and cigarettes through elimination of the latter. Such drastic action may some day be necessary, though I think not. But should it be, who in this Congress, who in this Federal Government, is ready now to assume the problems stemming from the sudden and drastic decline of an industry which provides the sole livelihood for hundreds of thousands of people? Cancer is a most serious problem, but so is widespread economic disaster. We should not blindly permit the solution of one problem to generate another; if this should be necessary, then it should be done deliberately and with preparation. It is not appropriate for the Federal Government to be concerned about the physical health of the Nation to the exclusion of the economic health of a substantial portion of the population. These considerations do not even include or contemplate the problems which would be created by the loss of some \$8 billion per year in local, State, and Federal tobacco taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt whatever that the FCC is well-intentioned in its proposal and that it has the best interests of the Nation uppermost. But if cigarette smoking is as dangerous to health as the Commission implies, then surely there are more effective and more appropriate means of improving and protecting the health of the Nation than censorship. I am most reliably informed that if only a small fraction of the tax revenue derived from the sale of cigarettes were to be invested in cancer research, a cure, or means for preventing cancer, would be forthcoming in a very short time. If this is true, imagine the speed with which a breakthrough might be obtained if the Federal Government and the tobacco industry were to jointly sponsor an intensified effort to find a cure

for cancer, and to determine if the harmful effects of cigarette smoking, if any, could be eliminated. Certainly this would be an example in the finest tradition of government and industry cooperating to solve problems of mutual concern and of aiding one of the most significant humanitarian endeavors of our time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress, instead of letting the restrictions imposed on the regulatory agencies expire, thereby letting each to independently pursue its own pet plan for solving the Nation's problems, let us maintain and exercise our appropriate responsibility in this most important matter. Let us strongly urge, insist if need be, that the administration and the tobacco industry jointly underwrite immediately a crash program of cancer research to find the cures and the scientific means of preventing cancer, and let us do it without further delay or debate.

ADDRESS OF DR. M. MACEO NANCE, JR., AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U.S.S. "SEA DEVIL"

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this morning to bring to the attention of the House an unusual and distinguished address by one of the outstanding educators of the country, Dr. M. Maceo Nance, Jr., president of South Carolina State College at Orangeburg, S.C. The occasion for Dr. Nance's address was the commissioning of the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *Sea Devil*—SSN664—at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. in Newport News, Va., on January 30, 1969.

Dr. Nance's address exhibits an unusually thorough understanding of the role of sea power in our national defense. Dr. Nance points out that the "one fundamental prerequisite" of our naval power is to "provide a vast variety of capabilities suitable for dealing with a broad range of constituencies."

The doctor's address also contains a stirring tribute to the original submarine *Sea Devil* of World War II fame. Dr. Nance also has some thoughtful words for all of us about the education of our young people today. I want all Members of Congress to have an opportunity to read this fine address.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY DR. M. MACEO NANCE, JR. Commander Currier, Officers and Men of *Sea Devil II*, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are proud and pleased to be here today to participate in these commissioning ceremonies. First we are proud because we come from a State very active in our national defense—particularly from a naval point of view in that the naval operations of the Charleston Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina, and its Supply Depot have long played a key role in our national defense and Charleston itself a key role since the Revolutionary War. We are very proud of and pleased with our role as home base for the fleet of *Polaris* Submarines, and the support

which the Naval Supply Depot lends to our fleet all over the world. Second, please let me hasten to add that I am pleased to be here as a son of the Navy. As a veteran of the Navy, we welcome the opportunity to state before our mates and before the public that we cherish our association with what we consider to be the finest of our military organizations.

The commissioning of this submarine today adds another important link to our country's arsenal for freedom, for in all the debates which have taken place over the centuries there has never been disagreement, or at least disagreement that history and facts did not substantiate the Navy's long standing position that control of the seas was important to the defense of this nation and in fact to any nation. In order to maintain this position of strength for the present and long-term interest, this country must remain alert to the changing requirements. *Sea Devil* (SSN664) is evidence of this kind of alertness. The world changes fast these days, and the state of our naval arts perhaps one of the fastest. We should all be forever mindful for we can be quite sure that among the important factors in our naval defenses at the end of the next decade will be some which few people are seriously concerned with today. Yet our ability to safeguard the peace and the defense of our country is going to depend in large measure on our ability to keep pace now with the realities of defense as they change over the years. *Sea Devil II* and its counterparts represent the "now" in our national defense and I submit to you they are a very strong deterrent.

It was most gratifying and encouraging to read earlier this month that the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, of Charleston, South Carolina, had introduced legislation to start a program for a new U.S. Navy. His plan, as you certainly read, calls for authorization of approximately \$3.8 billion for construction of Navy ships in fiscal 1970. This is roughly three times as much as was allocated for 1969!

"Only with a new program can we begin to have a Navy with adequate modern equipment," Congressman Rivers stated.

"Since the Navy must have ships able to go into any part of any ocean on a moment's notice, the necessity of having nuclear propulsion in our Navy is greater than ever before," he emphasized.

I was pleased to see that three nuclear powered attack submarines similar to the *Sea Devil* are among the 19 new war ships proposed.

To those in our country who express deep concern for the amount of funds necessary for the defense of our country, it is the duty of all of us to keep them mindful of this: We must have the type of military power or such a preparedness so that the President of our great country can apply the measure and the kind of force appropriate to any provocation. This is vitally necessary in order that he may use force, when justified, with some confidence that history will judge his actions as serving the best interest of the nation and of the world, and not merely as a weapon for massive mutual destruction. Thus one fundamental prerequisite will be that our naval power must always provide a vast variety of capabilities suitable for dealing with a broad range of constituencies. Our naval power must not only serve to deter those who would misuse the seas and misjudge our motives, but also, if deterrents fail, serve to defend.

The bonus we get from such fine war vessels, like the one we are commissioning today, is that as they patrol the high seas which belong to all of us, we do not risk the political confrontations inherent in the stationing of ground troops and air units on foreign soil. A second bonus would be that they allow us to maintain our own state of readiness and balance without interference

by outsiders. This nuclear type submarine *Sea Devil* (SSN664) represents this kind of balance in our naval power. God forbid that we should ever have naval personnel without the modern equipment and technology to do the job which needs to be done.

As we speak of "technology" one's mind has to turn to the builders of this most modern of our attack submarines, for without the knowledge and ability of this very fine old shipbuilding and drydock company such would not have been possible.

For more than three quarters of a century Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company has had an outstanding reputation of building fine ships for the Navy. I understand that this yard has built about one third of our nuclear submarines. The performance of these submarines is truly a testimony to this very fine organization's workmanship.

The contract for *Sea Devil* (SSN664) was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilders on April 21, 1966 as part of a three-ship order amounting to \$83,850,000. *Sea Devil* is the last of the three. This, we think, is further evidence of the Navy's confidence in the workmanship and abilities of this yard, for it is through the cooperation and dedication of industry working with government which have made this nation strong and will keep it strong.

As one who is working with our youth, we would only hope and pray that we are doing our part to continue to supply companies such as this with the personnel and know-how needed to carry on this fine work.

In our opinion, one of the finest traditions that the Navy has is to continue to keep alive the names of its fighting ships for all of them have a glorious past which should forever be a part of our continuing naval history. As families and industry strive to preserve their names for posterity, so does the Navy strive to preserve the names of her ships. The U.S.S. *Sea Devil* (SSN664) is the second ship of the fleet to bear the name of a giant ray fish noted for tremendous swimming power and great endurance.

She is named in commemoration of Submarine *Sea Devil* (SS400). It has been said that the past is only important in that it points up the needs of the future. In this instance we think it appropriate to mention the past as it relates to *Sea Devil* (SS400), in that it was a glorious past and certainly will serve as a motivating force for the pride that we share today in *Sea Devil*, II.

Our first *Sea Devil* was built at the Portsmouth Navy Yard in Portsmouth, New Hampshire and her keel was laid November 1943. She was launched 28 February 1944 and commissioned in the Portsmouth Yard 24 May 1944 with Commander Ralph E. Styles in command. During World War II she served with distinction, having made five war patrols and being responsible for the sinking of a total of 29,519 tons of Japanese ships. During her glorious career she won five battle stars as well as the Navy Unit Commendation.

After the war, *Sea Devil* (SS400) was decommissioned and recommissioned from 1951 to 1954 and from 1957 to 1964, during which periods she engaged in training in the Far East and off our west coast. To round out a most noteworthy career, in 1963 she participated in exercise in conjunction with naval units of the Republic of South Korea, Nationalist China and the Republic of the Philippines. She was decommissioned for the last time 17 February 1964 when she was sunk as a target.

The keel of *Sea Devil*, II was laid on April 12, 1966 and launched October 5, 1967. She is one of twenty-four vessels authorized by the Navy in the Sturgeon class of nuclear attack submarines. These ships are 290 feet long and have a surface displacement of 4,140 tons. The new *Sea Devil* is equipped with the latest navigation and electronic systems, a computer-controlled weapons system which enables her to detect and attack targets at

various distances. The characteristics combined with her ability to operate at high speeds for long periods of time and the environmental independence provided of nuclear propulsion, make a powerful weapon against surface ships and submarines alike.

Sea Devil, II joins a group of attack type submarines making a total of thirty-eight. In addition to this, we also have forty-one *Polaris* Submarines, making a total of seventy-nine nuclear submarines in operation. Thus *Sea Devil*, II becomes a part of a very potent submarine attack force which numbers approximately one-half of what Congress has presently authorized. I think it is worthy to note that *Sea Devil*, II's trial runs were under the direction of Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, who is considered to be the father of our nuclear submarines. Suffice it to say, *Sea Devil*, II well represents its namesake—the powerful giant ray fish commonly known as "sea devil" and which is also known as the king of its species.

Needless to say, the U.S. Navy has made tremendous strides since its first submarine, the U.S.S. *Holland*. From 1900 to January 1969 I think we can truthfully say we have made the Herculean step. It is highly possible that the type of attack submarine that we commission today was not dreamed of when the *Holland* was commissioned. It is of remarkable credit to this country and particularly to the Navy, to have had the kind of confidence that the Navy has had in the development of this so-called "new craft" or "new vessel" as was the case of the *Holland*. This is just another example of industry and government working cooperatively to meet common needs.

It is also interesting to note that in the first development of the submarine in the 1800s, it was thought by England that it would do more harm than good if it were adopted in that her enemies would copy it. But such is the challenge today—to keep not only abreast of the enemy but ahead. Again *Sea Devil*, II represent this "ahead" in her class.

In a world which is beset with problems, and indeed in a country which is confronted with dealing with problems of a magnitude never witnessed before in the history of this country, as we prepare ourselves here today to defend this country from the outside, we must be forever cognizant of the presence of those who would attempt to destroy us from within. And, as you men of the Navy, indeed of *Sea Devil*, II prepare to do your part, please be assured that we shall do everything in our power to do our part. Again I refer to those of us in roles of leadership related directly to the preparing and educating of our youth and the responsibilities which we have to restore in the minds of our youth faith in our nation. We must have them believe, as you and I were taught and as I still believe, that our great nation was forged in a furnace of faith—a faith that free men will prevail no matter what the struggle. We must dispel the idea that we are a nation robbed of reason and rationality by riots and rage sweeping through every American city or some sort of uncontrollable civic insanity. We must convince our young people that breaking down of law and order does not establish that our entire nation has lost its way in a tangled jungle of emotion and extremism. We must have them believe that the foment and difficulties over these issues in our country today are not the sign of failure. They are not a sign that our national fabric is being ripped apart. They are a sign that irrational inequalities can not be suppressed. They are a sign that we must face the challenges and eliminate injustices that condemn some citizens to an environment that breeds despair and violence. These are some of our challenges and as you do your part we wish to assure you that we shall be forever striving to do ours. We must carefully explain

to our youth and indeed to some people of this country, that many of the problems which we see today are not really new; in fact, they are not the problems of America alone, they are problems which exist throughout the world. "When dead they have seen the end of war." I didn't say that first; Aristotle did.

So, what is our responsibility? As I see it, it is developing stronghearted, resourceful men who, like yourselves, are willing to uphold and strengthen our Republic and a responsibility to show all concerned that this is a Republic which works and a kind of Republic which we all can look forward to in the future with confidence, courage, hope and spiritual strength so that you officers and men of this ship will know what you are working for and what you believe in is not lost.

The Atomic Age in itself is truly a challenge to the men of our Armed Forces today and certainly a great challenge to our Navy men whose branch of service has long been one of the most technical of all the Armed Forces.

The officers and enlisted men chosen to serve on this mighty vessel I am certain are among the finest that the country, and indeed the Navy, have to offer. One has only to read the background of your commander, Commander Currier, to erase any doubt that the responsibility of leadership of *Sea Devil*, II is in good hands, for his training and experience will serve him well in this command. And, we would say, without reservation, not having had the opportunity to read the biographical sketches of the other men who will serve on this vessel, they too are as equally prepared to serve her well.

So, as *Sea Devil*, II is commissioned today, I am confident that with all of us working together—you providing another link for the defense of our country and freedom from without and we providing a link of strength and faith from within—the dedication which we pledge will always prevail and, with all your preparedness for combat your very presence will guarantee smooth seas in a troubled world.

Thank you.

CROWDUS BAKER OF SEARS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of many Members of the House has just recently retired from Sears, Roebuck & Co. after many years of outstanding service in all branches of this farflung merchandising enterprise. He is Crowdus Baker, for many years president of the company, and more recently chairman of the board.

Crowdus Baker is one of the most inspiring examples of the way our great free enterprise system works that I have ever known.

Fresh out of college, when he was just a young man, he was attracted to the Sears organization and devoted his life working for it.

All by himself, without any help or influence, starting from scratch at the lowest level in a small west coast Sears store, by virtue of his own abilities, talents, perseverance, personal drive, and total loyalty to Sears, he speedily worked his way to the topmost post as president of what many think is the greatest merchandising organization of its kind in the world.

The brilliant career of Crowds Baker was one continual series of achievements for his company, its growth, its remarkable expansion, its new emphasis on public services factors—public relations, public contributions, public responsibilities. Under his wise, vigorous leadership, the company vastly enhanced its operations, boldly broke through old barriers to new fields of service in science, in art, in modern approaches—dynamic adaptation to the jet-space age—fabulous new opportunities for the buying public, unbelievable advances in the improvement of personnel relations—higher pay, better working conditions—enlarged profit-sharing benefits, health and social services, and other forward-looking improvements and benefits for the employees of the company and the public.

On top of this, Crowds Baker made great sacrifices to serve his country, State, and community. During his tenure, several Presidents of the United States called upon him for counsel, for help, and sought to bring him into the Cabinet, other high posts of honor, and national responsibility.

On several occasions, he declined high posts because of his conviction that he could serve his country best at the time by making Sears a more responsive, economic, and social mechanism for serving the people, by extending its areas of service, increasing its available stocks and goods and by stepping up and modernizing remarkably all its facilities and services to the public.

These Baker achievements are truly epochal and memorable. They are enduring contributions to the strength and vigor of our economy and Nation. They will be duly noted by history as they have been gratefully acknowledged in contemporary American life.

Crowds Baker is a two-fisted, red-blooded, Bunker-Hill American, strong, rugged, and undaunted as the Texas country he came from.

Instinctively modest and humble concerning his vast achievements, seeking no praise or encomium, he asked only to be understood in his determination to serve his company, its officers and employees, the American people, and the country with great, with an unprecedented drive and ability to discharge in full measure his corporate, public, and patriotic activities.

Ingrained with a tremendous sense of responsibility to the American people, and the Nation, endowed with the courage of a lion, the foresight and vision of a genius, the personal power to drive through with his ideas, animated by a fierce desire to help his fellow man and to improve his lot, Crowds Baker has the warm and kindly touch of a gentle summer breeze.

He wore no man's collar. Once he had taken counsel with those he trusted, and made up his mind to act, he exercised his power of decision, letting the chips fall where they may.

He was a man's man, a totally dedicated, courageous leader, willing at all times to carry through with any program that he was convinced was right for his company, its workers, the American public, and the country.

