EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CREDIT UNION RESCUES SERVICEMAN TRAPPED BY BANK

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, credit unions serving our military installations perform some of the most outstanding work in the area of assisting servicemen that one could imagine.

Typical of the services provided by the credit unions is the case of an Air Force staff sergeant stationed at Edwards Air Force Base in California who wrote to me in September with a problem that, unfortunately, has been faced by a number of servicemen in the past.

The serviceman enclosed a copy of a letter which he had written to a branch office of the Bank of America in Lancaster, Calif. The letter graphically depicts the situation faced by this serviceman:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1968.

MANAGER,
Bank of America,
Lancaster, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I wish to bring to your attention a matter that is now causing me a great amount of hardship and possibly also affecting other servicemen similarly situated.

I financed an automobile with your Bank on 14 December 1967. Since that time I have made my payments "as agreed" which fact can be substantiated by the Credit Bureau of Lancaster. Moreover, my general credit rating is also excellent. Nevertheless I was recently told that I could not take my automobile with me to Holland where I have been ordered to go PCS. This decision was made known to me by Mr. Morgan shortly after I financed my automobile. At that time my question was only one of idle curiosity and, although I was upset by the answer, it did not cause me any immediate concern.

Since I have been recently assigned to Holland, the problem has transformed itself from an abstract to a concrete one. I promptly conferred with Mr. Morgan and he gave me an equivocal but essentially negative answer. On this date, by phone conversation, Mr. Morgan stated flatly that it is bank policy not to allow the security to be taken outside the country. When I asked Mr. Morgan what I should do about my automobile, in light of his devastatingly negative reply, he answered, "take it back to the dealer."

I hereby ask you, sir, is this the way servicemen who are protecting you and your country are to be dealt with? If the answer is an affirmative one then I submit that bankers and other merchants who derive substantial pecuniary profit from the servicemen should be deeply ashamed.

It is my belief that your proposed course of action with respect to my problem is in clear contravention to the "standards of Fairness" contained in the DOD Directive Air Force Regulation 211–2 which I quote in pertinent part as follows:

"The debtor shall have the right to remove any security for the obligation beyond state or national boundaries if he or his family moves beyond such boundaries under military orders and notifies the creditor in advance of the removal of the new address where the security will be located. Removal of the security shall not accelerate payment of the obligation."

My alternative now seems to be that I either refinance my automobile at additional cost to me, or sell said automobile, probably at a loss, to say nothing of the inconvenience.

No doubt others have suffered by your policy but I hereby wish to bring to your attention the fact that I am most upset with that policy. My request is that you reconsider the wiseness of such a policy at a time when wider protections are being accorded the consuming public at large and servicemen in particular.

I await your reply.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

As soon as I received the letter, I contacted Brig. Gen. Evert Thomas, retired, the director of the Washington Office of CUNA International, the worldwide credit union association. General Thomas contacted the credit union at Edwards Air Force Base and asked them to assist the sergeant in his problem.

As you can see from the letter from Edwards Federal Credit Union to General Thomas, the credit union not only helped the sergeant obtain refinancing for his car, but was able to reduce his monthly payments from $132.91 to $88.78.

The letter follows:

EDWARDS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,
Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

Brig. Gen. EVERT THOMAS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL THOMAS: After I received your telepone call on October 3rd, 1968 I contacted Sgt. ——— telephonically concerning the possibility of his securing a loan from the Edwards Federal Credit Union. Sgt. ——— advised me that he had already contacted the Credit Union and discussed a loan with one of the employees. He submitted a loan application in which he requested $2,607.00 to pay off the Bank of America. When he visited the Credit Union with his loan application, I discussed his financial situation with him at length and as a result Sgt. ——— made out a new application (combination signature and collateral) in the amount of $3,371.00. This loan was approved by the Credit Committee and checks given to Sgt. ——— on October 9, 1968. By using the combination signature and collateral loan he was able to reduce his monthly payments from $132.91 to $88.78. He seemed to be deeply appreciative of the time and efforts expended by myself and staff.

The Credit Union received the title signed off by the Bank of America the day after he received his loan, and is presently in Sacramento being processed to show the credit union as legal owner.

I certainly appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention and allowing us to provide service to one of our members. If I can be of any further service please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HALLEY,
Manager-Treasurer, Edwards Federal Credit Union.

General Thomas and Edwards Federal Credit Union are to be commended for their prompt action in this matter and for assisting a serviceman who might have otherwise lost his automobile because of a highly restrictive and unfair policy invoked by the Bank of America.

It is gratifying to note that the credit unions still take a personal interest in the members of our Armed Forces that is apparently not shared by some other financial institutions. We owe a great deal to our servicemen, many of whom are giving their lives for our country. I do not feel it is asking too much for banks to soften some of their restrictive regulations to help our men and women in uniform.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Nation has just observed the 160th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Dr. Herman Blum, of Philadelphia, has prepared a collection of appraisals of Lincoln by Presidents who followed him. Dr. Blum's article was published in the Philadelphia Bulletin on February 12, as well as in numerous other papers around the country.

Dr. Blum is a member of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission; senior vice president of the Lincoln Civil War Society of Philadelphia; founder and director of Blumhaven Library and Gallery; and chairman of the board of Craftex Mills, Inc., of Pennsylvania.

I asked unanimous consent that Dr. Blum's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

LINCOLN ADMIRERS: THE PRESIDENTS' PRESIDENT

(By Dr. Herman Blum)

(NOTE.—The writer is on the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.)

Today, on the 160th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, it is magnificently comforting to recall the appraisals of our 16th President by the 19 who followed him.

Here are eulogies of Lincoln by his successors:

Andrew Johnson: "When future generations shall read the history of the second revolutionary crisis in our country, Abraham Lincoln will stand out as the greatest man of the ages."

Ulysses S. Grant: "A man of great ability, pure patriotism, unselfish nature, full of forgiveness to his enemies, bearing malice toward none . . ."

Rutherford B. Hayes: "Lincoln's fame is safe. He is the darling of history forevermore. His life and achievements give him titles to regard second to those of no other man in ancient or modern times."

James A. Garfield: "He was one of the few great rulers whose wisdom increased with his power and whose spirit grew gentler and tenderer as his triumphs were multiplied."

Chester A. Arthur: "Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and his second Inaugural are among the treasures and glorious expressions of mankind."

Grover Cleveland: "He was called to save a nation . . ."

Benjamin Harrison: "He stands like a great lighthouse to show the way of duty to all his countrymen . . ."

William McKinley: "A thousand years hence no story, no tragedy, no epic poem will be filled with greater words than that which tells of his life and death."

Theodore Roosevelt: "The lover of his country and all mankind; the mightiest of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the mighty men who mastered the mighty days."

William Howard Taft: "The oppressed and the lowly of all peoples, as liberty and free government spread, pronounce his name with awe."

Woodrow Wilson: "As he stands there in his complete manhood at the most perilous helm of Christendom, what a marvelous composite figure he is! The whole country is summed up in him."

Warren Gamaliel Harding: "We are dealing with the master martyr, the supreme leader in a national crisis, the surpassing believer in a fulfilled destiny and a colossal figure among the hero-statesmen of all ages."

Calvin Coolidge: "His presence filled the nation. He broke the might of oppression. He restored a race to its birthright. His mortal fame has vanished but his spirit increased with the increasing years, the richest legacy of the greatest century."

Herbert Hoover: "Lincoln, after all these years, still grows not only in the hearts of his countrymen, but in the hearts of the peoples of the world."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "With his charity and kindness, his insight and humor, his endurance and faith, he has come to be the exemplar of our American life."

Harry S. Truman: "Whereas the classic lines of his Gettysburg Address are enshrined forever in the hearts of all Americans; and whereas Lincoln's closing resolve, 'that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth' has a special and solemn connotation in the world affairs at the present moment."

Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Lincoln's leadership was accomplished through dedication to a single purpose, the preservation of the union. He understood deeply the great values that unite us all as a people. He knew that there were divisive influences at work but he knew also that they were transitory in character; they were flaming with heat but they were made of stuff that would soon burn itself out."

John F. Kennedy: "Abraham Lincoln does not merely belong to the United States. Now, he belongs to all those who believe in freedom, who believe in the rights of man."

Lyndon B. Johnson: "At this centenary of Lincoln's death, we should all give special thought to the humane principles, more pertinent now than ever before, to which he dedicated his life and for which he died."

A DEFICIT IN WORLD TRADE POSITION

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent report from the Department of Commerce our trade balance for 1968 was the lowest in 30 years or only a little over $700 million, with exports at a level of $33.84 billion and imports at $33.14 billion.

I am afraid the situation is worse than the figures indicate, for the export figures include governmentally financed and subsidized exports which increased the export figure by some $3 billion.

To present our exports in this fashion provides no true measure of the U.S. world trade position as a competitive operation. Should we expand our foreign aid and food for peace shipments we could make our trade surplus look even better, but that would not improve America's competitive position.

I note also that the report shows the value of our imports at their foreign value, before shipment to this country. This figure does not include ocean freight and marine insurance, and does not reflect the true cost of the goods to us. The proper way to show a trade balance is to record what we get for our commercial exports and then to compare it with what the imports cost us. This would reflect our competitive standing against imports into this country.

The average cost of bringing goods to this country is at least 10 percent and may be considerably more. Thus, imports of $33 billion really cost us over $36 billion. Most of the freight and insurance costs now go to foreign carriers and insurers because of the better competitive position enjoyed by foreign shippers.

If we add $3 billion overvaluation of our exports to $3.3 billion of undervaluation of our imports, we find ourselves with a deficit of well over $5 billion instead of a surplus of $700 million. This is a very unhappy situation which demands more than casual consideration.

Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an analysis of the American competitive position in world trade. It was prepared by O. R. Strackbein who heads the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. Mr. Strackbein needs no introduction to the Members of this body but his contribution to an understanding of our foreign trade problem may not be known to the new Members.

I nevertheless commend his analysis to all Members, old and new. It throws a revealing light on where this country stands competitively in world trade. I am glad to include Mr. Strackbein's trade analysis for printing at this point in the RECORD:

COMPETITIVE PLATEAU OF U.S. TRADE

(By O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, November 20, 1968)

The weak competitive position of American Industry in world trade is beyond dispute.

It may be useful to inquire into the degree of this weakness and to determine in what class of products it is most pronounced. It may also be useful to determine whether we enjoy competitive strength in some products even if the total competitive position is weak.

It may be helpful, further, to inquire into the causes of the competitive weakness from which our trade suffers and to determine what steps, if any, might be taken to overcome the weakness or to adjust to it.

WEAKNESS REVEALED BY TRADE TRENDS

The competitive weakness of this country in world trade has become increasingly visible in recent years. It is especially pronounced in some classes of goods and in our trade with several leading trading nations. It is also visible in the declining share of total world exports enjoyed by the United States.

WEAKNESS BY CLASS OF PRODUCTS

The principal competitive weakness has appeared in the trade in manufactured goods. Because of the most intensive application of labor in producing finished goods, compared with the lesser application of labor in the production of raw materials and agricultural products, the implications of the import trend for employment in this country are serious and will become acute if we return to a peacetime economy.

As recently as 1951 *manufactured goods* represented only 27.0% of our total imports. In 1967 this share had more than doubled, reaching 58.3%.

By contrast the share of our total imports represented by *raw materials*, which in 1951 stood at 50.3%, had declined to 21.3% in 1967.

The meaning of this trend for employment will be better appreciated if we compare employment within this country in the raw-material producing operations, namely, agriculture, mining, lumbering and fisheries, with employment in the manufacturing industries. The raw materials industries, with minor exceptions, supply the materials used in all manufacturing in this country. Exceptions are imported raw materials which represent less than 2% of all materials used by our industries. Raw-material production employed 4,656,000 workers in 1967 compared with 19,339,000 in the manufacturing establishments that processed the materials into finished goods. That ratio of manufacturing employment to employment in raw-material production was therefore over 4 to 1.

As imports shift from raw materials to manufactured goods, as they have in the past fifteen years, it becomes obvious that employment must suffer. The impact has become sharper, moreover, in recent years than in the past because of the heavy movement of workers in this country out of the raw-material-producing field into manufacturing and the service occupations. The shift has been the result of the still-rising productivity in agriculture and mining. In 1960, or less than eight years ago, the ratio of manufacturing employment to employment in agriculture, mining, lumbering and fisheries (the raw material industries) was only in the ratio of 2½ to 1, compared to more than 4 to 1 in 1967, as shown above. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968, Tables 317, 318, 320 and 993.)

In other words, our imports have been shifting from goods requiring the least amount of labor to goods requiring the greatest amount. Should, for example, 10% of our raw materials be imported the average straight-line labor displacement in 1967 would have been 465,600 workers, while if 10% of our manufactured goods had been imported the displacement would have been 1,933,900 workers. (The 10% share is for illustration purposes only.)

While it is true that finished manufactures represent about two-thirds of our exports, the share of total exports has remained about the same in recent years. In '58 and '59 the share was 67.8% and 66.5% respectively, compared with 66.2% in 1967. This lack of a trend shows that our manufactured goods as a whole are not gaining ground in foreign markets in contrast to the sharp gains foreign manufactures have made in this country.

COMPETITIVE STRENGTH IN MACHINERY AND CHEMICALS

Nevertheless in some lines we have enjoyed a substantial growth of exports. This is especially true of machinery, including sophisticated products such as computers; and chemicals. Since the share of manufactured goods in total exports has not grown, the gain in exports of machinery and chemicals was necessarily offset by declines in the exports of other products.

HELPED BY FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Two observations are in order. Our increasing exports of machinery and chemical products has been a parallel of our increasing investment abroad in plants and installations. Our industries have installed a vast amount of American machinery overseas (over $50 billion since 1960); and our chemical plants overseas have consumed great quantities of raw and semi-manufactured chemical products as feeders to their overseas plants.

SURPLUS OF MACHINERY EXPORTS NARROWING

The other observation applies particularly to machinery. Our imports of machinery have grown much more rapidly in recent years than our exports, and the export surplus, while still wide, is narrowing rapidly. From 1960 through 1967 our machinery exports increased 84.9%. During the same period imports of machinery increased 328% or about 3½ times as rapidly as our exports. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968, Tables 1218 and 1219.)

The foreign competitive advantage over us that resulted in the loss of export markets in steel, textiles, sewing machines, typewriters and a number of other products is obviously asserting itself in machinery. The relatively sharp increase in machinery imports is but a forewarning of what may be expected in the future. Thus may be expected the crumbling of our principal remaining export advantage. It will fall for the same reason that caused formerly strong export industries to fall back.

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

The handwriting on the wall was never clearer. When will those who shape our foreign trade policy recognize the overwhelming evidence? Year after year since 1958 they have said that the trend against this country's export position was only temporary and that the trend would soon right itself. Ten years is a long time to wait for a turn of the tide.

One excuse after another has been worn out during this period. In the most recent years when the tide should already have turned had the previous reassurances had any substance, the explanation advanced was that the prosperous conditions in this country attracted imports while our exporters were not greatly interested in export markets. This style of explanation would, of course, dispose of any and all trends in foreign trade.

CAUSES OF OUR COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGE

The refusal to face monumental facts is becoming very expensive to a number of industries and poses a serious problem for labor. If and when our economy moves toward a peace basis the harsh facts that have so long been ignored can no longer be brushed aside. It is already very late.

Let us look at the facts and what they mean:

1. Production costs in this country are higher in many lines of products than those of their foreign competitors.

2. Among the high cost elements are the high wages upon which our domestic market depends in the form of consumer purchasing power. Employee compensation represents by far the principal source of effective demand—by far, which is to say, in the magnitude of about 4 to 1 compared with all other sources combined.

3. The wage-gap separating this country from other countries (Canada excepted) is not by way of closing or coming within shouting distance of such an event. The outlook is that it is here to stay for many years.

4. Those who suggest that wages should stand still in this country to permit foreign wages to catch up in point of unit costs, are either deceived, or incapable of recognizing realities or, worse, refuse to see what so clearly and unmistakably stares them in the face.

5. The full impact of foreign competition has not yet been felt; nor the full effect of our foreign investments as a shrinker of export markets for finished manufactures in relation to the gross national product.

6. As a consequence our manufacturers have only one hope to regain a competitive position in the domestic market: namely, if the technology is at hand, to reduce manpower requirements sufficiently to shrink costs materially. Contrary to what mystics and romanticists might think, there is no other way to reduce cost of production significantly.

Also, no one should deceive himself that significant cost-reduction is a mild operation. In terms of employment it is harsh and drastic. We have a classic example in coal mining. In the mid-fifties this industry was moribund because of encroaching competition from diesel oil, natural gas and imported residual fuel oil. The only hope of survival lay in cost reduction. The objective was indeed accomplished by the introduction of machinery that supplanted men in a gargantuan ratio. The coal industry saved itself but the cost in coal miners' jobs was two out of every three. Employment dropped at a dizzying rate, falling from 480,000 to 140,000 or less in fifteen years. The problem known as Appalachia was a direct result. The cost of relief and inhuman misery was "unthinkable" and had it been appreciated ahead of time, would no doubt have been avoided as intolerable.

The coal example was not as extreme as might be imagined.

Other industries branched out overseas to avoid similar debacles. Today the steel industry faces a challenge, which, if less drastic in its exactions, is nonetheless perilous. The shoe industry faces annihilation in a matter of a few years. The textile industry, which, though partially protected against the same disaster, still faces great difficulties. Other industries are not out of the range of the import onslaught. The fisheries on the east coast, the vegetable producers of Florida, and others are in the same corner.

Our merchant marine is totally dependent on subsidization for survival; and has been allowed to fall to the lowest level in our history from lack of adequate support. American flag ships now carry only about 1/16 of our total imports and exports The facts are muted and smothered lest they awaken the dreamers and mystics who see nothing ominous in the competitive facts in our foreign trade.

7. Cost-reduction is not a monopoly of American industries, though its imperative presses insistently on them. While we continue as the most productive country in the world in terms of man-hour output, other countries, now equipped with our technology, are also capable of reducing their costs. Our own factories overseas, where our direct investments are now in the magnitude of some $60 billion, have introduced American methods of mass production, and other countries have not been backward in adopting the American system. If we automate in this country, so may and do our foreign competitors.

8. The cost-gap, although not uniform, will not go away, notwithstanding the theories of academic economists who apparently do their thinking in a vacuum wherein the realities of both national and international politics are absent. Competitive inequalities among the nations do persist, the economists notwithstanding, simply because free competition is now a museum piece thoroughly bolted down—largely, indeed, as a result of the very policies of those who invoke the free market to justify free trade but who buried free market forces under the weight of governmental controls, restrictions, heavy tax burdens, social welfare loans and other cost-inflaters.

The differential in shipbuilding and ship operation here and abroad is measured periodically by official wage surveys conducted by the Federal government. This differential is slightly over 100% and reflects the higher employee compensation in this country. That such differentials persist, as they may and do persist, despite economic theory that leaves the facts of life out of account, is shown by the fact that the maritime cost differential just mentioned has widened by 10% in the past ten or twelve years.

9. The competitive weakness of this country makes our economy stand like an island plateau against the pounding waves and tidal flows that beset it from all sides. The natural sequence will be a leveling process that will continue, unless it is halted, until we are level with the sea.

FALSE ASSESSMENT OF OUR COMPETITIVE HANDICAP

The competitive situation is serious indeed but is insulated against a remedy by the policy-makers who stubbornly refuse to accept irrefutable facts or insist on evasive interpretations. They will not believe or purport not to perceive that payment of an average industrial wage of $3 per hour in this country demands that our factories be several times as productive as their foreign rivals if they are to compete with them. With the exception of Canada, the highest foreign industrial wages will do well to equal 40% of our $3 level, while in many instances the gap is much wider. The difference in cost, now that our average duty on dutiable items is about 10% on foreign value, and destined to drop to about 7%, must be bridged by a productivity lead of sufficient magnitude to offset the foreign advantage. (For the industrial wage rate of the United States see Current Survey of Business, United States Department of Commerce, September 1968, p. S–15).

It is a favorite but false indictment of American industries that cannot compete with imports to say that they are inefficient. This indictment comes quickly to the tongue of those who continue to see in a free or liberal trade policy the future and the hope of this country's economy. The falsity of the indictment is indeed immediately established when in the next breath those who so eagerly accuse our industries of inefficiency insist that foreign competition is no danger because low foreign wages really reflect the low level of productivity abroad, which is to say inefficiency. We cannot be both too inefficient to compete and at the same time so far ahead of other countries in productivity that their low wages avail them nothing competitively because of their own greater inefficiency.

It was also a favorite and equally false assessment of the competitive situation to say that it was not our high-wage industries that were vulnerable to imports but rather our low-wage or labor-intensive industries. Our high-wage, capital-intensive industries, such as steel and automobiles, were among our leading exporters, thus demonstrating that high wages represented no wage handicap.

The vacuity of this claim has in recent years been demonstrated for all to see. In both automobile and steel our export position has collapsed and we have become net importers of both products. The same is true of other high-wage industries. Whether an industry is "capital-intensive" or "labor-intensive" does not alter the fact that employee compensation is in each case the major element of cost. "Capital-intensive" industries merely spread their costs over a larger number of successive steps of manufacture, as in automobile manufacturing. The Detroit cost, as the Pittsburgh cost in making steel, is only a part of the cost that extends back to mining, agriculture, processing, fabricating, transportation, insurance, financing, warehousing, and all else that is involved in production.

Yet, even as these pillars of economic theory have been knocked out from under the edifice, the economists steadfastly refuse to face reality. They are so inseparably wedded to their vested mental interest that mere facts produce no effect toward relinquishment of their untenable position.

These many years, as just noted, the economists have been at pain to say that our higher wages are attributable to our higher productivity. Therefore, they say, it is wrong to maintain that low foreign wages confer

a competitive advantage on foreign producers. Only a rather obtuse mind would fail to perceive the truth of the theory, according to these intellectually elite.

Now that facts to the contrary notwithstanding prove that other countries do enjoy a decisive competitive advantage over us these same economists duly take refuge in charging our industries with inefficiency despite the higher wages they pay—yes, even though high wages, by economic theory, reflect high productivity. By their measure our high-wage industries should have been invulnerable to import competition. The facts have been quite the opposite.

Their edifice having collapsed they seize on other arguments, as previously observed.

The fact is, of course, that considerable discrepancies in wages and costs among nations can and do persist because free competition no longer exists. The numerous interferences with the free market that impede free competition were instituted generally with the ardent support of the economists who, when it suits them, like to play as if the assumptions on which they lean so heavily, such as the play of free market forces, were still in operation.

The thrust of their untenable but stubborn contentions is that industry, agriculture and labor of this country are to be exposed to highly-advantaged foreign competition despite the heavy competitive handicaps loaded on the domestic producers by a hundred legislative enactments many of which soon came to rest on production in the form of higher costs.

What is the purpose of such a policy? Is it to disperse our capital to the four corners of the earth? Is it to restrain wage pressures coming from labor?

OPTIONS FACING DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

What, indeed, are the options of industry when it is confronted by import competition that captures an increasing share of the American market year after year?

One option is obviously that of investing abroad. This step has helped in two respects. (1) It has enabled American companies to supply from within some important foreign markets that would otherwise have been lost. (2) It has in many instances increased exports of machinery, equipment and sometimes semi-manufactures and parts, purchased by the foreign subsidiaries or branches.

On the other hand, some of the slow-down in our commercial exports may be attributed to the very act of supplying of foreign markets from within rather than exporting the finished goods from here. To that extent there has been a transfer of jobs or potential jobs from here to foreign countries. Jobs that do not materialize in this country add to the problem of unemployment. We need many hundreds of thousands of new openings to absorb the large numbers of new workers who come on the labor market each year. If potential jobs are transferred abroad the employment opportunities here naturally shrink by that much.

Also, in some instances foreign subsidiaries and branches export back to this country, thus creating additional competition from lower-wage areas. American automobile manufacturers in Europe, for example, sell numerous foreign-made cars in this country; so do American manufacturers of typewriters, transistor radios and other products.

The impact of low-cost products is not confined to finished manufactures, although these predominate today. A number of industries import parts as a means of achieving lower manufacturing costs in this country and thus to fend off eviction from the market for the finished product. It is true that we also export parts, especially for assembly in foreign plants, such as automobiles. Such exports may, however, face a decline since foreign countries have been insistent upon and indeed have required successively the use of higher percentages of locally manufactured parts in place of imports in their native plants.

THE ADJUSTMENT-ASSISTANCE PLOY

In the view of many economists adjustment assistance extended both to labor and to companies or whole industries should compensate for the injury done to domestic industries and labor by imports. Until 1962 it was the national trade policy not to cause injury to domestic industries as a result of larger imports attracted by lowered tariffs. In that year the Trade Expansion Act substituted the adjustment assistance program for the peril point and the escape clause which provided a cautious approach to tariff cutting and a remedy for injury.

The justification for adjustment assistance was that the reduction of tariffs and the resulting increase in imports would increase exports. The increase in trade would benefit the whole country. Therefore the public should make good any serious damage done to industries and employees injured as a result of trade agreements, past and future.

That policy, of course, reflected the peculiar mental seizure or lapse that held and still holds imports entitled to eminent domain in our domestic market, and that they should be allowed to push our industries out of the way. Imports, it would seem, are vested with some mystical virtue that gives them priority over domestic industry and employees. What this special virtue is has never been made known to the public. It is simply assumed. Our own industries, although heavily burdened with taxes and other high costs which were not of their own doing, under the new approach of adjustment assistance were to give way to imports from countries that imposed no comparable burdens on their own industries. The demand was so irrational that the fiction of inefficiency, previously mentioned, was invented to justify condemnation of our industry in deference to growing foreign access to our market. Beyond that, of course, was the concealed but powerful motive to help exports of industries that boasted heavy political muscle.

It developed that the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act were so tightly drawn that none of the score of applicants, including labor unions, succeeded in squeezing through the needle's eye. Not one dollar of assistance was paid in the six years since the law's enactment. The economic distortion caused by the great increase in defense expenditures enabled this country to absorb the great upsurge in imports that would otherwise have worked havoc on numerous industries. Now, however, further absorption will no longer be possible without disruptive effects; and should the economy move back to a peace basis, even if slowly, the exposure that was tolerable during the past few years would become intolerable to a growing number of important industries.

The suggestion is now put forward that adjustment assistance should be made easier to invoke. This suggestion ignores the odd philosophy from which the very notion of adjustment assistance arose in the first place. Legitimate American industry, which pays the high taxes exacted of it, that supports the vast welfare outlays through its high productivity and provides high employment at the world's highest wages, is to move over and make room for imports that achieve their competitive advantage from payment of much lower wages than those required by law in this country and very much lower than the wages above the minimum level paid here. What style of philosophy can so far overlook the fairness of treatment to which domestic industry is entitled, as to advance and support such a suggestion? It represents a philosophy that is essentially hostile to the industrial and economic system that supports the American civilization and the capacity of this country to provide aid to other countries. It demands that American industry be exposed to foreign competition, no matter how injurious it might be, regardless of the competitive handicap under which our industry labors.

Greater efficiency is demanded, as already noted, even if displacement of workers on a devastatingly large scale is involved. The government would assume the cost burden of retraining and possibly relocating the displaced workers. Such a policy strives for multiple Appalachias.

It is not explained why we owe such disruption of our industry to other countries or why some of our industries should be harshly treated, so that other industries might reap the benefit of greater exports. If the intention is, indeed, to drive industries to more rapid and radical automation it seems to be forgotten that the rate of mechanization is already a source of unemployment and needs no additional stimulation. The notion that displaced workers will soon be absorbed by other industries is belied by the stubbornness of the Appalachian problem. This provides further evidence of the sterility of economic theory when it refuses to take into account all the attendant circumstances that might upset expectations.

Adjustment assistance has little to recommend it if the condition to be remedied was deliberately brought about by pursuit of a policy that may be expected to produce the condition. Deliberate action that is expected to result in the serious injury of legitimate industry cannot be said to spring from any considerations of justice or from any concern about equal protection of the law. It is in fact a concept that is alien to the system of private enterprise and should be disowned as a legitimate and justifiable part of public policy.

MARKET SHARING AS A REMEDY

Now that the tariff has been virtually dismantled as a means of offsetting cost differences between this country and its competitors, and since the problem of our adverse competitive cost-handicap remains and bids fair to persist, a different remedy is needed to sustain the productive dynamism of this country.

The concept of market-sharing, implemented by flexible import quotas, offers the mildest form of trade regulation consistent with the extensive regulation of the economy as a whole. To free our external trade when the domestic economy is made competitively rigid *vis a vis* foreign production costs is both illogical and unfair. The heaviest cost factors in this country are very rigid indeed so far as competitive maneuvering is concerned.

Wages move in only one direction, and this movement underwrites expanding consumption so long as inflation does not cancel the higher compensation. Wages are entitled to rise as productivity increases.

Taxes are high and quite rigid and going higher if State and local taxes are taken into account, as they must be. The only opening of any significance therefore lies in the possibility of increasing productivity per man-hour; and, as previously noted, this can be accomplished almost exclusively by reducing the number of workers required per unit of output.

Yet such increase in productivity will not improve our competitive posture toward imports unless wages are not allowed to rise in proportion. If wages rise in proportion to the increase in productivity the competitive advantage is automatically canceled.

Therefore those who demand "higher efficiency" in our industries (even though we are productively the most efficient in the world) as a means of remaining competitive or as a means of recapturing our competitive position are committed to frozen wage levels. They cannot in all good conscience insist on supporting a liberal wage policy in this country and at the same time demand higher productive efficiency as a means of meeting import competition. They, of course, wish

fervidly to pose as friends of labor while promoting a policy that would strip labor of its compensation for increasing productivity, since increasing productive efficiency as a means of fending off rising imports would lose its effect if wages should increase in proportion.

If, however, ceilings should be established over imports at certain recognized levels that would accord to imports a liberal share of the domstic market, and permit them to increase in proportion to the expansion of the domestic market, the sting of unfairness would be taken out of import competition. Imports would be regulated in keeping with the regulation of the domestic economy. They would not have a license to benefit from a competitive advantage that rests in numerous instances on nothing more inspiring than the payment of a level of wages that if paid in this country would subject the employer to a legal penalty. Imports would not enjoy an open field on which to run wild regardless of the havoc they might inflict. Imports would be brought under the restraints that have deprived our industries of competitive flexibility except at the expense of employment. They would not be permitted to exploit the competitive handicap that public policy, supported by a generation of electorate preferences in this country, has placed on our productive enterprise.

They would nevertheless have liberal access to the richest market in the world.

SERVICE FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Maine Commission on Rehabilitation Needs met with the Governor's Conference in Augusta, Maine, on October 29, 1968, to present the results of its study on rehabilitative needs in our State and to submit plans to meet the needs through legislation.

Its recommendation to create a separate bureau of rehabilitation services within the Maine Department of Health and Welfare to organize all health, social, and rehabilitative services—correctional and vocational—in a single organizational structure is receiving Governor Curtis' consideration. With adequate funds, the bureau would have the ability to mobilize resources and conduct programs throughout the State to meet the needs of the handicapped of all ages so that they might have the opportunity to live fruitful, productive lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the creed of the Maine Commission on Rehabilitative Needs by the chairman of the commission, Mr. Leonard W. Mayo; the remarks by Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis; and the remarks by State Senator Bennett D. Katz, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A CREED FOR THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN THE HANDICAPPED

(By Leonard W. Mayo,* Chairman, Maine Commission on Rehabilitation Needs)

1. We believe in the American promise of equality of opportunity for all people, regardless of nationality, cultural, or ethnic background, race, religion, or geographical location.

2. We believe that every country, city, town, village, and plantation, and every individual in the state of Maine has an obligation to help bring to fruition in this generation the ideal of a full and useful life for every handicapped person in the State.

3. We believe that this is only possible via effective team work, wise planning, the efficient expenditure of additional public and private funds, and the development of a network of resources and services as set forth in the recommendations of the Commission on Rehabilitation Needs.

4. We believe in the interest, the concern, and the basic compassion of our fellow citizens when human needs are brought to their attention and in their ultimate response to the challenge of rehabilitation as part of the American dream.

We believe that the vast majority of our people want to replace violence with peaceful solutions, injustice with justice, indecencies with decency, rejection with acceptance, dependency with independence, and hence, disability, physical, mental, or social, with the opportunity for rehabilitation.

5. Finally, we believe in the handicapped person himself and in his capacity for development so frequently limited by our lack of imagination and neglect; we believe in his passion for freedom and independence that can be his only when those upon whom he must rely for education, training, guidance, and employment, do not fail him, but become articulate, dynamic, and effective partners in his determined struggle to help himself.

These things we believe, and believing, we pledge our hearts, our hands, our funds, and our full cooperation to the end that they shall be carried out.

THE GOVERNOR'S REPLY

(By Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis)

Thank you, Dr. Mayo, distinguished visitors and friends of rehabilitation.

It is truly a great pleasure to greet all of you who have come today to help launch this most important phase of our statewide planning for rehabilitation.

Many of you I know personally. I am acquainted with the important work you are doing in medicine, psychology, education, social work, industry, communications, employment and vocational rehabilitation.

Many of you are conducting programs that mobilize the resources of your communities to reach disabled persons of all ages and help them achieve their full potential.

Equally important, you are combatting a host of social ills such as schools that are poorly equipped and staffed to meet the social and emotional needs of children, especially the children of the very poor.

I want to express appreciation to all those who have made substantial contributions to this 20-month study—a study which has discussed and publicized for the first time our State's specific needs for total rehabilitation services, and has proposed equally specific ways to meet these needs.

Thirty-two commission members, 105 members of the six regional task forces, many members of special study committees, and scores of other persons have contributed their time and knowledge to this great effort.

The project staff, Dr. Peter Doran and Larry Lapointe, deserve special thanks, as do the hard-working members of the executive committee.

My principal goal, as Governor, is to develop this State's vast and still largely untapped natural and human resources.

We have learned from bitter experience that we can no longer afford to waste our natural resources.

We know that like our land itself, every individual has hidden resources which we must explore and develop.

But there are formidable obstacles to overcome in meeting this goal.

For example, the commission's study has revealed that approximately 52,000 persons are eligible for vocational rehabilitation services.

Yet the two major vocational rehabilitation agencies—the division of vocational rehabilitation and the division of eye care and special services, can extend services to only about 3,000 persons annually.

We know also that there are more than 16,000 young people in Maine between the ages of 5 and 18 who are so emotionally or psychologically disturbed that they are in serious need of professional help.

Yet very few of them, especially those in the public schools, receive that help.

These statistics document a pressing need for greatly expanded rehabilitation services.

The twenty major recommendations set forth by your commission provide many of the keys, I believe, to such a quality program of expanding services in this State.

These recommendations reflect the just principle that every disabled person is entitled to an equal chance to develop and use his considerable abilities.

Let me now discuss with you some actions that I have taken or propose to take in this area.

I have asked Commissioners Dean Fisher and William Logan to help prepare legislation to create a separate bureau of rehabilitation services in the department of health and welfare.

Creation of such a bureau has the value of organizing all health, social and rehabilitation services within a single organizational structure.

There is every expectation that this will improve the coordination of these services and provide a stronger and more visible unit.

It will also improve services to clients by bringing together these services within a single agency and improving referral and record keeping practices.

The new bureau should be part of the legislature's business when it convenes in January.

In correctional rehabilitation, another major concern of the commission, important steps have already been taken to bring vocational rehabilitation services, administered cooperatively by the Bureau of Corrections and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, to all correctional institutions in the state.

In addition, an effective program has been developed cooperatively by the Division and the Bureau of Mental Health at the Bliss Center in Pineland.

Similar vocational rehabilitation service should be provided at our mental, community and general hospitals, and I hope that this too can be accomplished in the coming year.

The needs of handicapped children must be given a prominent place in our planning.

Just as we have vocational rehabilitation counselors in our institutions, we should also have them in public school systems on both the elementary and secondary level.

In the elementary schools they can help the teaching and administrative staff identify handicapped youngsters.

On the secondary level they can assist guidance counselors and others to help handicapped young people find suitable training opportunities as well as appropriate job placement in the community.

We know too that prevention of handicapping conditions is at least as important as dealing with disabilities once they occur.

For this reason, the Department of Education should exert leadership to promote courses in health education in the schools of this state.

Recruitment and training of competent rehabilitation personnel is another high priority.

Degree programs and special courses should be developed within the state, especially at the university.

* Delivered before the Governor's Conference on Rehabilitation Needs, Augusta, Maine, October 29, 1968.

Tri-state planning with the New England Center for Continuing Education might make these training programs available to rehabilitation personnel in Maine and in our neighboring states of New Hampshire and Vermont.

I am prepared to propose this development of a training curriculum through the New England Governor's Conference.

If highly skilled people are essential to the rehabilitation effort, we must improve the pay scale for both rehabilitation and correctional personnel.

More realistic caseloads and working hours are also important priorities.

These concerns will be reflected in the new salary plan proposed by the Department of Personnel, and in institutional budget estimates submitted to me for my work in preparing the state's budget for the 104th legislature.

The commission has proposed a plan for developing our existing resources to provide an overall pattern of comprehensive care.

The plan includes, as a long-range goal, the development of a comprehensive rehabilitation center in the southern part of the state where medical rehabilitation programs are already well under way.

A center of this kind would provide the variety of services required to meet total medical, vocational and social rehabilitation needs within the state.

Vocational adjustment and eventual job placement must become a major thrust of our rehabilitation program.

There is, in this connection, a definite need to establish transitional adjustment and sheltered employment workshops for persons of all ages and disabilities, including the retarded.

We know that there are many persons considered "disabled" whose abilities, through proper training and placement, can become marketable.

A greater effort must be made to equip these disabled persons for suitable jobs, and then to match the job and the person through a computerized data processing system.

A list of known handicapped citizens will be kept up to date, and once the list has been established on a statewide basis, local employment offices will be able to locate within minutes a rehabilitated worker ready for placement.

To further this effort as time and funds permit, we need to go on and establish regional information and referral centers functioning as satellites of a central information and referral service.

Many public and private agencies operate or provide auxiliary services to rehabilitation programs.

Too often these agencies are physically separated from each other and operate without sufficient knowledge for adequate referral services.

A major goal for Government should be comprehensive social service centers—operating on a regional basis—which would pull together existing services and improve cooperative approaches to solving individual case problems.

I intend to ask the State planning office, the Bureau of Public Improvements and all State agencies to cooperate in planning this system.

I would expect that when they recommend financing, staffing and organization patterns their proposals would take into account your suggestion for a State information and referral service.

To further expand the availability of the State's vocational rehabilitation services, the State's Vocational Rehabilitation Act, which limits eligibility for these services, should be revised to conform more closely with the liberalized Federal statutes.

I expect to see a newly revised State act presented to the 104th legislature.

The legislature should also consider broadening the coverage of the architectural barriers law so that public buildings will be more accessible to our physically handicapped citizens.

To help implement these and a number of the other recommendations, I propose to revitalize the committee on employment of the handicapped by establishing it on a sound legal base and increasing its membership.

I have asked the committee to draft such legislation to be introduced at the next session.

In the meantime, I am issuing an executive order which will perpetuate the committee until permanent legislation can be enacted.

I believe that strengthening this committee and giving it permanent status will add immeasurably to the end result of all our rehabilitation efforts—namely, providing suitable employment to every man and woman who can be rehabilitated.

This is a realistic goal, and it is one in which the private employer has a great stake.

Many nationwide studies have shown beyond question that the handicapped, when properly trained and placed, are often above average in dependability and overall job performance.

In the recent survey of employer attitudes conducted by the commission, 85 percent of the firms interviewed who hired handicapped workers rated these employees "average" or "above average".

This sampling of experienced employers should encourage other employers to take advantage of the abilities that these handicapped persons can contribute.

The measures I have discussed so far reflect, in large part, the careful judgments of the commission on rehabilitation needs.

These judgments are only the beginning of a long process of implementation and further planning.

As Dr. Mayo pointed out earlier, the commission is only one of several planning groups that has been studying state services involved with the development of our human resources.

The commission has wisely maintained a close working relationship with these other groups, and particularly with the citizens task force on intergovernmental welfare problems.

Both groups recognized that persons in the lowest income brackets are far more prone to disabling illness and other handicapped conditions than the rest of the population.

Both groups have directed their efforts towards a common goal—substituting pay checks for welfare payments.

And both groups have developed programs that promise important new services for the people of our State.

To implement these programs will require time and money, though we should remember that we are aiming for the implementation of recommended programs by 1975.

Thus I am hopeful that the 104th Legislature will react favorably to many of the major recommendations of the Commission on Rehabilitation Needs, including the appropriation of increased funds for rehabilitation services.

Such an increased appropriation would entitle Maine to realize three times the amount of its appropriation in Federal monies earmarked for rehabilitation.

In the past, Maine has passed up more than one and a quarter million dollars in Federal funds because of the failure to appropriate its one-third matching share.

In 1970, the Federal matching component under present law will increase to four dollars of Federal money for each State dollar appropriated in cash or furnished in kind.

In our long-range planning, therefore, we must make a special effort to ensure that these Federal appropriations which we need and should have are not passed on to other less needy States.

I have singled out the legislature as having a major responsibility for ensuring that our handicapped citizens receive a fair chance for a useful, productive life.

Yet the legislature's effort can only be part of the story.

The rehabilitation process, leading to personal independence and economic self-sufficiency, requires all of our agencies, public and private, to pool their resources and adopt a team approach to each client and his family.

The employment security commission plays a vital role in matching clients and job opportunities.

Community action programs seek out the disabled poor and administer to local needs.

In the final analysis, however, it must be all of our citizens who insist that our priceless human resources are no longer wasted.

The very fact that all of us are here today is clear evidence that the need is recognized—and that there are many who are willing to assist in this vital enterprise.

I ask you, therefore, to share your knowledge and convictions with your fellow citizens, so that we can enlist them, too, in what should be our common cause.

WHAT ARE WE PREPARED TO REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR, THE LEGISLATURE, AND THE PEOPLE?

(By Senator Bennett D. Katz)

One of the characteristics of the public school education received by those of us who have reached middle age, is a most remarkable retention in our minds of words memorized an incredibly long time ago.

Remember the lines that Lieut. McCrea wrote "In Flanders Fields?" "To you from failing hands we throw the torch. Be yours to hold it high! If ye break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep, though poppies grow in Flanders Fields."

This afternoon, I think we are in the process of doing a little of this passing of the torch business, yet before we take our hands completely off the torch, we are going to be very sure it is grasped safely and surely.

When a group of men and women have devoted almost two years of their lives to a cause, there is an innate determination that the effort shall not have been in vain.

We who have served on the Maine Commission on Rehabilitation Needs were chosen from widely dissimilar ways of life, yet we have ended up with a common denominator—a zealous determination to make a lasting contribution to the cause of the handicapped.

When John Reed invited me to serve, at the end of 1966, my immediate reaction was to send my regrets. As the incoming Chairman of the Legislative Committee on Education, it was clear to me that I'd have my hands full in living up to heavy responsibilities in offering whatever leadership I could in the field of education. Yet I accepted, and now two years later, I have a deep feeling of gratitude to Gov. Reed and to his dynamic successor, Gov. Curtis, for permitting me the opportunity to serve in this stimulating project.

I have never devoted time in an area of human needs, where the needs were any clearer, nor the necessity for filling the needs any more pressing. I have never served in a project more capably led, nor more professionally staffed. George Nilson, our first chairman was a superb choice, and when regretably he left Maine, filling his shoes was a difficult challenge. The choice by Gov. Curtis of Dr. Leonard Mayo was warmly applauded by us all. Gov. Curtis, as a pretty successful politician himself, knows that we Republican Senators do not *necessarily* wax ecstatic over his every appointment. In this case, Gov. Curtis has hit a home run. Leonard Mayo has stepped in as a relief pitcher and has won the respect and admiration of us all.

So, here we are today, making a report to the Governor and to the people of

Maine. On September 5th, before the Maine Conference of Social Welfare at the Samoset in Rockland, I presented a detailed preliminary report of our recommendations.

At that time, I went into substantial detail as to the specific nature of our proposals. I laid out our suggested roadmap for progress in meeting unfilled rehabilitation needs in Maine. It was, I said, a distillation of about 26 pounds of facts, surveys and reports, representing the thinking of thousands of Maine citizens. Using a system of regional task forces, we have, in effect, asked Maine people to hold up a giant mirror of self-evaluation.

Today, we are making our report to the Governor. We are documenting with evidence the fact that there are thousands of Maine people who are handicapped and who are not receiving the help which they need. We are recommending several changes in governmental structure to serve these needs more adequately. We are recommending the creation of a new Division of Rehabilitation within the Department of Health and Welfare, to join and consolidate several presently separate agencies which work in the field of rehabilitation.

In the field of corrections, we are recommending a whole new exciting concept of attitude towards the convicted offender, long overdue in Maine, where the entire emphasis will be transferred from punishment for all, to rehabilitation for the greatest possible numbers. In this area, the implications for state institutions are substantial. We recommend that sentencing offenders to a certain institution for a prescribed length of time should be discontinued in favor of sentencing to the Bureau of Corrections. The Bureau, after knowledgeable professional evaluation of the individual prisoner, motivated heavily in the direction of maximum rehabilitation, will be responsible for ultimate disposition of each case.

As a member of the Maine Senate, sorely disturbed about the shortcomings of the education of our children, I feel my heart leap at the perceptive findings of the Commission with respect to handicapped children. The wording in the report reads, "Early remediation for handicapped children, socially maladjusted and mentally retarded should be given greater attention by all responsible agencies."

Let me pause here, and declare very clearly, that in my opinion, the education of our handicapped children is today the largest unfilled need of education in the State of Maine. In the category of the emotionally disturbed alone, there are 16,000 school age children who are indeed disturbed to the extent that they must be considered handicapped. They desperately need help—help far beyond what even a devoted classroom teacher can offer. They need our help—and they are not getting it.

I can think of no other area where there is so much loss of human potential, and where so little is being done to make progress.

The emotionally disturbed child disrupts his class—or withdraws into a shell. Frequently, he becomes a drop-out and we label him a failure. We set programs into motion to seek him out to bring him back to school, to make up for his failure—yet, it is not the disturbed child who has failed—it is we who should recognize his problems and offer timely professional help—before it is too late. And so often, it is too late, when the elementary child has become a young adult, and has passed from the responsibility of the Department of Education, to the Department of Social Welfare, or predictably, the Bureau of Corrections.

Yes, the education of our handicapped children is, today, the largest unfilled need of education in the State of Maine. I am very proud that the Maine Education Council, of which I am a member, will support legislation before the 104th Legislature, which, in proposing revisions in the all-important school subsidy bill, calls for state aid in the case of the handicapped child at a level 300% that of the ordinary pupil.

We, on the Maine Commission on Rehabilitation Needs, declare to you today that for the handicapped, education and training is the pass-key to human dignity and personal fulfillment. We declare that this education, this training is the responsibility of government, and the undeniable right of the handicapped individual.

Where is the money going to come from? Who will pay the cost implicit in the meeting of the needs of our handicapped people? Who will pay for their medical rehabilitation? Their education? Their training?

If we are to succeed, and succeed we must, we need an effectively functioning partnership—between government and the private sector. Each must assume that share of the burden which it can handle most effectively. The general hospitals, the sheltered workshops, the mental retardation and cerebral palsy groups, the Pine Tree Society and all the other associations of devoted workers in the vineyard of compassion—all must assume a proportionate share of the larger burden ahead.

In government, there must be renewed dedication to the importance of our tasks.

And in both sectors the most crying need is for increasingly dynamic leadership for those with responsibilities, and ever increasing understanding and support from the people.

But where will the money come from? Let me speak for the state.

Governor Curtis is presently wrestling with a budget which surely must seem improbable, if not impossible. When it arrives in the form of a program for consideration by the 104th Legislature, it will contain demands for record-breaking appropriations. Just to support presently authorized programs will require some $20 to $25 million dollars in additional revenue per year.

The cost of local education will continue to rise. Support of our newly expanded University of Maine system will make heavy demands. Expansion of state parks and recreation, increasing activity in air and water pollution control, restructuring and modernization of our cumbersome and archaic social welfare programs—all these will add to the insatiable demands for more money. Improvement of state institutions, continued maintenance and improvement of our highways, airports and port facilities, more realistic state retirement programs and more competitive pay scales for state employees who are continually pinched as the cost of living increases, broader promotion of Maine by DED, better protection of our people in the fields of banking, insurance and securities—all these require ever increasing support.

Yet, in a state of only a million people with limited resources, there is not an endless amount of money available, regardless of how worthy the purpose. And incredible though it may seem, Maine has never established any program of long range state goals and priorities.

When it comes to buildings—to bricks and mortar, we have indeed established priorities. Each biennium, the Bureau of Public Improvements takes all the requests from all state departments which are already in an intradepartmental priority listing, and integrates them in a single tally of requested capital improvements—listed in priority of statewide needs.

It do not suggest that this list is sacrosanct—that a determined governor or a nonconformist legislature never deviates, but in the BPI report we get a clear picture of all the non-highway capital needs of the state with an easily understood recommendation of relative urgency.

Not so however, in the biennial appropriations from the general fund and accumulated surplus. Here we have a Senate and a House reacting as effectively as possible to a proposed program of a governor, plus the demands of hundreds of legislative documents proposed by individual legislators.

Here, in the organized confusion of a legislative session there are no long-range guidelines apparent within which to operate. Here, a $10,000 request to underwrite the cost of attempting to encourage a few more Maine youngsters to attend dental school competes with a request by DED for more national advertising promoting our state—and a proposal to put much needed funds to expand a very successful apprenticeship program—and a request to support a program for practical nursing at one of our vocational technical institutes—and an appropriation to acquire land for the initial development of a state park—and many, many more. All worthwhile—All needed if we are to make progress. But we don't have money to do everything now.

The other day I heard of a proposal by a candidate for the Legislature to offer tuition-free education for any Maine youngster through 4 years of college. As Chairman of Education, one would expect me to support this as a meaningful method of increasing post high school opportunities. Instead, I found myself saying, "No! No! No!"

Sure, it would be nice to do this. But can we afford to consider seriously doing something because it would be "nice to do?"

In any system of priorities, with the urgent needs of so many people unfilled, can we afford to divert *any* tax monies to programs we don't deem absolutely essential?

When I hear of an eight year old boy who moves from one side of his room to another by crawling across the floor, when I know of youngsters whose untreated speech defects may relegate them to lives far short of their innate potential development, when I consider a father in his forties, suddenly disabled, with a life of fear and bitterness ahead of him, then I begin to develop my own set of priorities.

We vigorously support the establishment of long range state goals and priorities, and declare our belief that by any standard, meeting the needs of the handicapped must be given a high priority.

In my opinion, the absence of a system of long range state goals and priorities is a barrier to the successful recognition and realization of our goals.

In my opinion, the biennial system of legislative sessions is a barrier to the successful recognition and realization of our goals.

In my opinion, the combination of factors which in recent years has caused a turnover of some 53% amongst the ranks of our legislators each biennium—this is a barrier to the successful recognition and realization of our goals.

In short, I am saying that the absence of a system of long range state goals and priorities, developed by the executive combined with the existence of a legislature which meets too infrequently, is by weight of numbers one of the largest in the United States, which by its appallingly high turnover of members must surely be one of the most inexperienced in the nation—this in my opinion operates as a very significant barrier to the successful recognition and realization of our goals.

We acknowledge to the Governor our deep appreciation for the understanding, encouragement and complete cooperation he has given us from the start. He has shown a deep awareness of the importance of our task.

This then, is the report I make to the Governor. This then is the challenge which we lay before him and the people of the State. It is a challenge of heroic proportions, with no easy answers, no simplistic solutions. We eargerly await his response.

I speak as a Republican member of the Maine Senate, and say that there are no partisan implications in our concern for the less fortunate. I pledge to our Democratic Governor that, God and the electorate willing, I will work with him in any way, in every

way, in a bi-partisan partnership to translate our words into action, our programs into service.

There are thousands of people, not here today, who are depending on us. They are not as vocal as we. They are not as mobile as we.

But their cause is our cause.

And in their cause, let us be tenacious, dedicated and in the end, effective.

We must do no less!

THE LATE SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, only recently my attention was drawn to a column which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on October 29, 1966, under the byline of Raymond Moley. I was struck with the manner in which the columnist recounted significant events of our history and the warmth with which he described the character of the great American, the late U.S. Senator Harry Flood Byrd.

The legend of Harry Flood Byrd will continue to be expounded as the years roll by. It was my personal privilege to have known him during some of those years of greatness. I offer the column for inclusion in the RECORD in tribute to our dear friend and former colleague, as follows:

Perhaps had Mr. Roosevelt known that his decision would place in the Senate a man who over the years would, always with discretion and courtesy, oppose his favorite policies, he might have hesitated to create the vacancy from Virginia. For the new senator proved himself as the years passed a resolute warrior for fiscal responsibility and a valiant opponent of growing federal power.

The strength and influence of Byrd grew until, as chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, he was the leading American exponent of sound fiscal policy and of the constitutional balance of powers between states and the federal government.

Moreover, Sen. Byrd at all times stood for something greater than himself. He represented all the fine traditions so cherished by the great state of Virginia. He maintained organized political authority in his state, and through his influence that state met its problems of growth with enlightened responsibility. In a nation in which so many states have become mere fiefdoms of a federal bureaucracy, Virginia has maintained its sovereignty and its capacity to speak for itself.

Back in 1941 Sen. Byrd, deeply concerned about the growth of bureaucracy and of improvident spending, secured the creation of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, of which he was chairman. It was a tribute to the confidence in him in the Senate that twice when Republicans controlled the Senate he was retained in that chairmanship. Month after month his committee provided the record of the nation's finances and the number of federal employees.

The traditions which Byrd represented were Wilsonian. But far back before President Wilson—and even beyond the Confederacy—the roots were in the principles for which great Virginians fought before the Revolution. Whoever visits Williamsburg and is moved by the reminders there of Wythe, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and George Mason should remind himself that nearly two centuries later Harry Byrd stood firmly for the faith of those men. His memory is with them in a great tradition.

In writing a history of the First New Deal—now completed—I often had the feeling of cutting a way through a thicket of memories peopled by near-forgotten ghosts. But what I witnessed on March 4, 1933, stands out clearly from all the rest of those days. For I saw the Senate called to order minutes after Franklin D. Roosevelt finished his inaugural address. In the chair was John N. Garner, who had just taken his own oath of office.

A great and awesome stillness prevailed in a stricken and frightened country. Three years of depression had culminated in the closing of the banks. And the business before Congress in the week to come was to validate the President's order closing the banks and to provide for the banks' reopening. It was that, perhaps, which made this opening of Congress so significant.

A minor incident is memorable. For on that day, after the Vice-President called the Senate to order, the venerable gentleman from Virginia, Carter Glass, rose from his seat and offered the credentials which admitted to membership in the Senate a man who in age might have been his son.

That man, in his 46th year, was Harry Flood Byrd. The appointment of the junior senator by Virginia's governor came, interestingly enough, because of a decision by Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt sought, by the appointment of Virginia's already aging Sen. Claude Swanson as secretary of the Navy, to achieve two things. One was to permit Key Pittman, a stalwart supporter, to move up to the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee. The other was to place the custody of his beloved Navy with a completely sympathetic secretary.

If we look for an explanation of Byrd's lasting influence we must find the answer in his character. In a tribute to Byrd, this was said:

"Issues are eternally debatable; but character is not. Harry Byrd symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and to history."

FORMER SENATOR WAYNE MORSE SPEAKS TO AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ON HEALTH CARE

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the midyear Conference of the American Hospital Association, a meeting of the officers of each State hospital association, which was held in Chicago last week, former Senator Wayne Morse spoke challengingly about some of the problems and issues facing hospitals.

As usual, Senator Morse's comments were timely and informative, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will miss his contributions as we work on the health problems of the Nation. However, because he shows his continuing ability to contribute to the dialog of the health needs of the country, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE INDUSTRIALIZATION OF HEALTH CARE: A CHALLENGE TO THE VOLUNTARY HEALTH FIELD

The problems and issues that the American Hospital Association grapples with as an organization, and that each hospital faces in its daily operation, impress this observer with the extent to which medical care has in recent years moved into the mainstream of the industry of America. The recent changes in the organization of the American Hospital Association reflect your full appreciation of the demands upon you from American society, and your need to respond to them.

The last decade has seen a virtual revolution in the attitude of Americans toward health care, and consequently in the demands made upon the health professions. A reasonable, consistent degree of prosperity has enabled our people to think more in terms of minimum standards, rather than absolute necessities. It is axiomatic in your profession that health care has moved dramatically from a privilege to a right, or at least to a service that the average citizen feels he is entitled to, irrespective of his financial condition.

This changed attitude has reflected itself in many ways, and in many programs initiated and sometimes financed by the federal government. Undoubtedly, medicare is the most significant. Its enactment established the principle that the financial circumstances and resources of each, individual citizen, need not be the limiting factor in the state of his health, nor in seeking the professional help he needs. Once that principle was established, it spread—and is still spreading—to other aspects of health care.

Hospital administration is now in the process of adjusting, revamping, and reorganizing to meet this change. Congress is in the process of enacting new programs and appropriating new funds to keep up with the demand it created, both directly and indirectly, by medicare.

For it is not help in paying for a hospital stay that the public now expects. It expects the full benefit of the most advanced techniques and procedures known to medical science, even though the cost of such techniques and procedures may be so high as to preclude all but the most affluent from paying their full cost.

Congress bears a good deal of the responsibility for having created that demand, too. Federal financing of medical research, already high, rose from $750 million in 1964 to $1 billion, $258 million in fiscal year 1969. This record was achieved under the leadership of the incomparable Lister Hill of Alabama. Senator Hill served as chairman of both the Health Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where substantive legislation was prepared, and the Health Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where the money was provided. In that dual capacity, he led the nation in its most far-reaching exploration of the nature and treatment for human disease and disability.

Some medical scientists believe we made as much progress in our knowledge of medicine in the last 25 years as was added during all of the preceding years in the history of medicine. We have virtually eliminated many of the infectious diseases. We have developed new drugs for controlling illnesses that in the past took a heavy toll in death and disability. We have devised new surgical techniques that have greatly extended the span of life. If we are to continue the progress we have already achieved, we must continue to provide for an adequate investment in health research.

But we are now challenged to make this knowledge available to those in need of it. Not those who can pay for it: *to those who have need for it!*

How to do this is a challenge to *you*, and to Congress.

The first responsibility is yours. Whatever else Congress does, it is not likely to make it a federal project to operate and manage the nation's hospitals. You can expect help in those areas where your own resources are inadequate. But the major task of organizing health services will be in your hands.

It will be necessary for hospitals to devote themselves entirely to the service of the public, and to the needs of the patient. To that end, they will have to organize the services of the doctors who use the hospitals, as well as the service of the care itself. To those few remaining medical practitioners who think of a hospital as a place where a doctor practices medicine, I say: you will have to reorient your thinking!

There will be less and less room for the use of the hospital for the benefit of the technical expert. The issue you currently grapple with over allowing technical experts to bill patients directly for their services performed during a hospital stay will yield to the requirement of mass health care that the hospital be the unit the patient deals with.

It is hospital administrators who will bear the burden of keeping the cost of hospitalization as low as possible, consistent with good care. A plausible question arises of what pressures will contribute to that end? To the extent that your product is increasingly regarded as a public service and not a competitive contest with a rival hospital, that particular pressure to keep costs down is removed. In fact, there is increasing pressure that service—not necessarily costs—be improved by a greater sharing of facilities, rather than duplication which either raises costs exorbitantly or deprives a patient entirely of a service that may be available in another hospital nearby.

I may say parenthetically that our education system is being pressed in the same direction. The sharing of a single, highly expensive experimental piece of equipment for use by the physics departments of several neighboring institutions has become quite common. Colleges are taking the next step of integrated curricula, whereby the student attends more than one institution, to receive instruction in the various courses that make up his major field of study.

Greater specialization is possible; so is the student able to avail himself of a wider scope of study than he could get at all but the biggest and most comprehensive institutions.

The medical sciences are moving in the same direction. But this is not competition; this is collaboration for the benefit of the patient. Does it remove the incentive to keep costs as low as possible? Does the high degree of federal subsidization further remove that incentive?

Perhaps the answer to both is in the negative. But in any event, soaring costs will always be a prime object of a Congress and a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who are responsible for paying much of the bill.

Eliminating duplication of expensive facilities, and the cooperative use of them by more than one institution can turn out to be a cost-reducing practice, as well as one calculated to give the patient the best care available, no matter which of several hospitals he may enter.

How this can best be done in each locality is for you to determine.

Congress met a part of the same problem with its Regional Health Center Act of 1965. Its purpose was to create some 55 regional centers, to serve as depositories for the most advanced information on treatment for heart disease, cancer, and stroke victims. It was contemplated that the center would be administered by a university, school of medicine, a research center, or some other public or nonprofit agency or institution, making possible demonstrations, consultations, research, and training in these diseases for physicians and hospitals within the area served. This was a major means whereby each institution could draw upon a pooling of services, insofar as information was concerned.

Budgetary problems in the last two years have severely curtailed the funding of the Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Act. But it is a major step in bringing the fruits of research to each American citizen. It is as important to mass health care as is the common use, or interchange, of facilities.

Still another critical factor in putting health care onto a mass consumption basis is that of manpower. Testimony last year to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee disclosed that we need 50,000 more physicians than we now have. There is a shortage of virtually every category of health workers. We need more nurses, and x-ray technicians. A joint study of this Association and the Public Health Service showed that hospitals alone needed an additional 79,000 professional nurses in 1966.

In combatting the nurse shortage we face a complex problem. First, the proportion of high school students choosing nursing as a career has declined. This factor is compounded by the extremely high attrition rate that prevails for schools of nursing. Only two-thirds of the entering students at nursing schools stay on to graduate.

Furthermore, hospital schools of nursing that supply almost three-fourths of the graduates in nursing are closing in increasing numbers due primarily to the high costs of training programs. Nursing education at hospitals is normally subsidized to some extent through patient charges, but federal reimbursement formulas under Medicare do not permit the inclusion of the expenses due to nursing education. As a result of the curtailment of nursing schools at hospitals, we admitted 2,000 fewer new nursing students in 1967 than in 1966.

To reverse this trend we must provide full funding of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and its amendments under the Health Manpower Act of 1968. Among all health professions, it is the rising demand for care and not the absolute decline in people entering the field, that is responsible for the shortage. In 1950, 2.3 per cent of the labor force was in the health field; by 1960, it was 3.7 per cent of the labor force. But it is not enough; by 1975, it is estimated that over 4 per cent of the labor force will be engaged in providing for the health needs of the American people.

Here, too, budgetary limitations have produced a large backlog of applications for construction grants to build school buildings and related facilities under the Health Professions Act. The Act was designed to make it easier for students to enter these fields of study by providing them financial assistance. It sought to enhance the capacity and upgrade the instruction in the schools in nurses training and in allied medical fields. Medical record library sciences, medical technology, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and radiologic technology require a doubling of their present number just to meet current needs. The Manpower Act extended through fiscal year 1970 the authorization for Allied Health Professions Training.

In this connection, I would like to remind you that many hospitals do not seem to be utilizing one of our education programs as a source of capable but unskilled manpower. This is the work-study program for college students. It enables them to attend school and to earn expense money by working part-time. Many non-profit institutions have found their local colleges and universities to be a good source of this kind of help, and certainly it should be fully exploited by hospitals.

The genuine concern of Congress, and the Senate in particular, for the nation's health needs, is reflected in the fact that both Senator Hill and the new Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator Yarborough of Texas, have chosen the health subcommittee for their personal attention. I know that Senator Yarborough is much aware of the need in the manpower field. His subcommittee will devote much of its time to that problem in the months ahead.

Upon taking over the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Secretary Robert Finch pointed out quite correctly that the statutes are on the books that deal with our most urgent needs in health and education. What is, and has been, the bottleneck has been the lack of funding. This is as true in health as it is in education, where I guided to passage the most far-reaching legislation to upgrade the nation's education in the history of the country. But laws of this kind are empty without the money to carry them out. Whatever else may be on your agenda for Congress and the Administration in 1969, the full funding of these laws should have your top priority.

Another issue you will be discussing in the halls of Congress is that of amending the Hill-Burton Act to permit more federal money to go into the modernization of existing hospitals. As you know, this provision was passed by the Senate, but dropped in conference with the House when Congressman Staggers expressed the wish to have the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hold hearings on it. Certainly the medical publications are full of design plans and architectural plans that show how much time and manpower could be saved by automation not only in buildings under construction, but in the modernization of old hospitals. The increased use of computers, not only for keeping track of supplies, but in the care of patients, offers an area of cost saving and manpower saving that would be well worth the initial expense. Senator Javits, the sponsor of this amendment last year, points out that one-third of existing hospital facilities are considered obsolete. That degree of obsolescence means a waste that we cannot afford at a time when all medical services are so strained.

All this adds up to the entry of medicine into a full public service role. What has happened to you in recent decades is comparable to the changeover of industry from cottage industry to mass production industry. Coverage in 1966 of many hospital employees under the minimum wage law was one recognition of this change. Increased demands for collective bargaining rights and collectively bargained working conditions is another. In fact, the establishment of procedures whereby employees can be dealt with as unions and without work stoppages is one of the frontiers you are facing. Greater use of mediators and voluntary arbitration seems to be an appropriate direction to take, but most governmental entities and other administrators in public service have been rather slow to explore the field.

It should be great consolation to you, and a challenge as well, to know that yours are the problems of growth and expansion. In cooperation with Congress, and with state and local governments at all levels, I feel confident that you will meet them, and that in both quality and availability, the health care of the American people will continue making us among the healthiest people in the world.

BOY SCOUTS UNDER RED ATTACK

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America have been historically a cherished training organization in the principles of Americanism for our youth.

The official publication of the Boy Scouts is Boy's Life.

I was flabbergasted to discover in the October 1968 issue of Boy's Life an article, "Folk Songs," by one David Bittan. The article dwells at great length on such un-American individuals as Pete Seeger and the late Woody Guthrie—notorious, identified Communists.

The usual generalization of "Oh well, a lot of people became Communist back in the depression" cannot be applied to Pete Seeger. His record shows continuous diligent activity for the Communist Party through 1968. And Guthrie was known to use his musical talent as an entre to youth at clubs and recreational facilities.

I realize, of course, that most local Scoutmasters are probably not aware of the background and purposes of these individuals. But certainly, could not the editors of Boy's Life advise the youthful readers and their parents that these so-called great musicians are enemies of the American people hard at work to overthrow the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I place a list of officers of Boy's Life and the identification of Pete Seeger and Woody Guthrie from various reports following my comments:

LIST OF OFFICERS OF BOYS' LIFE

Lyndon B. Johnson, Honorary President.
Irving Feist, President.
Alden G. Barber, Chief Scout Executive.
Oliver S. Johnson, Publisher and General Sales Manager.
Edward L. Kern, Marketing Director.
Robert Hood, Editor.
Walter Babson, Executive Editor.
Andrew Lessin, Art Director.
Bert Marsh, Art Editor.
Dick Pryce, Senior Editor, Special Features.
Louis Sabin, Articles Editor.
Ernest Doclar, Regular Features Editor.
Ellen D. Small, Copy Editor.
Jean Pharo Lilly, Fiction Editor.
William K. Powers, Editorial Promotion Director.

Contributing editors: Frances Smith, Movies, TV, Travel; Bill Hillcourt, Scoutcraft; Glenn Wagner, Hobbies; Al Stenzel, Cartoon Features.

Book Department: Stanley Pashko, Director.

Production: Thomas R. Marvel, Director; Gene Allendorf, Advertising Production Manager.

Advertising: James N. Greaney, Eastern Advertising Manager; Kirkwood Sampson, Western Advertising Manager; Frank X. Simonds, Pacific Coast Advertising Manager; Dorr & Doty, New England Representatives; Robert L. Goldsmith, Promotion Director; Frank J. Rowe, Assistant to the Publisher.

Circulation: Lloyd Eberhart, Business and Circulation Director; William E. Downs, Circulation Promotion Director; John J. Duffy, Subscription Director.

Boys' Life Committee: William Harrison Fetridge, Chairman; Philip C. Carling, Richard W. Darrow, Francis W. Hatch, James B. Kobak, Charles B. McCabe, Charles F. McCahill, Kenneth Dale McCormick, Herbert D. Maneloveg, Chester L. Posey, Vittz-James Ramsdell, Frank C. Rand, Jr., Warren J. Reynolds.

PETE SEEGER

Pete Seeger has claimed to have been born in New York City on May 3, 1919, the son of Charles Louis and Constance deClyver Edson. In 1943 he married one Toshi Aline Ohta. Three children—Daniel Adams, Mika Salter and Virginia were born of this union.

In the past Pete Seeger was employed as an Assistant to the Curator in the Archives of the American Folk Songs of the Library of Congress. In the 1940's he teamed with Woody Guthrie and has stated he toured the South, Southwest and Mexico and "collaborated on writing labor and anti-Fascist songs." Seeger is reportedly a member of the editorial staff of *Sing Out* Magazine and is recognized as a folk singer and composer.

The September 19, 1968 issue of the New Guard noted "identified Communist Party member Pete Seeger is now writing for the *Daily World*, the Communist Party newspaper. Seeger was named in congressional testimony as a member of the Communist Party and was also identified as a member of the Music Section of the Cultural Division of the Communist Party according to the Daily Worker of May 4, 1949."

In August, 1955 Pete Seeger was a witness before a hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Seeger refused to answer questions dealing with Communist activities and associates. Specifically, he refused to answer whether he had been a member of the Communist Party since 1947. As a result of Seeger's refusal to answer questions of the Committee, he was cited for contempt of the House of Representatives on July 25, 1956.

Seeger was convicted of the contempt charges in the U.S. District Court in New York City on March 29, 1961. His conviction was reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals on May 18, 1962 on the grounds of procedural errors in the trial in the lower court. The reversal was based solely on faulty wording in the grand jury's indictment which the court claimed failed to state as it should have, that the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities before which Seeger testified had authority to conduct that particular hearing.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Date: June 7, 1968.
For: Hon. Edwin E. Willis.
Subject: Peter Seeger.

This Committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the Committee. The fact that the Committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated.

Symbols in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication mentioned herein indicate that the organization or publication has been cited as being subversive by one or more Federal authorities. The name of each agency is denoted by a capital letter, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and, S—Subversive Activities Control Board. The numerals after each letter represent the year in which that agency first cited the organization or publication. (For more complete information on citations, see this Committee's "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.")

COMMUNIST PARTY MEMBERSHIP

Harvey Matusow, a witness in public hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, February 6, 1952, testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party from October 1947 to January 1951, and that he had known Peter Seeger to be a member of the Communist Party in New York City [Communist Activities Among Youth Groups (Based on the Testimony of Harvey M. Matusow), February 6 and 7, 1952, pages 3288 and 3297] *Note:* see attached memo, "Significance of Testimony of Harvey Matusow."

(Note in the reference under Testimony by subject, below, that Peter Seeger refused to state in public testimony whether or not he was or had been a member of the Communist Party.)

TESTIMONY BY SUBJECT

Peter Seeger was subpoenaed to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities, August 13, 1955. When asked if he was then or had been a member of the Communist Party, he refused to answer these and numerous other questions about activities in association with cited Communist organizations. [See the following attachment: "Proceedings Against Peter Seeger," July 15, 1956, which contains Mr. Seeger's testimony.]

LEGAL PROCEEDING

Year 1956: As a result of his refusals to answer questions of the committee without giving a valid reason for doing so, Mr. Seeger was cited for contempt of the House of Representatives, July 25, 1956. [See attached reproduction of "Proceedings Against Peter Seeger."]

Year 1961: He was convicted of the contempt charge in the United States District Court in New York City on March 29, 1961. [See attached reproduction of an article from the New York Times, March 30, 1961, p. 20]

Year 1962: His conviction was reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals, May 18, 1962, on the grounds of procedural errors in the trial in the lower court. [The conviction was reversed not for any error, omission or improper action by the committee in the Seeger hearings or in the Committee's or the House of Representatives' citation of him for contempt. Neither Matusow's identification of Seeger nor his subsequent and completely unsubstantiated claims that he had given false testimony were at issue in the case and had nothing to do with the reversal. The reversal was based wholly on faulty wording in the Grand Jury's indictment of Seeger which failed to state, as it should have, that the Subcommittee before which he testified had authority to conduct the particular hearing.]

(NOTE.—The following is a record of Seeger's activities subsequent to his testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 18, 1955.)

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATIONS

People's World (C–1941; S–1955), 1958: Sent congratulations on its 20th Anniversary (L.A. Edition, People's World, January 4, 1958, p. 4).

New Horizons for Youth (C–1962), 1962: Granted an interview to a representative of the periodical which was presented, complete and unedited, in its April–May 1962 issue, pp. 10 and 11.

American Dialog (C–1967), 1965, 1966, 1967: Sponsor (American Dialog, May–June 1965, contents page, November–December 1966, contents page, and Spring 1967, contents page). Writer of article to appear in autumn issue of American Dialog (National Guardian, October 28, 1967, p. 10 (ad)).

Freedom Ways (C–1962), 1965, 1968: Entertained at its program honoring Paul Robeson, April 22, 1965, New York City (Freedomways, Summer 1965, p. 364; National Guardian, April 17, 1965, p. 11; The Worker, May 2, 1965, pp. 3 & 11). Entertained at its "DuBois Centennial Celebration," Carnegie Hall, February 23, 1968 (National Guardian, February 3, 1968, p. 4 (ad); The Worker, February 6, 1968, p. 6 and March 3, 1968, pp. 3 & 14).

Metropolitan Music School (C–1947), 1954–57: To appear at concert on June 12, 1954, presented by the school; proceeds to go to the school's Scholarship Fund (Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, June 10, 1954, p. 7). Instructor (School Catalog for 1955–56, p. 12). Featured artist at its annual concert series, May 19, 1957; proceeds to go to the school's Scholarship Fund (Daily Worker, May 10, 1957, p. 7).

National Lawyers Guild (C–1944; I–1956), 1956, 1957: Furnished entertainment at its 1956 and 1957 conventions (Lawyers Guild Review, publication of the NLC, Spring 1956 issue, p. 32; and the National Lawyers Guild 20th Anniversary Convention Program, February 21–24, 1957, p. 11).

Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (C–1958; I–1956), 1957, 1962, 1963: Scheduled to participate in its conference on January 30, 1957 (Handbill of the organization). Accepted its invitation to attend a Victory Celebration Reception" on June 14, 1962 (Ad, National Guardian, June 4, 1962, p. 10; also reported in The Worker, June 12, 1962, p. 6). Scheduled to participate in a concert at a theater party arranged by the ECLC to be held on February 21, 1963, the proceeds to go to the organization's campaign against the McCarran (anti-Communist) Act (The Worker, January 29, 1963, p. 8).

California Labor School (A–1948; C–1956; S–1957), 1958: One of a group of "lecturers and guest artists" who, in the past, appeared at a steady stream of important affairs" at the now closed California Labor School. (A pamphlet of the school, entitled Once They Did It To Speak-Easies, Now They Do It To Schools!", May 15, 1958, p. 6).

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (A–1947; C–1944; I–1956), 1958, 1960, 1962, 1964: Scheduled to give a concert under the auspices of the Chicago Chapter of the organization on October 25, 1958 (The Worker, September 21, 1958, p. 12). Scheduled to entertain at a Rally of the organization on November 8, 1960 (Ad, The Worker, October 30, 1960, p. 11). Entertained at a reception given by the National Council for the Cherman Titova on the eve of their flight back to the Soviet Union (New World Review (C–1959; I–1956), June 1962, p. 4; The Worker, May 15, 1962, p. 8). Entertained at its 23rd Annual Meeting which celebrated the 47th Anniversary of the Russian socialist revolution and the 31st year of diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union (The Worker, November 17, 1964, p. 7).

National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (C–1961), 1960, 1966: Present among the 34 members of the organization who met at the Taft Hotel on October 11, 1960, to map plans for nationwide actions against the Committee on Un-American Activities (The Worker, October 16, 1960, p. 10). Sponsor (Letterhead of January 8, 1966 with attached list of sponsors).

New York Council to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee (C–1961), 1961, 1962, 1965: Attended a rally on April 21, 1961 (The Worker, April 30, 1961, p. 10; a letterhead of the Rally to Abolish . . . , dated April 21, 1961; and The Worker, April 16, 1961, p. 10). Was on the platform and sang at a rally of the organization which also urged clemency for Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, convicted for contempt of Congress (their convictions were upheld by the Supreme Court decisions handed down February 27, 1961) (Abolition, a publication of the New York Council, November 1961, pp. 1 & 6; The Worker, November 28, 1961, p. 8 and December 3, 1961, p. 9; National Guardian, December 18, 1961, p 3). Scheduled to entertain at a reception held by the New York Council on February 1, 1962 in New York City (Ads in The Worker, January 28, 1962, p. 11 and January 30, 1962, p. 6; and the National Guardian, January 22, 1962, p. 3 and January 29, 1962, p. 4). Scheduled to participate in a rally on October 24, 1962 at Manhattan Center, N.Y.C. (Letter of October 12, 1962 with attached handbill; The Militant, October 22, 1962, p. 3). Scheduled to participate in a meeting on April 11, 1965, in New York City (Ads in the National Guardian, April 3, 1965, p. 8 and April 10, 1965, p. 9).

National Guardian (C–1956), 1961, 1964–67: Entertained at its picnic on September 16, 1961 (National Guardian, August 21, p. 6, August 28, p. 5 and September 25, 1961, p. 9). Scheduled to entertain on the "Guardian Boat Ride," on June 22, 1961 (National Guardian, May 22, p. 9, June 5, p. 3 and June 12, 1961, p. 3). Scheduled to entertain at the annual Guardian picnic, September 19, 1964 (Ad, "Picnic with Pete!", August 15, p. 5, August 22, p. 6, August 29, p. 5, September 5, p. 4, September 12, p. 3, and September 19, 1964, p. 3, issues of the National Guardian). Entertained at annual Guardian picnics, September 18, 1965, September 17, 1966 and September 16, 1967 (National Guardian, October 2, 1965, p. 10, September 24, 1966, p. 2 and September 9, 1967, p. 4 (ad)).

Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (A–1947; C–1944), 1961, 1962, 1967: Recorded songs of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade which were offered for sale by the Guardian Buying Service (National Guardian, July 24, 1961, p. 8). Entertained at its rally on February 25, 1962, which was also a demonstration against the McCarren Act. The money collected was to be used in the fight against the Justice Department to keep the organization from registering as a "Communist front" as ordered by Attorney General Robert Kennedy. (The Worker, March 4, 1962, p. 12; National Guardian, February 12, 1962, p 10; The Worker, February 4 and 13, 1962, pp. 9 and 2 respectively; and a handbill of the organization). Member of Committee of Sponsors for a VALB dinner in tribute to Dr. Edward K. Barsky on the 30th Anniversary of the war in Spain, to be held February 24, 1967 in New York City; proceeds are to be used to establish a "defense fund for those young men and women in the United States and ir Spain who are today on the firing line of the fight for peace, civil rights and civil liberties." (January 31, 1967 letterhead with attached invitation.)

World Youth Festivals (Communist-dominated), 1962, 1965: Scheduled to lead a "Folk and Jazz Concert" to raise funds for the U.S. Festival Committee on April 25, 1962, the proceeds to be used to help send representatives to the 8th World Youth Festival, Helsinki, Finland (The Worker, April 24, 1962, p. 6; ad in the National Guardian, April 16, 1962, p. 11, placed by the U.S. Festival Committee). Scheduled to entertain at a "Festival Folk Concert," June 1, 1965 in New York City, sponsored by the American Youth Festival Committee, the administrative body established to process all applications for the 9th World Youth Festival to be held in Algiers (the 9th World Youth Festival was cancelled at a later date) (Ads in the National Guardian, May 29, 1965, p. 10, and The Worker, May 30, 1965, p. 10; handbill: "The American Youth Festival Committee Presents, June 1, 1965 . . .")

World Peace Council (C–1951), 1963: Entertained at meeting in San Francisco on May 7, 1963, of the Continuations Committee of the 1962 World Congress on General Disarmament and Peace (held by the World Peace Council, July 9–14, 1962 in Moscow) (The Dispatcher, April 19, 1963, p. 4; undated handbill, rec'd May 1963: People's World, May 11, 1963, p. 12).

National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell (C–1956), 1966, 1967: Honorary sponsor of its Committee to Free Morton Sobell (Letterheads of the Committee to Free Morton Sobell, August 29, 1966, June 6, 1967 and December 1967).

Spring Mobilization Committee to End War in Vietnam (C–1967), 1967: Participated in its April 15th demonstration in New York City (National Guardian, April 8, 1967, pp. 1 & 3, and April 22, 1967, p. 5; New York Times, April 13, 1967, p. C–29 (ad); People's World, April 15, 1967, p. 12).

ADDITIONAL PERTINENT INFORMATION

Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, 1965, 1966 (The committee's report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8–15, 1967)," released March 31, 1967, states on page 48 that the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee "is a New York City antiwar-in-Vietnam organization which, like the Spring and Student Mobilization Committees, has a mixed group of identified Communists, notorious fellow travelers and pacifists in its leadership.") Entertained at its "Sing-In for Peace" at Carnegie Hall, September 24, 1965 (The Worker, September 21, 1965, p. 8; National Guardian, October 2, 1965, p. 4). To participate in a meeting on August 25, 1966 in New York City (National Guardian, August 27, 1966, p. 8 (ad)).

Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, 1966, 1967 (Our report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8–15, 1967)," released March 31, 1967, states on page 24 that "Like a number of other organizations mentioned in this report, the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee is supported by a mixed group of professed and identified Communists, fellow travelers, and pacifists.") Entertained at meeting on October 9, 1966 in New York City (The Worker, October 16, 1966, p. 1). Sponsor (Letterheads of the committee dated from October 25, 1966 through July 17, 1967). Signer of the organization's petition to the President urging him to "exercise clemency and elementary justice in the case of James Johnson, Dennis Mora and David Samas, and to release them immediately from prison, and thus restore them as American citizens with full rights to civilian life." (Ad, New York Times, March 26, 1967, p. E–5) (James Johnson and David Samas were sentenced by an Army general court martial panel at Fort Dix, New Jersey to 5 years imprisonment, dishonorable discharge and forfeiture of pay for refusing to obey an officer and refusing to fight in Vietnam. Dennis Mora was sentenced to a 3-year prison term with a dishonorable discharge and forfeiture of pay. An appeal to stay the court martial ruling against the three soldiers was denied by U.S. Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan according to The Worker, October 18, 1966, p. 7).

Support of Known Communist, 1967: Sponsor of the William L. Patterson Tribute Committee which held a program in tribute to Patterson on the occasion of his 75th Anniversary, January 26, 1967 (Program, January 26, 1967) (William L. Patterson is a publicly identified Communist Party member.)

[From "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States," vol. 14 (1941), HCUA, p. 8463]

TESTIMONY OF HAZEL HUFFMAN BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ON MAY 22, 1941

According to reports, Woodie Guthrie, known as "Woodie," is a conscriptee and is now at Camp Dix.

Now, Woodie Guthrie, a Communist, is a guitar-playing, ballad-singing entertainer, brought to New York by Will Greer, also a Communist, and incidentally the grandson-in-law of Ella May Bloor, known as "Mother Bloor," Pennsylvania State secretary of the Communist Party.

Woodie Guthrie was brought by Will Greer from Oklahoma and advertised as one of the "Joads," or migratory workers.

During the past 3 or 4 years Woodie Guthrie has become one of the outstanding entertainers in the Communist Party, Communist Party fronts, and other left-wing organization meetings.

Now, at a recent American Peace Mobilization meeting, in fact I might say that at the upper Manhattan meeting, the midtown meeting, one of the large Harlem meetings, a meeting in Queens, and a meeting in Brooklyn, people in the audience, before the meeting had started, did a great deal of rejoicing over the amount of good that Woodie Guthrie could do now that he was in the camp.

He is an entertainer of the droll, homespun variety that tells tales and plays his guitar. And I have heard him on numerous occasions and it is always with this definite Communist Party tinge, and in his singing and in his talk he has never tried

to attempt to conceal the fact that he was the columnist for the Daily Worker or that he was a member of the Communist Party and represented it as such.

Besides mentioning that one particularly, for the boys who are attending the Peace—who are attending these American Peace meetings and have their registration cards or have just been called for their examination, there is always a great deal of, I would say, almost joy over the fact that they are going to get in—not that the boys particularly want to go but they are going to get "work done there in the camp."

The second method of contact is through the families of the boys. Now, in the American Peace Volunteer publication for May 17, 1941, on page 2—may I correct that, please, on page 4 we find an item that: "Staten Island visits families of conscriptees last week. The members of the American Peace Mobilization Council on Staten Island visited the families of 30 draftees. During the course of these visits more than 20 bought A.P.M. literature and promised to come to council meetings."

Now, the fact is that contacting the families of the conscriptees has been discussed not so frequently from the platform at public American Peace Mobilization meetings as it has been discussed by the people who were later the speakers and discussed before the meetings started.

The next form of contact is through club and recreational facilities set up by these groups in areas surrounding the camps.

[From the Worker, Nov. 14, 1967]

STEEL UNION'S TRIBUTE TO WOODY

Woody Guthrie, who died last month at the age of 55, was destined to be one of those persons to be praised in death but whose work was deplored as "revolutionary" by those institutions he attacked in song and verse, for he hated the forces which created the Dust Bowl of the 1930s, which drove farmers and workers to the roads as hoboes and he despised the people of wealth who vowed to fight trade unions with machine guns.

The people whose business it is to name things, like power stations in our vast system of federal dams came up with the idea that one at Grand Coulee should bear Woody's name. This was the same Guthrie who was condemned as an "agitator" of working people in the day of CIO organization because he put to song the hopes and the faith of common people. Guthrie's most lasting "memorial" will be his ballads, sung by other generations and a fulfillment of the promise of America:

"This land is your land, this land is my land.
From California to the New York Island.
From the redwood forest to the Gulfstream waters.
This land was made for you and me."

—From an editorial in Steel Labor, organ of the United Steelworkers union.

INDIANA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD NOW ON DUTY IN VIETNAM

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have been informed that the only Army National Guard unit now on active duty in South Vietnam is composed of the 200 Indiana guardsmen who were called up last May and who have been stationed near Saigon since December 31. Assigned to a primary role of spying on the enemy, it is interesting to note that this all-Hoosier group has named its base "Camp Atterbury East," after the area where the members had received the bulk of their training while in the Guard.

The former Indiana adjutant general, John S. Anderson, recently had the opportunity to visit these men in Vietnam and has reported enthusiastically on their activity. The commander of this unit is Capt. Ronald E. Himsel, a graduate of Purdue University, who succeeded his brother, Maj. Kenneth W. Himsel, an Indiana University graduate who is now serving with another outfit in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles published in the Indianapolis Star describing General Anderson's visit and the high morale, living conditions, and mission of this unit be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Jan. 10, 1969]

GENERAL ANDERSON TO SEE INDIANA'S GUARD IN VIET

Indiana Adjutant General John S. Anderson will leave tomorrow for South Vietnam to visit an Indiana National Guard unit which has arrived there for combat duty.

Yesterday the Defense Department announced that the unit, Company D (Long Range Patrol) of the 151st Infantry, arrived in Vietnam on Dec. 31 from Fort Benning, Ga.

Anderson will not be going as a representative of the state but as a general officer since he will not be the adjutant general under Governor-Elect Edgar D. Whitcomb.

Company D is made up mostly of men from the Greenfield, Muncie and Evansville areas. It was called to active duty last May.

At that time its commander was Capt. Kenneth W. Himsel, 30 years old, Indianapolis. He since has been promoted to major and is serving with another unit in Vietnam.

His brother, Capt. Ronald E. Himsel, 27, Indianapolis, who had been the company's executive officer, now is the commander.

The two officers are sons of Mr. and Mrs. Luther J. Himsel, R.R. 1, Jasper.

Before going on active duty, Major Kenneth Himsel, an Indiana University graduate, was a supervisor in the data processing division of the All-State Insurance Company here.

Capt. Ronald Himsel, a Purdue University graduate, was in sales work for the International Harvester Company.

After completion of advanced training last month at Fort Benning, high Army officials said Company D was the best unit ever trained there.

Three years ago the company also was rated the best that had ever received jungle warfare training in Panama.

The 200 members of the company, the only National Guard unit in Vietnam, are paratroopers. Their visitor, Gen. Anderson, was a paratrooper in World War II.

The duties of long range patrol units, such as Company D, include going far into enemy territory to observe movement of troops and supplies.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Jan. 23, 1969]

AT CAMP ATTERBURY EAST: 200 INDIANA GUARDSMEN SPY ON FOE IN VIETNAM JUNGLE

Two hundred Indiana National Guardsmen are spying on the enemy in Vietnamese jungles from a base near Saigon they have named Camp Atterbury East.

They are members of Company D (Long Range Patrol), 151st Infantry, who were called to active duty last May and arrived in Vietnam on Dec. 31. Before going on Federal duty last May much of their training had been received at Camp Atterbury near Edinburg, Ind.

This week members of the all-Hoosier unit started going out into the jungles on reconnaissance patrols.

Before they started out on missions in six-man patrols, the Hoosiers received an Indiana state flag from their former commander, John S. Anderson of Shelbyville, who had been Indiana adjutant general until early this month.

The flag, along with a letter, were sent to them by Governor Edgar D. Whitcomb. In the letter, the Governor said he was extremely proud of the guardsmen and "know that you will be successful in any mission to which you are assigned."

Members of the company, the only Army National Guard unit on duty in Vietnam, have an extremely high morale, according to Gen. Anderson.

Anderson said he learned from a visit last week with the company at its base camp northeast of Saigon that "their biggest objective is to make Indiana proud of them."

As evidence of their objective, they have printed on their company headquarters sign these words, "Indiana's Finest."

Anderson said the Hoosiers have excellent living quarters in spite of the fact they are in "the boonies." They are living in barracks built of metal with showers in each building. Their food is excellent and they even have ice with their fruit punch at mealtime, Anderson said.

Anderson, a veteran of some of the fiercest battles in Europe in World War II, said the company is one of the best supported he has ever seen. The company has all new equipment, including automatic weapons.

Many of these comforts will be given up by the guardsmen from five to 10 days at a time while they are in the jungles on patrol.

They may walk into their patrol area, be taken in by helicopter or dropped by parachute from fixed-wing airplanes.

If they get into tight spots they may have to fight their way out or be lifted out by helicopter. Their role on the patrols will be to try to avoid combat as they report on enemy troop and supply movements.

The company is commanded by Capt Ronald E. Himsel, 27 years old, Indianapolis. He is a son of Mr. and Mrs. Luther J. Himsel, R.R. 1, Jasper, and a graduate of Purdue University.

Gen. Anderson said he received no complaints from the guardsmen but has many requestes to call wives, parents and girl friends to tell them not to worry and that the company will be back in Indiana next December to rejoin the Indiana National Guard.

WHAT NEW SPACE PROJECT WILL SOVIETS ATTEMPT NEXT?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Charlotte Saikowski, staff correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial dated January 29, 1969, reviews the development of the Soviet space program and the significant effort that the Soviets are making in space. The article points out that the Soviet Union is continuing to place major emphasis on its

space effort despite the strain on its own resources that is required. Because of the significance of this article I commend it to the reading of all Members, as follows:

WHAT NEW SPACE PROJECT WILL SOVIETS ATTEMPT NEXT?

(By Charlotte Saikowski)

Moscow.—What next in space for the Russians?

This is the intriguing question, now that the Soviet Union has performed a docking between two manned spacecraft in near-earth orbit and shifted men from one orbiting spacecraft to another.

Soviet scientists say that they are not racing the Americans to land a man on the moon. Their space programs are geared to broad and long-range planetary exploration.

There are two basic methods of reaching the moon with today's space technology. The more-direct flight plan calls for a rocket as large as—or larger than—the American Saturn 5. There is no sign the Russians have been testing a rocket of this size.

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

The more-indirect flight plan would call for assembling an earth-satellite station, with several launchings involved, and then assembling the moon rocket in stages at the earth-satellite. Since the moon rocket would already be in earth orbit at time of launching, it would need much less size and power to reach the moon.

The successful linkup of the Soyuz 4 and the Soyuz 5, and the switchover of spacemen, are a step in the direction of the construction of an orbital station. The Russians now have proved they can dock, transfer crews, and put something together in orbit.

As their next logical step, say the experts, the Soviets may try to build something in near-earth orbit.

Indeed, ever since the Soyuz 4 landed in Kazakhstan on Jan. 17 there has been an outpouring of comments by Soviet scientists on the significance of the flights for building orbital stations.

A Soviet physicist says that the manual linkup "is the first step towards creation of orbital space stations who significance it is hard to overestimate." It makes possible the delivery of cargoes to such stations, the replacement of crews and repair work, he adds.

This theme is echoed by a famed Soviet scientist, Anatoly Blagonrayov, who comments that specialists will now be able to go to orbital stations and return to earth when they need to. "The time when we shall become eye-witnesses of such business trips to outer space is not far ahead," he remarks.

The Russians, of course, do not mention rockets or a moon launch or a lunar landing in this connection. The orbital stations are always described as serving as space laboratories to carry out planetary research and, as one engineer comments, "tackle various applied practical problems."

LANDING CRAFT NEEDED

Speculating on the possibility of a Soviet moon landing of "lunar-ologists" poses still another question: What would the Soviet cosmonauts land in? The United States has been working on the lunar module or "bug" in which it plans to land its spacemen. On Feb. 28 the Apollo 9 mission will practice separating the lunar spacecraft and the two-man lunar module in near-earth orbit and then docking the two. The latter is an operation performed by the Soyuz 4 and Soyuz 5.

It is not known, however, whether the Russians have a landing vehicle. Conceivably they might try to land the moon-orbiting spacecraft itself—an exceedingly difficult operation.

Whatever their approach, the Russians are undoubtedly working toward manned flights to the moon. The Soviet Zond 5 and Zond 6 spacecraft, which traveled to the vicinity of the moon in 1968, carried living creatures and are admitted to be adaptable for piloted flights. Scientific observers believe the Zond and the Soyuz ships are in fact the same.

The problems of building in near-earth orbit—if this is what the Soviet scientists attempt next—are mammoth. The simplest work with hand tools has turned out to be immensely difficult for pressure-suited, weightless astronauts.

A WHOLE NEW WORLD

And as watchers of Apollo 8 telecasts saw for themselves, it is a whole new world out there, where there is no up or down with which to anchor tools and materials. They merely float.

Along with manned flights, the Soviets, of course, continue their vast program of interplanetary research. In this field they have an edge over the United States, which cut back its program for budget reasons.

Despite an even bigger strain on their own resources, the Russians are forging ahead with probes to far planets. Two unmanned stations are now on their way to Venus and are expected to soft-land on the planet in May. It is thought that during the next "window" opening or favorable opportunity—in March—the Russians will send a probe to Mars.

As for a manned planetary landing, the moon is seen to be the only practical goal for the Americans and the Russians at this stage of space exploration. Hence it is reasoned that sooner or later the Russians will be there.

SEVEN OUTSTANDING AMERICANS ARE SYMBOLS OF SUCCESS EVEN THOUGH HANDICAPPED

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we often cite the stories of persons or point to individuals whose lives are an inspiration to others. We describe friends who, through their courage, determination, and initiative, have overcome tremendous obstacles in achieving success or in leading a full life. Today I call attention to the inspiring story of the physically and mentally handicapped Americans who accomplish much or who—and this is a fantastic achievement in so many of these severe cases—are gainfully employed, productive members of our society.

I extoll the virtues and characteristics of handicapped persons leading productive lives. Our Nation has a commitment to afford the disadvantaged an opportunity. We support these programs and those who are participating. But it is only when we study the history of a handicapped person that a true awareness is realized. Then, we really sense their courage, perseverance, and motivation in a realistic degree.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and to have been reappointed recently to another 3-year term. Our committee continues its vital work through a program of information and education for employment of the handicapped with the cooperation of public and private groups. We strive to foster more enlightened attitudes toward the work capabilities of the handicapped. Each year in the discharge of our responsibility more and more "success stories" are presented to the citizenry of this Nation. In this connection, the February issue of Performance, the monthly publication of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, contains a feature on "Seven Outstanding Americans." They are handicapped citizens, and they are inspirational examples for all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

SEVEN OUTSTANDING AMERICANS

CHARLES E. BENNETT

Congressman Charles E. Bennett has shown that the handicapped can succeed in politics.

A Member of Congress from Florida for over 19 years, Congressman Bennett is known as "Mr. Ethics" within the Congress and was named as the first chairman of the House Ethics Committee. He has led the fight to make public buildings accessible to the handicapped, and legislation first introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Bennett has recently been enacted into law.

He also holds the all-time voting record for the Congress, not having missed a roll call vote since June 4, 1951.

He contracted polio in 1945 in Northern Luzon, the Philippines, where he was leading 1,000 guerrillas in mountain and jungle fighting. Two years later he walked out of a hospital on two canes determined to win a seat in Congress, although he was sometimes confined to a wheelchair.

Since 1951, he has introduced numerous bills in the House of Representatives, several of which have become major enactments in the field of government ethics. In the first session of the 90th Congress, the House established a permanent ethics committee.

Early in his career in the House of Representatives, Congressman Bennett started working on a Code of Ethics for Government Service. This Code of Ethics, adopted in 1968, covers all government employees, including Members of Congress and employees of the Legislative Branch of government. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., said in a letter that the Code of Ethics for Government Service was "a major contribution in this field. It has done much to stimulate awareness of responsibility for employee conduct, and to emphasize to employees the importance of their duties."

Congressman Bennett knows first hand the inconsiderate manner in which many public buildings have been and are being designed.

As a result of this on behalf of all handicapped persons, he was the first Member of Congress to introduce correctional legislation. His bill, which was signed into law on August 12 by President Johnson, requires that federally financed buildings be constructed in such a manner as to be accessible to the handicapped. This legislation is designed to eliminate the "second class status" which has been forced on many handicapped persons who have tried to gain access to public buildings and facilities through freight elevators, kitchens, and other such means. Once these handicapped individuals manage to get inside these buildings they find internal design to be just as obstructive.

In a recent tribute to Congressman Bennett on the floor of the House, as a result of his all-time voting record, Congressman Paul Rogers remarked, "The voting record is of par-

ticular importance to Congressman Bennett because of his handicap and stellar war record. To gain this all-time record of 17 years without missing a record vote, he has overcome snowstorms, grounded airplanes, slow trains, broken legs and recently a fractured knee."

Congressman Bennett married after being elected to the Congress and has four children. His hobby is history, and he is the author of *Laudonniere and Fort Caroline* and *Settlement of Florida*, both published by the University of Florida Press. He has also written over 20 articles for various publications, ranging from *Pageant* to the *Florida Historical Quarterly*.

DONALD E. BOTHUN

Donald E. Bothun is 40 years old. Since his high school days he has been confined to a wheelchair due to muscular dystrophy. His muscular deterioration is such that he has no use of his legs and must use both hands to lift objects like a telephone receiver.

Yet, he maintains a physical pace that would be admired by most men and his mental energies are described by a business colleague as "boundless."

As a young man, Mr. Bothun faced a bleak future. His family was not financially able to offer him a college education, nor was he physically able to attend. His medical diagnosis was one of continued physical deterioration with an uncertain life expectancy. Even public agencies working with the handicapped could not offer him suggestions as to how he might become gainfully employed.

But—he was determined not to become a burden upon his family or society.

One of his first business ventures was tying fishing flies at home and offering them for sale. His orders for fishing lures gradually increased until he was hiring several neighborhood housewives to assist him. This business expanded from his home to a one car garage, and eventually to a main street commercial building.

In 1963, he incorporated his business under the name LeRoy Products Corporation, and in 1965 he obtained a Small Business Administration loan to purchase a building and additional equipment. This was the only substantial financial assistance he has ever received.

Though the firm still manufactures fishing lures, they now comprise only about 10 percent of the sales, and 15 other items have been added. The dollar volume of sales have increased from about $50,000 to ½ of a million in 10 years. LeRoy Products Corporation today employs 60 people, including several handicapped, with a payroll of $147,000. It paid over $35,000 in Federal and State income taxes alone in 1967.

Donald E. Bothun has not only not become a burden to his family or society, he has become a substantial businessman and community leader. He has also helped countless other handicapped men and women to become productive self-supporting citizens.

HAROLD V. KNIGHT

The editor of a Colorado newspaper summed up Harold V. Knight with these words: "He is very much a 'newspaperman's newspaperman'—collecting, editing, writing, and distributing the legislative news material that has given him the reputation with Colorado editors of being one of the few men who really know the inside operations of State government."

Mr. Knight was born with cerebral palsy. The only formal therapy he has had was when he was 30 years old, when he went to New York City for a year of therapy.

He has difficulty in speaking, walking, and using his hands. Because his handwriting is quite illegible—even to himself—he has developed a keen memory and a style for quoting the essence of a speaker or interviewee. His reputation for accuracy is unquestioned by the scores of editors who use his reports regularly. A slow typist, he revises in his mind and does little rewriting.

Yet—he keeps up with other reporters.

He is the author of *With Liberty and Justice for All—The Meaning of the Bill of Rights Today*, published in 1967 by Oceana Publications of New York. It is now in its second printing.

Concern for workers and small farmers has been his lifelong dedication. For years he edited the *North Dakota Union Farmer* and subsequently was the executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Colorado.

Such devotion to the cause of civil liberties and the hard work it requires—is "often unpopular, usually unpublicized, and almost always unpaid," according to Knight's publisher. Harold V. Knight has never been satisfied to worry only about himself and his handicap, he has through the years fought to make the world a better place for all men.

WILLIAM PASSMORE

William Passmore is an inspiration to young people, to handicapped people, to despairing people.

For the past 20 years, he has helped others in East Chicago, Ind., to live more fully. Today, he works with disadvantaged youth through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

He is teacher, counselor, friend, taskmaster, and in a sense, parent to the enrollees in the program. In addition, he has found jobs for any number of these young men and women in private industry—jobs which are their key to an independent future.

Life was not always so full and rewarding for William Passmore. His father died when he was five leaving his mother to raise a family during the grim days of the depression.

He understands loneliness. He knows pain. In 1945, a football accident confined him to a hospital bed for 3 years, and later cost him his legs. His spirit escaped.

What would be insurmountable difficulties to others, he has overcome—not with ease, but with persistence, good humor, and courage.

His first job was as a dispatcher for a cab company, working the midnight shift for 11 years. He is also a reporter for the Chicago Defender, and for 18 years readers have enjoyed his column "East Chicago on the Go."

During these years he has made friends with practically the entire city of East Chicago, Indiana—58,000 people. He is a bridge between all sectors of the city built around heavy industry and sharply divided by economic, ethnic, and racial barriers.

He is also a leader, and is active in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Northern Indiana Political Action Group, St. Mark's AME Zion Church, the East Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the Anselm Forum—an interracial, interreligious, and multiethnic group working toward better human relations in the community.

An example of his firm roots in the community was when the police sought him out for his advice on handling what could have been a serious youth disturbance early last year.

He regularly visits the community hospitals to talk with patients and offer encouragement. He also visits the State prison at least twice a month to help with their rehabilitation program.

No stranger to awards, Mr. Passmore was the local Jaycee "Man of the Year" in 1962, received the "Citizen of the Month" award from the Mayor of East Chicago, and "Visitor of the Year" in 1967 from the local hospital.

MARTIN RAVELETTE

Born without arms, Martin Ravelette has managed with courage, initiative, and resourcefulness to overcome his handicap and to lead a surprisingly normal life.

He has refused to say "I can't do it." In fact, he has shown that he can indeed do most things done by "normal" persons—including driving a car, pitching a ball, swimming, hunting, fishing, and a host of other activities.

In addition, he holds a full-time job as custodian at the Lane Community College in Eugene, Oreg.

He is a source of inspiration and encouragement to all handicapped.

His handicap began at birth. His parents, feeling unable to care for him, put him at the age of two months into a combination orphanage-crippled children's home. He remained there until he was 16.

He then finished high school, helped his parents farm, and even attended college until he had to drop out because of financial problems.

Ravelette is married and his wife also was born without arms. The couple have a normal 3-year-old daughter, and Mrs. Ravelette cares for the child and manages their home with no outside help.

The Ravelettes hope someday to work with persons born with similar defects. They are particularly interested in working with the "thalidomide babies" of Europe.

They actively seek out parents of children born without limbs and offer them both help and hope in coping with their child's problems. They have traveled throughout Oregon to meet such families and show by example that no handicap is hopeless—that they have succeeded by faith and feet.

"I learned to use my feet as hands at an early age, and other children born without arms will get more out of life if they can learn to use theirs." Ravelette says . . . "I think because I have a handicap, I can be of more inspiration and help to them by showing what can be done than a person could by just telling them."

GEORGE E. STOCKING

Twelve years ago, two military jets collided in mid-air leaving two men dead and two seriously injured. One of the pilots was burned so badly that his family was told not to expect his recovery. After three months on the critical list, the doctors said that they had never known anyone to live with the type of facial burns that the pilot had sustained. He was left with literally no face—no eyes, nose, ear, or scalp.

Yet the pilot's spirit was not burned away. Today, more than 100 operations later, George E. Stocking has completed his Master's Degree in Education at the University of Miami, and is working as a psychology technician at the Veterans Hospital in Miami, Florida.

Married and the father of three children, Stocking is especially sensitive to the rehabilitation needs of others. His scarred face is a badge of courage for others to see and the way he has adjusted to total blindness is an inspiration to the clients with whom he works.

His enthusiasm and dedication to his job have restored the lives of countless other handicapped people.

He set an example for his community. Because of his successful employment, the Florida Council for the Blind employed a blind counselor; the Social Security Administration is setting up a training program for the blind as service representatives.

STEVIE WONDER

Stevie Wonder is 18 years old, a top popular singer, and totally blind.

His great love is music, "I began singing on front porches and in backyards and in church," he says. By the age of 10, he was able to play the piano, harmonica, and drums, an ability which he describes as "a gift from God—I never had any lessons."

He made his first hit record at the age of 12, and quickly went on to establish an outstanding career as a recording artist and performer.

As he is unable to read printed music, he has developed the use of earphones with the lyrics read to him a phrase ahead of the music.

He doesn't neglect other interests. He attends the Michigan School for the Blind in Lansing, and when he is traveling, he is accompanied by a special teacher.

He urges that other handicapped people be given the opportunity to demonstrate what they can do. He is active in programs for the blind, disadvantaged, public offenders—providing entertainment, encouragement, and musical and show business tips.

He seems older than most people his age—partly, he explains, because music has given him direction, and partly, because as he puts it, he has "seen" a lot of life.

Blind at birth, he was the third of six children in a poor ghetto family.

He speaks with wisdom about his generation. "Teenagers want a chance in life," he says. "They're concerned about the problems in the world. They want immediate change, but you can't change the world that fast."

He hopes to finish high school this June. Then, he intends to study composing and arranging at the University of California.

His singing engagements have already taken him across the United States, to Europe and Japan, and he is looking forward to touring Africa and South America.

He has appeared on major television programs and in two movies. He has worked with such start as the Supremes, Red Buttons, Frank Sinatra, Jr., April Stevens, and Ray Charles (whom he admires most).

"Everyone asks me the disadvantages of being blind, but no one ever asks about the advantages. When I meet a girl, for instance, I don't see her physical appearance. You might meet her, take one look and because she's not what you had in mind, forget her. But I don't have that handicap. I can develop the relationship and probably find she is a very beautiful person," he said in an interview with a disc jockey.

Being blind has helped him in another way, he points out. Since he has never experienced sight, colors are only labels to him. He classifies people by personality and character, not color.

NEW FEDERAL HIGHWAY REGULATIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS ON HIGHWAY LOCATION AND DESIGN DECISIONS

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation has taken a noteworthy stride toward fulfilling both the letter and the spirit of the freedom of information law.

In new regulations published in the Federal Register on January 17, 1969—pages 727–730—the agency has set forth sound procedures which will encourage greater public participation during the planning stages for location and construction of new Federal-aid highways.

The right, and the desirability, of citizens involvement in major governmental decisions affecting their lives have always been clear. A democratic system of government cannot function well or fairly without such involvement, and the importance of the new highway regulations is that they provide one more avenue for effective public participation.

It was in the interest of fuller information and greater citizen participation that I testified before the Federal Highway Administration on December 16, 1968, in support of predecision hearings on new highway proposals.

The new procedures, which apply to all Federal-aid projects administered by the State highway departments provide for:

Two public hearings on major Federal-aid projects, one preceding route selection and another preceding design decision.

One combined public hearing on design and location decisions on lesser highway construction projects.

In addition, the regulations require the State highway agencies to consider the social, economic, and environmental factors in roadbuilding decisions; to provide comprehensive information about alternative routes and designs under consideration; to give adequate notice of all hearings on proposed projects, and to solicit the views of other State, Federal, and local agencies affected by the development or improvement of highway corridors.

Some critics of the new regulations have argued that highway programs will be slowed by public participation in the decisionmaking process. I do not believe this will be the case if State agencies move quickly and cooperatively to implement the new policies in the spirit of Federal freedom of information requirements.

The Federal Highway Administration deserves praise for adopting an open-door policy on highway planning.

The text of my testimony during the Federal Highway Administration hearings on December 16, 1968, follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DONALD RUMSFELD, CONGRESSMAN FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. RUMSFELD. My Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to express my views on the proposed new highway hearing procedures which have been put forward by the Federal Highway Administration and I congratulate the Department for holding the hearing on this subject.

I view these proposed procedures as representing an important step forward. In two basic and essential ways they constitute a landmark effort in the administrative of the Public's business.

First, the new procedures, designed to expand the role of the individual in governmental decision-making, are being initiated by the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

We have heard much in recent years of the need for Government to consult with and involve citizens in the decisions of government, such as in proposals for an ombudsman, a public consumer counsel, local control of community action and other anti-poverty programs. Generally, these proposals represent at least in part, attempts to preserve a degree of local and individual involvement in view of the trend toward centralization. As society grows more complex and as the problems of urban life seem to multiply, the pressures which lead to this trend will unquestionably continue—and so too will the need and desire for some reaction to these pressures.

The proposed procedures represent a commendable effort to increase the degree of meaningful citizen participation in an area of life which is of great importance to an increasng number of citizens.

These new procedures should, in my judgment, contribute positively to improving public understanding, resolving many disputes, reducing much unavoidable resentment and resistance, and to advancing a more constructive transportation system in our country. This would be accomplished under these procedures by providing for a greater degree of local resolution of local issues through timely, pre-decision hearings; by assuring that Federal and State highway agencies consider fully the social, economic and environmental effects of proposed highway locations; by stimulating a closer coordination of Federal, State and local planning agencies; and by providing a timely opportunity for the consideration of the pros and cons of the alternatives available as was intended by the Congress.

Second, and even more important, the new procedures would implement the Federal Public Records Law, known as the Freedom of Information law, in a manner more constructive, more far-reaching and more in the true spirit of that law than yet achieved by any other agency of the Federal Government heretofore.

As a co-sponsor of that law, and as a member of the Committee and Subcommittee of the House which shepherded it through the legislative process, I would place particular emphasis on the importance to its implementation through the adoption of these new procedures. Full and timely access to information is essential if citizens are to be sufficiently informed so that they may participate wisely in the affairs of government and if they are to be in a position to make known the best interests of their communities.

As we know well, tremendous pressures are being exerted today upon our society and upon our form of government. While the various political and social protests with which we have become familiar often appear to be exclusively negative and destructive in nature, some cannot be dismissed as simply as that.

We are witnessing, I believe, an awakening in our society by individuals from all walks of life who are resisting—some intelligently, some otherwise—the processes of the effects which an advanced, highly technical society seems to impose upon them. We are witnessing man's attempt to preserve or regain that which is so precious—self-respect and a degree of control over the decisionmaking in his affairs.

Those in government, in the schools and universities, in business and labor—in all walks of life—can attempt to resist, block or simply ignore these activities for a time. But eventually, we must recognize the frustrations which cause them, and attempt to channel those energies in all directions, in directions which will permit the timely and informed expression of views and thereby strengthen our system of government.

The initiative was taken by the Federal Highway Administration in proposing these new hearing procedures represents, in my opinion, a recognition of the need to permit the involvement of the individual more completely and positively in the workings of society.

Let there be no doubt, there will be participation. The question is whether it will be constructive and useful, or erratic and wasteful. The proposed procedures constitute a path-breaking effort to encourage the former, which can only aid in the development of our society.

The general right and desirability of participation in the democratic processes by the citizens is clear. The problem is the practicality of that participation. If citizens in this society are to have an input to the decisions of government, they must know what that government is planning and doing. Without information on the problems, the alternatives, and an actual opportunity to express views, the superstructure of our system is without foundation. Any degree of participation in decisions of government is meaningless unless the participants are informed.

And, it is not enough today to say the

knowledge is not there, therefore the participation is not merited and should be denied. Rather, we must understand that the participation will be there—either useful or wasteful—and it is our task to see that it is the former by providing the information, the timely opportunity, and the access.

This recognition motivated those Members of Congress who worked for the nation's first comprehensive Freedom of Information Law. In signing the law, the President of the United States said:

"A democracy works best when the people have all the information that the security of the nation permits. No one should be able to pull curtains of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest."

The spirit of the law—in fact, its language—supports the stated procedures for disclosure which the Federal Highway Administration has proposed. As one who has thoroughly and carefully studied the applications of the law, it is my view that the procedures under consideration would carry out the intent of the Congress and of the sponsors of the legislation.

A careful reading of the language of the Freedom of Information Law clearly encourages the adoption of the disclosure procedures now being considered. The law was drafted to grant individual citizens access to information which would permit intelligent participation in the processes of government.

The procedures now being considered would place before the public the basic information about proposals for highway construction and location—certainly an important aspect of government's activity.

If adopted, the new procedures for hearings on highway locations would be published in the Federal Register. That is the intent of the Freedom of Information Law. For example, the first section of the law clearly states that "each Agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register for the guidance of the public . . . rules of procedures." The reason for this requirement in the law is that without publication for the rules by which the Government conducts the people's business, the public cannot be aware of its rights. And that is the reason advanced for a portion of these proposed procedures.

The spirit of the law is reflected in the proposed procedures for hearings on highway location, for the proposal would require the news media and the affected, Federal, State and local agencies to be informed on highway location plans.

In our society, the public has a right to know the general plans of government agencies which will affect them. The public has a need to know before the plans are solidified into final programs—before it is too late. Without timely and complete information, the public is unable to participate.

This principal was recognized by the Congress which passed the Freedom of Information Law and by the President who signed it. This law and this ideal of public participation are effectively implemented by the proposed procedures for public access to information concerning highway location plans.

To conclude, I wish to emphasize that I do not believe that these new procedures will either increase Federal control or have the effect of causing excessive delays in highway construction as some seem to fear.

Federal control over the present highway program has historically been strongest in precisely those cases in which local authorities have been unable to solve their problems locally. When citizens have felt—rightly or wrongly—that local agencies at times have been secretive, unresponsive or unfair, their complaints have traditionally escalated to anyone who would listen; the Congress, the Federal Highway Administration, the Secretary of Transportation, and the courts. By providing an effective basis for dialogue between local authorities and an informed public, Federal control over the highway program very probably will be diminished, not increased.

Similarly, excessive delays in urban highway construction are so common today as to be the rule rather then the exception. By providing a mechanism for resolving highway disputes on a local level and at an early stage, the new procedures may well have the effect of speeding up needed highway construction rather than slowing it down.

But even if this were not the case, the argument that Government "efficiency" must supersede a citizen's right to know is, in my opinion, profoundly wrong. Freedom of information is the foundation upon which a free society rests. To destroy or unduly restrict the information and access which is the basis of informed and timely participation is to undermine our society.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO DAY, FEBRUARY 12

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we paused to join our loyal Polish-American friends in honoring that great adopted Polish soldier and statesman, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Americans cannot recall without deepest emotion this young patriot's completely selfless devotion to the cause of our own liberty and freedom. Exiled from his beloved Poland for resisting its dismemberment by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, Kosciuszko transferred his determined quest of freedom for his own countrymen to aiding the American colonists to throw off the shackles of British domination.

Even before our Declaration of Independence was signed this young Polish officer sailed across the Atlantic and appeared before Gen. George Washington to volunteer his military skill and training to help create a telling military force from the fledgling Continental Army.

Kosciuszko was commissioned a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army with the task of strengthening the breastworks at Saratoga as well as the fortifications along the Delaware River and at West Point. The ardor and the zeal of this young officer were equaled only by his courage. It is small wonder that Thomas Jefferson hailed him as "the purest son of liberty I have ever known."

Throughout the six long and bleak years of the American Revclution, Kosciuszko devoted himself to helping General Washington win the war. In addition to his engineering prowess which meant so much to the Continental Army, this talented officer fought valiantly on the battlefields in the North as well as in the South. Leading cavalry troops through the bitter campaign of the Carolinas, he played a major role in driving the British out of Charleston.

Not only did Kosciuszko endear himself to his superior and his fellow officers but with the surrender of the British forces and the assurance of independence and peace, the Continental Congress voted him a grant of 500 acres of land and over $12,000 as a cash award. He never used these funds, but as a further gesture of his passion for giving freedom to all mankind, he gave Thomas Jefferson his will which directed that his estate be used to purchase freedom for Negro slaves.

Kosciuszko might have chosen to dwell in America and enjoy the love and acclaim of the American people while making continued contributions to our Armed Forces of which he was now a full fledged general officer. The grateful Congress, in addition to land and money, had bestowed upon him all the rights and privileges of American citizenship.

Kosciuszko chose to return to Europe and to his native Poland where he issued a call to arms. Polish patriots rushed to his side to begin a telling battle for Polish independence. Unfortunately, the military might of Catherine the Great was so enormous, the efforts of Kosciuszko and his followers were in vain. The gallant leader was captured at the battle of Maciejowice and imprisoned in a dungeon. Only upon the death of Catherine was he liberated—sorely ill and suffering physically, but still with a burning passion for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, few men have contributed more to the gaining and preservation of liberty in this country than did Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko. None of our heroes is more deserving of our affection and our warmest praise. It is no wonder that since our own freedom was so significantly influenced by such Polish patriots as Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and others, we have such deep bonds of friendship with the Red-dominated people of Poland today. We can only repay our debts to these great colonial heroes by constantly championing the rights of the Polish people for the return of their independence and self-determination. To this end we should rededicate ourselves on the anniversary of one of our greatest Polish-American citizens.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year marks the 51st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Lithuania was once an ancient civilization. Its roots reach back to the second century. In modern times, it was a thriving nation with a highly commendable political, economic, and social record. But her life as a proud nation was snuffed out in 1940, along with the lives of many thousands of her citizens, when the Soviet Union moved troops into Lithuania and the neighboring Republics of Latvia and Estonia.

The recent invasion of Czechoslovakia was a dramatic illustration of the lengths to which the Soviet Union will go to suppress the yearnings for liberalization and freedom. Both in Czechoslovakia and the Baltic States, the Russians have learned that freedom is the most irrepressible

and contagious of men's desires. We in the free world who have the liberty to speak, must give voice to the muffled longing of those whose cry cannot be heard. We must not relax our pressure on the Soviet Union to make it live up to the charter and principles of the United Nations. We shall continue our support for the noble aspirations of all men and nations to freedom and self-determination.

HUNGER IN AMERICA—PART I

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in a country as rich as ours it is a disgrace that any of our citizens should still suffer from hunger and malnutrition. Yet, as numerous investigations and studies have shown, the threat of starvation is a constant reality for millions of Americans.

A series of articles by Homer Bigart, which started in Sunday's New York Times dramatically portrays the plight of these citizens and the opposition faced by those attempting to alleviate this blight. I will bring these articles to the attention of my colleagues as they appear.

There follows the first article in the series entitled "Hunger in America: Stark Deprivation in a Land of Plenty," which appeared in the New York Times on February 16, 1969:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1969]

HUNGER IN AMERICA: STARK DEPRIVATION IN A LAND OF PLENTY—PART I

(By Homer Bigart)

BLUFFTON, S.C.—Hunger is a noun that means, among other things, a compelling desire for food, a nagging emptiness of stomach and gut. Persons old enough to remember the Great Depression may recall going hungry, but today it is a sensation generally reserved for those mired in poverty.

Chronic hunger seems so remote in this bounteous land that reports of extreme malnutrition among Negroes in the rural South, among migrant farm workers, among Mexican-Americans and reservation Indians have been set down as exaggerations and lies, the observers frequently assailed as charlatans or do-gooders who would sap the initiatilve of the hungry poor by expanding "giveaway" Federal food programs or even conspiring for adoption of a guaranteed minimum wage.

Here in Beaufort County, Donald E. Gatch, an intense youthful-looking country doctor, has been shunned by the white community for insisting that hunger is a daily fact of life among the black families of this mossy tidewater.

He began losing his white patients two years ago after he charged publicly that he had seen children dying of starvation, that most black children of his area were infested with worms, and that families were living in hovels worse than the pigsties of his native Nebraska.

The Beaufort Gazette accused him of "running his mouth." Every other doctor in the county signed a statement deploring his "unsubstantiated allegations," contending that the "rare cases of infant malnutrition" that came to their attention were invariably due to "parental inexperience, indifference or gross neglect." And the County Health Officer, Dr. H. Parker Jones, said he had "never seen a case of starvation or extreme malnutrition."

Ostracized by the staff of Beaufort County Memorial Hospital, annoyed by threatening telephone calls, boycotted by white patients, Dr. Gatch closed his Beaufort office, sold his home and moved with his British-born wife and two young sons back to Bluffton (pop. 356), where he had started his practice 10 years ago.

One chilly, overcast day at the tag end of January Dr. Gach consented to take a visitor on a tour of Negro shanties near Bluffton.

LIKE A MISSIONARY OUTPOST

The doctor, who sometimes appears disconsolate and withdrawn, peered gloomily at the scene through horn-rimmed spectacles that kept sliding down his nose. From the clay road the weathered shanties, woodsmoke curling from the chimneys, looked quite charming. But Dr. Gatch, in his low, tired voice, spoke only of the overcrowding, the filth and the smell of poverty within.

The Gatches had taken over a group of summer cottages on the bank of a tidal creek, living in one, using another for frequent guests (nutritionists and sociologists from all over are coming to see him) and hoping to convert a third into a clinic. (The doctor maintains a large, well-equipped office in the center of the village.)

The Gatch compound, shaded by live oaks decked in Spanish moss, had the quiet, mournful isolation of a missionary outpost in central Africa. The African connection was further strengthened when Dr. Gatch remarked that he had treated several children for kwashiorkor, a disease generally thought to exist only in underdeveloped countries.

Kwashiorkor is a Ghanian word meaning literally "the disease that takes the child after it leaves the mother's breast." It is a disease of extreme protein deficiency, a starvation often brought on by a mother's inability to breast-feed an infant.

Down a dirt road Dr. Gatch paused at the decaying stoop of a family named Kinnard. Silent children with skinny legs sat listlessly on floors and beds. Fifteen people lived in the shack, Dr. Gatch said, and there was no privy.

COMFORTABLE WHILE STILL

He went directly to a young woman who was holding a crying, seven-month-old baby girl. He had examined the baby before, he said, and had detected symptoms of both kwashiorkor and scurvy. He remarked how the baby's hair had thinned, how the hairline had receded about an inch, and how the hair color had changed from black to dirty gray. These were the stigmata of kwashiorkor, he said.

He took the infant girl from the mother's arms and placed her on a sofa. The baby kept her matchstick legs drawn up and raised her arms until the tiny hands were bent close to her head. Then she stopped crying.

"As long as the baby is completely still, she's comfortable," Dr. Gatch said, "but pick her up and she'll start crying again."

He noted the extreme dryness of the skin, the absence of subcutaneous tissue. He said the baby's diet was so deficient in iron that her hemoglobin count was "half of what it should be."

The baby's mother had been out of work since December. Dr. Gatch said the infant was now getting some baby formula food. It would probably live, he said, but he feared it had suffered irreversible damage through growth retardation of bones and brain cells.

As he left, Dr. Gatch noticed a 3-year-old girl sitting on the stoop, staring vacantly at the brown fields. Her legs and face were bloated by edematose swellings, the result probably of Vitamin A deficiency, the physician said, and the same deficiency was impairing her vision.

"There's just no excuse for rickets in this country," complained Dr. Gatch as he drove to another shack, hunting this time a whole family that he said was rachitic, a mother and five children.

Rickets is a disease of infancy and childhood resulting from a deficiency of vitamin D and characterized by soft, deformed bones. The rachitic family was not at home, but Dr. Gatch found them on the stoop of a neighboring house.

ALL HAVE MISSHAPEN LEGS

The victims had gotten some relief and were now on a proper diet, Dr. Gatch said. All had misshapen legs. The mother, who seemed stout and cheerful, was very bowlegged; her children were either bowlegged or knock-kneed. Dr. Gatch commented that the legs of the three older children seemed to have straightened somewhat, but the twisted spindly legs of the two youngest remained badly deformed.

Milk is the main source of vitamin D, Dr. Gatch noted, and the family might never have been blighted with rickets if fortified milk had been available to them.

But the Government's food donation programs for the domestic poor did not provide fortified milk until the end of 1968. Dr. Gatch might have been angrier had he known that since 1965, at the insistence of the United States Public Health Service, the Department had been shipping dry milk enriched by vitamins A and D to American aid programs overseas.

The three-year gap during which fortified milk was sent overseas while being denied to the poor at home came to light last month in testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Dr. Gatch stopped at an abandoned country store. Inside, two bedridden old ladies had found terminal shelter. One of them, crippled by rheumatoid arthritis, had been rescued from a mouldering shack where the bedding stank of urine and feces. The other was afflicted by Wernicke Syndrome, which Dr. Gatch said was characterized by loss of memory and confabulation (filling in a memory gap by falsifications that the patient accepts as correct.)

DIET OF RICE AND GRITS

Dr. Gatch said he believed Wernicke Syndrome could have been induced by lack of thiamine, which is essential for growth, normal function of the nervous system and normal metabolism. Thiamine is found in liver, lean meat, eggs, whole grain or enriched cereal and cereal products. The old ladies, Dr. Gatch suspected, had been eating little more than rice and grits.

Now they were on Medicare and presumably getting a better diet. The old store was spotlessly clean, neater than most nursing homes.

Dr. Gatch was asked if he had encountered pellagra, one of the more dreaded of the dietary deficiency diseases. This disease, caused mainly by a deficiency of niacin, but also of thiamine, riboflavin, folic acid and other essential nutrients, is marked in its late stages by the classical four D's: dermatitis, diarrhea, dementia and death.

Dr. Gatch said it was not even rare. He produced an old man of about 70 who, he said, had pellagrin symptoms, including hyperpigmentation of elbows and knees. There the flesh had thickened and roughened until it felt like sandpaper.

How many pellagra victims had he seen?

"I would guess 150 to 200 cases," Dr. Gatch replied.

Deaths by starvation, deaths by any of the diseases of malnutrition, were never counted, he said. Too many death certificates simply read "natural causes," Dr. Gatch said, and he intended to campaign for post-mortems in those cases.

Over the years Dr. Gatch became convinced that there was close correlation between malnutrition and intestinal parasites. Most of the undernourished children he ex-

amined were wormy. Many Negro shacks, he observed, had no privies; people relieved themselves in the fields and woods. Children treated for worms quickly became reinfested by stepping on feces that contained the eggs of parasites.

"If you have 100 or 200 of these foot-long roundworms in your belly they're going to take a lot of food," he said. "They migrate to the stomach and actually get the food before the child does."

Some notion of the extent of infestation in the Negro children of Beaufort County was given a few days later. A study of 178 Negro preschool children showed that nearly three of every four had intestinal parasites, either ascaris (roundworm) or trichuris (whipworm), or both.

"Fantastic," said Dr. James P. Carter, nutritionist of the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, who participated in the survey. "Parasitism in Beaufort County ranks with some Central American countries and with Egypt."

In Nashville, Dr. Carter said the nutritional status of the 178 children was "in most cases inadequate and in all instances minimal." He said that by minimal he meant that the children had a low margin of safety, particularly from pneumonia and diarrhea.

The survey, financed by the Field Foundation, was conducted by researchers from the University of South Carolina, the Meharry Medical College, in Nashville, and Vanderbilt University.

The results were considered so shocking that some even suggested that the data be withheld from general publication. Many white Southerners feel that poverty conditions among the rural blacks have been exploited by civil rights zealots.

Dr. E. John Lease, nutritionist of the University of South Carolina, was among those who feared that the report, if given wide publicity, would anger the white establishment and perhaps wreck the chances of cooperation on remedial projects.

Dr. Lease wrote to his collaborators suggesting that the distribution of data be restricted and that "none of the work coming from the University of South Carolina should be published or mentioned on radio or television as the results of the university or any of its staff members."

Later, Dr. Lease apparently had a change of heart, for the material was released to the press in Columbia, S.C.

There were other indications that the establishment now wanted the situation exposed. On Jan. 31, to the astonishment and gratification of Dr. Gatch, Senator Ernest F. Hollings, the former Governor, turned up in Bluffton and made the hunger tour.

FEDERAL DELAYS CHARGED

The Senator saw a near-starving baby, a reputed pellagrin, a rachitic child and another child said to be recovering from scurvy. Deeply impressed, Senator Hollings said he would demand an end to "Federal roadblocks and red tape," which, he said were frustrating local efforts to help the poor.

The local State Senator, James M. Waddell, also blamed the "Feds." He charged that the Office of Economic Opportunity had refused to fund a project that included privies for the poor.

"We can send a man to the moon," he cried on the floor of the South Carolina Senate, "but we can't build an outhouse."

Senator Hollings plans to testify next week before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

The committee, headed by Senator George S. McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, and dominated by liberals, had been planning field trips to suspected areas of hunger in a dozen states.

However, last week the Senate Rules Committee, dominated by conservatives, slashed the select committee's $250,000 budget request by $100,000. Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York, minority leader of the select committee, said he intended to carry the fight for the full appropriation to the Senate floor. But if the cut remains, the committee will have to curtail its travel plans, visiting perhaps only five or six states.

It means that the committee members will not see Beaufort County.

They still plan to visit the camps of migrant farm workers, such as those in Immokalee, Fla., where life seems even more degrading than in the shacks of Beaufort County.

HUNGER IN AMERICA—PART II

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the second in his series on "Hunger in America" Homer Bigart has described graphically the plight of migrant farmworkers and the intolerable conditions under which so many live in migrant labor camps.

In Collier County, Fla., neither the food distribution program nor the food stamp program is available to the migrants because of the refusal of county officials to participate in those programs. This illustrates the need for the Department of Agriculture to immediately set up procedures to bypass local officials so that people are not permitted to starve.

The article which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, February 17, 1969, follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1969]

HUNGER IN AMERICA: POVERTY LEAVES MIGRANTS PREY TO DISEASE—PART II

(By Homer Bigart)

IMMOKALEE, FLA.—Ten miles southwest of here, strung out like garbage along the edge of a cypress swamp, is Smith's Camp, a gathering place for some of the migrant farm workers who flock here in winter to pick the vegetable crops.

It consists of a dozen or more windowless plywood shacks, all without toilets or running water, all painted a dull green and all facing a dark slough choked with bottles and trash.

Some distance away there are three smaller shacks, two of them privies, the third a cold-water shower. None shows signs of recent use. Few migrants are hardy enough to take cold showers out of doors in the dead of winter, even in Florida, and the latrines are unspeakably filthy, seat and floors smeared with dried defecation. So the people use the woods.

A spigot planted in the ground provides water for the shacks. But the 20 or 30 migrants who live here say the water is foul smelling and foul tasting. The only apparent amenity is the naked electric light bulb hanging from the ceiling of each shack.

Such a place is Smith's Camp, its condition of poverty far removed from the showy affluence of nearby Gulf Coast resorts and its people, during frequent periods of unemployment, vulnerable targets for hunger and disease. A Senate committee investigating hunger will be in the area March 10.

GATHERED IN CANTEEN

On a recent Saturday, a visitor found most of the camp's adult population assembled in the canteen. The migrants had just been paid, apparently, and several men and women were finding release from the surrounding squalor by getting themselves soddenly drunk.

One woman, still sober enough to talk, said that in good times she made as much as $60 for six days work in the fields, picking beans and peppers, but now work was slack because cold weather had retarded the crops.

"We've got to pay $10 a week for these huts," she said. "Last week the water was up so high we had to wade to the door. I never would've left Carolina, but they told us the rent was free."

Someone had skinned a possum in front of one of the shacks, then left the meat for the flies. The cadaver of another skinned animal floated in the slough.

A man who introduced himself as "Hobo Bob" reeled out of the canteen and proudly produced an old photo that showed him with a wine bottle in one hand and a pistol in the other, a cigarette dangling from lips creased in a grin. He said he was sending the photo to a cousin in South Carolina, to show the relative what a happy life migrants could lead.

"That's Hobo Bob," he laughed, patting the photo.

Retrieving a cardboard box from his shack, Hobo Bob offered visitors some cold grits mixed with beans and fatback.

Smith's Camp is one of 60 or 70 accommodations for migrants around Immokalee. Other camps seem less appalling in physical appearance but hold a greater potential for human degradation and misery because they swarm with children.

UNEMPLOYMENT HEAVY

Albert Lee, an energetic young Negro who heads the local antipoverty project, the Community Civic Workers, said it was a bad season for migrants, with heavy unemployment.

Immokalee, a town of 3,000 near the northern edge of the Everglades, normally has a mid-winter population of 12,000 migrants, he said, but now there were only about 10,000. Many who normally wintered in Immokalee had gone to Texas instead.

Immokalee is in Collier County. Many well-to-do retired people live in Naples, the county's biggest community, and this element, plus the big farm owners, have insured a highly conservative county government.

The county has a long history of snubbing Federal aid, even during the Depression era, and in recent years the county commissioners have stoutly rejected the food distribution programs of the Department of Agriculture.

Today Collier County offers neither direct food distribution nor the food stamp program. Migrants who run out of money here are out of luck.

How do they keep alive Mr. Lee was asked.

He said he had received on Christmas Eve $500 from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The instructions were that the money could be distributed only for emergency food.

PINCHING AND PINCHING

"Now I've got a few dollars left," he said, "but I've been pinching and pinching and pinching."

He explained how he made the money last. He was doling out $1 a day per person to the most desperately hungry, then cutting them off after 14 days.

"That's it," he said. "After 14 days if they can't get handouts from the neighbors they don't eat."

Two young lawyers from the O.E.O.-financed South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program. T. Michael Foster and William F. Dow 3d, said that their organization had been trying for years to get Federal food sent into Collier County.

Last summer Mr. Foster wrote to the then Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, telling of hunger and malnutrition in the labor camps, reporting the refusal of Collier County to participate, like most Florida counties, in making food surpluses available to the poor, and pleading for intervention.

ATTITUDE OF COUNTY AIDES

Washington did nothing. Congress had authorized the O.E.O. to take over the distri-

bution of food in the poorest counties, which, for one reason or another, were not participating. But Collier County was not poor enough to qualify; the median annual family income, thanks to the wealthy Gulf Coast resorts, was $4,673 a year.

"I've seen hunger in Immokalee as bad as in Latin America," said Mr. Dow, a graduate of Yale and Columbia, "yet the Collier County commissioners always say the problem doesn't exist, that the county always looks after its own 'worthy poor'."

Observers noted that the rural admonition, "root hog, or die," seemed to express the commission's attitude toward migrants. They recalled that at a hearing last August Vice Chairman A. C. Hancock warned: "There are those sitting with their hands out waiting to be fed, and that's a situation we won't go for."

Other officials expressed the fear that if migrants were given food they would not work. Others thought that free food would drive the corner grocery into bankruptcy.

Immokalee, which calls itself the "watermelon capital of America," is a flat, sprawling, dusty town where people of different colors, black, brown, red and white, live in strict residential segregation. Smith's Camp, out in the swamp, is all black, but there are several other Negro camps inside the town.

These are in "The Quarters," an area that contains not only the Negroes but "Utopian Homes" of concrete-block huts occupied by Mexican-Americans. Outside "The Quarters," scattered around the rest of the town, are camps for white migrants. A few score Seminole Indians live in grass huts on the eastern edge of the community.

RENT OF $10 TO $20 A WEEK

Most of the camps are clusters of wooden shanties, concrete huts, trailers. Rents range from $10 to $20 a week, plus utilities. Flush toilets are a rarity, most camps providing a communal latrine. Regardless of the color of the occupants, the camps appear universally mean and squalid.