This great business expert has made a lasting indelible imprint upon the commercial, mercantile, and economic leadership of this generation.

He has brought luster to the constructive purpose, the social concern, the efficiency, and accountability of private enterprise and our great, American economy.

He has left a rich legacy, a challenging example to those who follow him in American business.

What is even more important, in many respects, his career leaves inspiration and hope to even the poorest and humblest youth of the land that in this system of ours there is real opportunity and promise for those who have the ability, the will, determination and courage to aim at the highest goals.

Let us hope in the future of this country that opportunity which symbolizes the life and career of Crowds Baker and exemplifies free enterprise, will always be open to the imaginative and worthy, the talented, the ambitious of spirit, the lofty of purpose, the generous of impulse, and to all those of every race and creed, who, like Crowds Baker, realize that it is not the dollar sign, not the badge of privilege and influence, not the empty shibboleth of captive power, but the real worth and merit, personal ability, understanding and recognition of humane, social values that must dictate the leadership and policy of business in this Nation and world, where free, private enterprise, as we know it, is facing its greatest challenge in history. It is men like Crowds Baker who can save it for posterity, else it could well be lost in the turmoil of irrational change that confronts us.

Hail and salute to this great son of Texas, Crowds Baker. He has demonstrated what men can do when they are fired by ambition, blessed with great talents, dedicated to something more than pelf and wealth, and intent upon truly serving their country and its people in this troubled age, rather than kneeling before the corny images of Mammon, paganism, and subversion which surround and threaten us today.

As a Member of Congress and a personal friend of this great American, I am proud, as well as pleased and privileged, to congratulate heartily and thank this great business genius from the Lone Star State for his persevering labors, sacrifices, and priceless contributions in difficult times which are so meaningful in terms of noteworthy progress, brilliant performance, and effective, unselfish labors for the people of this country and our free institutions.

My esteem, affection, and best wishes go with our valued friend, Crowds Baker, and his lovely wife, Winnie, and his family into his retirement and his future life, and I wish them every happiness and blessing for many years to come.

But in a very real sense there will be no retirement for such a vibrant, unquenchable spirit. As long as the good Lord gives him strength and breath, he will continue to serve, to help, sustain, encourage and assist those who for one reason or another cannot help themselves, and he will defend with his life, if

need be, the liberties and blessings of the American way of life that he, in his great day, did so much to enrich and preserve.

May his successors in the great Sears complex be mindful of his concerns for the people, as they struggle for the success which was his. Best wishes to all of them.

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week Mrs. Brown and I had the pleasure of welcoming to Washington, and to our home, a pair of fine young men from the Seventh District of Ohio who exemplify the very best qualities of America's youth. The two teenagers, 15-year-old James Lawrence, of Springfield, and 17-year-old James Kizzlar, of Fairborn, were winners of an essay contest sponsored by the Tecumseh Council, Boy Scouts of America. Planned in conjunction with National Boy Scout Week, the topic of the essay was "This Is My Country."

The thoughts expressed by Scout Lawrence and Explorer Kizzlar in their essays are inspirational, and I wish to share them with my colleagues.

I include the essays in the RECORD.

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

(By James H. Kizzlar)

I am an American. I say this with pride, because I am proud to be a part of all that America is, and all that she stands for.

When our forefathers founded this nation, they found limitless opportunity awaiting them in all walks of life. And today, this nation is one of increasing opportunity for all men—opportunity to learn, to speak, to worship, to succeed . . . this is my country.

The splendor of a sunrise over virgin forests, the taste of pan-fried trout taken from a running stream . . . this is also my country.

The laughter on a small child's face, the satisfied determination of a young man's first voting experience . . . this is truly America.

The greatest strength of my nation is pride. What is pride? A meaningful reverence and earnest salute as our nation's flag passes by; that certain lump in my throat when I hear "Battle Hymn of the Republic"; the belief in our past heritage and the hope for our future. Pride is the people of my country.

Yet, America is more than just rolling wheat fields or Niagara Falls or Disneyland. It is a haven for free and open thought; a land where each man can remain an individualist and yet be an integral part of the entire establishment.

This is my country. It is sights and sounds, a feeling, a pride—many things to many people. To me it is the greatest nation on earth. I thank God that America is my country!

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

(By James Lawrence)

The United States of America is my country. I share it with 200,000,000 Americans like myself. We are all proud of our heritage and reputation. We should be. Our heritage is one of a struggle—a struggle for independence as a country and interdependence with

the world. In 1776, not quite 183 years ago, we declared ourselves independent. Look where we stand now. Through the course of the years, we have become the most influential, most powerful, and most prosperous nation on earth. Some citizens think that now we should be content with our position, but, because this is my country, I have the right to disagree with them.

I believe that as the leader, my country must not take advantage of her position, but use it for the good of the world. The job of the leader is to lead. He does this by helping others and setting a good example for all to follow. This is what our country should do. How does America do this? First, and most important, all of its citizens must set a good example. An individual must remember that his every action affects someone else and our country.

"In God We Trust" is our motto, and in God we must trust if we are to remain the leader. God gave us America, the ability to build it, and he continues to guide us in our progress. Our progress, for good or bad, success or failure, advancement or defeat, right or wrong, is dependent upon the combined actions of each of its citizens. Therefore, my country depends on me.

In a country where one vote can determine who becomes the President of the United States, the responsibility of each person is all important. The example that I set in citizenship and my ability to urge others to follow a good example is what America stands for and what America becomes.

PRESIDENT NIXON ENDORSES ELECTORAL REFORM WHICH WOULD ACCORD ELECTORAL VOTES IN PROPORTION TO POP- ULAR VOTE RECEIVED BY EACH CANDIDATE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the encouraging signs of the times is the recognition now being given to the need for reform in the method used for the election of the President and Vice President.

It is well known that we are now using an outmoded, horse-and-buggy method of choosing these top officials, and reform is long overdue.

The House Committee on the Judiciary is now engaged in a full-dress hearing on the subject, which provides hope for some significant progress in improving this antiquated system. The many evils of the present system are self-evident.

At a recent news conference President Nixon was quoted as saying he was inclined to prefer a reform which would accord to each candidate for President and Vice President his share of the electoral votes in each State, in proportion to the popular vote received. In my judgment the President's views are sound and will meet with popular approval.

Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of testifying before the Committee on the Judiciary on this subject, at which I gave my reasons for favoring the so-called proportional or district plans—either of which would be a great improvement. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of my testimony, which follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE O. C. FISHER,
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, FEBRUARY 5, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to testify briefly concerning proposed changes in the method of electing the President and Vice President. I along with many others have introduced a resolution on the subject, and it is encouraging to know that this great committee will seek ways to improve the present system.

To begin with, it seems to be generally agreed that the present method is completely outmoded and should be changed. The original concept of choosing these officials has degenerated into a "winner takes all" technique whereby the candidate who leads the voting in a State, even though he may not receive a majority in that State, is credited with all the votes cast there.

The need for a change has been widely recognized for more than a hundred years. It has been debated extensively, but emotionalism and provincialism have often displaced reason and logic in the vain search for a better answer. Reams of debate and hearings have been recorded. Let us hope this committee can be realistic and come to grips with the problem and the sort of improvement which would have a reasonable chance of approval in Congress and ratification by the States.

If success is to be achieved a plan must be devised which will be acceptable not only to the populous States but also to the small, rural ones. Without this general accord, I fear you will have engaged in another exercise in futility and your efforts, however laudable, will come to naught.

From my limited study of this subject I am convinced there is no perfect plan. Fault can be found with any that has been proposed. It is a matter of finding and embracing the best possible improvement within our reach.

PRESENT SYSTEM OUTMODED

Above everything, we know the present system is permeated with faults, and the need for a change is urgent. For example, under the present method eleven of the 50 States hold enough combined votes in the Electoral College system to elect a President, with bare majorities or pluralities in each, even if the other 39 are solidly opposed to that candidate.

Such a system is obviously not equitable, it is not fair, and it is fraught with great danger.

Under the present system there have been some fifteen instances where Presidents have been elected who have received less than fifty percent of the popular vote. And there have been at least three instances where candidates who got a majority of popular votes were not elected.

Here are a few of the apparent evils of the present method.

There is no uniformity in the method of choosing Presidential electors; each State elects its electors as it sees fit.

There may, under this system, be "independent" or "unpledged" electors who are not legally bound to cast their vote in the manner directed by the people. We have seen that demonstrated recently.

The present system tends to restrict National campaigns to a dozen or so key pivotal States.

It was never intended the unit vote system would evolve into a method whereby a candidate receives all the electoral votes of a State regardless of his margin of victory.

The Electoral College as it now functions permits and invites control and domination by organized minority groups within the key States, and encourages the development and solidarity of religious, economic, and racial blocs within these States.

A candidate receives credit for his opponents votes in the States he carries but does

not receive any credit for his own votes in the States his opponents carry.

FAVORS "PROPORTIONAL PLAN"

Mr. Chairman, I favor the so-called "proportional plan," which simply distributes the electoral vote in each State in proportion to the popular vote in each State. Under that scheme, the total of the electoral votes would reflect the popular vote. In other words, under this proposal every voter, whether he be from the small state or from the largest, would go to the polls with the knowledge that his preference would be tallied for the candidate of his choice—regardless of whether or not his candidate happened to lead in that State.

This method provides that the winning candidate must receive at least 40 percent of the electoral vote, failing in which the Congress would select the President and Vice President from the three highest numbers of electoral votes.

Thus, this system embraces the direct vote concept and insures meaningful participation by every voter in the outcome of every contest.

"DISTRICT PLAN" ACCEPTABLE

Now, I have no particular objection to the so-called "district plan." It would achieve about the same objective as I and others have proposed. The proportional plan was a great favorite of the late Senator Norris of Nebraska. I believe it has been debated and explained to the people more than any of the other reforms that have been offered. It was once approved by the Senate, and it should be easy to sell to the State legislatures. I earnestly hope it will be most thoroughly examined by this committee.

DIRECT VOTE PLAN

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the interest that has been shown in the election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote. It sounds good. I am fearful, however, that the advancement of this proposal will endanger the likelihood of any electoral reform by this Congress. Arguments against the direct vote method are well known. Here are a few of them:

The direct method would deprive the small or sparsely populated States of the competitive advantage of having two electoral votes for their two Senators. Since this constitutes a built-in advantage for the smaller States, it is highly improbable that such a change would be approved by two-thirds in Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

The adoption of the direct method could easily result in regulatory control over political parties by the Federal Government instead of the States, and perhaps seriously impair our principle of Federalism upon which this Nation was established.

Moreover, campaign expenditures would likely increase; campaigns would cover a larger territory and on a wider scope; and campaigning would still be predominantly in the populace States and in the metropolitan areas and cities.

The importance of the relative weight of each State's vote would no longer depend upon population but upon the number of votes cast. This would create a natural temptation of some States to lower the voting age to 18, or even 16, in order to give that State a bigger voice in the election. And in the hope of giving a State more power and influence there would be the temptation of corruption by meddling with ballots or counting those in the cemeteries.

DIRECT VOTE WOULD ENCOURAGE SPLINTER PARTIES

A major objection to the direct vote plan is the fact that it would tend to increase the number of "splinter" parties. This threat should not be treated lightly. It would contribute to the destruction of the present two-party system that tends to prevent our

national government from being splintered by a series of minority loyalties.

Mr. Chairman, on this subject of what causes splinter parties to arise, I am intrigued by some views expressed several years ago by Judge Homer Ferguson, former U.S. Senator, who said:

"It is perhaps the best commentary on the importance and durability of the two-party system that this country has known 70 political parties in its history, each of which has elected at least one member of Congress. But each one, and in a very short time, disappeared or was absorbed in one of the two major parties. This did not happen by luck or chance. The electoral system itself had much to do with it. . . .

"Under the present unit system, minority political groups, usually advocating extreme views, rarely attract enough votes to capture the electoral vote of a State. At most, they can swing their voting strength between the two major parties. . . . Their inability to gain electoral votes under the unit rule deprives them of incentive to remain compact and to grow as individual parties. At the same time, their limited voting strength is enough to cause ferment in the major parties, which are forced to clean house and adopt new ideas to gain the aid of minority groups. The result is to prevent fragmentation into multiple parties with its attendant evils, and to preserve and to invigorate the two-party system."

In other words, there would very definitely be less incentive for the appearance of splinter parties under the proportional or district plans, than under the direct vote, because the strength of the upstart groups would be fragmented and diluted by the retention of the electoral vote concept. That is a most important factor in the consideration of this issue.

We know what splinter parties have done to France, Italy, and Germany, where governments are often carried on through a conglomerate of coalitions of the various political factions, with resulting instability and chaos.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the arguments pro and con regarding the various proposals are numerous and will, I am sure, be thoroughly developed during this hearing.

It will be recalled that the Honorable Ed Willis, former distinguished member of this committee, prepared and inserted in the June 18, 1968 issue of the Congressional Record a very objective and comprehensive discussion of all aspects of the Electoral College issue.

It would seem that the reasonable, sensible approach would be to approve the proportional plan. It protects every citizen in the right to have his vote counted for the candidate of his choice. It would in effect reflect the popular vote of all the people. And it would definitely eliminate most of the recognized evils of the present system.

POULTRY INDUSTRY SEEKS EQUITY IN LABELING

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the poultry industry throughout the country constantly seeks new markets and new uses for poultry products. This is in keeping with the free enterprise system under which we operate in the United States.

A fairly recent development is the use of poultry in hot dogs, an all-American food. The potential market for frank-

furters containing poultry meat, however, is severely restricted by present regulations handed down by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Frank Frazier, executive vice president of the National Broiler Council, expressed the nature of the problem in his address at a press conference in New York on January 30, 1969. I include his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY R. F. FRAZIER, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL BROILER COUNCIL

Every American eats on the average a total of 60 hot dogs a year . . . which makes hot dogs a fairly universal food and a very significant subject for discussion with people who communicate with the public. The three samples you tried contained all beef and pork, 25% chicken and the rest beef and pork, and 50% chicken and the rest beef and pork.

When we planned this press conference, we had expected we would be presenting a brief from the National Broiler Council at a series of hearings in four cities called by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the period between February 19 and March 1. Since that time, as one of former Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's last official acts, the hearings were called off for a period of at least 90 days at the request of certain red meat packing industry associations, without advance notice to us or opportunity to express our views.

Rather than being a help to our industry, this action further delays a decision on an issue which our industry has been asking to have resolved for approximately four years. The lack of a decision places an unjust economic hardship on our industry because it denies to them certain markets they are now serving. Therefore, we feel strongly that our case should be made known to you and to the public at large.

So we appreciate this opportunity to discuss the situation and later on we will welcome your questions and comments.

The crux of the issue is that chicken meat, which is the equal of red meat as an ingredient in frankfurters and other sausage products, should be treated the same as other meats in labeling. Chicken meat provides sausage manufacturers with a wholesome, federally inspected meat component at a lower cost than many others now included.

Frankfurters are labeled, as you know, in one of three main categories: "all beef", "all meat", or just "frankfurters". Obviously, all beef frankfurters are not part of our discussion today any more than an all chicken frankfurter would be. But "all meat" frankfurters or plain "frankfurters" are of considerable interest to our industry. They represent a big market which we are currently serving.

Now, to refer to the point about chicken being a meat. Meat is defined by Webster as "the flesh of animals used as food." Chicken is listed under meats on restaurant menus; it is sold in the meat department in grocery stores; it is served as a meat by consumers at home.

Historically, the government's definition of poultry as a meat as evidenced by recent legislation and regulations covering inspection is somewhat of an accident. Originally, at the turn of the century, federal inspection of red meat packing plants shipping products in interstate commerce was established by the 1907 Meat Inspection Act. At that time, only live chickens were available to the consumer. It was not until the dressing operation moved from the homemaker's kitchen to the processing plant that a poultry inspection law was considered and passed by Congress—some 50 years after enactment of the meat inspection law.

The result was a dual scheme of inspection: one covering the meat of cattle, sheep, swine and goats; the other covering the meat of chickens, turkeys, ducks and geese.