Mrs. Angela Spencer, 38, and two small pallid children occupied a trailer in one of the white camps.

"I was lucky enough to get three days work this week," she said.

She said she had been averaging two and one-half days of work a week, earning $25, out of which she had to pay a baby sitter $3. The rent was $15. That left $7 for food and all other expenses. She owed $19 in back rent, she said, and $100 in doctor's bills.

There was a platter of green beans and hominy on the stove. Clouds of flies wheeled about. The refrigerator was empty except for three sticks of margarine, a partly empty bottle of milk and a box of powdered milk.

She had been helped from Albert Lee's meager allotment of cash, as had Mrs. Caroline Conner, an attractive blonde who lived in another white camp and was 10 days out of the hospital after delivering a baby girl. Her husband had abandoned her.

"We were real desperate," Mrs. Conner said of herself and the baby. "If it weren't for my friends, I wouldn't have been able to make it."

LIKES MICHIGAN BEST

Mrs. Conner said she had been migrating from Florida to the Great Lakes and back for the last four years, following the spring strawberry crop to northern Florida, then Arkansas, Illinois and Michigan; picking Michigan's blueberries, peaches and grapes during late summer and early fall, then going back to Immokalee for winter tomatoes, peppers and "cukes," or cucumbers.

She liked Michigan best, she said, because migrants got free quarters there. In Immokalee her rent was $20 a week, and she had just about run of out the money she had received from Albert Lee.

"Whether she feels well or not, she's gotta go to work," Mr. Lee said.

"I got to do something," Mrs. Conner agreed.

Down in The Quarters, an elderly black named James Kelley and his yellow dog, Lady, found a way to beat the rent. A tolerant crew leader had let them take over an old abandoned bus.

Mr. Kelley, a diabetic whose fingers were gnarled and disfigured, was wearing two pairs of pants against the cold. An unvented oil heater had been installed near the front of the bus, and he had to keep a window open to avoid suffocation from the fumes.

He and Lady slept on piles of rags near the rear, where there was a little cookstove. The only food visible was a pan of fatback and some pieces of fish heavily salted for preservation. Mr. Kelley said he had not worked in eight months, but he seemed happy. He had just received $7 from Mr. Lee.

TEN CHILDREN IN HUT

In a black camp near Mr. Kelley's bus, Mrs. Pauline Milton and 10 children were crammed into a two-bedroom-and-kitchen hut.

"Me and two of the little ones sleep in this bed," said Mrs. Milton," and there are two beds in the other room and one in the kitchen for the rest."

She had worked two days that week, earning $11.05 each day, and paying $2 a day for baby sitters.

"I couldn't afford to give them breakfast," she said, surveying the hungry brood, "but we have boiled beans, rice and potatoes for lunch, and I'll give them the same for supper."

Mrs. Milton is one of a comparatively few migrants eligible for county welfare, for she has lived in Immokalee for seven years. She said she had applied, but had been told that her application would take 30 to 45 days to process.

Of all the ethnic groups, the Mexican-Americans probably suffered most during times of hunger, Mr. Dow said as he drove past "Utopian Homes." Some of the Mexicans had tried to alleviate the bleakness by planting flowers around the huts.

"Mexicans are proud," Mr. Dow explained, "and feel they are violating cultural mores if they ask for help."

Mr. Foster said that the Florida State Board of Health had denied the existence of widespread malnutrition in Collier County.

PARASITIC INFECTION CITED

"People are hungry, no one can quibble about that," he insisted. "And there is a tremendously high incidence of parasitic infection."

Last March the state health board issued a report saying that a team of doctors had "closely observed" some migrant children at play or in schools and clinics and that "none had gross signs of malnutrition."

The report said that pellagra, a severe dietary deficiency disease, had been noted but only in "known chronic alcoholics."

In riposte, friends of the migrants released next day the results of clinical examinations of 23 migrant farm children of Immokalee by the Variety Children's Hospital of Miami.

The sampling uncovered 38 clinical diseases in the 23 children, ranging from pneumonia to worms.

The hospital's executive director, Gerald W. Frawley, described the findings as "rather incredible . . . a most extraordinary morbidity rate" and concluded: "The migrant population must be about the most underprivileged in the nation, at least in terms of medical attention."

In a few weeks Collier County will feel the spotlight of national publicity. The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs is making this county its first stop on a tour of suspected hunger areas.

The committee is seeking information on the failure of the Federal food programs to reach millions of poor Americans.

FILLING THE MILITARY'S HERITAGE GAP

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud to submit an article which appeared in the February issue of Air Force and Space Digest, the magazine of aerospace power, published by the Air Force Association, which gives recognition to one of my constituents, Maj. George M. Boyd. He is commander of Detachment 19, 4500th Support Squadron—TAC—McConnell Air Force Base, Kans., a 23-year Air Force veteran and a resident of Leonia, N.J.

Major Boyd's biography and the article follow:

BIOGRAPHY OF MAJ. GEORGE M. BOYD

Prior to his arrival at McConnell Air Force Base on 5 December 1966, Major Boyd served as Chief of a Command Assistant Manpower Team, Headquarters Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) at a base in Southeast Asia.

Major Boyd was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in December 1948 and received his rating as Radar Observer (Jet All Weather) in July 1952.

He graduated from the Leonia High School, Leonia, New Jersey, in 1944. Later, in 1964, he received a B.A. in Economics from Park College, Parkville, Missouri. His professional military education includes Air Command and Staff College, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Air War College. He is also a graduate of the Air Force Manpower and Management Engineering School.

Besides serving in Southeast Asia, he has held tours of duty in Greenland and Japan.

During his service in the Air Force, Major Boyd has been instrumental in developing several navigational and electronic devices to aid pilots flying military aircraft. He is the author of articles which have been published in various aviation magazines and periodicals.

Major Boyd and his wife, a Captain in the Air Force Reserve Nurse Corps, the former Mattie L. Sheppard of St. Louis, Missouri, reside at 2904 Westover Drive, McConnell Manor.

Major Boyd's present assignment is Commander of Manpower and Management Engineering Detachment 19, 4500th Support Squadron, Tactical Air Command, with operating location at McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas. His Air Force specialty code is manpower and management engineering staff officer.

FILLING THE MILITARY'S HERITAGE GAP

(By Maj. George M. Boyd, U.S. Air Force)

(NOTE.—The author, Major Boyd, is a twenty-three-year Air Force veteran assigned to a manpower post in a Tactical Air Command unit at McConnell AFB, Kan. During his career he has served in Southeast Asia and on Greenland and Japan, and is a graduate of the Air Force Manpower and Management Engineering School. This article reflects the author's personal views and should not be construed as necessarily representing official Defense Department or US Air Force policy.)

In a period of rapid and sometimes violent change, as an active-duty Air Force officer I am sincerely concerned with those aspects of leadership that involve more than the "tunnel vision" usually ascribed to military thinking. I believe that there are many aspects of service life and responsibility related to the cultural revolution which we,

as military men, must recognize and become constructively involved in without degrading our primary task of military preparedness.

Responsible leadership is more important today than it has ever been, especially in the armed forces. And the key to that kind of leadership is human understanding. We must understand our people individually and collectively. Of particular concern, in the face of national unrest, is the role the military must play in its relationships with our civilian population. We are committed to the augmentation of local police forces for the purpose of maintaining law and order. Although the preservation of order is normally a function of civilian law-enforcement agencies, we recognize that civilian law-enforcement agencies cannot always cope with extraordinary situations. Thus, it is obvious that military leadership must be concerned with the current national crisis.

The days have long since passed when military officers could study basic military tactics in a private world of weaponry, protocol, and national security objectives, while completely ignoring the social and political trends across the nation. This means that the peripheral vision of military officers, at all levels of command, must be broadened to prepare them for meaningful contributions to society.

It is not easy to analyze the social aspects and trends in contemporary society. Our military forces are subordinate to our civilian government and rightfully so. This is their charter under the Constitution. But at the same time, military men, especially officers, must know our system of government, must understand the people and their problems. Without such understanding, military leadership, no matter how sincere, will not be adequate. Indeed, it will be sterile.

There is a moment of truth when American military men must face American citizens to quell disorders. In most cases, military personnel do not know why this situation has degenerated to a state of confrontation. Normally the military is called out in a crisis on short notice and instructed to secure certain objectives, as part of a mission directive. Under such circumstances, many a commander has been faced with the soul-searching problem of analyzing his own beliefs and convictions as they relate to his duty to enforce the law.

How do we improve our leadership so that we as military officers can meet our mission objectives using minimum force and completing the operation with a maximum of understanding and compassion for our fellow citizens? These are not questions of mere physical control. The problem is much deeper, and to solve it, new and imaginative techniques are needed.

I have come to believe that all military officers should be exposed to a course of training that analyzes the citizens of the United States in terms of who and what they are, what their problems are, the basic causes for their grievances, and what reactions can be expected from them under varying circumstances. This information is generally available and can be made a part of the over-all continuous military training program.

Most of what I have said up to now has had to do with officer leadership. But I believe that enlisted personnel in the armed forces should eventually receive such training too. There is no reason to believe that this cannot be accomplished within our current military structure and resources.

There are many people in the United States who have occupations involved in the total defense effort. These individuals must maintain their objectivity in spite of changing social pressures and situations. The military officer is committed to the defense of the entire nation, as is every serviceman. To do this he has to know what his job is and that his job is bigger than his own aspirations and grievances. The first item in the Code of Conduct for Members of the Armed Forces says, "I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense."

This means that a Negro serviceman who is discouraged from swimming on the beach of a southern state must be prepared to defend that same beach with his life, if necessary, without evasion of purpose or mental reservation. This thought can be hard to live with. But duty requires, too, that a white serviceman must be prepared to protect the right of a Negro student to attend a college or grade school that the white soldier may believe it is wrong for Negroes to attend. Leadership in such a climate is difficult. The country cannot afford to ignore the problem of training men to cope with such conflicting ideas. Military men who are charged with the preservation of the nation itself must be prepared for such complex responsibilities.

As a black American and as an Air Force officer with many years of service, I have thought long and hard about some of the causes of the current social unrest in our country.

It appears to me that the main cause is what I call a heritage gap. It stems from the pattern of segregation instigated against the Negro after the Civil War as a result of economic pressures. I refer to the competition in the labor market between freed slaves and free labor already in the market. The hatred, suspicion, and misunderstanding of that time have survived to the present. When a Negro child looks at a school book, he sees no one who looks like himself in a position of authority or in a hero's role. He identifies himself with servants and menial workers. He knows that the Negroes were freed more than 100 years ago. Yet, he wonders, what have they accomplished except becoming a "problem"? He is not aware of his heritage. He does not know that members of his ethnic group have made major contributions in every walk of life.

The white child has a reverse problem. When he opens the book, he notes that the former masters and slave owners look like himself, and so do the "heroes," good or bad. He, too, is aware that the Negroes were freed over 100 years ago, and he does not know what they have accomplished to improve their position in society.

Thus, from two vantage points, we have what I call a heritage gap. A partial solution to this problem is to add more Negro culture to the school book at all levels. I note that in the past several years more and more Negro oriented messages and advertising has become evident. This is an important step toward understanding and respect and recognition. But more can be done, especially in the military environment, to help close this heritage gap.

I recommend a Department of Defense agency that would have the mission of disseminating historical reference data about ethnic groups, in terms of their contributions as members of our armed forces, both past and present. Such an effort would by no means solve all the problems, but I do contend that such positive action within our present capability is a valid "mission requirement."

There are many sources of historical reference which could be compiled by the Department of Defense's research people. This information could be used in military writings of a public-information nature. I recognize that there are some scattered efforts in this direction. However, I believe we must sharply increase and focus such programs.

There is certainly precedent. In each military branch of the Department of Defense there are programs and briefings on the customs and characteristics of the people of other lands where we have military personnel stationed. Certainly, it is time American servicemen become educated about their fellow citizens. Such an effort, geared to study of minority groups of America and minority-group military contributions, is an essential endeavor in terms of promoting understanding among our servicemen and, indirectly, among all Americans.

Recognizing that the military services are dedicated to the common defense of the total United States population, it should be clearly understood that such a proposal encompasses the contributions of all ethnic groups to the American military heritage.

The Department of Defense has been and continues to be a leader in advancing race relations. In these times of strife and turmoil, part of our contribution should concern itself with enhancing positive aspects of our history. Millions of Americans pass through the military services in a relatively short period of time. Obviously these men and women return to civilian life with experiences that they would not otherwise have had. This fact alone is justification for a vigorous in-service national heritage program, one that has the specific purpose of helping create a sense of identity and pride among the many peoples who together make up the American people.

To my way of thinking, the knowledge and understanding that will contribute to the personal dignity of those Americans who have been hitherto deprived of such advantages are not only worth working for, but are, in fact, aims we have a moral obligation to advance.

I also believe that military personnel should participate in our total national commitment without sacrificing the historical mission of defending the nation. I firmly believe, too, that, in addition to pursuing our role of national defense, the Department should conduct its business in ways to help solve pressing domestic problems. I hope that what I have written may contribute in some small way to our total national welfare.

END OF THE SIT-IN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks we have seen a new wave of campus unrest which included outbreaks at three major universities in Illinois.

It is obvious to objective observers that there is a basic pattern involved in the student demonstrations and that university officials have not been effective in handling the radical behavior of their students.

The Chicago Tribune editorial Saturday, February 15, commenting on the end of a sit-in at the University of Chicago carries some practical suggestions which merit consideration.

The article follows:

END OF THE SIT-IN

Nobody emerges with much credit at the end of the 15-day sit-in by student rebels at the administration building of the University of Chicago except the great majority of students whose resolute refusal of support caused the collapse of the protest. Leaders of the squatters admitted that the lack of campus backing was the reason for their failure.

The university administration will no doubt assert that its policy of passive resistance had something to do with the outcome. If so, it was a triumph for flabbiness. The insurrectionists wore themselves out punching a bag of mush. The university wouldn't

negotiate and it wouldn't call the cops. It just went limp.

Altho the university did refuse the rebel demand for amnesty, and altho it has instituted disciplinary proceedings against some members of the occupation force, there is implicit in its attitude some suggestion that students are a privileged class, exempt from the processes of authority and law which govern all others.

This outlook is reflected in some rather muzzy rhetoric with which President Edward H. Levi saluted the end of the sit-in. He said that universities are different "from other institutions of modern life." By extension, we suppose, students also are to be considered different from the common herd, whose actions are governed by a healthy respect for the arm of the law.

As the distinguished Charles B. Huggins said, the hard-core revolutionaries who seek to bring America to its knees seized university property and engaged in other criminal acts. Dr. Huggins was almost alone among the members of the administration and faculty to voice censure of this behavior in unmistakable language.

If any ordinary person had tried to take possession of someone else's property the law would be breathing down his neck in an instant. But the university, with vast forbearance, put up with this intolerable act of aggression for 15 days. We have said repeatedly that any institution or official with a decent respect for law and property rights would not have stood still before this challenge but would have cleared the building without delay. A threat of expulsion nipped a similar invasion of the university's administration building within 20 minutes last May.

We do not see any material difference between the invasion of the premises of a private university and the invasion of a private home. Both are acts of lawlessness, and they invite the penalties written into law that apply to everyone.

By turning the other cheek the university encourages a repetition of these tactics, and the revolutionists promise to satisfy this death-wish. The rebel circular announcing the end of the sit-in said, "It's over for now." The operative words are "for now."

The intention was repeated by a leader of the squatters in saying, "But let the university know this: We will be back. We must regroup and plan new strategies. We may wait until spring or this fall, but we will be back."

There is one thing the university can do to protect itself against the threat, and that is to throw the book at everyone who had a hand in bringing disgrace to the institution. The lot of them should be sent packing. Any other university which wants them can have them, but it is warned what to expect.

A GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge the issuance of a Gen. Douglas MacArthur commemorative stamp.

Issuing such a stamp would be but a small tribute to a man who was in every sense a heroic American. Our country will not soon produce another man of MacArthur's greatness. He belonged to an age which acknowledged the imperatives of duty, honor, and country.

We can find no better words to live by, this side of Scripture, than his, given at his last public appearance at West Point:

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll . . . But in the evening of my memory . . . always there echoes and re-echoes: Duty, Honor, Country.

A stamp would be an appropriate tribute to the memory of Douglas MacArthur, but the record of his life will always be his finest memorial. Graduated from West Point in the class of 1903, he had a 4-year average of 98.14—a scholastic record unequaled for 50 years. He won his "A" in athletics and the rank of first captain of the corps.

As a young officer in Mexico, MacArthur was with the U.S. expedition that seized Veracruz in 1914. He led a scouting mission so daring that he was recommended for, but not awarded on that occasion, the Medal of Honor.

In World War I he was wounded twice and decorated 13 times. He was called the "greatest leader of troops we have" by the commander of the American Expeditionary Force, Gen. John J. Pershing.

After serving as the Army's youngest Chief of Staff, MacArthur arrived in the Philippines in 1935 to map defenses for the islands. On orders from Washington, MacArthur turned over to Gen. Jonathan Wainwright the task of defending Bataan and Corregidor and moved to Australia to direct the war in the Pacific. He vowed: "I shall return." He did.

On October 20, 1944, the General waded ashore with his troops at Leyte. Nine months later, liberation of the Philippines was completed. On September 2, 1945, aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, General MacArthur accepted the Japanese surrender and embarked on a new career which some say was his greatest.

As the Supreme Commander in Japan, he wrote the constitution that shaped that country's democratic future. He transformed a feudal, militaristic nation into a peaceful democracy and a staunch ally.

At 70 years of age, MacArthur again commanded troops. His defeat of the North Koreans was brilliant. Then Red China entered the war, and MacArthur was forbidden to carry the initiative into China.

The general passed away in 1964. However one judges his role in history, none would deny the impressive impact he made on all by his outstanding qualities of leadership, his profound dedication to whatever he undertook, his sense of justice, his high principles, and his firm ideals.

So that this Old Soldier will never die in our memory, let us urge the approval of the issuance of a stamp to commemorate proudly the memory of one of our Nation's greatest military leaders.

MILT EVATT OF CALIFORNIA: WARRIOR, ENTERTAINER, MARSHAL, PLANNER, SHIPBUILDER, AND FRIEND

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 28 last the wonderful career of my friend, Milton J. Evatt, came to a close.

Uncle Milt was a little-sung hero but one of those rare individuals who in one lifetime could manage a dozen separate careers and bring a little guidance and light into the lives of those he touched.

Milt was an unsung hero of a generation of very talented people—self-taught—not by any college or any training school. He many times mused over his teenage tenor 3-hour night club engagements when his repertoire would extend from Irish lullabys to Yankee Doodle Dandy.

A soldier during World War I, he not only entertained the troops but ended up in the hospital, a poison gas victim.

After the war he returned to Vallejo where he started at the bottom in ship construction and rose to assistant manager of the progress section, a position he gallantly filled during World War II.

He voluntered to emcee the Elks USO show during the war years when he matched wits entertaining troops with the best acts of the last generation. He worked for many years on the Elks Sick Committee having a main concern for his buddies and comrades of World War I. He also served as Commander of American Legion Post 104. He retired with 30 years' service from the Navy yard in 1952.

No man to retire before his time, Uncle Milt was recruited as Assistant Solano County Probation Officer where he worked for another decade with hard-to-handle juveniles—his advice was 14 carat.

He worked for years in civic development, rising to the position of chairman of the Vallejo Planning Commission.

Upon reaching mandatory county retirement, he worked for a half dozen years as an assistant Federal marshal in San Francisco.

He was later to emcee my first organizational dinner in my bid to this seat in the U.S. Congress.

An adviser to my office for many years on the problems of the elderly, his counsel will be missed and his friendship treasured.

Part of his newspaper epitaph reads as follows:

MILTON J. EVATT TAKEN BY DEATH

Milton J. (Milt) Evatt, 77, of 301 Butte St., Vallejo resident prominent in community activities for the past half-century, died Monday night in a local hospital after a brief illness.

Mr. Evatt, a native of San Francisco, came to Vallejo in 1919 following Army Service in Europe in World War I. He was employed as a pipe fitter at Mare Island, and retired in 1952 as a progressman.

He was a survivor of the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906 in which his

family home was destroyed. His late father, John W. Evatt, was a career officer on the San Francisco Police Department.

OTHER POSTS

After his retirement from Mare Island, Mr. Evatt served as an assistant Solano County probation officer for five years, then served part-time with the U.S. Marshal's office.

He was the husband of the late Mary A. Evatt, who died in 1960; the father of Edward Vincent Evatt and Mrs. Beverly Ann Whorton, both of Vallejo. Five grandchildren also survive.

Mr. Evatt's community activities included nine years of service on the Vallejo Planning Commission, with terms as chairman; as a member of the board of directors of Catholic Social Service, and as chairman of the 1960 March of Dimes in Solano County.

ELKS MEMBER

He had been a member of St. Vincent's Parish since coming to Vallejo in 1919. From 1943 to 1946, as a member of Vallejo Elks Lodge 559, Mr. Evatt was director of the lodge's canteen for servicemen and for this voluntary work, he was presented with an Award of Merit from the Grand Lodge of Elks.

Mr. Evatt was a member of the Last Man's Club of Solano County, an organization formed in 1937 with a roster of 37 veterans of World War I who have met annually for a reunion on Armistice Eve. He also was a past commander and adjutant of American Legion Post 104, a member of Carl H. Kreh Post 1123, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and of the Association of the 363rd Infantry Regiment, Co. C., 91st Division, American Expeditionary Force.

He was a member of Solano Chapter 16, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, and of Samoset Tribe 22, Improved Order of Red Men.

A popular master of ceremonies throughout his years in Vallejo, Mr. Evatt was a member of American Guild Variety Artists, an organization of show business people. He also was a life member of Eagles Aerie No. 5, of San Francisco.

GIVE PRIORITY ON POSTMASTER JOBS TO CAREER POSTAL WORKERS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I favor taking the selection of postmasters out of politics and I have developed far-reaching legislation toward this end in the postal reform bill—H.R. 4—which I introduced on the opening day of the 91st Congress.

At the same time, I believe that we should give initial consideration to our career employees in selection of postmasters—even as the Department has been doing for years with its noncompetitive examinations for postmaster candidates. In more and more cases, in recent years, our new postmasters have come from the ranks.

However, in announcing his policy on selecting postmasters, Postmaster General Blount has eliminated the "promotion" prospect for career postal workers. He would have only the open competitive examination. This is a mistake.

I am introducing legislation today which will give priority to career postal workers in selecting postmasters.

It requires that a competitive examination be given first to career postal workers when a postmaster vacancy develops. If there is no qualified postal worker, then an open competitive examination can be given to all who wish to apply.

The examinations would be given by the U.S. Civil Service Commission as they have been right along.

The Postmaster General would be required to select for appointment the top qualified individual from the list which would be certified by the Commission. Political clearances would be barred.

It is my firm belief that selection of postmasters should be on the basis of merit and experience.

U.S.S. "PUEBLO": MISTAKES THAT CANNOT BE IGNORED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the temporary relief which came at the release of the men of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* has now been replaced by an anxious concern. Across the Nation people are examining reports from the inquiry by the Navy and expressions of interest by various congressional committees.

No greater interest in the men of the *Pueblo* and the ramifications of the incident has been indicated than by the Newark, Ohio, Advocate. Their constant probing for answers, their constant reminders, and attempts to distill facts from contradictory reports, have been helpful to the people of their area and have also provided a fine standard of journalistic interest and expression.

This newspaper recently published three editorials on the incident. Three more in a long series. First, a comment of December 23 following release of the crew. Second, a statement of January 14 which calls for an investigation by Congress. Third, a statement 1 year after the seizure directed at an examination of the roles played before and after the surrender and seizure.

The concern of the paper and the people of that area has also been brought to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, in a continuing attempt to have the problems clarified and the answers given.

The point of it all is simple: mistakes of this magnitude over such a long period cannot be ignored.

I insert the editorials at this point:

HONOR VANQUISHED

The men of the Pueblo are free.

That is good.

Eighty-two of them are still alive.

But that is where the goodness stops. From there, negligence, incompetence, cowardice in the face of the enemy and humiliation take over. It is time for investigation.

We have bemoaned the fact that a fourth-rate power like North Korea could so easily defeat the United States of America.

Well—look at the facts and the mystery disappears:

1. North Korea showed greater nationalistic pride and purpose than our leaders judged them to have when they approached the Pueblo with armed ships.

2. Their military men showed more personal courage and national dedication than U.S. fighting men when they captured by force of arms an American ship on the high seas.

3. North Korean leaders showed superior dedication, planning and tactical ability when they delivered the Pueblo to a North Korean port while our leaders wallowed in indecision and self-pity.

4. Once they had our ship, our men and our national pride, North Korean leaders proceeded to out-negotiate us with a decisiveness of purpose, which has become foreign to our own diplomats and military leaders.

5. In the final humiliation, our leaders agreed to a statement that could have been signed months ago. North Korea made the United States dance to its tune until it was tired of playing.

6. They have our ship, our national defense secrets and a big chunk of our national pride.

7. That makes North Korea a fourth-rate power with first-rate national pride, courage, decisiveness and dedication. The United States of America is stuck with the role of being a first-rate power with fourth-rate military and diplomatic leaders.

Shame on us.

These seven points make one thing very clear: The incompetence, cowardice and indecisiveness must be removed from our military and diplomatic services, for another Pueblo can never happen.

The role of our leaders—from the highest general to the officers of the Pueblo—must be investigated by Congress. Congress alone knows the dedication, courage and pride of the American people. Let it act swiftly to remove those military and diplomatic leaders who do not truly reflect these great qualities.

We dare not lose time. If these so-called leaders had been men of honor, they would have resigned their commission by now. In the absence of honor, let us at least have justice and safety for the American people.

INVESTIGATION, NOT VENGEANCE

The Advocate is seeking congressional investigation of the Pueblo fight. We single out military and diplomatic leaders simply because they are responsible. Regardless of who did what in the fight, those who accept the honor of their positions must accept the responsibility when things go wrong.

Top Navy and Pentagon officials are presently preparing a "court of inquiry" involving the Pueblo's crew. Well, the Pentagon can have its little witch hunt. It's not the Pueblo's men who need investigating in this fight. America needs to investigate the investigators—and the sooner the better.

The Advocate does not seek vengeance. We seek information on behalf of the people, just as we do when local public officials refuse the people public information. The Advocate has gone to court on many occasions to establish the "People's Right to Know." We can do no less on matters of national or international injustices. In that area we are indeed a small voice, but that does not excuse us from speaking.

Only Congress can get at these men of high position because they have built buffers and platoons of "yes men" to keep the public ignorant of their weaknesses, fears and mistakes. They often treat the public like employes who are given information when or if they feel it is necessary.

As most Americans, The Advocate is angered by the seizure of the Pueblo. We were concerned about the fate of the 82 deserted Americans. We were ashamed by the treat-

ment we got and accepted at the hands of an outlaw nation—treatment that was greeted by silence or glee by other nations of the world.

But we are horrified at the thought of such a blow to our national safety happening again or even becoming commonplace. We know the military and diplomatic leaders who let the Pueblo fight happen did not allow it on purpose—that they are sorry. We know that all men are subject to mistakes and many can be ignored or forgiven.

But mistakes of this magnitude over such a long period cannot be ignored. They must be probed until all the weaknesses and fears have been fully bared and defined. Only in this way will we and other nations of the world know that it will not be permitted to happen again.

Only then can we safely announce in advance what we will do if any outlaw nation tries it again. It is childish to expect the generals of the Defense Department or the diplomats of the State Department to wash their dirty linen in public.

Career men run those departments and they would already have resigned if they intended to dash their own careers and those of their associates in weakness and fear.

It has come down to this: Only one man and his associates can protect America against the threat of such fights in the future. He is most emminently qualified.

This man is Cong. L. Mendell Rivers of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Our plea for investigation rests with him because Congress is where our hope lies.

Write to Cong. John Ashbrook and Cong. Rivers, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Tell them in your own words why America must have this investigation.

SCAPEGOAT—NO, NO, NO

It is fitting for The Advocate, and every concerned American, to make special note of this date—the first anniversary of the Pueblo fight. It is not a time for breast-beating about our loss but rather a time for reasoned investigating into causes and preventive measures.

The Navy and the Pentagon are at this moment trying to make Commander Lloyd M. Bucher scapegoat of the whole affair with the dishonest hope that this will satisfy the American people.

Well, it won't.

The investigators need investigating.

We believe they should and will be. We are not qualified to make a judgement or even comment upon the guilt or innocence of Commander Bucher. But we know for certain that the full responsibility for this shameful incident in American history does not rest upon the shoulders of one frail man.

The most shameful roles in this incident were played before and after the surrender and seizure.

FFA WEEK

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as a recipient of the FFA honorary State Farmer Award, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that February 15 to 22 is FFA Week in America. The theme of National FFA Week is "An Opportunity for You."

FFA provides an opportunity for youth in agriculture to learn, to do, to earn, and to serve. The FFA organization does not make these young people great. But rather it provides them the opportunity to excel, to grow, and become outstanding youth leaders for agriculture in America.

Experience in leadership, citizenship, and cooperation, and the pursuit of vocational and educational objectives provide these young people with opportunities for personal growth. Participation by members at local, State, and national levels within the organization is the basic plan.

An FFA member begins his career as a student of vocational agriculture. He has thus elected to begin his career in agriculture. He and the others like him find common goals and objectives in FFA.

His opportunities in FFA are many; much more than the awards or contests which are important in providing competition, experience, incentive, and encouragement. The member can apply what he learns in the classroom to his personal agricultural situation. Through active participation, the member can demonstrate his ability in public speaking, parliamentary procedure, or livestock judging. He also takes part in establishing chapter goals, and just as important—helps accomplish them. Many typical chapter activities include earning their own resources and providing community services.

Through the FFA, a member can develop skills and prepare himself for his vital role as an adult leader in American agriculture. Millions of young people have grasped these opportunities and progressed. Many more will find opportunities in FFA to learn, to do, to earn, to serve.

MID-DECADE CENSUS BILL

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which provides for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in the year 1975, and every 10 years thereafter.

This legislation is not new and, in fact, passed the House of Representatives in August of 1967 but, unfortunately, it failed enactment by the Senate during the 90th Congress. I urge its adoption by both Houses as quickly as possible, because there appears to be universal agreement that an inventory at 10-year intervals of the most important resource of our country—its people—is altogether too infrequent. We are in fact now paying the price for failure to act years ago to provide for a 1965 census by having to use obsolete 1960 figures in appraising our condition and needs, and in the planning and conduct of vital programs in education, poverty, roadbuilding, and many other fields. Not only the Federal Government, but State and local governments, business and other interests, are suffering from a lack of timely and reliable data. Much money has been spent to fill in the statistical gaps with surveys and estimates but the results fall short in comprehensiveness and reliability of what a mid-decade census would have produced.

Other national censuses—agriculture, manufacturing, retail and wholesale trade and services, mineral industries, transportation, State and local government—have by law been placed on a 5-year basis. This bill would restore the most important and widely used census to an equal footing with the others in terms of frequency.

I would like to cite some events which have taken place in Toledo, Ohio, in the Ninth Congressional District which clearly illustrate the need for a mid-decade census.

Toledo, Ohio, has grown by 20 percent since the last census was taken 8 years ago. This is one of the fastest growth rates in the State of Ohio, and the city's largest population boom in nearly half a century.

But because most Federal and State programs returning tax dollars to local communities are funded under formulas based on the 1960 census—the only recent official figures available—this tremendous growth has cost the city of Toledo hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Toledo's largest documented loss is the forced return of more than half a million dollars in local government fund payments because the census did not show that 81 percent of the residents of Lucas County live in incorporated areas. The last census figures showed 79 percent of the county's population living in incorporated areas, 2 percent less than the number required by law to enable the city to get a 70–30 split of the local government fund.

After 1963, when city officials knew that the 81-percent figure had been passed, largely by virtue of annexations, it began claiming a 70–30 split and the money was granted by the State. However, the county filed a claim for return of $377,831 on the basis that the city-county fund had to be based on the latest census figures and the county won in court. The city was therefore ordered to repay the money.

The dispute over the funds has taken on many additional arguments on both sides and the city has been ordered to repay $445,000 and $176,000 in fund overpayments. But the basic dispute goes back to the census figures and based on four appeals, court decisions have gone against the city in the past 15 months.

These rulings have gone against the city despite the fact that the Toledo-Lucas County Plan Commission has said that by 1964 as many as 85 percent of the county's residents were living in incorporated areas. The Commission estimates that 90 percent of all Lucas Countians live within incorporated areas now.

In addition to the money the city has been ordered to repay, the outdated 1960 census figures have cost Toledo and other incorporated communities in the county thousands more than could have been claimed if the official figures were up to date.

Another example of the need for a mid-decade census is illustrated by the results of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote edict in 1962 requiring redistricting of congressional districts and reapportionment of State legislatures. In Ohio, as in other States, officials used estimates of current population in get-

ting in line with the equal vote dictim. But those plans using the current population estimates were overturned when justices ruled that official figures—even though outdated—had to be used.

In the past 8 years we have witnessed a dramatic rise in the number of Federal programs designed to aid States and localities and various segments of our population in such areas of education, health, regional development, housing, transportation, urban renewal, and resource development. We have appropriated millions of tax dollars to these all-important efforts to improve our domestic welfare. It is imperative that these tax dollars go where they are needed and planners can only assure that this is done if they have the official statistical data giving them an accurate picture of where the need lies.

As the Congress strives to enact the programs which will improve the environment and opportunities of all our citizens, we must be certain that we act on the most up-to-date and accurate information available. We do not have this data now. With the dynamics of economic and social change constantly accelerating, the need for timely accurate statistics will be even greater in future decades. It is our responsibility to see that this data is at our fingertips—that it is available for use by all public officials and planners—and as we seek the assistance of private industry and organizations in efforts to make this country a better place in which to live surely we have an obligation to give them the facts as they are.

RELEASE OF LT. JOSEPH P. DUNN FROM RED CHINA

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO OBTAIN THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF LT. JOSEPH P. DUNN, OF RANDOLPH, FROM RED CHINA

Whereas on February 14, 1968, Lt. Joseph P. Dunn of Randolph, a U.S. Navy pilot, was shot down in the China Sea and has been detained by the Red Chinese government, although Peking has acknowledged publicly only the fact of his crashing; and

Whereas the unreasonable detention of Lt. Dunn tends to heighten the already tense relationship between Red China and this country while his family and friends attempt to endure the agonizing wait for information as to his well being: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to use all reasonable means to obtain the immediate release of Lt. Joseph P. Dunn from the control of the Peking government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, February 5, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

OUR FORMER COLLEAGUE, BARRATT O'HARA

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Harold P. Smith, of Congregation Agudath Achim of South Shore, 7929 Yates, Chicago, Ill., extends a great tribute to our former colleague, Barratt O'Hara. Rabbi Smith is a former chairman of the Rabbinical Council of America with a host of friends in the House of Representatives where he was former acting chaplain. He was invited by the Chicago Daily Calumet on January 24, 1969, to write a "Viewpoint" column for the religious community of the Calumet area. I take pleasure in extending my remarks to include this column which pays tribute to our former colleague, Barratt O'Hara:

APPLAUSE FOR O'HARA

(By Rabbi Harold P. Smith)

I have been invited to write this "Viewpoint" column today, and although I am an Orthodox rabbi I want to follow the unorthodox procedure of dedicating this column to one faithful individual in public life whose unmatchable faithful service to our Southeast area constitutes, in itself, a very beautiful chapter in public service. I do so because all too often we take such rare individuals for granted.

I refer to the outgoing Congressman of our Second Congressional district, Barratt O'Hara.

You should know if you don't already know, that Barratt O'Hara has been one of the most beloved and most revered men in the United States Congress. Having been chairman of the Rabbinical Council of America, I have been in position to observe, often from close quarters, how deep and abiding has been, and still is, the reverence and love with which the legislators regard Barratt O'Hara.

It is not merely because he is one of the few still surviving veterans of the Spanish-American war. It is not merely because he has been one of the most informed, most intelligent men in the United States Congress and has remained remarkably alert and knowledgeable despite his 87 years. It is not merely that he is such a very loveable man who constitutes a personal embodiment of the Biblical ideal that "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is all of these things and many more.

But the big quality I would point out here is the remarkable and extraordinary sense of loyalty and faithfulness which Barratt O'Hara has manifested to every single citizen who has been one of his constituents. I would assert with confidence and without fear of contradiction that no citizen of our Second District, however unimportant he may consider himself, has ever gone to Barratt O'Hara's office in Washington without getting the highest possible level of attention, courtesy, and friendship from Barratt O'Hara himself, personally.

What has all this to do with religion? A great deal! The quality of gratitude is the very essence of religion, and ingratitude nothing short of religious desecration.

Prayer, in its highest form was never intended to be exclusively petitionary, i.e., asking the Good Lord for things we want. Much more was it intended to provide us an opportunity to give expression to our feelings of thanks and gratitude for the blessings which are Divinely bestowed upon all of us.

The proper development within us of the fine human quality of gratitude and appreciation is, in a very real sense, as religious a process as prayer.

As Barratt O'Hara leaves office after all these years of loyal and faithful service far beyond the call of duty, I am wondering whether there is in our hearts an adequate measure of gratitude.

I don't think we ought to let such a venerable man merely fade out of office without any expression of public thankfulness. It is my "Viewpoint" that we ought to have a public testimonial dinner in our district where nobody wants anything from anybody—no fund raising, no political motivations, nothing—only to express appreciation to a wonderful human being who has faithfully and capably served our area.

I am hereby making the first reservation.

CORALVILLE DAM

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when spring draws near in Iowa, especially after a severe winter such as the State has experienced this year, thoughts naturally turn to the problem of possible floods. It can be a frightening time of year for those who live in areas subject to flooding. The personnel of the Corps of Engineers and other State and Federal officials concerned, assure me that their contingency plans are in order, and that they will be ready and able to cope with any problems which may arise.

In this respect the Iowa City Press Citizen recently featured an excellent editorial on the background and function of the Coralville Dam, which relates to this problem. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER TEST?

The Coralville Dam and Reservoir have been in operation about a decade now. That's long enough for it to become accepted as a part of the landscape, long enough to make it difficult to recall when the river in Iowa City wasn't turned on and off like the water from a spigot. It's even long enough so that the bulk of controversy about water levels and discharge rates is confined to election years.

But what is the reservoir? It is:

At summer level, 680 feet above sea level, it is the second largest body of water now existing in the state of Iowa—only Spirit Lake is larger—with a surface area of 4,900 acres. (Completion of the Red Rocks and Rathbun Dams and Reservoirs soon will take the Coralville Reservoir down a couple of places in the rankings.)

During the summer months, June 15-Sept. 25, the reservoir holds more than 17½ billion gallons of water which, its operators,

the Army Corps of Engineers, calculate would make 281 billion cups of coffee. At that level, the conservation pool extends 21.7 miles upstream.

During the spring, Feb. 1 to June 15, the level is lowered to 670 feet above sea level to store any flood waters which may come down the Iowa River. The aim, the purpose for which the dam was built, is downstream and on the Mississippi below to reduce flood crests on the Iowa River the point at which the Iowa enters the larger stream at that low level, to which the reservoir is being reduced now, it will extend upstream 17.4 miles and hold 5½ billion gallons of water.

If the reservoir were ever used to capacity, it could hold 156 billion gallons of water, cover 24,800 acres and extend upstream 41.5 miles. It never has been full.

As a recreational attraction, it drew 750,000 visitors during 1968.

Most importantly, as a means of reducing floods on the Iowa and Mississippi Rivers, the dam already has proved its value. In its first years, the reservoir cut down one flood approximately the size of that of 1947, one of the greatest ever on the Iowa. And it has reduced crests on the Mississippi by a foot or so at times when that foot might be the difference between safety and disaster.

If the advance indications are borne out by developments during the next few weeks, the Coralville Reservoir will be tested again, for those indications point to another flood.

COURTS BROKE DOWN FIRST

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, one of the major topics of conversation in recent months has been the serious crime problem here in the District of Columbia and many theories have been advanced as to the principal causes. There is general agreement, however, that our overburdened court system and some of the policies pursued by the courts has been a major contributor to the frightening growth in the crime rate, with particular emphasis on the weaknesses of the bail bond law now operative in the District.

An editorial appearing in the February 11, 1969, edition of the Peoria Journal Star, discusses these points in considerable detail and I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

CRIME IN WASHINGTON: COURTS BROKE DOWN FIRST

(By C. L. Dancey)

In the last few years Washington, D.C., has become the crime capital of the world, and in 1969 even that high rate of crime has exploded into a new epidemic.

The courts are inundated so completely that they cannot begin to cope with the cases and hundreds of persons captured and facing robbery charges are loose in the streets on bond.

In one case that came through personal contact to my attention, two men entered a business place, one with a sawed-off shotgun, the other with a pistol, took the money, handed it to a confederate and then returned for no other apparent purpose than to shoot the proprietor and patrons. The proprietor opened fire himself and shot both of them.

That was two weeks ago. One of these wounded armed bandits is still in the hospital. The other is out and freed on his own personal bond!

The "wheel of joy" that we once attacked locally in these columns began in Washington, D.C., with the practice of the courts there of assuming that the Constitution requires that bond be given, regardless of the offense, the circumstances, or the character of the accused.

Then the last Congress passed a new beautifully "enlightened" bail bond law.

Soon, a host of persons caught in connection with the crime wave was back on the streets under "reasonable bond" awaiting trial. Meantime, they were under greater pressure for cash than before, even, with the need to "beat the rap" later. If they happen to be revenge-minded, they have also been given their chance. If there were witnesses, they have the chance before trial to do something about them.

Many got caught again—and turned loose on bond the second time, with two "trials" pending, presumably.

Then, as might be expected, the wheel took another turn, as the system itself built up the pressure, and the crime wave took another staggering leap forward.

Now, the courts have so many cases, they can't begin to try them, and they are obliged to turn these desperate men loose on bond—some of them for the third time without any real action!

There are more than 500 robbery cases alone backlogged!

Most cab drivers won't work after 11 P.M. anymore because even for them the streets aren't safe. (But business is good for taxis people with three blocks to go ride cabs—they are afraid to walk.)

On "open store" nights, the downtown is deserted.

Almost every citizen you meet, except the big shots, has had an experience with some form of robbery or assault, and the big shots, from the President down, have had it happen to their employes.

A church that was never closed for generations has closed its doors because a young woman was knifed to death while praying at its altar one evening—because this was not the first such incident there.

Meanwhile, the "government by oratory" goes on in the U.S. Senate, and "government by seminar" goes on in the Supreme Court.

This underlines the problem in all American cities, where in varying degrees crime has also blossomed in recent years.

In Peoria, most of it is juvenile crime, and the massive professional crime problem of not many years ago has been hit some pretty solid blows—with a long list of convictions, a court calendar that is under control, and better bail bond policies.

The fact that it is most unmanageable of all in Washington, D.C., which has the largest per capita police force, and undoubtedly one of exceptional training and selection, is significant.

The problem is not in the police, and not in the "Peorias" policies. The problem had its origins in Washington where all the courts are, in effect, federal courts, and where the judges are so sensitive as to presume that bail is a constitutional requirement.

This is only a clue to their exaggerated sensitivities about other Supreme Court decisions on police actions, evidence restrictions, etc., and accounts for the most massive court breakdown in the land coming in Washington—followed by the inevitable enforcement breakdown.

In fact, while 40 states have clear constitutional requirements for bail—Heaven help them!—in all but capital cases, the federal constitution's requirement for "reasonable bail" is directly out of the old English law which has never applied to anything but bailable cases.

It has always been and still is equally established in English law that a person whose record or circumstances of arrest suggests a serious potential threat to honest citizens may be deemed ineligible for bail of any kind.

It has always been accepted by the Supreme Court that bail can be denied in capital cases—those involving death—and this was the obvious intent of the framers at a time when virtually all present felonies were, indeed, capital cases under law punishable by death.

Yet, senators and judges and lawyers are busy arguing the purity of form instead of the reality of fact . . . and the beneficaries are the criminals of this land, especially, right there in Washington. No wonder they are making the most of it!

Here at home, where the juvenile problem has taken over center stage in the crime problem, it would do us well to look again with a very critical eye at the rash of new juvenile laws which pursue some very pretty theories.

It is time to judge whether those theories have proven sound, or whether we have instituted special practices for juveniles that have not solved the problem, but given it epidemic impulse.

Meanwhile, those who find fault with the police are not looking responsibly to find the real source of "where we went wrong." And we will have to go to the source to set it right.

OUR NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM MUST BE REORGANIZED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is urgent need to reorganize and consolidate our national cemetery system.

I am introducing legislation today to centralize the control and responsibility of national cemeteries in the Veterans' Administration.

This would replace the present ridiculous division of authority over national cemeteries among five different agencies.

The present pattern of national cemeteries is clearly inadequate. There is heavy concentration in the eastern part of the Nation, but even those cemeteries are becoming filled and lack provision for expansion.

For example, in my own State of New York, there are three cemeteries under Army control—the Long Island National Cemetery at Farmingdale, Woodlawn National Cemetery at Elmira, and the Cypress Hills National Cemetery in Brooklyn—and the Veterans' Administration cemetery at Bath.

Of the three Army-controlled cemeteries, Brooklyn is already closed, Elmira is expected to be filled this year and Farmingdale is estimated to reach capacity by 1975. The VA cemetery at Bath is expected to reach capacity by 1976.

Here in the Nation's Capital, restrictions have been placed on burials in Arlington National Cemetery. This cemetery is excepted from the provisions of my bill because the Committee on Veterns' Affairs, recognizing the division of opinion over operation of this site, has asked for further study and recommendations.

The committee, of which I am a member, has looked very carefully into the present status of our national cemeteries and has concluded that the consolidation under the Veterans' Administration is the only solution.

Under the present divided authority, there has been completely inadequate and uncoordinated planning. Indeed for nearly 20 years, there has been a policy opposed to expansion of the cemetery system in the face of more and more need for burial space for our Nation's veterans.

The present disorganized system cannot be allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing today legislation to increase the allowance for burial and funeral expenses of veterans. I believe that the time has come to increase the present $250 allowance to $450.

THE BUREAU'S NCIC—INFORMATION IN A HURRY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, to law enforcement officers throughout the country the fantastic service provided by the FBI's National Crime Information Center is both familiar and appreciated.

Picture a car being stopped in Baton Rouge, La., for disregarding a stop sign. Because of suspicious circumstances, the number of the operator's license is transmitted to the NCIC in Washington where the computer goes to work. Word comes back to the apprehending officer that the individual is wanted by the FBI in connection with a bank robbery in Queens, N.Y. The entire operation took less than a minute.

The uniqueness of this instant-information setup explains why in only 2 years 47 States, plus the District of Columbia and Canada, are now capitalizing on this invaluable service. In 1968 the NCIC computer handled a message from local, State, or Federal police agencies—on an average of every 3 seconds of each day.

Briefly, NCIC is a computerized system which stores information concerning wanted criminals and stolen property, including vehicles, guns, securities, and other identifiable items. With unbelievable speed an officer on the west coast can have for his reference pertinent data on a suspect from the huge storehouse of information assembled in Washington. As far as persons are concerned, the data pertains to criminals only, and is for use solely by law enforcement personnel.

In Pennsylvania, the city of Philadelphia, recognizing the potential of the new program, was one of the first to participate. Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo is understandably "high" on NCIC as a weapon to help protect the law-abiding citizens of that city. The Philadelphia Inquirer, in its Sunday issue of February 9, gave a detailed description of how the system operates. Written by Saul Kohler of the Inquirer Washington Bureau, the article, "FBI's Incredible Computers Tighten the Noose on Criminals," points up the tremendous assistance rendered to both Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania by this FBI-pioneered development.

Director J. Edgar Hoover is quick to point out that "much of the center's success is due to the excellent cooperation and enthusiastic interest shown by local and State police agencies in connection with its development." Certainly, the Bureau and its State and local counterparts are to be commended for their efforts in this venture.

Who knows how many would-be criminals might think twice about NCIC and their ever-decreasing chances of success—and go out and get an honest job.

I insert the above-mentioned article by Saul Kohler in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 9, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

INSTANT DATA FOR POLICE EVERYWHERE: FBI'S INCREDIBLE COMPUTERS TIGHTEN THE NOOSE ON CRIMINALS

(By Saul Kohler)

WASHINGTON.—Crime doesn't pay, and every day it's paying a little less because of a new era of cooperation between city, state and federal authorities.

Spearheaded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation just two years ago, the National Crime Information Center has become one of the most valuable tools available to officers of the law. Its value is incalculable and the number of policemen's lives it will save could run into the hundreds.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has hailed the NCIC as "a real break-through in fighting crime." And his enthusiasm is matched by local officials. Philadelphia Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo calls it "tremendous" and points with pride to the fact that the city was one of the first to join.

Col. Frank McKetta, Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police, uses the same adjectives, but goes a step further—he would like to see every local police department give the system the same selfless cooperation which his own force has shown.

You have to know about computers to appreciate the inner workings of the system. But let it suffice to say that in a demonstration for the Inquirer Washington Bureau, agents of the FBI were able to get a "no record" response to the name of the reporter, his birth date and his Social Security number.

And it took three seconds.

DOSSIER IN 9 SECONDS

The next test took a little longer. An agent-supervisor fed the machine the name of Charles Lee Heron, one of the FBI's 10 Most Wanted Men. The result was: His name, his description, his aliases, the fact that he was one of the most wanted, the details of a holdup he committed in New Jersey, his charge of murder in Kentucky and the warning that he was armed with a revolver.

That took nine seconds.

Philadelphia Police Inspector James Herron, who is in charge of communications and computers for the force, calls the speed of the system "remarkable." And so it is:

In Baton Rouge, La., a detective stopped a car for going through a stop sign. He didn't like what he heard in reply to his questions. He asked the driver to wait a moment and used his radio. In less than a minute he had his answer: The car was stolen, the driver was wanted for robbing a bank in New York two days earlier.

On the Pennsylvania Turnpike, a state trooper sees a car speeding. He telephones the information to regimental headquarters, right from his car and even as he follows the speeder. He gets a report that the driver is wanted and may be armed. He gets help and approaches the speeder with caution. Perhaps even with his revolver drawn.

Montana State Police stop a car hauling a trailer. A man and a woman are in the vehicle and it looks as innocent as the day is long. While one officer keeps the couple under surveillance, the other uses his equipment. Moments later (it really takes longer to tell about it than to live it), this information cames back: The trailer was stolen in California, the car in North Dakota; the woman is wanted in North Carolina and the man is being sought by Florida authorities.

NARROWING THE ODDS

Incredible? Yes, it is. But that's the way they do things these days—and they're going to do them a lot better before too long.

Inspector Herron would like to see the day when the "MO" of each wanted criminal is placed into the data bank so the search can be narrowed down when there is a particularly unusual crime. He wants to see the criminal history of each wanted man and woman entered into the files.

In short, Herron—like all police officers and most citizens everywhere—wants to eliminate the even break for criminals and give society the long end of the odds.

He, Rizzo and McKetta are lavish in their praise of the FBI, which pioneered this system. The bureau is proud of what is has accomplished in two years, feels it can make even greater strides in the coming years and points out that the system is paid for by the Federal Government—except for the local police officers and clerks needed to run the terminals.

Rizzo uses eight policemen and two clerks to staff his terminal 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And if you closed the center, you'd cut a little out of Frank Rizzo's success story.

It has worked so well that the medical profession is interested in starting something similar—putting patient information on a national circuit so a man from Philadelphia can be treated in Los Angeles if he is taken suddenly and inexplicably ill out there.

"But in medicine, you would be dealing with the personal lives of innocent people," an FBI agent said. "And that's something we don't do here at the center."

LIMITED TO LAW AGENTS

"This is not a 'Big Brother' operation, not by any means. This is strictly information on actively wanted persons, and the users of the information must be law enforcement agencies staffed by law enforcement personnel."

If it has a number, it can be placed into the discs which comprise the data banks of the machines located in FBI headquarters here. They used to use rolls of tape, but now even the computers have become more sophisticated.

Everybody smiles, because the equipment is manufactured by International Business Machines, and the Justice Department—parent organization of the FBI—has gone after IBM in the Federal courts, charging violation of the antitrust laws.

But they point out quickly that the IBM equipment interfaces with machinery manufactured by other companies, and that no police agency anywhere is told which equipment to buy.

A total of 78 police forces in 47 states—plus the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—are part of the system. Only Wyoming, North Carolina and Alaska still haven't joined, and this, too, will be taken care of soon.

"In Alaska, there is a geographical problem, but we are solving that—after all, Hawaii is in the system," an agent said. "Wyoming and North Carolina have internal problems, such as whether the Bureau of Investigation or the Highway Patrol should be the participating agency.

"When their legislatures meet and iron out the details, they'll join in."

All the police involved have one common comment—you get out of the system only as much as you put into it.

"I think it already has proved its worth, but I feel that many departments still must gear up for NCIC to reach its full potential," Col. McKetta said. "They may think they have one terminal in Harrisburg for the State Police, but I consider that we have 96 terminals—at least one in every county.

"I like to think of our entire teletype network as being part of this system and that each man on patrol in a radio-equipped car also is a part of it."

The commissioner is so high on the program that he's planning orientation courses for the smaller police departments around the commonwealth, to teach them the best way to use the system for the good of society.

The system is unique because of its speed, and for this reason it has drawn observers from all over the world. Israel, for example, is attempting to set up a similar operation.

"They have it a little easier than we do," an FBI official said, "because when they started their little country they gave everybody a number for identification purposes. This is something we have never done in the United States."

How about Social Security numbers? Well, that's a start, but it is simple for a man—so far, at any rate—to get a couple of different ones. And anyway, criminals don't contribute to Social Security. But there are other numbers available to NCIC.

The speed is important in another way. Sure, it saves the lives of officers who ask for help if they are told there is danger. But it keeps police within the letter of the law.

The Supreme Court has ruled that a policeman must have "probable cause" to search and hold a man. A quick exercise in NCIC-manship establishes that probable cause, if it exists.

SCORE ON FIRST DAY

"We are proud to have been a part of this system since its beginnings two years ago," Commissioner Rizzo said. "In fact, we made the first 'hit' on it the day it went into operation. A car had been stolen in New York and it turned up in our city.

"I consider the cost very, very small—the Federal Government pays most of it through an appropriation by the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency—but whatever it is, it's worth it."

Rizzo pointed out that in addition to people the system helps track down cars, license plates, typewriters and other office machines, cameras and firearms.

And the FBI added currency, securities, government bonds, travelers' checks—indeed, anything that can be traced by a number.

The agents who man the center (most of them have the square jaw of Dick Tracy and the habit of quoting J. Edgar Hoover instead of themselves) try to be blase about their system. But there is a hint of pride in everything they say when they talk about it.

They consider the Philadelphia and Pennsylvania State Police forces their best customers—in a typical week early this year the city police used the system 6880 times and the state troopers 4200 times—and they note that their services include 50 statewide systems, 100 major cities and 800 small police departments who come for help.

"The idea originated in this bureau and Director Hoover gave it his wholehearted support," the agent supervisor said. "He is a great champion of NCIC, and to use its services must make you an advocate of it."

Inspector Herron is living proof of that statement.

RAPID AND ACCURATE

"You can't give enough credit to the FBI," he said in an interview while visiting Washington. 'They came up with the idea and we in the Philadelphia Police Department consider this one of the greatest strides forward in the history of police work.

"This is the only area where the city, state and Federal authorities work together and do it well and effectively. The NCIC system is marked by speed and accuracy, and that's what we need the most."

A by-product of the system itself is the manual for its operation, rapidly becoming the bible of communications between jurisdictions.

"The departments have to talk to each other, so they have to talk the same language," the FBI spokesman said.

He smiled as he looked over the busy terminal room, which looks for all the world like an insurance office.

"You must keep it going and you must keep it updated," he said. "This is a pretty fast-moving operation."

"We have to give credit for a lot of the success to the participating departments. After all, the success has been based on their cooperation—and if we had a few more Philadelphias and a few more like the Pennsylvania State Police, we'd be even better."

Better? It may seem impossible, but the FBI feels there is room for improvement, even in the present scope of the operation.

The agents can't emphasize enough the need for speedy reporting to the data bank.

"A car is stolen in Philadelphia and the thief can be in New Jersey in 10 minutes," the agent said. "An hour later he can be in New York, Delaware or Maryland.

DATA INSURE "HITS"

"Someone might spot that car. Some officer somewhere might stop the driver for speeding. But if there is no information in the system, they'll let him go. I've seen 'hits' inside of two hours—and only because the departments which form the system cooperated with it."

There are certain ground rules, of course. In addition to human beings, the data banks will accept the numbers of stolen firearms regardless of value, and description of stolen property other than guns if that property is worth $500 or more.

"There is an exception," the FBI man said. "If the property is necessary in an investigation, we'll take it regardless of the value. For instance, the kidnap victim might be wearing a watch worth $5, but it might lead to the kidnaper."

As for people, the NCIC is not interested in traffic violators. The offense must be a felony or serious misdemeanor. In short, would the state which is searching for the micreant go through the trouble of extraditing him if he is arrested in another jurisdiction?

If the answer is yes, the center is ready, willing and able to help, regardless of the hour or the day of the week.

In one 24-hour period last month, the computer received and transmitted 72,618 messages in servicing local, state and Federal law enforcement agencies.

Other Federal "clients" include the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Internal Revenue Service, the postal inspectors and the Federal Narcotics Bureau.

The computer itself is connected to special equipment operated by the local agencies all over the country. In Philadelphia, the terminal is at the "Roundhouse," the Police Administration Building.

In Harrisburg, it is located at regimental headquarters of the State Police, in the Highway and Safety Building of the Capitol.

The participating agencies need only type the information on teletypewriters—and voila, it is stored for reference. To withdraw information, these agencies type their requests and get their replies in seconds. Once the data is placed in the system, its processing is completely automatic.

"You might say it is untouched by human hands," the FBI declares in a rare display of joviality.

Indeed, once the information is fed into the computer, anyone anywhere can draw it out at once.

AVERAGE OF 25,000 TRANSACTIONS DAILY

The FBI even goes so far as to make certain that the local police aren't asleep at the switch. They'll call the attention of the inquiring agency to a "hit" in the interest of justice and cooperation.

Two years ago—the system got under way on Jan. 27, 1967—the NCIC was operating about two hours a day. In January 1969, there was an average of 25,494 transactions a day (one about every three seconds), with roughly 200 "hits" daily.

As of the new year, a total of 754,429 records were on file at the center.

Actually, the NCIC should provide an example, and a deterrent, to young people who think a life of crime is the good life.

"Some people keep on brushing with the law," the FBI man said. "The trouble was that before the inception of this system, the law couldn't put it all together. Now it can."

The idea for NCIC grew out of the need for vital information in a hurry. But Frank Rizzo looks at it another way.

"Let's say there is a killer at large," he said. "Our officers are supposed to check the files before reporting for duty. But we're human, and some day some patrolman is going to miss some flyer—and that killer may slip through our fingers.

"This way, let's say the policeman stops a car. The man shows him a driver's license. While the officer is questioning him, his companion can call in the information and within seconds, we'll have it.

"If the man is not wanted, there was no harm done. If he was the killer, we've helped the cause of justice."

To carry it a step further, supposing a lone policeman stops a car on a back road somewhere. He approaches and the killer, seeing the uniform, panics. He fires at the officer—and another lawman has lost his life in the pursuit of his duty.

But if the car can be checked out, the policeman might save his own life by placing a request for an NCIC check on the air—and holding off for the few seconds it takes to get the results.

Because this essentially is a numbers game, the FBI has set these standards for making inquiries:

Guns—Local police must have the make and serial number.

Articles (such as TV sets)—Type and serial number.

Vehicles—The identification number, or license number and state of registration.

Securities—Type, denomination and serial number.

Wanted persons—The name and date of birth or any other "personal descriptor."

HOW SPEED PAYS OFF

The term "personal descriptor" includes any military number, alien registration number, mariner's document number, police identification number, passport number, port security card number, Selective Service number, Veterans' Administration claim number, driver's license number and, of course, the Social Security number that has become so popular in identification.

Any department having any of this information is able to draw from the "bank" of data which not only is unbelievable but is impossible for the layman to fathom.

Think of two million pieces of information on a single disc light enough for a child to hold in his hand—with the ability to search out the proper fact at random in a matter of seconds—and you have some idea of what NCIC is and how it functions.

In fact, when you think about it, there is more time spent in typing out the request than in getting the information.

Because police can hold suspects for a reasonable time only the speed is important.

A man was arrested for disorderly conduct in a New Orleans taproom. He was taken to headquarters for booking and while he was being entered in the "blotter," a request went out to NCIC. Before the desk sergeant could complete the entry, the reply was received.

The man was wanted for murder in California.

In the past, the suspect would have been held a short time, brought before a magistrate and fined $5. He would have paid the fine and the police would have released him. And by the time there was an exchange of fingerprints with the FBI, he would have been anywhere.

"BANK" FOR FINGERPRINTS

The point is he would have been anywhere but New Orleans and he might have eluded officers again and again—and possibly killed again and again.

The FBI, when it has sweet dreams, envisions using a similar data bank in the National Crime Information Center to store fingerprint facts. But this is so far in the future they're reluctant to talk about it.

Meantime, they're anxious for every shred of information possessed by local and state police. And men like Frank McKetta are cooperating.

"We collect information from local police departments into our own data bank," the State Police Commissioner said. "Eventually we will include all our own data in the NCIC, and then Pennsylvania will have a truly integrated system."

McKetta envisions tying the system in with the Department of Revenue, which has control of car registrations in Pennsylvania—and sharing with the rest of the nation the information which he has at his disposal.

Rizzo puts it another way:

"We feed the system every day and we draw on it every day. The human factor is eliminated, and I believe we should be feeding even more information into it.

"It's tremendous and the Philadelphia Department is doing all it can to help expand this system to its full capability."

The FBI believes "full capability" will have been achieved only when wanted men are at an absolute minimum and when pictures in the post office are there strictly for decorative purposes.

RESCHEDULE OF PAY—ARMED SERVICES

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress, I sponsored H.R. 15507, a legislative proposal to equalize the compensation of military retirees by basing their retired pay upon current active duty rates, as provided by law prior to 1963.

At that time, the Department of Defense opposed the measure primarily upon the grounds that the issue had already been resolved by Congress. However, they also issued some figures showing that if the recomputation system were restored for the future, the cost would grow in a little over 70 years to a rather staggering figure each year, assuming the maintenance of forces of the present strength throughout the entire period.

I believe that military people, both active and retired, who entered military service prior to June 1, 1958, when the recomputation principle was suspended, have the right to have their retired pay computed no less favorably than was provided by law when they undertook the obligation of a military career in anticipation of such benefits.

I am today introducing a simplified version of H.R. 15507, which would accomplish the basic purposes of the previous legislation through an amendment to chapter 71 of title 10 of the United States Code.

This amendment would provide recomputation generally for retirees who entered the service prior to June 1, 1958. The new proposal, by eliminating the application of the legislation to those persons who entered the service after the system had been changed, would reduce the ultimate cost. It would cost the same as the original proposal only for the first year of its effectiveness and would show a cost savings from the Defense estimate beginning in 1978, with the savings rapidly escalating in future years.

I also believe that restoration of these earned benefits would have so favorable an effect upon the active duty forces that savings would result from a more favorable retention rate in the active force.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this much needed amendment.

ROCKY: HIGH TAX OR SKINFLINT?

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, since the recent election day, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of the State of New York, apparently embarked upon a change of policy and a change in his image. Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, the distinguished Democratic minority leader of the New York State Assembly, has had occasion to reflect publicly upon this transformation at the annual dinner of the Empire State Chamber of Commerce, in the presence of the Governor, on Tuesday, February 4, 1969, in Albany. I believe that our colleagues would like to share Mr. Steingut's reflections. The text of Assemblyman Steingut's address follows:

I am delighted to join with leaders of the business communities this evening. And I am grateful for the opportunity to share this platform with the distinguished Governor of our State, Nelson A. Rockefeller.

I have been a member of the State Assembly during the entire period that Governor Rockefeller served as Chief Executive. It has been my privilege to support the Governor on some of his programs and policies. On other occasions, it has been my duty and responsibility to oppose them.

That does not mean that I am ambivalent towards the Governor. I have deep affection for him as a human being. I admire his courage and envy his talents.

Frankly, I don't really believe any of this. But so much of that old brotherhood and good will is oozing out of the atmosphere tonight, that I feel constrained to be on my best behavior, lest my hosts, the Empire State Chamber of Commerce, never invite me again as a cad and a clod.

Actually in the recent past, the Governor and I have been drawn very close to each other. That's because we shared a common disaster.

A funny thing happened to the Governor on his way to the White House. And a funny thing happened to me in the Assembly on my way to the rostrum.

It has been truly written that adversity is an ennobling experience. In both the Governor's case and mine, our normal sympathies for the alienated and disaffected has been enlarged to embrace each other.

Indeed, herein lies the basic reason why I resigned as Chairman of the Kings County Democratic Committee, when I was elected Minority Leader. I just could not see myself walking into a Rockefeller office and pretend to be a Boss. I had no recourse but to accept gracefully my demotion to Minority Leader.

I confess to a feeling of disadvantage, in appearing on the same platform with the Governor, at a meeting of business executives of our great State. I assume all of you share the Governor's view that an increase in State income taxes will create so massive an exodus of executive talent, as to make the Biblical Exodus appear like a promenade.

I concede that I lack the Governor's perceptive insight into what makes the executive talent click. In my ignorance and naivete, I wouldn't give two cents for an executive who finds happiness in his tax haven in Waukegan.

Try as I might, I can't figure out what Jack Benny would be doing at this moment, had he never left Waukegan.

As a member for many years of the State Legislature, I am certain that all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, share the Governor's concern over the character of the Budget for the next fiscal year. Those of us, who have served in the Legislature, during the Governors terms of office, are convinced that it was only with greatest reluctance that he recommended reductions in education, health, and welfare programs and in State aid to localities programs. To paraphrase a slogan that achieved questionable popularity, just a little more than four years ago: In his heart, the Governor knows he is wrong.

In his Budget Message, the Governor called upon the Legislature, and the public generally, to view our fiscal problems in "their larger perspectives." It is not out of generosity of spirit that I join in the Governor's recommendation to so view the budget. In fact, I suggest that it is imperative that we do so.

It is just little more than a month ago, that we all glowed with pride over the Apollo flight to the moon, and we all glowed in the reflected glory of the courage and skill of the Astronauts, and in the scientific and technological achievements we demonstrated. As a Nation, we can reach the moon. As a Nation, we have millions of children whose reach fall short of their daily bread.

In what proved to be his last speech as Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson said: "We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love we give to our fragile craft."

The conditions under which life can survive and grow are so limited that, to the best of our knowledge, they exist only on the surface of the earth. Even if we land men on the moon, they can survive there only to the extent that they are linked to the earth, as by an umbilical cord.

Throughout the Nation, economic and social forces, seemingly beyond control, are driving increasing numbers of people from the farms to the urban centers. Industrial smog spreads from our cities to the countryside, while sewage and chemical effluent pol-

lute our rivers, our lakes, and our water resources.

In the larger perspective in which, at the Governor's urging, we examine the budget, let us not forget that the vast majority of babies born today will witness the dawn of the 21st Century. Our Budget for the next fiscal year is not only a fiscal plan for the year ahead. It is also a blueprint for tomorrow; it sets the framework through which we should see a picture of the kind of heritage we leave for our children and our grandchildren, when they face the brave new world of the 21st Century.

We are an affluent society. Yet there is a malaise in the land. Hunger stalks our land; fear stalks our streets; and remorse stalks our conscience over the rising tide of racial discord and violence. Too many of our youngsters resort to drugs and narcotics to ease the pain of their daily life.

As we glimpse the future, we know that we shall need more rather than less education, to cope with the growing complexities of life and with the needs of a growing technological society. Our people will refuse much longer to suffer the indignities of slum life, the enduring disabilities of inadequate education, maternal and infant mortality rates so high that they demean our society. As we glimpse the future, we know that we shall need more rather than less public services.

As a nation, we spend millions on ballistic missiles, hundreds of millions on anti-ballistic missiles, and billions on anti-anti-ballistic missiles, as if our Nation's security depended on the endless proliferation of prefixes. Certainly we must reorient our priorities, to bring rays of hope to the nation of poor, within our Nation, whose daily lives are circumscribed by an endless struggle for the basis necessities of life—food, clothing, shelter.

In his Budget Message, the Governor called for a program of Federal revenue sharing, in order to preserve the relative competitive position of the individual States, in relation to attracting and retaining industry and commerce. No one can quarrel with the Governor's recommendation.

However, it is also true, that within our State, counties, cities, towns, and villages also compete for commerce and industry. And the State aid to localities programs, at least in part, tended to equalize the relative competitive positions of our local governments. Indeed, the shift of the burden of government costs to property taxation will tend to destroy the relative competitive positions of the localities. I suggest, further, that such a shift to property taxes, will impair the competitive position of the State as a whole. Corporate executives, seeking locations for new plants, are more concerned over property taxes, than they are over most other taxes.

And let us not be blind to the revolt of the homeowner and the business man over increasing property taxes. In recent years, an increasing number of school districts in our State found their school budgets rejected by the people, because the budget required an increase in property taxes. In Youngstown, Ohio, schools were closed for a full month, because of a revolt of the property tax payer. We certainly want no Youngstowns in New York.

It is within this context, and from this larger perspective, that the people of our State, through their local public officials, through spokesmen of business, industry, and labor, through civic and community leaders, will make known their views on the Governor's Executive Budget, at legislative hearings next week.

It is my fervent hope, that as a consequence of those hearings, that the Governor and I will not once again share a common disaster.

That would be tragic for both of us. The Governor and I remain of an age, that across the horizon new conquests beckon us. And we are prepared to face those challenges, with the political skills that so recently failed us.

We all know that the Governor is now busily engaged in making whistle stops to change his image. Before too long, he will no longer be known as High Tax Rocky. We shall soon affectionately call him Skinflint Rocky.

Just the other day, the Governor spoke enviously of how more pleasant things were in Arkansas. Here in New York, the Governor said, we get back only five cents for each dollar the Federal government takes from us. Arkansas gets back three Federal dollars for each dollar in Federal taxes.

As a native, and life-long resident of Brooklyn, I never thought I would see the day when a Rockefeller would find greener the grass in another man's field.

But it figured. I discovered that the greener grass in Arkansas belonged to his brother.

There is comfort in all of this for the Governor. He is the only person in the United States who, for 27 months, has his own, private, hand-picked United States Senator. Our Constitution thus makes our Governor the equivalent of half a State. Among his intimates, he is now known as Half-Nelson.

As I leave the rostrum in behalf of the Governor, I trust that this evening, in relation to me, he will be only Half-Hard.

TRANSFER OF TITLE OF BROOKLYN NAVY YARD TO CITY OF NEW YORK REQUESTED

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, some 2½ years ago with little regard for fact, history, or consequences of the act, the New York naval shipyard, known as the Brooklyn Navy Yard, was closed by the Department of Defense. Almost 10,000 skilled, loyal workers found themselves looking for other employment. It was, in short, a very tragic time, a bitter time, a time of anger. Bitterness and anger, yes. Despair, no. For the people of Brooklyn refused to quit and together with their elected representatives in the city and State governments and the Congress have fought continually to once again make the navy yard area a productive area.

On January 27, 1969, the distinguished minority leader of the New York State Assembly, the Honorable Stanley Steingut, addressed the State assembly on the navy yard problem. Following his remarks the State assembly and the Senate approved a resolution requesting the Congress "to approve as expeditiously as possible proposed legislation to permit the transfer of title to the New York naval shipyard to the city of New York, without cost, for the governmental purpose of redevelopment of such property as an industrial park."

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include the remarks of the Honorable Stanley Steingut and the resolution as approved by the New York State Legislature:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE STANLEY STEINGUT

In June, 1966, the New York Naval Shipyard, in the Borough of Brooklyn, was closed down and declared surplus Federal property. The consequences of the Shipyard closing were tragic for the people of our Borough.

To us it meant the loss of one of our most cherished landmarks and the loss of an institution, almost as old as our Republic, which had served as a vital link in our Nation's defense since 1801.

To ten thousand skilled and trained workers, the closing of the Naval Shipyard resulted in loss of jobs, uprooting their families, and in some cases daily commutation to Philadelphia, for jobs where their skills would be fully employed.

To the people of our City and State, the closing of the Naval Shipyard meant the loss of employment opportunities for the jobless, financial losses to vendors and suppliers of the Shipyard, and economic losses suffered by the community as a whole, when so significant an industrial operation ceases to function.

Monumental efforts were promptly taken to bring new life and vitality into the area. Mayor Lindsay, the Board of Estimate, and his Administration have devoted unstintingly of their time and energies to plan for the redevelopment of the Naval Shipyard, in a manner to best serve the interests of our people. The same is true of Governor Rockefeller and his Administration.

In our own Borough, the Borough of Brooklyn, leaders of commerce, industry, and labor, community and civic and minority group leaders, organized the Commerce, Labor and Industry Corporation of Kings, commonly known as CLICK, to plan for the development of the industrial park, to inspire the interest and investments of commerce and industry in the area, and to insure a flow of manpower into the area for decent jobs, with adequate training programs, to provide for the upward mobility of labor from unskilled and semi-skilled jobs to skilled classifications. CLICK has been officially designated by the Mayor and the Board of Estimate as the agency responsible for the project.

I am among those who initiated the organization of CLICK and I am proud of the progress we have made. Mr. Hilly, and those who have worked with him, have tackled the problem with zeal and imagination. Having worked so hard and diligently on this project for two and a half years, we now can almost see the day when the real, hard work begins—to make a reality of the challenge that has been before us.

This past Friday, Vice President Spiro Agnew and Mayor Lindsay, in a joint conference made public policies of the Nixon Administration to make available surplus Federal properties, at below market values, to permit their development for commerce, industry, and economic expansion. Such a policy is essential for the economic growth of our Nation. Such a policy will bring jobs to the unemployed, reduce mounting welfare costs, and bring a better quality of life to those subsisting at poverty levels.

The Vice-President suggested the possibility that property may be transferred to the City without cost—a prospect whose consummation is devoutedly to be wished. The transfer of this property to the City at below market value, or without cost, does not involve a major change in Congressional policy. Surplus Federal properties may, at the present time, be sold at below market value, where the property will be used for park or recreation purposes. All that is necessary is for Congress to give to the war against poverty, to the need for economic growth and expansion, the same National properties which the Congress has long since given to parks and recreation.

The urgency for immediate action is clear. A developer stands ready to invest more than $50 million dollars to install facilities that will provide 3,000 jobs. We cannot delay too

long, without fearing the loss of the prospective investor and the 3,000 jobs.

In so far as the State Legislature is concerned, I am pleased to acknowledge that it has done what is necessary to move this redevelopment program to reality. In 1967, and again in 1968, on Home Rule Messages from the Mayor and the City Council, the State Legislature adopted laws giving the City of New York power and authority to develop the Naval Shipyard area. The Resolution before you today simply confirms action we have taken in the past and attests to our continued concern and interest in this problem.

Governor Rockefeller, and Mayor Lindsay are in Washington today meeting with Vice President Agnew, our two United States Senators, and representatives of the Brooklyn Congressional delegation. The Resolution before us now is designed to add our voice to the massive efforts now under way to bring the redevelopment plans for the Naval Shipyard to the point where they can be put into operation. What we have in Brooklyn is a blueprint for progress. I urge adoption of this Resolution, so that the promised economic development and job opportunities may become a reality.

RESOLUTION No. 37

Concurrent resolution of the New York State Legislature memorializing Congress to act expeditiously on proposed legislation to transfer title to the property known as the New York Naval Shipyard, in the Borough of Brooklyn, to the city of New York for redevelopment as an industrial park

Whereas, The New York Naval Shipyard, in the Borough of Brooklyn, was closed in June, nineteen hundred sixty-six, and such closing resulted in the loss of ten thousand skilled and well-paying jobs, in the impairment of employment opportunities for others, and adversely affected the economy of the Borough of Brooklyn and of the City and State of New York; and

Whereas, The Legislature of this state has already demonstrated its approval of the redevelopment program by enacting chapters five hundred eighty-two and seven hundred fifty-seven of the laws of nineteen hundred sixty-seven and by enacting chapter ten hundred sixty-one of the laws of nineteen hundred sixty-eight, such laws authorizing and empowering the City of New York to undertake such redevelopment program; and

Whereas, The Mayor of the City of New York, the members of the Board of Estimate, the Governor and concerned departments of the State and City of New York, and the Commerce, Labor and Industry Corporation of Kings (CLICK), a non-profit corporation representing commercial, industrial, labor, community and civic leaders of the Borough of Brooklyn, have jointly developed plans for the redevelopment of the New York Naval Shipyard as an industrial park; and

Whereas, The successful completion of such redevelopment will result in the creation of twenty thousand on-site jobs and an equal number of off-site jobs among vendors supplying materials, goods, and services to industries located on the site; and

Whereas, The creation of such jobs will create employment opportunities for the unemployed, reduce the burdens of welfare costs, and promote the economy of the Borough of Brooklyn, the City and State of New York and of the Nation; and

Whereas, It is essential for the development of the industrial park that the federal government transfer the property as expeditiously as possible to the City of New York at below fair market values; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, (if the Senate concur), That the Congress be, and hereby is, memorialized to approve as expeditiously as possible proposed legislation to permit the transfer of title to the New York Naval Shipyard to the City of New York, without cost, for the governmental purpose of redevelopment of such property as an industrial park; and be it further

Resolved, (if the Senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congress of the United States by forwarding one copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate, one copy to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and one copy to each member of the Congress from the State of New York.

By order of the Assembly.

DONALD A. CAMPBELL,
Clerk.

CRISIS IN WORLD STRATEGY: PROGRAM FOR THE NEAR EAST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the 7-day Arab-Israel war of June 1967 closed the Suez Canal, diverted European shipping around the Cape of Good Hope and disrupted world commerce. Since then, a series of incidents between the Arabs and Israelis has repeatedly emphasized the deadly struggle in that ancient crossroads—a struggle that antedates Alexander the Great.

As stated by General MacArthur in his immortal 1951 address to a joint session of Congress, this struggle is global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector, oblivious to those of another, is but to court disaster for the whole.

As demonstrated by recent events other focal points in the world situation are—

First. The Denmark-Alps line in Europe where Soviet forces in 1968 occupied Czechoslovakia and face the forces of NATO nations.

Second. Southeast Asia where the United States is carrying the greatest part of a major war that has already claimed over 37,000 American lives.

Third. Southern Africa, where our own Government has applied mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia, thus opening the backdoor to war with South Africa and other countries in that vast area, for which effort the once great Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has prepared a general staff type of war plan.

Fourth. Panama, where officials in one government have jeopardized limited ownership and control of the strategic Canal Zone territory and the Panama Canal in an area of endemic revolution and endless political instability that is acutely vulnerable to Communist revolutionary subversion.

Eminent students of world strategy have written extensively about all of these focal points and some of their commentaries are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My statement, "Crisis in World Strategy: An Appraisal," in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, 1967, before the Arab-Israel war of that year, is but one example.

The latest contributions to the literature in world strategy are a four-part series of articles by Dan Smoot, an exceptionally able and careful writer, in the January 20 and 27, and February 3 and 10, 1969, issues of the Dan Smoot Report. In these, he presents the key problems of the Near East and offers a realistic plan of action for the United States.

The four indicated articles follow and are commended for study by all Members of the Congress and cognizant officials of the executive branch as well as editors and professors:

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Jan. 20, 1969]

ISRAEL—PART I

Palestine is a region of some 10,000 square miles (about the size of New Hampshire) at the southeastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. It is the Canaan or Promised Land to which Moses led the children of Israel who fled from bondage in Egypt. Many centuries passed, however, before the Jews built a strong, national state in Palestine.

For a brief time at the beginning of the 10th century before Christ (during the reign of King David), the Jewish nation included in one dominion all of Palestine (and a little more). But before long, the nation had split into two Hebrew kingdoms: Israel, the larger of the two, occupying most of Palestine north of Jerusalem; and Judah, a diminutive kingdom which included the city of Jerusalem and some contiguous territory. Assyrians conquered the northern kingdom of Israel in 722 B.C. One hundred and thirty-five years later (587 B.C.), Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem. The Babylonian Captivity began, and the kingdom of Judah vanished.

The Maccabees established a new Jewish nation in Palestine in the second century, B.C., but it lasted only 79 years.

For the next 2000 years, Palestine was a province or protectorate of various empires. Since the 7th century A.D., Palestine has been occupied largely by Arabs.

When the Ottoman Turks captured Egypt in 1517, Palestine became a province of the Ottoman Empire, and remained in that status for four centuries.

In the late 19th century, the zionist movement emerged in Europe and the U.S. The purpose was to colonize Palestine with Jews from Europe and elsewhere until there would be enough Jews there—controlling the wealth and industry of the land—to create a Jewish nation.

Actual colonization (by a few European Jews, financed by the fabulously wealthy Rothschild family) began in 1883. International political zionism, as a movement to reclaim Palestine for the establishment of a Jewish state, was formally organized four years later, in 1897. Since then, the movement has been largely financed and directed by American Jews.

Simultaneously with the emergence of zionism, Arabs in Palestine were developing a strong sense of nationalism, yearning to throw off the Turkish yoke and to establish an independent Arab nation.

At first, there was little conflict between zionism and Arab nationalism—primarily because an insignificant number of Jews chose to immigrate to Palestine. In 1914, for example, after 31 years of zionist colonization, 94% of the Palestine population was still Arab.

When World War I began in 1914, Turkey became an ally of Germany. On August 30, 1915, the British promised to support Arab independence for all Arab lands (including Palestine) within the Turkish empire, if Arabs would support Great Britain's war against Turkey. Arabs revolted against Turkish rule on June 5, 1916; and Arab guerrilla forces were organized to support the British military campaign against the Turks.

But the British were also making deals with Jews—not because of any military assistance Jews could give in Palestine, but because of the enormous wealth, power, and

influence of world Jewry, especially in America.

In November, 1917, the Earl of Balfour, British minister of foreign affairs, issued the Balfour Declaration, giving a British pledge to world Jewry that a "National Home for the Jewish People" would be established in Palestine, with a proviso that the religious and civil rights of other sections of Palestine's population were to be safeguarded. Winston Churchill later (in 1922) asserted that the Balfour Declaration merely intended to support the idea of a Jewish *home* in Palestine and that the creation of a "wholly Jewish Palestine" was never contemplated. The British also later asserted that their 1915 promise to Arabs did not contemplate Arab political control of Palestine.

Whatever the intent of the British, Arabs helped the British in World War I because they thought they had the British promise to support Arab political control of all Arab lands, including Palestine; and the zionists considered the Balfour Declaration a promise to support the establishment of a Jewish nation in Palestine.

In December, 1917, British military forces, with the help of Arab guerrillas, wrested Southern Palestine from the Turks. Arab guerrillas were subsequently organized into an Arab national army, which helped the British smash the Turks in 1918. This was the deathblow to the old Turkish empire, and it ended Turkish control of Arab lands.

Following the cessation of military action (October 30, 1918), the British placed the head of the Arab national army in charge of the military administration of Syria and much of the surrounding territory. The British army administered Palestine and adjacent areas.

In 1923, the League of Nations mandated Palestine and Iraq to the British as protectorates, and mandated Syria and Lebanon to the French. The Palestine mandate incorporated the Balfour Declaration, provided for increased Jewish immigration into the country, and stipulated that Jews should be encouraged to settle on the land.

With their technical skills, hard work, and enormous financial support from world Jewry, the Jews, in the relatively limited areas they colonized, accomplished more in a few years (irrigating land, creating industries, building cities) than Arabs had accomplished in centuries.

Arabs—knowing they could not compete with these able and industrious aliens who had almost limitless financial backing from abroad—became hostile. Arabs felt they had been betrayed by the League of Nations. They regarded the alien Jews coming into the Arab homeland as shock troops of Western imperialism, whose intent was to subjugate Arabs in their own land, as they had been subjugated by the Turks for 400 years.

Hostility between Arabs and Jews deepened in the mid-1930's, when nazism in Germany stimulated large-scale Jewish immigration to Palestine. Before 1932, the British mandatory government had never admitted more than about 5000 Jewish immigrants a year. In 1932, 9533 Jewish immigrants were admitted; 30,327 in 1933; 42,359 in 1934; 61,854 in 1935.

The influx of aliens into a small, desert country with a primitive economy created intolerable problems. Between 1936 and 1939, native Arabs staged several rebellions against the mandatory government. Arab guerrillas committed acts of terrorism against Jews, and Jewish guerrillas retaliated in kind.

Hostilities subsided in the latter part of 1939, after the British imposed restrictions on Jewish immigration—and after many of the young militants, both Jews and Arabs, had enlisted in military units under British command to fight nazis in World War II.

On November 3, 1942, the British defeated the Germans at El Alamein in North Africa, thus putting an end to German ambitions in the Middle East. Immediately afterward, a secret Jewish army was formed in Palestine; and bands of Jewish guerrillas spread death and terror throughout the Arab population. The Jews got their arms and ammunition by thefts from British Middle Eastern forces. Jewish leaders officially expressed disapproval of the lawlessness and terrorism, but did not cooperate in bringing the lawbreakers to justice.

In 1944, both Republican and Democrat parties (bidding for the big Jewish vote in New York) promised U.S. support of the zionist demand for unrestricted Jewish immigration into Palestine.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt publicly expressed sympathy with certain zionist aims, but also gave Arabs assurances which they regarded as U.S. commitments not to support any Palestine program objectionable to Arabs.

On March 3, 1945 (after a trip to the Near East), Roosevelt said a Jewish state in Palestine could be established and maintained only by military force. On April 5, Roosevelt wrote a letter to the King of Saudi Arabia, confirming an earlier personal promise that the U.S. would not support the zionist aim of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. A week later, Roosevelt died. Within a few days after Harry Truman succeeded to the presidency, the Secretary of State (Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.) briefed him on Palestine.

The position of the U.S. State Department was the same as that of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff—namely, that the oil and strategic location of the Middle East made the area vital to U.S. interests; that Arab governments and populations (totaling more than 100 million people) were traditionally friendly toward the U.S.; that U.S. support of the zionist program in Palestine would alienate Arabs and drive them into the Soviet orbit. Stettinius warned Truman that zionists would put heavy pressure on him to support their aims.

The Egyptian prime minister wrote President Truman directly, saying:

"It is greatly to be regretted that persecutions of the Jews in certain European countries . . . should have been seized upon by certain political elements to advance the politico-racial theories of Zionism and to appeal to the world at large for the support of their program. Unfortunately, the brunt of their effort has concentrated on Palestine where the Arabs, who, throughout their history, have shown great tolerance and even hospitality toward the Jews, are the innocent victims. . . . Why . . . one small nation of 1,000,000 people living in a very small territory should be forced to accept in 25 years immigrants of an alien race up to nearly 50 per cent of their own number is hard to understand. . . .

"Now, the guests at the Arab's table are declaring that . . . they are going to bring in large numbers of their kinsmen, take over all of his lands, and rule to suit themselves."

Truman assured the Arabs and his own State Department that he would keep Roosevelt's promises with regard to Palestine. At the same time, he was demanding that the British immediately admit 100,000 European Jews into Palestine.

In his memoirs, Truman says:

"My efforts to persuade the British to relax immigration restrictions in Palestine might have fallen on more receptive ears if it had not been for the increasing acts of terrorism . . . committed [by Jews in] Palestine. . . .

"The Jews themselves . . . [were] making it almost impossible to do anything for them."

Concerning Jewish pressures on him, Truman says:

"I do not think I ever had as much pressure and propaganda aimed at the White House as I had in this instance. The persistence of a few of the extreme Zionist leaders—actuated by political motives and engaging in political threats—disturbed and annoyed me. Some were even suggesting that we pressure sovereign nations into favorable votes in the General Assembly."

Nonetheless, Truman continued pushing the British to lift restrictions on Jewish immigration into Palestine. He says he acted not in response to Jewish demands, but out of compassion for the suffering of Jewish refugees in Europe who did not want to return to their nations of origin. Truman also says he felt a responsibility to implement the Balfour Declaration of 1917—though he never explains why an American President should be bound by a British promise which the British themselves were denying.

Unable to find a solution satisfactory to Truman, the Jews, and the Arabs, Great Britain eventually referred the Palestine problem to the UN.

On November 29, 1947, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. According to the resolution, the British mandate over Palestine was to end not later than August 1, 1948; independent Jewish and Arab states were to be formed not later than October 1, 1948; and an international administration was to be set up for the Jerusalem area.

Meanwhile, terrorism continued in Palestine. The worst incident occurred on April 9, 1948, when a Jewish terrorist band murdered all inhabitants (men, women, and children) of an Arab village near Jerusalem.

Soon thereafter, the British said they would end their mandate and withdraw from Palestine by the middle of May, 1948. A special session of the UN General Assembly was called. The U.S. supported a plan for a UN trusteeship over Palestine; but on May 14, 1948, zionists proclaimed the State of Israel. Eleven minutes after this proclamation was made in Palestine, the White House in Washington announced U.S. recognition of the new State. The U.S. delegate at the UN was caught still arguing the virtues of the trustee plan when Truman acted.

The day the new state of Israel was proclaimed, the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 began.

Later: Details on the three Arab-Israeli wars since 1948, commentary on contemporary events, and suggestions about what the U.S. should do now.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Jan. 27, 1969]

ISRAEL—PART II

(NOTE.—Policies of the U.S. government are responsible, to a considerable degree, for the dangerous situation in Palestine. Unless those policies change, they will eventually get us into a war in the Middle East. This is the second in a series of articles attempting to outline what those policies are, and how they evolved.)

Palestine has been the homeland of Arabs for 2000 years. Throughout the Middle Ages (and afterward), when there was harsh hostility between Christians and Jews in the Christian nations of Europe, Jews and Arabs got along well together. The relatively few Jews who sought refuge in Arab lands were welcome.

No real conflict between Arabs and Jews developed until late in the 19th century, when the movement known as zionism was formally launched.

Just as many Negroes in the United States have been deceived into supporting the communist-planned civil-rights movement, thinking it was a humanitarian effort to improve the lot of Negroes, many Jews throughout the world have been deceived into supporting zionism, thinking it was: (1) a humane effort to provide a refuge for persecuted Jews; and (2) a religious movement to establish a national headquarters for the Jewish faith.

Actually, zionism always has been a political movement, whose purpose was to colonize Palestine with enough alien Jews to take the land away from Arabs and create a Jewish political state.

The zionist claim, that Palestine is historically Jewish land, rests on the historical

fact that a Jewish nation existed there for a brief period almost 3000 years ago. By the same logic, present descendants of Indians who inhabited the Americas 400 years ago could lay claim to ownership of the entire Western Hemisphere.

The zionist claim that homeless Jews were entitled to a refuge in Palestine has had strong humanitarian appeal. But what about Arabs who—in almost exactly equivalent numbers—were despoiled of their lands and other property and driven into squalid refuge camps in the process of making Palestine a haven for Jews?

The conflict in Palestine between zionism and Arab nationalism could never have escalated into its present dangerous importance, without the machinations of political leaders in Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

Great Britain started zionism and Arab nationalism on a collision course during World War I—by promising Arabs political independence in Palestine, while also promising to support the zionist program for Palestine. Harry Truman engineered the collision in 1948 by supporting the establishment of a zionist state in the heart of the Arab homeland. The Soviets—by using Arab hatred of Israel and resentment of the United States to promote Soviet expansionist aims in the Middle East—have aggravated the problem into an explosive situation that could shatter the world.

The first Arab-Israeli war began May 14, 1948, when zionists in Palestine suddenly and unilaterally proclaimed the Jewish state of Israel. Eleven minutes later, a spokesman for President Truman in Washington announced U.S. diplomatic recognition of Israel.[1] Truman was facing a presidential election which few thought he could win. He needed the votes and powerful influence of Jews, especially in the key political state of New York where, in one city alone, at least two million Jews resided. There was no politically important "Arab vote" or "Arab influence" in the United States.

As soon as the state of Israel was proclaimed on May 14, 1948, troops from Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia entered Palestine to help the Arabs. They wrested a part of northern Jerusalem and the Jewish quarter of the Old City from the Israelis. The UN Security Council ordered a cease-fire, which went into effect on June 11, 1948. While UN representatives were in Palestine trying to mediate a settlement, the Israelis smuggled in, by air and sea, huge quantities of arms. On July 9, the Israelis suddenly renewed hostilities, and successfully routed the Arabs on all fronts. Thereafter, the Israelis ignored all UN Security Council cease-fire orders that did not suit their immediate needs.[2]

Sporadic fighting continued until January, 1949. A formal armistice agreement was made February 24, 1949. In that first Arab-Israeli war of 1948, about one million Arabs were driven from their homes, their farms, their businesses in Palestine. Most of them took refuge in the Gaza Strip (a narrow piece of desert on the Mediterranean coast) and in other Arab territory, where they and their progeny are still living, in hopeless poverty, surviving on an American dole administered by the United Nations.

Arab refugees—homeless and propertyless, embittered and desperate, and now numbering almost two million—have created grave economic, social, and political problems in the Middle East. They supply the recruits for the *fedayeen*, guerrilla groups that make retaliatory and terroristic raids on Israel. In the smaller Arab nations that have tried to remain pro-Western, and moderate in their attitude toward Israel (Jordan and Lebanon), the *fedayeen* often have more public support, and therefore more strength, than the official governments. They are sometimes beyond the control of government even in the strongest Arab countries.

The precise boundaries of the state of Israel are not known. A United Nations partition plan of November 29, 1947, assigned 4300 square miles of Palestine for an Arab state, 5700 square miles for a Jewish state. In the 1948 war, Israel seized and kept 1400 square miles of territory that had been assigned to Arabs.[2]

Israel thus annexed almost a third more territory than was allotted to it under the UN partition plan. Egypt took over the Gaza Strip. Jordan annexed the west bank of the Jordan River, including the Old City of Jerusalem. Israel was in possession of the New City of Jerusalem. The UN plan for an internationally administered Jerusalem was dead.

Harry Truman won his election in 1948; but political wars never really end. Congressional elections came up in 1950, and Democrats made another strong bid for zionist support. In May, 1950, the Truman administration entered a joint agreement with France and England to aid any victim of aggression in the Middle East. This meant, of course, protecting Israel in the possession of Arab territory seized during the 1948 war.

In 1952, both Republican and Democrat parties pledged the American government to defend any Middle Eastern nation against aggression.

On April 10, 1956—continuing crises in the Middle East having come to another crescendo—President Eisenhower announced that the U.S. was "determined to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to . . . aggression [in the Middle East.]" At that time, it looked as if the "aggression" would be committed by Arabs trying to take back some of the territory seized from them in 1948.

But a few months later, all went topsy turvy. In July, 1956, Nasser of Egypt nationalized the internationally-owned Suez Canal, and closed it to Israeli shipping. In October, Israel suddenly attacked Egypt, driving deep into the Sinai Peninsula and occupying the Gaza Strip. Great Britain and France joined Israel two days later, attacking Egyptian airfields and making paratroop landings in the Canal Zone.

Clearly, someone was a "victim of aggression," and we were on record to defend *any* such victim.

Egypt was in the hands of a dictator who was a virtual puppet of our enemy, the Soviet Union. France, Great Britain, and Israel were presumably our best friends; but they had plunged into war, in an area where we had dangerous commitments, without discussing the matter with us or even giving us advance notice. Was Egypt the aggressor for provoking Israel? Or was Israel the aggressor for making a military attack on Egypt?

What should we do?

This hard decision confronted President Eisenhower a few days before the 1956 general election when American voters would decide whether to return him to office or to replace him with Adlai Stevenson; and, at that time, political analysts were predicting the contest would be very close.

Candidate Stevenson spoke on the issue first, saying the U.S. should intervene—*on the side of Israel*. The public was alarmed at the prospect of American intervention in the Middle Eastern war.

President Eisenhower took his stand on the evening of October 31, 1956, saying:

"The United States was not consulted in any way about any phase of these actions [against Egypt by Israel, Great Britain, and France]. Nor were we informed of them in advance. . . . In the circumstances. . . . there will be no United States involvement in these present hostilities."

That turned the trick in the 1956 elections. Eisenhower won handsomely.

Eventually, France, England, and Israel responded to U.S. and U.N. pressures for a cease-fire. Israel withdrew from the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip. The U.N. sent a 6000-man peacekeeping force to patrol the Egyptian side of the 170-mile frontier between Israel and Egypt.[3]

Then, with the election safely behind him, President Eisenhower reached into the pockets of American taxpayers to reward our allies for stopping the war they had started: a $500 million loan to Great Britain, forgiving an $83 million interest payment due on previous loans; a promise of oil and other aid to all of Europe to keep it from suffering the consequences of the brief Middle Eastern war.

Soviet influence waxed and American influence waned in the Middle East, following the 1956 war. In an effort presumably intended to retrieve some of the Arab friendship we had lost, President Eisenhower (in January, 1957) asked Congress to approve the Eisenhower Doctrine. This Doctrine (which Congress approved, though public opinion was 9 to 1 against it) was a promise of limitless military aid, including the use of American armed forces (with the proviso that our troops would be under the "overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council"), to any Middle Eastern nation requesting such aid against "overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism."[4]

The 1957 Eisenhower Doctrine did not deter Soviet penetration of the Middle East. Its chief result was a 10-year armaments race. The U.S. helped finance both sides, giving military aid to Israel and Arab nations.[5] France and England (with American tax money which had been given or lent by our government) also helped finance both sides. The Soviets, pursuing their strategy of encouraging Arab-Israeli hostility to widen the rift between the U.S. and its former Arab friends, gave military aid only to the Arabs.

In 1967, Nasser of Egypt demanded withdrawal of the UN force that had been in Egypt patrolling the Egyptian-Israeli border since the 1956 war. The UN complied. Nasser blustered about closing Suez and the Strait of Tiran (passage to the Gulf of Aqaba) to Israeli shipping, and about an Arab holy war to destroy Israel. The Middle East, heavily armed and fully mobilized, was a tinderbox.

Both sides accuse the other of making the first strike in the 1967 war. Facts indicate that Israel struck first. At any rate, Israel struck, efficiently and furiously, on June 5, 1967, destroying Arab air power on the ground.

In six days, Arab forces were utterly smashed. Israeli casualties were 679 killed, 2563 wounded, 16 captured. Arab casualties were 15,000 killed, 50,000 wounded, 11,500 captured. Of the some $700 million in military equipment (mostly Soviet) lost by the Arabs, a great deal was not destroyed, but was captured by the Israelis. Israel seized from Syria, Jordan, and Egypt territory four times bigger than the nation of Israel before the 1967 war;[6] and she immediately began building roads linking the conquered Arab lands to Israel, thus giving rather convincing proof of her intention to keep them permanently.[7]

In the 1967 war, Israel brilliantly demonstrated a military principle which all Americans should yearn for their own government to heed: namely if you are going to fight a war, fight it—quickly, fiercely, totally, aiming for nothing less than complete victory at the earliest possible moment.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Memoirs*, by Harry S. Truman, Doubleday, 1956, Vol. II, pp. 132–69.

[2] *The Encyclopedia Americana*, 1961 edition.

[3] *U.S. News & World Report*, June 19, 1967, pp. 44–6.

[4] Message to Congress, by Dwight D. Eisenhower, Jan. 5, 1957.

[5] *U.S. News & World Report*, June 26, 1967, p. 28.

[6] *U.S. News & World Report*, June 26, 1967, pp. 11, 26, 27.

[7] *U.S News & World Report*, Jan. 20, 1969, p. 48.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 3, 1969]

ISRAEL—PART III

Without U.S. political support, the state of Israel probably never could have been created. Without U.S. economic support, Israel probably could not have survived.

U.S. government aid to Israel has totaled about $1.5 billion in 20 years—which means that Americans have been taxed to provide approximately $600 for every man, woman, and child presently living in Israel. The federal government also helps Israel economically by granting tax exemption to organizations whose primary purpose is to raise money for Israel from private sources in the U.S. High officials of our government often make speeches at rallies to promote fund-raising for Israel.

When the 1967 Arab-Israeli war began, the United Jewish Appeal (which exists to raise money in the U.S. for Israel, and which enjoys federal tax exemption) asked for $200 million in contributions for Israel. Many individual gifts of $1 million, and several in six figures, were made immediately. In New York City alone, $20 million was raised in a day or two; $3.5 million in Chicago, $3 million in Philadelphia; $2.5 million in Boston.[1]

The United Jewish Appeal has raised as much as $365 million a year for Israel.[2] Most of this money is contributed by wealthy people who deduct the contributions from their federal income taxes. Other Americans must be taxed, of course, to make up the resulting loss of tax revenue for the federal government. The vast annual flow of tax-free money to Israel also adds greatly to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, which has created the worst U.S. monetary crisis in this century.

In short, Americans have been very generous to Israel—so generous, in fact, that Israeli leaders seem to think Israel can count on U.S. support even if Israeli actions are embarrassing or damaging to the United States.[3] In a sense, the mighty U.S. has become a captive of the little socialist nation of Israel which our politicians helped create and which the bounty of our people and our government has subsidized.

For example, Israel unilaterally decided to invade Egypt in 1956—knowing this would bring on a long chain of serious consequences for the U.S., but so unconcerned about our reaction that she did not even give us warning.

The most brazen demonstration of Israel's indifference to, or contempt for, U.S. public feeling and U.S. national interests occurred in 1967.

In the spring of that year, when war clouds were darkening over the Middle East, an Israeli official publicly announced that the United States had committed the U.S. Sixth Fleet (based in the Mediterranean) to help Israel. The U.S. denied that any such commitment had been made.[4] This denial made no difference to Arabs. The Israeli statement sounded like the truth to them.

Arab resentment of the United States flared into violence. Mobs stoned and burned U.S. diplomatic facilities. Lives of American tourists and businessmen were in danger. By the first of June, it was apparent that evacuation of some 20,000 American citizens from Arab countries would soon be necessary.

On June 2, 1967, the U.S.S. *Liberty*, a U.S. Navy communications ship, with a crew of 275, left Rota, Spain, bound for the Eastern Mediterranean. Her mission was to assure communications between U.S. government posts in the Middle East and to help with communications problems involved in the massive evacuation of Americans.

While the *Liberty* was enroute, the Arab-Israeli war began, June 5. On June 8, the *Liberty* was cruising at 5 knots in international waters about 15 miles off the coast of the Sinai Peninsula (Egyptian territory). At about 1:30 p.m., two Israeli jets flew over the *Liberty*, taking a good look at her. Seas were calm. Visibility was practically unlimited. The American flag was flying on the ship, and her name and other identification marks were prominently in view.

At about 2:00 p.m., three Israeli jets made several strafing runs on the *Liberty*, splattering decks and hull with some 821 rocket and cannon hits. The *Liberty* (armed only with four 50-caliber machine guns) never returned the fire. Some crewmen apparently were killed before they could reach their battle stations. About 20 minutes after the strafing, three Israeli patrol boats appeared and attacked the *Liberty* with guns and torpedoes. One torpedo-hit flooded a compartment and drowned 24 crewmen. Total American casualties in the two attacks which lasted about 30 minutes: 34 dead, 75 wounded. Damage to the ship was critical.

Soon after the attack by Israeli patrol boats, another Israeli boat and a helicopter came by and apologized, saying the *Liberty* had been mistaken for an Egyptian ship. Later, the Israeli government formally apologized.

The U.S. government accepted the apology but rejected the explanation that the attack was accidental. On June 10, 1967, the U.S. Defense Department released a statement saying:

"[We] cannot accept an attack upon a clearly marked noncombatant U.S. naval ship in international waters as 'plausible' under any circumstances whatsoever. . . .

"The suggestion that the United States flag was not visible and the implication that the identification markings were in any way inadequate are both unrealistic and inaccurate. The identification markings of U.S. naval vessels have proven satisfactory for international recognition for nearly 200 years." [4]

Obviously, the attack on the *Liberty* was a deliberate decision by some important Israeli officer.

One published account in June 1967, said the Israelis deliberately tried to sink the *Liberty*, knowing it was American, because it had intercepted and recorded messages proving that Israel had started the war with surprise attacks. Israeli and American officials denied this story—on the grounds that it was "unthinkable," because Israel regards the U.S. as her chief ally.[4]

Israeli behavior in 1968, however, suggests the possibility that Israel feels safe in defying her "chief ally" at will—believing that zionist economic and political influence in the U.S. is strong enough to guarantee U.S. support of Israel regardless of what Israel does.

On December 26, 1968, two Arab terrorists attacked, with hand grenades, an El Al (Israeli) commercial airliner at the airport in Athens, Greece. One Israeli citizen was killed, another wounded. The plane was severely damaged. The terrorists were arrested immediately and jailed in Athens, where they will stand trial under Greek law. The Arabs were carrying leaflets of the Popular Front For the Liberation of Palestine, an Arab commando group (*fedayeen*) which has offices in several Arab countries, including Lebanon. The Israeli government said the two men traveled to Athens on a commercial airliner which they boarded at Beirut, Lebanon.[5]

There is no indication that Lebanon was responsible in any way for the two men.[6] Apparently, they are not even Lebanese citizens, but are from a camp of refugees driven from their homes in Palestine by the Israelis. In fact, Lebanese and Israeli officials had a meeting the day after the attack on the El Al plane at Athens. The Israelis made no protest about the attack, and said nothing about Lebanese responsibility.[7]

Nonetheless, Israel retaliated against the nation of Lebanon.

On December 28, 1968, a strong detachment of Israeli soldiers, traveling in military helicopters, made a 45-minute raid on the Beirut airport. They inflicted no personal injuries, and sustained none; but they destroyed on the ground all airplanes with Arab markings, after removing from the planes, at gun point, passengers and personnel. Published reports said 13 commercial airplanes (representing half of Lebanon's entire commercial airlines fleet) were destroyed. Eight of the planes belonged to Middle East Airlines (which is partially owned by the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency of the U.S. government); two belonged to Lebanese International Airways (55% of whose stock is owned by U.S. shareholders); three belonged to Trans-Mediterranean Airways (owned by Lebanese private interests).[3] Israeli defense minister Moshe Dayan—acknowledging in a TV interview that the Beirut airport raid was an official Israeli army operation—said 14 planes were destroyed.[8] Ownership of the 14th plane has not been disclosed.

The fact that Israel—presumed throughout the world to have a virtually unbreakable hold on United States support, including military support if needed—would attack a sovereign nation, in retaliation for the crimes of two individuals for whom the nation had no responsibility, raises a fearsome possibility: the possibility of some aggressive Israeli action, over which we have no control, involving us in war.

All major powers denounced Israel. The British said the Israeli attack on Beirut airport illustrates a "terrifying trend." The French called it deplorable. The Soviets said Israel should be compelled not only to pay damages, but to punish Israeli personnel who participated in the attack. U.S. Ambassador to the UN, J. R. Wiggins, called the raid on Beirut airport "a most regrettable Israeli action which my government condemns," [6] saying there is a "difference between the acts of two individual terrorists and those of a sizeable official military force operating under government orders." [9]

Walter W. Rostow, President Johnson's special assistant for national security affairs, said:

"We think it is a grave matter for regular forces of the government of Israel to attack a civil international airport in a country which has been striving toward moderation in the Middle East." [6]

A special session of the UN Security Council was convened Sunday night, December 29, 1968. On December 31, all 14 nations represented (including the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.) voted unanimously to condemn Israel for its "premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the [UN] charter and the cease-fire resolutions." [5] The resolution of denunciation asserted that Lebanon is entitled to redress for the destruction it suffered, and warned Israel that UN Security Council "would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions" if Israel repeats such adventures as the raid on Beirut airport.[10]

The Israelis are contemptuous of UN resolutions. They also show contempt for the United States.

Lebanon, with a population (half Christian, half Moslem) about the size of that of Israel (2.5 million) is traditionally pro-Western,[11] and is America's closest remaining friend in the Arab world.[3] Hence, the Israeli raid on Beirut airport—coming the day after announcement that the U.S. would sell 50 jet fighter aircraft to Israel for $200 million, and lend her part of the purchase price—was more than an embarrassment to the United States. It was a deliberate affront.

An AP dispatch from Tel Aviv, January 1, 1969, asserts that Israelis generally are boastful that the United States cannot "exert its will on Israel." Israelis proudly point out that "the likelihood of American disapproval did not deter the Israelis" from making the raid on Beirut airport.[10]

Footnotes at end of article.

Outraged public feeling in Lebanon is pushing that once-neutral nation toward the militant Arab groups and their Soviet sponsors; and United States influence in Lebanon is rapidly disappearing—all of which, well informed Lebanese say, is exactly what Israel wants.

Pro-American Lebanese officials believe Israel is determined to alienate the U.S. from the entire Arab world, and to force a U.S. confrontation with the U.S.S.R. over the Middle Eastern problem, feeling that the United States will inevitably take the side of Israel.[12]

Not only among pro-American Lebanese officials, but also inside the U.S. State Department, there is strong opinion that Israel is deliberately using terrorist tactics against moderate Arab regimes in Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait, to drive these nations into the Soviet orbit and further away from the U.S. The purpose is to leave the U.S. with only one "client" or "friend" in the Middle East: Israel.

This conviction in the State Department (that Israel's truculent behavior is designed primarily to divest the United States of any remaining vestiges of Arab good will in the Middle East) was very strong following the Israeli attack on the Beirut airport. Influential U.S. officials wanted to cancel all U.S. arms deliveries to Israel. They were restrained from making this decision by President Johnson's orders to leave major policy changes to the incoming Nixon administration.[7]

What should President Nixon do? We will deal with that question next week, when concluding this four-part series of Reports on Israel.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "From U.S., A Flood Of Aid To Israel," U.S. News & World Report, June 19, 1967, p. 8

[2] The (Flagstaff, Arizona) Sun, Apr. 25, 1968

[3] The Wall Street Journal, Dec. 31, 1968, p. 6

[4] U.S. News & World Report, June 26, 1967, pp. 33–4

[5] Time magazine, Jan. 3, 1969, p. 26 and Jan. 10, 1969, p. 27

[6] The Dallas Morning News, Dec. 30, 1968, p. 1

[7] "Washington Wire," The Wall Street Journal, Jan. 10, 1969, p. 1

[8] Mike Wallace interview with Moshe Dayan, on the CBS 60 Minutes TV program, broadcast Jan. 21, 1969

[9] Editorial, The Dallas Times Herald, Dec. 31, 1968

[10] The Dallas Morning News, Jan. 1, 1969, p. A4

[11] Extension of Remarks of U.S. Rep. John Rarick, Congressional Record (daily), Jan. 6, 1996, pp. 250–251

[12] "Frictions With Israel Push Lebanon Toward Aggressive New Policy," The Wall Street Journal, Jan. 14, 1969, pp. 1, 10

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 10, 1969]

ISRAEL—PART IV

Israel and the Soviet Union display bristling hostility toward each other, while the U.S. and Israel are still regarded as inseparable friends. Yet, there is more ideological and cultural kinship between Israel and the Soviet Union than between Israel and the United States.

Though our government has been socializing the U.S. economy (in violation of our Constitution), our government officials still pay lip service to "free enterprise." A preponderant majority of Americans (though accepting socialism under false labels) are emotionally and historically committed to a free-enterprise economy. They reject the *idea* of converting America into a socialist state. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is historically and ideologically committed to socialism. So is Israel. Most of Israel's agricultural production is on collective farms like the collective farms of communist China and the Soviet Union. Indeed, many entire settlements in Israel are communal communities of the type which is the ideal and ultimate goal of communism.

Concerning the cultural kinship between the Soviet Union and Israel, note this important fact: in recent years, European (or Western) Jews have been leaving Israel in significant numbers. Simultaneously, there has been an influx into Israel of oriental Jews (sometimes called "Arab" Jews).[1] Today, in Israel, oriental Jews (whose cultural roots are in the East, as Russia's are), outnumber European Jews (whose cultural roots are in the West, as America's are).

The historical record shows that American Presidents have been pro-Israel ever since Israel came into existence. President Truman's role in helping create the state of Israel, in defiance of the counsel of his own diplomatic and military advisers, is well known. Recently (January 5, 1969), on a nationwide tv broadcast, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said "Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy indicated that we have a moral and emotional commitment to Israel."[2]

There can be no doubt about President Johnson's pro-Israel bias. When the 1967 Arab-Israeli war erupted, a U.S. State Department official said the U.S. attitude was "neutral in thought, word, and deed." This aroused the ire of President Johnson, who did not try to conceal his bias toward Israel.[6] Johnson would have ordered military action on the side of Israel in the 1967 war, if Israel had appeared to be losing. Hence, the quick Israel victory, obviating need for U.S. intervention, pleased the President.[3] After the 1967 war, Johnson supported Israel's position that there should be no Israeli withdrawal from conquered territory until secure and recognized boundaries were established.[4] It was Johnson who asked congressional authorization for the sale of 50 jet fighters to Israel to replace planes lost or damaged in the 1967 war. Hubert Humphrey, as a spokesman for the Johnson administration, was aggressively pro-Israel.

Between the 1956 and 1967 Arab-Israeli wars, the Soviet Union gave a huge quantity of aid to Arab countries; and so did the U.S. ($3.4 billion in U.S. economic aid to Arabs; $300 million in military aid).[5] But the *per capita* aid which the U.S. government gave Israel in the 1956–1967 period was at least seven times greater than the *per capita* aid it gave Arab countries.

Clearly, in the eyes of the world, the opposing sides in the 1967 war were "client" states: Israel, client of the U.S.; Arab nations, clients of the U.S.S.R.

At first glance, the Soviet Union may seem to have been on the losing side: Arabs were shattered, with humiliating ease and speed. Yet, when the war ended, the Soviets were nearer than ever before to one of their most cherished goals in the Middle East—eliminating American influence in the Arab world, establishing Soviet dominance.

There has been speculation that the Soviets encouraged Egyptian bluster and truculence to give Israel provocation for initiating the 1967 war—to increase Egyptian dependence on the Soviet Union. At any rate, Soviet influence on Egypt did become much stronger after the 1967 war. One significant result is that the Soviet Navy now has Mediterranean bases in Egyptian ports—an ancient Russian ambition which previous communist leaders and the czars before them were never able to realize.[7]

The Israeli raid on Beirut airport (December 28, 1968) brought more significant gain for the Soviets in the Middle East, loss for the United States. On January 2, 1969, for example, the Lebanese cabinet decided to admit Soviet Navy ships to Lebanese ports upon request, but ruled that U.S. naval vessels would no longer be welcome—because of the U.S. sale of jet fighters to Israel. This was a sharp reversal of Lebanese policy, which theretofore had been distinctly more friendly to the U.S. than to the Soviets.[8]

Behold, then, this strange situation: Israel and the Soviet Union, while excoriating each other with harsh words, are pursuing a common objective in the Middle East: to isolate all Arab countries from the United States and drive them into the Soviet orbit.

The U.S. government's attitude toward the Middle East armaments race is equally strange. On December 27, 1968, U.S. officials announced that 50 jet fighters would be sold to Israel. On December 28, Israeli airborne troops raided the Beirut airport. On December 29, U.S. officials denounced Israel for the Beirut raid. On December 30, U.S. military sources said they expect the Soviets to sell Egypt 200 more jet fighters, and to make other arms deals with Arab states, as a result of the U.S. sale of jets to Israel.[9] And on December 30, 1968, the U.S. government issued a plea for Middle Eastern disarmament.[10]

What will President Nixon do about the Middle East? At present, it is hard to tell.

The 1968 Republican Party platform said:

"In the tinderbox of the Middle East . . . we will seek an end to the arms race through international agreement and the stationing of peacekeeping forces of the United Nations in areas of severe tension . . . .

"Nevertheless, the Soviets persist in building an imbalance of military forces in this region. The fact of a growing menace to Israel is undeniable. Her forces must be kept at a commensurate strength both for her protection and to help keep the peace of the area. The United States, therefore, will provide countervailing help to Israel, such as supersonic fighters, as necessary for these purposes."[11]

During the 1968 campaign, Richard Nixon sounded even more pro-Israel than Lyndon Johnson. Speaking to B'nai B'rith, Nixon promised military aid to "tip the balance" of Middle Eastern military power in Israel's favor. This Nixon promise was intended not only as a bid for zionist political support, but also as an effort to eliminate the hostility of the news media, most of which is pro-Israel.[12]

Having squeaked through to victory, without zionist support, Nixon apparently tried to back off a bit from his promise to help Israel achieve military superiority over the Arabs.[12] Nixon's emissary to the Middle East, William Scranton, came home saying the U.S. should pursue a more "even-handed" policy in the area—that is, a policy less partial to Israel.[12]

Zionists howled; and Nixon tried to placate them by granting a much-publicized interview with Moshe Dayan, Israeli defense minister. Prior to that, the President-elect had stood firm on the position that he would see no foreign leaders until after his inauguration.[12]

What *should* President Nixon do about the Middle East?

There is really only one safe and sensible way out of the harassing dilemmas which our political leadership has created for us in the Middle East and elsewhere—and that is, to return, as quickly as possible, to the policy of benign neutrality which George Washington recommended in his Farewell Address and which this nation followed for more than a century. Neither give offense to other nations, nor take any. Neither grant special favors to a foreign nation, nor expect any. Show partiality to none. Sternly reject all foreign influence on American policy, whether exerted from within or from without. Keep our government out of the wars, revolutions, and political turmoil of other countries. We have enough problems of our own.

It was tragically wrong for us to get in-

Footnotes at end of article.

volved in the Middle Eastern mess in the first place. But, having made the error, must we perpetuate it? We are so deeply involved now that we probably should not instantly wash our hands of the problem. We could and should, however, immediately stop all direct U.S. government intervention in the Middle East. Specifically, the U.S. government: should officially declare its neutrality in the Middle East and strictly observe neutrality in deed and word; should stop giving aid of any kind to Arab nations and to Israel; should stop the sale of the 50 jet fighters to Israel, and prohibit any other sales of armaments either to Israel or to Arab countries; should eliminate the privilege of tax exemption for any organization that collects funds in the U.S. for transfer to Israel or to Arab countries, and take any other steps necessary to prohibit the flow of tax-free private funds from the U.S. to Israel or from the U.S. to Arab countries.

While withdrawing from direct intervention, the U.S. should work diplomatically for a solution to dangerous Middle Eastern problems which our meddling helped create. Our efforts should be made through traditional diplomacy, and not through the United Nations, because the UN is worse than useless as a means of solving international problems and settling international disputes.

Our diplomacy should be aimed at the accomplishment of a three-point program:

(1) The historical boundaries of the land known as Palestine prior to the creation of the state of Israel should be identified; and a new political state, with dominion over the entire area, should be created. It should not be a Jewish-governed state, or a Christian-governed state, or a Moslem-governed state, or any other kind of theocratic state, which is an anachronism in our time. It should be a state ruled by a representative government, answerable to all inhabitants, of whatever creed, who qualify as voters.

(2) The property and other rights of all present inhabitants of Palestine should be scrupulously protected.

(3) All Palestinians—Moslem, Christian, Jew, or otherwise—who have been driven from their homelands as a consequence of Arab-Israeli conflicts should be repatriated and indemnified for loss of property. The indemnification should be determined and provided by the government of the new nation of Palestine.

That program, if accomplished, might achieve a just and enduring peace in the Middle East.

The people and governments of the area may not respond to U.S. diplomatic pressures and leadership toward accomplishing such a program. The hatreds and entrenched interests may be so deeply rooted that no fair and sensible program can be adopted.

But our government should try, because its previous actions have given it a responsibility. If, in the end, all U.S. efforts fail, we can at least get out with good conscience.

Would American neutrality ease and speed communist control of all Arab states? No one knows; but we do know that American intervention in the Middle East turned the once-friendly Arabs away from us, and toward our deadliest enemy.

Though Arab states, like Israel, have adopted the subtle form of communism called *socialism*, undisguised communism is repugnant to most Arabs, because it is openly atheistic; and most Arabs are Moslems. Generally, Moslems are such militant fighters for their religious faith that they scorn close alliance with atheists. This condition is reflected by the fact that the Communist Party is still outlawed in most Arab countries, despite the vast amount of aid they have received from the Soviets.[14]

Arab bitterness toward the United States for its role in helping carve a zionist state from the heart of the Arab homeland made it possible for procommunist dictators like Nasser to push the Arab world into the Soviet orbit—during the very period when Arabs were receiving even more aid from the U.S. than from the Soviets.

From the record, it is plausible to assume that communist influence in the Arab world would decline, rather than grow, if the United States adopted a clear policy of impartial non-intervention.

But (plausibilities and assumptions aside) the important thing is to get the U.S. out of all treaties, agreements, and programs with inherent possibility of involving us in a Middle Eastern war—before the desert sands are red with American blood.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Human Events, Dec. 28, 1968, p. 13
[2] AP dispatch from Washington, The Dallas Morning News, Jan. 6, 1969, p. A4
[3] U.S. News & World Report, June 26, 1967, p. 34
[4] The Dallas Morning News, Jan. 1, 1969, p. A4
[5] U.S. News & World Report, June 26, 1967, p. 28
[6] U.S. News & World Report, June 19, 1967, p. 28
[7] "Intelligence Report," Parade, Dec. 17, 1967, p. 5
[8] Extension of Remarks of U.S. Rep. John Rarick, Congressional Record (daily), Jan. 6, 1969, p. 250
[9] The Dallas Morning News, Dec. 31, 1968, p. A3
[10] The Dallas Times Herald, Dec. 30, 1968, p. A1.
[11] 1968 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, p. 994
[12] "Israeli Overkill?", National Review, Jan. 14, 1969, p. 15
[13] Time magazine, Jan. 3, 1969
[14] "Middle East: Tom Anderson Reports From the Scene," American Opinion, February, 1969, p. 48

U.S. PASSENGER SHIPS: CAN THEY BE SAVED?

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the restoration of health to the American-flag passenger fleet is a matter of concern to all of us interested in maritime affairs. As a long-time member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have been worried about the steady decline of the U.S. passenger ship fleet. While the passenger ships of other nations—most particularly of Russia—increase in number, ours has shrunk. The flourishing cruise trade operating throughout the Caribbean out of Miami consists totally, for instance, of foreign-flag ships. In recent days the S.S. *Independence* has been laid up and the company that operates her is seeking permission of the U.S. Maritime Board to abandon passenger operations altogether.

There is, however, a ray of hope on the horizon. Negotiations are going on to consolidate three U.S. passenger ship operations into one so that five major American-flag ships can be kept afloat. The National Maritime Union and its President Joseph Curran have been participating in these important negotiations. In the current issue of the NMU publication, the Pilot, there is an excellent account of the discussions currently in progress. I insert this article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

CONSOLIDATION OF U.S.-FLAG PASSENGER FLEET MAKES PROGRESS—NMU PLAYS AN ACTIVE ROLE IN HIGH LEVEL DISCUSSIONS; UNION HOPES THAT CURRENT NEGOTIATIONS WILL WORK OUT

A major move to save the American-flag passenger fleet through establishment of an independent company that would consolidate operations is making progress.

The new company would operate five ships currently belonging to United States Lines, Moore-McCormack and American Export Isbrandtsen. The five ships are the SS United States, Constitution, Independence, Argentina and Brasil.

NMU PARTICIPATES

Vice President Mel Barisic and the National Maritime Union have been participating in the high-level discussions that are directed toward the retention of United States passenger shipping. The discussions have been taking place with officials of the present Maritime Administration, the three companies and the National Maritime Union and other maritime unions.

The new company, Curran pointed out, would help cut the disproportionately high administrative cost and general overhead expenditures that have seriously hampered American-flag passenger shipping. It also would, he said, lead to improved passenger facilities in New York City, refurbishment of the five ships to make space more salable, and more flexibility for the ships to compete both for regular service and in the cruise trade.

EXTREMELY HOPEFUL

Curran said that he was "extremely hopeful" that the current negotiations would be successful. "By all odds, U.S. passenger ship service should not be allowed to disappear from the American scene or in competitive world travel service," he said.

The move to establish the new company represents a culmination of a long fight by the National Maritime Union. In October, 1965, when the Maritime Interagency Task Force recommended a phasing out of U.S. passenger ship operations, NMU led the campaign against the government and some of the industry. Now the strong support which MarAd is giving to the establishment of the proposed new company attest to the rightness of NMU's fight against phasing out passenger ships.

NMU LEAVES NOTHING TO CHANCE

"The future of American-flag passenger ships will stand or fall on the ability of a passenger ship company to successfully operate the present passenger ships," Curran said. "We are leaving nothing to chance as far as NMU is concerned. We must and we will do everything reasonable to make it a success. NMU members are completely aware of the continuing need for superior service to passengers. The NMU members know that when the new company proves successful, the present ships will be replaced and additional passenger ships will be built."

Curran further added that he felt the future of ocean travel was bright.

"Regardless of the continued growth of air travel, there is a solid market for ocean travel, both for regular service and in the cruise trade," he said. A certain body of travelers will always desire ocean transportation. This market should be adequately serviced.

"There is a definite market for travel by ship which is limited only by the ability and imagination of Government, labor and management to seize upon it. An appreciable portion of the U.S. travelling public will always be attracted to ocean travel. Until now this has been a luxury which millions cannot afford. We should make it possible for

these millions to secure voyages at sea to fit their pocketbooks."

MANAGEMENT MUST BE STREAMLINED

Curran pointed out that American-flag passenger ships were constructed at a time when the full impact of overseas air transportation could not be accurately projected. "Now, many of these passenger ships have been operating at or below the nonprofit level," he said. "The changes that have occurred in recent years—in traffic patterns, modal travel demand and the like—require more streamlined central management to successfully operate."

SOYUZ AND APOLLO

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Hotz, in the January 27, 1969, issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology discusses the progress of the Apollo lunar program and the Soviet manned space effort. Mr. Hotz, in his editorial, points out the rigorous schedule and difficult decisions that were necessary for the United States to develop its manned space flight capability and develop a significant effort in the field. He cautions the Nation that the Soviets should not be counted out of manned lunar exploration and that it will not be easy for the United States to achieve a lunar landing this summer. I commend this thoughtful and important editorial to my colleagues and the general public:

SOYUZ AND APOLLO

(By Robert Hotz)

The recent successful manned space flights of the Soviet Soyuz 4 and 5 in earth orbit and the U.S. Apollo 8 in lunar orbit appear to have stimulated some basic misconceptions in the popular press about the nature and progress of these programs.

Flawless performance of the Apollo 8 astronauts in their spacecraft in orbiting the moon has apparently convinced many people that the toughest part of the Apollo mission is over and that a manned landing is certain for this summer.

The excellent performance of Soviet cosmonauts in docking and exchanging crews between Soyuz 4 and 5 in earth orbit has also produced a feeling outside the USSR that the Russians have really abandoned their oft-announced plans to land man on the moon and, instead, are concentrating on earth orbital space stations.

Both assumptions are very wrong. The Soviets still are aiming for the moon. The toughest part of the Apollo lunar landing mission still lies ahead.

It should be remembered that when the USSR and the U.S. first began to contemplate design of manned orbital spacecraft, the perfect sphere appeared to offer the best engineering solution. The Soviets, being first to develop actual hardware, proceeded with the spherical concept. They have expanded it through Vostok, Voskhod and Soyuz, although the latter has been enlarged by other modules coupled to its still basically round re-entry vehicle. The U.S., starting later, was able to utilize some significant research from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics' Ames laboratory on ICBM nose cones for spacecraft. This became the basic design for Mercury, Gemini and Apollo, the Langley laboratory development of a blunt-nose.

Similarly, the manned lunar landing concept as originally developed in both countries envisioned use of an earth orbiting space platform for launching a manned vehicle to the moon. This is the course the Soviets are still pursuing. Again, because the U.S. was so obviously lagging behind the USSR in the early era of manned space flight, the new National Aeronautics and Space Administration had an overpowering sense of urgency in searching for a faster alternative to the earth orbital route. For then, the lunar landing race already appeared hopelessly lost to the Soviets. Again, a group of brilliant researchers at the Langley laboratory came up with an answer, providing the required docking and launch maneuvers in lunar orbit instead of earth orbit. This offered an opportunity to slice as much as a year from the Apollo development time. After a searching, critical review by the NASA hierarchy, the lunar orbiting concept was approved in 1962 for the Apollo mission. Key manned space flight program managers thought it could give the U.S. a slightly better-than-even chance to beat the Russians with men on the moon.

However, the Russians, for a variety of reasons, have stuck to their original program of assembling an earth orbital platform from which to launch their lunar landing mission to the moon. The docking and crew transfer of Soyuz 4 and 5 were an essential milestone in Soviet progress to build this earth orbital launching platform. They have never abandoned their lunar landing goal. They are now well along their chosen path to achieve it. Nor do we think they will abandon it, even if U.S. astronauts are the first to set foot on the lunar surface. The moon is far too valuable as a base for future space exploration and scientific study for the Soviets to ignore it simply because some other flag was planted there first.

Not all U.S. manned space flight experts were convinced that the lunar orbital concept was the most prudent course. They maintained that the earth orbital method, while possibly slower, offered a broader and more useful base for future manned space operations than lunar orbiting hardware. In fact, NASA's decision to go the lunar orbital route was a strong stimulus for the Air Force to develop its own manned orbiting laboratory (MOL), leading to a militarily vital manned reconnaissance satellite. The Soviets, who have never noticeably suffered from this dichotomy between military and civil in their space program, are developing both a moon launching platform and a manned reconnaissance satellite with their Soyuz hardware. They will have the manned reconnaissance capability for at least several years before the USAF MOL reaches an operational stage. There are some who argue that achieving this military manned reconnaissance capability is a much more important element in keeping peace on this small planet than achieving a lunar landing.

But, as any quarterback can tell you, the pressures of coming from behind and playing catch-up football always force decisions and impose risks that are not necessary when enjoying a comfortable lead. This aspect of the U.S. space program provides yet another example of the staggeringly high cost in the end of unimaginative economy in the beginning of any new technical exploration project.

Apollo 8 was a smashing success in transporting man across half a million miles of space and giving his eyes the first long look at his own planet and the first close look at the moon. But, in the perspective of the ultimate Apollo goal, it was an operational reconnaissance that executed only two-thirds of the final mission. The toughest portion lies ahead, for it is the lunar module (LM) that is the most advanced and complicated part of the Apollo spacecraft system. It also is the most vital to the success of the landing mission. It will not get its first manned flight test in earth orbit until at least next month on Apollo 9. Nor, will it be tested in lunar environment until late this spring on Apollo 10. Only when the lunar module proves as reliable as the rest of the Apollo system can the landing mission be attempted.

So, let's not count the Soviets out of manned lunar landing exploration nor assume that we already are a cinch to put men on the moon this summer.

REFLECTIONS ON LIFE IN THE CITY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks several Members of this body offered unsolicited advice to newly elected Members of Congress concerning their place of residence while pursuing their duties as legislators. The implication was that the District of Columbia offered choice residential, educational, and cultural facilities as opposed to those of nearby Maryland and Virginia. There was further, in the unsolicited advice, a sort of veiled threat that unless new Members partook of the residential opportunities in the District they would be negligent in pursuing their constitutional duties.

In response, Mr. Speaker, I labeled this advice as poppycock, which is what it was. No constitutional provision sets forth residential requirements for any Member of Congress in the Washington area. I also used the opportunity to point out the safety, freedom, progress, and future of suburbia, and urged new Members not to overlook these areas where a child can walk to school unmolested and a housewife shop in reasonable security.

On the heels of my response, the editorial writers of our Washington dailies in nauseating repetition attacked me by charging that my interest was purely financial because a few members of my family own real estate businesses in the northern Virginia suburban district I represent.

The point I made, and they ignored, Mr. Speaker, is that the District of Columbia as it is presently being run is unsafe for civilized Americans, and it will remain so until drastic changes are made, which the Congress should make with the greatest of haste.

I now note, Mr. Speaker, that a young woman living in the District, named Anne Chamberlin, in an article appearing in the Washington Post, of all newspapers, entitled "Reflections on Life in the City," used her personal story of mugging and death as a rapier and scalpel to dissect the fear and nonsense allowed on the streets and highways of the District of Columbia.

I commend Miss Chamberlin's article, Mr. Speaker, not only to the new Members of Congress for thoughtful consideration, but also to the editorial writers of our daily newspapers whose heads have too long been buried beneath the muck and misery their blindness to fact has helped create in the Nation's Capital.

She was on the street, Mr. Speaker, where the action is, and where the edi-

torial writers avoid the heroic stance they often assume in the security of their think tanks.

The article reads as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON LIFE IN THE CITY

(By Anne Chamberlin)

(NOTE.—This article represents the personal viewpoint of Miss Chamberlin, a Washington-based writer for the late Saturday Evening Post. The editors of Style welcome contributions to "Point of View.")

I was reflecting the other evening, as I scraped the pavement out of my left kneecap, took inventory of my bruises and reassembled my groceries, that you newcomers moving to Washington this January have a lot more to consider in selecting a place to live than they did, say, the year Mr. Nixon didn't quite make it.

I should perhaps explain that my knee got scraped when I was thrown to the ground by four teen-age toughs who had followed me home from the market. The bruise above my mouth was from the heavy glove which had stifled my cries for help. My coat pocket was torn loose by their hasty search for my wallet. My dinner was trampled as they made their escape. It happened at 7:15 in the evening.

Half running, aware they were behind me, I had gotten half way down the driveway of my own apartment building, 10 yards from the lobby, the switchboard, the closed-circuit TV security system, and about 15 feet from a police patrol car. So it wasn't as if they had all day.

But I really only wanted to make the point that a newcomer here used to choose his neighborhood for touchingly Old World reasons—schools, trees, gardens, lawns, neighbors. These days, you choose according to your taste in crime. (During the election campaign they tried to downgrade our crime standing to somewhere between Montgomery, Alabama, and Leopoldville in the Congo. But now that we can get back to telling it like it is, if they don't move us back to the top three, we should demand a recount.)

I have a friend, for example, who is passionately devoted to the Cleveland Park area. She has had four break-ins. She has awakened in the night to see a pair of hands prying apart the bars on her bedroom window. She has seen an arm reach in and remove her purse from her desk in the living room. She just asks the management to keep installing thicker bars. She is now happily ensconced in a sort of tastefully upholstered tank trap, and as she keeps telling me, she gets home in one piece with her groceries.

A lot of people will try to tell you Chevy Chase is where the action is. At least you won't have to plan any after-dinner entertainment. At a small party there a few Saturdays ago the front door burst open and the next thing everybody knew they'd been separated from their money and jewels, the men had been bound, gagged and stacked in the living room, while one wife was escorted upstairs and raped. Neighbors were home and awake, lights blazing all over the block, but when the "entertainers" had finished their act, so to speak, they faded into the night unimpeded.

Georgetown, of course, is still full of charm, and I lived there myself for years. But even I could kick open the delightful French doors that gave access to and from the garden, which backed onto a dark alley. And I got tired of the nightly ritual, before going out to dinner or upstairs to bed, of preparing the place to be ransacked. The purse open and conveniently placed by a lighted lamp, the jewelry spread out on the bureau, the antique Korean chest unlocked, so it wouldn't be necessary to have at it with an axe to discover it was full of nothing but old tablecloths. It always reminded me of those snacks we used to leave out for Santa Claus on Christmas Eve when we were children.

In the New Southwest, where I now live, I inhabit a cement box. It would take a block and tackle and pitons to climb to my windows and I've added a police-approved drop-bolt second lock to the door. The management requires a key, but I have to assume they aren't passing out samples in the neighborhood. As the new Prime Minister of Canada says, "You've got to believe somebody."

There's just the matter of shopping. They run a pretty taut ship at Peoples Drug, where there are often two cops with guns patrolling the candy counter and a squad car outside with the motor running. But for the younger set, not big enough for wallet-snatching, the Safeway is a razzle-dazzle year-round smorgasbord party. The first course is usually fruit—a few grapes here, an apple, orange or banana there. At this season it's pomegranates. Around the store it's sip and munch as you go. Pit, skin, pith, core, seeds or empty Pepsi cans get spat or tossed into the bins with the frozen broccoli. Sometimes the pomegranates fall apart sooner and land among the butter and eggs. One night when I was there a young man made off with eight steaks. When I visited my friend's Cleveland Park Safeway, she remarked, a little louder than I thought necessary, that it "must seem odd for a Southwester to bother with the checkout counter."