In 1967 Congress eliminated this accidental discrepancy and provided the basis for uniform treatment of all meat and meat products. The Wholesome Meat Act enacted in November 1967 and the Wholesome Poultry Products Act signed into law last August have many identical provisions. Through a reorganization of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Service, red meat and poultry inspection services are completely merged. This in our view, involves a recognition by both Congress and USDA of the similarity of the industries' products and the recognition of chicken as meat from a consumer protection standpoint.

At the time the legislation was moving through Congress, no indication was given that it would be used to deny chicken access to a market the industry was serving at the time the laws were passed. In fact, both Secretary Freeman and Congressman Graham Purcell, floor manager of the measure, assured the poultry industry of protection on this score.

But when we get to labeling, it is another story. The Department of Agriculture, as you know, is the regulatory agency for meat and poultry labeling, rather than the Food and Drug Administration which supervises labeling of other food products.

Over the period of the last four years during which our industry has been actively petitioning on this issue, Secretary Freeman and those who have administered the labeling provisions of the poultry and meat inspection laws have required the product name for frankfurters to be changed when chicken is used, despite the fact that research has firmly established chicken as an excellent high quality ingredient comparable to other meat ingredients, from the standpoint of flavor, texture, appearance and other characteristics.

Therefore, instead of simply including chicken in the list of ingredients as is approved for beef, pork, mutton and goat meat, the product name must be changed to "frank-chicken added", "Chicken Franks" or some similar term even though only a small amount of chicken is used.

When a new generic name is introduced, both the retailer and the consumer anticipate that a new product is being offered. Yet, as you discovered from your own experience here today, the frankfurters containing chicken do not offer a significantly new flavor, color or texture. Hot dogs taste like hot dogs . . . the seasoning may vary, but none of them taste or look like pork, beef—or even chicken.

A frankfurter processor is thus caught in a dilemma. If he uses chicken as an ingredient, he is required to label the product as if it were something different from a traditional hot dog; yet the product is actually indistinguishable from what consumers are used to.

Under these circumstances, if you were a frankfurter producer and found chicken to be an excellent ingredient to include in your franks, would you risk the confusion of the consumer and the retailer simply to comply with this discriminatory requirement of USDA? Or would you play it safe, by-pass chicken, and continue to use red meat only, even though you might have to turn to imported meats for your supply?

Let's take a look at the product our broiler industry is making available to the sausage manufacturer:

First of all, it is clean, wholesome, federally inspected boneless chicken meat. It is truly a quality product, comparing favorably with the best of other meats used in sausage products.

Why is it now available when consumer use of chicken is at an all time high? By

using modern technology and a new business structure the broiler industry has dramatically increased efficiency. Consumer response now enables our industry to produce seven times as many broilers annually as were produced after World War II . . . a growth unparalleled by any other phase of American agriculture and one achieved under the free enterprise system without government controls.

This production revolution has led to marketing innovations. Retailers began merchandising not only whole or cut up chickens, but parts—legs, breasts, etc. At first these were packaged at the supermarket, but more and more the packaging operation has shifted to the chicken processing plant. The demand for the meaty parts was excellent, but processors needed to find new uses for the necks, backs and wings which are just as tasty and nutritious.

This led to the invention of a machine to remove raw chicken meat from the bone far more efficiently and economically than was ever possible by hand. So three developments—industry growth, centralized packaging and a new machine—fostered the use of chicken as a component in franks and other sausage products.

Soon after the introduction of the deboning equipment about five years ago, USDA imposed the requirement for altering the product name if chicken were used as an ingredient in sausage products. This was done without giving those affected an opportunity to publicly comment and without publication in the Federal Register. Naturally our industry has protested this ruling and has sought a change.

Early in 1965, Dr. Robert L. Saffle of University of Georgia, made available to the USDA a detailed evaluation of the effect of various amounts of chicken in franks on yields, chemical analysis, bacterial analysis, visual appraisal and taste panel analysis for keeping qualities, technically justifying such a change.

No action was taken until mid-1967 when two taste panels convened by USDA indicated that franks with chicken as an ingredient were just as acceptable as those without.

In July a survey letter was sent to a number of food editors and writers to obtain additional consumer opinion about chicken in frankfurters. Those of you who received it may remember that the letter seemed to appeal for a biased response.

When still nothing happened, on September 28, 1968, the National Broiler Council requested by letter that USDA, and I quote, "expeditiously publish for public comment a proposed regulation which would specifically authorize the use of chicken meat in frankfurters subject to appropriate identification in a statement of ingredients as may be properly applicable to other components of such products."

Although we were assured action would be taken, none was until nearly three months later, when on this past Christmas Day a proposed regulation appeared in the Federal Register. Instead of dealing with our labeling issue separately on its own merit, the proposed regulation was expanded to involve several unrelated controversial and unstudied issues such as the maximum 30% fat level. This complication plus the subsequent postponement of public hearings means that the trade barrier imposed on our industry must continue for at least another three months unless the new administration acts.

On its face, the proposed regulation seems to be an improvement over existing unpublished policy, but let's take a closer look:

1. Chicken and other poultry meats are listed as "optional" and limited to a 25% portion, while other meats are listed as alternative required ingredients without a discriminatory percentage limitation.

2. Chicken could be used in an "all meat" frank only if white and dark meat were in natural proportions. This would require use of meat from the entire chicken carcass, including the breast, thigh and legs. This is not imposed on any of the red meats, thus permitting high-priced items like steaks and chops to be omitted from sausage products.

3. The proposed regulation departs from a traditional concept which permits a combination of parts of the beef carcass, for example, to be designated merely as "beef" in the list of ingredients on a package of franks. The same is true for pork, mutton and goats. But for chicken, the ingredient terminology required is "comminuted" chicken from a specified part—legs, necks, etc., although product characteristics from different parts are quite similar. The practical effect of requiring parts to be specified individually is a multiplicity of labels designating each part and would involve a major packaging cost to be passed on to the consumer.

And, how many of you know the definition of "comminuted"? Do you expect the consumer to know what this word means, or will she interpret it in some unfavorable way? The word means simply "finely ground or chopped tissue". If it is to be used at all, it could well apply to the other meat components in cooked sausage. However, neither this nor parts identification has been required of red meats.

While the existing federal labeling regulations have minimized the use of boned chicken meat in cooked sausage products in interstate commerce, the product has been well accepted by intra-state manufacturers of franks who have not experienced the trade barrier restrictions of the federal labeling regulations. Many have used deboned chicken since it came on the market in 1964, and find it quite satisfactory, helping them to achieve a product of good quality at a reasonable price which has enjoyed excellent consumer acceptance.

But, we now have new meat and poultry inspection laws, both of which require intra-state operations to meet federal standards, including labeling standards, within two years from date of enactment of the legislation. So the time is nearing when the trade barrier impact will reach the intra-state sausage manufacturer, and further reduce our market potential to none at all.

We have discussed the fact that the change in proposed regulations that we ask would work no hardship on the consumer . . . in fact, quite the reverse. It would provide an important market for a wholesome, high quality chicken product. And it would also benefit the sausage manufacturer. We have discussed the favorable taste test comparison of chicken with any other meat component. But we have not emphasized its low cost . . . less than half the price per pound of imported beef, a popular meat component for sausage products. Yet our product is not likely to upset the economic appellation for red meat producers because it currently represents only a fraction of one percent of the meat used in cooked sausage. Even if we achieved the full potential for all types of poultry, over 95% of the meat used in franks would continue to come from red meat sources. This is the economic fact of the matter . . . but even if it were not, we submit that it is not the purpose of a consumer protection law to regulate markets and erect trade barriers. Yet, this is what Department of Agriculture officials appear to be doing on the chicken in frankfurters issue.

We believe our appeal for the same labeling treatment as accorded other meats by USDA is eminently fair, reasonable, and in the public interest.

On January 17, following the announcement of the postponement of the public hearings, we sent a telegram to Secretary

Orville Freeman noting that the postponement means severe commercial hardship for the broiler industry. We recommended either that the postponement be reconsidered and denied or that a labeling regulation authorizing poultry meat in cooked sausage, as already presented to USDA, be published immediately.

No action was taken by Mr. Freeman, as you can appreciate. On January 24, therefore, we wrote to the new Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, attaching a copy of the telegram and requesting an opportunity to discuss the background of the issue with him and his staff.

In addition, we have prepared a presentation stating our position for use at the public hearings when and if they are held.

What we are asking is that all meat ingredients for sausage products be given uniform treatment, that chicken be subject to the same labeling requirements as those pertaining to any other meat, that there be uniformity in labeling requirements under the Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

All USDA would have to do is adopt a simple three-line amendment to the present regulation under the Meat Inspection Act which would read as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided in this section, sausage shall be prepared with meat, or meat and meat by-product, as defined by this part, or poultry products, as defined in the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended . . ."

This proposed amendment is unanimously supported by all of the major national and regional poultry organizations, whether they represent chicken or turkey meat.

AMERICA—OUR RESPONSIBILITY

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my young constituents, Mr. John J. Cangilos of Albany, N.Y., a freshman student at the College of the Holy Cross, delivered an address at a seminar of the Women's Forum on National Security in Washington on February 5. His topic was "America—Our Responsibility," and his subject matter was particularly appropriate to these times when so many Americans are concerned about the attitudes and conduct of young people and their seeming alienation from society and their fellow citizens.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues the cogent views of young Mr. Cangilos:

AMERICA—OUR RESPONSIBILITY

In addressing myself to the topic, "America—Our Responsibility," I should like to examine with you the status of patriotism and the attitudes connected with it among one of the most publicized and controversial segments of our society—the millions of young Americans on college campuses. For it is only through an understanding of how these men and women conceptualize their responsibility to their country, that we can begin to fathom why they react the way they do, and what can be done to capitalize on that which is constructive, and how to redirect that which is destructive.

In examining the major influences which result in the formation of the primary attitudes of the campus community, basic ideals

emerge which, when left unbridled, result in the chaos which has struck so many of our institutions of higher education. The first of these which we shall see emerge from the changed environment of college life is that of individuality.

The revolutionary approach which men and women of college age utilize when facing American society has its foundation in the social revolution which is taking place in campus life. Previous theories governing the regulation of student behavior and appearance, most of which relied upon punitive action for those who failed to comply, or utilized academic suspension or expulsion as a similar instrument of enforcement, have largely been discarded. Gone are the days when a general uniformity was enforced by such measures. The role of the faculty and administration has come to play less and less of a directly formative role in the character and behavior of the college student. The result is that, whereas previously the student would look to the directors of the institution for instruction as to how he would live, this recourse is now denied him and the student is thrown back on himself as the final authority, to determine what he will do and will not do. Since many college students find themselves truly independent for the first time in the university, they are totally emancipated in an atmosphere which encourages them to assume the major share of control over their own behavior. Here is where the consciousness of individuality strikes the student with its weightiest impact, and the realization is that from this point forth, behavior will be entirely that of his own choosing.

But this is not to suggest that the student is no longer susceptible to outside influences which would aid in the formation of a right character. For the age-old barrier between the three distinct segments of the campus community, the faculty, the administration, and the student body, dissolves in a mutuality of intention, and life is enriched by a diversity of approach. All must take their responsibilities more seriously, because no one forces anyone to achieve success, and failure is entirely the fault of the one who fails. And so, college changes from being a place where one is sent to learn how to live, to a place where one goes to study why one is living.

The extreme of this development is the individual who concludes that nothing has any right to infringe on his individuality whatsoever, and who actively opposes such infringement even when demanded for the common good. This leads to the activity of the few radicals who enjoy the full attentions of the press, while those who judiciously exercise their freedom in maturity go unnoticed. But for now, suffice it to say that we have uncovered the first of the prime motivations of the college student—that of individuality.

In conjunction with this awareness of self, the student of the American college is, for the most part, a concerned man, concerned for the welfare of his fellow human beings, and anxious to exert his influence in those areas where his voice will be heard. This is an essential point, for when his voice is not heard, the result is either violence or apathy. But through the academic pursuit of the social sciences, seeing the relation of all men through the chain of history, the brotherhood of all men philosophically and in the open life of the dormitory, the idealism of youth combines with the concern for other men to kindle in this individual a desire to actively promote the welfare of his fellow man.

And this concern leads us to the third major motivating force we want to discuss today. The desire to actively promote the welfare of his fellow man leads the college student to focus on involvement. For it is not enough, he realizes, to theorize about what should be. It is more important to enlist

the energy and talent at hand to actualize the theoretical, and strive to make real the ideal. At this point, it becomes possible to sketch a definition of the responsible college student: He is an individual fully aware of his own identity, who seeks to better the lot of his fellow man through direct participation in efforts to affect change.

Now that we have seen who this individual is, the question becomes: what can this person do to assume his fair share of the responsibility for the destiny of America?

It seems advisable to examine the extreme reactions of the minority of college students to understand why they react negatively to America. One of the primary concerns of the American college man is his relation to the draft. Campus extremists consider themselves individuals compelled against their consciences to serve, idealists who see racial and religious discrimination, and concluding that American society is beyond repair, become activists seeking at every turn to disrupt the effective operations of society and government. Do not allow yourselves to be misled into thinking that they speak for the American college community. We acknowledge them as members of our ranks, but we refuse to call their tactics and ideologies representative. The vast majority of students at all the universities which encountered disruption from these radicals were not in sympathy with them, and did not lend their support to them. The increasing role of violence in campus demonstrations cannot be considered American, and must not be seen as typical of campus dissent.

Another source of division is the militant Black Separatist Movement, especially popular on campuses where some Afro-American students eat, study, recreate, and live together in a self-imposed segregation. These are the ones we read about. But what about the thousands of others who are fighting for integration by leading normal campus lives?

The whole point is that active un-Americanism is not as rampant on college campuses as we might tend to believe. It is true that there is some, but its proponents are sensationalists who are always in the minority.

What, then, about the remainder of this vital segment of our society? What about the non-demonstrators, the ones who don't make the headlines for refusing induction or defying the police? In short, what about the majority of the American campus community? What are they doing in line with their responsibility to America?

For one thing, they are taking advantage of the opportunities provided by you, their parents, to receive as much education as possible so as to be more productive citizens in the America of the future.

They, too, are concerned individuals committed to involvement. The Peace Corps, Vista, and numerous community and religiously-affiliated charities serving the poor, the slum dweller, and the retarded child receive much of their manpower from dedicated college men and women who are fulfilling their responsibility to America through service to her people. This is patriotism in action. This is student responsibility. This is the positive role colleges and college men and women play in our national life, making a contribution to America second to none. And in addition, the future leaders of our armed services are trained in college ROTC programs, where in many cases membership is voluntary, and entails effort on the part of a young man to fulfill a patriotic duty. Again, positive activity, student responsibility, and a display of patriotism in action.

But the active patriotism of the mature college student is never superficial. The truly dedicated individual delves into the particular project with which he is concerned, and seeks to find the ultimate answer to the problem he faces by finding the ulti-

mate authority with the will and the resources to eradicate it. And here is where the majority of responsible college youth, well intentioned, mature, and dedicated, confront an insuperable obstacle.

The social worker seeks more facilities, more equipment, more personnel. In order to finance his plans, he turns to that ultimate authority: government. The civil rights activist seeks enforcement of statutes on the books, and looks to secure passage of new bills and programs. He turns to that ultimate authority: government. The student connected with the armed forces takes an interest in the policies which will shape his role in active service, and could well determine the course of his life. He, too, turns to that ultimate authority: government. And all three, the social worker, the civil rights worker, and the soldier, as well as countless millions of intelligent, interested, college-age men and women are denied any effective participation in the most powerful influence in our nation: government.