There is quite a selection of parks, by the way. Rock Creek, where the wife of a high State Department official was raped by three teen-agers as she was walking her dogs—at mid-morning, in plain view of Massachusetts Avenue—has retired the rape trophy. (The fourth member of the band obliged by holding her dogs. *Question de nuance.*) The Chesapeake and Ohio canal towpath, rescued from the bulldozers by Mr. Justice Douglas and his ragged band of nature lovers, is perfectly beautiful, especially in the spring and fall. A friend of mine was murdered there in broad daylight, within hailing distance of the Georgetown Esso Station.

You might want to consider your Police Precinct. Here again my friend in Cleveland Park is almost obnoxiously enthusiastic about Number 8. Having naturally seen quite a bit of them, she enjoys a very warm relationship, often inviting the investigating officers to stay for a cup of tea when they've finished taking notes. "The Captain says you have a very nice place here," one of them confided the last time around (TV set, clothes, typewriter.)

Along with the addresses of caterers and part-time butlers so vital to Washington social life, you will find your address book will soon include the names and direct telephone numbers of the detectives assigned to your various confrontations.

Your wife may want to reappraise her wardrobe. Every day on the Society pages, of course, you see pictures of our Beautiful People attired in minis, maxis and genuine Puccis. Although she was asked to go home and pile on more clothes, one of our social leaders actually *turned up* at the Smithsonian in a see-through. But in general it's better to strip down to go out than to dress up. Remove watch and rings. Conceal credit cards around house in case it's broken into while you're out. Wear an old pair of glasses. Your wife might as well wear heels. She couldn't outsprint these pursuers if she wore cleats. They're *motivated* and all she is is scared.

Self defense? There can't be any such thing. A friend once gave me a tear gas pen and when I drove alone to parties at night I carried it in my purse. But I was in such constant terror that I'd inadvertently empty some movie theatre or pollute the mousse at the French Embassy, that I finally had to give it up. It seems to me that if you carry a gun, at the speed of the usual scenario you'll be lucky if all you do is shoot yourself in the foot.

Unless you want the police to think you're a boob, you should start training yourself to remember what the man with his foot on your windpipe *looks* like. This requires as much mental discipline as Black Belt Judo—which it would be a good idea to take up, by the way. The unschooled mind focuses on useless irrelevancies, like survival, which is no help to the police. In vain have I studied the etiquette for these occasions. When my turn came I *fought* for my wallet. I had the absurd conviction that it was *my money.* My mother gave me the wallet last Christmas and, idiotically I even wanted to hang onto *that.*

The policeman knew the trails across the No-Man's Land between the lighted highrises and the dark brick shanties with the broken bottles and beer cans in the yard like the inside of his pocket. It was horribly dark and God-forsaken, and it seemed to me, as he spotted the foursome crossing a vacant lot, stopped the car and got out, that we were edging into a bad Clint Eastwood movie, and I wished I hadn't offered to come along.

"I want to talk to you fellas," he said, as he got out. I don't remember that his hand even brushed his gun. But it was an understood quantity.

They didn't answer. But they moved closer to the car, slowly raised their hands, and leaned forward against it, their chins on the roof, while he ran his hands down their sides. I gathered they'd had this conversation before.

I'd *seen* it before myself. Once outside a Safeway on P Street (that one of my friends affectionately calls The Addicts' Safeway.) Once outside the National Gallery. It's one of our ceremonial sights in Washington, our local *lingua franca,* like the mating dance of Australian bower birds.

I suspect now that they *were* the ones. But in the searchlight they looked smaller, even vulnerable. I had to confess I wasn't sure, and he sent them on their way.

"I'm sorry this happened to you," he said, closing his black notebook back in the brightly lighted lobby. "It's a horribly upsetting thing." He seemed very young and it was a thought I was surprised he'd had time for.

"If you'd been five seconds sooner . . ."

"If I'd seen them," he said, "I'd have shot them."

I've tried to stay on the right side of this argument, and on the wrong side of Mayor Daley. And my Due Process speech was out before you could say Gideon v. Florida. But to be honest, I was only being polite. The thought of that foursome lying in traction in D.C. General didn't bother me one bit.

That's the problem, you will find. Principles so nobly held as abstractions seem to evaporate in the crunch.

I remember, at my friend's funeral, the difficulty I had in digesting the comfort offered by the man who brought God's Word to us across her casket:

We must pray for the poor man who murdered her.

The message seemed to imply that it was somehow *her* fault for being alive, talented, beautiful and vaguely apart. You might call it class. She got her breaks by *birth.* Now give the Little Fellow his chance.

The same unspoken thread seemed to underlie the defense of the man accused. "This little man," his lawyer kept calling him. His circumstances were punishment enough. Society should not inflict any more. The argument, I was later told, broke along those lines in the Jury Room. He was acquitted.

So, if you run into trouble with your responses, you're not the only one. It will take a lot more practice for all of us before we learn to serve gracefully as vehicles for self-expression in a language that is so unfamiliar to us.

Well, I didn't mean to ramble. I only meant to say Welcome to your new neighborhood, wherever it is. And Lots of Luck.

THE DYING LAKE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another frightening warning of what man is doing to his environment. This last of many warnings appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, February 10, entitled "The Dying Lake." That grim and heart-rending article points out that some biologists find pollution of Lake Erie growing out of control.

The article follows:

THE DYING LAKE: SOME BIOLOGISTS FIND POLLUTION OF LAKE ERIE GROWING OUT OF CONTROL—INDUSTRIAL WASTES, SEWAGE CAUSE HUGE ALGAE PILES, DESTROY FISH AND BIRDS—STRANGE TASTE IN THE WATER

(By Kenneth G. Slocum)

CLEVELAND.—The oil-slicked Cuyahoga River, which oozes its way through this city to Lake Erie, catches fire periodically, earning it the dubious title of "the only body of water ever classified as a fire hazard."

The bacteria count of the chocolate-brown river water, which bubbles like a witch's brew because of fermenting gases on the bottom, often matches that of pure sewage. The river's mouth, once a wonderful spot to catch black bass, now is so contaminated that surprised scientists have found it doesn't even contain sludgeworms, which thrive on waste. Moreover, most local folks agree, the Cuyahoga stinks.

The Cuyahoga and dozens of other polluted Lake Erie tributaries are the focus of a historic and stormy struggle to save the fourth largest of the Great Lakes from becoming useless to man.

"Lake Erie represents the first large-scale warning that we are in danger of destroying the habitability of the earth," says Barry Commoner, a Washington University biologist and critic of current efforts to curb Erie pollution. "Mankind is in an evironmental crisis, and Lake Erie constitutes the biggest warning."

A "BIOLOGICAL EXPLOSION"

Not all pollution experts will go that far, but there is general agreement on one thing: In little more than 50 years, man has wrought on the world's 12th largest lake a startling ecological change. And, biologists agree, the lake may be on the verge of a "biological explosion." They also agree, however, that there's still a lot they don't know about Lake Erie. "We're only now beginning to understand the lake," says one biologist.

Experts figure the 9,940-square-mile lake, gouged out by glaciers 12,000 years ago, has been artificially "aged" 15,000 years in the past half century. The obvious by-products of pollution and aging abound. For 40 miles along the Cleveland area, Lake Erie waters, contaminated with slugs of raw sewage, human excrement, oil and chemicals, are generally unfit for swimming.

Algae, organisms invisible to the eye in a healthy lake, litter the Erie shoreline in long, rotting piles, clog city water intakes and add objectionable taste to many communities' drinking water. During summer, the algae collect in the western basin in an 800-square-mile mass two feet thick, turning the lake into a solution resembling pea soup.

KILLING FISH AND DUCKS

Pollution also has killed most of the lake's commercial and game fish, such as Northern Pike, Blue Pike, sturgeon and cisco. Now the lake is populated by scavenger varieties, such as suckers and carp, which have little commercial value. In addition, the pollution is a significant factor in the sharp decline of wild ducks on Lake Erie and its tributaries. On the Detroit River, where in 1899 ducks were so plentiful one hunting club bagged 122 in a single hour, 10,000 ducks were destroyed by oil pollution in 1960 and huge numbers shared similar fates each year since then, according to Federal wildlife experts.

The chemical interaction that has led to this massive devastation of Lake Erie was little understood until recently. Scientific information on lake ecology generally is at least 50 years behind that of rivers, according to one expert. And even now some aspects, particularly the effectiveness of recommended cures for Lake Erie, are controversial to say the least.

In the main, according to a five-year, $3 million Federal study recently completed, Lake Erie is choking to death on city sewage, although scientists prefer to call it over-enrichment or eutrophication. By far the biggest polluter, the study found, is the Detroit area, which contributes more troublesome municipal waste to Erie than all other U.S. cities combined. (Michigan denounces the study and is demanding sections referring to it be withdrawn.) The Cleveland-Cuyahoga River Basin ranked second. The lake is bounded by Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania and Canada.

PIPING IN RAW SEWAGE

One obvious source of the pollution is raw, untreated sewage, piped into the lake as a result of inadequate or faulty sewer systems. For the last half of 1968 in Cleveland, for instance, a main sewer line was under repair and during that time up to 30 million gallons of raw sewage daily was channeled into the Cuyahoga River. The same situation prevailed for six months in 1967 while the line was down for repair. All told, the same line in Cleveland, whose residents recently voted $100 million to upgrade its antiquated sewer system, has had major breaks in each of the past four years.

Vast amounts of raw sewage also are channeled to the lake by combined storm-sanitary sewer systems, which during rains divert sewage through overflows. "Probably no city in the country has so many overflows, and each one is a source of pollution," states a recent city-financed study of the Cleveland sewer system.

For decades, pollution experts assumed such raw sewage was primarily responsible for lake pollution and ecological damage. As the organic material is broken down by bacteria, it uses up the water's oxygen, killing small and beneficial forms of animal life and even fish themselves.

But of late investigators have found that even greater devastation to the lake results from sewage plants, which had been considered modern and adequate. After treatment to remove indigestible solids and to break down organic material, sewage is discharged as about 85% inorganic products, particularly nitrate and phosphate. These consume no oxygen, and it was long assumed they were swept harmlessly on to eventually reach the sea.

Now the scientists believe that most of this phosphate and nitrate remains in the lake, where it fertilizes monstrous growths of algae, which bloom and quickly die. Although the phosphate and nitrate don't consume oxygen, the algae do use up enormous supplies of it. Total oxygen demand on Lake Erie from algae is placed at 18 times that of organic material from sewage plants.

As a result, nearly 25% of the bottom of Lake Erie is almost completely devoid of oxygen in certain periods, a situation that wreaks havoc on the ecology. Such life as nymphs of may flies, a choice food for such popular fish as bass and long considered the most common animal in Lake Erie, no longer exists in huge areas of the lake. Instead, sludgeworms abound at up to 30,000 per square yard. Similarly, fish that require high oxygen content, including pike, have been largely replaced by those requiring less, such as suckers and carp.

Worse, say biologists, the lake may be on the verge of a "biological cataclysm," involving sudden release of pollutants collected for a century in Lake Erie's bottom mud, which ranges from 30 to 125 feet thick. The result would be depletion of most Lake Erie oxygen, which could have an enormous additional impact on lake life. Even use of the lake as drinking water—it currently is used by some 11 million people—could be threatened, the biologists maintain.

THE FUSE ON THE BOTTOM

The fuse of this biological bomb, scientists contend, is a thin skin of ferric iron overlaying the mud bottom of Lake Erie. With ample oxygen, ferric iron forms hard insoluble complexes with materials on the bottom, sealing off the deposits from the water above. But with depletion of oxygen ferric iron can become soluble, and materials in the mud then can dissolve in the water above. The release of enormous quantities of these materials, ranging from nutrients such as nitrate and phosphate to insecticides and industrial chemicals, has already begun, according to some experts.

Municipal waste, although Lake Erie's biggest problem, is not the only one. An industr'al complex ranging from Detroit's auto plants and Cleveland's steel mills to Erie, Pa., paper operations and Akron rubber plants, constitutes the second biggest source of pollution. An estimated 11 million pounds of chlorides and undetermined amounts of cyanide, acids, oil and similar industrial pollutants are dumped into the lake every 24 hours.

The exact impact of these, particularly on reproduction of fish and birds, isn't known But pollution experts say the danger is growing.

Despite the awesome proportions of the problem, many pollution experts are confident Lake Erie can be salvaged. "There's no question but that the lake can be saved, but I don't know that it will be," contends George Harlow, director of the Lake Erie office of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. "We can't fool around any longer."

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

The key to saving the lake, pollution experts figure, is removal from waste of most phosphorus "because it is the one essential nutrient for which control measures are best known." Some 137,000 pounds of phosphorus are dumped into the lake daily, with 72% of that stemming from municipal waste, studies show. About two-thirds of the phosphorus in city waste stems from detergents.

To remove phosphorus and cut down on untreated sewage, chemicals and other pollutants, the Federal Government is recommending immediate expenditures of $1.1 billion by cities and $285 million by industry.

But at least one biologist contends Lake Erie probably won't be saved even if all the steps recommended by the Federal Government are carefully followed.

"The idea of cleaning up Lake Erie by cutting back phosphates won't work," declares Mr. Commoner. "Nitrate levels also are serious." He adds further, "The job can't be done until we come to grips with the stuff on the bottom. To clean up Lake Erie may require the dimensions of the space program, and in the end it may even be irreversible."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last year we joined with our warm friends of Lithuanian extraction in celebrating the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On yesterday, 51 years have elapsed since the day when these proud freedom-loving people gained their first taste of liberty after five generations of enslavement.

The free world rejoiced at this historic event. Messages of congratulations came from heads of state throughout the world. Men who covet liberty and enjoy freedom were gratified indeed that one more great nation had achieved independence and sovereignty. The oppressive bonds of Russia and Germany had been severed—Lithuania was free and its hardy people could now select their own leaders, speak openly on issues without fear of the sinister acts of the secret police, and worship where and as they chose.

The full meaning of that historic day was shared by hundreds of thousands of Americans—the relatives and friends of the Lithuanian people and the Americans who had long worked with and admired the qualities of our loyal Lithuanian-American neighbors.

These same Americans who shared in the joy of the long overdue independence were not only shocked and saddened at the sudden loss of this cherished freedom but were appalled at the illegal and inhuman acts of the Soviet Union against Lithuania and her sister Baltic States in the chaotic days which followed the Axis surrender ending World War II.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation can be proud of the fact that we have never recognized the Soviet grab of the Baltic States. We can be proud that we continue to accredit the governments in exile as the official representative of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian people. But, Mr. Speaker, this Nation should hang its head in shame because for the past 28 years we have put forth only meager and futile efforts to restore freedom to our trusted friends.

It is true that we have protested, we have resolved publicly and we have proclaimed officially our continued opposition to the unwarranted takeover of these sovereign states by the Red Communists, but we have done all too little to enlist the support of the rest of the free world to join us in applying various *sanctions* against Russia and her Communist stooges.

It is my deepest hope that during this 51st year of Lithuania's independence we may take positive steps to restore freedom to our enslaved friends. This we can do by supporting the splendid works of the loyal Lithuania-American organizations and the Assembly of Captive Nations; this we can do by forcing the Soviet Union to defend its gangster acts before a tribunal of the United Nations; and this we can do by taking both independent as well as joint action with other powers in applying telling sanctions against the U.S.S.R.

I am proud to assure my Lithuanian-American friends, both here and in their homeland, that I shall dedicate my efforts to obtaining positive action which will once again permit the sons and daughters of Lithuania to regain their long-sought independence and to have restored their rights and blessings of a sovereign nation.

I am certain that many of my colleagues will join me in these assurances to all Americans who glory in their Lithuanian extraction and heritage. This is the least we can do for an outstanding segment of our society that has demonstrated by hard work, by meticulous law observance and by wholehearted support of our domestic and foreign programs their earned rights as true American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I commend all of them and congratulate them on their achievements. May our help give them courage to intensify their efforts in achieving freedom for their loved ones.

THE FREEDOM LAND

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, Metropolitan Opera Singer George London, who recently was appointed musical administrator of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, suggests that Congress commission a leading poet to write new words to the tune of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

A constituent, Glorietta I. King, of St. Charles, Mo., has written the following lyrics to that tune:

THE FREEDOM LAND

(By Glorietta I. King)

1

America, the beauty, lies between two mighty seas
Propagated by the heirs of Israel's decrees
Molded into glory by the brave and loyal men
Who signed with freedom's pen.

CHORUS

Glory to our mighty Nation,
Praise the God of our salvation,
Honor Him with high elation
For freedom's promised land:

2

America was bought with blood of war for free men's cause,
Established on foundations made from God's own basic laws
Forests, rivers, mountains, deserts, plains beyond compare,
Are here for free men's care.

3

This land became a haven for unhappy refugees;
The poor and wretched from the countries out beyond the seas
Were melted with a fervor in the great refiner's flame
To bring our country fame.

NATIONAL DEBT INCREASE—AGAIN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago Congress was pressured by the then administration-in-power to raise the national debt ceiling to an historic record high of $365 billion.

Last week Congress and the Federal judges were given a pay raise. Then, Treasury Secretary, David M. Kennedy, announces he will request the debt ceiling be hiked by $10 to $12 billion.

Now the President is urged to continue the 10 percent surtax—a tax on the duty to pay taxes.

The American people have been told that there was little difference in the two major national parties—not a dime's worth of difference. This may refresh their memories.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of runaway inflation and endless government spending, our people cannot afford to increase the debt any further.

Today, the American taxpayer is being taxed as never before in the history of our Republic. We must exert leadership for commonsense fiscal sanity. We cannot continue to escalate taxes in excessive percentages without expecting a tax backlash from the people who rightfully should demand that the Federal Government get off the merry-go-round.

Mr. Speaker, I include news clippings from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star for February 12 and 13, 1969, on these subjects following my remarks:

PERMANENT 10 PERCENT SURTAX IS URGED: PROPOSAL TO AID STATES IS MADE BY ROCKEFELLER

(By Garnett D. Horner)

New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller proposed to President Nixon and his Urban Affairs Council today that the 10 percent federal income tax surcharge be made permanent as a national tax for the support of state and local governments, particularly for education.

He also proposed using 25 percent of the cumulative growth of federal revenues to finance national standards for welfare and to take over the full cost of welfare programs, now shared by the states.

THIRTY BILLION DOLLARS IN 4 YEARS

Rockefeller estimated that these two programs would give the states and cities about $6.5 billion in the first year, growing to $30 billion in four years.

And Rockefeller proposed a government-sponsored compulsory health insurance program. This, he said, would provide a "first line of defense against costs of illness."

Nixon acted as chairman of the Urban Affairs Council at the start of a session at the White House in which Rockefeller submitted his suggestions for a major redistribution of tax revenues.

Nixon moved on 35 minutes later to preside at a meeting of his National Security Council, in session at the same time, leaving Vice President Spiro T. Agnew presiding for the remainder of the urban affairs meeting.

At noontime, Nixon laid a wreath at the Lincoln Memorial during brief ceremonies marking the 160th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth today.

The President, obviously cheerful and without a topcoat despite cold winds, paused only twice during the noon commemoration.

Once he placed the wreath in position in front of the massive statue of Lincoln, and later traded pleasantries and handshakes with persons in the crowd of 400 on hand for the ceremonies.

The Nixon appearance was the high point of the traditional marking of the day. Since 1923 every president except John F. Kennedy has attended such an event, which today included a military band, honor guard and the massed flags of all 50 states. The Gettysburg Address was read by Sen. Charles McC. Mathias, R-Md.

FINCH IS OPPOSED

After the urban affairs meeting, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert Finch, a member of the council, noted that he and Nixon have advocated national minimum standards for welfare, but took a dim view of Rockefeller's other proposals.

Asked about Rockefeller's suggestion that the government take over the full cost of the welfare program, Finch said that to keep HEW from becoming a "department of the dole" he thought there should be a kind of balance between its activities in health, education and welfare—leaving the states their share of responsibility in all these fields.

On the Rockefeller proposal to make the surtax permanent as a means of financing more school aid to the states, Finch said he doubted if it would be good strategy to try to earmark revenue from the surcharge for a particular purpose in arguing for its extension in Congress. He said he thought the funds needed for education could be provided otherwise.

Rockefeller argued at the urban affairs meeting that state and local spending to meet human needs has been rising much more rapidly than federal spending for domestic purposes, although the federal government collects two-thirds of all tax revenue.

He said the remaining one-third of tax revenues collected by state and local governments are inadequate to meet such needs as rising costs of primary and secondary school education and to reduce welfare inequities.

Under Rockefeller's proposal, the federal government would turn over 25 percent of the 10 percent income tax surcharge yield to the states in the first year, adding 25 percent each year until all this revenue was going to the states in the fourth year.

Rockefeller estimated that at the end of four years the surcharge would yield $14 billion, and the earmarking 25 percent of other federal revenues for welfare would provide another $16.75 billion—a total of $30.75 billion a year after four years.

He urged that such aid be distributed in "block" grants, consolidating present categorical grants-in-aid.

As alternative to such block grants, he suggested that the federal aid funds be given to the states on a per capita basis.

Urging the establishment of federal standards for welfare payments across the nation—long an Agnew proposal—Rockefeller proposed that over a 4-year period the federal government take over the complete cost of welfare using 25 percent of the growth in federal revenues apart from the income tax surcharge to finance it.

He also urged a national contributor health insurance system as a first line of defense against rising health costs.

BID TO LIFT DEBT LIMIT BY $10 BILLION SLATED

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The Nixon administration soon will ask Congress to raise the $365 billion federal debt ceiling by about $10 billion or $12 billion, informed sources said today.

They said it will be difficult to obtain the increase over stiff opposition by congressional economizers in both parties.

Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy announced in a speech last night that the administration will request an increase, but offered no details.

An "immediate" increase will be needed to get past seasonal squeezes just before the big tax collections in mid-March and mid-April, he said in a speech to a Lincoln Day dinner in Dallas.

In addition to this temporary relief, he said, the ceiling must be raised to accommodate the debt in fiscal 1970, the year starting next July 1.

Debt ceiling legislation always provokes congressional battles, and the fight may be rougher than usual this year.

Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, was assured by Treasury technicians last June that no increase in the ceiling would be needed in fiscal 1969 if Congress enacted the income surtax and expenditure ceiling, which it did.

Relying on these assurances, Mills said in a House speech that the debt ceiling issue would NOT plague Congress again in fiscal 1969.

Administration officials realize that Mills, whose committee handles debt legislation, hates to back down from public commitments. They expect to have a hard time persuading him that legislation is needed now, especially since revenue collections are running higher than expected.

The usual political problems are aggravated by the shift to a Republican administration.

House Republicans have opposed debt ceiling increases by big margins in the past, leaving it up to the Democrats to pass the legislation.

Unless the Nixon administration can switch a lot of Republican votes, congressional Democrats said, the debt ceiling increase will be in trouble.

With a Republican in the White House, they said, it is not realistic to expect the Democrats to bail him out.

Analysts said the Treasury might be able to squeak through March within the present debt limit, and an increase of only about $1 billion probably would be adequate for April—barring bad breaks.

The debt will decline seasonally after mid-April, so no insoluble problems would be expected even if the limit dropped to $358 billion for one day on June 30, as provided by existing law.

But the debt will rise seasonally next fall and winter. Rather than going back to Congress again to deal with this problem, the administration is expected to request a high enough debt ceiling in the next few weeks to take care of fiscal 1970, too.

Assuming no big changes in the Johnson administration's forecast of small budget surpluses in fiscal 1969 and 1970, analysts estimated, the Treasury will need an increase of about $10 billion or $12 billion in the debt ceiling.

The debt subject to the $365 billion ceiling totaled $362.9 billion Feb. 7, the latest date for which figures are available.

Even with the projected budget surpluses of $2.4 billion in fiscal 1969 and $3.4 billion in fiscal 1970, the debt will rise from time to time because of seasonal fluctuations in spending and tax collections.

Another reason for debt ceiling problems even when the budget has a surplus is the need for the Social Security and other government trust funds to invest their spare cash. The Treasury must issue securities, which count in the debt, to provide the trust funds with investment vehicles.

One way to avoid this problem would be to apply the debt ceiling only to debt held by the public, excluding the $90 billion to $100 billion of debt held by the trust funds.

Although the Treasury has considered this approach, informed sources said they doubt the administration will try this time to sell the idea to Congress.

NEW INITIATIVES TOWARD CHINA NEEDED

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week in my weekly radio, television, and newspaper report to the people of my district I urged that the Nixon administration undertake new initiatives to break the political deadlock between the United States and China. In my remarks I urged, as a logical first step, that the President appoint a special ambassador to conduct the Warsaw talks on February 20 with the Chinese Communists. I also urged that the embargo on trade with China be lifted so that trade with her will be on the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union. I believe we should offer to exchange scientific, cultural, and economic delegations with China; study the possibilities of aviation links with China; and indicate our willingness to permit the establishment of a Chinese news agency office in the United States. To facilitate contact and trade, the United States should offer to establish a trading mission in China or consular relations, as other countries have done.

The seizure of three yachts last weekend by the Chinese near Hong Kong illustrates the need for better communication.

Mr. Speaker, I place the full text of my report in my remarks at this point:

WEEKLY RADIO, TV, AND NEWSPAPER REPORT TO PEOPLE OF THE 20TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

(By Representative PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois)

A new United States "open door" policy to China is needed to replace the present unsuccessful one. Any discussion of our difficult relations with China must begin with the realization that China is a nation older than history and determined to be independent. Her people, the most numerous on earth, have the capacity for patience, labor, and industry which for three millennia has compensated for China's lack of collective method and cohesion. The result has been a very special civilization which has affected our own development.

China is a tremendous country, geographically compact, extending from Asia Minor and the steppes of Europe to the long shoreline of the Pacific, and from the ice of the north to the tropical regions of India and the Gulf of Tonkin. For a thousand years instinctively inward looking and scornful of foreigners, but conscious and proud of her ancient traditions, she has striven to master internal problems. So ancient is China that she among all nations has earned the one ascription "eternal".

Since the Communists came to power in the "gates of heavenly peace" in Peking an enormous effort has been required for the exploitation of natural resources, industrial development, agricultural production, national education, and the struggle against the scourges inherent in China—hunger, pestilence, erosion, and floods. As has always been the case in the Communist system, what was achieved involved terrible suffering among the people, implacable constraint for the masses, tremendous losses and waste of property, and the collapse of countless human values. Notwithstanding all of this and the throes of her most recent cultural revolution, China has achieved a centralized government which for the first time in eight

hundred years exercises effective, albeit ruthless control over the mainland.

Originally we in the United States perceived China as a satellite of the Soviet Union. But the illusion has been dispelled. Doubtless there are certain doctrinal solidarities and common interests between Moscow and Peking. Yet aside from this there is an inevitable difference in national policies. The vast frontier between the two states is the longest that exists in the world. Russia's interest is to conserve and maintain that status and China's is to grow and to acquire. Thus their interests are diametrically opposed.

The United States sought originally to isolate and contain China. She has been contained but she is not isolated. President Nixon himself said in his inaugural speech that the United States seeks to isolate no nation; indeed we cannot isolate a nation such as China. In the years since the Communists came to control the mainland an increasing number of states have given diplomatic recognition to Communist China. When Canada and Italy have followed through on their announced plans to establish relations with Peking, a majority of our NATO allies will have established formal diplomatic relations and already the majority of our SEATO allies have done so. Today two-thirds of China's total trade is with the western countries, compared with only one-third a few years ago.

There is no political settlement notably with regard to Cambodia, Korea, Laos, Vietnam, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, or Japan which does not concern or affect China. There is neither a war nor a peace imaginable on the whole Asian continent without China being involved in it. Considering all this the United States must be able to listen to China directly and also make ourselves heard.

It would seem to me that the advantages to the United States in improving relations with China are obvious. The relative permanency of the Communist control of the mainland, the deep divisions and effects of the Sino-Soviet split, the growing military power of China, the normalization of relations with China by our European allies, the likely departure from leadership of Chairman Mao and perhaps other present leaders during the next four to eight years—all make this the appropriate time to institute a series of steps which would improve relations. In a recent meeting with Dr. Henry Kissinger, Special Assistant to the President for National Security, and in a memorandum to the Secretary of State I have urged this series of steps to improve political relations with China. For political reasons full diplomatic relations may be neither prudent nor possible at this time.

However, in the meantime other means may accomplish much of what we hope would result from full diplomatic relations. The legal tangle over the implications of diplomatic relations, our relationship with Formosa, and the U.N. seating for China might be so acrimonious and embarrassing as to defeat or reduce largely the hoped-for benefits for taking the move in the first place.

Between these extremes of no relations with China or full normalization of relations lies a prudent course consisting of several small steps—a course which would not force a showdown over the larger controversial issues, but nevertheless measures which taken together would open the door to China.

These steps would serve to encourage moderate elements in the Chinese leadership. They would remind the Soviets that American policy towards China is independent and does not exist to serve Moscow's interests. Hopefully these steps would lead to settlement of smaller outstanding differences including the release of American prisoners, among which is Major Phillip Smith of Roodhouse.

Key elements of the policy should be that the United States:

1. Aims ultimately at normalization of relations with China.

2. Has no military designs, direct or indirect, on the mainland of China. We stand by our commitment to defend Formosa and the off shore islands, but do not intend to provoke war with China and have no intention of supporting or countenancing military action against the mainland.

3. Rejects the idea of an unending or protracted conflict with China. We believe our differences can ultimately be resolved.

4. Wishes to communicate with China. We are respectful of legitimate Chinese complaints and understand—even though we cannot always support—Chinese views on certain matters.

5. Will not join with the Soviet Union in attempting in any way to "gang up" on China.

6. Will keep policies towards China always open to review and modification as changed circumstances justify.

In order to implement a policy which would be built around the above elements, I feel that the President of the United States by Executive Order should remove the complete embargo on trade with China, and the trade with China should be placed on the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union. As a minimum, the United States should permit the sale of grain and other foodstuffs to the Chinese. It makes little sense to deny American farmers a market of 700 million Chinese when our allies including Canada and Australia are selling agricultural products there.

China is potentially a great customer of U.S. food products. As a nation we look foolish acting as if China does not exist while at the same time selling wheat and generally seeking a detente with the Soviet Union, a nation which possesses a far greater and more immediate threat to our security. Trade arrangements could be facilitated by proposing the opening of a trade mission or consul in China. This would give the United States a political and economic presence in China such as Italy and Lebanon have. Indeed Germany is now considering such an arrangement with China. Consular relations between the United States and China would enable each nation to communicate on an informal basis while temporarily avoiding the more complicated question of formal diplomatic recognition. This is so because consular relations do not imply diplomatic recognition.

On February 20 the United States will hold its first meeting with the Chinese in Warsaw, Poland in thirteen months. In order to upgrade the level of the talks, I proposed to the President and the Secretary of State that the United States should designate a special ambassador with expertise in Chinese matters to conduct our side of the Warsaw talks. This individual should be a person other than the ambassador to Poland who of course is primarily responsible on U.S.-Polish matters. The talks in Warsaw are now more than ten years old. They have become formalistic and have none of the give-and-take that is necessary for realistic diplomatic understanding. New initiatives are needed at Warsaw. I believe the selection of a person with ambassadorial rank for the express purpose of conducting negotiations would show the significance we place on talks with the Chinese. It would be worthwhile even if it meant flying this ambassador to Warsaw for each meeting. In the event this would be inconvenient, consideration could be given to moving the site of the talks back to Geneva where they were held originally or perhaps to London or Paris where special U.S. Ambassadors could be permanently stationed.

Other steps can be undertaken to improve relations. The exchange of scientific, cultural, and economic delegations is possible. There may be American air carriers who are interested in air links with China because of the growing passenger service between China and Indonesia, Japan, and other points in the Far East. The Chinese government could be informed that the United States is willing to permit the establishment of a New China News Agency Office in the United States.

These steps, taken together, would constitute a policy change on the part of the United States of sufficient substance and breadth to test the interest of China in a new, more moderate policy. At best, these actions would lead in time to a new Open Door policy towards China with normal communication between the two countries.

At worst, if China made no reciprocal moves and rejected each opportunity for cooperation, our initiatives would nevertheless enhance our prestige in the eyes of the world and encourage moderate elements in China to work and hope for better days. We cannot of course nurse illusions in this regard. Nor by undertaking these steps do I mean to express any approval of the political system which at present prevails in China.

In summary, perhaps the best argument for providing diplomatic relations and improved relations with China was that made by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on the occasion of Britain's formal recognition of China in 1950. He told the House of Commons, "We send an ambassador to Peking not to confer a favor, but to secure a convenience for His Majesty's government."

UKRAINE'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ACT OF UNION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by Americans of Ukrainian descent who assembled at Fitzgerald Auditorium in Warren, Mich., to commemorate the 51st anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Ukraine and the 50th anniversary of the Act of Union of the Ukrainian people:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE AND THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACT OF UNION, FEBRUARY 9, 1969

Whereas, January 22, 1969 marked the 51st Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukraine's Independence and the 50th Anniversary of the Act of Union; and

Whereas, the independence of Ukraine was proclaimed in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, on January 22, 1918 and the Act of Union took place a year later on January 22, 1919, also in Kiev; and

Whereas, young Ukrainian democratic republic was immediately recognized by a number of foreign governments, including that of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas, the Soviet Russia, almost simultaneously with recognition, began a large-scale invasion of Ukraine, which alone and unaided, succumbed to the superior forces of Communist Russia; and

Whereas, the freedom loving people of Ukraine have not accepted Soviet Russian domination and have been fighting for the re-establishment of their independence by all means at their disposal;

Now, therefore, we Americans of Ukrainian descent, from the State of Michigan resolve as follows:

1. To take into proper consideration heroic struggle of the Ukranian people who strongly

oppose enforced Russification, aiming at the cultural and linguistic genocide of the native population;

2. To assist by all possible methods the Ukrainian nation in their struggle for freedom and independence;

3. To support the political action of the United States Government in its struggle with Communism, particularly with Russian imperialistic Communism;

4. To give moral support to all of those Ukrainians, who presently are engaged in active struggle against Communist advances;

5. To request the United States Government and both legislative bodies to redouble their efforts in promoting and extending the application of the principles of human rights to the Ukrainian people, enslaved by Communist Russia, and to help the Ukrainian nation in achieving their freedom and self determination.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 9, 1969.*

THE GREAT AMERICAN FRUSTRATION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "The Great American Frustration," written by Archibald MacLeish, which appeared in the July 13, 1968, issue of the Saturday Review:

THE GREAT AMERICAN FRUSTRATION

(By Archibald MacLeish)

(NOTE.—This article is based on the first Milton Eisenhower Lecture, delivered by Mr. MacLeish at the Johns Hopkins University. *"The Wild Old Wicked Man" and Other Poems,* a collection of Mr. MacLeish's lyric poetry, will be published by Houghton Mifflin in September.)

That Americans have changed their nature since Andrew Jackson's day or Theodore Roosevelt's or even Harry Truman's is now taken as self-evident—at least among the Americans. No visiting European from Crévecoeur to Somerset Maugham would have reported us to the world in the terms in which we now report ourselves, nor would Charles Dickens, who liked us least and used almost every other derogatory term to describe us, have used the word we repeat most frequently today. Arrogant, perhaps. Self-confident and bumptious, certainly. But frustrated? If there was one people on earth incapable of frustration it was the people who inhabited the United States . . . a hundred years ago.

But not now. Not to us. Not in the newspapers or the television programs or the lecture circuits or anywhere else our national mania for prodding and poking at our national psyche indulges itself. For a time last winter the word frustration was almost as frequently seen and heard in those quarters as the word America itself, and when Robert Kennedy was shot in Los Angeles, though the talk was all of the "sickness of American society," it was still the American sense of frustration and helplessness which spoke. We have not only accepted our frustration, we have embraced it. To the young it seems somehow to explain what is otherwise inexplicable in the numb uneasiness with which they approach their lives. To the old it provides an alternative to the exhausting labor of struggling to comprehend an increasingly incomprehensible epoch.

But what the great frustration actually means is not so obvious. Most of us, questioned about it, would reply Vietnam, meaning one of two quite different things: either that the stupidity of our involvement in the war in Vietnam has shaken our confidence in our ability to manage our own affairs, or that our astonishing failure to win the war once we had involved ourselves has undermined our belief in our greatness as a world power. But is either reply correct? Would we believe in our greatness as a world power today if we had used our incontestable superiority in weapons to blast what Governor Reagan refers to as "a water buffalo economy" off the earth? Or would we now regain our political self-confidence if we were to repudiate the President, whoever he was, who involved us in Vietnam in the first place? I doubt it. I think any such washing of the hands would end where, indeed, it has already ended; in the realization that no one, whether Eisenhower or Kennedy or Johnson, can usefully be blamed for the events which led to our involvement in Vietnam because no one of them was really in control of those events. And that realization, far from curing our sense of frustration, would only deepen it.

Or, more precisely, it would show us what this frustration which we confess so readily really is. It is not, as we like to think, Vietnam. Not the sense of individual helplessness which plagues the citizens of a large country when they become aware of the blindness and ineptitude of their rulers, the stupidity of those in power. Not the impotent rage which follows the failure of events to conform to expectations, the failure of history to keep to the plot as written—the refusal of the water buffalo economy to collapse before the electronic power. Not the first mistake which committed us to the Asian war, or the last mistake which has left us in it, or anything else which has to do with Vietnam alone—which began in Vietnam and will end there. It is none of these things but something larger and more troubling: a numb, uniformed, persistent sense, like the hinting pinch of a pain which is not yet brutal hurt but will be that we, as Americans, we perhaps as members of our generation on this earth, have somehow lost control of the management of our human affairs, of the direction of our lives, of what our ancestors would have called our destiny.

It is a sense we have had in one form or another for a long time now, but not as an explicit, a formulated fear until we found ourselves deep in the present century with its faceless slaughters, its mindless violence, its fabulous triumphs over space and time and matter ending in terrors space and time and matter never held. Before that there were only hints and intimations, but they were felt, they were recorded where all the hints and intimations are recorded—in poems, fictions, works of art. From the beginning of what we used to call the industrial revolution—what we see today more clearly as a sort of technological coup d'état—men and women, particularly men and women of imaginative sensibility, have seen that something was happening to the human role in the shaping of civilization.

A curious automatism, human in origin but not human in action, seemed to be taking over. Cities were being built and rebuilt not with human purposes in mind but with technological means at hand. It was no longer the neighborhood which fixed the shape and limits of the town but the communications system, the power grid. Technology, our grandfathers said, "advanced" and it was literally true: it was technology which was beating the tambours, leading the march. Buildings crowded into the air not because their occupants had any particular desire to lift them there, but because the invention of electric elevators and new methods of steel and glass construction made these ziggurats possible and the possibility presented itself as economic compulsion.

Wildness and silence disappeared from the countryside, sweetness fell from the air, not because anyone wished them to vanish or fall but because throughways had to floor the meadows with cement to carry the automobiles which advancing technology produced first by the thousands and then by the thousand thousands. Tropical beaches turned into high-priced slums where thousand-room hotels elbowed each other for glimpses of once-famous surf not because those who loved the beaches wanted them there but because enormous jets could bring a million tourists every year—and therefore did.

The result, seen in a glimpse here, a perception there, was a gradual change in our attitude toward ourselves as men, toward the part we play as men in the direction of our lives. It was a confused change. We were proud—in England, and even more in America, raucously proud—of our technological achievements, but we were aware also, even from the beginning that these achievements were not altogether ours or, more precisely, not altogether ours to direct, to control—that the *process* had somehow taken over leaving the purpose to shift for itself so that we, the ostensible managers of the process, were merely its beneficiaries.

Not, of course, that we complained of that, at least in the beginning. A hundred years ago, with the rare exception of a Dickens or a Zola, we were amenable enough—amenable as children at a Christmas party. Inventions showered on our heads; steam engines and electric lights and telegraph messages and all the rest. We were up to our knees, to our necks, in Progress. And technology had made it all possible. Science was the giver of every good and perfect gift. If there were aspects of the new world which were not perfect—child labor for example—progress would take care of them. If the ugliness and filth and smoke of industrial cities offended us, we put up with them for the sake of the gas lights and the central heating. We were rich and growing richer.

But nevertheless the uneasiness remained and became more and more evident in our books, our paintings, our music—even the new directions of our medical sciences. Who were we in this strange new world? What part did we play in it? Someone had written a new equation somewhere, pushed the doors of ignorance back a little, entered the darkened room of knowledge by one more step. Someone else had found a way to make use of that new knowledge, put it to work. Our lives had changed but without our changing them, without our intending them to change. Improvements had appeared and we had accepted them. We had bought Mr. Ford's machines by the hundreds of thousands. We had ordered radios by the millions and then installed TVs. And now we took to the air, flew from city to city, from continent to continent, from climate to climate, following summer up and down the earth like birds. We were new men in a new life in a new world . . . but a world we had not made—had not, at least, intended to make.

And a new world, moreover, that we were increasingly unsure, as time went by, we would have wanted to make. We wanted its conveniences, yes. Its comforts, certainly. But the world as a world to live in? As a human world? It was already obvious by the beginning of this century that many of our artists and writers—those not so silent observers of the human world who sit in its windows and lurk in its doorways watching—were not precisely in love with the modern world, were, indeed, so little in love with it that they had turned against life itself, accepting absurdity and terror in its place and making of human hopelessness the only human hope. And there were other nearer, stranger witnesses. Before the century was two-thirds over numbers of our children—extraordinary numbers if you stop to think about it—were to reject, singly and secretly, or publicly in curious refugee encampments, the whole community of our

modern lives, and most particularly those aspects of our lives which were most modern: their conveniences, their comforts . . . their affluence.

It was inevitable under these circumstances that some sort of confrontation should occur between the old idea of man as the liver of his own life, the shaper of his own existence, and the new idea of world, the newly autonomous world—world autonomous in its economic laws, as the Marxists hoped, or autonomous in its scientific surge, its technological compulsions, as some in the West began to fear. And, of course, the confrontation did occur: first in rather fatuous academic ructions in which science and the humanities were made to quarrel with each other in the universities, and then, in 1945, at Hiroshima. What happened at Hiroshima was not only that a scientific breakthrough—"breakthrough" in the almost literal sense—had occurred and that a great part of the population of a city had been burned to death, but that the problem of the relation of the triumphs of modern science to the human purposes of man had been explicitly defined and the whole question of the role of humanity in the modern scientific age had been exposed in terms not even the most unthinking could evade.

Prior to Hiroshima it had still been possible—increasingly difficult but still possible—to believe that science was by nature a human tool obedient to human wishes and that the world science and its technology could create would therefore be a human world reflecting our human needs, our human purposes. After Hiroshima it was obvious that the loyalty of science was not to humanity but to truth—its own truth—and that the law of science was not the law of the good—what humanity thinks of as good, meaning moral, decent, humane—but the law of the possible. What it is possible for science to know science must know. What it is possible for technology to do technology will have done. If it is possible to split the atom, then the atom must be split. Regardless. Regardless of . . . anything.

There was a time, just after Hiroshima, when we tried—we in the United States, at least—to escape from that haunting problem by blaming the scientists as individuals: the scientists, in particular, who had made the bomb—the mysterious workers in the cellars at Stagg Field and the laboratories of the Manhattan Project. And the scientists themselves, curious as it now may seem, cooperated; many of them, many of the best, assuming, or attempting to assume, burdens of personal guilt or struggling, somehow, anyhow, to undo what had been done.

I remember—more vividly perhaps than anything else which happened to me in those years—a late winter evening after Hiroshima in a study at the Institute at Princeton—Einstein's study, I think—when Niels Bohr, who was as great a man as he was a physicist, walked up and down for hours beside the rattling radiators urging me to go to President Truman, whom I did not know, to remind him that there had been an understanding between Mr. Roosevelt and the scientists about the future neutralization of the bomb. I gussed that Bohr, even as he talked that evening, realized there was nothing Mr. Truman or anyone on earth could do to unknow what was known. And yet he walked up and down the freezing study talking. Things, of course, were "done"—attempted anyway. In the brief time when we alone possessed what was called "the secret," the American Government offered to share it with the world (the Baruch Plan) for peaceful exploitation. What we proposed, though we did not put it in these words, was that humanity as a whole should assert its control of science, or at least of this particular branch of science, nuclear physics, limiting its pursuit of possibility to possibilities which served mankind. But the Russians, with their faith in the dialectics of matter, demurred. They preferred to put their trust in things, and within a few short months their trust was justified: they had the bomb themselves.

The immediate effect in the United States was, of course, the soaring fear of Russia which fed the Cold War abroad and made the black plague of McCarthyism possible at home. But there was also a deeper and more enduring consequence. Our original American belief in our human capability, our human capacity to manage our affairs ourselves, "govern ourselves," faltered with our failure to control the greatest and most immediate of human dangers. We began to see science as a kind of absolute beyond our reach, beyond our understanding even, known, if it was known at all, through proxies who, like priests in other centuries, could not tell us what they knew.

In short, our belief in ourselves declined at the very moment when the Russian belief in the mechanics of the universe confirmed itself. No one talked any longer of a Baruch Plan, or even remembered that there had been one. The freedom of science to follow the laws of absolute possibility to whatever conclusions they might lead had been established, or so we thought, as the unchallengeable fixed assumption of our age, and the freedom of technology to invent whatever world it happened to invent was taken as the underlying law of modern life. It was enough for a manufacturer of automobiles to announce on TV that he had a better idea—any better idea: pop-open gas-tank covers or headlights that hide by day. No one thought any longer of asking whether his new idea matched a human purpose.

What was happening in those years, as the bitterly satirical fictions of the period never tired of pointing out, was that we were ceasing to think of ourselves as men, as self-governing men, as proudly self-governing makers of a new nation, and were becoming instead a society of consumers: recipients—grateful recipients—of the blessings of a technological civilization. We no longer talked in the old way of The American Proposition, either at home or abroad—particularly abroad. We talked instead of The American Way of Life. It never crossed our minds apparently—or if it did we turned our minds away—that a population of consumers, though it may constitute an affluent society, can never compose a nation in the great, the human, sense.

But the satirical novels, revealing as they were, missed the essential fact that we were becoming a population of consumers, an affluent society, not because we preferred to think of ourselves in this somewhat less than noble role but because we were no longer able to think of ourselves in that other role—the role our grandfathers had conceived for us two hundred years ago. We were not, and knew we were not, Whitman's Pioneers O Pioneers.

It is here, rather than in the floundering failures and futile disappointments of Vietnam, that this famous frustration of ours is rooted. Vietnam alone, disastrous as that whole experience has been, could never have have produced, in a confident and self-reliant people such as the Americans once were, a mood like the American mood of these past months. Not even the riots of last summer and this spring could have afflicted us as we are now afflicted if we had still believed that our principal business was the making of a nation, the government of ourselves. Indeed the riots are, if anything, the consequences, not the cause, of our self-doubt—or, more precisely, the consequence of the actual causes of that doubt. It is not without significance that the targets of the mobs in the burning streets are supermarkets and television outlets rather than the courthouses and city halls which would have drawn the mobs of earlier times. Courthouses and city halls stand—or stood once—for The American Proposition. Supermarkets and television outlets are the symbols of The American Way of Life. Mobs strike for the Bastille in any rising and the Bastille in the United States today is whatever stands for the American Way of Life: the goods and services, the material wealth, which the majority claim as the mark of their Americanism and which the minority are denied.

It is because we are unwilling to recognize this fact and unable to face the crisis as a crisis in the long struggle for the creation of a true Republic—because, indeed, we are no longer primarily concerned with the creation of a true Republic—that the majority respond to these riots with nothing but a demand for more police and more repression, while the Congress sits impotent and paralyzed in Washington.

Which means, of course, however we put it, that we no longer believe in man. And it is that fact which raises, in its turn, the most disturbing of all the swarming questions which surround us: how did we come to this defeated helplessness? How were we persuaded of our impotence as men? What convinced us that the fundamental law of a scientific age must be the scientific law of possibility and that our human part must be a passive part, a subservient part, the part of the recipient, the beneficiary . . . the victim? Have the scientists taught us this? A few months ago one of the greatest of living scientists told an international gathering composed of other scientists: "We must not ask where science and technology are taking us, but rather how we can manage science and technology so that they can help us get where we want to go." It is not reported that Dr. René Dubos was shouted down by his audience, and yet what he was asserting was precisely what we as a people seem to have dismissed as unthinkable: that "we," which apparently means mankind, must abandon our modern practice of asking where science and technology are "taking us," and must ask instead how we can" manage" science and technology so that they will help us to achieve our purposes—our purposes, that is to say, as men.

Dr. Dubos, it appears, scientist though he is and great scientist, believes rather more in man than we do. Why, then, do we believe so little? Perhaps we can answer that question best by asking another: how was our original, American belief in man achieved? Where did it come from? Thomas Jefferson, who had as much to do with the definition of our American belief as anyone, reflected on that subject toward his life's end. It was that famous trio at William and Mary, he decided, who "fixed" his "destinies." It was his education in his college, the teaching of Small and Wythe and the rest, which shaped his mind, gave it its direction. John Adams would have said the same and doubtless did: it was in Harvard College that he found those Greeks and Romans who taught him what a man could be and therefore should.

Is it our education, then, which has shaped the very different estimate of man we live by? In part, I think; in considerable part. Education, particularly higher education, has altered its relation to the idea of man in fundamental ways since Adam's day and Jefferson's. From the time when Harvard President Charles Eliot introduced the elective system there—from the time, that is to say, of the renunciation by the university of an intention to produce a certain kind of man, a man shaped by certain models, certain texts—the university's concern with "man" as such has grown less and less and its concern with what it calls "subjects" has become greater and greater. The important thing has become the academic "offering" (revealing word): the range of subjects from which the student, with his eye on his career, may choose. And the ultimate consequence, only too evident in the time we live in, has been the vocationalization of the higher schools.

The college no longer exists to produce men qua men, men prepared for life in a society of men, but men as specialized experts, men prepared for employment in an industry or a profession.

Getting ahead in the world," says Professor Allen Tate of the University of Minnesota, "is now the purpose of education and the University must therefore provide education for our time, not for all time; it must discover and then give to society what society thinks it wants. . . ." Some of us, looking at the present state of American society—the decay of its cities, the bewilderment of its citizens—may wonder whether the university has really provided "education for our time," but no one, I think, will deny that Professor Tate's emphatic irony has its bite. The vocationalism which a technological society demands of the graduate schools has produced a secondary vocationalism which the graduate schools impose on the colleges, and the result is that undergraduate education—far more important to the preparation for citizenship than graduate education—is increasingly affected by the vocational taint.

What is happening, and in the greatest universities as well as in the less great, is that the entire educational process is becoming fixed—hung-up as the phrase goes now—on its vocational end result. The job out there in the profession or the industry dictates the "training" (their word, not mine) in the graduate schools, and the graduate schools dictate the preparation in the colleges, and the whole system congeals from the top down like a pond freezing. The danger is that, the society may congeal with it, for nothing is more certain in the history of our kind than the fact that frozen societies perish.

As specialized, professional training, higher education in the United States today is often magnificent. Young doctors are better and better as their specialties become more specialized: so much better that it is now a recommendation in almost any field to say of a young doctor that he is young. Student physicists in the great graduate schools are so notoriously productive at twenty-two that a professional physicist of thirty regards himself, or is regarded by his juniors, as middle-aged. But the educated *man*, the man capable not of providing specialized answers, but of asking the great and liberating questions by which humanity makes its way through time, is not more frequently encountered than he was two hundred years ago. On the contrary, he is rarely discovered in public life at all.

I am not arguing—though I deeply believe—that the future of the Republic and the hope for a recovery of its old vitality and confidence depend on the university. I am confining myself to Dr. Dubos's admonition that we must give up the childishness of our present attitude toward science and technology, our constant question where *they* are taking *us*, and begin instead to ask how *we* can manage *them* "so that they can help us get where we want to go." "Where we want to go" depends, of course, on ourselves and, more particularly, on our conception of ourselves. If our conception of ourselves as the university teaches it or fails to teach it is the conception of the applicant preparing for his job, the professional preparing for his profession, then the question will not be answered because it will not be asked. But if our conception of ourselves as the university teaches it is that of men preparing to be men, to achieve themselves as men, then the question will be asked *and* answered because it cannot be avoided. Where do we want to go? Where men can be most themselves. How should science and technology be managed? To help us to become what we can be.

There is no quarrel between the humanities and the sciences. There is only a need, common to them both, to put the idea of man back where it once stood, at the focus of our lives; to make the end of education the preparation of men to be men, and so to restore to mankind—and above all to this nation of mankind—a conception of humanity with which humanity can live.

The frustration—and it is a real and debasing frustration—in which we are mired today will not leave us until we believe in ourselves again, assume again the mastery of our lives, the management of our means.

AMERICAN CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION OUTLINES POSITION ON TAX ISSUE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the American National Cattlemen's Association at its recent national convention adopted resolutions on several important tax questions effecting the livestock industry. The association has been concerned for some time about the impact of Federal estate taxes on farm and ranch land and supports legislation which would provide for a more realistic evaluation of farm and ranch property based on productivity or earning capacity.

A resolution was adopted reaffirming support of the principle that farmers and ranchers should be permitted to average losses and profits over a several-year period, compatible with price and climatic cycles effecting the livestock industry.

The association also passed a resolution opposing the proposals which would force farmers and ranchers to use an accrual method of accounting rather than the cash or unit livestock method.

Mr. Speaker, the resolutions which I have referred to are included as a part of this statement, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—TAXATION

Whereas, a proposal has been made in Congress that would, in effect, require or force farmers and ranchers to change from the cash or unit livestock price method of accounting to the accrual method, and limit the right of farmers and ranchers to claim capital gains of sales of breeding livestock; and

Therefore be it resolved, that the American National Cattlemen's Association oppose the adoption of any rule or regulation or the passage of any legislation that would require or have the effect of requiring or forcing farmers and ranchers to change from the cash or unit livestock basis, to the accrual method of accounting, that would change, restrict or limit the right of farmers and ranchers to claim capital gains on the sale of their breeding stock as under existing law, that would in any way discriminate against persons engaged in farming or ranching by imposing on them restrictions with respect to deductibility of losses incurred in their farming and ranching operations when such restrictions do not apply to persons engaged in other business activities; and

Be it further resolved, that the American National Cattlemen's Association recognizing that there do exist problems caused by a very few persons entering the farming and ranching business for the purpose of making a "tax profit" as opposed to an economic profit, support and encourage the strict and rigid enforcement of existing federal tax and securities law, so that this problem can be eliminated, and further pledge its support and will work for the enforcement of rulings and regulations under present law which will eliminate this problem, but which will not adversely affect bona fide operators of farms and ranches.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—ESTATE TAXES

Whereas, for federal estate tax purposes farm and ranch land is being assessed on the basis of its current sales price reflecting an inflated and speculative value; and

Whereas, these values represent unreasonable levies against the estates of stockmen; and

Whereas, a more realistic valuation of farm and ranch property can be determined based upon productivity or earning capacity;

Therefore be it resolved, that the American National Cattlemen's Association endorses the principle that the valuation of farms and ranches for federal estate tax purposes be made on the basis of the value of the farms and ranches for agricultural production; and

Be it further resolved, that the American National Cattlemen's Association commends Senators Fred Harris (D-Okla.), former Senator Frank Carlson (R.-Kan.) and Carl Curtis (R-Nebr.) for the introduction of Senate Bill 2600, and commends Congressmen Graham Purcell, Jr. (D-Tex.), Al Ullman (D-Ore.), James Battin (R-Mont.) and former Congressman William Harrison (R-Wyo.) for sponsoring House Resolution 14249, all in the past session of Congress, and recommends that similar bills be introduced and passed in the current session of Congress.

RESOLUTION NO. 8—REAFFIRMATION ON TAXES

Whereas, the livestock price and production cycles, as well as the climatic cycle affecting stockgrowers are such that the period over which losses can be carried forward and back, and the base period used for computing income, subject to averaging for federal income tax purposes are too short to provide the necessary relief to the livestock industry;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Association hereby go on record that the federal income tax laws should be amended to provide the stockgrower with a better opportunity to offset losses against past or future profits, particularly by extending the loss carry-forward and carry-back period and the income averaging base period to a number of years more nearly compatible with the price, production and climatic cycles affecting the livestock industry.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Americans of all nationalities join with the American Lithuanians in celebrating the 51st anniversary of their proclamation of independence. However, in Lithuania itself, the celebration is not so joyous. For although February 16, 1918, marks the date of the Lithuanian proclamation of independence, these courageous people are again living under the suppression of the Russians and must observe their anniversary quietly.

It is easy to understand the pride Lithuanians feel about their native land. They have fought valiantly over the centuries to retain their sovereignty. And in the face of harsh adversity, have re-

sisted the total sublimation of their national origins.

On July 27, 1922, the United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government and has never recognized this nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. We as the leader of the free world, must continue to espouse the cause of liberty and freedom so that a gallant people such as the Lithuanians may again be free from the yoke of Russian tyranny.

SCIENCE SHIRKS HONEST INQUIRY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, no society can be built on a foundation of myth.

The egalitarians have promoted their doctrine in such an extremist fashion that any proposed search for truth by impartial scientific methods is bitterly denounced as "racist" and "neofascist."

The internationalists have become so adamant in obstructing research that even the National Academy of Science is intimidated from pursuing its scientific duty to separate a perhaps painful truth from a profitable myth.

The Academy, in its magazine, Science, disavows any consideration of the question of heredity versus environment. Unadmittedly, their dereliction stems from fear of the catcalls and smears by the egalitarians; yet, they seek to justify their inaction with the excuse that any scientific inquiry "might be destructively exploited by racists if the Academy even ratified it as the right question."

When has Science feared to ask a question or seek the answer?

The taboo on race discussion continues as a device to allow the liberal left to exploit more and more of the productive citizens' tax dollars—for such emotional goals as "full equality," "brotherhood," to fight poverty, to appease criminals, and to rebuild the slums. No one dares question this utopian soft-sell because it is predicated upon a philosophical dogma that "all men are equal."

Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan, recently appointed Special Assistant on Urban Affairs, in his book, "Negro Families: The Case for National Action," illustrates well the use of the myth by his assertion that:

> There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group.

Thus, he feels cultural differences are strictly environmental and all injustices can be corrected by rebuilding the environment—a noble experiment. But always with taxpayer's billions—and with the profit going to the already wealthy financiers of the egalitarians. A highly sophisticated form of blackmail.

Yet, even the retreating National Academy of Science on October 17, 1967, at Ann Arbor, Mich., admitted the fallacy of Moynihan's rationalization by reporting:

> There is no scientific basis for a statement that there are or that there are not substantial hereditary differences in intelligence between Negro and white populations.

But, the taxpayers are made to invest billions in the egalitarians' unfounded, but profitable, adventures in experimental culture without any degree of scientific workability.

The American people are victimized by the taboo on open, frank discussion of racial and cultural differences. In the vacuum resulting from deprivation of freedom to gain the truth, the majority suffers from a guilt complex while some minorities suffer from resentment. The guilt neurosis in the white leaves them overly permissive—tolerant of acts of violence and destruction as if a compensatory repayment of past injustices. On the other hand, the egalitarians who have successfully stymied a search for truth and reason based on scientific study of heredity and environment have so incited the Negro he feels he has a grudge against the white man which, unless immediately remedied, justifies riots, crime, and extra privileges.

Unless the American people are given an impartial, scientifically oriented report on heredity versus environment and a full, frank discussion on the necessity of freedom of individual cultures there will be no peace, no law and order, nor sanity in our land. And based on a half-truth—a lie—all of the proposed tax spending and rebuilding will be for naught.

We must free our scientists from the chains of superstition and fear of persecution should they dare to seek the truth.

An addendum by Mr. Carleton Putnam prepared for inclusion in the new edition of his book, "Race and Reality: A Search for Solution," is must reading for all our colleagues who are truly interested in searching for truth and finding solutions instead of provoking more antagonisms in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I place Mr. Putnam's addendum and a release from the AP science writer at this point in the RECORD:

(NOTE.—The attached addendum was prepared for inclusion in a new edition of Race and Reality: A Search for Solutions. Remembering that a copy of the first edition was sent to you about two years ago, I trust you will find this short up-dating of the book of interest.—Carleton Putnam.)

ADDENDUM

The back of the jacket of Race and Reality contains a quotation from Dr. William Shockley, a Nobel laureate whose activities in the two years since this book was published deserve brief mention here.

Dr. Shockley has a special contribution to make to the race controversy. He is personally one of the most distinguished members of our scientific establishment. The fact that he is a physical or "hard" scientist rather than a "life" scientist gives him a detachment of approach which in itself, under current conditions, has value. As a scholar of exemplary scientific training, yet as one who comes to the subject of race with a fresh viewpoint unbiased by the turmoil of past debate, his qualifications for testifying to what he finds are unique.

Shockley received his Nobel prize for his part in the discovery of the transistor. Previously he had been awarded the Medal for Merit for his work as Director of Research of the Anti-submarine Warfare Operations Research Group of the United States Navy during World War II. He also holds the Holley medal of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the O. E. Buckley prize of the American Physics Society, the Comstock prize of the National Academy of Sciences and the Morris Liebmann prize of the Institute of Radio Engineers. He received his doctorate from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He became the Director of the Transistor Physics Department of the Bell Telephone Laboratories in 1953 and, in addition to this work, is presently Poniatoff Professor of Engineering Science at Stanford University.

Shockley, in other words, knows something about scientific method and has a broad acquaintance throughout the highest echelons of our scientific hierarchy. What he has found and reported in regard to the suppression of the existing evidence on genetic race differences, as well as to the avoidance of additional research, is of more than passing interest.

Early in the fall of 1966 Shockley started his appeals to the National Academy of Sciences to sponsor its own race studies. In a speech on October 17 of that year, he urged the establishment of a summer study group to seek new approaches to the "environment-heredity" uncertainty, remarking that "I evaluate the marrow of the city slum problem to be our uncertainty about its genetic aspects and our fears to admit ignorance and to search openly for relevant facts." When the National Academy was unresponsive, Shockley began to talk about "entrenched dogmatism." In April of 1967, in another speech to the Academy, he stated: "Results I obtained in a few days of research convinced me it must be a thinking-block rather than the difficulty of doing research that has kept such research from being done." He added that he estimated that at a cost of less than ten mililon dollars, and in less than a decade of time, reliable answers could be obtained.

His pleas to the Academy finally reached the point where its Council apparently felt some action on their part was required. As the magazine *Science* put it, "Shockley's vigorous advocacy has been a matter of some discomfort to the Academy, which finds itself situated between its traditional belief in free inquiry and its realization that the formulation of heredity versus environment adds up to a loaded question that might be destructively exploited by racists if the Academy even ratified it as the right question." So the Council appointed a Committee which on October 17, 1967, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, rendered a report remarkable in two particulars.

First, it stated that "there is no scientific basis for a statement that there are *or that there are not* [emphasis mine] substantial hereditary differences in intelligence between Negro and white populations." For a group officially designated as the scientific advisory agency of the United States government—a group which, since the beginning of the Boaz era in anthropology some forty years ago, has been consistently condoning the saturation of the American public in the no-genetic-differences dogma—to come forward now with a statement that there is no scientific basis for such a dogma, is startling to say the least.

But even more surprisingly, the report recommended the rejection of Shockley's pleas for further research on the grounds that "none of the current methods can produce unambiguous results. To shy away from seeking the truth is one thing; to refrain from collecting still more data that would be of uncertain meaning but would invite misuse is another." I leave the evaluation of this statement to the reader. And I would venture the assertion that if such excuses had been adopted by scientists in the past no scientist would ever have discovered anything. One can see why Shockley found himself that

autumn "in profound disagreement with the position endorsed by the Council."

Nor is it difficult to understand the frame of mind in which Shockley made his most recent speech to the Academy on April 24, 1968. This speech is noteworthy in that in addition to his continuing appeals for Academy-sponsored research and his protest at their rejection, he now records the results of his own investigations into the *presently existing* evidence. He says in part:

"During the past two years of my part-time investigations I have come to accept as facts, not yet perhaps facts at the level of pure mathematics or physics, but nonetheless facts that I now consider so unassailable that I present them before fellow members of the National Academy of Sciences with a clear scientific conscience. The basic facts are these: Man is a mammal and subject to the same biological laws as other animals. All animals, including man, have inheritable behavioral traits. *The concept of complete environmental plasticity of human intelligence is a nonsensical, wishful-thinking illusion.* . . .

"The most dangerous illusion . . . facing humanity today is the belief [which] most scientists lack the courage to doubt, at least for the record, typified by the expressions of our government through its Department of Labor and echoed by the Office of Education. I quote: 'There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group.' [1] The only reason that I do not characterize this statement as a lie, and in my opinion a damnably evil lie, is that I have no way to appraise the intellectual acumen of its authors. They may actually believe it."

He then goes on to what is perhaps the most trenchant sentence in this speech: "An objective examination of relevant data leads me inescapably to the opinion that the major deficit in Negro intellectual performance must be primarily of hereditary origin and thus relatively irremediable by practical impovements in environment." Such has been the impact upon a trained scientist and Nobel laureate of experiences and observations similar to those recorded by the author in Chapters II and III of Race and Reality. The difference is that the first are reported by an expert within the Anglo-American scientific hierarchy, the others by a layman on the outside.

I believe I speak for Shockley as well as everyone else on the side of the realities in this debate when I say that we have no intent to deny the existence of injustice in our society nor the need to correct it. The Negro has been done injustice, in the United States and elsewhere, throughout history. So have other races and individuals, here and abroad. The error lies in preaching that these injustices have been the primary cause of poverty and inequality when the truth is that poverty and inequality are primarily the result of genetic variability in human capacity. If every social injustice on earth were removed tomorrow there would still be many people who would be relatively poor and there would still be widespread differences in status.

The most serious result of the denial of this truth, as events since the publication of *Race and Reality* have continued to prove, has been that it has given the Negro the idea that he has a grudge against the White man and the White man the notion that he should feel guilty about the Negro far beyond anything that can be relieved by the practicable correction of existing injustices. The grudge incites the Negro to riots and crime, and the guilt leads the White man to a policy of perpetual permissiveness and appeasement. Thus is created an adult society which is bewildering and disillusioning to the young, both white and black. Nothing is less to be respected, or more certain to be disobeyed, than an adult world weltering and fawning in an orgy of misconceived guilt. It will lack all force, all leadership, all credibility and all authority. Hence comes the current epidemic of juvenile delinquency from the home to the campus to the courts.

Meanwhile, and for identical reasons, we witness the steady erosion of the principles underlying our constitutional, representative republic, always in the name of "justice" and always in the direction of a "pure" democracy, the latter being a fatal corruption of our heritage. The one-man-one-vote principle, for example, or the increasing taxation of success to support failure (which not always, but more often than not, means the punishment of excellence to reward its opposite), will undermine any stable, free society, but especially one which is racially mixed and which pits politicians against each other in bidding for the votes of the least qualified segments of our society. The behavior of the leaders of our liberal-minority group coalition, both Republicans and Democrats, is characteristic, along with the redundant references to "justice" as the blanket excuse for each descending step.

The only sickness in our nation today is a public attitude of mind. This attitude has been conditioned and nourished by a fallacy spawned by a small but powerful group in our scientific hierarchy forty years ago and promoted by an equally powerful mass and educational media ever since. Our politicians of all parties have lacked the courage to examine it, and our courts have hastened to enshrine it in our Constitution. But beyond anything else at the moment one must regard as deplorable the performance of the National Academy of Sciences. The irresponsibility and the timidity which have led these men to stumble over their own feet in pronouncements like the one from Ann Arbor in 1967 will someday, I hope, become obvious even to them.

The fundamental scientific points is this: the overwhelming preponderance of the existing evidence indicates that one American Negro out of five surpasses the average White man, while four out of five fall below him, in those qualities of mind and character needed to maintain and advance our Western civilization. The same evidence also indicates that the difference is primarily due, not to injustice, but to genetic limitations inherent in the Negro race. These, in turn, appear to be related to a difference in evolutionary grade. Dr. Coon has estimated the gap at perhaps 200,000 years. No contradictory evidence is of record.

The question therefore arises whether the American people are entitled to know what the available evidence discloses so that it may be considered in the forming of public policy. Changes in laws and customs which have as their purpose, or will produce as a result, the infusion into our White gene pool of perceptible amounts of Negro genes, or the alteration of White standards and traditions to accommodate those of Negroes, will in all probability in the long run have a profound and adverse effect upon our society. If our people as a whole want to take this risk, let them take it, but let them at least know what is going on.

And above all let them examine their guilt complex in the light of the known facts. The threat of genetic alteration is bad enough. The danger of a falsely inspired attitude of permissiveness and appeasement toward crime and disorder is equally serious and more immediate.

CARLETON PUTNAM.

[1] The quotation is from Daniel P. Moynihan, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action.* Moynihan has been appointed Special Assistant to the President on Urban Affairs in the Nixon administration.

[From the Jackson Daily News, Feb. 6, 1969]

STUDY REVEALS DIFFERENCE IN RACIAL MENTAL ABILITY—160 EACH NEGRO, WHITE CHILDREN CHECKED BY RESEARCH EDUCATORS

(By Ralph Dighton)

LOS ANGELES.—Recent studies of 160 Negro and 160 white children in California show "obvious differences in inborn mental ability," an educator says.

"It is a reasonable hypothesis that hereditary factors as well as environmental factors play a part in this difference. The bulk of the evidence is that three-fourths of the variability of intelligence is accounted for by genetic factors in our present society," said Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, director of the Institute of Human Learning at the University of California at Berkeley, where he is a professor of educational psychology.

He said the white children averaged "significantly greater ability" to grasp abstract concepts, an ability he described as necessary for intellectual pursuits such as science and engineering. He said Negro children are not deficient, however, in rote learning.

Jensen, here for a symposium today on "Race and Intelligence" at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, told an interviewer:

"Our research should be redirected to capitalize on the strengths of all segments of our society. We must find better ways to help the disadvantaged in our schools, such as the use of computerized teaching consoles which enable the teacher to fit the training program to the individual student's ability."

A spokesman for the association said it is the largest in the United States devoted to research in education. He said more than 4,000 educators and psychologists are attending sessions in two downtown hotels.

Jensen reported on a study he made of 160 white and 160 Negro children aged 5 to 10 in the San Francisco Bay area.

"We asked them to recall a number of familiar objects in four different categories, shortly after showing them the objects," he said. "The white children showed a significantly greater ability to conceptualize the objects, the difference being greater with age and with the number of times the objects were shown.

"A strong indication that the difference might be genetically based came when the results were compared with a similar study made earlier of Liberian Negro children, who had scored about the same as the American Negro children. The California Negro children resembled the Liberian children far more closely in this respect than either resembled the California white children."

Jensen said his and other studies have shown "the American Negro child is not deficient in rote learning, but in abstract reasoning and conceptual learning."

"Our educational system is geared, however, to abstract learning. The I.Q. test is primarily a measure of abstract conceptual ability and that is why Negro children on an average score lower than white children."

He said the national average I.Q. for whites is 108, against 85 for Negroes. "And the difference in scholastic performance is comparable," he said.

On the basis of his studies, Jensen recommended changes in U.S. school methods.

"All the basic learning skills—the three Rs—can be achieved by rote learning, and this is the way many disadvantaged children should be taught," he said.

"All children should be taught in accordance with their learning pattern ability, and this calls for a greater number of options for student and teacher than we now have in our schools."

Jensen said he does not believe it necessary to segregate schools to provide different training programs for Negroes and whites.

"A promising alternative", he said, "is computed-assisted training, in which the pro-

gram can be adjusted to the individual student. In this way rote learning can be emphasized for some and abstract learning for others, according to ability.

"By not recognizing these differences we run the risk of failing to develop the various capabilities of all our peoples."

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, known to all of us as a long-time entertainer and spirited comedian is Red Skelton.

As may be the case with all comedians, their moments of thoughtful seriousness are the more impressionable because it seems, perhaps, "out of character". Such an instance arose when on January 14, 1969, Red Skelton took a pause from the lighthearted and jovial atmosphere of his hour-long TV show, and in a moment of quiet reflection, spoke of his feeling on the Pledge of Allegiance which, I am sure, inspired all who listened.

Because of these trying times, Mr. Speaker, and the ever-present need, by word and deed, to reaffirm our dedication in "one Nation, under God," I include Mr. Skelton's words at this point in the RECORD:

THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

[From the Red Skelton Hour, January 14, 1969]

I remember this one teacher. To me, he was the greatest teacher, a real sage of my time. He had such vision. We were all reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and he walked over. Mr. Lasswell was his name . . . He said:

I've been listening to you boys and girls recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester and it seems as though it is becoming monotonous to you. If I may, may I recite it and try to explain to you the meaning of each word:

I—me, an individual, a committee of one.

Pledge—dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

Allegiance—my love and my devotion.

To the Flag—our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom. Wherever she waves, there is respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job.

Of the United—that means that we have all come together.

States—individual communities that have united into 48 great states. 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose, all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common purpose, and that's love for country.

Of America.

And to the Republic—a state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern. And government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

For which it stands.

One nation—meaning, so blessed by God.

Indivisible—incapable of being divided.

With liberty—which is freedom and the right of power to live one's own life without threats or fear or some sort of retaliation.

And justice—the principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

For all—which means it's as much your country as it is mine.

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country and two words have been added to the Pledge of Alliance—"under God."

Wouldn't it be a pity if someone said, "That's a prayer" and that would be eliminated from schools, too?

FEBRUARY 15–22 IS FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA WEEK

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, February 15–22 is National Future Farmers of America Week. During this period, members of the 65 chapters of the North Dakota Association of FFA will join with 450,000 FFA members in the 9,000 chapters throughout the Nation in sponsoring special activities focusing attention on the importance of agriculture.

The theme of National FFA Week is "An Opportunity for Youth." Certainly this is a top priority item today. The steady decline in the Nation's farm population, particularly among younger people, has wrought vast changes not only in agriculture but in the tens of thousands of small communities across the country whose economy rests largely upon agriculture.

There is urgent need for more job opportunities in rural America. The vocational agriculture departments of our schools are helping to meet that need.

I join with Americans across the country in saluting members of the Future Farmers of America and the great work they do.

During November of 1928, a small group of high school vocational agriculture students met in Kansas City and decided to form a national organization of boys studying vocational agriculture under the provision of the Federal Smith-Hughes Act. North Dakota was represented at that meeting by two delegates. The group decided on the name Future Farmers of America.

On May 11, 1929, a small delegation of vocational agriculture students from 29 North Dakota schools met at the North Dakota Agricultural College, now the North Dakota State University, and decided to organize a State FFA association and ask for a State charter. The charter was granted October 7, 1929. The association was the 30th State association to receive a charter from the national organization.

This June, 750 FFA members and advisers representing approximately 3,500 members of the 65 North Dakota chapters, will gather at NDSU for their 40th State FFA convention.

The FFA has come a long way since its humble beginning in 1928. The organization has taken its place among the many other national organizations whose primary purpose is the improvement of agriculture and the enriching of country life. Today, 41 years after that organizational meeting in Kansas City, the FFA is recognized as one of the most highly respected youth organizations in the world with approximately 450,000 members in 9,000 chapters in 50 States and Puerto Rico.

The FFA's force for good is felt in every community where there is a local chapter. The primary purpose of the FFA is to develop competent, aggressive agricultural leadership. The organization has been built on the foundation of leadership, cooperation, thrift, character, patriotism, improved agriculture, and service. The organization's motto expresses this purpose well: "Learning To Do, Doing To Learn, Earning To Live, Living To Serve."

The FFA is composed of chartered State associations which are made up of local chapters in public secondary schools having recognized departments of vocational agriculture. Boys enrolled in vocational agricultural courses are eligible for FFA membership, but membership is entirely voluntary.

Officers are elected annually for each unit of the FFA—local, State, and national. Approved parliamentary procedures and ceremonies are used for conducting meetings and for passing qualified members to the different degrees of active membership, but there is no secrecy in the organization. Vocational agriculture instructors serve as chapter advisers, and State supervisors of agricultural education serve as advisers of State associations. The director of the agricultural education branch of the U.S. Office of Education is adviser of the national organization.

There are four degrees of membership: Greenhand, Chapter Farmer, State Farmer, and American Farmer. Advancement from one degree to the next depends on the member's accomplishments in his farming program and in leadership, scholarship, citizenship, and cooperation. When a boy first joins a local FFA chapter, he holds the Greenhand Degree. He may be advanced to the Chapter Farmer Degree by the local chapter. The State Farmer Degree is awarded by the State association and is limited to 2 percent of the association's active members. The national organization confers the American Farmer Degree, highest recognition a member may attain.

Richard Frith, Devils Lake, is the North Dakota State FFA President. Other officers of the State association are Kenneth Frey, Minot, vice president; Marvin Witt, Rugby, secretary; Carl Berger, Leeds, treasurer; Dennis Boyle, Enderlin, reporter; and Richard C. Larsen, Williston, William Ongstad, Fessenden, Rodney Schaaf, Bowman, officers-at-large.

Ernest L. DeAlton of NDSU is State adviser. Winston H. Dolve and Shubel D. Owen, also of NDSU are assistant advisers.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 17, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today is the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of

Independence of Lithuania. Fifty-one years ago, in the same spirit of freedom and self-determination that led to the founding of our great country, the people of Lithuania undertook to create a free and open society.

But in 1940 the Soviet Union, in an all too typical and unacceptable act of aggression, invaded and occupied Lithuania. Since that time the people of Lithuania have been held captive in an illegal occupation.

The United States, along with the other free nations of the world, condemned the Soviet action in 1940 and has remained steadfast in refusing to recognize the illegal Soviet takeover. The many Americans of Lithuanian descent have justly held the hope that someday their homeland will again be free and this dream is shared by all Americans as it is shared by all freedom-loving peoples.

So today, on the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, we pause to again commit ourselves to the eventual freedom of the people of Lithuania just as we are committed to the eventual freedom of all the peoples of the world.

"BARBERS FOR NIXON" MOVES INTO FIELD OF WORLD PEACE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Albert J. "Red the Barber" Rothe, who headed the "Barbers for Nixon" drive during the presidential campaign just ended, has now formed a new group, to be known as the "Barber to Barber Foundation."

The purpose of this group, as Mr. Rothe explains it, is to make the views and policies of our new administration known throughout the world by enlightening the barbers of the world's leaders so that they, in turn, might enlighten their famous and powerful clients.

An article concerning Mr. Rothe's new foundation appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun, a daily newspaper in Arlington, Va., on Saturday, January 4, 1969. I commend the following article to my colleagues so that they might know of the effort of this truly dedicated man:

"BARBERS FOR NIXON" MOVES INTO FIELD OF WORLD PEACE

(By R. C. Monk)

ARLINGTON.—Albert J. (Red the Barber) Rothe, who headed the "Barbers for Nixon" drive during the presidential campaign, announced today that the group will be continued as the "Barber-to-Barber Foundation."

Its purpose will be to broadcast Nixon's views and policies, Rothe said.

"We will be sending all over the world a message for peace," the former Navy barber said.

"Every leader in the world has a barber, and if the barbers can be sold on peace, then they can sell it to their leaders.

"We are even willing to contact Ho Chi Minh's barber to get him to help bring about peace."

Explaining his motives for wanting to promote world unity through the Barber-to-Barber Foundation, Rothe said, "If you ever put a year on a Stryker Frame with 40 per cent of your body burned, you know what it is like to experience hardship and pain.

"After that, you can never forget how lucky you are to be alive, so you want to help others. You want to do something for the world."

(Rothe was burned badly in an accident in 1952. He was given no chance to survive, but after 18 operations and more than 300 blood transfusions, he returned to barbering. He met then Vice President Richard M. Nixon during his recovery, and Nixon and U.S. Rep. Joel T. Broyhill, R–10 District, of Arlington were instrumental in helping him establish in 1955 a barbershop at 2117 Wilson Blvd., Clarendon.)

A former Easter Seal chairman, Rothe mentioned a little-known side of Nixon which prompted him to help form the Barbers for Nixon Committee.

"Nixon was always a man to do something for the disabled. I remember one time when I was cutting his hair at the Senate Office Building. A group of disabled high school students were being given a tour then.

"One boy, who was partially paralyzed, had spilled soup over his tie during lunch. He was in an awkward position in his wheel chair and the soup spilled staining his tie. Mr. Nixon, noticing the boy's discomfort, took off his own tie and gave it to him."

Rothe added that he found out later the tie had been a favorite of Nixon's, but the vice president never hesitated in giving it up.

He also mentioned that he has often heard the President-elect say that the condition of the mind was directly related to the condition of the body.

"Mr. Nixon is very anxious to build a healthy, vigorous America," Rothe said.

He predicts that the foundation, presently consisting of 250 members in the United States, soon will be expanding to countries all over the world.

He anticipates help from many organizations, from the Rotary Club to the Peace Corps, and predicts that through their barbers, people around the globe will develop a "better impression of America."

CRIME IN THE 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September the people of this area were the victims of a total of 1,905 major crimes in the seven categories used by the FBI Crime Index. This amounts to 63 major crimes every day or 2½ major crimes every hour. During this month, the people in the district suffered 24 larcenies of $50 and over every day, 19 burglaries, and 16 car thefts daily.

The cumulative statistics for the first 9 months of 1968 reveal a total of 17,118 major crimes reported in the district as follows:

January	1,775
February	1,630
March	1,797
April	1,901
May	1,960
June	2,115
July	2,050
August	1,985
September	1,905
Total	17,118

The Crime Index trend for the month of September and for the first 9 months of 1968 follows:

	September 1968	1st 9 months, 1968
Crimes against the person:		
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	1	16
Forcible rape	6	38
Robbery	49	553
Assault	75	729
Total crimes against the person	131	1,336
Crimes against property:		
Burglary	568	5,646
Larceny, $50 and over	725	5,718
Motor vehicle thefts	481	4,418
Total crimes against property	1,774	15,782

It should be observed that the statistics do not disclose the full picture of criminal activity in the congressional district. The statistics do not include crimes omitted from the FBI Crime Index. Nor do they include crimes not reported even though included within the FBI major crime categories.

The police precinct and station house addresses in this district are: 60th Precinct, 2951 West Eighth Street; 61st Precinct, 1423 Avenue U; 66th Precinct, 5822 16th Avenue; 67th Precinct, 35 Snyder Avenue; and 70th Precinct, 154 Lawrence Street.

Attached are two charts, one showing criminal statistics for the 13th Congressional District during the month of September and the other the 9-month cumulative total.

SEPTEMBER 1968 STATISTICS

Precinct	Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	Larceny, $50 and over	Motor vehicle thefts	Total
60	0	1	12	37	124	97	60	331
61	1	2	10	13	130	254	181	591
66	0	0	9	14	126	101	75	325
67	0	1	9	4	68	105	66	253
70	0	2	9	7	120	168	99	405
Total	1	6	49	75	568	725	481	1,905

CUMULATIVE STATISTICS, JANUARY–SEPTEMBER 1968

60	5	13	158	354	1,144	899	515	3,088
61	5	7	109	115	1,449	2,052	1,704	5,441
66	4	3	69	93	923	694	673	2,459
67	0	5	110	85	863	869	567	2,499
70	2	10	107	82	1,267	1,204	959	3,631
Total	16	38	553	729	5,646	5,718	4,418	17,118

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report to my constituents:

MEMO

TAX REFORM

As I reported in an earlier Memo, I have made one of my prime legislative objectives early action by Congress to revise and reform our federal tax laws. The goals should be fairness and greater simplicity. Numerous inequities and complications have crept into the tax laws since the last revision in 1954 and this job must be gotten under way if the people are to retain confidence in the system. I am glad to be able to report progress toward action by Congress:

COMMITTEE

The Ways and Means Committee (on which I serve) will start tax reform hearings this week, beginning with the subject of tax-exempt foundations, and will continue for a number of weeks covering 17 different broad subjects. My hope is that the Committee will report legislation for consideration by Congress this year.

ADMINISTRATION

I met with President Nixon and Wilbur Mills, Chairman of Ways and Means, at the White House and the President has agreed that tax reform would become part of the program of his Administration. This was followed by a statement issued by the Secretary of the Treasury promising cooperation with the Committee in its studies and stating that the Administration would later be sending up its proposals in this area.

PUBLIC

Widespread interest in tax reform has been evidenced in the press and among the public, indicating the underlying need for prompt action and increasing, through the operation of public opinion, the chances for legislation in this area. My own mail, for example, following public statements I have made on the need for tax reform, reflects a deep interest across the country in action at an early date.

POSTMASTERS

I can also report progress on another front. I have long urged the removal of post office appointments from politics and I have introduced legislation in the last three Congresses to accomplish that objective. I have also announced that I would not recommend postmaster and rural carrier appointments on a political basis in our district. I was pleased, therefore, when President Nixon and the Postmaster General announced their intention to remove postal appointments from politics by eliminating the political advisor system and requiring Civil Service examinations for all vacancies. Political appointment is only one of the things wrong with our present postal system, but its early removal is an important step toward modernizing the Post Office Department in order to insure prompt and efficient service.

CRIME

President Nixon is being given high marks in Washington for the emphasis he is giving on an attack on crime in the District of Columbia as part of an over-all program to alleviate this nation-wide problem. He has asked for more police; more judges and a reform of a bail law which permits hardened criminals to go free and commit more crimes while awaiting trial, as well as for efforts to get at the basic causes of crime, including dope addiction and the spread of narcotics.

DISTRICT TRIP

Because of a congressional recess, I was able to spend most of last week in the District visiting with many of you during office hours in Green Bay, Manitowoc, and Appleton. The views, ideas, and suggestions given to me during these visits are going to be very helpful to me during the course of what promises to be a busy session.

CONCERN FOR OUR BELOVED COUNTRY

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place a letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I received in the mail a few days ago. Though I cannot share all the opinions of the writer and in particular those regarding the legal profession, I would like my colleagues to share the concern of one person for what is happening to our beloved country.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Balboa, Canal Zone, January 30, 1969.

Hon. HOWARD W. POLLOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POLLOCK: For many years now I have been greatly concerned about the degeneration of our society. When I first became aware of this degeneration, I was confident the enlightened members of Congress would take necessary corrective action. My confidence in our elected representatives has been severely shattered.

I have watched the disappearance of a moral principle that honesty is a desirable trait of the American people. In lieu of this trait, I have seen the development of a moral principle which states that an honest man is a sucker and it is all right to lie and cheat if you gain a material advantage from it. Why has this happened?

I have watched the disappearance of respect for the law and in its place I find disdain for the law. This has happened even though an extremely high percentage of our law enforcement officers are honest, hard working, dedicated, people with morally sound principles. Why?

I remember when a scream for help would have brought every able-bodied person within hearing, running to assist. Today you can be beaten to death on the street within sight of twenty witnesses and not one will raise a finger to assist you. They won't even call the police. Why?

Today, a man injured in an accident can bleed to death for the want of simple first aid. This can happen even with a doctor in a crowd watching the man bleed to death. Why?

I have watched nationalism wane and now anarchy is speeding to replace it. Why?

I have observed self-confessed criminals, convicted by a jury, who received no punishment for their crimes because an appellate court threw out the decision of the jury. Why?

I have watched the importance of the jurys verdict decline to such a low level that today a jury trial is nothing more than a prelude to the real trial. The only power a jury has left is to declare a defendant "not guilty." Why?

I have watched the Supreme Court consistently violate the Constitution it is sworn to uphold by enacting legislation through court decisions. Why?

The Congress has sat idly by while the Supreme Court, again and again, usurped the legislative powers reserved to the Congress by the Constitution. Why?

The Congress has permitted the Supreme Court, under Mr. Warrens leadership, to become a super legislative power in direct violation of our Constitution. Why?

The intent of the Bill of Rights has been distorted to permit the individual to usurp the rights of the majority in a nation that is supposed to be governed by the will of the majority. Why?

Both the Congress and the Supreme Court have completely disregarded the all important precepts set forth in the preamble to our Constitution. Why?

Rioting, looting, arson, and mugging have become common occurrences on the streets of this nation. Why?

The anarchy now being practiced in our schools and universities by a minority of students and professors, in disrupting the educational progress of the majority who wish only to further their education. We are permitting this to happen. Why?

An extremely high percentage of otherwise honest citizens now knowingly and willingly cheat on their income tax. Why?

Corruptive practices and dereliction of duty have become condoned acts of high government officials. Why?

The degeneration which already exists in this great nation has created a disrespect for the government, a disrespect for the law, mass civil disobedience, riots, looting, arson, anarchy, a general disdain for authority, and an almost complete lack of discipline.

During my extensive travels throughout five continents of the world, I have had the misfortune of being present in several countries whose governments were toppled by a military coup d'etat. The reasons, given by the military for their actions, are all contained in the preceding paragraph. I don't know about you, but I am seriously concerned that conditions are fast approaching a state that can only result in a military coup d'etat or a revolution followed by a military takeover.

You, as a member of Congress and the action arm of the people, have an extremely difficult task before you. It has been made doubly difficult for reasons you may not be aware of.

Permit me to give you an opinion. I ask only that you give it due consideration. In about 1932, the average American citizen had developed such an apathy toward politics that he no longer took an active interest in the political system of this country. By 1942 his only participation was in marking his ballot on election day. Even his participation in this was very poor. He knew almost nothing about the candidate or how his name happened to be on the ballot. Politically speaking, he had become a sheep in a very large flock.

At the same time the average citizen was developing his apathy toward politics, a small professional group was becoming extremely active in our political system. They came from all ethnic groups, all religious sects, and they had various political beliefs. However, they all had the same profession, the same educational background, and they were all taught to believe in a perculiar basic philosophy.

Their infiltration into both major political parties was fast and furious. By 1942 they had gained absolute control of our political system. They had absolute control of the Senate, absolute control of the appellate court system including the Supreme Court, and effective control of the House of Representatives.

The lawyer profession was now in a very unique and enviable position. They now had the power to make our laws, judge our laws,

prosecute our laws, defend our laws, interpret our laws, or change our laws. To put it bluntly, they now had the power to effectively establish a clandestine dictatorship over the American people. They could now run this country according to their own philosophy and could now create provisions in our laws which would absolutely guarantee the propagation of their own profession.

I have no way of knowing if the action they took was the result of malicious intent or if it was the natural result of their peculiar basic professional philosophy. In any case the result of their actions was disastrous for the American people. The rule of law was on its way out.

Criminals became the unfortunate victims of their environment. An insane person could no longer be held responsible for his crime because to punish him would be punishing an innocent man. The "real him" hadn't committed any crime. A man is murdered but no one is guilty of the crime. The lawyers have rode this horse to death. Every trial involving a major crime, now almost automatically includes sanity hearings.

Law enforcement officers were prohibited from collecting evidence by a succession of court decisions which created clearly defined and unduly restrictive mandatory procedures.

Law enforcement officers were prohibited from using modern investigative techniques.

Even if the police collected a preponderance of truthful, factual, relevant evidence and it was later found that one insignificant bit was obtained in violation of an existing law, the criminal was freed. Justice wasn't even a consideration, the lawyer philosophy of protect the criminal at all costs prevails.

At the same time the police investigative powers were being destroyed the criminal was being protected and shielded from arrest and conviction by the Supreme Court decisions issued under the guise of the protection of individual rights. Through these decisions the Supreme Court also amended our Constitution. The Supreme Court is prohibited from doing this by the Constitution but so what. The decisions substantially and materially benefit the lawyer profession so who in the Senate is going to object.

Are you familiar with the Warren Court's decision in the Miranda v. Arizona case? If you aren't, you should be. In addition to amending the 6th Amendment to the Constitution, it served three purposes. It freed a *self-confessed* rapist and kidnaper; it dealt a devastating blow to all law enforcement agencies, and it guaranteed the propagation of the lawyer profession.

During the time all of the above was taking place, the lawyer profession was creating a fantastic monstrosity known as the individual income tax laws.

Included in this monstrosity are more injustices, more inequities, more favored special interest groups than you can find in a month of concentrated study. I get absolutely sick with anger every time I go through this horrendous monument to the lawyer profession. There have been hundreds of articles written pointing out both specific and general problems with these laws. I will assume you have read at least a few of these articles. Of all the articles I have read, none of them proposed a solution that I consider adequate. I do not believe these laws can be modified to produce a just and equitable method of collecting revenue. They should be scrapped and a completely new set of laws established. I would even suggest you pursue the feasibilty of a modified federal sales tax which would tax all exchanges of property, goods, and services having a monetary value. Everyone would then pay as they go, and nobody would be exempt. Furthermore, a law based upon this principle would automatically create a tax obligation in direct proportion to the amount of the individual's income.

If you seriously consider proposing such a system, you will run into frantic opposition by the lawyer profession, because it would eliminate a very lucrative source of income for them. It would also drastically reduce the number of personnel required in the Internal Revenue Service, so you would get some opposition from this quarter too.

Let me suggest a very quick and effective method that will permit you to identify some of the most blatant injustices in our tax laws. Request the Internal Revenue Service to furnish you with the files of all people who had a personal income in 1967 of $50,000 or more and *who did not pay a single penny of income tax.* If you do this, you will receive an excess of 36,000 files. Add up the total combined gross income reported on these tax returns. Be generous and take only 10% of this amount. You will end up with a figure of approximately $2,000,000,000. The average American citizen paid the income tax for these people. Why? Search out the answer to this question and you will know *some* of the injustices that need correcting in our tax laws.

Why have the American people, who once valued honesty above all other traits, become dishonest in their daily lives? Because now, it pays to be dishonest. Why should a man be honest if he is penalized for it?

Why do the American people have a disrespect for our laws? The application of our laws is inequitable and unjust. Why should anyone respect such laws?

Why do the American people openly exhibit a disdain for our law enforcement agencies? Our law enforcement agencies have been legislated into such a weak and ineffective group that they can no longer cope with the criminal element or maintain law and order in our streets. Why should anyone respect such a group?

Why do the people of this nation turn their back on a desperate call for help? The people of this nation are afraid of being sued for such a humanitarian action. Why should they place their entire livelihood in jeopardy just to aid a stranger?

Why has the spirit of nationalism disappeared from the American scene? The people of this nation have a disrespect for our government. How can anyone be nationalistic under these circumstances?

Why can a self-confessed criminal, convicted by a jury, be freed by the decision of five Supreme Court Justices? Because the Congress has been derelict in allowing the Warren Court to usurp the legislative powers reserved to the Congress by the Constitution. Why shouldn't the lawyer profession take advantage of a group that doesn't have the guts to protect itself?

Why has the trial by jury lost its value? The members of the lawyer profession have destroyed its effectiveness to guarantee the protection of their criminal clients. Why shouldn't the lawyer profession destroy the jury trial if the people are too apathetic to even register a protest?

Why have the Supreme Court and the Appellate Courts consistently violated our Constitution by enacting legislation through court decisions? Because the Congress has been derelict in carrying out its responsibilities. There are too many lawyers in the Congress who saw nothing wrong with the decisions. Why should lawyers protest a legislative decision that supports their own philosophy?

Why has the intent of the Bill of Rights been distorted to permit the individual to usurp the rights of the majority? Because of the distorted thinking and unconstitutional actions of the five members of the Warren Court and dereliction of duty by the Congress. Why shouldn't Warren cram his stupid decisions down our throat, if we don't have the guts to stop him.

Why is the youth of our nation involved in rioting, looting, arson, and anarchy in our school system? The youth of this nation look around them, see the existing mess, and take the first course of action available to them to let off some steam. God help us if they recognize the source of these injustices before you are able to bring into effect the changes necessary to start this sick nation on the road to recovery.

Why do the people of this nation, who live in the most affluent society in the world, have a disrespect for their government? By now, I think you should be able to answer this question yourself.

I beg you to take whatever action you can to ensure that this Congress will be a "do something useful" Congress.

A democracy can exist only if its laws, and the application of those laws, are based on the will of the majority.

A dictatorship can exist only if its laws, and the application of those laws, are based on the will of the dictatorship.

I ask you to give serious consideration to all aspects of our system of Justice as it now exists. After you have done this, I would like for you to answer the following question:

Do our laws and the application of our laws reflect the will of the majority, or do they reflect the will of the lawyer profession?

I also ask you to read the preamble to the Constitution. You will notice our founding fathers accepted the fact that no government can be perfect. The Constitution reflects that they also knew a government based on the will of the majority is the most perfect form that can be established. It is time we accepted this fact, too.

Consider the preamble to the Constitution. Do our laws "establish Justice"? No, they do not. Do our laws "insure domestic tranquility"? No, they do not. Do our laws "provide for the common defense"? Yes, they do. We have been so successful in this that we have created a monstrous military machine which we, at present, are still able to control. Do our laws "promote the general welfare"? If socialism (the creation of a welfare state) is the promotion of the general welfare, then we have made too much progress. Do our laws "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity"?????

I have refrained from mentioning the so called "race problem" because I do not believe we have one. What we do have is a morals problem. Eliminate this problem and the so called "race problem" will automatically disappear.

I do not believe in any of the recognized religions of the world, because I do not believe they represent the true word of God. However, I do believe the basic teachings of all of these religions are beneficial to mankind. Our founding fathers were religious men. When they included in our Constitution the provision "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or the free exercise thereof" I believe it was their intent to prevent the establishment of a single official religion and permit us to believe and freely practice the religion of our choice. A vast majority of us believe in some form of a Supreme Being. Why then, did the Warren Court illegally amend our Constitution to prohibit the majority the free exercise of their religion when he issued his decision in the school prayer case? Why did the Congress, who represents the majority, permit this to happen?

The recent active participation of our youth in the grass roots politics of this nation during the political campaigns, brought forth a ray of hope. They more than offset the actions of the mislead, misused youth who took to the streets in Chicago. Anything you can do to encourage the youth of this nation to take an active part in the grass roots politics of our political system will be a great service to this nation. These young people will, only too soon, be the older generation. Let us do everything we can to ensure that *their* children will respect them for their accomplishments, instead of taking to the streets in pro-

test. If we can't throw off the lawyer dictatorship, let us at least give the youth of the nation the power to do so. It can't be done peaceably unless all of the people start taking and continue to take an active interest in the grass roots politics of this nation.

I recommend the immediate enactment of a federal law which will require all educational institutions to include in their curriculum, at every grade level, a course of instruction on our Constitution and our political system. The course must be designed to ensure that all students will gain full knowledge of our Constitution, and our political system. Successful completion of this course should be mandatory for promotion to the next higher grade or graduation. This must be done even if an amendment to the Constitution is necessary to accomplish it. This will serve two purposes. It will educate our youth and encourage their participation in our political system. It will eliminate the Warren court's legislative decision which makes all citizens legally ignorant of their rights.

Some information about myself: I am a Class I Foreign Service Staff Officer with 25 years of government service. I am presently assigned to the American Embassy in the Republic of Panama. I am a citizen who is seriously concerned about the future of my beloved country. Please! help heal our sickness. We are in serious trouble.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS W. COX.

REVISED VERSION OF THE ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ACT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring, with the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER), a revised version of the Electric Reliability Act. The bill will be sponsored by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY in the Senate.

The legislation is designed to assure an abundant supply of reliable electric power to meet our growing national needs and insure against large-scale blackouts of the kind that recently occurred in Florida and Massachusetts, and in the Northeast in 1965. A massive blackout can literally paralyze an entire region in this day when we count on electricity to perform so many functions. The mechanisms in this bill for avoiding such disasters closely parallel those recommended by the Federal Power Commission and the administration in the last Congress.

In addition, this bill contains new protections for the consumer and for the *quality* of our environment, through the establishment of a National Council on the Environment to assure that generation and transmission projects shall not be responsible for environmental deterioration; new procedures to assure that new thermal and hydro generating plants do not contribute to environmental pollution; and full protection for parks, shrines, national monuments and Indian reservations, among other things. In my judgment, it is essential that such safeguards accompany any effort to strengthen our electric power supply system.

LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles dated February 15 and 17 in the Christian Science Monitor by its chief sports columnist, Ed Rumill, are properly complimentary to the vast activities of Little League baseball. He describes the involvement of 2,000,000 Little Leaguers as "one of the most efficient and worthwhile youth programs in the world today." The news articles describe the fine influence and excellent direction given by its first and still very active president, Peter McGovern, and state that he is "just as dedicated as the people he directs—perhaps even more so."

Continuing, the articles state:

Peter McGovern and his staff . . . make a religious effort to keep faith . . . and forever uphold the high ideals of Little League baseball.

These observations of the worldwide movement benefiting our male youth should receive national attention. Hence, they are presented herewith:

TWO MILLION LITTLE LEAGUERS

(By Ed Rumill)

WILLIAMSPORT, PA.—The grandstand, diamonds, and other playgrounds covering 50 acres behind Little League headquarters are deserted these days. The calm and chill of winter have thrown a blanket of inactivity over the entire recreational area.

But inside the three-storied headquarters building there is a mid-season liveliness. Peter J. McGovern, president of Little League baseball, has a staff of more than 40 people getting ready for a 1969 program that will spread over 22 countries and involve a record two million youngsters.

"This is the time of the year we mail in excess of a million manuals, rule books, handbooks, and other pieces of information that will assist the thousands of volunteers who make our program possible," McGovern explained, smiling.

WHERE WILL IT ALL END?

It was in 1952 that McGovern came here as a representative of the United States Rubber Company to better organize the Little League setup. "U.S. Rubber had become interested in Little League ball," Peter continued, "but suddenly it became so big and involved that better administration was needed. They sent me here from New York in '52 to put it on sounder footing. The plan was that I'd stay for two or three years. I'm still here."

There were 900 leagues in the Little League division in '52. Today there are about 5,800 leagues, plus 1,600 more in the recently added senior division, and an expected 200 more in the newly organized big-league division.

I asked McGovern where it would all end—just how big Little League ball might eventually grow.

He thought about it for only a moment, then said: "Well, the growth was as much as 30 to 50 percent back in the early days, but there's been a leveling off. In '68 the increase was just five percent. Growth should be even less in '69. We've reached a point where we can be more select. But I think the final answer will come from the population explosion. If a greater percentage of youngsters is available, and the parents want it, Little League will continue to grow."

I asked McGovern the inevitable question: how did he feel about the occasional charges that Little League ball is injurious to many boys—mostly because defeat often is hard for the little fellows to take?

"I think that most of this criticism has come from people unfamiliar with Little League ball," Peter replied. "And although it has become a paramount criticism that keeps coming up, if acceptance were not there, how could the program keep growing?"

McGovern laughed, then continued: "The people who work at this Little League business—and I'm referring to those volunteers who are out in the field directing leagues and teams—are the most intensively devoted and dedicated group that I have ever encountered. This is one of the reasons why I'd better do my job right. Because if I ever let the standards and ideals of the Little Leagues be lowered or tainted, these people would descend upon me with bats and clubs. And," he quickly added, "I would not blame them."

Of course, Little League ball need have no fear of this happening. The man who sits in the president's chair, in the attractive office overlooking the diamond where the Little League World Series is played every August, is just as dedicated as the people he directs—perhaps even more so.

It is fortunate, too, that there is a Peter McGovern in the driver's seat, for there is a sad lack of interest at the major-league level in this wonderfully beneficial program for the male youth of the United States and a number of foreign countries.

MAJORS SHOW LITTLE INTEREST

"Most of our money comes from public contributions," McGovern explained. "A great percentage of it donated by the parents of the boys playing the game. Men like Walter O'Malley and Dan Topping have also been helpful. But we wish big-league baseball felt our program was worthy of their overall support."

Who can deny that Little League ball is an incubator for the pros? This is more evident now than ever before, with the new big-league division joining the Little League and senior groups.

"Our program can now take a boy nine years of age right on up to college age," stressed Bob Stirrat, public relations director at Little League headquarters. "Little League ages run from nine to 13, the senior group from 13 to 15, and the big-league group right up to college-class ball."

The only trouble with Little League ball, President Joe Cronin of the American League once said, is the parents.

"We try to educate the parents to act like adults," Peter McGovern said, again smiling. "A parent naturally wants his or her boy to win. But the chief object is to help these little fellows get started on the right road to manhood. We like to think our program is educational—a wholesome, beneficial experience for everyone involved. That is our main objective."

HOW LITTLE LEAGUE PROTECTS YOUNGSTERS

(By Ed Rumill)

WILLIAMSPORT, PA.—Have you ever sat on a wooden bench on a summer afternoon and thrilled as your boy, in red or blue helmet and baggy pants, raced around the bases for a home run?

Now that he has grown to manhood, has a career and family of his own, do you ever let your memory dream back to those wonderful Little League days and all the fun you had together?

Perhaps very few parents who uniform their youngsters the Little League way, and cheer through their victories and defeats, are fully aware of the intense, dedicated work that goes on behind the scenes, making these games possible.

Little League baseball, as presided over and directed by Peter J. McGovern, is one of the most efficient and worthwhile youth programs in the world today.

CONSTANT RESEARCH IN SAFETY

The Little League Pledge goes, "I trust in God, I love my country and will respect its laws; I will play fair and strive to win; but win or lose I will always do my best."

Peter McGovern and his staff, at headquarters here just across the Susquehanna River from downtown Williamsport, make a religious effort to keep faith in this pledge and forever uphold the high ideals of Little League baseball.

But just as important in the overall operation, which comes to an exciting climax in the stadium behind the headquarters building in late August with a nationally televised and written-about World Series, is the protection given every one of the more than two million boys who will compete in the 1969 program.

"Safety has always been one of our chief concerns," said McGovern. "We had to feel our way along in the beginning, of course, and learn by trial and error. But for more than 10 years now Dr. Creighton J. Hale, formerly of Springfield (Mass.) College has carried on a concentrated research program for us in safety. Dr. Hale has, I believe, disproved the myths of long standing concerning the capacity of young boys to play baseball and other sports without harmful consequences."

Not only has research contributed much towards improving the safety-on-the-field factor through better equipment, better facilities, and better training, but Dr. Creighton has even come up with improvements that have spread to the major leagues.

"Dr. Creighton has a mechanism in our basement that can propel baseballs at controlled speeds," explained Bob Stirrat, director of public relations for Little League ball. "And, perhaps surprisingly, he discovered that the helmet originally used by the major leagues could be shattered by a pitch traveling only 80 m.p.h. Also, the ball could strike the helmet on one side and shatter the material on the other.

"When the new and tougher helmet was manufactured, Dr. Creighton added the wrap-around ear flaps. All the majors did was cut the flap off on one side. Suspension straps inside the helmet were discarded for foam-rubber padding. Metal shoe clips were exchanged for rubber cleats."

"Research revealed that among boys in the Little League class, ages nine through 12, 90 percent of the injuries were above the belt," Stirrat said. "In the senior group, ages 13 through 15, it was just the opposite—approximately 90 percent were below the belt. When we found this out we made the senior group use rubber cleats. They had asked for the metal spikes the first year."

Dr. Creighton has improvised a flap above the catcher's chest protector, in the form of a padded collar, that guards against the troublesome foul tip in the throat. Out of all this has developed a safety booklet which is distributed to more than 7,500 leagues that will operate this year in the Little League, senior, and big-league divisions throughout the United States and more than 20 foreign countries.

All boys who play Little League baseball in all three groups, as well as the adults who voluntarily serve without pay as managers, coaches, umpires, player agents, safety officers, and official scorers must be covered adequately by accident insurance. In the insurance departments at Little League headquarters are files containing every claim made since the protection was inaugurated soon after McGovern's arrival here in 1952.

The complete story of Little League baseball, of course, fills a fair-sized volume. Some of the more worthy sides of the story have been overlooked here. But anyone who has taken part in the program, or who has come here and visited men like Peter McGovern and Bob Stirrat, quickly get the feel of the Little League—become immediately aware of the tremendous job that is being done for the male youth of the world.

LEGION FAVORS STRONG MERCHANT MARINE

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the American Legion will celebrate its 50th anniversary beginning on March 15 of this year. We are all familiar with the Legion's several programs of service to the State and Nation over the past half century, particularly in the field of youth activities, Americanism, and rehabilitation of disabled veterans. However, among other lesser known activities, the Legion has also insisted that our country maintain a strong national defense posture, including a merchant marine second to none.

On January 29, 1969, Mr. James R. Wilson, Jr., director of the Legion's national security division, addressed a seminar in Washington, D.C., on "Maritime Outlook 1969" sponsored by the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO. Mr. Wilson's remarks are timely and, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the full text of his statement:

REMARKS OF JAMES R. WILSON, JR.

In somewhat more than a year, I've been privileged to speak to two meetings of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO. By way of reciprocity, Paul Hall consented to address the National Security Commission prior to our national convention in New Orleans, Louisiana.

We were extremely proud when Mr. Hall said his "appearance gave him the chance to say 'thank you' to the American Legion for the continued fight it has waged to make our merchant fleet a strong partner in America's defense structure. No group in the United States," he said, "has been more vigorous in its support of the U.S. Flag fleet than the American Legion . . . and you deserve a vote of thanks for the work that you have been doing."

As an organization which has among its membership of more than 2,600,000 many laboring men and many others who derive their livelihood from the sea, I am grateful for this opportunity to present my views on what the future holds for the merchant marine.

Let it be clearly understood we recognize you as the experts, but even though we are generalists who in broad terms understand the role of the merchant marine, we share with you this common bond of concern for its well being.

At our national convention in New Orleans, the American Legion unanimously adopted resolution No. 552 which will be the base for our support of the American merchant marine during this vital year. The resolving clause of that resolution urged that a strong, vibrant merchant marine be proclaimed as one of our prime national goals; that a program to build 35–40 new merchant ships each year in United States shipyards be implemented immediately; that we fully develop the potential of nuclear power in our merchant fleet; and that the American flag be restored to its rightful position of leadership on the high seas.

When the law revitalizing the American merchant marine is written, the "nuts and bolts" of the law will be the work of experts like you who know and appreciate what it takes to build and maintain this "fourth arm of defense." Let me assure you that our organization will stand shoulder to shoulder with you in seeking the achievement of this objective.

Represented here among you today are men influential in shipbuilding, ship operation, both labor and management. For as long as I can remember, there has been unanimity of opinion in recognizing that the American merchant marine is in serious straits and in desperate need of help. For some unknown reason, however, the elements that support the building of a strong American merchant marine have never gotten together in a massive coordinate effort to bring about the legislative, administrative and fiscal reforms vital to its rejuvenation.

Those who support the need, no . . . the imperative requirement, for rebuilding and maintaining a strong American owned and operated merchant marine must wonder what it takes to do the job.

Last year, for example, legislation designed to overcome the deficiencies in our merchant marine and to begin the task of restoring it to its rightful position was introduced in the Senate by Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, and Edward Garmatz, Chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Despite widespread support, this timely proposal was not enacted into law. The proposals of the Johnson administration presented last May fell woefully short of our maritime needs and was characterized by our national commander as a "betrayal of the American merchant marine and all it stands for in the building of this Nation's past, present and future."

Despite the past, I am optimistic about the future and what it portends for the American merchant marine. Meetings, like this, are indicative of the desire of management, labor, government and the private sector to join hands to assure that corrective steps are taken.

Certainly the impetus to set about the task is apparent all around us. It is a well established and oft repeated fact that the United States has steadily, year by year, drifted down the ladder of standings in world shipping.

This Nation, once first, has become a fifth-rate maritime power. Today, our active merchant fleet is less than one-fifth the size of our World War II fleet. Then we were building about a thousand freighters a year; now we are building 11–13 ocean-going cargo liners a year. Even the Soviet Union has more merchant ships in her active fleet than we do, and soon her tonnage will surpass ours.

Although it should be manifestly clear to everyone, Viet Nam proved again that the only way to move massive amounts of materiel at a cost we can afford is by water. Take the present back-breaking commitments of our fleet serving Viet Nam. Our aging active merchant fleet, supplemented by World War II relics from the reserve fleet, is carrying roughly 98 per cent of our supplies and equipment moving daily to our fighting forces there.

Finally, the emergence of the U.S.S.R. merchant navy as an instrument of its forward looking foreign policy, may shake up the elements which give "lip service" to rebuilding the American Merchant Marine sufficiently to get together for a united effort.

The threat to the world of the Soviet merchant marine build-up is best summarized by the chief of naval operations who recently said: "This merchant fleet is a major instrument of Soviet national power. These ships flying the Red flag do more than just transport cargo. Theirs is a strategic function as well. Soviet merchant ships now visit 600 ports in over 90 different countries . . . and never lose sight of the fact . . . at every port which a Russian merchant ship visits, there must be some form of Russian trade organization and Soviet consular representation. As the U.S.S.R.'s merchant fleet expands, and her commercial dealings with the world expand, the Soviet commercial and consular penetration of the nations of the world must also expand."

If I had a crystal ball, I could give you a ready answer to "Maritime Outlook 1969." The fact that several very important representatives of the Congress, management and labor have been invited here to speak indicates your desire to peer into the future.

A most hopeful sign are the statements of President Nixon which give great promise of new life for American-flag shipping. He has said, "it is essential to increase U.S.-flag participation in our overseas trade as part of our export promotion policy—we must set as our goal, a sharp increase in the transport of U.S. trade aboard American-flag ships (at least 30 per cent)."

We sincerely hope the new administration goes forward with this bold new program to revitalize all segments of the American Merchant Marine. The President has pledged this. His campaign position paper on the merchant marine stated: "The time has come for new departures, new solutions and new vitality for American ships and American crews . . ." I am certain each of us fervently pray the program will be forthcoming from the White House, and soon.

At that time the Congress and the industry must lend their full support to put this proposal into effect. It is only through direct courses of action that the American Merchant Marine can again assume its rightful place as the leader among the merchant fleets of the world and regain her lost supremacy on the high seas.

I personally believe Mr. Nixon will carry through on his promises to restore America as the world's leader in seapower. The American Legion will be following closely the President's actions in subsequent months concerning the American Merchant Marine. As I said, I believe he's a man of his word.

For the good of the country's economic development and its national security, as they concern the merchant marine, we sincerely hope he will fulfill his promises.

WELCOME TO THE AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the American Dietetic Association, with a membership of 20,000 trained in the profession of dietetics, has members living in every State of the Union. This organization will soon celebrate its 52d year as a group dedicated to a continuing program of sound nutrition for everyone.

At this time, when we hear so much about malnutrition and the tragedy of Biafra, the efforts of the members of this fine group take on added significance. Recently the American Dietetic Association created the position of legislative liaison within its staff so that the expertise of dietitians could be more readily offered in the legislative area, as appropriate. I hope the Congress will listen and, hopefully, find a successful solution to our continuing war against hunger in America.

It is my pleasure to welcome the association to Washington. I do hope that the knowledge of their profession will be utilized as we work to eradicate not only malnutrition in this country, but also in our efforts to assist emerging nations in the crisis in nutrition worldwide. The association has a part to play in achieving better health not only through practical research but in day-to-day application of improved nutritional practices.

ROTARY INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. William E. Walk, of Ontario, Calif., has been selected to serve as president of Rotary International starting July 1, 1970. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Rotary International is the world's largest and oldest service club with a membership of 600,000 business and professional men around the world, devoted to the work of improving their communities, their countries, and all mankind.

The honor of Mr. Walk's election to this august position is of great significance. The last American to hold this office was Mr. Richard Evans, of Salt Lake City, and before that, former Governor and former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Luther Hodges. The fact that a good friend and a citizen of my district has achieved such eminence fills me with pride.

Rotary will be well served by Mr. Walk, an attorney with a long and distinguished record of service to his community and to Rotary. He is a graduate of the University of Southern California and a partner in the law firm of Walk, Etchason, Davidson & Liesch in Ontario. He also is a director of the First National Bank & Trust Co.

A Rotarian since 1948, Mr. Walk served as vice president of Rotary International 2 years ago. He is a member and past president of the Ontario Rotary Club, served as district governor in 1957 and chairman of the constitutional and bylaws committee in 1965. Last year he was chairman of the organization's convention in Mexico City. He is active in the State bar association and the San Bernardino County Bar Association where he served on the board of directors. He is a member of the American Bar Association and the National Trial Lawyers Association of California.

Mr. Walk was one of the founders of the San Bernardino-Riverside County Blood Bank and now is serving on the advisory board of San Antonio Community Hospital in Upland, Calif. He served as president of the Ontario-Montclair School District for 12 years.

Mr. Walk and his wife, Louise, have two fine children—Barbara, a high school teacher, and William E. Walk III, a premedical student at the University of Redlands.

As a Rotarian myself, I know that Mr. Walk's outstanding record fully qualifies him to lead this worldwide organization whose motto is, "Service Above Self."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, repression and domination of once sovereign nations by the Communist regime of Soviet Russia is well documented in the annals of history.

Self-determination, freedom, and independence, won in these United States by great sacrifice and sustained only by determined vigilance and a dedication to these principles for which men continue to give of their lives and fortunes, must not be denied to any nation whose spirit is bolstered by the hope that the United States will advance their cause. To retreat from this challenge is to diminish our own security as a free nation.

I gladly take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to join other of my colleagues in the recognition of Lithuania's 51st anniversary of the declaration of independence, February 16, 1969. Ironically, Lithuania is the only country unable to commemorate this occasion except in the undying spirit of her peoples that Lithuania will again one day be restored to independence.

The following is a statement of dedication and appeal, prepared by the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., on behalf of Americans of Lithuanian descent:

PRO MEMORIA ON LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Soviet Russia's invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was a dramatic reminder to the free world of the identical Soviet invasion and occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States in 1940. In both instances the Soviet aggression was unprovoked, in flagrant violation of existing treaties and international law, and against the free will of the people.

The United States Government sternly denounced this wanton Soviet aggression in July 1940 and has steadfastly refused to recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet communists. This just and honorable position, a basic tenet of United States policy, has been maintained by all succeeding administrations.

Despite the condemnations of the occupation by the free world, the Soviet Union still forces Lithuania and its people to suffer oppression and exploitation under despotic communist rule. Lithuanian national culture is gradually being destroyed and russification of the country and its people is being brought about. Yet, even though their country has been converted into a colony of the Soviet empire, the people of Lithuania—and the patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent—demand freedom and independence for Lithuania!

We are sincerely grateful to the United States Government for its continued firm refusal to recognize the consequence of Soviet aggression. However, this stand in itself is not sufficient to bring about the liberation of presently-subjugated nations.

It is our firm conviction that strong and steady pressure must be exerted upon the rulers of Soviet Union by the governments and peoples of the free world to effect the liberation of Soviet-captive nations. We demand, and ask the free world to join us in demanding, that the Soviets withdraw their army, police and ruling apparatus from Lithuania, so the people of Lithuania could

freely elect a government of their own choosing, in accord with the Atlantic and United Nations Charters and the principle of self-determination which the Soviets demand for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin American countries.

As citizens of the United States, we Americans of Lithuanian descent appeal to you to urge the United States Government to take all possible peaceable means to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all other captive nations.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

DAVY CROCKETT HAD A WORD FOR IT

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to reread an episode from the life of a great Tennessean who once served in this Chamber. The lesson it teaches about public funds and public responsibilities is a great one, and I include it in the RECORD because of its value:

NOT YOURS TO GIVE

One day in the House of Representatives, a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in its support. The Speaker was just about to put the question when Crockett arose:

"Mr. Speaker—I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every member upon this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the government was in arrears to him.

"Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give one week's pay to the object, and if every member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bill asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage, and, instead of passing unanimously, as was generally supposed, and as, no doubt, it would, but for that speech, it received but few votes, and, of course, was lost.

Later, when asked by a friend why he had opposed the appropriation, Crockett gave this explanation:

"Several years ago I was one evening standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other members of Congress, when our attention was attracted by a great light over in Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. We jumped into a hack and drove over as fast as we could. In spite of all that could be done, many houses were burned and many families made houseless, and, besides, some of them had lost all but the clothes they had on. The weather was very cold, and when I saw so many women and children suffering, I felt that something ought to be done for them. The next morning a bill was introduced appropriating $20,000 for their relief. We put aside all other business and rushed it through as soon as it could be done.

"The next summer, when it began to be time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around among the boys of my district. I had no opposition there, but, as the election was some time off, I did not know what might turn up. When riding one day in a part of my district in which I was more of a stranger than any other, I saw a man in a field plowing and coming toward the road. I gauged my gait so that we should meet as he came to the fence. As he came up, I spoke to the man. He replied politely, but, as I thought, rather coldly.

"I began: 'Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate beings called candidates, and—'

" 'Yes, I know you; you are Colonel Crockett. I have seen you once before, and voted for you the last time you were elected. I suppose you are out electioneering now, but you had better not waste your time or mine. I shall not vote for you again.'

"This was a sockdolager . . . I begged him to tell me what was the matter.

" 'Well, Colonel, it is hardly worth-while to waste time or words upon it. I do not see how it can be mended, but you gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not capacity to understand the Constitution, or that you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case you are not the man to represent me. But I beg your pardon for expressing it in that way. I did not intend to avail myself of the privilege of the constituent to speak plainly to a candidate for the purpose of insulting or wounding you. I intend by it only to say that your understanding of the Constitution is very different from mine; and I will say to you what, but for my rudeness, I should not have said, that I believe you to be honest. . . . But an understanding of the Constitution different from mine I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions. The man who wields power and misinterprets it is the more dangerous the more honest he is.'

" 'I admit the truth of all you say, but there must be some mistake about it, for I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any constitutional question.'

" 'No, Colonel, there's no mistake. Though I live here in the backwoods and seldom go from home, I take the papers from Washington and read very carefully all the proceedings of Congress. My papers say that last winter you voted for a bill to appropriate $20,000 to some sufferers by a fire in Georgetown. Is that true?'

" 'Well, my friend; I may as well own up. You have got me there. But certainly nobody will complain that a great and rich country like ours should give the insignificant sum of $20,000 to relieve its suffering women and children, particularly with a full and overflowing Treasury, and I am sure, if you had been there, you would have done just as I did.'

" 'It is not the amount, Colonel, that I complain of; it is the principle. In the first place, the government ought to have in the Treasury no more than enough for its legitimate purposes. But that has nothing to do with the question. The power of collecting and disbursing money at pleasure is the most dangerous power that can be intrusted to man, particularly under our system of collecting revenue by a tariff, which reaches every man in the country, no matter how poor he may be, and the poorer he is the more he pays in proportion to his means. What is worse, it presses upon him without his knowledge where the weight centers, for there is not a man in the United States who can ever guess how much he pays to the government. So you see, that while you are contributing to relieve one, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you had the right to give anything, the amount was simply a matter of discretion with you, and you had as much right to give $20,000,000 as $20,000. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all; and, as the Constitution neither defines charity nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to any and everything which you may believe, or profess to believe, is a charity, and to any amount you may think proper. You will very easily perceive what a wide door this would open for fraud and corruption and favoritism, on the one hand, and for robbing the people on the other. No, Colonel, Congress has no right to give charity. Individual members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. If twice as many houses had been burned in this county as in Georgetown, neither you nor any other member of Congress would have thought of appropriating a dollar for our relief. There are about two hundred and forty members of Congress. If they had shown their sympathy for the sufferers by contributing each one week's pay, it would have made over $13,000. There are plenty of wealthy men in and around Washington who could have given $20,000 without depriving themselves of even a luxury of life. The congressmen chose to keep their own money, which, if reports be true, some of them spend not very creditably; and the people about Washington, no doubt, applauded you for relieving them from the necessity of giving by giving what was not yours to give. The people have delegated to Congress, by the Constitution, the power to do certain things. To do these, it is authorized to collect and pay moneys, and for nothing else. Everything beyond this is usurpation, and a violation of the Constitution.

" 'So you see, Colonel, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point. It is a precedent fraught with danger to the country, for when Congress once begins to stretch its power beyond the limits of the Constitution, there is no limit to it, and no security for the people. I have no doubt you acted honestly, but that does not make it any better, except as far as you are personally concerned, and you see that I cannot vote for you.'

"I tell you I felt streaked. I saw if I should have opposition, and this man should go to talking, he would set others to talking, and in that district I was a gone fawn-skin. I could not answer him, and the fact is, I was so fully convinced that he was right, I did not want to. But I must satisfy him, and I said to him:

" 'Well, my friend, you hit the nail upon the head when you said I had not sense enough to understand the Constitution. I intended to be guided by it, and thought I had studied it fully. I have heard many speeches in Congress about the powers of Congress, but what you have said here at your plow has got more hard, sound sense in it than all the fine speeches I ever heard. If I had ever taken the view of it that you have, I would have put my head into the fire before I would have given that vote; and if you will forgive me and vote for me again, if I ever vote for another unconstitutional law I wish I may be shot.'

"He laughingly replied: 'Yes, Colonel, you have sworn to that once before, but I will trust you again upon one condition. You say that you are convinced that your vote was wrong. Your acknowledgment of it will do more good than beating you for it. If, as you

go around the district, you will tell people about this vote, and that you are satisfied it was wrong, I will not only vote for you, but will do what I can to keep down opposition, and, perhaps, I may exert some little influence in that way.'

" 'If I don't,' said I, 'I wish I may be shot; and to convince you that I am in earnest in what I say I will come back this way in a week or ten days, and if you will get up a gathering of the people, I will make a speech to them. Get up a barbecue, and I will pay for it.'

" 'No, Colonel, we are not rich people in this section, but we have plenty of provisions to contribute for a barbecue, and some to spare for those who have none. The push of crops will be over in a few days, and we can then afford a day for a barbecue. This is Thursday; I will see to getting it up on Saturday week. Come to my house on Friday, and we will go together, and I promise you a very respectable crowd to see and hear you.'

" 'Well, I will be here. But one thing more before I say good-by. I must know your name.'

" 'My name is Bunce.'

" 'Not Horatio Bunce?'

" 'Yes.

" 'Well, Mr. Bunce, I never saw you before, though you say you have seen me, but I know you very well. I am glad I have met you, and very proud that I may hope to have you for my friend.'

"It was one of the luckiest hits of my life that I met him. He mingled but little with the public, but was widely known for his remarkable intelligence and incorruptible integrity, and for a heart brimful and running over with kindness and benevolence, which showed themselves not only in words but in acts. He was the oracle of the whole country around him, and his fame had extended far beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance. Though I had never met him before, I had heard much of him, and but for this meeting it is very likely I should have had opposition, and had been beaten. One thing is very certain, no man could now stand up in that district under such a vote.

"At the appointed time I was at his house, having told our conversation to every crowd I had met, and to every man I stayed all night with, and I found that it gave the people an interest and a confidence in me stronger than I had ever seen manifested before.

"Though I was considered fatigued when I reached his house, and, under ordinary circumstances, should have gone early to bed, I kept him up until midnight, talking about the principles and affairs of government, and got more real, true knowledge of them than I had got all my life before.

"I have known and seen much of him since, for I respect him—no, that is not the word—I reverence and love him more than any living man, and I go to see him two or three times every year; and I will tell you, sir, if every one who professes to be a Christian lived and acted and enjoyed it as he does, the religion of Christ would take the world by storm.

"But to return to my story. The next morning we went to the barbecue, and, to my surprise, found about a thousand men there. I met a good many whom I had not known before, and they and my friend introduced me around until I had got pretty well acquainted—at least, they all knew me.

"In due time notice was given that I would speak to them. They gathered up around a stand that had been erected. I opened my speech by saying:

" 'Fellow-citizens—I present myself before you today feeling like a new man. My eyes have lately been opened to truths which ignorance or prejudice, or both, had heretofore hidden from my view. I feel that I can today offer you the ability to render you more valuable service than I have ever been able to render before. I am here today more for the purpose of acknowledging my error than to seek your votes. That I should make this acknowledgment is due to myself as well as to you. Whether you will vote for me is a matter for your consideration only.'

"I went on to tell them about the fire and my vote for the appropriation and then told them why I was satisfied it was wrong. I closed by saying:

" 'And now, fellow-citizens, it remains only for me to tell you that the most of the speech you have listened to with so much interest is simply a repetition of the arguments by which your neighbor, Mr. Bunce, convinced me of my error.

" 'It is the best speech I ever made in my life, but he is entitled to the credit for it. And now I hope he is satisfied with his convert and that he will get up here and tell you so.'

"He came upon the stand and said:

" 'Fellow-citizens—It affords me great pleasure to comply with the requests of Colonel Crockett. I have always considered him a thoroughly honest man, and I am satisfied that he will faithfully perform all that he has promised you today.'

"He went down, and there went up from that crowd such a shout for Davy Crockett as his name never called forth before.

"I am not much given to tears, but I was taken with a choking then and felt some big drops rolling down my cheeks. And I tell you now that the remembrance of those few words spoken by such a man, and the honest, hearty shout they produced, is worth more to me than all the honors I have received and all the reputation I have ever made, or ever shall make, as a member of Congress.

"Now, sir," concluded Crockett, "you know why I made that speech yesterday.

"There is one thing now to which I will call your attention. You remember that I proposed to give a week's pay. There are in that House many very wealthy men—men who think nothing of spending a week's pay, or a dozen of them, for a dinner or a wine party when they have something to accomplish by it. Some of those same men made beautiful speeches upon the great debt of gratitude which the country owed the deceased—a debt which could not be paid by money—and the insignificance and worthlessness of money, particularly so insignificant a sum as $10,000, when weighed against the honor of the nation. Yet not one of them responded to my proposition. Money with them is nothing but trash when it is to come out of the people. But it is the one great thing for which most of them are striving, and many of them sacrifice honor, integrity, and justice to obtain it."

THE MEHAFFEY BRIDGE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Pat Meyers of Solon, Iowa, has written a short history of the efforts to obtain the Mehaffey Bridge across the Coralville Reservoir near Solon.

Written for a class project at the University of Iowa, the paper pays proper tribute to the Mehaffey Bridge Committee which worked so hard and long on behalf of the new bridge. Their continuing efforts have been justly rewarded.

The above-mentioned material follows:

THE MEHAFFEY BRIDGE

Thirteen residents of Johnson County organized in 1956, during the construction phase of the reservoir, when it became apparent that the old Mehaffey Bridge would be removed, and there was no plan for a new one. This small group was composed largely of Solon and North Liberty residents plus those of rural areas between these towns. They decided they needed a name for their group and after much discussion decided to call themselves the Mehaffey Bridge Committee. This committee took action against the federal government to seek a bridge over the Coralville Reservoir between North Liberty and Solon.

The Solon Community School building was designated as their meeting place. These thirteen residents met several times to plan and to study what steps they should follow to preserve this bridge. They gathered information about the value of the bridge to the developing area along the reservoir and Lake McBride and about its importance to other residents of the county. They sought information from whomever might have it.

The main purpose of this committee was to try and save the present Mehaffey Bridge because the government plans were to take it out when the Coralville Dam Project was completed.

This group decided to start with petitions in the area. One man was made responsible for petitions. It was his duty to get them written up and to see that they were circulated around the surrounding communities. They were signed by 2500 people. Then this committee met with the local Board of County Supervisors at Iowa City. They had the supervisors draw up a resolution asking that the bridge be restored. This resolution and the petitions were sent to our Senators and Congressmen at Washington, D.C.

Many citizens of the area were contacted by telephone and also many were contacted personally and were asked to attend the meetings of this group, so as to stir up more interest in the project. At some meetings over 200 persons attended from all surrounding communities. These people were asked to write letters into Washington D.C. to plead their case. The response was very successful.

A survey was conducted by local people and also the Highway Commission to see how many cars and trucks crossed the bridge each day. An attorney was consulted to see if something legally could be done to retain this bridge. Property owners of Lake McBride were contacted individually about the position they took on this matter.

This group prepared a report on why this bridge was so essential to many citizens of Johnson County. This report listed many of the vital reasons why this bridge must stand. It read as follows:

1. It is a necessary public convenience and without a crossing serious economic loss to the public will occur.

2. The Iowa Highway Commission has made a study of the traffic and estimates that between 400 and 500 vehicles a day would use the crossing on week ends.

3. It would save the motorists traveling between North Liberty and Solon about 12 miles.

4. It would give much better access for people coming from the west and southwest to the Coralville reservoir and Lake McBride.

5. It would give direct access from Iowa City to the area set aside for the University of Iowa to be used for recreational teaching and camping facilities.

6. It would provide better fire protection, shorter school bus route, better medical service, delivery of food, fuel, and mail, and would relieve traffic on other roads around Iowa City.

7. Many farmers in the area need the bridge as they have land on both sides of the river.

This committee arranged meetings with Sen. Thomas E. Martin and Congressman Fred Schwengel. Congressman Schwengel visited the area and inspected the bridge. It

was decided by Congressman Schwengel to present a resolution to the Public Works Committee asking consideration of building a new bridge to replace the old bridge. The committee's secretary wrote letters to Senator Martin and Senator Hickenlooper asking for support of this resolution. Letters were also written to the Chief Engineer at Washington, D.C.

The group decided they needed more publicity on this project so they contacted radio stations and daily papers and asked their help in presenting this problem to the public. They appointed the editor of the Solon Economist newspaper to take care of the publicity. Many editorials and articles were written about the work of this committee and the progress they had made. The Iowa City Press-Citizens and Cedar Rapids Gazette carried the stories, and many articles were made public nation wide through the Associated Press. This publicity stirred up much needed interest by the public.

The Iowa City Boat Club did not support the Mehaffey Bridge Committee because their prime interest was to remove the old bridge immediately so the water level could be raised to 680 feet. They had no interest in the new bridge and accused the committee of petitioning the Board of Supervisors for their own interests. One Iowa City Boat Club member stated that the Bridge Committee was blackmailing Congress by holding the old bridge until there was a new one. After this feud took place it was made public by local newspapers, and the press did more harm by stating that the bridge would only serve local people. This publicity was damaging to the cause this group was trying to accomplish.

After several meetings with the Boat Club and many hours of presenting their reasons for the necessity of the bridge to the entire state and revealing the hundreds of hours of work in planning, talking, and sending letters committed on this project, the Boat Club began to feel differently about the situation. The members finally gained the support of this Club, and they began to realize the Bridge Committee was working for the good of all the people and that no selfish motive was involved. The Bridge Committee learned from this experience that they must be patient and must continue their monthly meetings so interest would stay alive in their project.

The group decided to send some representatives to Washington, D.C. to plead their cause to Congress. They asked for donations from business men and the people in the surrounding communities. They received financial support from over 200 people. They gathered all their material, which consisted of road maps, historical background, future development of the area, and all their reasons for the need of the bridge. Then four able men were sent to Washington, D.C., which consisted of two engineers, a member of the Conservation Commission and Senator Nolan. This trip proved very successful.

A bill presented by Congressman Schwengel, known as the Mehaffey Bridge Bill became a law when President Eisenhower signed the bill. Now that the bill was passed, the next concern was to get Congress to appropriate the money for the bridge.

Discouragement would have led many to give up during these days, but the small committee spent countless hours with the County Board of Supervisors, with county officers, state legislators, state officials, the Corps of Engineers, members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senators. Still no funds were allotted for the new bridge. New legislation was required to get the money for the bridge, but the committee knew that this responsibility was with Sen. Martin, Sen. Hickenlooper and Congressman Schwengel. The committee wrote more letters and made more trips into Washington, D.C. They had to raise more money to finance these trips, and this was accomplished by donations.

In 1961, $70,000 was made available by the Public Works Appropriation Bill. In 1962 $40,000 was made available for the bridge by another bill. In 1963 a bill made it possible to finance the bridge when enough money was obtained. These bills were signed by the late President Kennedy.

A cost of $1.2 million bid was submitted jointly by the Iowa Bridge Company of Des Moines and F. A. Moser, Incl. of Farmersburg for the new Mehaffey bridge over the Coralville reservoir.

Few people would have given this natural group of individuals a chance of succeeding in their objective. Many compared them to David and Goliath, and as this familiar story ended, so did the Mehaffey Bridge Project end. It wasn't the giant who emerged the victor.

The efforts of this natural group assured the county a new bridge. On October 27, 1966, the bridge was opened to the public for use. It is the highest and most expensive bridge in Johnson County history. The new Mehaffey Bridge is an asset to Johnson County providing a crossing of the Coralville Reservoir-Iowa River between the Butler Bridge just north of Iowa City and the Highway 218 bridge at Mid-Rivers. It is valuable to the residents of the area on either side; it is valuable to the residents of Iowa and the thousands of people who come each year to the reservoir and Lake McBride for recreation. Its value will increase each year, and all who use the bridge in the years ahead can thank a small natural group, called the Mehaffey Bridge Committee, who worked for many long years in the face of tremendous obstacles to make it possible.

FATHER OF JUNIOR ROTC

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as you know, ROTC programs have become the target of attacks by the leftist students on our college campuses. Much to my chagrin, the administration at institutions where such unrest is occurring have not always stood firmly behind the ROTC program.

Among our Ivy League schools, Yale, Harvard, and Dartmouth have stripped the ROTC program of academic credit, and it is feared that more institutions will follow suit.

A determined effort is being made, however, to halt the attacks being leveled at the ROTC programs, and institutions are being urged to defend and stand behind the reasons for providing the programs with academic credit.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, a ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, is leading this effort. He is especially close to ROTC, and over the years has earned the title of "Father of Junior ROTC."