The enthusiasm of youth never permits them to go half way. It is frustrating to learn that you can make recommendations for expanded social service facilities, and not be able to vote for a candidate who would enact your proposals. It is disheartening to see the needs of Black Americans, and not be able to vote for candidates who propose solutions. It is unfair to be prepared to sacrifice your life for your country, and then have no say in the determination of the policies which chart your future. This utilization without representation is just as un-American as the violence which becomes the weapon of the radical in protest against the system. And Senator Jacob Javits was wise enough to see this when he justified his position in favor of the 18 year old vote by stating substantially that youth is interested in politics, and that if this interest cannot find expression within the system, it will do so without it. The college student is discerning enough to realize that power holds the greatest sway in politics, realistic enough to expect a man whose job depends upon votes to listen closest to those with the power of the vote, and idealistic enough to hope that America has the vision to grant him the final means of direction over the responsibilities he is presently facing.

We can talk about the generation gap, about the breakdown of communication, about the divisiveness in American life. We can talk about it, or we can do something about it. We can continue to exclude the millions of college men and women between the ages of 18 and 21 from our elective process, or we can enlist their individuality, concern, and involvement to enrich our way of life through participation in the formation of our government and its policies. For the two generations can never adequately dialogue with any degree of success until both take each other seriously.

But we can correct the situation. We can make our republican form of government more representative. We can include the campus community in the mainstream of American political life. We can channel the patriotic impulses of our youth into politics and government as well as into social service, military service, and education.

Then we will be able to assume more responsibility for the destiny of America, because we will have a say in shaping that destiny. We will be able to translate our concern into intelligent positions on such questions as crime, clean government, and foreign policy, because in today's shrinking world these formerly remote issues strike us directly. And we will be able to act on our concern through the vote. Then we will be able to assume our rightful share of the responsibility. We will be fully participating in American life through concern for our fellow man, preparation for the future, and participation in the workings of government.

This is what our responsibility should be. This is what we, together, can make it. It is up to you, the obviously concerned patriotic adults, to join our effort to let us join you. Then the dissidents will lose their support because you will have provided us a place in our system. Then the cries of protest will modulate into meaningful dialogue as we feel ourselves participating in the American process. Then, we will belong.

It is said that faith begins as an experiment and ends as an experience. If you do place your faith in us, based on the unpublicized, unglamorous, but solid record of achievement as you experience our past through investigation, then America will not only be our joint responsibility, but will become our mutual opportunity.

**PAUL RAND DIXON, FIGHTER FOR
THE PUBLIC INTEREST**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, has established a reputation as one of the great fighters for the public interest in the Nation's history. His reputation is based on his work as a staff member of the Federal Trade Commission, as the eloquent and effective counsel to the Senate Antitrust Committee under the chairmanship of the late and beloved Senator Estes Kefauver, as well as his outstanding service as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission since his appointment by President Kennedy in 1961.

I can speak personally as to the effectiveness of this latter phase of his career as it has been my pleasure to work closely with the Commission and its distinguished Chairman in my capacity as the chairman of the Regulatory Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee. As an example the Commission has recently proposed a trade regulation rule covering the use of games of chance in conjunction with the marketing of automotive gasoline and groceries. This rule will sharply regulate the use of the games and do much to protect both the consumer and the small businessman. Similarly, the Commission issued a report sharply critical of the lumber industry and is currently continuing its investigation of the misgrading of lumber and allied problems.

There have been other examples, too numerous to mention, where the Commission has acted to protect the rights of a small businessman, to protect an individual consumer, to enforce the antitrust laws, to prevent deceptive practices, or take similar action when the case has been forwarded by my subcommittee.

There are, to be sure, delays in obtaining results which sometimes cause impatience. It is clear that these delays are the result of an agency with a staff, too small for the task, attempting to cope with all the complexities in the entire economy of a nation of 200 million people. When it takes 5 years, or even more, to obtain a final ruling from the courts in attempting to stop one individual

practice in one individual industry, it becomes readily apparent that policing of the entire consumer and antitrust front is a task of truly prodigious proportions—particularly when compared with the modest budget and staff of the Commission.

At any rate, the name and the reputation of Paul Rand Dixon are so well established that nothing I say here today can add or detract. Recently, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has carried the full text of a report critical of the Federal Trade Commission and its Chairman. In fairness, I believe that Chairman Dixon's brief statement concerning that report should also appear in full text. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include Chairman Dixon's statement, as well as two articles covering this same subject matter by John Chamberlain, columnist for the King Features Syndicate, at the conclusion of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN PAUL RAND DIXON

The protection of the consuming public of the United States from fraud and deception is vital to free enterprise and the public interest. I believe strongly in that principle. Most of my adult and professional life, both at the Federal Trade Commission and as a member of the staff of the United States Senate, has been devoted to the study and elimination of trade and consumer abuses.

When I was made Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in 1961, I found the staff of the Commission to consist of approximately the same number of personnel that comprised the staff in 1938, the year that I joined the Federal Trade Commission as a \$2,000 P-1 attorney. Today the Commission has a staff of less than 1,200 members, including professional and clerical personnel. Our mandate from Congress is the widest and most inclusive of all of the independent regulatory bodies. We need the best advice and techniques available to carry out this broad mandate from Congress.

On June 17, 1968, Ralph Nader called on me at my office and informed me that a group of students and recent law school graduates wished to study the activities of the Commission. I welcomed the idea. After some discussion, I informed Mr. Nader that I had no objection to members of the staff being contacted and interviewed so long as it was done on a reasonable basis and that I had no objection to furnishing the group information in our files that was in the public domain. I hoped, and based on what I was told I had every reason to believe, that the result would be a serious, intelligent and impartial survey resulting in informed, conclusive suggestions for improvement. Instead, the study resulted in a hysterical, anti-business, diatribe and a scurrilous, untruthful attack on the career personnel of the Commission and an arrogant demand for my resignation. This report emanates from a group with a self-granted license to criticize a respected government agency by the use of a type of invective and "smear technique" that newspapermen inform me is unusual even for Washington.

This Nader group chose the Federal Trade Commission as its target for its 1968 summer vacation "smear" project. As stated in the comment in *The Wall Street Journal* of July 10, 1968, on page 14, if this group is successful in undermining the Federal Trade Commission this year, then other groups of students may make similar raids on other agencies in the future. Mr. Nader is so quoted in this article as follows:

"The crusader has recruited five other students from leading universities, including William Howard Taft IV, great grandson of the Republican president, mainly to investigate what Mr. Nader terms the failure of the

Federal Trade Commission to move boldly enough against deceptive business practices. 'If this works, man, next summer, more students, more agencies...' Mr. Nader vows."

The feel of destructive power gained from vicious attacks is self-stimulating.

On the afternoon of January 2, 1969, I began to receive phone calls from the press and other media requesting my comments on the "Nader report," which obviously had been distributed to them. By letter of the same date, I was requested by the Public Broadcast Laboratory to appear on a half-hour program the night of Sunday, January 5, to reply to the statements in the report. I informed all requesting parties that I had not received a copy of the report and was unable to comment on it until I had been afforded the opportunity of at least reading it. Later that afternoon, I was called by Mr. John Schulz, who stated that a copy of the report had been mailed to me that day and that I should receive it soon.

I made it a point to watch the half-hour program by the Public Broadcast Laboratory, which appeared on TV station WETA at 9:30 p.m. on Sunday night, January 5. At one point the producer saw fit to dub in a previously taped interview with me, which made it appear that I was a part of the program dealing with the report itself. This was not true. At the time of this program, I had not as yet even seen the report. When I reached my office on January 6, the promised report had not arrived and as of today, January 7, it still has not arrived. The copy on the basis of which I am now commenting was borrowed for me by the Commission's Information Officer from a member of the news media.

As I see it, ordinary courtesy would require the authors of such a document as this to provide me and the other members of the Commission with a copy of it before releasing it to the press. Since this was not done, I can only conclude that the preparation of this report was not the result of a serious, unbiased study of a group seeking to aid this agency in the performance of its public responsibilities, but was, on the other hand, a deliberate effort to undermine it.

Let's turn to the report itself. Laying aside the monotonous accusatory adverbs and adjectives in the critique, the primary difference between the fundamental position of the Nader group and that of myself is that I believe that the American businessman is basically honest and they believe he is basically dishonest, trying consistently to defraud the American consumer. The group contends that American business, particularly the larger corporations selling directly or indirectly to consumers and using extensive advertising, are engaged in what are, or should be, criminal activities and that the officers of these corporations should be sentenced to terms in federal penitentiaries. On page 68 of the critique, for example, it is stated: "It is particularly important to apply criminal sanctions to dishonest corporate behavior, for it is far more damaging in contemporary America than all the depredations of street crime." In other words, corporation executives are engaged in much more reprehensible conduct than rapist, robbers, muggers, etc. In light of this extreme anti-business bias of these young zealots, it is not surprising that the equitable and reasonable enforcement policies of the Commission would be so enthusiastically and unjustifiably criticized.

Shortly after I became Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Commission turned from its general policy of emphasizing case-by-case adjudication to one seeking broader compliance with the law through new procedures. Experience had taught me that the case-by-case approach standing alone was not appropriate in the 1960's. The problems of regulatory lag and trial by convenience had been noted by the Landis Report and referred to by President Kennedy in

his State of the Union message shortly after he assumed office.

The Commission's new procedures contemplated the broad use of guidelines, statements, trade regulation rules and advisory opinions. Also, where warranted, the Commission began to accept assurances of voluntary compliance under the many statutes which it administers. The Commission turned to these new procedures with a belief that by their use justice could be administered more equitably by government. This technique has proved successful. With its limited personnel, the Commission realized that it had to reserve its litigation procedures for use against that small percentage of businessmen in the business community that refused to follow advice.

Running throughout the Nader group report is the repeated reference to the failure of this program and that the Commission is in error in believing that any worthwhile compliance with its laws can result from any procedure other than formal adjudicative trials. In other words, the promise of a businessman cannot be trusted. In a people's government no law is any better than the will of the people to abide by it. I have great faith in the honest businessman of America. I do not think he loves his country any less than do these young zealots.

On pages 58 and 59 of the report, reference is made to the fact that Ralph Nader acquired a copy of a report dealing with automobile warranties and made it public. It is charged that the report was deliberately suppressed. On page 59, the following appears:

"The real reason for the proposed plan for suppression lay in the contents of the report, which was highly critical of GM, Ford and Chrysler. Whether release would have eventually occurred is academic now, but there is little doubt based upon our interviews that Chairman Dixon was determined to suppress the report at least until after the election to avoid alienating Henry Ford II and other business interests who were contributing heavily to Hubert Humphrey's campaign."

This is a false charge and a blatant lie. Such unfounded charges as this would appear to me to be beneath the dignity of Ralph Nader. I think it is high time that the press confront Mr. Nader with this statement and inquire expressly if he agrees with it. If he does, I think somebody in America had better start worrying about Mr. Nader.

The Nader group vigorously contend that because many of the key staff members of the Commission were born in small communities they cannot understand or appreciate the consumer problems of urban America and, therefore, should be replaced. This novel qualification test for those public officials having responsibility for considering the problems of urban America would have disqualified most of the Presidents of the United States, the vast majority of the Members of Congress and at least some of the Justices of the Supreme Court. The suggestion springs both from ignorance and arrogance. In addition, the students overlooked the fact that practically all of these key members of our staff, as well as the Chairman, have been living in urban metropolitan Washington, D.C., since before the students were born.

Nothing galls me more than that section of the Nader group report which accuses me of hiring only high-ranking law students from "mediocre" law schools. For a number of years I have sent to the Deans of all the major law schools and most, if not all, accredited law schools throughout the United States, letters requesting them to encourage their graduating seniors to apply for employment at the Federal Trade Commission. I am proud to say that my efforts in soliciting the many Deans have proved quite successful. The Federal Trade Commission has always had many more applicants than positions available. With rare exception, offers of employment have been made to appli-

cants who graduated in the upper 50% of their class or had other outstanding attributes that made them attractive to the Federal Trade Commission. I have consistently believed any federal establishment is a better agency when its staff membership comes from various sections of the country. The Nader group infers strongly that the hiring practices of the Commission discriminates against "prestigious" law schools. Indirectly, I read in this charge that if a graduating student did not attend one of these schools he is adjudged a second-class lawyer coming from a mediocre school. What arrogance!

The lowest of all blows in the report is the charge on page 114 that "The FTC has not been averse to hiring Negroes, but 'only in their place,' i.e. the lowest GS 1-4 positions." Here are the facts. Since assuming my office as Chairman, I have made a positive effort to attract and hire qualified Negroes for attorney positions and other professional positions. In 1961, I found that there was not one Negro lawyer on the Commission staff. Starting in 1961, I was able, as a result of an internship program at the Commission, to persuade the top-ranking law student at Howard University to accept an appointment as a staff member. Since that time, by the adoption of more aggressive recruitment measurements, I have been able to persuade nine other Negroes to join the staff as attorneys. Five are still so employed. (The Nader report states that the Commission has only three Negro lawyers.) Many other Negroes have been offered appointments, but have generally declined the offers for the stated reason that they had offers which involved working in the civil rights area.

In short, contrary to allegations made in the report, the Federal Trade Commission has been engaged in a continuing positive effort to recruit high quality personnel, including minority group candidates. To those involved in developing and promoting this effort, it is disheartening to read the unfounded allegations made in the Nader group report. The report paints a completely false picture of the Federal Trade Commission's efforts and accomplishments in the areas of recruitment and equal opportunity. This false picture will do untold damage to the Commission's continuing effort in this regard. What a shame to be faced with this problem at this time in the life of America.

The Nader group report contains unfounded false accusations with respect to political influences at the Federal Trade Commission. For instance, the report says that of the nearly 500 attorneys on the staff of the Commission that only about 40 are Republicans. Since assuming office on March 21, 1961, I have borne the responsibility of hiring new attorneys on the Commission's staff. The great majority of the attorneys that have been hired over the period 1961 to date have been graduating seniors from law schools. Under no condition and at no time was anyone connected with this program authorized to inquire into the party affiliation of an applicant. How the Nader group arrives at this mystical figure of 40 Republicans, I do not know. There is nothing in the Federal Trade Commission records to reveal it. It appears to me that this is another charge grossly unfounded.

Throughout the report reference is made to a report of the Civil Service Commission dated June 1965. This report was made by the Civil Service Commission as a part of its regular program of inspecting personnel management in Federal agencies and is considered a part of the internal housekeeping process in the Federal government. Repeatedly in referring to this report, the Nader group charges that the recommendations in the report have been ignored. However, this is absolutely not true. Contrary to the false statements respecting action recommended by the Civil Service Commission, I, in fact, adopted virtually all of the recommendations.

How any group could profess or claim to

have made an empirical study of the activities of the Federal Trade Commission and make no mention of at least a single accomplishment by the Commission is beyond me. I shall mention a few.

The Commission's issuance of a Trade Regulation Rule in regard to disclosures of health hazards of cigarette smoking stimulated the enactment of the *Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act*, P.L. 89-92.

The Commission's proposal to issue guides relating to retail installment selling in the District of Columbia and in interstate commerce, and testimony furnished by the Commission with respect to abuses in credit selling, contributed in large measure to enactment of the *Consumer Credit Protection Act*, sometimes known as the *Truth-in-Lending Act*, P.L. 90-321.

The Commission played a major role in bringing about an enactment of the *Amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act*, P.L. 90-189, to give the public more adequate protection against flammability of household fabrics.

The Commission was a prime mover in proposing the bill known as the *Deceptive Sales Act of 1968*, S. 3065, which passed the Senate in July 1968. This bill would enable the Commission to obtain a temporary injunction in a United States District Court to halt violations affecting the consumer, pending completion of the administrative proceedings. In 1962, President Kennedy had endorsed passage of legislation which would have permitted the Commission on a proper showing of irreparable harm and injury to have sought temporary injunctions in a United States District Court on all facets of its work.

In consultation with Senator Magnuson, the Commission conducted a pilot project in the District of Columbia to identify the types of deceptive and unfair trade practices that might be preying upon poor people. The results were published in the June 1968 *Report on District of Columbia Consumer Protection Program*. To characterize this effort on the Commission's part as "so small and halfhearted that it could be called a show-case for publicity purposes" is both vain and unrealistic. This very effort at one point required approximately one-third of the appropriations available to the total Deceptive Practices program.

In making this study, the Commission was fully aware that it had many responsibilities for actions in the District of Columbia. It was believed then, and it still is my belief, that the lessons learned from this study are applicable to the various states of the nation which have the responsibility for unfair and deceptive acts occurring in "intrastate" commerce. Even the Nader group recognized the need for changes in the jurisdiction of the Commission if the Commission is to create offices in Detroit and Philadelphia and other cities to assume dual responsibility with the States.

The Commission's economic study of *Installment Credit and Retail Sales Practices of District of Columbia Retailers*, published in 1968, illuminated the problems of retailing in low-income areas. This study gave great impetus to the need for the *Truth-in-Packaging* legislation.

The Commission's economic studies on *Milk and Bread Prices* in 1966, the *Baking Industry* in 1967, and *Games of Chance in Supermarket and Gasoline Retailing* in 1969, as well as earlier reports on *Organization and Competition in Food Retailing*, *The Structure of Food Manufacturing*, and *Anti-competitive Practices in Gasoline Marketing*, contribute to the general fund of knowledge needed by the Commission, the Congress and interested members of the public in carrying forward and developing an effective trade regulatory program.

The *Economic Report on Webb-Pomerene Associations* in 1967, will undoubtedly have a significant effect on foreign trade policy.

The report on *Cents-Off Promotions in the Coffee Industry* in 1966, serves as a basis for consideration of regulations which may be issued under the "cents-off" provisions of the *Fair Packaging and Labeling Act*.

The staff report on *Automobile Warranties* forms the basis for public hearings soon to be held wherein the Commission will be determining the need, if any, for a trade regulation rule in this area.

I have felt compelled to mention these few actions on the part of the Commission because I think the public is entitled to know the important role the Commission has played and is playing in the area of consumer protection.

Most of us are producers and sell in some manner our talents and efforts, and all of us are consumers. The one should be in balance with the other. The Commission's role is to guide and advise the producer and, if necessary, to curb deception and to aid in informing the consumer.

I intend to remain at the Commission, consistently seeking better ideas and better techniques and increased efficiency in the operation of the Commission in fulfilling its very important role in protecting the consumer public. I intend to use my efforts to prevent, if I can, the extreme anti-business bias as exemplified by the views of these energetic, but misguided, students from poisoning the operation of the Federal Trade Commission to which I have given so much of my life.

THESE DAYS

(By John Chamberlain)

I'LL TRY THE WHOLE CASE AND CONDEMN YOU TO DEATH

One doesn't know whether to laugh or cry over this one.

Last June, Ralph Nader, the man whose name has become synonymous in many minds with consumer protection because of his scaring book on the automobile industry, went to Paul Rand Dixon, the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, with an idea for a "summer project" which would give some Yale and Harvard law school students an opportunity to see how a regulatory agency works. An ex-University of Florida football coach who had been a lawyer for Senator Estes Kefauver's investigatory committees, which had never been easy on anyone remotely suspected of mulcting the consumer, Dixon thought favorably of the proposed project. Accordingly he let seven young men, including a great-grandson of President William Howard Taft, have the run of the Federal Trade Commission's premises for two-and-one-half months.

The students proceeded to interview, to browse through the files, and to peer over various shoulders—and, at the end of their stint, to do a "critique of the consumer protection record of the FTC." Their chief recommendation: get rid of Chairman Paul Rand Dixon.

Faced with the many charges made by the boys in a 186-page document, Mr. Dixon not surprisingly has reacted as if bitten by adders. Here he had tried to help the students get an education, and they had replied by accusing his staff of incompetence, lassitude, absenteeism, and even alcoholism, not to mention their allegation that he himself had "degraded and ossified" the FTC by cronyism and by a weakness for hiring lawyers with degrees from institutions other than Yale, Harvard, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dixon's sense of outrage at the conduct of the young group that has become known as "Nader's Raiders" is quite understandable. Since I have never investigated the workings of the FTC myself, I am hardly the one to pass on the charges made by the students. Their document, however, is a singular one on its face, if only because it

assumes in its opening pages on "the crisis" that the capitalist system is close to being totally depraved. The students begin by accusing the American business system of such sins as maintaining "intra-corporate tyranny over executives, price leadership, oligopoly or shared monopolies, conglomerate empires, tacit agreements precluding challenge to mutual vested interests, corporate domination of regulatory agencies, product fixing, manipulation of credit, and other subtle forms of coercion which block new competitors and new ideas."

The boys go on to speak of the "disadvantages of mouthwashes (which many dentists say irritate the mucous membranes of the mouth), detergents (most of which now add particles to your clothes rather than remove them, many of which can irritate the skin), cars of all types, drugs of almost every variety, deodorants (which now clog pores . . .), diet soft drinks (some of which can harm internal organs), and so on."

Then, having posited their case against the capitalist system, the boys proceed to condemn the 1,200 employees of the Federal Trade Commission for not stopping all these practices at once. They even condemn the FTC for not doing anything about advertisers who "sell sex and power in relation to various phallic symbols, undulating women and potent wild animals." In other words, the FTC ought to prosecute Esso for saying "there's a tiger in your tank," an obviously misleading statement if you think the use of metaphor constitutes a lie. Query: how humorless can you get?

After reading all this, I can sympathize with the embattled Chairman of the FTC. Like him, I wonder how the students, with two-and-one-half months at their disposal, managed to find out all those things about deodorants, mouthwashes, detergents, automobiles, drugs, oligopolies, intra-corporate tyranny over executives, and so on. Of course, the students didn't spend a snitch of their time investigating the sins of the capitalist system in relation to the failure of the FTC to prosecute. They assumed the villainies at the outset, and then, because the 1,200 employees of the FTC didn't seem to be investigating all these alleged iniquities at once, they proceeded to accuse Paul Rand Dixon of "incompetence."

Really now! Is that the way the Yale and Harvard law schools teach young men to conduct an investigation? Simply because of the students' high-handedness, I intend to give Mr. Dixon's side of the case in another column.

THESE DAYS

(By John Chamberlain)

WHAT PHILOSOPHY FOR A REGULATORY AGENCY?

Between Chairman Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission and the seven Harvard and Yale law school students who spent last summer investigating the commissioner's regulatory agency there are many gulfs. The students are Ivy Leaguers from the campuses of the Northeast; Dixon was educated in Tennessee and Florida. The students, who include William Howard Taft 4th and Peter Bradford (now an assistant to Maine's Governor Curtis), grew up in the affluent America of the Sixties, which takes affluence for granted; Dixon comes from the hard knocks period of the depressed Thirties. The age gulf, the regional gulf, even the contrasting habits of speech and attitudes toward courtesy, are enough to explain the quite obvious fact that Dixon and the young investigative team organized by consumer crusader Ralph Nader were bound to clash.

Clash they certainly did, for the report issued by the young investigators charging incompetence, indolence, and alcoholism in the FTC is perhaps the toughest rap since

the mine workers' chieftain, John L. Lewis, called Vice President John Nance Garner a poker-playing, whisky-drinking, evil old man. I won't comment on the personal aspects of the clash other than to say that the students showed Mr. Dixon scant courtesy when they turned over their report to television and the press before placing a copy on the commissioner's desk. It should be relevant to note, however, that, in addition to all the other gulfs, there is a gap as wide as the Atlantic Ocean between Mr. Dixon's philosophy of what a regulatory agency should do and the philosophy expressed by the Nader-organized investigatory team.

Mr. Dixon, a veteran of the Kefauver investigations into consumer practices, can hardly be called anti-consumer. He was a Kennedy appointee at the FTC, with a renewal under Lyndon Johnson, and he believes that capitalists must submit to regulation if only to save them from themselves. Yet his philosophy stipulates that the American system isn't supposed to produce more laws than is necessary. "You can't enforce a law," he says, "that the people don't want enforced."

This attitude, when translated into the world of a regulatory agency, results in such things as "advisory opinions," "consent decrees," promises to "cease and desist," "voluntary compliance" and other things which the Nader-recruited law school students regard as horrifying softness.

Their report makes it obvious that they want a Federal Trade Commission that would "multiply its staff and budget many times over," engaging in positive detective work by employing engineers, chemists and other experts capable of looking into such things as the workings of household appliances, the strength of construction materials, the performance of cars. In short: a "Big Brother Is Watching You" approach which Mr. Dixon, who thinks most business men can be trusted to behave decently if you tell them the rules, finds personally obnoxious and which Congress has always refused to sanction with supporting funds.

The difference in viewpoint between "Nader's Raiders" and Chairman Dixon is clearly apparent in their respective uses of rhetoric. The young critics want "criminal sanctions" applied to "dishonest corporate behavior." Mr. Dixon would agree provided that criminality is involved, but he finds it disturbing when his young critics go on to say that the "dishonesty" of corporations "is far more dangerous in contemporary America than all the depredations of street crime." Such language, he thinks, betrays the "extreme anti-business bias" of the "young zealots," for what they are saying is that corporation executives "are engaged in much more reprehensible conduct than rapists, robbers, muggers, and so on." Chairman Dixon finds it hard to believe that his young critics can actually equate the crime of raping a woman in a dark alley with the "tyranny" involved in "exploiting" a housewife "by games, gimmicks and deception." Yet in the "young zealots'" equation, the commercial use of "gimmicks" becomes actually more reprehensible than a mugging.

There will never be any reconciliation between the Nader and Dixon points of view. But as between the "Big Brother Is Watching You" approach advocated by the law school students and the "give 'em a chance to comply" philosophy of the regulatory agencies, Congress, which represents a blend of producer and consumer interests, has always preferred to stop considerably short of George Orwell's 1984. The gimlet-eyed gumshoeing advocated by the students for policing detergent and mouthwash sales would not only cost billions, it would also result in a far less productive business system, which wouldn't help the consumer at all.

SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frank N. Trager, professor of international affairs and director of the national security program at New York University, has for many years been recognized as an expert in international affairs, particularly in the geopolitical considerations of American foreign policy in the cold war struggle.

Recently, he prepared a statement of his views on a possible settlement in Vietnam, and because a great portion of his academic career has been devoted to Southeast Asia, I thought his remarks would be of special significance to the Members.

The statement follows:

SETTLEMENT IN VIET NAM

So much has been written and spoken on the background to, and the war in Viet Nam that there is no necessity here to review the past. However, it is pertinent to refer to the Asian policy conceptions of President Nixon as these were suggested during the recent campaign. (See reports of a Chicago broadcast and a New Jersey address, "To Keep the Peace" in *The New York Times*, October 20, 1968.) President Nixon emphasized: "Preventive diplomacy"; "non-Communist Asian security alliances"; "No more Viet Nams"; the "threat from Communist China" and the "danger of a confrontation between nuclear powers," that is, the risk of escalating local conflict into world war.

In the light of the much debated past Viet Nam policy and the implications of President Nixon's outlines of his Asian policy this paper is concerned solely with the availability and desirability of various U.S. options in any settlement of the conflict in the divided land of Viet Nam.

I. U.S. INTERESTS AND OBJECTIVES

It is here asserted that at least since June 1950 (the Korean War) U.S. major interests in Asia can be reduced to three:

To assist the independent states of Free (i.e. defined as non-Communist) Asia to maintain their security and stability, and to improve their conditions of living.

To deny the countries and peoples of Free Asia to Communist aggression and subversion (defined respectively as overt war across boundaries and warfare by proxies—guerillas, insurgents, "liberators").

To encourage these Asian and Pacific states in all forms of co-operative endeavor designed to promote their security, stability and improvement in the conditions of living (e.g. Asian regionalisms such as ASEAN, ASPAC, ADB, Commonwealth defense agreements, SEAMES, Mekong River Valley Development, etc.)

In support of these interests, the U.S. prime objectives in Viet Nam have been to preserve the independence of the Republic of Viet Nam, to resist Communist aggression, and to assist it to develop the institutional bases for a non-Communist state, capable of assuming its proper role among the other states in the Arc of Free Asia.

II. DRVN OBJECTIVES AND INTENTIONS

The basic objectives of the DRVN remain what they were before Geneva 1954. That is, first to acquire by military and political means the control over all of Viet Nam; and secondly, in my view, to extend such domination over all of the former French Indochinese territory. Ho Chi Minh had been given that charge when Moscow originally delegated him to organize in July 1930 the

Indochinese Communist Party or Communist Party (Indochina). To be able to accomplish these objectives in 1969 the DRVN must bring about the early and complete withdrawal of U.S. and Allied troops from the area and must continue to demand as a *minimum* settlement of the war recognition of and a full role for the NLF-Viet Cong-Peoples Revolutionary Party in any post-truce or post-cease-fire government in South Viet Nam.

With the decision on the "their-side, our side table" it may be said that the Paris negotiations, as distinct from the talks, have begun. Before any option is considered, one must ask a basic question, the answer to which cannot be certain; and, hence, implicative contingency planning must be ready for a range of answers—this constitutes a *real* war game. The question is: Why, in 1968, did the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, the Communist North Viet Nam, agree first to "talks" and then to "negotiations"? A non-exhaustive range of answers follows:

1. The DRVN wanted to achieve what could be made to appear as one of their major world-wide propaganda objectives, namely unconditional cessation of U.S. bombing of North Viet Nam. Also, and with greater realism, the DRVN was "hurting" on its own soil. Cessation of bombing would give them a respite for renewal, regrouping and continuing the struggle at a later date, which would prove difficult for the U.S. then to counter.

2. The DRVN had concluded that it could not win the military struggle and that its military and political assets in the South (its direct NVN forces and its satellite NLF forces) were being eroded. Negotiations could further their aims at less cost, and their infrastructure in the South, more or less clandestinely resupplied, could do the rest. Negotiations, with threats of reviewable hostilities, and continued lower-level fighting could assure a political role and influence for the NLF in any "peace" in the South. Further, since the Republic of Viet Nam (RVN) was displaying increased military capability and political growth, it would, therefore, be in the DRVN's interests to start protracted talks and negotiations, so as to diminish U.S. activity and support, thereby slowing down the RVN's capabilities. Such a chain of events also increases the prospects of the NLF.

3. The DRVN could count on continued assistance from the USSR and the China People's Republic (CPR) (despite the latter's objections to negotiations), while the U.S. would predictably want to lower its military and economic commitment to the Republic of Viet Nam (RVN). In the course of protracted negotiations and some uncertainty over the ultimate U.S. position in Viet Nam and elsewhere in Asia, U.S. and RVN allies (Australia, Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand) will at the least be predictably confused. Such confusion will help the DRVN and her allies in assisting "liberation" moves in Thailand, Cambodia, and especially Laos.

4. The DRVN had found that conventional military battle, in which it was engaged at the time it agreed to talks, had not "paid off," hence the need to revert to the so-called Chinese Communist strategy of "Ta Ta Tan Tan" ("Talk, Talk, Fight, Fight"—in guerrilla fashion). This could and would be done during negotiations.

III. OPTIONS

See The New York Times January 12, 1969 for a brief presentation by William Beecher, of six options ranging from "a unilateral [U.S.] withdrawal to a massive bombing effort against North Viet Nam." *The New York Times* story referred to U.S. options while negotiations continue. They are:

1. Doing what we are now doing militarily and politically in contributing to the building of security and stability factors of the RVN.

2. Unilateral reduction in U.S. Force-levels but willingness to continue in a long war.

3. The so-called dual-track approach in which the U.S.-DRVN negotiate a military cease fire and mutual withdrawal of troops between us and Hanoi, while insisting that political negotiations for a settlement in the South be conducted by the RVN government and the NLF.

4. A military and political settlement that provides for a compromise role for the NLF-Vietcong in the "political process" of South Viet Nam.

5. Gradual, mutual but substantial withdrawal of forces.

6. The "Ike-Korea" ploy, namely a *threat* of renewed and significant attack on the North if a truce or cease-fire is unduly delayed in the negotiations.

Obviously the position papers that detail these options amplify their content. However, it would appear that these options, as reported, gloss over two quintessentially important issues. These are:

1. The U.S. stance on a political settlement that includes the NLF, as such, in a new coalition government in South Viet Nam.