He also is chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the ROTC programs—junior and senior. Mr. HÉBERT set forth his attitude in a speech before the National Association of Military Schools, and I hope that every Member of Congress, after reading it, will rally behind him.

The speech follows:

TEXT OF SPEECH OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE F. EDWARD HÉBERT DELIVERED BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MILITARY SCHOOLS, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Colonel Williams, Members of the National Association of Military Schools, and Friends: I genuinely appreciate the opportunity to talk to you today since there is perhaps no other group in the country which is as close to the ROTC philosophy as are you.

Both the Senior and Junior ROTC programs are essential to the future wellbeing of our nation. These programs represent the well-spring from which are derived the men who at some future date will direct the destiny of our nation in its continuing effort against aggression.

Since before the dawn of civilization man has been concerned with the problem of security.

Security against the ever-present grim specters of hunger, disease, and war. But of all these concerns—the most critical by far has been the problem of war—the problem of insuring against aggression.

Man's continuing advances in his fight against hunger and disease have, most significantly been accomplished only after he has established an environment and climate of relative peace and tranquility. In short—man's freedom from fear of aggression is an essential condition precedent to genuine human progress—and one attainable only through military security.

Yet, despite this most evident fact, there is incontrovertible evidence to indicate an organized and determined effort on the part of some segments of our society to discredit, disparage, and destroy our traditional respect for the honorable profession of soldiering.

Only a few days ago, the faculties of three prominent Eastern Universities, Yale, Dartmouth, and Harvard, took steps to strip military training of its academic standing and voted to relegate the Reserve Officer Training Corps at those institutions to the status of an extracurricular activity.

I am told that the Chairman of the Yale Faculty Committee on the Curriculum went so far as to say that—

"ROTC is like singing in the Wiffenpoofs—a perfectly fine activity but one that we don't think merits any academic standing."

Besides being an utterly asinine statement, the observation made by this not so distinguished gentleman at Yale, is intellectually dishonest.

No effort was apparently made by the Chairman of the Yale Faculty Committee to explain why Yale had for many years given academic credit for ROTC courses and was now suddenly constrained to change its policy.

No evidence was forthcoming that the caliber of teaching or training provided ROTC students had suddenly deteriorated.

No evidence was forthcoming that the military personnel who were teaching these courses had demonstrated their failure to maintain the same competence formerly exhibited by their predecessors.

No action, to my knowledge, was taken by any of these schools to present evidence of a deterioration in the content of the ROTC courses heretofore given academic credit.

These facts make it abundantly evident that the faculty had simply succumbed to the demands of the Students for a Democratic Society who have publicly announced their determination to destroy the ROTC programs on our campuses throughout the nation.

The action taken by the faculties at these institutions is only another illustration of the "jellyfish" attitude adopted by many of our so-called leading educators" who evade issues by pretending they don't exist.

Make no mistake about it, the action taken by these schools in withdrawing academic credit from the ROTC program was not motivated by any "concern for academic standards" but rather fear of a reprisal from the student far left.

The gentlemen from Yale, Harvard, and Dartmouth, and any other schools who choose to adopt this course of action by explaining it away as a concern with academic standards—are, in my view, forfeiting any possible claim to intellectual honesty and objectivity.

These gentlemen are patently and clearly guilty of the rankest discrimination against the profession of soldiering by discouraging any military presence on campus.

It is inconceivable to me that these ivory tower "scholars" could possibly insulate themselves against even an elementary awareness that progress in the "educational community" could not have been achieved without the protection and the freedom provided through our National Defense Forces.

How would Yale, Harvard, 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 such as we find in Cuba today where there is in fact no truth but the "party truth?"

How much good would all the liberal arts degrees in the world be today if there were not the freedom in which to profess and practice these arts?

Obviously, none.

A contemporary writer perhaps best states the necessity for the maintenance of a competent military establishment when he said:

"One can only abjure violence because others are prepared to commit violence on their behalf."

Those educators who wish to demean the military profession should pause for a moment and reflect on the essentiality of these forces to our future as a nation.

No one can quarrel with the fact that our Ivy League schools have contributed tremendously to the greatness of America. They have produced graduates who have wielded untold influence on the policies of our nation. These schools, therefore, have an awesome responsibility to all of America to insure that the wisdom and the abilities of their graduates permeate the highest echelons of our government so as to insure America's greatness for the future.

I, therefore, find it impossible to comprehend the determination of the faculties to dry up, if you will, the opportunity for Ivy League graduates to influence military policy as members of that noble profession.

The faculties of these schools in stripping ROTC of academic credit are, in truth, making a conscious and deliberate effort to ignore their responsibility to our country.

It is time that we in America who still believe in our country and old fashioned patriotism stand up and be counted.

I, for one, intend to do just that.

We can not acquiesce in any action which will dilute or detract from the excellence and prestige of our ROTC programs.

Do you know that the major source of officer procurement for the Army is the ROTC program?

Do you know that most of the senior Army generals in Vietnam today are ROTC products?

As a matter of fact, 5 of the 7 Army divisions in Vietnam are now commanded by general officers who received their commissions in the ROTC program. Is it any wonder then that I and many other Members of Congress are greatly disturbed by the action taken by these schools in stripping their ROTC programs of academic credit?

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I intend to urge the Department of Defense to withdraw ROTC units from institutions which have stripped the ROTC program of academic credit. I am sure that I will be joined in this demand by the vast majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services and its Chairman, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers.

The withdrawal of senior ROTC units from these schools will not adversely affect the production of ROTC graduates since there are literally hundreds of schools throughout the country who are eagerly awaiting the opportunity to install an ROTC unit and provide it with appropriate academic credit.

In addition, I will urge the House Committee on Armed Services to review other statutory avenues which the Congress can utilize to insure that ROTC will remain a permanent military program observing its high traditional standards and providing our nation with its military leaders for the future.

STATISTICS SHOW 1968 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME RATE UP NEARLY 25 PERCENT

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Police Department has released figures which show dramatic increases in serious crime in the Nation's Capital for the year just ended.

Rapes increased 51.1 percent over 1967, and armed robberies were up 49.7 percent. It is little wonder that President Nixon, in one of his first acts as Chief Executive, outlined a comprehensive crime-fight plan for the District.

In my opinion, the figures released last week indicate that there is pressing need for bail reform in the Federal courts. I have joined other Members in introducing legislation which would implement bail reform—a vital aspect of the President's program to reduce serious crime in Washington.

Because of the special interest all Members have shown in this critical problem, I insert an article from the February 12 issue of the Washington Post in the RECORD at this point:

SERIOUS CRIME IN 1968 ROSE NEARLY 25 PERCENT

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

Reported serious crime in Washington in 1968 was up 24.7 per cent from the previous year, with much of it reflected in armed robberies and rape.

The increase was disclosed in final figures for both the calendar year and the month of December, 1968, released yesterday by the Metropolitan Police Department.

In comparing tabulations for December with those of the same month in 1967, officials noted that armed robberies had increased 69.4 per cent; rapes, 20 per cent; homicides, 46.7 per cent; aggravated assault, 8.1 per cent; burglaries, 14.7 per cent, larcenies over $50, 7.8 per cent, and auto thefts, 17.4 per cent.

Comparing figures for the year 1968 with those of 1967, officials noted that reported armed robberies were up 49.7 per cent; rapes, 51.1 per cent; homicides, 7.8 per cent; burglaries, 22 per cent; larcenies over $50, 10.6 per cent and auto thefts, 33.5 per cent.

Among the serious crimes, only reported aggravated assault showed a decrease for the year. It was down 1.3 per cent. Officials attributed the decline to more thorough screening of assault complaints by both police officers and the U.S. Attorney's office.

Overall in 1968, 194 homicides, 260 rapes, 8622 armed robberies, 3102 aggravated assaults, 17,865 burglaries, 7876 larcenies over $50 and 11,354 auto thefts were recorded in Washington.

Police officials said that during December, the 11th Precinct in the Southeast section of the city led in the number of serious crimes reported, with the 13th Precinct in the heart of the city and the Ninth Precinct in Northeast Washington following closely behind.

ECONOMIC ADVISERS FOR BENNETT BILL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers has approved my bill, H.R. 951, to establish a Budgetary Information Service in the Congress to promote fiscal responsibility and give the legislative branch of Government computerized analytical capability.

The Council Chairman, Paul W. McCracken, wrote of the bill, which I have introduced over the last several Congresses:

We approve of this proposed legislation. It is a long-needed step in the direction of enabling the Congress to exercise more effectively and responsibly the task of providing budget authority and reviewing proposed and existing federal programs.

Chairman McCracken said such an agency would work hand in hand with the Government's planning-programing-budgeting system—PPBS.

McCracken wrote:

For PPBS to work effectively, Congress needs its own budget staff to review and evaluate agency proposals and supporting materials. This bill would fill that need.

The bill would set up an agency in the Congress with a director working with a staff and the most modern equipment available, including computers, to determine the cost/effectiveness of Federal programs.

I believe Congress needs a budgetary information service to bring it into the space age and out of the horse and buggy era. My bill would point out areas of duplication, inefficiency, overlapping of funds, excessive expenditures, and surplus of funds. The Congress is the authorizing and appropriating branch of Government and we should meet our responsibilities in this in an up-to-date manner to save taxpayers money on the operation of their Government.

The bill is pending in the House Committee on Government Operations and I am hopeful for early hearings and approval on the bill. A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 951

A bill to provide for a congressional Budgetary Information Service to promote fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Budgetary Information Service Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing growth and complexity of the Federal Government and its budget and fiscal expenditures has created difficulties for the Congress in the evaluation of ideas and untried plans which it must consider and assess. The Congress further finds that there exists a need to study proposals in depth to determine whether planned programs will be economical and effective and what the consequences of plans, programs, and policies will be as against alternative courses of action; and that, under existing procedures, the information necessary for such an evaluation is usually not available or when available is frequently inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established an agency of the Congress which shall be known as the Budgetary Information Service and which shall be under the direction and control of the Director. The Director shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, without reference to political affiliation and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, and he shall hold office for ten years. The Director shall be eligible for reappointment; he may be removed at any time by a concurrent resolution of Congress after notice and hearing, when in the judgment of Congress he has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient, guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment. Any Director removed in the manner provided in this section shall be ineligible for reappointment to that office. When a Director attains the age of seventy years, he shall be retired from his office. He shall receive the same salary as a Member of Congress.

(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Director shall appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such employees in the Budgetary Information Service as may be necessary to carry out the work of his office.

(c) The Director is authorized to utilize such equipment as may be necessary to fufill the functions and duties of the Budgetary Information Service. Such equipment may include that needed to provide the agency and the Congress with a complete computerized analytical capability which could be utilized by the various committees of both Houses of the Congress and the joint committees should such be the desire of the Congress at some later date.

SEC. 4. The Budgetary Information Service shall be an advisory agency of the Congress and shall not set policy. Under the direction of the Director, it shall provide both Houses of the Congress and individual Members of the Congress with up-to-date budgetary information relating to budgetary proposals and to agency performance. It shall further provide operations analyses by testing in advance of any proposal before either House of the Congress the relative effectiveness of alternative courses of action.

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Every bill reported to either House by a committee of such House shall be accompanied by a report of the Director.

(2) The provisions of this subsection are enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) Where feasible, each report of the Director made pursuant to this section shall contain a cost/effectiveness analysis of the proposal, a projection of the expected long-range cost of the proposal, and an operations analysis of alternative courses of action and their expected long-range cost. In addition, it shall analyze the proposal as against previously enacted legislation so as to point out areas of duplication, inefficiency, overlapping of funds, excessive expenditures, and surplus funds. The Director may provide any other information and analysis which seems to him appropriate and proper, and either House may request such additional information as it may from time to time desire.

SEC. 6. The Director shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of the Congress or by any committee of either House. The Director shall also, at the request of any committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request.

SEC. 7. All departments and establishments of the Federal Government shall furnish to the Director such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them under the security protections established heretofore by law; and the Director, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department or establishment. The authority contained in this section shall not be applicable to expenditures made under the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 107).

A POLLUTED WORLD

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the problems which beset our environment in the form of air and water pollution are well known. We need only glance at the oil-blackened shores of the California coast for a poignant example of the dangers of manmade disasters. Pollution is no longer a term in the esoteric vocabulary of technical government agencies. It is a danger which our citizens have begun to feel personally and they are now demanding effective action. There is no need for involved rhetoric and complicated statistics to demonstrate the evils of pollution. Its effects are easily seen and understood. No one better understands the spoilage of nature than a child and it is for this reason that I wish to make permanent record of the following letters sent to me by four sixth-grade students of the Lester Shields School in San Jose. Their sincere concern for the destruction of natural beauty demands that something be done and I commend their teacher, Michiko Hashimoto, for her educational technique of merging the school world with the real world and its very real problems:

A POLLUTED WORLD

(By Brian Hoshino)

Pollution is something that fills the air, clouds up the water, and spoils natural things. It could kill us, it could choke us, and yet people don't do anything about it except move away. Pollution is something caused by progress, and if we don't progress fast enough to stop pollution we won't progress anymore.

Pollution cuts down our air and water so we couldn't live breathing carbon dioxide and drink factory waste. It effects us deeply to have our natural resources poisoned, and living things to die. If we don't do something now we will die of air poisoning or of thirst.

The results of all this pollution would be death to all living things on earth. The world would no longer be polluted because all mankind had died. Then the world would be peaceful again as in the beginning of time.

I'm against pollution all the way because I'm an outdoorsman and I like to fish, swim, ride bikes, and play basketball without wearing a gas mask. So I hope you do something like I will try to do to stop pollution.

POLLUTION?

(By Vicki Barton)

Pollution! How do you define the word?
Destruction! Nothing will be left of the world.
Extinction! From which there is no return.
Elimination! Death, that's what we'll earn.
Asphyxiation! We're being driven to it.
Extermination! It sickens me to think of it.
Suffocation! This terrible polluted place.
Death! Very soon I'll loose face.

POLLUTION

(By Gene Ingram)

Pollution is very bad; I don't like it and it's very dirty. People just throw stuff away in the water and think it won't matter. Soon the water will be so bad that no one could clean it. All the factories just dump trash and junk into the water until they won't call it water thy'll call it "wasteland where no one can do anything". They'll keep blaming each other and then when they stop to think about it they'll realize that its partly their fault. But by the time they do something it will be too late and then the world would be thought of as a dump or just a garbageland. Air pollution is bad also. The world is getting uglier and dirtier every day because of all this junk, litter and smoke. If we landed on the moon and started civilization on the moon after a few centuries there would be pollution on the moon, too. So if you don't want to be a person who destroys the world littering try not to be a litterbug.

WATER POLLUTION

(By Nadyne King)

Water pollution is a terrible thing. It is so terrible because it kills plants, trees and many other things of God's creations. It is so terrible also because there are no places where you can go without seeing trash and garbage. Water pollution is mainly caused by factories and by people who think "just this little bit of trash won't make a difference."

Water pollution is a terrible menace to people who are trying to see what is supposed to be beautiful country. Most people aren't aware of this.

Some swimming areas have been closed down because of very unthoughtful people.

I would try to stop water pollution by providing garbage cans or something to throw your garbage away in.

In case there weren't any garbage cans around I would carry a paper bag in the car, and you could too.

I know throwing my trash away doesn't seem like it could help much but I try. Everytime I turn I take I see some kind of garbage and I can tell you I am getting tired of it.

On TV I hear many very good suggestions about water pollution and how to solve it, but all they do is talk and talk about it and they never do anything about it.

I would like you to stop and think. Everytime you throw some trash or garbage down,

it's just like throwing a piece of yourself away because it is just being destructive to where you live and grow. So if you want to keep memories when you grow up, please use a trash can and not the ground.

This world was made for love, peace and joy, not for litter.

If you care you can do your part. Think about it.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY HOSTS RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas State University at Manhattan, in cooperation with the senior Senator from Kansas, Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, recently conducted a rural community development workshop. Many persons vitally interested in community and job development in rural Kansas attended, and numerous useful ideas were exchanged during the 2-day conference.

Senator PEARSON has been a leader in seeking Federal legislation to assist rural communities with industrial development. He is a principal sponsor of the Rural Job Development Act of 1969, now pending in the other body. I have sponsored companion legislation in the House.

Every effort must be made at all levels—Federal, State, and local—to assure increased rural job opportunities if our Nation is to continue to prosper. There can be no true affluence if vast stretches of rural America are in a perpetual state of depression. The Kansas State Rural Community Development Workshop was especially productive, for local and State initiatives were discussed, ideas were exchanged, and patterns of successful development in individual communities were explored for the benefit of all participants.

Senator PEARSON took the opportunity to explain his Rural Job Development Act, and many present indicated keen interest in its provisions.

Because of the widespread need for rural job development, I insert in the RECORD a summary of the workshop activities prepared by Mr. Wilbur E. Ringler, assistant director, Division of Extension, Kansas State University:

KANSAS RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

An estimated three hundred persons, representing communities throughout the state of Kansas, participated in a Kansas Rural Community Development Workshop, December 16–17, at Manhattan, Kansas, sponsored by Kansas State University in cooperation with Senator James B. Pearson.

Several nationally recognized economists, federal and state government officials and representatives of rural Kansas communities participated in the program.

The second day of the workshop featured a "community success" breakfast with participants seated at tables according to the size of their home communities. Representatives of each community had the opportunity to tell of successful programs and projects. Several outstanding ideas resulted.

The workshop clearly demonstrated that community leaders in Kansas are aware of the need of, and are enthusiastic for, economic development within all areas of the state.

Fully realizing that individual communities must take initiative in readying themselves for new industry which will bring new jobs and income (something many are already doing), the community leaders also stressed the need for legislation and services from the federal and state governments which will aid rural areas in attracting new industry.

Jack Lacy, Director of the Kansas Department of Economic Development, told the workshop audience that industries are beginning to look with favor toward rural communities for expansion and relocation purposes. He pointed out that 86 new industries had located in rural Kansas communities with a population under 5,000 during 1968.

"Such incentives to industry as more favorable taxes, a more productive labor force, better community cooperation and in general a more favorable atmosphere have contributed to the flux of industry to small towns," Lacy said. "Small rural communities look to industry and the jobs they provide as a new lease on life. Their desire and efforts to attract and to keep an industry are perhaps the key to rural economic development," Lacy said.

Lacy added that small rural communities are making their communities attractive to industry through active commercial development associations and by enlisting the services of state and federal government.

Senator Pearson, who gave the workshop's keynote address, pointed out that the subject of rural development is a matter of growing interest all across the nation. Within the past two years the general theme of rural development has been enthusiastically endorsed and promoted by an impressive array of the nation's political and opinion leadership.

"This interest has been prompted by a growing recognition that a great imbalance between rural and urban America has developed; an imbalance most dramatically demonstrated by the growing crisis of the cities which we see in terms of festering slums, rising crime rates, disintegrating families, chronic unemployment, riot-torn streets, massive traffic snarls, burdening welfare rolls, polluted air and contaminated water," Senator Pearson explained.

"As we search for the underlying causes of this situation," Pearson continued, "many have come to recognize that these problems, to a very considerable extent, can be attributed to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry. Thus, as this recognition has spread, many have begun to accept the idea that in dealing with this crisis, the *challenge is simply not to make the large cities more efficient and livable for more and more people, but to keep more and more people from crowding into them.*"

The primary cause of the migration from rural to urban areas, Pearson said, is the lack of opportunities in the rural community. "Therefore, if we are to influence the present population movement and distribution patterns, we must significantly expand the economic and social opportunities in these rural communities.

The rural development movement is not a "back-to-the-land" movement, Senator Pearson added. "Nor will it mean the death of our New Yorks and Chicagos. But, hopefuly, it will mean a more efficient and common sense geographical distribution of our ever growing population and economic wealth."

"Reduced to its simplest terms the most fundamental ingredient of rural areas development is jobs," Senator Pearson emphasized to the workshop participants. "Unless we can create new jobs, nothing else we do will have any lasting effect, and it has been estimated that it would take at least 500,000 new jobs each year in our rural communities to significantly alter the present rural-to-urban migration patterns."

Pearson told the workshop that "what we seek here is the creation of completely new jobs rather than the transfer of jobs. For if we were to simply take jobs out of Kansas City and put them in Goodland and Liberal there would be no net gain to the state or the nation as a whole."

Pearson explained his Rural Area Job Development proposal to Congress which is designed to help create rural area jobs. "This proposal would seek to encourage new job-creating industries to locate in rural areas by making available to businessmen a series of tax incentives such as credits on building and machinery and accelerated depreciation allowances," he said. "But tax incentives are not alone sufficient for doing the job." Pearson added. "Industrial plant location is influenced by a great number of factors." He listed spirit, determination and leadership of the local community as one. New industries, he said, are also concerned about the quantity and quality of such things as housing, medical services, recreational opportunities, water and sewage systems, electrical power supply, transportation facilities, etc.

"Rural community development is not only a desirable goal for Kansas but for the nation as a whole," Senator Pearson emphasized. "Indeed I would go further and assert that rural community development is, in fact, a national necessity."

ONE FIRM'S HELP

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Hopi Indian Reservation in northeastern Arizona is completely surrounded by the Navaho Reservation. The Hopis, encircled by another culture and isolated on high, relatively barren mesas, have preserved and cherished their identity and culture. The following letter describes the assistance being provided to the Hopis by the Winslow Mail. Aside from furthering the identity of the Hopis, it allows the outside non-Indian culture to learn more of the triumphs and problems facing their Hopi neighbors.

The letter follows:

NAVAJO COUNTY PUBLISHERS, INC.,
Winslow, Ariz., December 27, 1968.

Hon. SAM STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: This letter is to inform you of what we think to be a significant contribution to the cultural exchange between the Hopi Indian Tribe and the citizens of Winslow and surrounding areas.

Beginning with the issue of November 14, 1968, the Winslow Mail now incorporates the Hopi Action News. Prior to that time the Hopi Tribe had issued this news in mimeograph form.

With the inclusion of this Hopi News in each weekly issue of the Winslow Mail, we are able to render a great service to our neighbors on the reservation by the inclusion of pictures as well as their news stories.

We feel that a circulation of 1,200 copies of this newspaper to the Hopi Reservation is an excellent medium of exchange of ideas and information between the red and white American.

The Winslow Mail makes no charge of any kind to the Hopi Tribe for the publication of their news, nor do we ask for payment for the 1,200 copies distributed to them each week. We are happy to render this service for the Hopi people. The Winslow Mail is a weekly publication with a total circulation of 3,700 copies.

We would appreciate you bringing this matter to the attention of those interested and concerned. If you are able to read this information into the Congressional Record we would like to have a copy for our files.

Thank you for your consideration, and we wish you much success in the coming year.

Sincerely,

ROBERT DONOVAN,
Editor, Winslow Mail.

THE ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ACT OF 1969

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. Moss) and 38 cosponsors in introducing the Electric Reliability Act of 1969 (H.R. 7052). Companion legislation is being sponsored in the Senate today by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The legislation that we are sponsoring here today proposes the first major review of the Federal Power Act since the Public Utilities Act of 1935 and represents the culmination of more than 3 years of effort.

The purpose of this bill is twofold.

First, to assure that an abundant and reliable source of electric power is available throughout all U.S. utility systems and to prevent recurrence of the massive, cascading blackouts that have paralyzed whole regions of the country in recent years.

Second, but equally as important, the legislation is designed to assure that the future growth and expansion of generating and transmission facilities will not cause a further deterioration in the quality of our environment. Both of these goals are essential to the well-being of this Nation and our people.

Over the past 35 years we have seen dramatic changes in our social and economic structure.

Our population has soared by 59 percent and has shifted from a rural to an urban base.

Our production, as measured by our gross national product has increased more than threefold.

As a result, our demand for electric power has increased nearly twelvefold and we have come to rely heavily upon electricity not only for industry but for the comfort and safety of our citizens in their daily lives.

RELIABILITY ESSENTIAL

The extent of our reliance on electric power was brought home very forcefully to the people of the Northeast in November 1965 when a single relay—a unit no larger than a toaster—at the Niagara-Mohawk plant on Lake Ontario failed. Within minutes, system after system collapsed and a massive blackout spread over a 30,000-square-mile area, paralyzing six of our most populous and most highly industrialized States. Thirty million people were left without power; some of them, in the Nation's largest city, for as long as 13 hours. Air control systems throughout the entire Northeast failed and a major air tragedy was averted only because the night was clear and there was a full moon. Hospitals were without power. Some 600,000 people were stranded up to 7 hours in the New York City subway system alone.

Subsequent investigations showed that had the utility systems been properly coordinated with an adequate reserve of power available, all of this could have been avoided.

Two years later, this lesson was underscored when an accident involving a temporary transmission line in Pennsylvania precipitated another cascading failure that spread throughout 15,000 square miles of the mid-Atlantic region and deprived 13 million people of power at the height of the evening rush and dinner hour. We were extremely lucky that neither of these power failures precipitated even greater disaster and our luck has held over the past 2 years. The handwriting, however, is on the wall.

In the past 2 years there have been about 190 blackouts of varying degrees of severity in various regions of the country. Of these 37 were classified as major cascading blackouts. According to power experts the only thing that has saved us from a repetition of the 1965 and 1967 disasters is the fact that last summer was relatively cool.

COORDINATION THE KEY

It is possible to coordinate and strengthen our utility system to make such failures impossible and it would be foolish of us not to do so.

The legislation that we are submitting today would give the Federal Power Commission the authority to take the steps that are necessary. It would give the Commission the authority to coordinate the Nation's generating and transmission facilities so as to assure a reliable and abundant supply of power available for each and every system.

Achieving this goal of reliability and maintaining it in the future is going to require substantial expansion in both generation and transmission facilities. FPC experts estimate that merely keeping pace with the demands of our normal rate of growth will require doubling of capacity every 10 years. And not only will we have more plants and transmission lines but they will be considerably larger than today's facilities.

It is vital that we set up the mechanisms to keep these facilities from contributing to the deterioration of our environment.

Today's steam generating plants are a major source of air pollution. Studies released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that they are the third largest source of air pollution in the Nation accounting for some 20 million tons of airborne pollutants each year. In New York, they are actually responsible for more air pollution than the automobile.

Steam and nuclear plants both are sources of thermal pollution of the Nation's waterways. It has been estimated that within 10 years nuclear generating plants will be using one-fifth of the total fresh water runoff in this country for cooling. The cumulative effect of this, as the hot water is poured back into rivers and streams could be devastating. With normal cooling devices, the water discharged from such plants may still be as high as 25 degrees hotter than it was at its intake and the water which is deficient in oxygen and rich in nutrients may eventually "kill" a waterway.

ENVIRONMENTAL THREATS

Because the facilities of the future will have to be so much larger, their potential threat to our environment is much greater. It is projected, for example, that the bulk of our new generation will come from nuclear powerplants. A recent report by the Office of Science and Technology estimated that most of the capacity for the next 20 years will come from about 250 nuclear powerplants, each with a capacity of between 2 and 3 million kilowatts.

In the area of transmission, we are already experiencing serious conflicts between scenic beauty, land use planning, and the needs of our utility system. As I pointed out when I introduced my powerlines legislation in the 89th Congress, 7 million acres of land are devoted to transmission lines. Projections from FPC estimates indicate that by 1980 the amount of land devoted to transmission lines will almost treble to a total of 20 million acres which is practically twice the acreage in our national park system. There will not only be more lines, but they will be substantially bigger. For the future, we are looking to EHV lines double and evcntually even triple the largest that are in service today.

PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

The legislation that we are introducing here today would provide the mechanism for assuring that our electric power system will grow without devastating our environment.

It would create a National Council on the Environment consisting of five members with special expertise in environmental service, conservation, and planning. This Council, which would be appointed by the President, would be required to pass upon all proposals before the FPC either for generating facilities or transmission lines. In the event of a conflict between the Council and the Commission, the Council would have special standing to challenge the FPC in court.

To assure maximum coordination of effort, the FPC would be given authority to approve all power generating facilities in excess of 200 megawatts.

At present, the FPC only has authority over hydroelectric facilities involving navigable waterways. Nuclear plants are regulated by the Atomic Energy Commission and its authority extends only to the question of safety. Fossil fuel plants are not subject to Federal regulation in any way.

The legislation we are submitting today would bring all of these plants under

the jurisdiction of the FPC, although the AEC will continue to pass upon the safety of nuclear plants. Under this system there would be one agency, and only one agency, responsible for assuring that all generating facilities are wisely and economically integrated into our national power system. And this one agency would also bear the responsibility for assuring that the necessary steps are taken to keep such facilities from contributing to the deterioration of our environment.

Let me briefly outline the key points of this bill.

Regional councils: These councils, established by utilities with the help of the Federal Power Commission, would be composed of all interested utilities in an area. They would plan together the steps to strengthen coordination and insure that all electric systems in a region—large and small, private and public—benefit from cooperative efforts. Experience has shown that regional planning is essential for safe, reliable, and low-cost power and for protection of our natural resources, and that responsible regional councils are a sound approach.

Coordination: Each regional council would be required to file with the FPC a comprehensive development plan, which could be modified or changed at a later time. The FPC could accept or reject the plan and the proposed changes, depending on whether they are consistent with reliability standards and environmental protection. In all of its licensing and other decisions, the FPC would consider the extent to which its action is consistent with the appropriate regional coordination plan or plans.

Criteria of reliability: The FPC is directed to promulgate compulsory regulations on reliability.

Construction of EHV facilities: No extra-high-voltage transmission lines or generating plants can be constructed until the FPC has found the proposed facility to be consistent with the regional coordination plan and with reliability and environmental standards developed by the FPC.

National Council on the Environment: A National Council on the Environment consisting of five members appointed by the President would be established. The Council would pass on all FPC proposals to assure that they do not have an adverse impact on the environment. It would have initial veto power, subject to later reversal by the FPC, over proposals which might have such impact and would have standing to challenge FPC decisions in court. The National Council must include experts in environmental sciences, conservation, and land-use planning.

Restrictions on condemnation: Utilities would not be allowed to exercise the power of eminent domain until the National Council on the Environment had been given a chance to present its views to the FPC on the environmental considerations. If there is an objection to a proposal, no condemnation will be permitted unless the FPC record shows that the proponent has sustained the "burden of proof" that there is no feasible or prudent alternative.

Conservation: Use of park, recreation, wildlife refuge, and historic site land for extra-high facilities is prohibited unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to such use, and unless all possible planning has been done to minimize harm.

Consumer protection: Consumers would be given a larger voice in regional and interregional utility planning and maximum publicity would be given to regional plans and construction proposals to encourage public participation. Whenever practicable, the FPC would be required to hold public hearings in convenient locations within the regions affected.

Underground transmission lines: The FPC is instructed to study the social and economic impact of overhead transmission lines, including adverse environmental effects. This proposal which I first introduced in the 89th Congress is an essential first step in overcoming the damaging effects that unsightly and dangerous transmission lines have been proven to have on property and community planning.

Other provisions: Among other provisions included in the bill I introduce today are: establishment of a National Electric Studies Committee to facilitate development and exchange of technical information improving reliability; expansion of the FPC's power to require interconnection of electric systems; authorization to the FPC to require common use or ownership of extra-high-voltage facilities, when such cooperation is in the best interests of economy, reliability and environmental protection.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to each of the following distinguished Members who have joined in sponsoring this important legislation:

ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ACT OF 1969—SPONSORS

Mr. GLENN ANDERSON, Democrat, of California.

Mr. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana.

Mr. FRANK J. BRASCO, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. GEORGE BROWN, Democrat, of California.

Mr. DANIEL E. BUTTON, Republican, of New York.

Mr. JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.

Mr. JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Mr. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, Democrat, of California.

Mr. JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan.

Mr. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Mr. THADDEUS DULSKI, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California.

Mr. JOSHUA EILBERG, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Democrat, of Maryland.

Mr. WILLIAM J. GREEN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York.

Mr. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine.

Mr. KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia.

Mr. HENRY HELSTOSKI, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Mr. EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. GEORGE E. MILLER, Democrat, of California.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan.

Mr. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Mr. BERTRAM L. PODELL, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. ADAM C. POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. THOMAS REES, Democrat, of California.

Mr. OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York.

Mr. PETER W. RODINO, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Mr. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York.

Mr. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

Mr. FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Mr. JOHN V. TUNNEY, Democrat, of California.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona.

TEACHERS' SABBATICAL LEAVE ACT

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the plight of U.S. classroom teachers who want to advance their professional training, but cannot for financial reasons, should be remedied and as quickly as possible.

As a solution to their problem, I recently introduced a bill to provide grant assistance to experienced teachers for improvement of their qualifications in secondary and elementary education.

My proposal, H.R. 6636, the Teachers' Sabbatical Leave Act, would provide grant funds to a teacher—up to $200 per month—for a period not to exceed 12 months, and available not more frequently than once in 7 years. Any qualified teacher who receives aid under the act must be given a leave of absence from his employer with reasonable assurance that his job may be resumed after completion of study.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill, if enacted, will present a positive investment in better education. With rapid and dramatic changes being made in all areas of human knowledge, I feel that such a program would be invaluable to working teachers.

Many teachers, already underpaid, can simply not afford the cost of study to keep abreast of expanding professional

knowledge. This bill will provide that opportunity—to the benefit of participating teachers and their pupils. The overall gain to our Nation has enormous promises. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to join me in support of this measure.

THE COMING CRISIS IN EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one-tenth of the children in America have physical, emotional, or mental handicaps which prevent them from progressing normally in school. Although many of these pupils are capable of the same academic achievement as other children, only a few are afforded the opportunity. Only about 30 percent of handicapped children have access to special education programs, and less than half of the Nation's public school districts offer such programs.

The response of the Federal and State Governments and the local school districts has been callously inadequate to meet this challenge. Furthermore, a worse situation is presently developing. As the New York Times emphasized in an article on February 12, thousands of children handicapped during their mothers' pregnancy by the 1964 German measles epidemic are now ready for school, but the school systems grossly lack the special education programs required.

I hope that this Congress will respond to this challenge by greatly increasing the appropriations under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and by passing further legislation which will deepen the Federal Government's commitment to the education of handicapped children.

The New York Times article of February 12 follows, with an article from the Detroit Free Press:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1969]

GERMAN MEASLES VICTIMS TAX SPECIAL SCHOOLS

(By Richard D. Lyons)

The tiny girl with the infectious smile was trying desperately to understand.

Over and over her teacher was repeating the word "open," a sound that was amplified to the bone-jarring level of a jack hammer and relayed by earphones to the child's profoundly deaf ears. The teacher also mimicked the meaning of the word by opening boxes and cartons.

But it was doubtful that the message was getting through to 4-year-old Li-Ora Rothman, one of the 30,000 surviving children who were born handicapped after the greatest German measles epidemic in a generation swept the nation in 1964.

Li-Ora is fortunate in some ways: Perhaps 15,000 babies died before birth because of the epidemic; about 5,000 who were born died in early infancy, and thousands of the survivors are receiving little or no training or educational help because facilities have been overwhelmed.

Schools for the handicapped in New York and other cities have doubled and even tripled new enrollments in preschool classes. But even this expansion fails to meet the need since the number of children handicapped as a result of the epidemic was five times the number in nonepidemic years.

TIME TO LEARN IS NOW

The lack of special training facilities is particularly tragic for deaf children, about 15,000 of whom were maimed by the epidemic. Most educators agree that the time for these children to try to learn to hear and talk is now since a child starts to talk at the age of 2 and by the age of 4 he should develop all the words necessary for colloquial speech.

"When my wife and I first learned that Li-Ora was deaf we were stunned," said the child's father, Martin Rothman of Flushing. Mrs. Rothman, a teacher, was exposed to German measles when she was pregnant but did not develop the full symptoms of the disease such as rash and fever.

German measles, or rubella as it is known medically, is a viral disease that has mild, innocuous effects on most people. But if an expectant mother develops the disease in the first three months of pregnancy the virus attacks the child's developing organs, especially his ears, eyes, heart and brain. One-quarter of these babies will die before birth, while half will have birth defects.

Mr. Rothman, a psychologist, said that when Li-Ora (Hebrew for "to me light") was a year old "we suspected that something was wrong because she went through the babbling stage and then fell silent." As with many deaf children, Li-Ora slept little as a baby, which left the Rothmans "in a state of chronic fatigue."

COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

After medical examinations found that Li-Ora was profoundly deaf, meaning that she could not hear anything but very loud noises, the Rothmans moved from Rockaway, N.J., to Queens so the girl could receive training at the Lexington School for the Deaf in Jackson Heights.

"We're very hopeful for our child's future," Mr. Rothman said. "She's an extremely bright, gutsy little girl who will get on in the world even though she may never be able to speak understandably to anyone but ourselves."

"But we still feel very thankful," he added, "when we see other children who have been afflicted by German measles who are brain-injured or blind."

Physicians who are seeing these children have told poignant stories of such youngsters being abandoned by their parents, or husbands deserting the mothers of children with birth defects, of the development of guilt feelings and antagonism between parents of such children, and of the maladjustment of the children to their siblings.

"The problems are hideous," said Dr. Donna O'Hare, the director of the City Health Department's Bureau for Handicapped Children.

SOME 375 VICTIMS UNDER STUDY

Dr. O'Hare's bureau, together with the National Foundation and the Department of Hospitals, is working with the Rubella Birth Defect Evaluation Project at Bellevue Hospital, which is studying 375 children who were afflicted in some way by the German measles epidemic.

The project's director, Dr. Louis Z. Cooper, an assistant professor of pediatrics at the New York University Medical Center, said that the strains placed upon a family by the problems of a child with birth defects were enormous.

"Some of the children can't even lift their heads, others suffer from periodic rage reactions because their tolerance to stress is low, others scream at night and their parents have to put them to bed in the basement," Dr. Cooper said.

Many parents have difficulty taking their children to special training classes on public transportation or even in taxis, whose drivers often ask embarrassing questions such as "what's wrong with the kid, lady?" he said.

Dr. Cooper, a 37-year-old soft-spoken Georgian, estimated that 50 of every 100 children born with rubella-induced birth defects would have hearing problems, including 20 who would also develop brain damage or behavioral disturbances. In addition, 20 children will have both hearing and sight impairments, and five to 10 others will be so seriously handicapped that they must be permanently institutionalized.

Dr. Cooper estimated at almost $3-billion the total cost of educating, training and institutionalizing the children who have birth defects as a result of the 1964 rubella epidemic.

But even this amount, he said, will only take them through the age of 18 and "assumes that all the children would be able to have specialized help—which they won't."

Bellevue is running an experimental preschool training class for 10 rubella children in a newly decorated, toy-cluttered ward. The children are fitted with special hearing aids through which the teachers may talk or play records.

The aim is to make the children aware that sound does exist and to stimulate their interest in its meaning so that eventually they will connect it with speech and be trained in lip reading and the manual alphabet if it is impossible for them to hear and speak.

Principals of schools for the deaf and handicapped in the New York metropolitan area report that there are many more applicants than places in their institutions.

"In New York State there are 500 such children who can't get into special schools—we have a waiting list a mile long," said Dr. Leo Connor, head of the Lexington School for the Deaf.

Dr. Connor said the Lexington School, which last year moved from Manhattan into a new $10-million building in Queens, now has 135 children under the age of 6 in preschool classes, more than double the number of two years ago.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

In the last decade the city school system has increased the number of schools having classes for handicapped children from five to 34, but according to Richard M. Lubell of the Board of Education, "There still are not enough places to go around—and in the foreseeable future there will not be enough to go around."

Mr. Lubell, who is assistant superintendent for special education, said that it takes "six months just to get through the red tape of rental procedures" to expand facilities.

One parent of a rubella victim, Robert J. Fields of Brooklyn, spent almost a year hounding public officials from Governor Rockefeller on down before his son was placed in a special class last month. Mr. Fields said he felt he was fortunate in finally finding a class for his son but wonders what is happening to the thousands of other children in the country who are not being helped.

In the last two years Congress passed two acts designed to aid handicapped children, yet only $2-million has been appropriated to help plan facilities yet to be built and expand those already in operation. The appropriation works out to 40 cents for each handicapped child in the nation.

Dr. Donald Calvert of the Federal Bureau of Education for the Handicapped estimated that only 100 children who are both deaf and blind "are appropriately placed in the country, yet the total number of such children needing help is 1,600."

"Facilities are very tight," he said, "and the situation is going to worsen because of the rubella epidemic."

[From the Detroit Free-Press, Jan. 30, 1969]

DEAF PUPILS STRAIN SCHOOLS; LEGACY OF 1964 EPIDEMIC

(By Roberta Mackey)

An epidemic of German measles, a disease so mild some people never realize they have

it, more than three years later is sending tragic shock waves through special education programs for handicapped children.

The Detroit Day School for the Deaf has enrolled twice as many three-year-olds as usual.

Oakland County has doubled its facilities for deaf and hard of hearing pre-schoolers.

Garden City has identified 14 of the 40 children in its pre-school classes for deaf children as "rubella babies."

They are children whose mothers contracted German measles, more technically known as rubella, during the first three months of their pregnancy.

Deafness is only one of their problems. Other complications may include cataracts, heart or kidney conditions, mental retardation or other handicaps.

Rubella has been recognized for a number of years as a crippler of unborn children, but when the worst epidemic in recorded history began in the East in 1964 and swept west, there was nothing anyone could do except make plans to take care of the babies when they were born.

A doctor from the National Institutes of Health predicted at the time that 30,000 defective children would be born in the United States as a result of the epidemic.

"We certainly have noticed the influx," said a spokesman for the Oakland County Intermediate Board of Education. "We have had to add a second teacher to our pre-school program."

Of deaf children being admitted now, she said, mothers in 70–80 percent of the cases reported a history of rubella or an unexplained rash during pregnancy.

Some of the babies were taken to Oakland schools when they were only a year old, and the county plans to be ready for them when they get to high school.

Expansion of the program, at Bloomfield Hills High School, will be based on the expectation that there will be 50 or 60 handicapped youngsters where now there are only 11.

Now the babies are in the beginning steps—learning to look at people's faces and to realize that that's where the sound comes from.

Their mothers are learning that they must start right away talking to their babies, standing always where the light shines on their faces and placing the baby at a level where he can see what his mother is doing.

Where normally there are 20 or 25 preschoolers in the Detroit Day School for the Deaf there now are 52, and Mrs. Harriet Kopp, the principal, says about 25 of these are rubella babies.

"We need more personnel, and we need to experiment with methods," Mrs. Kopp said. "It is still necessary to work out a program for helping children with this variety of problems."

About 10 of the Day School's 52 three-year-olds are alumni of the school's infant clinic, where children as young as six weeks may be accepted.

"It is so important to begin stimulating their brains as early as possible," Mrs. Kopp said. "We want to get deaf babies thinking in language terms. When you realize that children set their whole thinking pattern before they're five, you can see how much harder it becomes if we don't see deaf children much earlier than that."

The Day School, which is operated by the Detroit Public Schools, is applying for a state grant which will make it possible to hire more personnel and so to try more experimental ways of helping children with multiple handicaps.

It will also make possible a repeat of last summer's highly successful summer preschool.

Meanwhile, scientists are in a desperate race with another epidemic, expected in 1971 if rubella follows its usual pattern.

A vaccine is still in the trial stage, and there is some doubt how soon it can be approved for general use.

Pharmaceutical manufacturers say they'll beat the deadline. Dr. M. K. Agah, director of maternal and child health for the Wayne County Department of Health, is not so optimistic.

"I think it will be two years before the vaccine can be licensed," he said, "and that will not be soon enough."

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the National Recreation and Park Association presented an excellent statement last year to the platform committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the association's views, I submit the text of the statement for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION

INTRODUCTION

The National Recreation and Park Association is a nonprofit organization with concern for leisure opportunities for all people and with concern for the enhancement of the environment and, in general, for parks, recreation, conservation, preservation and restoration.

A 63-member Board of Trustees representing a cross-section of the nation's business, professional and lay community governs the policies of the organization.

Our membership consists of over 15,000 professional and lay leaders throughout the country with interests in Federal, state, county and municipal parks and recreation systems; hospitals and institutions; colleges and universities; the armed forces at home and abroad; zoological parks and gardens; industrial recreation; private and voluntary recreation; and commercial recreation programs and services.

PREAMBLE

Recreation is a basic human need and essential to the national welfare. We believe that the need for recreation programs, facilities and personnel is increasing rapidly due to the continued growth and urbanization of the population and because of the increase in leisure time, improved transportation and higher standards of living.

We believe that it is the responsibility of local communities to provide recreation areas, facilities and services to the people within their political boundaries through public, private and voluntary agencies. We believe that state governments have the responsibility to assist the communities by enacting adequate enabling laws; by providing advisory and information services; and by providing such complementary recreation areas, facilities and services throughout the state as may be needed.

We further believe that the Federal government has the responsibility for developing recreation resources on federally owned lands and to complement state and local programs in full cooperation with the states and their political subdivisions, without assuming responsibilities that properly rest with the states and their political subdivisions.

We believe it to be the responsibility of the executive and legislative bodies of our country to be sure that appropriate and adequate park, recreation, and conservation legislation is enacted and that assistance be given to all agencies and governments interested, concerned and/or responsible for parks, recreation, and conservation to be certain that they have adequate funds, facilities, leadership, programs and services to meet the recreation needs of our people.

PARKS, RECREATION, AND THE NATION

The population of our country today exceeds 200 million; predictions are that by the year 2000 our population will be 300 million.

The work week of our nation has been reduced from a 60-hour work week in 1900 to an average 39-hour work week today. Predictions are that by the year 1975 we will have a 32-hour work week.

Estimates are that participation in outdoor recreation during 1965 increased 51 percent over 1960 with projections of a 65 percent increase by 1980.

Government (Federal, state, county, and municipal) spending for parks, recreation and conservation in 1967 was at an all time high and estimated in the billions of dollars. If expenditures for these purposes by private and voluntary recreation agencies, hospitals and institutions, armed forces, and commercial recreation agencies were tabulated, the total figures would be increased by several billions of dollars. The American public spends 50 billion dollars a year on outdoor recreation pursuits alone.

Examinations and studies reveal a vast shortage of professional leadership; inadequate public facilities, and programs and services, especially in the urban areas; lack of adequate funds among public and voluntary recreation agencies to meet the recreational needs and demands of our people; a gross inadequacy of services for the disabled and retarded; and inadequate facilities and programs in our schools, institutions, hospitals and military installations.

We also find a need to advance the programs of the cultural and performing arts.

Mass public transportation facilities to reach public parks are most inadequate, especially in the large cities of our country.

No one can deny that much has been done in parks, recreation and conservation. However, much more needs to be done if we are to keep pace with our changing environment and society and the recreation needs and demands of our people.

The need for park and recration facilities and programs is increasing rapidly due to continued population growth, increasing urbanization and mobility, technological advances and a greater public desire for recreation opportunities.

The meaningful use of leisure opportunities is essential to the national welfare. Creative leisure activities affect the moral and physical fiber of this nation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

General

1. *We recommend* the establishment of a special task force to review the recreational needs of the urban areas and to evaluate existing Federal programs in terms of meeting these needs. Professional consultants and lay citizens, together with top officials of Federal agencies and departments having an authorized responsibility in the urban areas, serving as an advisory committee, should be given the responsibility for this evaluation.

2. *We recommend* a continuance of programs designed to improve, enhance and protect our environment and natural resources; including but not limited to grants-in-aid to state and local jurisdictions for undergrounding utility and distribution lines, water and air pollution control, the expansion of parks and recreational areas, and highway encroachment controls.

3. *We recommend* that your leadership

give active support and assistance to officials of local government in providing a program of recreational facilities and to be sure that they are equitably distributed throughout the community.

4. *We recommend* that your Party recognize the urgent need for leadership training in the park and recreation field; that colleges, universities and other training institutions be encouraged to establish practical curricula for supplying such leaders.

5. *We recommend* that your Party give adequate attention to finding ways and means of further strengthening the efforts of the private, commercial and voluntary recreation agencies to be certain that their vast resources and leadership will continue to make substantial contributions toward meeting the leisure time needs of our people.

6. *We recommend* that your Party recognize the value of recreation in rejuvenating the body and mind of individuals, the accumulating effect on the public welfare, inducement toward meaningful uses of leisure time, and advancement of American culture.

7. *We recommend* that your leadership pledge the Party to promote all forms of legislation which will aid and induce governmental agencies at all levels in acquiring and developing recreational resources for the use and inspiration of the people, the preservation of the unique features and wilderness areas of our country, the beautification of our daily environment, the interpretation of our historic and cultural heritage, and in providing inspiring leadership to aid in the wholesome use of our local, state and Federal recreation resources.

8. *We recommend* that your Party pledge support for continual and increased amounts of Federal aid to lesser levels of government, to guard against detrimental intrusion of recreation resources and to broaden the powers of governmental agencies in controlling the character of environment in recreation development areas and projects to the end that orderly and aesthetically attractive regional development may take place; and that the Federal Highway Act of 1966 be amended to permit more beautification and protection of the corridor of scenic highways.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *We recommend* that the office of the National Director of Youth Activities be created, centralizing responsibility for youth programs. Among the responsibilities to be undertaken would be the creation of summer youth conservation teams for 15–18 year olds and that, whenever possible, members of these conservation teams be put to work in their own locales, using existing local youth agencies for organization and supervisory work.

2. *We recommend* that Federal work and education programs be established under a National Service Corps for 18–25 year olds on a year-round basis to assist with park, recreation, conservation, and restoration programs.

3. *We recommend* that priority be given to the distressing shortage of adequate park and recreation space in the disadvantaged sections of core cities using land and water conservation funds and any other available governmental funds.

4. *We recommend* that a unified Federal Park and Recreation Department be created. With more than 90 Federal agencies, boards, councils and/or committees responsible for park, recreation and conservation program services, we see a great need for a centralized approach. With an increase of Federal involvement we have had more and more fragmentation, causing competition among agencies and boards, and duplication and overlaps.

5. *We recommend* that your Party support and enforce the junkyard control provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1966.

6. *We recommend* that Federal grants-in-aid in adequate amounts and on a matching dollar basis be provided to local communities for demonstration projects to convert overhead electric distribution lines to underground; further, that you support the adoption of policies undergrounding distribution lines at Federal installations and facilities.

7. *We recommend* that you support the establishment of a Special Roads Fund to provide matching grants to states for the development of scenic road systems and to finance a Federal program for national parkways and scenic roads development.

8. *We recommend* that your Party pledge itself to seek legislation to permit the disposal of surplus lands at no cost to public bodies for park and recreation purposes.

9. *We recommend* that you support the principle that military lands be made available whenever possible for outdoor recreational use.

10. *We recommend* that support be given to create an urban and suburban community forestry program in cooperation with the states to protect, improve, and plant trees in every local community and that the Federal government provide the technical and financial assistance for these programs.

11. *We recommend* that a task force be created to examine, study and report on the adequacy of indoor recreation facilities and programs on a state-to-state basis and that steps be undertaken, as may be necessary, to improve the appropriateness and adequacy of these facilities.

12. *We recommend* that special attention be given to the provision of adequate quality leadership, facilities and recreation programs for the retarded and disabled in our hospitals and institutions; and that there be added emphasis to provide quality recreation programs in our military establishments both home and abroad.

BEALL ADDRESSES COUNTY OFFICIALS

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and fellow Congressman from Maryland, J. GLENN BEALL, JR., made an interesting address last month to the annual meeting of the Maryland Association of Counties at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Baltimore. In it were several thoughts which struck a very responsive note with me and, I am sure, will with you. His comments on the relationship of Federal to State and local government reflect a deep understanding of the serious problems that face us in this sector of governmental operations.

In my judgment, the entire House should have available the full text of this speech, and, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

SPEECH BEFORE STATE MEETING OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, BALTIMORE, MD., JANUARY 9, 1969

It's a real pleasure to be here and, since this is my first formal speech as a duly sworn Member of Congress, it's a special occasion for me, too.

I can't think of a more symbolic place to launch my new Federal career than with you—Maryland's county commissioners—because, if there's one place where we need some new direction, it's in the field of Federal, State and local relations.

This is a big subject and we have some big problems demanding our attention. As a freshman Congressman, I do not presume to have all the answers but, as a veteran of our State legislature, I do have some definite views.

First, I subscribe to our Founding Fathers' conviction that those governments closest to the people possess the potential to govern best. This means I'm in favor of governmental activity performed locally, as long as it is effective.

Today, one citizen's complaint most frequently heard concerns the inability of government to relate to the people or to respond swiftly to their will. I say that local government has that ability.

Local government can offer citizens the opportunity to participate in the daily decisions which most directly affect their lives. Local government, because it is closest to the people and can be kept small, provides an opportunity for person-to-person contact which no other level of government can offer.

Let's face it, we're a country of 200 million people. We're a rapidly growing state of almost four million people. Certainly, the Federal and, to a great degree now, even the State government, are too big to reach or be reached by the people. That leaves the local government as the best unit to talk to and be talked to by the people. This also means local government remains the best instrument to serve and fulfill the individual.

State government, which often parallels local government in service, is more divorced from personal contact and more remote from individual concerns. Even the issues local government concentrates on are often the most important issues to the local resident. It may be a point as minor as efficient garbage collection or as major as primary or secondary school education, but it's a responsibility first and foremost of local government.

For the average citizen, the zoning policy of their county arouses more interest than the capital construction program of their State because it creates a more immediate impact on his life.

State government deals with the representative, the lobbyist, the civic leadership. Local government deals directly with the citizen.

State government, due to the scale and scope of programs, must act slowly and depend upon the consensus of divergent interests. Local governments require less extensive programs to serve a more homogeneous population. Thus local government can act swiftly, its action simplified by its limited scope. Local government need not always compromise to accommodate a variety of constituents for it serves one basic community of interest, and it may design programs in specific response to that community's needs.

For instance, in many cases Allegany County's problems are quite different from those of Baltimore County and Baltimore City and even those of Wicomico or Worcester or Washington Counties. The State must accommodate the constituents of all subdivisions, but Allegany County need only account for its own.

Each of these points reinforce the premise that local government holds the promise to be the most responsible governmental unit. It has the potential to become the most vital and viable governmental instrument. But, as is the case with all instruments, it requires sharpening to function effectively, continuous care to operate efficiently, and redesign to serve present and future generations.

National, State and local governments each have a part to play in perfecting our Federal system. But leadership for the modernization of local government cannot come from the White House or the State house; it must begin in the county courthouse. No one is closer to your problems than you—the elected local officials—and if you want a partnership with rather than a dictatorship from Washington, you must exercise your responsibilities as well as assert your rights.

While I am the first to favor a considerable loosening up of Federal restrictions and directions, I am also the first to see it must be balanced by an equal effort on the part of local governments.

Professional administration, courageous financing and the ability to plan and execute with imagination are attributes county leadership has all to often accepted in principle but denied in deed. All too often it has been the limited perspective of local officials rather than the rigid requirements of Federal officialdom which has impeded progress. I am not excusing the latter by citing the former. Both practices are detrimental and both should be stopped.

Acceptance of the status quo in county governments discourages initiative in the same way that big bureaucracy suffocates individual service. In both cases defensive and protective attitudes obscure honest evaluation, retard necessary reform and discourage creative development.

It will be to the best interest of all our citizens to guarantee that wherever Federal Government scales down in terms of quantity—county governments scale up in terms of quality.

I believe that any reform to achieve a more responsive Federal system must be viewed as a two-edged sword. I am only being realistic when I say that the Federal Government cannot afford to take unilateral action in this sphere. It cannot consider such monumental steps as revenue sharing or general support grants if this means turning huge sums of money over to unprofessional, inefficient or ineffective local units.

Maryland's county governments stand in a most favorable position when compared with the majority of similar units across the country. Our local governments have benefitted from a concerted effort on the part of past State administrations to strengthen their capacity. To this end, the State fiscal reform program provided both additional revenue and alternative revenue resources for subdivisions. We have also made measurable progress in regional cooperation and several counties are now tackling the critical problem of home rule.

It is my hope that all Maryland's counties will soon undertake this fundamental step toward independence. For it is an essential step toward improving intergovernmental relations. Why? Because it is almost impossible to justify why a county should exercise autonomy over Federal funds when it does not exercise autonomy in other areas.

The next most important step is to assure professional administration. This depends upon the recruitment and retention of well-trained personnel. It requires decent pay and realistic fringe benefits. Most of all, it calls for a climate of opportunity in which creativity is encouraged, ability is rewarded and security is assured for those unafraid to think or do their best.

Maryland's county governments face a particularly difficult personnel problem. They must compete not only with State government but the top dollar bid by nearby Federal Government for able employees. This very real problem is not going to go away or get any easier. I've given it a lot of thought and I'm convinced the one way for you to compete is by offering creative opportunity and responsibility to prospective recruits. One thing is for sure, you are able to guarantee bright young people who want to work, far more work to do. You can assure them more areas to advance new ideas and you can provide new ways for the enhancement of their personal prestige. County governments—like small but thriving industries—can put the accent on authority and advancement which are often more appealing to the ambitious and inventive person.

In turn, the Federal Government has an obligation to take a good hard look at what can be done to improve intergovernmental *relations.* An obligation I am confident President-elect Richard Nixon intends to fulfill.

During his campaign for the presidency, Mr. Nixon spoke often about the importance of scaling down the colossal federal establishment in order to return balance to our federal system and power to the people.

The President-elect summed up the failures of a big national government perfectly when he said, "as we look back over this middle third of the century we find that we have been getting more and more government for the people, but less and less government of the people and by the people."

To correct this situation, the President-elect has proposed the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Reorganization to study and recommend measures to increase efficiency and responsiveness of Government.

In his essay, "Toward an Expanded Democracy," Mr. Nixon writes that this Commission "would be charged with searching out every feasible means of decentralizing government, of getting it closer to the people, of transferring functions to State and local governments, of creating new instrumentalities where appropriate to involve the people at the community level directly in the decisions that affect their own lives."

Certainly, these words indicate we are about to enter a new and, I believe, better era in intergovernmental relations. The Nixon administration appears intent upon achieving some basic reforms in this sphere and I hope to find the ninety-first Congress of the same mind and spirit.

For Congress holds the power to solve many of our present problems. Reforms of the grants-in-aid program is perhaps the biggest problem. Right now, over 400 grant categories exist but only 30 of these grants claim 89 cents out of every Federal aid dollar. This leaves 370 programs financed by the residual 11 cents per Federal dollar.

Consolidation alone will free more money for the States and subdivisions simply by eliminating the duplication and overlap which now exist.

I believe that one of the first orders of business of the new administration is to bring together programs dealing with the same problems under one agency. While the Federal Government has the capacity to develop new programs, it seems to have the tendency to render them ineffective through confusing administration. The mumbo-jumbo of redtape should be cut so that it is easy for local governmental units to intensify and take advantage of Federal programs. The tendency of the Federal Government to create a new department with each new program developed must be stopped. Federal programs should complement each other rather than lead to competition between agencies for jurisdiction.

Increased use of bloc grants and various revenue sharing methods merit serious consideration by Congress. The former should enable comprehensive planning and the latter should eliminate the unfair art of "graftsmanship" which so often harms the less sophisticated subdivision.

In no case would I endorse any system of Federal aid that would favor one level of government over another. Our goal should be balance. Our objectives should be to assure flexibility and efficiency through comprehensive planning based on critical priorities as determined by the States and their communities.

The priority selection area also, in my opinion, deserves special attention. One of the shortcomings of many of today's Federal programs is the fact that priorities are established in Washington and, in many cases, these priorities do not relate to the local needs. There must be sincere effort to leave the selection of priorities to the local units so that our people's problems are dealt with in the proper order and we receive the maximum benefit from the taxpayer's dollar.

You have my pledge that I shall work toward the development of programs that will substitute cooperation and coordination for the competition that now exists. In turn, Members of Congress will look to you for proof that county governments are fulfilling their potential in terms of professional organization, responsible administration and responsive operations.

All levels of government are in the people business, but it is your level of government which holds the greatest promise to serve people as individuals. It is my hope that you will bring all the tools of modern management, all the wisdom of modern sociology and all of your personal dedication to the task. I am certain that your efforts will win the support of the new administration and the new Congress. I am confident that together we can create a new and more perfect Federal system, where those governments closest to the people govern best.

FAIR TAXES: A KEY TO GOOD GOVERNMENT

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday the second of a series of tax reform measures aimed at eliminating some of the abuses in our tax structure. Loopholes in the tax laws erode public support for good government because they build resistence to activities that should be undertaken now. The defeat of school bond issues and other socially important measures in recent years is partially the result of the average taxpayer's belief that he is bearing more than his fair share of the tax burden. Unfortunately, his belief is correct—the lower- and middle-income taxpayer bears more than his proportionate share of the tax burden. This is an injustice—every American can demand that taxes be applied and collected fairly.

There are certain fundamental duties in our society that should apply equally and fairly on each citizen. Military service, the right to vote, equal treatment under law, taxes, all fall in this category. The history of our country echoes with the struggle to insure that these civic obligations and the rights that accompany them are fairly shared by all. Unfair taxes such as the British Stamp Act, and the Townshend levies on tea, paint, paper, and other items imported by our forebearers were the causes of the end of British rule in the Colonies. It should be clear that unequal application of the fundamental duties of our society, especially when recognized, yet tolerated by public officials, destroys the fabric of that society. It is high time that we correct the abuses and close the loopholes that corrupt our tax system.

I have included in my bill a provision to reduce the depletion allowance now extended to oil, gas, and certain other minerals. Despite high and rising profits in the oil industry, we continue to give special treatment to both oil companies and to individuals who invest in oil companies. The Treasury estimates that it loses $2 to $3 billion each year as a result of the depletion allowance. The depletion allowance and other tax loopholes made it possible for the top 22 oil

refiners with a gross profit of more than $5.1 billion in 1964, to pay only 4 percent of that profit as U.S. income tax. By contrast, most companies paid up to 50 percent of their profits as U.S. taxes and most individuals were taxed at 20 to 30 percent of their incomes. The profits of the major oil companies do not show the need for special tax subsidies. My bill reduces the depletion allowance from 27½ to 15 percent, allowing an incentive for the independent oil company to undertake exploratory drilling but removing the gross unfairness of the current allowance.

I have also included in my bill a provision to remove the special tax benefits for those earning income from accumulated wealth or special forms of payment such as stock options. Under present law, a person holding certain types of property that has greatly increased in value since he originally bought it, is not taxed if he gives this property to his heirs on his death. It is estimated that as much as $15 billion in potential capital gains tax is lost each year through this loophole. My bill would also tax stock options at the appreciated value and would raise the gift tax rate to that currently applied to estates. Those able to earn income as a result of accumulated wealth should bear as much responsibility under our tax system as those who work for a wage or ordinary income. Stock options and gifts should not give the wealthy a means to avoid their fair share of the tax burden.

My bill also eliminates a provision in the tax law that allows corporations to artificially organize their activities to avoid the Federal surtax on profits. By splitting their companies into many subsidiaries, some corporations have reduced their tax bill by as much as 28 percent. The Treasury loses an estimated $235 million each year through this loophole. In an era of high corporate profits, partially the result of heavy spending connected with the Vietnamese conflict, there is no excuse for this evasion. This abuse can and should be corrected.

Complex and difficult tasks face our Government today. We face a crisis in our cities. We face demands from the States for a share of Federal revenues to meet rapidly rising expenses. We must bear the costs of an effective, balanced defense system. And all of these tasks will require some assistance from our Government. This assistance will cost money and will require tax support. This support can be lost if we do not constantly work to reform our tax structure. We must move now to pass needed tax reforms.

RECOGNITION FOR POSTAL SERVICE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in her commendable effort to obtain national recognition for the outstanding public service performed by America's postmen, Mrs. Peter B. Kuhl, a constituent of mine residing in our 30th Congressional District, has furnished me with a copy of a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles City Council honoring Postman George Herman Frelo II on the completion of 20 years service to the citizens of the Windsor Square area of Los Angeles.

In addition, Mrs. Kuhl has also been kind enough to send me two items expressing her own personal thoughts on the value of our postal service, as well as the historic connection between February 14, St. Valentine's Day, and the tradition of excellence in postal communication.

Under unanimous consent, I include this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RESOLUTION

Whereas, the citizens of the Fourth Councilmanic District realize that the postal establishment is in many ways the most human of our national institutions, touching more people in a more personal way and more often than does any other agency of our government, and its success or failure depends basically on the performance of the human beings who work for it, and

Whereas, Postman George Herman Frelo II is one of these trusted representatives, and the members of the community would pause to salute him as he terminates twenty years of service in the home area of Windsor Square to transfer to the business section of Wilshire Boulevard, and

Whereas, Postman Frelo was born August 11, 1921 at Lake Charles, Louisiana, where he graduated from the Second Ward High School June 22, 1939; married Frances Yvonne Hans, is the father of two daughters, Mrs. Virginia Antoinette Johnson and Mrs. Sharon Yvonne Moses and a grandfather of four, and

Whereas, he served in the United States Army August 17, 1943 to January 16, 1946 as a Squad Leader in the Pacific, and

Whereas, George Frelo entered the U.S. Postal Service in Los Angeles, California on December 15, 1947 and was recently the recipient of the 10-Year Safe Driving Award from the Post Office Department, and

Whereas, he is a devoted churchman; a member of the Greater Olivet Baptist Church where he serves as financial secretary and trustee, and

Whereas, Mr. Frelo's hobbies are golf, fishing, bowling and practicing the art of good human relations, and

Whereas, we would salute Postman Frelo in the words of Arthur Chapman who wrote in his book Romance in Business, "We Look for the postman as one waits for the morning, and seldom does he fail us. He serves us well": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles City Council by the adoption of this resolution, recognizes and appreciates the postal service of which George Frelo is symbolic, and extends every good wish for his continued activity and good health in the years to come.

Presented by:

JOHN FERRARO,
Councilman, Fourth District.

Seconded by:

L. T. TIMBERLAKE,
Councilman, Sixth District.

THE LEGEND OF FEBRUARY 14

About the year 270 a young Roman Martyr by the name of Valentine was languishing behind prison bars when he spied a violet growing outside the window; its leaves were the shape of a heart.

He called to the warden who brought him a leaf on which he scratched with his finger nail "I love you" and "Thoughts of thee". It was delivered to his best beloved.

Years later Valentine was canonized on February 14 and ever since on this day mailmen throughout the world have come merrily along under a bag loaded with love—thoughts of thee.

The language of the violet is known as "Thoughts of Thee".

Let us pause to salute these men.

I HAVE A DREAM

It began in 1901 on the Wolfskill orchard tract where I lived for more than a quarter of a century—my birthplace.

The joy of our day was the visit of the Postman; we revered him—and I believe we had the same one through the years.

Especially was he looked for on February fourteenth—no communication gap then between the generations—He always came loaded with love for all.

Since the first mailman for St. Valentine, the Roman Martyr, in 270 A.D. delivered a message on a violet leaf, then to the pony express, the mail coach, the train, the car and now the air, there is still no substitute for all the steps that must be taken in sunshine and snow—day and night. With all the Special deliveries—each postman is a martyr—let this special day canonize him.

GILBERT BILL TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs to represent the interests of consumers within the Federal Government.

The need for such a Department has long been evident. Even a cursory study of the Federal Government discloses that the agencies which have consumer responsibilities have not been providing the necessary protection. They have not, for the most part, because they are structurally unable to do so.

Some of them, like the Food and Drug Administration, cover too narrow a field.

Others, like the Federal Trade Commission, have been ineffective, largely because of an unclear mandate from Congress.

Still others, like the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, are torn by a conflict in responsibility between the consumer interest and the interest of their own constituents. The Commerce Department exists to promote the interests of business. The Agriculture Department exists to promote the interests of the farmer. Frequently, these interests run counter to what is best for the consumer, for the American public generally. I suppose if the injury to the consumer is particularly flagrant, these Departments will stand up for the consumers. Yet there is a conflict of interest here, and in the thousands of instances, the "marginal" cases, it will not be the consumers for whom these agencies will look out.

That is why we desperately need a Department of Consumer Affairs.

The executive branch has, for some time, recognized the deficiency that

exists inside the Government of a spokesman for the consumer. Under President Kennedy, a consumer representative became a part of the White House staff. This practice has continued. But under both President Kennedy and President Johnson, the representative was not sufficiently effective, largely because the office was itself powerless. Under President Nixon, a consumer representative has been named about whom I have severe reservations. I think the deficiency will become worse. I believe that the only real solution to the problem is to end the institution of the stop-gap Presidential adviser and replace it with a real and authoritative Department of Consumer Affairs.