2. The situation in Laos and Thailand, namely the role of Asian regionalism (ASEAN, ASPAC, etc., etc.) in any security arrangements for Asia in the post-Viet Nam War environment.

Discussion of the above or other options depend on certain inescapable factors arising from the analysis of U.S. interests and objectives in Asia. Any option that fails to consider the possible impact of its terms on the half of humanity who live on the mainland and islands of Asia and the Indo-Pacific Ocean area is dangerously short-sighted; as is the shallow argument that having allegedly been "Asia Firsters", it is now time for Americans to redress the balance by becoming "Europe-Firsters" (or "Latin-American-Firsters or African-Firsters," etc.). Any option that offers a sacrificial gambit in Viet Nam, that is yielding in some part on the preservation of the independence of a non-Communist RVN, in order to achieve a detente with the USSR and ventilation through the Bamboo Curtain of the PRC, will most probably face the loss of Viet Nam and the failure to gain either a detente or a window. The sacrifice of the RVN interests will whet the political appetites of Moscow and Peking who still are by common consent and President Nixon our chief adversaries, whether or not we are bound by the strategy and tactics of the not so cold "Cold War."

The key factors that should condition any policy option selected by the Administration are:

1. Coalition: Negotiations must not be allowed to force a coalition government, inclusive of the NLF-Viet Cong, or any Saigon Government. The rebels, the insurgents, the aggressors—call them what you will—against every government of the RVN since its independence must not be rewarded by a gift of a share of that government. This is not a moral judgment; it is a practical, political one. The U.S. agreed-upon "troika," or coalition government for Laos in the Geneva 1962 Conference almost succeeded in destroying Laos. The Pathet Lao today, technically a member of the government it is militarily attacking, reinforced by North Vietnamese troops and supply, control by arms significant provincial areas in the "Pan" and the "Handle" of Laos, contiguous to North and South Viet Nam. If Laos survives today, it is because its Premier and the U.S. have introduced armed counter-measures (also contrary to Geneva '62) to help it survive. In related fashion the coalition government including the Communist Party (PKI) brought into being by Sukarno almost succeeded in destroying the possibility for the existence of a non-Communist Indonesia. And, neutralist Burma, anxious to end the Communist rebellion in that country, was willing to make extreme concessions to the Burma Communist Party in the negotiations of 1963. It wisely refused the BCP demand for coalition.

Almost twenty years of consecutive governmental and private sector experience in Southeast Asia have convinced me that no newly independent state in Asia, including the RVN, can get on with the business of building viable and free institutions, can proceed with the vital functions of nation-building if its governmental structure is forced into a coalition with its Communist Party and Front.

The U.S. has used such Pickwickian phrases as "we shall not impose a coalition on the RVN" when we know that Saigon, above all else, rejects a coalition government with the NLF-Viet Cong. U.S. Allies in the Viet Nam war have rejected the principle of such coalition government. And, certainly, security in Thailand, Laos and Cambodia would be further jeopardized if Saigon was "forced" or "persuaded" into a coalition with the NLF-Viet Cong.

The only justifiable position for the U.S. in any option is to oppose a coalition. Our policy should be: amnesty and full, individual citizenship rights for all rebels who peacefully lay down their arms; no coalition government.

2. The factor of Viet Nam's mainland Southeast Asian neighbors looms large in any option in part because of the vulnerability of Laos and Cambodia, as contiguous states to an aggressive Communist state, and in part because these two, and Thailand, a staunch ally since SEATO (1954), and Burma are under present attack from Peking and/or Hanoi. The vulgar interpretation of the so-called "domino theory" has beclouded its more sophisticated meaning. States will not automatically fall, as do dominoes, when one "domino" is toppled. But these Southeast Asian states have experienced and continue to experience armed attack across boundaries, "domestic" insurgency, and tension-creating, anxiety-laden, situations because of Communist policies sponsored by the PRC and DRVN. Were the DRVN to attain its objectives in Viet Nam, there is abundant evidence that it could and would pursue its further objectives in Laos and Cambodia. Simultaneously its supporting ally, the PRC harasses both Thailand and Burma. None may "fall" but all are threatened.

The only correct position for the U.S. in any option is to insure that these mainland Southeast Asian, non-Communist states gain the opportunity of having secure borders.

Proposals for achieving this have been made. They range from variations on the theme of "neutralizing" some or all of these states, and "guaranteeing" their neutrality through some form of big power agreement, to converting an enlarged SEATO into a NATO-type collective security arrangement. The latter would require a dominant U.S. strategic and conventional presence.

Neutralization in any variation and a NATO-type security arrangement are not desirable aspects of any option. Southeast Asian neutralists (Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos and Burma) have in varying degrees lost their original enchantment with neutralism. Indonesia has joined with collective security-minded Thailand in ASEAN. Laos, tacitly and necessarily, accepts its own, and U.S. violation of Geneva '62 which neutralized it. Though Cambodia deliberately denounced the protection of the SEATO Protocol, its leadership is now (I do not guarantee "tomorrow") accepting of a U.S. military presence in the area. Burma, after an exchange of 1968 visits with ASEAN members, Singapore and Malaysia, speaks in terms of the "community" of Southeast Asia that must cooperate for its own good.

A NATO-type agreement in place of SEATO would inevitably continue U.S. dominance in the Asian-Pacific area. The military and social-psychological costs of such dominance are enjoyed neither by Asians nor Americans.

In this situation, whether expressed or implied, U.S. policy in any option should

be (1) to welcome and encourage all forms of Asian-Pacific regionalism, understanding by this that the Asian-Pacific states so involved (they presently included five members of ASEAN and nine members, one observer of ASPAC—with some duplications) are cautiously moving toward forms and institutions for economic, cultural, political, and, (hopefully in time), security cooperation. Secondly, U.S. policy should include a (diminished) military presence in the area. The guiding principle for U.S. policy in this regard is *unum inter pares, not primus inter pares*.

IV. THE NEGOTIATING POSITION OF THE U.S. AT PARIS

In the light of the above discussion the following propositions are the essential ones for our stand in Paris. They assume that the U.S. will consult and share in full all policy deliberations with our fighting Allies in Viet Nam.

1. For a Cease-Fire. A cease-fire means that—

(a) The DRVN will stop all hostile actions both of its own direct forces and of those of the NLF and Pathet Lao, against the RVN and Laos, including infiltration of personnel and supplies in these countries.

(b) Infiltration into Cambodia and use of it as a sanctuary both by the DRVN and NLF-Viet Cong will stop.

(c) The NLF-Viet Cong will stop all hostile actions within RVN.

(d) The U.S.-RVN and Allied Forces will stop all hostile actions in both Viet Nams and in Laos and Cambodia.

(e) The various hostile forces will execute the cease fire in place. Regrouping and subsequent transit will follow after item (f) has been initiated.

(f) Effective inspection and verification procedures will simultaneously accompany all cease-fire action as herein defined.

2. *Military Phase-Out.* All foreign troops, regrouped and provided with transit rights, in the RVN, Laos, Cambodia and the DRVN will be phased out under effective inspection and verification procedures. Exchange of prisoners will take place in accordance with the Geneva Convention.

3. *Free passage* during a fixed time period will be accorded to all those who wish to depart the DRVN for the RVN, and vice-versa. Similar arrangements shall be made for Laos-DRVN and Cambodia-DRVN. Effective inspection and verification procedures insuring freedom of choice for those who elect emigration will be instituted.

4. *Amnesty* and full, individual citizenship rights shall be granted and restored to all indigents who fought within and against the RVN and Laos.

5. The DRVN and RVN agree that each is a sovereign state, whose borders are to be demarcated roughly at the 17th Parallel that presently divides them. Formal recognition and unification may be subsequently negotiated between them.

6. *Timing.* This item absolutely governs the propositions in Cease-Fire, Military Phase-Out, Free Passage and Amnesty.

(a) A maximum "X" days (30 days would appear to be sufficient) shall be assigned to reach agreement on above items IV, 1-4, inclusive. During this period the U.S.-RVN-Allied Forces will continue in ready action to improve their military posture within South Viet Nam. They will also maintain full combat readiness to proceed against the DRVN, if necessary, in the North. Also the RVN will continue to improve its political posture in South Viet Nam.

(b) In the event of agreement of items IV, 1-4, inclusive, within days, combat and combat readiness as in 6a above will be terminated according to the provisions of IV, 1-4.

(c) In the event that the DRVN-NLF pursues and implements a Korea-type, protracted negotiations ("Talk and Fight") be-

yond the 30 day period, a variation on the Ike-Korea policy shall be executed. The circumstances and consequences of exceeding the 30 day period shall be quietly communicated to the DRVN-NLF forces and to their Allies before the expiration of the 30 day period.

If on the thirty-first day there is no substantial agreement on items IV, 1-4, the U.S.-RVN-Allied Forces shall strike hard against a single objective within DRVN territory, between the Demilitarized Zone and the northern boundary for bombing fixed by President Johnson in March-April 1968. Since such an attack does not absolutely contravene the terms of reference in sitting down to negotiate in Paris, negotiations continue. Hopefully this attack will persuade Hanoi to proceed forthwith toward a conclusion on items IV, 1-4 inclusive.

(d) Negotiations from Day 30 to Day 45 shall be allowed for reaching conclusions on items IV, 1-4 inclusive. In the event that these fail, order a land, sea and air attack on one vital DRVN center, e.g. Vinh in the southern part of North Viet Nam. Announce simultaneously that the U.S.-RVN forces are prepared to return to negotiations at Paris.

(e) The Sixtieth Day shall be fixed either for concluding negotiations on items IV, 1-4 inclusive, or, for resumption of full scale warfare, including the invasion of the home territory of the DRVN. Use whatever conventional power is necessary with utmost speed completely to incapacitate North Viet Nam and simultaneously announce that the military defeat inflicted on the DRVN will not seek to depose its Communist regime. This latter is intended to diminish the risk of a big-power war on the assumption that Moscow and perhaps Peking will accept the DRVN defeat provided the Communist world does not lose a regime it had regarded as "belonging" to that world. The U.S. still adheres to its long-term objective of fighting to preserve the independence of the RVN.

(f) Termination of the conflict now proceeds according to prompt execution of IV, 1-5, inclusive.

V. COMMENT ON U.S. FORCE LEVELS IN SOUTH VIET NAM AND ITEM IV 5 IN NEGOTIATING POSITION

I believe—though this is another subject—that the more than 550,000 U.S. military in South Viet Nam is excessive. This is partly so because we failed to use our power decisively, i.e., maximum resources applied to the target in the shortest possible time. The gradual build-up, over years, was necessitated because we successively changed our analyses of the situation in Viet Nam and suited military doctrine and force levels, our "roles and missions", to each analysis.

We originally had a training mission; in 1961 we changed this to a military support and training mission, still uncertain on how to combat "insurgency"; in 1962 we instituted "counterinsurgency" training and support; in 1965 we undertook limited conventional warfare with U.S. combat forces in action. Limited warfare as to our goals was clear; limited warfare as to the means to be employed and the targets to be attacked were wretchedly compromised at every stage of the war since 1965. Each change was incremental, not substitutional. The number of riflemen, the ground troops who actually fight in the present U.S. military in South Viet Nam is probably no more than 10-12% of the total. We used our Air power with such restraints that we did not bomb the most important DRVN air base until October 1967; our Navy was until late 1968 not equipped to fight in the typical waterways that characterized all of deltas of mainland Southeast Asia, etc., etc., etc.

Hence, I believe we can substantially reduce U.S. Forces in Viet Nam whatever the outcome in Paris. Two factors must now condition such reduction: the true readiness of the ARVN (some 900,000 strong)—ask Gen-

erals Abrams and Goodpaster for this decision. The second factor is our assurances to our Allies and friends in Asia that our policy is equivalent to: "Reduction yes, withdrawal, no". They will understand, even sponsor such a decision. They will also understand that what we do in this regard is directly related to our strong desire to see Asian regionalism as effective as possible in preserving and further developing the Arc of Free Asia.

With respect to item IV, 5, the acceptance by the DRVN and RVN of their respective sovereignties in their respective territories: This was not accepted at the Geneva '54 Conference by the Vietnamese on either side of the 17th Parallel. Acceptance now does not insure future peace between them—witness the situation between the two Koreas. On the other hand it places responsibility on the governments and peoples of the two Viet Nams to get on peacefully with their political life as they determine it. This latter is the situation between the two Germans. In a much troubled and polarized world, this is about as much as can be accomplished.

WILDLIFE PRESERVATION

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to help preserve wildlife in this country and abroad that is threatened with extinction. A similar bill was passed by the House during the last session of Congress, but did not pass the Senate. It is imperative that this legislation be passed by both branches of Congress as soon as possible.

The threat to wildlife increases with each day. The demand for exotic furs such as the leopard and the tiger and a market for alligator skins has led to the senseless destruction of these species. If this slaughter is allowed to run its course, these animals will soon join the ranks of the passenger pigeon, the sea mink, the Florida wolf and other lost species. In our rush to exploit nature's resources, we have wiped out 50 species of animals native to the United States. In contrast to the normal course of nature, in which one species may disappear in every thousand years. Today the rate is estimated to be a thousand times higher.

Man has shown an intolerance and a disregard for the other creatures that live on our earth. The penalties that we may pay for this disregard are not known at this time. Elimination of a species may create a biological imbalance that can be harmful to man. The death of certain birds, for example, leads to a rapid multiplication of certain insects. The destruction of predators such as the wolf may lead to a multiplication of rodents. Man must then spend his energies correcting that imbalance. And we do not know when we may wipe out a species that is vital to our survival.

This bill will prevent the importation of threatened animals from abroad and also stop the interstate shipment of animal skins. In the later case, poachers have violated existing laws and threaten to wipe out the alligator, and some of the fur-bearing animals. Federal action can curb this abuse.

A series of articles on our endangered

wildlife, by Marcia Hayes, recently appeared in the Buffalo Evening News. These articles graphically portray the plight of many American and foreign animals. I include these articles in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

OUR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE—I: SPECIES WIPED OUT BY MAN, THE HUNTER, OR MAN, THE BUILDER

(NOTE.—By the year 2000 most of the world's wild animals may be extinct. What is behind this problem and what can be done to prevent it is the subject of this series on our vanishing wildlife.)

(By Marcia Hayes)

NEW YORK, January 27.—This generation may witness the end of most of the world's wild animals.

Trapped, hunted and crowded out of their natural habitats, hundreds of species are already losing the fight for survival. By the year 2000, conservationists foresee a world whose polluted continents and oceans will be the almost exclusive domain of men, livestock and rats.

The World Health Organization estimates that there is one rat for every human in the world—3.3 billion of them. But the rest of the world's wildlife has not fared as well. In the name of sport, profit and progress, 550 species of mammals, birds and reptiles have been pushed to the brink of extinction within the last century.

In the U.S., 50 native American species have been wiped out in a period of 50 years. It took just over a century to exterminate 5 billion passenger pigeons. Bison, once numbered in the tens of millions, were slaughtered methodically by hunters and cavalrymen until only a few dozen of one species remained.

Among those already extinct here are the sea mink, the Florida wolf, the Eastern cougar, two species of bison, and the bighorn sheep.

The American mountain lion, the Canada lynx, the Florida key deer and the American alligator are on the verge of extinction. All are being hunted despite restrictions.

In Africa and Asia, cheetahs, leopards and tigers are being trapped by the hundreds for their furs. Zoologists don't expect them to last out the decade. Orangutans and mountain gorillas are being crowded out of their jungle habitats. Elephants, slaughtered by the thousands for their ivory, are becoming the bison of Africa. And sportsmen are killing off the rhinoceros, the gazelle and the polar bear.

Names familiar to every child fill row after row of the list of endangered animals compiled by the International Union for Conservation of Nature & Natural Resources. Among them are seven kinds of whales, five varieties of bears and tigers, seven types of seals and leopards, five species of rhino and line kinds of gazelle.

Mammals alone are disappearing at a rate of one species per year, according to the IUCNRR. And the organization reports that the ranks of 250 mammals are dwindling so fast that they may become extinct at any moment—in a year or in a decade.

Whether he wears a hunting jacket or a business suite (or sits at the controls of a bulldozer, civilized man is the most formidable opponent animals have encountered since the first giant reptiles roamed the earth 200 million years ago.

Man hunts primarily for pleasure. But he kills in quantity to satisfy demands for exotic foods and fashions, and he destroys and pollutes animal habitats to make way for his own housing, transportation, and industry.

Before man became civilized, the death of a species was a fairly uncommon event. Geologists estimate that 1000 species may have become extinct over a period of one million

years, a rate of one every thousand years. Today the death rate is more than a thousand times higher.

A species is headed for extinction when its death rate exceeds the rate at which new animals are born. Its extermination is assured when its breeding population falls below a certain critical level, which varies with every species. Although a few individuals may remain, they will be easily outnumbered by their natural enemies. And they may be scattered over such wide distances that they cannot find each other to mate.

This is the plight of the great blue whale, largest of the world's mammals, now thought to be extinct as a species. Dr. Ross Negrelli, curator of the New York Aquarium, estimates that less than 1000 and perhaps as few as two dozen of the whales remain in the vast southern oceans of the world. Dispersed over thousands of square miles, the odds are slim that a mating pair will meet.

Blue whales have been on the endangered list for years. Yet it was 1967 before the whaling industries of Russia, Norway and Japan agreed to stop hunting them. And the industry has yet to set reasonable quotas on other endangered whales.

Fin whales are being caught at the rate of 14,000 per year, three times the catch that conservationists say the species can stand. There is no limit at all on the sperm whale, and some 29,000 of the mammals are killed every year.

The dilemma of the whaling nations is shared by all industries that have a stake in endangered wildlife: Their source of profit is disappearing and they know it. Yet the investment in equipment is so great—millions of dollars in the case of whaling ships—and the profits so high, that they will not voluntarily regulate the catch.

Hunters are also a big threat to several endangered species. Although the majority of sportsmen limit their catch and stalk their prey on foot, there are hundreds of callous trophy-seekers who don't care how they get their game.

A number of guide services cater to this type of client. One agency guarantees its customer a polar bear for a \$3500 fee.

The World Wildlife Fund estimates that polar bears are being killed at the rate of 1200 per year, while the total population is less than 12,000. Only stiff international controls can save the bears, which drift along with the Arctic ice sheet through the territorial waters of the United States, Russia, Norway, Greenland and Canada.

In Alaska, the increasingly rare American timberwolf is still hunted for bounty, pursued across the tundra by airborne hunters, who get \$50 for every hide they bring in.

Equal to sport and industry as a threat to wildlife is that byproduct of civilization known as progress. Every housing development, road, or industrial park destroys the home of at least one animal species and may wipe out the plant life and prey on which its life depends. Only an educated public can stop this form of destruction.

Most nations have laws to protect wildlife, but they lack the money and manpower to enforce them. The worst offenders are poachers—primarily in the fur and hide industries, and the U.S. is now making an effort to take the profit out of such illegal hunting. A bill introduced in the House last year would prevent the import of hides and skins of endangered wildlife and would forbid the interstate shipment of animals and animal parts taken contrary to state law.

Vehemently opposed by lobbyists for the fur and hide industries, the House bill is awaiting action by the new Congress.

OUR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE—II: FASHION'S APPETITE PERILS MANY RARE, BEAUTIFUL SPECIES

(By Marcia Hayes)

NEW YORK, January 28.—The last wild tiger in the world could end up on a Seventh

Ave. coat rack. The last American alligators may be sold as a set of matched luggage. Right now the odds are for it.

In the U.S. it is quite possible to import almost any animal, alive or dead, in any number. Likewise the interstate shipment of hides or furs from rare animals is not prohibited.

Until legislation is passed and strictly enforced, poachers will continue a virtually unrestricted slaughter of endangered fur-bearing animals and reptiles.

The price of rarity is high, but many are prepared to pay it. Status-seeking consumers willingly spend thousands for a "fun fur" and hundreds for a single pair of shoes. The demand is encouraging the methodical destruction of the world's most beautiful and ancient animals.

Within the next few years, all of the great cats except the lion will be pushed beyond the biological point of no return. The American alligator has already been exterminated over most of its range, and the Chinese alligators are not expected to last much longer.

In the past, the fashion industry came close to doing in the sea otter, the ostrich, the snowy egret, and the trumpeter swan. Luckily, otters were saved at the last moment by a conservation campaign, and the birds were spared by sudden change in style.

But furs don't go out of style, and the market for them continues to increase. Recently, a Somali leopard coat, fashioned from eight skins, was advertised in a New York paper for \$16,000.

In a recent full-page magazine ad, three furs from the rare Himalayan snow leopard were shown draped across a model above the caption: "Untamed . . . born free in the wild whiteness of the High Himalayas only to be snared as part of this captivating fur collection."

Somalis, considered the most desirable type of leopard, are being decimated so quickly that conservationists don't expect the species to last 10 years.

One leading furrier says he bought close to 500 leopard skins from Somaliland alone last year, along with approximately 1000 less valuable furs from Asia and other parts of Africa. The industry as a whole is estimated to have imported about 7000 leopard skins, and the yearly world trade is close to 50,000.

Furriers are not happy with the situation. Some, like furrier Jacques Kaplan, find it tragic. Mr. Kaplan recently published a full-page ad in the New York Times declaring his intention to stop trading in the furs of endangered species and encouraging other furriers to do the same.

But he says he has received no response and a lot of abuse from American furriers as a result.

Tigers, described as an "interesting" fur by one industry spokesman, are disappearing fast from India. A curator at the American Museum of Natural History estimates that there may be 4000 Bengal tigers left. Yet they are shipped by the hundreds to furriers in New York and Paris and they are still hunted on safari.

The Bengal tigers are numerous compared to the Siberian tigers, which number no more than 250. Only 50 Caspian tigers remain and less than 25 native Javan tigers roam the island. But the rarest tiger of all is the native species of Bali. There are thought to be only four left.

Two South American cats have had the bad luck to be beautiful. Jaguars and ocelots are shipped out by the hundreds, and the jaguar's future is already in doubt. Ocelots are becoming rare. It takes two dozen of the small cats to make one coat and they are exported accordingly.

Peru alone shipped 11,244 ocelot skins out of the country in a recent year. And last year U.S. customs passed 115,458 from all parts of South America.

So numerous in 1900 that a dozen skins could be bought for \$5, chinchillas are believed extinct in the wild. They are now bred in captivity, and the price of a chinchilla fur reflects the expense of raising them. A stole is worth \$50,000.

The shy, delicate vicuña, whose soft fur is fashioned into coats, scarves, and blankets, is extinct over most of its former range. It is now found only in remote areas of the Andes, where the Peruvian government is taking steps to protect it.

Poachers make between \$50 and \$100 for a leopard skin, somewhat less for a tiger, and somewhat more for a cheetah. Ocelots bring less than \$20.

Cats are not the only quarry of the fur trade. At the beginning of this century, sea otters were practically wiped out by fur trappers. But conservationists stepped in at the last moment and saved the species. Rigidly controlled for years, otters are once again numerous enough to be harvested.

But fur seals are now being killed with the same abandon that almost wiped out the otter. Whole herds of seals are trapped on shore, where they are virtually helpless, and beaten to death with huge clubs.

Next to cats, reptiles are the biggest victims of fashion, and the American alligator is the major victim among them. Snapped up by handbag, shoe, and luggage manufacturers as fast as they can be hauled out of the swamps, the gators are pursued to the densest, remotest areas by airborne hunters. Using helicopters and airboats, the poachers can land almost anywhere in the vast marshlands.

Such a vast area is hard to control by game wardens, and the only hope of saving the alligator lies in legislation aimed at closing the market.

"The American alligator is now common only on a few restricted areas in the state and federal refuges and parks," says a representative of the Southeastern Association of Game & Fish Commissioners. A retired alligator poacher put it more bluntly: "I wouldn't give the gator more than four years," he told a reporter recently. "There are 1000 professional hunters in Florida alone, and the laws are so weak they laugh at them."

Alligators are mourned not for their beauty in the wild but for the part they play in balancing their environment. Predators on gar and other game-fish destroyers, they also open up "alligator holes" where deer and other game can find water in the dry season.

Alligators bring up on \$6.50 per foot, and hunters can make as much as \$300 for three nights of work in the swamps. If they poach in pairs, the profits can often be tripled.

Alarmed conservationists also are viewing the pet business as an increasing menace to wild animal populations. According to U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service reports, approximately 900,000 birds, reptiles, amphibians and mammals will be imported this year. An additional 20 to 30 million fish are brought in for the aquarium trade.

In 1967, out of a total of 830,000 animals imported, 74,300 were mammals, 203,189 were birds, 405,130 were reptiles, and 137,697 were amphibians. There is no legal limit on the type or quantity of animals that can be imported. The only restrictions involve periods of quarantine for animals that may be harboring a communicable disease.

Of the 62,526 primates imported, a large number were designed for medical research. Although usually treated well, the number of monkeys and apes used in research is depleting the wild populations severely.

Compared to the fur trade, the pet industry plays a relatively small part in exterminating a species. But it subjects thousands of animals to needless suffering.

For every animal that makes it to a pet shop, four or five others will have died in a native poacher's trap or in an airplane.

The animals that do survive in captivity are as good as dead for any natural purposes. Once these animals are removed from the wild breeding-group participation ceases, and they might as well have been shot.

OUR ENDANGERED WILDERNESS—III: PASSENGER PIGEON WIPED OUT BY THE HUNTER'S RUTHLESSNESS

(By Marcia Hayes)

NEW YORK, January 29.—On Sept. 1, 1914, the death of a bird in a Cincinnati Zoo became front page news across the country.

Martin, as the zoo named her, wasn't a particularly pretty bird, but she was as rare as a creature can get. She was the last of a species that had numbered more than 5 billion less than a century before—the passenger pigeon.

At the turn of the 19th Century, ornithologists estimated a third of all the birds in America were passenger pigeons. One observer in Kentucky reported seeing a flock a mile wide and 200 miles long that blotted out the sun.

The idea that a few hunters could make a dent in this population seemed incredible then, as it does now. But 100 years later, the species was exterminated.

Its executioners earned 2 cents a head for every bird they shot. Using a special repeating rifle, predecessor of the machine-gun, hunters slaughtered entire flocks of pigeons for the New York markets, where they were prized for their delicate flesh. The feathers were used in women's hats.

A year after the last passenger pigeon died, the Cincinnati Zoo saw the extinction of another native American bird, the Carolina parakeet. A native of semi-tropical cypress swamps, the colorful bird was once numerous in the southeastern United States. But when the swamps were drained for orange plantations, the birds ate the fruit and became a pest. In less than two decades, fruit farmers had exterminated them all.

The passenger pigeon and the Carolina parakeet are martyrs to the cause of conservation, and ornithologists are fighting to keep the tragedy from being repeated. Among the winged candidates for extinction are members of almost every bird family.

The task of conserving rare birds is difficult. Many, like the whooping crane and the California condor, require several hundred acres of territory for each individual.

But ornithologists have a number of successes to their credit. The best-known example is the trumpeter swan. Once hunted for their plumage, which decorated women's hats in the 1920s, the trumpeters were reduced to a flock of 73 when conservationists stepped in to save them in 1935.

Today the Interior Department's Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife estimates there are between four to five thousand of the swans, divided between wildlife refuges in Yellowstone National Park and Lacreek National Park in South Dakota.

Conservationists now have reason to hope that the whooping cranes can be saved from extinction. Down to 14 birds when the bureau began to monitor them in 1948, there are now 43 of the giant birds in the wild and 18 more in captivity.

Another plus on the conservation scoreboard is the Hawaiian goose. Extremely rare in the wild, they have been raised so successfully in captivity that 30 were recently returned to a refuge on the islands.

And the ivory-billed woodpecker, pronounced extinct several years ago, has been rediscovered in the big thicket country of eastern Texas. If the area remains undeveloped, conservationists are hopeful that the birds can make a comeback.

But the future looks dim for many other species. The giant Canadian goose is dying out. So is the Florida sand-hill crane. In California, the closely-guarded condors are

being literally squeezed out of existence by encroaching housing developments. The bald eagle has almost disappeared from the U.S. and is decreasing in Alaska and Canada.

Louisiana's official bird, the brown pelican, has completely disappeared from the state—victims of the small boats that ply the swamps of Southern Louisiana, disturbing the bird's nesting grounds.

"The main problem is people," says William Conway, director of the New York Zoological Society. "There are too many of us, and in polluting and destroying our own habitat, we make the environment unfit for wildlife." But why, asks the skeptic, should we bother to save wild creatures?

Conservationists are ready with four reasons: moral, economic, ecological and esthetic. Perhaps the most convincing argument is a selfish one—that in the long run, it is man himself who suffers most from the death of a species.

Ecologists—specialists in animal environments—point out that when an animal disappears from the earth, nature is pushed a little more off balance. As predator or prey, the animal was part of a complex natural system by which animal and plant populations are kept healthy.

An equally compelling reason for saving animals, say conservationists, is that many now being slaughtered for hides and skins could be an economic asset to their countries if harvested properly. One square mile of East African savannah, for instance, can support 16,000 pounds of cattle, but can graze up to 90,000 pounds of wild game.

Lastly, it is morally and esthetically wrong to destroy another form of life, the conservationists argue. "The wildlife of the world is not ours to dispose of wholly as we please," wrote the late conservationist William Hornaday. "We hold it in trust, for the benefit of ourselves and for equal benefits to those who come after us."

OUR ENDANGERED WILDLIFE—IV: ONCE IN A WHILE, CONSERVATIONISTS TRIUMPH

(By Marcia Hayes)

New York, January 30.—Scattered through the dreary records of wildlife conservation are a few success stories that offer hope to the world's endangered animals.

The American bison, down to a herd of less than 1000 at the turn of the century, was saved largely through the efforts of one man, zoologist William Hornaday.

Mr. Hornaday, first director of the Bronx Zoo, organized the American Bison Society, which lobbied in defense of the vanishing American buffalo and finally pushed protective legislation through Congress. Today there are several thousand bison in the Far West, enough to need occasional thinning out.

In England, the Duke of Bedford has been solely responsible for saving the Pere David deer from extinction. The species was wiped out in its native China at the turn of the century, largely during the Boxer Rebellion. But from a few survivors sent to the duke, a herd of several hundred has been raised.

A number of years ago a pair of the deer were returned to China, but it has been impossible to learn whether they survived.

Sea otters, once almost decimated by the fur trade, have been protected for several years and are now being harvested under strict international law. Trumpeter swans, down to a flock of 73 in 1935, have just been removed from the U.S. list of endangered animals. There are now more than 4000 of the birds, the nation's largest waterfowl. And whooping cranes seem to be making a comeback.

In Thailand and Kenya, government officials are fixing export quotas by species so that a controlled trade in live animals and their furs and hides can be maintained.

And in this country, a bill has been introduced to Congress that would prohibit the import and interstate shipment of rare or

endangered animals, their furs and hides or products made from them.

Happily, some animals don't need to be conserved. In America, the black bear and deer are thriving. And coyotes, or prairie wolves, are increasing as rapidly as their two relatives—the red and timber wolves—are dying out. Valuable as a predator of rabbits and other rodents, the coyote has extended its range into almost every state. They have recently been spotted as far north as Vermont and as far south as Florida.

In the crowded suburbs, skunks, flying squirrels, possums and raccoons have adapted to dense zoning and heavy traffic. Living in trees and burrows, they sleep by day and raid garbage pails by night.

Chipmunks, rabbits and mice are so numerous that dogs and housecats will never exhaust the supply.

And despite the most ingenious efforts to wipe him out, there is one animal multiplying as rapidly as man himself—the rat. It is the only animal species that is a match for man in endurance and tenacity—the only one that is uniquely adapted to his habitat.

Rats thrive on waste and filth. The most congenial environment for them is the sewer, where they find water and shelter. And with the advent of garbage disposal units, a sewer also supplies them with food. Health officials fear that as sewers spread through the suburbs, the rat population will mushroom.

But the numbers of the world's most beautiful and curious animals are dwindling fast. The few conservation credits are cancelled out by the huge debit: 550 birds and animals on the verge of extinction.

Pulling for the animals are dozens of organizations with intentions that far outdistance their budgets. Among them are the Defenders of Wildlife, The National Wildlife Federation, the Committee of International Affairs in Ecology and Conservation, the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, and the Sierra Club.

The largest financial contributions have come from both the World Wildlife Fund, which has chapters in the United States, Britain, Austria, West Germany and Switzerland, and the New York Zoological Society, which sponsors a number of projects in Africa. Its current projects include an expedition to observe the rare mountain gorilla and a donation to the government of Tanzania for the creation of a national park and game preserve.

Almost all of the conservation organizations support the Charles Darwin Research Station in the Galapagos Islands, which is working to preserve the giant tortoise and the marine iguana. The Zoological Society maintains a full-time conservation warden on the islands.

A world wildlife conference, such as the one proposed by Texas Sen. Ralph Yarborough, could bring these diverse organizations together and perhaps establish a basis for future co-operative effort. Most importantly it could lead to an agreement among the governments of the world to stay the execution of our greatest national resource.

"The beauty and genius of a work of art may be reconceived," wrote the late conservationist William Beebe, "but when the last individual of a race of living things breathes no more, another heaven and another earth must pass before such a one can breathe again."

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the old proverb, "An

ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

A recent article from the American Journal of Public Health speaks to this point, and I include it in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues.

The article makes the urgent point that the health professions should turn their attention from cure to prevention. I ask that the editorial be reprinted not merely for its application to health, but because that point is so relevant to policy with which Congress has to deal in many areas.

In international relations we concern ourselves too easily with security and defense, instead of concentrating on the ways by which we might foster cooperation between nations and thus in the end reduce the tensions that create the need for rising armaments.

In urban affairs we develop crash programs of relief or make special arrangements for maintaining law and order, when if we had polished our techniques of local government, there might not have been a crisis.

In education we are concerned with the backward, the dropouts, the low standard of many public schools. It would have been far cheaper to focus on prevention instead of cure in all of these fields.

I therefore include the article, written by my friend and former Pittsburgher, Philip S. Boughton, in the RECORD, because of its relevance to a more far-sighted approach to public policy: prevention, not cure, should be our guide.

The article follows:

[From the American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health]

THE VALLEY OF DECISION

The creative environmentalist is unhappy. He notes that when his peers get together to produce a report they deal with traditional problems and go about it in their own traditional ways. They want more of the same, but done better; that is the substance of his complaint.

Not one of the reports, the many, many reports on the environment that have come out in the last few years, could wholly escape such criticism. But if environmental health is to become more fundamental, more comprehensive, what must it do?

Plainly it must be preventive—but to be preventive on the urban scene is to move in and have impact at the point of decision. What kinds of cities should we have? What social, economic, and political policies will produce them? What is the impact of the profession on decision-making when it comes to questions like that?

The answer, unfortunately, is "very little." The profession, like the nineteenth-century family doctor, is called in after the patient is sick. In environmental control that means after all the decisions have been made. Made by whom? By those who manipulate the land as so many parcels of real estate to be bought and sold. The decisions are made by building developers, the automobile industry and its constituencies, the special interests in one or another commercial development.

So it is that we bury our cities a mile deep in aerial manure. Then we note that the chronic bronchitis, lung cancer, and emphysema rates go up. On these induced rates the sickness professions then project a need for case finding and chest clinics.

We bury our cities seven feet deep in solid waste and pile it in the interstices of tumble-down tenements. We then count the rat population and we classify unhealthy children by their infirmities. We then propose a rat

control program and improved pediatric services.

We clutter our cities with enough noise, confusion, and frustration to drive a colony of saints crazy. The answer is bright, clear, and full of high human purpose: we need more psychiatric services!

But suppose our city fathers, or our state legislators, or the planning commissioners should turn to the profession and ask for health criteria for environmental design. The whole tradition of the health sciences and their virginal professional integrity would run against getting answers.

The refusal to answer would be based on the highest professional standards. First, there is no public health responsibility until a health hazard has been definitely established, i.e., until we can tell exactly how many people will keel over or die if it is not solved. To get that answer may take years of careful research. Hence, all decisions must be made by somebody else.

Thus the professional tends to deal only with sick cities, sick societies, sick environments, situations which everybody already knew or strongly suspected were sick. Criteria of human stress are commonly applied in advance for industrial and military planning, but not in making decisions about the closed urban environment our cities have become.

The Task Force of the National Commission did invade two fields of political jurisdiction which run beyond the traditions of the sanitary sciences. It was first to develop the concept that the area of jurisdiction must be coterminous with the problem to be solved; the phrase "problem shed" makes its first appearance in the literature. Beyond that it declared that "... social, economic, and political agencies ... are no longer adequate and require modification or revision. *Failing such, there can be no prospect of adequate environmental protection.*"

Second, it also recognized that increasingly many programs scattered throughout the range of government have health aspects. Here the Gordian knot of jurisdiction was cleanly cut: beyond the normal areas of operating jurisdiction there must be, within a governmental structure, a single final focus of decision on health criteria and standards. In this the role of the director of health is analogous to the role of the attorney general in legal decision.

These are political science contributions which recognize the new geographical scope and functional diversity of the environmental challenge. In most fields, the neighborhood, the town, or even the county, the prospect of local control is gone. Many other agencies need a health science input but deal with matters that cannot be health department operating jurisdictions.

But, alas, the health professions have not yet shown any strong capability for making an impact on environmental design. Architects and planners have asked for a health input. Review the program of the 1967 meeting of the American Institute of Planners, devoted entirely to the health issues of planning; after which, review the proceedings and note how few efforts to answer came from those who would classify themselves as members of the health professions. Read the table of contents of such a magazine as "Eklistics," devoted to world-wide abstracts of contributions on the design and practice of effective human communities. Again, there is little contribution from the health professions.

In reappraisal: the traditional priorities of the profession have been far more concerned with the pathology of the environment than with the health criteria of environmental design prior to the point of decision.

*Task Force on Environmental Health of National Commission on Community Health Service.

One is moved to speculate. Had schools of public health been more closely associated with schools of public and urban affairs; with schools of design and architecture and planning; with schools of applied engineering and law—had they been less strongly oriented to the medical profession and medicine—might we have developed a more relevant pattern for the late twentieth century?

THE LIMP YOUNG GENERATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day while driving in I happened to catch the editorial commentary on radio station WAVA and felt that this editorial covering the young generation was penetrating and sound in the subject it addressed. Therefore, I feel this objective treatment reflects the commonsense approach and insert it into the Record in an effort to draw the proper attention it merits:

THE LIMP YOUNG GENERATION

The most recent harsh arithmetic on the increasing rate of juvenile crime and use of various drugs in the Washington area has been followed by a new rash of handwringing, special PTA meetings, school board conferences, clarion calls by officials for parents to look after their children and for Congress to look after juvenile delinquency.

The shape of the young generation, (particularly our young males) is in fact, a pretty sad story—evidenced both by the rate of their military draft rejection and the raw mathematics of crime and cases of dope problems in local schools. The story is only compounded by the Liberals' insistence that there have always been juvenile problems and that this generation is the same and no different from the last—that somehow the kids will find their way out of it.

Well, our young American male is not the same simply because he is being raised in a vastly changed society. He is today a product of a comfortable home, soft school standards and a rich industrial nation in which mental exercise has been replaced by evening television, his physical development by the problem of fitting his car into the high school parking lot—and for a poor report card he gets a week's reduction in his allowance.

This is not something which is happening just out in Los Angeles and Chicago—it is in Bethesda, and Southeast Washington and Fairfax, Virginia at any local drive-in or basement beer party.

At the usual risk of oversimplification, it must be concluded, though we don't like to hear it, that we are creating a mentally stagnant, spoiled, slack-jawed young so-called male with a notable lack of emotional and physical maturity and of the intellectual curiosity, guts and ambition to cut his own way in the world. He has a quick dollar philosophy and a will only to find security through someone else. He is the limp American.

The prime victim of this is the young lady of the same generation. She must wonder whatever happened to the self-sufficient, independent, female dominating young man of the American history book ... that strong-jawed, strong-armed determined young buck whose sense of honor equaled his love.

The drift of remissiveness regarding these conditions among our youth is unacceptable. Someone wiser wrote that the responsibility of tolerance lies with those who have the wider vision. That wider vision of the impact of crimes and drug addiction cannot be the

responsibility of those under 18 years old, for they are too young to see its effect on their future. It is ours, parents, and school officials and local government to set up and enforce by rules, law and tough discipline those common standards of social decency under which as grownups this young generation will have to live. There are things to be learned today—tomorrow, in crime and drug, is forever.

APOLLO MISSION STATUS REPORT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call attention of the Congress to the current report on the progress of our national space program to place an American astronaut upon the lunar surface this year.

Hypergolic propellant loading of the Apollo 9 space vehicle began on Monday and will continue throughout the week in preparation for the countdown demonstration test. The countdown test is scheduled to start next week with the astronauts participating in the final day of the test.

The Apollo 9 astronaut crew is continuing mission simulation training at the KSC with the flight controllers participating at the MSC Mission Control Center. Exercises simulating rendezvous, spacecraft service propulsion system and descent propulsion system firings, extravehicular activity and spacecraft transposition-docking-ejection maneuvers are planned.

The Apollo 10 launch vehicle malfunction overall test was completed early this week. A test is underway of the mobile launcher swing arms which provide access to the various stages and modules of the assembled space vehicle. Final preparations are being made to move the spacecraft from the manned spacecraft operations building to the vehicle assembly building for erection on the launch vehicle. The move is scheduled for Thursday, February 6.

The Apollo 11 command and service module is in the manned spacecraft operations building where a cabin leak check and umbilical build-up are in progress. Later this week the crew optical alignment system and the docking target will be aligned. The lunar module is also in the manned spacecraft operations building where stress corrosion modifications are underway. The descent stage is expected to be moved to the altitude chamber late this week and will be followed by the ascent stage next week.

The Saturn V second stage for Apollo 11 is now aboard the NASA barge *Orion* and is scheduled to arrive at KSC on Wednesday, February 5. The stage was test fired at the Mississippi test facility before being loaded aboard the *Orion*.

The Apollo 11 launch vehicle first stage will be shipped by barge from the Mississippi test complex on February 10, to arrive at KSC on February 16. The instrument unit—IU-6—is due to leave Huntsville February 20 aboard the Super Guppy cargo aircraft. The third stage for the Apollo 11 vehicle arrived at the Kennedy launch site January 19.

MISS AMERICAN TEENAGER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 7, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged and proud that Miss American Teenager of 1969, Fran Garten, is a constituent of mine. Miss Garten, of Great Neck, N.Y., recently was selected to receive this honor after extensive competition among young women from throughout the country.

One of Miss Garten's greatest interests is the danger caused by cigarette smoking and she has devoted a good part of her young life to point out the dangers of smoking. An article entitled "Why I Don't Smoke Cigarettes" authored by Miss Garten explains rather touchingly why she feels so strongly about the health hazard of smoking.

Because of the relevance her comments have for young people like herself and under leave to extend my remarks I include her article in the RECORD at this point:

WHY I DON'T SMOKE CIGARETTES

(By Fran Garten)

(Miss Garten, 17, of Great Neck, New York was crowned "Miss American Teen-Ager" in the 9th annual "Miss American Teen-Ager Contest" held in September. She is a senior at Great Neck South High School.)

I am very grateful for winning the 9th

annual "Miss American Teen-Ager" Contest for it has given me the opportunity to tell Americans everywhere my reason for deciding not to start smoking cigarettes. I was never tempted to smoke, not because I was afraid that it would anger my parents, but because of something that happened to me. Whether you smoke or not, let me tell you my story, and then draw your own conclusions;

I once thought I would like to become a nurse, so two years ago I worked as a Junior Nurses Aide at our local hospital. It seemed a good idea to see if I would be able to cope with some of the situations a nurse has to handle in her work. I found it very rewarding. One experience during that period I can never forget.

The first week I was assigned to a floor where the accident victims were. I met one very pleasant lady there. We talked quite often, but she never said what was wrong with her, and I didn't ask. But I wondered about it. She seemed perfectly healthy to me. Because I was assigned to many different floors in the hospital, I didn't see her again until the end of the summer. One day my duty was on the fourth floor. I had been warned by my fellow aides that this floor was the most depressing of all. The patients on four were terminal cases. I walked into one of the rooms, and was very surprised to see the pleasant lady I had talked with at the beginning of the summer. How she looked really shocked me; I learned later that her appearance was typical for a victim of lung cancer. . . .

This was my own experience; I didn't read it in a book or see it in a movie. I'll never forget it, and if ever I have the slightest yen to start smoking, remembering that very nice person in such pitiful condition, should certainly be enough to squelch it.

Sports, especially tennis, are another reason I don't smoke. They are a big part of my life, and I know cigarettes would cut my wind, and also slow up my game. This is only one, not-too-serious effect of smoking I've already told you the final effect, the very final one.

Science is one of the forces today that we young people are very aware of, and scientists have proved that cigarettes cause cancer among other diseases. I saw an American Cancer Society movie at school that showed what smoking does to different parts of the body. There is just no room to dodge the cold facts anymore.

And there are a lot of other facts in our world that can't be dodged. I've done some volunteer work with the underprivileged, and also with handicapped children, so I do know a little about life's injustices first hand. Like many teenagers in this country, I'd like to try to do something about these things. Winning the nationwide Miss American Teen-Ager Contest and traveling throughout the country with this title, will help me achieve this goal. I plan to become a Physical Therapist in college, and hopefully, to join the Peace Corps after that. With all these things that I hope to accomplish, I don't want cigarette smoking to ruin my health, before I get a chance to do them.

So, the next time someone offers you a cigarette and you want to feel like you "belong" or think it will make you a "sophisticated" remember my story, and know that it is better to deny yourself that single moment of so-called glory, than to deny yourself with good health and LIFE itself. I have a collection of buttons with sayings that kid the smoking habit. My friends and I have a great time wearing them. People's reactions are amazing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 17, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord give thee wisdom and understanding, that thou mayest keep the law of the Lord, thy God.—1 Chronicles 22: 12.

O Lord of love and God of all goodness, in this sacred moment we bow at the altar of prayer thanking Thee for the recess we have had and praying for Thy guidance as we face the days that lie ahead.

With the wings of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy spirit may we accept the heavy responsibilities placed upon us in this high hour of our national life. During these turbulent times filled with the bitter tones of angry hatred, help us to hear Thy still, small voice speaking the words of justice and freedom and peace:

Be Thou our wisdom, O Thou our true word;
We ever with Thee, and Thou with us, Lord;
Thou our Great Father, we Thy true sons;
Thou in us dwelling, and we with Thee one.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 7, 1969, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, United States Code, section 2701, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. STAGGERS and Mr. LUJAN.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 110(a), Public Law 90-448, the Chair appoints as members of the National Advisory Commission on Low-Income Housing the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, and Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HALEY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

NAME LATIN-AMERICAN CHIEF

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now approximately a month since Inauguration Day and no one has yet been named to the vitally important post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

While appreciating the multitude of problems which face President Nixon and wishing in no way to add to his difficulties, nevertheless I respectfully suggest that someone should be named to this position immediately.

Not only are we involved in the increasingly disturbing hijacking problem with Cuba and the rising tide of expropriation and anti-Americanism in Peru, but we must follow closely the approaching election in Chile and support Bolivia's attempts to improve her internal security and general stability. Added to this are the increasing concern about the status of economic development in the Latin countries and the need for a review of the Alliance for Progress program. Finally and most urgently we have recently been confronted with the Peruvian seizure of American fishing boats and the actual firing of shots at U.S. ships.

With all these problems facing us and other potential ones in the offing, surely an experienced, knowledgeable and able person is needed at the head of this subdivision of the State Department.

I hope and trust that this nomination will be made without further delay.