What is important about such a Department is that it will have genuine enforcement powers. It will have responsibilities to look out for the consumer interest. It will have programs, a staff, an incentive to serve. We have failed to protect the American public by taking for granted their interests in the realm of consumer affairs, but the evidence has now become overwhelming that this agency is badly needed. I call on my colleagues to join the cosponsors of this measure in supporting a change important to every one of his constituents.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the decision by President Nixon to release Miss Willie Mae Rogers from any responsibility for Federal consumer programs was in the best interest of everyone concerned. I am hopeful that the new consumer adviser to be nominated by the President will represent at the highest levels of Government the importance which this responsibility entails.

On Friday, February 14, 1969, I held a press conference to urge President Nixon to reconsider his appointment of Miss Willie Mae Rogers as his adviser on consumer affairs. Following are my remarks from the press conference, and several editorials which confirm my doubts as to the suitability of Miss Rogers' appointment to that post. I am also including my statement released to the press after Miss Rogers' resignation:

ROSENTHAL STATEMENT

As Chairman of the Special Inquiry on Consumer Representation in the Federal Government of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have been studying for over two years the efficiency and effectiveness of federal programs designed to protect the consumer. We have held hearings on supermarket practices in the ghetto, the sale of government-rejected food items in retail stores, and consumer information responsibilities of the federal government.

We have also been gathering data and information on the 260 consumer protection activities in which 33 federal departments and agencies are engaged. It has taken my staff and myself over two years to begin to understand the consumer programs that are dispersed among those agencies and to comprehend the complexity of consumer needs.

I am distressed about the appointment of Miss Rogers as the President's consumer Advisor, both because of a possible conflict of interest from her association with a questionable profit-making publication, and because of that publication's role in the consumer protection field.

It is all the more important that Miss Rogers' qualifications be scrutinized today because her appointment is not subject to Senate confirmation and therefore she has escaped the customary questioning by congressional committees.

Willie Mae Rogers was sold to the public as a consumer champion based on her reputation as "Keeper of the Seal". It is necessary, therefore, to examine and make public what is known about Miss Rogers as a consumer advocate and about the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval itself.

The existing office of the Special Assistant to the President on Consumer Affairs operates on an annual budget of $421,000. It is charged with a number of important tasks. No Presidential Consumer consultant can do an adequate job if she or he is working on a part-time basis. One or two days a week is simply not enough. The job calls for an individual actively working full time and dedicated to objectively determining whether the consumer is adequately protected by the federal government and, if not, what can be done to increase that protection.

Miss Rogers' enthusiasm for her new assignment is reflected in the fact that she chose not to resign her job with Good Housekeeping but preferred to moonlight in Washington.

I believe that working on a part-time basis in itself would be enough to disqualify Miss Rogers. But there are other grounds for disqualification. There is a built-in conflict of interest stemming from her association with Good Housekeeping magazine. What this means in cold practical terms is that Miss Rogers, whose salary will be paid by the advertisers of Good Housekeeping, will be expected to cast a critical eye on agencies who in turn are expected to cast a critical eye on her advertisers. Miss Rogers will be advising the President about the consumer protection programs of the Federal Trade Commission, which passes on the truthfulness of the claims made by the manufacturers of the products which have the Good Housekeeping Seal and on the integrity of the Seal itself—the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration, which scrutinize the packaging and advertising practices of the food, drug, and cosmetic companies whose advertising fills the pages of her employer, Good Housekeeping—the National Commission on Product Safety before which her employer, Good Housekeeping, refused a request to testify.

You cannot serve the advertisers of Good Housekeeping and the President of the United States at the same time and report to the President objectively. Miss Rogers is put in the difficult role of having to snitch on her friends. Miss Rogers depicts herself as Mrs. Clean and Apple Pie and Motherhood, but her heart belongs to Daddy, and Daddy is Good Housekeeping.

How can she report on the vitality and efficiency of consumer programs administered by federal agencies like the Food and Drug Administration when the very products advertised in her magazine are under suspicion? Products seized by FDA as unsafe still carry the Good Housekeeping Seal and are being advertised in Good Housekeeping magazine.

Miss Rogers' attitudes towards the consumer movement would also disqualify her for the position of special Assistant to the President on Consumer Affairs. What do we know about these attitudes?

In February 1966, she testified before the National Commission on Food Marketing. As a member of that Commission, I was on the panel questioning her—along with Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan and Doctor Elmer R. Kiehl of the University of Missouri. Some of her statements before the Commission suggested at that time that she was hardly sympathetic towards or in close touch with consumer problems and the consumer renaissance in America.

Let me quote for a moment from that testimony:

"I don't suppose there is anybody anywhere who thinks the food industry, or any other industry, is like Caesar's wife, above reproach. But I do believe that as in so many instances, their magnificent contribution to the job of making America the best fed nation in the world gets a bit lost now and then in the criticism of a few conditions."

And another quote; when she was questioned:

"Mr. ROSENTHAL. 'If I am not mistaken the President in his State of the Union Message for—called for enactment of Senator Hart's Truth in Packaging bill. I take it you are not in agreement with that?'

"Miss ROGERS. 'No, I just do not think all of it is needed.'

"Mr. ROSENTHAL. 'What portion do you think is not needed?'

"Miss ROGERS. 'Right this minute I could not but in that scrap book that I hope now after I have done it you all will take time to look at it . . .'"

I read that exactly as it was recorded.

In the press conference Miss Rogers held on February 12, 1969, she stated that, "For the first time in the history of a Consumer Affairs Council or Committee within the Government a President has taken a good look at it and has come to somebody who has had practical experience in this whole area." But Miss Rogers' previous experience in this field consists only of positions with Union Electric Co., St. Louis and Admiral Corporation, and her job at Good Housekeeping. At that same press conference Miss Rogers stated: "I think the Government does a marvelous job of protection of consumers." It appears that she has already reached a conclusion about the very area she is charged with investigating. Assigning Miss Rogers to the role of Presidential consultant on consumer affairs is like putting a fox in a chicken coop.

Now let me explain how my subcommittee became involved in investigating Good Housekeeping. We have always been interested in providing the consumer with information on the performance and quality of goods and services. Last fall, we began an investigation into government and private product testing organizations. Good Housekeeping was among the institutions we studied.

Good Housekeeping maintains a testing laboratory which its officials state has an annual budget of $1 million. It tests about 900 products a year.

On December 11, 1968, I sent a letter to the technical director of the Good Housekeeping Institute, requesting that he answer twelve questions pertaining to the procedure Good Housekeeping follows before it endorses or approves a product. In response, two attorneys were sent from Good Housekeeping. We learned the following information about Good Housekeeping and the Seal—which is claimed, by the way, to influence the buying decisions of 42.9 million women.

We learned, first of all, that Good Housekeeping, a successful profit-making commercial organization, apparently makes the seal available to any manufacturer who will advertise in the magazine—with the exception that liquor and contraceptive advertisements are rejected as a matter of policy. Lawyers for Good Housekeeping could not provide a list of advertisers who had been denied the seal. Before 1941, any manufacturer could apply for the seal. In 1941 the policy was changed. The seal became available to only those who advertised.

To keep the Good Housekeeping seal, an

advertiser must continue to allocate a proportionate share of his overall advertising budget to the magazine. In other words, increasing advertising in other magazines or newspapers or radio and television require comparable increases in advertising in Good Housekeeping. The advertiser, therefore, must spend more with Good Housekeeping whenever he increases his total advertising outlays.

These provisions which force advertisers with limited resources who want the Seal, to advertise only in Good Housekeeping—which limits the extent to which it can advertise in competing media—would seem to be highly unethical and may be illegal restraints of trade. Both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have indicated an interest in this requirement.

Good Housekeeping, in 1968, paid out an average only 23 claims per month; it rejected 85% of the claims it received. And the lawyers I spoke to said that they could not recall or document any product that lost the Seal.

I'd like to give President Nixon the benefit of the doubt, and assume that, in naming Miss Rogers, he was the victim of bad advice. He probably relied on the Seal of Approval in making his appointment and had been taken in by this program, which is administered by Miss Rogers. He was probably so sure of the integrity of the Seal that he did not check further on her credentials. If he had, he would have found that she had a record of public opposition to the Truth-in-Packaging Law. He would have found that Good Housekeeping was among the major magazines joining grocery advertisers in 1966 in opposition to the then pending Truth-in-Packaging legislation, and that same year Good Housekeeping sponsored the full-page ad I have here before me from the New York Times of November 16, 1966, criticizing the consumer food boycotts in Denver and elsewhere.

Based on everything that is known about Miss Rogers, and about the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, I believe that she should have been disqualified for that office before she was ever appointed.

I hope now that President Nixon will reconsider her appointment in light of these circumstances.

On February 15, Miss Rogers resigned as President Nixon's Consultant on Consumer Affairs. Upon hearing this announcement, I released the following statement to the press:

I believe that the severance of Miss Rogers and her role in the business community from the nation's consumer protection program is in everyone's best interest. I commend the President for his action which now makes possible the search for a real spokesman for the country's consumers. I hope he will give his new consumer advisor the authority, staff and representation at the top of the Administration which the consumer deserves.

We have played too long with the notion that part-time advisors, or those with divided interests or inadequate experience can properly speak for the consumer. Let's find the right person now but even more, let's find the right level of representation in the government—at the Cabinet level—for the consumer.

I am attaching, herewith, editorials which appeared in the Washington Post of February 16, 1969, and the New York Times of February 17, 1969:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 16, 1969]

MISS ROGERS BOWS OUT

President Nixon and Miss Willie Mae Rogers are both to be commended for having thought better of the irregular arrangement whereby Miss Rogers as a paid employe of *Good Housekeeping* magazine would have served as Mr. Nixon's consultant on consumer affairs. Yesterday Miss Rogers declined the appointment, and it was withdrawn. Apparently there had been new conditions attached by the White House which requested that Miss Rogers take a leave of absence from her *Good Housekeeping* job, and apparently Miss Rogers felt that her future effectiveness had been undermined by the criticism of her appointment. One doesn't want to bear down too heavily on either the circumstances of her withdrawal or the official public language in which it was explained. The point is that with unaccustomed speed, an Administration saw fit to rectify a mistake in public, and that act deserves an unreserved welcome.

President Nixon, however, may have been slightly off the point in regretting that "the integrity of Miss Rogers and the organization she represents have come under unwarranted criticism." The eye of the three-day hurricane was not Miss Rogers' integrity, but rather the suitability of her appointment. And whether the criticism of the organization she represents was warranted or not will be somewhat clearer when the findings are all in from the Government Operations subcommittee in the House, which is currently looking into the procedures of the Good Housekeeping Institute and other product-testing organizations. What the fuss has demonstrated is a growing awareness on the part of both the public and its elected officials of the importance of consumer protection—a complicated (and sometimes life-and-death) matter that requires serious and full-time attention from Government. It used to be that consumer affairs were regarded as a marginal issue, and it still is true that for purposes of record-keeping, statistics and political analysis we tend to categorize "consumers" as a separate population group along with, say, labor union members, farmers, nonwhites and blue-collar workers. But in terms of both good politics and good government the classification is illusory. The thing about consumers is that everybody is one.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1969]

GOODBY, MISS ROGERS

The abrupt exit of Willie Mae Rogers from the White House was the sensible way out of a dreadful appointment. Zeal in protecting consumers is an obvious first requisite for a Presidential adviser on consumer affairs. Miss Rogers' insensitivity to that requirement was made plain by her inability to recognize any incompatibility between her White House role and continued identification with a sales-oriented testing bureau whose quality certifications are linked with advertising in the magazine that runs the bureau.

More interesting than the Rogers departure—an inevitability almost from the moment that the original appointment became known—is the elliptical disclosure in the White House statement announcing her going that President Nixon has a "program to assure American consumers of all possible protection." Since most of Mr. Nixon's emphasis in the campaign was on self-reliance in the market place, it is encouraging to be informed that such a program exists. Its details will be of significance to all 200-million American consumers.

ON CURBING OIL POLLUTION

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the California State Water Resources Council Board today began a series of meetings on pollution problems besetting the coastal areas of the State.

In view of the recent oil discharge in the Santa Barbara Channel, these hearings could hardly be more timely. I am submitting the following statement, for inclusion as part of the record of the hearings, which may be of interest to some of our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

The Santa Barbara Channel oil leak has riveted public attention on the potentially dire effects of pollution on what here in California is certainly one of our most precious natural assets—our shoreline. The swift growth of our population is paralleled by an increase in demands on our beaches. Since the coastline cannot be lengthened or perceptibly altered, our only recourse is to attempt to preserve what we already have.

The millions of people who enjoy and use the beaches of Southern California at this point must think very little of the steps taken so far by the Federal Government to protect these beaches. I blame Washington, rather than Sacramento, since the State Government has imposed more stringent controls on drilling operations in the tidelands under its jurisdiction. I have noted for one thing, that California requires the encasement of drill-pipe to at least 1,200 feet below the ocean floor, while the Interior Department calls for protective casing only 300 feet down—and apparently is prone to waive even that modest standard. I frankly fail to comprehend the logic behind the weaker Federal regulations.

Whatever the merits, or lack of them, of the taking of crude petroleum from the Outer Continental Shelf, it has become a bonanza for the Federal Government. Since 1953, oil and gas revenues have totaled $4.4 billion, and last year alone $1.5 billion in bonuses, royalties and rentals were collected by the Interior Department.

What concerns me, and has prompted this statement, is the allocation of these vast sums. Right now, they're practically all winding up in the general fund of the Treasury Department. Under Public Law 90-401, enacted last year, about $100 million in OCS revenues will be used to make up an expected deficit in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The rest of the money will go into the Treasury, with no strings attached.

It seems to me that we in the Federal Government, who must assume major responsibility for oil and gas recovery operations on federally leased tidelands, should take it upon ourselves to do more—much more—to prevent accidents of the sort that devastated the Santa Barbara Channel.

I propose that as a start we earmark a certain percentage of the OCS receipts for *research* aimed both at improving drilling procedures and responding more effectively when blowouts do occur.

Currently, the Government is doing next to nothing to support investigations into the causes and prevention of these leaks, whether they occur underwater or in the hold of a tanker. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has contracted for some relatively modest research projects in this area, and has kindly provided me with a summary of them. However, studies of this nature, so essential to the integrity of our coastal areas, are not specifically authorized. The FWPCA, in a vivid example of robbing Peter to pay Paul, has had to siphon off funds from other, equally valuable programs to finance these experiments.

A number of agencies and bureaus within the Interior Department are well qualified, because of the nature of the roles assigned them by Congress, to investigate estuarine oil pollution. Besides the FWPCA, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey come immediately to mind. As I see it, the latter two agencies would concentrate on *preventive* measures and the FWPCA would concern it-

self primarily with the best *remedial* steps to take following one of these disasters.

As one example, we need to know a lot more about the chemicals employed to disperse concentrations of oil. Despite the occasionally extravagant claims for their effectiveness by certain oil companies, there is reason to suspect some of these detergents may be doing more harm to fish and other forms of water life than the raw petroleum itself.

Congress and the White House have not, up to now provided the kind of leadership that is clearly needed if we are to develop a coordinated assault on the off-shore pollution problem. I am told that a year or so ago the Budget Bureau, in a truly short-sighted move, rejected an FWPCA request for $50 million for a five-year examination of all aspects of the oil seepage menace.

With public interest—and concern—greater than ever before, now is clearly the time for action. We must get behind legislation to authorize a concerted research effort that should have been undertaken years ago. And what could be a more logical source of funds for this program than the OCS rentals themselves? Surely we could afford to earmark a small portion of this largesse, say one or two percent, for research. I have no complaint about the diversion of some of these revenues into the Land and Water Conservation Fund—but, laudable as it is, the fund does nothing to remove the potential for contamination of our shore line from which, however indirectly, it is profiting.

I am certain that most of my colleagues in Congress would respond positively to specific proposals by the Interior Department for applying a small fraction of the OCS windfall to a research program for safeguarding our beaches and at the same time banishing forever whatever doubts and fears may have developed in the public mind about the intentions of our Government.

COMPUTERS FOR CONGRESS—A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in a 1965 speech in Pittsburgh, I said:

Responsible decisionmakers in Government and in industry need new techniques and systems of organizing, storing, retrieving, integrating, analyzing and testing the multitude of factors upon which a rational decision must rest. Now is the time to use these techniques at the highest level of Government where the mass of relevant and important information is the largest, where the complexity of the interrelationships is the greatest and hence, where the decisionmaking is the most difficult.

Again, in 1966, I said:

Our constitutional government with its delicate system of checks and balances depends on the development of computer capability in the legislative branch. I propose that we bring Congress from the horse and buggy age into the age of the computer.

Last year, I urged that—

With private enterprise, the executive branch and the state legislatures in the computer age, Congress must change its ways or it will fail the American people. Computers cannot make congressional decisions, but as our world gets more complex, Congress will be unable to make rational decisions without computers.

In the 90th Congress, because of the growing awareness and articulated concern of Members of Congress that we should enter the computer age—because it has become imperative that we have better and more timely information and more sophisticated analysis on which to base our decisions—I introduced legislation to establish a Legislative Data Processing Center for Congress.

This bill, which was unfortunately introduced too late in the last session for hearings, does not contemplate, as some might suppose, turning the U.S. Congress into one giant "think tank," but rather proposes the development of an eventual on-line system serving every Congressman, Senator, and congressional committee, able to communicate with all other on-going systems.

In 1966, except for one small unit which the Library of Congress used to handle its payroll, Congress did not possess one penny's worth of ADP equipment.

Today, the Clerk of the House is doing the payroll and the inventory of mechanical and electrical equipment, furniture, and property through the use of his computer, and considering the merits of an automatic voting system, computerized addressing service, and the possibility of an information retrieval system; the Sergeant at Arms on the Senate side is already doing computerized mailing for the Senators; the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress is publishing the Digest of Public Bills through the use of their computer; and there are proposals to expand LRS's facilities; to establish a new division for information and analysis within GAO; and other proposals. I support the philosophy behind all of these efforts, but in my proposal, these systems could "talk to each other." The keynote is coordination.

Cicero once said:

If truth were self-evident, eloquence would not be necessary.

In support of my remarks, I would like to include a very eloquent article from the Washington Post of February 16, by writer Richard Lyons, entitled "Hill Takes a Step Into Computer Era," which discusses the new computer capability in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I welcome this kind of support; I further think as we go forward—sometimes as it would seem, step by step—that this pilot operation is an excellent example of the need for the type of legislation I am reintroducing today.

I am delighted that my friend and colleague, the Honorable ROBERT MCCLORY, of Illinois, has agreed to cosponsor this legislation. Having the support of the articulate spokesman from the other side of the aisle, an acknowledged leader in this field, is evidence of the bipartisan interest and backing for this kind of endeavor on Capitol Hill today.

Because I feel that this electronic marvel has the versatility, adaptability, and capability to be of great service to Congress and staff alike, I urge your attention to the Post article, and would welcome your support.

The article follows:

HILL TAKES A STEP INTO COMPUTER ERA

(By Richard L. Lyons)

Congress, which cherishes its quill pen and snuff box atmosphere, has taken a first small step into the computer age.

In the offices of the House Banking and Currency Committee is a teleprinter connected with a computer in the Library of Congress that can produce within seconds every detail of the status of the several hundred bills before the Committee.

Type out a question to the computer about a bill, say H.R. 11 to revamp the Federal Reserve System, and out clatters in neatly printed form everything that is known about it. You get the name of the sponsor, the date introduced, a summary of its provisions, whether hearings have been held and if so, the witnesses, whether the bill was amended and how and whether it was approved by the committee, the House and the Senate.

RUNNING DOWN QUERIES

This may not be as important as finding water in an $80 billion defense budget, but it's a start and could spread. The House Appropriations Committee is considering use of computers to try to make sense out of a Federal budget approaching $200 billion.

For members of Congress this first small step is important. One of their most time-consuming chores is to run down queries from constituents on the status of legislation.

Occasional publications that attempt to keep up with legislation usually are obsolete when printed. In two weeks the Banking Committee has found that, at a cost of $350 a month, it can instantly produce all information on the status of a bill as of the day the request is received.

HELP TO COURTS

Committee staff members who worked on the project see a greater future dividend from it than answering daily queries. It could build into the computer a detailed legislative history of the bill that could help courts years later determine the intent of Congress as the courts seek to construe the meaning of a statute. Courts now rely to a great extent on committee reports and floor debate, which is not always precise or even accurate.

The potential use of computers by Congress as it struggles to ride herd on a highly computerized Federal bureaucracy and private industry is probably enormous but at best only dimly understood.

Two years ago, the House finally brought in a computer to handle its payroll and all sorts of other uses suddenly became evident. The computer may soon be tied into the House voting machinery to produce instant and accurate breakdowns of roll call votes.

It may be that after watching helplessly for more than a generation as power shifted downtown to the giant bureaucracy, Congress could make some use of the technological advances of this century and regain a measure of control.

WISN–TV NEWSFILM IS BEST IN THE WORLD

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to report that a Milwaukee, Wis., television station, WISN–TV, has won first place for the best TV general newsfilm in the world at the Newsfilm Festival in London. This award was received for the film, "Just Another Day," a poignant Christmas story, filmed

by Photographer Mike Crivello, a Ninth District constituent and a personal acquaintance of several years.

The award is the latest in a long series for WISN-TV newsfilm photographers, who received 27 major awards in 1968 alone. That is a record, I daresay, few, if any, stations in the country can challenge.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEFENSE OF THE FOUR FREEDOMS FOR THE UKRAINE

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in this great Republic there are innumerable groups, organizations, fraternal and welfare societies whose general and avowed aims are to extend some help to the needy, to work for the betterment of social and cultural life in communities, and to carry on welfare and social work.

The number of such groups is legion. Among these are a few organizations whose principal aim and purpose is to rekindle and keep alive the spirit and love of freedom among peoples abroad who are robbed of all freedoms, and are suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The Organization for Defense of the Four Freedoms for the Ukraine has such a mission: to fight for the defense of four freedoms for the unhappy people in the Ukraine, with all the means and might it can muster among its members and supporters.

Since its formation in 1947, this organization has remained true to its aim and purpose, has gathered strength and has grown in size during the course of its activity in nearly all Ukrainian-American communities throughout the country, and today it can boast 45 local branches.

It has become a nationwide organization, and its headquarters in New York is a busy center of activity. Under its auspices books and monographs on the lot of the people in the Ukraine are published. The organization has its own periodical, Visnyk—herald. And it holds biennial conventions in which prominent authorities deliver speeches on the actual conditions in the Ukraine today. In all this fine work, the organization cooperates with other Ukrainian groups, and is closely affiliated with the Ukrainian Congress Committee on America.

Long before the enunciation of the four freedoms by our wartime President in 1941, all forms of freedom were suppressed in the Ukraine by the agents of the Kremlin. But the noble idea and the spirit were not dead among the people there.

After the last war it was hoped that the people would be allowed at least some freedom, but the Stalinist-inspired regime saw to it that there was none.

At this juncture a group of patriotic Ukrainian-Americans felt that by the formation of an organization here for the purpose of keeping the righteous cause of Ukraine alive was urgent, and set up the Organization for Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, during the 22 years of its existence, the organization has done fine work, acquainting the public in this country with conditions in the Ukraine under Communist totalitarian tyranny. I wish it more power and strength, and unflagging success in all its endeavors.

SUEZ CANAL STATUS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as all students of Panama Canal history soon discover, the Suez and Panama Canals are parts of a round-the-world canal route. Significant developments at one usually make their impact on the other.

A most informative summary of the present status of the Suez Canal, written in Beirut, Lebanon, by John K. Cooley, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, was published in a recent issue of that great international newspaper.

In his article, correspondent Cooley stresses, first, that Soviet arms shipments to Vietnam, as a result of the closure of the Suez Canal, have to be shipped around Africa or over the Trans-Siberian Railway; second, that the U.S.S.R. is consolidating its relations with Arab countries along the Red Sea route; third, that the canal closure is indirectly aiding Israel by encouraging the construction of an oil pipeline, new highway and port facilities, making this strategically located country a transit route; and, fourth, that the shipping prospects of the Suez Canal have been seriously affected by the construction of supertankers that will never use it because toll-free voyages around the Cape of Good Hope are more economical.

The indicated article follows as part of my remarks:

CAIRO BACKS SURVEY FOR SUEZ

(By John K. Cooley)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The Suez Canal is again a main focus of the Middle East crisis.

For the second time since the canals closing in the June, 1967, Arab-Israeli war, Egypt has authorized surveys aimed at freeing 14 ships trapped there during the war.

Israel complained to the UN Security Council Feb. 13 of Egyptian sniping on the canal-bank cease-fire lines. Egypt countered with a detailed complaint that Israel plans to keep all the territories it took during the June war.

Both the Israeli and Egyptian Armies have moved most civilians out of the canal zone and reinforced their positions.

These developments illustrate the two main currents of crisis. They are parallel but flow in opposite directions; one toward prospective peace arrangements, the other toward possible new fighting.

PEACE STEP SEEN

Egypts apparent willingness to meet the shipowners wishes to free their ships could—but will not necessarily—be a move toward reopening the canal.

Reopening the canal could, in turn, be one step in a phased timetable for peace. Such a timetable is called for by the Soviet peace proposals of last December and has been endorsed by the French and United Arab Republic Governments.

Soviet, French and British diplomats have often suggested Israeli troop withdrawal out of artillery range from the canals east bank as part of a "package deal." This, they say, could end in opening the canal and in Israel's gaining the free access to it which is one of its permanent objectives.

Israeli spokesmen have publicly rejected any "piecemeal" solutions and pressed for a general U.A.R.-Israeli peace agreement.

PLEDGED 25-MILE SURVEY

The UAR Government said Feb. 13 the Suez Canal Authority could supervise the survey of 25 miles of the 108-mile-long canal, from the Great Bitter Lake southward to Suez. The shipowners would pay for it.

The UN truce-observer team in the canal zone might supervise its security, according to a representative of one of the British shipowners.

An American ship, the Observer, is blocked in Timsah (Crocodile) Lake, just south of Ismailia. Farther south, in the Great Bitter Lake, are 14 ships of other nationalities.

On Jan. 25, 1968, Israel told the UN it would permit surveys of the southern but not the northern exit route. UAR divers and boats began to inspect sunken obstacles the next day.

But when canal-authority tugs attempted to enter the canal stretch north of Lake Timsah, the Israelis opened fire and all survey operations stopped.

MISSION STALEMATED

The January, 1968, halt in canal operations was followed by a stalemate in UN Ambassador Gunnar Jarring's peace mission, though for different reasons.

One reason was riots against the regime in Egypt in February which weakened President Nasser's internal position. Diplomatic observers say they believe this is why he then gave up plans to take the unpopular step of sending peace emissaries to hold talks with Dr. Jarring and emissaries of Jordan and Israel in Cyprus.

Now the situation resembles, in some ways, that at the start of canal surveys in January, 1968. Israel says through the UN that clearing can take place, but not in the canal's northern half. Soviet ships are moored in Port Said, at the northern tip of the canal, close to Israeli lines.

Israel charges Egyptian snipers are trying to provoke its troops on the canal. Israeli statements reported firing in the area of Ismailia and near Port Tawfiq at the canal's southern outlet.

COMPLAINTS CALLED PRELUDE

Pro-Egyptian newspapers in Beirut Feb. 14 viewed these Israeli complaints as a prelude to an Israeli attack or raid on the canal. They also said the complaint to the UN mirrored Israeli anxiety over Arab commandos in Sinai. Israeli has charged these are directed by Egyptian Army intelligence officers.

Cairo Feb. 13 released the text of a note from U.A.R. Foreign Minister Mahmud Riyad to the Security Council. It drew attention to Israeli Premier Levi Eshkol's recent Newsweek magazine interview.

Mr. Eshkol's remarks and those of other Israeli leaders, the U.A.R. note pointed out, indicate Israel intends to keep many of its territorial gains instead of withdrawing, as the November, 1967, Security Council resolution specifies.

Britain and the Soviet Union are the two big powers pressing most strongly for Israeli withdrawal from the Suez Canal and its reopening.

SOVIET-VIETNAM OBSTACLE

The canal's closing impedes Soviet arms deliveries to North Vietnam. These have to be sent around Africa or across the long Trans-Siberian Railway route.

Like that of Britain in past centuries Russia's effective presence in the Mediterranean requires free passage for Russian naval and merchant shipping through the Suez Canal. The Soviets have been consoli-

dating relations with Egypt, Sudan, the Somali Republic, and North and South Yemen, the states along their Red Sea communications lines.

The canal's closing has sharply decreased its economic value and indirectly aided Israel, now becoming a transit country for petroleum. The expansion of the Israeli port of Eilat and its linking to the Mediterranean by a new road and pipeline under construction will enhance this role, according to oil experts here, provided Israel continues to receive shipments from the Western oil consortium in Iran.

SHIPPING PROSPECTS ALTERED

Supertankers are changing the prospects for the canal's future. The canal's 1967 capacity was to pass ships of up to 65,000 tons. Egypt had been planning to increase this capacity up to 200,000 tons by 1976.

But oil-industry sources say the supertankers of 200,000 to more than 300,000 tons now on order or under construction in Japan are so economical that, even if canal tolls remain at their June, 1967, level, it would be cheaper for them to use the long route from Middle East oil fields around Africa.

HUNGARY REMEMBERED

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the heroic days of October in 1956 when the Hungarian people won, for a brief but memorable period, their freedom. The brutal physical repression which followed, and which we have seen repeated so recently in Czechoslovakia, succeeded in conquering the territory, but not the people, of Hungary. In October of 1968, a group of exiled Hungarians gathered from all over the world on the solemn anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. They issued the following manifesto. Because of the document's historical importance, and because many peoples of the world are still striving to throw off the chains of slavery, I include it in the RECORD:

MANIFESTO ISSUED ON THE OCCASION OF HUMAN RIGHTS' YEAR IN THE INTERESTS OF THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE AND WORLD PEACE

We, the undersigned Hungarian individuals and organisations in the free world, address the following appeal to world opinion as well as to all Hungarians whether living at home or abroad:

The Hungarians living in freedom, dispersed over the five continents of our globe, remain closely linked with the main body of the nation by bonds of a common history, language and cultural heritage. They are therefore the natural spokesmen of their country, which has lost its independence, and a helping hand extended towards their people living under foreign occupation. More than one million Hungarians in the free world represent a powerful source of strength to the homeland.

Behind the Iron Curtain the seeds sown by the Hungarian Revolution have ripened into a harvest ready to be gathered in. This is evidenced by our neighbours who are struggling to achieve their right to freedom despite the heavy pressure weighing upon them; even their Communist governments are seeking the road to national independence.

Of course, there is no chance as yet for the nations aspiring to independence and freedom to extricate themselves from the abject bondage into which the Second World War had pushed them. The aggression committed against Czechoslovakia on 21 August—which in concert with world-wide indignation we condemn most bitterly—has proved this once again. However, this violation by Soviet force of arms of a "fraternal" Slavonic ally and fellow Communist government of the Soviet Union also proves that irreconcilable contradictions are making their disintegrating effect felt, even within the European zone of the once homogeneous Communist camp.

These are not mere ideological deviations: grave conflicts of interest are involved. Moscow's hegemony has become insupportable. The Communist governments of Eastern Europe are therefore each groping for a way out from the abyss into which political and economic pressures have thrust their countries.

The United Nations Organisation has declared 1968 Human Rights Year in order to recall the Universal Declaration which first formulated those human rights 20 years ago. Respect for this code is binding upon all member nations. Let us therefore summarise those requirements which, in the light of the Human Rights Declaration (hereunder abbreviated to H. R.) appear as indispensable to the maintenance of peace and in the interests of this nation.

1. Our country's sovereignty, infringed by the presence of Soviet divisions, must be restored, in conformity with a number of resolutions passed by the U. N. General Assembly since 1956. Neither the Peace Treaty nor the Warsaw Pact empowers Soviet occupation troops to stay in Hungary. Nor can there be any strategic justification for this occupation as our fatherland has no common frontiers with NATO countries. The occupation of Hungary and its neighbours is dictated by the imperialist policy of the Soviet Union, not its legitimate defence interests. (H. R. Article 4.)

2. Freedom of assembly, the possibility of forming democratic parties and ensuring their functioning, must be guranteed constitutionally. In this world of ours, striving for ever more freedom, party monopolies are out of date; they lead to dictatorship which is profoundly repugnant to the Hungarian soul. (H. R. Article 20.)

3. In the interests of the freedom of the Press and free access to information, foreign agencies and publications must be given full equality of treatment by the government; all discrimination must be abolished (H. R. Article 19.)

4. Freedom of worship must be ensured. An end must be put to the ambiguous situation in which the freedom of religion, guaranteed by the Constitution and advertised to the external world, is in fact obliterated by craftily disguised methods of persecution. Persons imprisoned for giving religious instruction must be released. The adoration of the Golden Calf, whether it be done done under the sign capitalism or Marxism, has stirred up the indignation of youth all over the world. Wherever we may be we should all revert to the correct awareness that "man shall not live by bread alone". (H. R. Article 18.)

5. Political prisoners must be released and Cardinal Mindszenty rehabilitated. He is a victim of the Stalinist Rákosi period which has been condemned even by the present régime. (H. R. Articles 18, 19, and 20, as above.)

6. A new economic order is needed, freed from the fetters of outdated theories and striving only for the true welfare of the people. The primary aim of economic development must be the raising of living standards as quickly as possible. Democracy in industry must be restored, workers being guaranteed a fair share of the goods produced by them, and the independent protection of their interests. Wage-earners must be allowed their just claims even though the State itself is their employer. There is also need for a radical land reform to restore the peasants' interest in their work and thus raise production. The peasants' right to contract out of a co-operative or choose other forms of co-operation is in theory ensured by law. An end must be put to the colonial exploitation of the Hungarian people by the one-sided oppressive system of COMECON,* and the country's economy must be again opened to free exchanges on world markets. (H.R. Articles 17 & 23.)

7. The protection of the family, both morally and materially, must be ensured, for this is the biological basis of the Hungarian people's survival. Even to this present century our nation has been subjected to much blood-letting: let not the embryo be destroyed in the mother's womb for no good reason by "provisions of the law". The statistics of the last few years in this respect are frightening. (H.R. Article 16, paragraph 3.)

8. The social care of the aged and the infirm, who are nowadays hardly able to eke out an existence with their miserable allowances, must be improved. (H.R. Article 25.)

9. Let everybody's right to a passport be respected, and the system of limited permits be abolished. There should no longer be any murderous devices at the frontiers, particularly those with neutral Austria whose peaceful population has lost many a victim amid the mine fields and barbed-wire entanglements. (H.R. Article 13, paragraphs 2 & 14.)

10. Every nation has a right to self-determination. Honest differentiation must begin as a prerequisite to integration in the Danubian Basin which is the keystone of lasting peace in Europe. Let there be neither privileged nor underprivileged nations in the Danubian Basin. That two-faced morality which, by making hypocritical play with the slogans of democracy, used to punish and reward according to the changing moods of great-power selfishness, must be eliminated. In the meantime, inter-governmental agreements should ensure equality of rights for the Hungarian minorities living in the neighbouring countries, in the spirit of the community of fate and fraternal solidarity of all concerned. The future of two million people in Transylvania, 650,000 in Czechoslovakia, and half a million in Yugoslavia—that is a total of more than three million Hungarians—is at stake. (H.R. Article 21.)

It depends on the Hungarian Government how soon and how many of the reforms, indispensable to serve the people's true interests, can be made to materialise. If the reforms are not made, the government will continue to be the mere satraps of an alien power. An independent, democratic Hungary, however, regardless of the party politics pursued by the government of the day, can count on the support of Hungarians living abroad. But the same people protest, and will fight with all their might, against the perpetuation of their homeland's dependent, semi-colonial status.

Lajos Veress de Dálnok, Chairman of the World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters (Great Britain).

Dr. Tibor Eckhardt, a former Chief Delegate of Hungary to the League of Nations (U.S.A.).

Gusztáv Hennyey, former Minister for Foreign Affairs (Federal Republic of Germany).

Colonel General Ferenc Fakas de Kisbanak.

Professor Karoly Kerényi (Switzerland). (Federal Republic of Germany).

Ferenc Marosy, Hungarian Ambassador Madrid (Spain).

Béla Padányi-Gulvás, former Member of the post-1945 National Assembly, former Parliamentary rapporteur of the Foreign Ministry, a former delegate to the Interpaliamentary Union (Switzerland).

Professor Imre Sövalye Tóth (Turkey).

Dr. Victor Stankovich, journalist and broadcaster on international affairs (France).

*The Soviet-controlled economic groupings in Eastern Europe.

Dr. Béla Teleki, a former Member of the pre-1945 Parliament (USA).

Albert Wass, writer, President American-Hungarian Arts Guild (USA).

World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters (Signed by Dr. András Pogány, Vice Chairman, (USA).

Federation of Former Hungarian Political Prisoners (Dr. Nándor Liszka, Chairman, Sweden).

National Federation of Former Political Prisoners (Tibor Helcz, Chairman, USA).

World Federation of Hungarian Veterans (Major-General Elemér Mészöly, Chairman, USA).

Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists (Dr. László Varga, USA).

Federation of Hungarian Organisations in Germany (László Légrády, Chairman, Federal Republic of Germany).

Hungarian Organisations in Belgium (Dr. Ernö Töttösy, Belgium).

Hungarian Liberation Committee (Erno Rigoni, Chairman, France).

Action Committee for the Preparation of the Unity of Hungarian Emigree Organisations (Ferenc Tury, Netherlands).

Federation of Hungarian Organisations in Switzerland (László Farkas, Chairman, Switzerland).

Viennese Hungarian Federation (Dr. Andor Papp, Acting Vice Chairman, Austria).

Federation of the Free Press (Dr. Zoltán Makra, Secretary General, Federal Republic of Germany).

Canadian Hungarian Federation (György Nagy, Chairman, Canada).

Széchenyi Society (József Fülöp, Chairman, Canada).

Hungarian Cultural Foundation (József Ertavy Barát, USA).

Federation of Hungarian Boy Scouts/Europe (Ferenc Z. Tury, Netherlands).

A. B. N. Mission to the APACLROK (Dr. Lajos Katona, Formosa).

THE AGE OF DISCONTINUITY

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 and 7, 1969, I took occasion to call to the attention of the House certain thought-provoking excerpts from a book entitled "The Age of Discontinuity," by Peter F. Drucker, which excerpts appeared in the Washington Post.

I now offer for the information of the House a final segment of these excerpts, as follows:

REPRIVATIZATION

Such a policy might more properly be called "reprivatization." The tasks that flowed to government in the last century because the family could not discharge them would be turned over to the new nongovernmental institutions that have sprung up and grown the last 60 to 70 years.

Government would start out by asking the question: "How do these institutions work and what can they do?" It would then ask: "How can political and social objectives be formulated and organized in such a manner as to become opportunities for performance for these institutions?" It would also ask: "And what opportunities for accomplishment of political objectives do the abilities and capacities of these institutions offer to government?"

This would be a very different role for government from that it plays in traditional political theory. In all our theories, government is *the* institution. If "reprivatization" were to be applied, however, government would become *one* institution—albeit the central, the top, institution.

Reprivatization would give us a different society from any our *social* theories now assume. In these theories, government does not exist. It is outside of society. Under reprivatization, government would become the central social institution.

Political theory and social theory, for the last 250 years, have been separate. If we applied to government and to society what we have learned about organization these last 50 years, the two would again come together.

The nongovernmental institutions—university, business and hospital, for instance—would be seen as organs for the accomplishment of results. Government would be seen as society's resources for the determination of major objectives and as the "conductor" of social diversity.

I have deliberately used the term "conductor." It might not be too fanciful to compare the situation today with the development of music 200 years ago. The dominant musical figure of the early 18th century was the great organ virtuoso, especially in the Protestant north. In organ music, as a Buxtehude or a Bach practiced it, one instrument with one performer expressed the total range of music. But as a result, it required almost superhuman virtuosity to be a musician.

By the end of the century, the organ virtuoso had disappeared. In his place was the modern orchestra. There, each instrument played only one part, and a conductor up front pulled together all these diverse and divergent instruments into one score and one performance. As a result, what had seemed to be absolute limits to music suddenly disappeared. Even the small orchestra of Haydn could express a musical range far beyond the reach of the greatest organ virtuoso of a generation earlier.

The conductor himself does not play an instrument. He need not even know how to play an instrument. His job is to know the capacity of each instrument and to evoke optimal performance from each. Instead of "performing," he "conducts." Instead of "doing," he leads.

AUTONOMY IMPORTANT

The next major development in politics, and the one needed to make this middle-aged failure—our tired, overextended, flabby and impotent government—effective again, might therefore be the reprivatization of the "doing," of the performance of society's tasks. This need not mean "return to private ownership." Indeed, what is going on in the Communist satellite countries of Eastern Europe today—especially in Yugoslavia—is reprivatization in which ownership is not involved at all.

Instead, autonomous businesses depend on the market for the sale of goods, the supply of labor and even the supply of capital. That their "ownership" is in the hands of the government is a legal rather than an economic fact—though, of course, an important one. Yet to some Yugoslavs, it does not even appear to be incompatible with that ultra-bourgeois institution, a stock exchange.

What matters, in other words, is that institutions not be run by government but be autonomous. Cooperatives, for instance, are not considered "capitalist" in the Anglo-American countries, although they are "private" in that they are not run by government. And the same applies to "private" hospitals and the "private" universities. On the other hand, the German university has traditionally been almost as autonomous as the American "private" university, even though—as is the case with European universities generally—it is a state institution.

Reprivatization, therefore, may create social structures that are strikingly similar, though the laws in respect to ownership differ greatly from one country to another and from one institution to another. What they would have in common is a principle of performance rather than a principle of authority. In all of them, the autonomous institution created for the performance of a major social task would be the "doer."

Government would become increasingly the decision-maker, the vision-maker. It would try to figure out how to structure a given political objective so as to make it attractive to one of the autonomous institutions. It would, in other words, be the "conductor" that tries to think through what each instrument is best designed to do.

And just as we praise a composer for his ability to write "playable" music which best uses the specific performance characteristic of French horn, violin or flute, we may come to praise the lawmaker who best structures a particular task so as to make it most congenial for this one or that of the autonomous, self-governing, private institutions of a pluralist society.

Business is likely to be only one—but a very important—institution in such a structure. Whether it be owned by the capitalist, that is, by the investor, or by a cooperative or a government might even become a secondary consideration. For even if owned by government, it would have to be independent of government and autonomous—as the Yugoslavs show—not only in its day-to-day management but, perhaps more important, in its position in the market, and especially in a competitive capital market.

CREATED TO CREATE

What makes business particularly appropriate for reprivatization is that it is predominantly an organ of innovation; of all social institutions, it is the only one created for the express purpose of making and managing change. All other institutions were originally created to prevent or at least to slow down, change. They become innovators only by necessity and most reluctantly.

Specifically, business has two advantages where government has major weaknesses. Business can abandon an activity. Indeed, it is forced to do so if it operates in a market—and, even more, if it depends on a market for its supply of capital. There is a limit beyond which even the most stubborn businessmen cannot argue with the market test, no matter how rich he may be himself. Even Henry Ford had to abandon the Model T when it no longer could be sold. Even his grandson had to abandon the Edsel.

What is more, of all our institutions, business is the only one that society will permit to disappear. It takes a major catastrophe, a war or a great revolution to allow the disappearance of a university or of a hospital, no matter how superfluous and unproductive they might have become. Again and again, for instance, the Catholic Church in the United States attempts to close down hospitals that have ceased to be useful. In almost every case, a storm of community nostalgia forces the supposedly absolute bishop to retract his decision.

But when the best-known airplane manufacturer in the United States, the Douglas Co., designer and producer of the DC-3, was in difficulty in 1967, neither the American public nor American Government rushed to its rescue. If a competitor had not bought the company and merged it into his operations, we would have accepted the disappearance of Douglas—with regret to be sure, and with a good deal of nostalgic rhetoric, but also with the feeling: "It's their own fault, after all."

Precisely because business can make a profit, it must run the risk of loss. This risk, in turn, goes back to the second strength of business: Alone among all institutions, it has a test of performance. No matter how inadequate profitability may be as an indicator, in certain respects, it is a test for all to see.

One can argue that this or that obsolete hospital is really needed in the community or that it will one day again be needed. One can argue that even the poorest university is better than none. The alumni or the community always have a "moral duty" to save "dear old Siwash." The consumer, however, is unsentimental. It leaves him singularly unmoved to be told that he has a duty to buy the products of a company because it has been around a long time.

The consumer always asks: "And what will the product do for me tomorrow?" If his answer is "nothing," he will see its manufacturer disappear without the slightest regret. And so does the investor.

This is the strength of business as an institution. It is the best reason for keeping it in private ownership. The argument that the capitalist should not be allowed to make profits is a popular one. But the real role of the capitalist is to be expendable. His role is to take risks and to take losses as a result. This role of the private investor is much better equipped to discharge than the public one.

We want privately owned business precisely because we want institutions that can go bankrupt and can disappear. We want at least one institution that, from the beginning, is adapted to change, one institution that has to prove its right to survival again and again.

If we want a really strong and effective government, therefore, we should want businesses that are not owned by government. We should want businesses in which private investors, motivated by their own self-interest and deciding on the basis of their own best judgment, take the risk of failure.

The strongest argument for "private enterprise" is not the function of profit. The strongest argument is the function of loss. Because of it, business is the most adaptable, and the most flexible, of the institutions around. Therefore, it is the one best equipped to manage.

SOME GLOBAL SUCCESSES

Reprivatization is still heretical doctrine, but it is no longer heretical practice. Reprivatization is hardly a creed of "fat cat millionaires" when Black Power advocates seriously propose making education in the slums "competitive" by turning it over to private enterprise, competing for the tax dollar on the basis of proven performance in teaching ghetto children.

It may be argued that the problems of the Black Ghetto in the American city are very peculiar problems—and so they are. They are extreme malfunctions of modern government. But if reprivatization works in the extreme case, it is likely to work even better in less desperate ones.

One instance of reprivatization in the international sphere is the World Bank. Though founded by governments, it is autonomous. It finances itself directly through selling its own securities on the capital market. The International Monetary Fund, too, is a case of reprivatization. Indeed, if we develop the money and credit system we need for the world economy, we will have effectively reprivatized the creation and management of money and credit that for millennia have been considered the prime attributes of sovereignty.

Again, business is well equipped to become the "doer" in the international sphere. The multinational corporation, for instance, is our best organ for rapid social and economic development. In the Communications Satellite Corp. (Comsat), we are organizing worldwide communications (another traditional prerogative of the sovereign) as a multinational corporation.

A socialist government, the Labor government of Britain, has used reprivatization to bring cheap energy to Britain—in contracts with the multinational oil companies for the exploration and development of the natural gas fields under the North Atlantic Ocean. And the multinational corporation may be the only institution equipped to get performance where the fragmentation into tribal splinter units, such as in the "mini-states" of Equatorial Africa, makes performance by government impossible.

But domestically as well as internationally, business is, of course, only one institution and equipped to do only one task, the economic one. Indeed it is important to confine business—and every other institution—to its own task. Reprivatization will, therefore, entail using other nongovernmental institutions—the hospital, for instance, or the university—for other, noneconomic "doing" tasks. Indeed, the design of new nongovernmental, autonomous institutions as agents of social performance under reprivatization may well become a central job for tomorrow's political architects.

We do not face a "withering away of the state." On the contrary, we need a vigorous, a strong and a very active government. But we do face a choice between big but impotent government and a government that is strong because it confines itself to decision and direction and leaves the "doing" to others. We do not face a "return of laissez-faire" in which the economy is left alone. The economic sphere cannot and will not be considered to lie outside the public domain.

But the choices of economy—as well as for all other sectors—are no longer either complete governmental indifference or complete governmental control. In all major areas, we have a new choice: an organic diversity in which institutions are used to do what they are best equipped to do.

In this society, all sectors are "affected with the public interest," whereas in each sector a specific institution, under its own management and dedicated to its own job, emerges as the organ of action and performance.

FIFTY YEARS ASTRAY

This is a difficult and complex structure. Such symbiosis between institutions can work only if each disciplines itself to strict concentration on its own sphere and to strict respect for the integrity of the other institutions. Each, to use again the analogy of the orchestra, must be content to play its own part.

This will come hardest to government, especially after the last 50 years in which it had been encouraged in the belief of the 18th-century organ virtuosos that it could—and should—play all parts simultaneously. But every institution will have to learn the same lesson.

Reprivatization will not weaken government. Indeed, its main purpose is to restore strength to sick government. We cannot go much further along the road on which government has been traveling these last 50 years. All we can get this way is more bureaucracy but not more performance. We can impose higher taxes, but we cannot get dedication, support and faith on the part of the public.

Government can gain greater girth and more weight, but it cannot gain strength or intelligence. All that can happen, if we keep on going the way we have been going, is a worsening sickness of government and growing disenchantment with it. And this is the prescription for tyranny, that is, for a government organized against its own society.

This can happen. It has happened often enough in history. But in a society of pluralist institutions, it is not likely to be effective too long. The Communists tried it, and after 50 years have shown—though they have not yet fully learned—that the structure of modern society and its tasks are incompatible with monolithic government. Monolithic government requires absolute dictatorship, which no one has even been able to prolong much beyond the lifetime of any one dictator.

Ultimately, we will need new political theory and probably very new constitutional law. We will need new concepts and new social theory. Whether we will get these and what they will look like, we cannot know today.

But we can know that we are disenchanted with government—primarily because it does not perform. We can say that we need, in a pluralistic society, a government that can and does govern. This is not a government that "does"; it is not a government that "administers"; it is a government that governs.

RICHARD NIXON, IDEOLOGICAL DESCENDANT OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, the 160th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, it was my pleasure to speak at the Walworth County Lincoln Day dinner at Delavan, Wis.

In a small way, my theme was a comparison of the responsibility and the approaches of our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, and our 15th Republican President, Richard Nixon.

The main thrust of my remarks was as follows:

Certainly, the Republican Victory of 1968, the election of a Republican President, was gratifying to all of us here. By our victory, along with our Republican President we have shouldered significant responsibilities.

In the hour of trial that accompanied Abraham Lincoln's installation in the White House, he found himself with grave problems inherited from his predecessor. James Truslow Adams referred to Abraham Lincoln's tenure as "the hour when America's trial was sorest." He then referred to Lincoln as "the greatest soul that Democracy has yet produced."

In our hour of trial in 1969, each day presents further evidence that a great soul sits in the White House.

Just as in 1860, so in 1968 has a moral and political leader come out of the great west to heal the wounds of a divided nation.

As Abraham Lincoln rebounded from political defeat in 1848 when he fell into such bad political grace that he was denied an opportunity to run for re-election to the House of Representatives, so did Dick Nixon rebound from the assigned political limbo of 1962.

As James Buchanan, the handy Democrat winner of 1856, bowed out of the race four years later before the wrath of disgusted Americans, so did Lyndon Johnson, the handy Democrat winner of 1964, bow out of the race in 1968 before the wrath of similarly disgusted Americans.

As Lincoln gained victory with slightly over 40% of the popular vote, with the remainder split among dissident wings of the previously dominant Democrat party, so did Nixon win under similar circumstances.

As Abraham Lincoln had made himself a familiar figure in Wisconsin before his victory, so did Dick Nixon endear himself to the residents of the Badger State by his frequent appearances here.

Lincoln's early recollections of Walworth County were probably not entirely pleasant, for when he was mustered out of the service in the Blackhawk War at the end of his fourth enlistment on July 10, 1832 near Whitewater, he found himself without a horse (which had become lost, strayed or stolen) and so had to walk from one end of

Walworth County to the other on his way back to Illinois.

But Wisconsin must have left an overall favorable impression on Lincoln for he returned within the next decade to walk from Sheboygan to Milwaukee, with intervening stops, while he considered the possibility of settling and establishing his law practice in the then Territory of Wisconsin. It is interesting to contemplate the changes in the history of Wisconsin and the history in the life of Abraham Lincoln had he decided to remain here. But we must have no regrets for as practical politicians I think we'll have to concede that had he lived in a state so small in population he would not have become our first Republican president.

Lincoln next left his mark on Wisconsin when he spoke at the Wisconsin State Fair on September 30, 1859. The next morning Lincoln traveled through Walworth County to Beloit where he spoke at a meeting of the Beloit Republican Club and later in the day spoke in the Rock County Courthouse in Janesville.

Before leaving the tie-up of Abraham Lincoln and his family with Wisconsin it is interesting to recall that Mrs. Abraham Lincoln, during her prolonged illness after the President's death, spent several months in Waukesha imbibing of our mineral spring water and taking mud baths in an effort to regain her health. Unfortunately for the Chamber of Commerce efforts of the "Saratoga of the West," the treatments did not completely restore Mrs. Lincoln's health.

Then, I recall the personal thrill, when I was a young lawyer in Waukesha, of examining an abstract of title in which was set forth a document signed by Robert Lincoln, the President's oldest son, as trustee for some Chicago interests which owned one of the famous Waukesha resort hotels of the latter 19th century. Robert Lincoln at that time was a well known Chicago attorney.

In our own time and referring to our new great Republican president, it is pleasant to recall that 19 years ago this month our Lincoln Day speaker at Waukesha was a young Republican Congressman from California who enthralled his audience at a dinner held at one of Waukesha's last remaining health spas with a revelation of his role and the role of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in unraveling the bizarre story of Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers. Most of us here can gratefully recall the several appearances here in Wisconsin of Dick Nixon in campaigns and at fund raising dinners in non-campaign years. It was a fitting stroke of fate in light of Dick Nixon's affinity for Wisconsin and Wisconsin's affinity for him that our delegation at Miami Beach was permitted to cast the 30 votes that put Dick Nixon over the top as our candidate for president.

It is clear that our 37th President, our fifteenth Republican President, has drawn heavily upon the philosophy the hopes and the dreams of the sixteenth President, our first Republican President, whose memory we honor tonight.

In his 1859 State Fair Speech in Milwaukee, Lincoln said:

"Educated people must labor. Otherwise, education itself would become a positive and intolerable evil. No country can sustain in idleness more than a small percentage of its numbers."

I commend that statement tonight, to those pseudo-educated idlers in Madison who have dishonored themselves, our State University, and our State.

At Concord New Hampshire on February 3, 1968, Richard Nixon said:

"The way to fulfillment is in the use of our talents; we achieve nobility in the spirit that inspires that use.

"The American system of private enterprise is the greatest instrument of change and of progress the world has ever known. And the skills and the resources it now commands are those that we need if new freedoms are to be made a living reality for all of our people."

That, too, I would commend to the Madison campus' predominantly out-of-state long-haired rabble.

In his famous "House divided" speech, which formed a part of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates, Lincoln said:

"A House divided against itself cannot stand. A nation cannot exist, half slave, half free."

In a speech at New York on December 8, 1967, Richard Nixon said:

"Are we two nations, black and white, confronting each other at opposite poles, separated by irreconcilable issues and posed for irrepressible conflict? There can be only one answer—we are not. We are, and must ever remain, one nation and one people."

In that same New York address, Nixon further said:

"No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not, to go forward at all is to go forward together."

Lincoln said:

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

". . . The legitimate object of government is 'to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves.' . . ."

In his Concord speech, Nixon said:

"The choice we face today, very simply, is this: Do we continue down the road that leads to big government and little people . . . or do we take a new road, one that taps the energies of the greatest engine of productivity the world has ever seen—the engine of American industry and American private enterprise?"

On the issue of law and order, Lincoln said:

"Let me not be misunderstood as saying there are no bad laws, or that grievances may not arise for the redress of which no legal provisions have been made. I mean to say no such thing. But I do mean to say that although bad laws, if they exist, should be repealed as soon as possible, still, while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed."

In his Inaugural Address, President Nixon said:

"For its part, government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways—to the voices of quiet anguish, the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart—to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard."

But—

"For all of our people, we will set as our goal the decent order that makes progress possible and our lives secure."

In his second Inaugural, which has become a classic of American literature, Lincoln said at the conclusion:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Nixon in his Inaugural on January 20 concluded as follows:

". . . I shall consecrate my office, my energies, and all the wisdom I can summon, to the cause of peace among nations.

"Let this message be heard by strong and weak alike.

"The peace we seek to win is not victory over any other people, but the peace that comes 'with healing in its wings'; with compassion for those who have opposed us; with the opportunity for all the peoples of this earth to choose their own destiny.

"The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker. This honor now beckons America—the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil, and onto that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization.

"If we succeed, generations to come will say of us now living that we mastered our moment, that we helped make the world safe for mankind.

"This is our summons to greatness."

Who shall say, who indeed among us, can say that Richard Nixon, our fifteenth Republican President, is not the ideological, the philosophical, as well as the political descendant of our first Republican President?

Secure in that assurance, we can hope and believe that the Nixon Administration will manfully, in a Republican manner, cope with the inherited problems of our Country.

Americans continue to grieve at the sore trial of the Pueblo incident. While we were deeply involved with our men and our interests in Vietnam, our enemies struck off North Korea, just as in 1863, the French moved into Mexico, while we were involved in our great fraticidal conflict to set up a puppet emperor across our border.

A Republican President and a Republican Secretary of Defense will not permit Commander Bucher and his crew to be used as the scapegoat for failure in higher places in the Defense Department. It should be kept in mind that the Board of Inquiry is not a trial. Rather, it is more like a grand jury, acting to determine if there is basis of fault or delinquency, and if so, who the responsible people might be. We shall get to the bottom of this disgraceful incident. We shall not stand by to permit the innocent to be persecuted, or the guilty to go free. We shall assure that such a disgrace shall not happen again. And then, ultimately, we shall restore respectability, even as respectability was restored when the puppet French Emperor of Mexico was called to account at the close of the Civil War.

We have inherited the grievous problem of Vietnam. It is our inherited responsibility to bring that dilemma to an honorable solution. We can but say that it had become impossible for the Johnson Administration to find that solution. The Nixon Administration has an opportunity to find it and will find it.

We have inherited the critical problem of inflation, inflation which is the direct result of the repeated huge deficits of our Federal Government. We have been presented with a final Johnson budget which is balanced in technical form but not in actual substance. Stringent measures will be required to bring that budget into line, to permit reduction of the tax burden, and to remove the spending jets which fan the fires of inflation.

President Nixon has come into office at a time when lawlessness and disorder have replaced our traditional law and order. We can take hope and confidence from the knowledge that John Mitchell has been installed in the office of Attorney General; that the frustrations engendered by failures and lack of fulfillment will be, and are being replaced by the confidence engendered by calm action and problem solving.

In his efforts to deal with these inherited problems, our Republican President will need our support and our patience. Richard Nixon is his own man. He is running a taut ship. He is cautiously surrounding himself with people of knowledge and competence. He will use these people for what they know and for what they can do, but in the final analysis, Richard Nixon will make his own decisions. As Abraham Lincoln told his aggressive Secretary of State:

"That which must be done, I myself will do."

Richard Nixon will use the advice and the knowledge with which others can provide

him. But in the final analysis that which must be done, Richard Nixon himself will do.

Richard Nixon, fifteenth Republican President of the United States, is indeed the ideological, philosophical, and political descendant of our first Republican President. As a Republican President he is entitled to our prayers, our patience and our support.

COMPETITIVE PLATEAU OF U.S. TRADE

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in collaboration with Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, I am pleased to present this analysis of the foreign trade position of the United States. I hope all Members will study it carefully:

The weak competitive position of American Industry in world trade is beyond dispute.

It may be useful to inquire into the degree of this weakness and to determine in what class of products it is most pronounced. It may also be useful to determine whether we enjoy competitive strength in some products even if the total competitive position is weak.

It may be helpful, further, to inquire into the causes of the competitive weakness from which our trade suffers and to determine what steps, if any, might be taken to overcome the weakness or to adjust to it.

WEAKNESS REVEALED BY TRADE TRENDS

The competitive weakness of this country in world trade has become increasingly visible in recent years. It is especially pronounced in some classes of goods and in our trade with several leading trading nations. It is also visible in the declining share of total world exports enjoyed by the United States.

WEAKNESS BY CLASS OF PRODUCTS

The principal competitive weakness has appeared in the trade in manufactured goods. Because of the most intensive application of labor in producing finished goods, compared with the lesser application of labor in the production of raw materials and agricultural products, the implications of the import trend for employment in this country are serious and will become acute if we return to a peace-time economy.

As recently as 1951 *manufactured goods* represented only 27.0% of our total imports. In 1967 this share had more than doubled, reaching 58.3%.

By contrast the share of our total imports represented by *raw materials*, which in 1951 stood at 50.3%, had declined to 21.3% in 1967.

The meaning of this trend for employment will be better appreciated if we compare employment within this country in the raw-material producing operations, namely, agriculture, mining, lumbering and fisheries, with employment in the manufacturing industries. The raw materials industries, with minor exceptions, supply the materials used in all manufacturing in this country. Exceptions are imported raw materials which represent less than 2% of all materials used by our industries. Raw-material production employed 4,656,000 workers in 1967 compared with 19,339,000 in the manufacturing establishments that processed the materials into finished goods. The ratio of manufacturing employment to employment in raw-material production was therefore over 4 to 1.

As imports shift from raw materials to manufactured goods, as they have in the past fifteen years, it becomes obvious that employment must suffer. The impact has become sharper, moreover, in recent years than in the past because of the heavy movement of workers in this country out of the raw-material-producing field into manufacturing and the service occupations. The shift has been the result of the still rising productivity in agriculture and mining. In 1960, or less than eight years ago, the ratio of manufacturing employment to employment in agriculture, mining, lumbering and fisheries (the raw material industries) was only in the ratio of 2½ to 1, compared to more than 4 to 1 in 1967, as shown above. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968, Tables 317, 318, 320 and 993.)

In other words, our imports have been shifting from goods requiring the least amount of labor to goods requiring the greatest amount. Should, for example, 10% of our raw materials be imported the average straight-line labor displacement in 1967 would have been 465,600 workers, while if 10% of our manufactured goods had been imported the displacement would have been 1,933,900 workers. (The 10% share is for illustration purposes only.)

While it is true that finished manufactures represent about two-thirds of our exports, the share of total exports has remained about the same in recent years. In '58 and '59 the share was 67.8% and 66.5% respectively, compared with 66.2% in 1967. This lack of a trend shows that our manufactured goods as a whole are not gaining ground in foreign markets in contrast to the sharp gains foreign manufactures have made in this country.

COMPETITIVE STRENGTH IN MACHINERY AND CHEMICALS

Nevertheless in some lines we have enjoyed a substantial growth of exports. This is especially true of machinery, including sophisticated products such as computers; and chemicals. Since the share of manufactured goods in total exports has not grown, the gain in exports of machinery and chemicals was necessarily offset by declines in the exports of other products.

HELPED BY FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Two observations are in order. Our increasing exports of machinery and chemical products has been a parallel of our increasing investment abroad in plants and installations. Our industries have installed a vast amount of American machinery overseas (over $50 billion since 1960); and our chemical plants overseas have consumed great quantities of raw and semi-manufactured chemical products as feeders to their overseas plants.

SURPLUS OF MACHINERY EXPORTS NARROWING

The other observation applies particularly to machinery. Our imports of machinery have grown much more rapidly in recent years than our exports, and the export surplus, while still wide, is narrowing rapidly. From 1960 through 1967 our machinery exports increased 84.9%. During the same period imports of machinery increased 328% or about 3½ times as rapidly as our exports. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968, Tables 1218 and 1219.)

The foreign competitive advantage over us that resulted in the loss of export markets in steel, textiles, sewing machines, typewriters and a number of other products is obviously asserting itself in machinery. The relatively sharp increase in machinery imports is but a forewarning of what may be expected in the future. Thus may be expected the crumbling of our principal remaining export advantage. It will fall for the same reason that caused formerly strong export industries to fall back.

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

The handwriting on the wall was never clearer. When will those who shape our foreign trade policy recognize the overwhelming evidence? Year after year since 1958 they have said that the trend against this country's export position was only temporary and that the trend would soon right itself. Ten years is a long time to wait for a turn of the tide.

One excuse after another has been worn out during this period. In the most recent years when the tide should already have turned had the previous reassurances had any substance, the explanation advanced was that the prosperous conditions in this country attracted imports while our exporters were not greatly interested in export markets. This style of explanation would, of course, dispose of any and all trends in foreign trade.

CAUSES OF OUR COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGE

The refusal to face monumental facts is becoming very expensive to a number of industries and poses a serious problem for labor. If and when our economy moves toward a peace basis the harsh facts that have so long been ignored can no longer be brushed aside. It is already very late.

Let us look at the facts and what they mean:

1. Production costs in this country are higher in many lines of products than those of their foreign competitors.

2. Among the high cost elements are the high wages upon which our domestic market depends in the form of consumer purchasing power. Employee compensation represents by far the principal source of effective demand—by far, which is to say, in the magnitude of about 4 to 1 compared with all other sources combined.

3. The wage-gap separating this country from other countries (Canada excepted) is not by way of closing or coming within shouting distance of such an event. The outlook is that it is here to stay for many years.

4. Those who suggest that wages should stand still in this country to permit foreign wages to catch up in point of unit costs, are either deceived, or incapable of recognizing realities or, worse, refuse to see what so clearly and unmistakably stares them in the face.

5. The full impact of foreign competition has not yet been felt; nor the full effect of our foreign investments as a shrinker of export markets for finished manufactures in relation to the gross national product.

6. As a consequence our manufacturers have only one hope to regain a competitive position in the domestic market: namely, if the technology is at hand, to reduce manpower requirements sufficiently to shrink costs materially. Contrary to what mystics and romanticists might think, there is no other way to reduce cost of production significantly.

Also, no one should deceive himself that significant cost-reduction is a mild operation. In terms of employment it is harsh and drastic. We have a classic example in coal mining. In the mid-'fifties this industry was moribund because of encroaching competition from diesel oil, natural gas and imported residual fuel oil. The only hope of survival lay in cost reduction. The objective was indeed accomplished by the introduction of machinery that supplanted men in a gargantuan ratio. The coal industry saved itself but the cost in coal miners' jobs was two out of every three. Employment dropped at a dizzying rate, falling from 480,000 to 140,000 or less in fifteen years. The problem known as Appalachia was a direct result. The cost of relief and inhuman misery was "unthinkable" and had it been appreciated ahead of time, would no doubt have been avoided as intolerable.

The coal example was not as extreme as might be imagined.

Other industries branched out overseas to avoid similar debacles. Today the steel industry faces a challenge, which if less drastic in its exactions, is nonetheless perilous. The shoe industry faces annihilation in a matter of a few years. The textile industry, which, though partially protected against the same disaster, still faces great difficulties. Other industries are not out of the range of the import onslaught. The fisheries on the east coast, the vegetable producers of Florida, and others are in the same corner.

Our merchant marine is totally dependent on subsidization for survival; and has been allowed to fall to the lowest level in our history from lack of adequate support. American flag ships now carry only about 1/16 of our total imports and exports. The facts are muted and smothered lest they awaken the dreamers and mystics who see nothing ominous in the competitive facts in our foreign trade.

7. Cost-reduction is not a monopoly of American industries, though its imperative presses insistently on them. While we continue as the most productive country in the world in terms of man-hour output, other countries, now equipped with our technology, are also capable of reducing their costs. Our own factories overseas, where our direct investments are now in the magnitude of some $60 billion, have introduced American methods of mass production, and other countries have not been backward in adopting the American system. If we automate in this country, so may and do our foreign competitors.

8. The cost-gap, although not uniform, will not go away, notwithstanding the theories of academic economists who apparently do their thinking in a vacuum wherein the realities of both national and international politics are absent. Competitive inequalities among the nations do persist, the economists notwithstanding, simply because free competition is now a museum piece thoroughly bolted down—largely, indeed, as a result of the very policies of those who invoke the free market to justify free trade but who buried free market forces under the weight of governmental controls, restrictions, heavy tax burdens, social welfare loads and other cost-inflaters.

The differential in shipbuilding and ship operation here and abroad is measured periodically by official wage surveys conducted by the Federal government. This differential is slightly over 100% and reflects the higher employee compensation in this country. That such differentials persist, as they may and do persist, despite economic theory that leaves the facts of life out of account, is shown by the fact that the maritime cost differential just mentioned has widened by 10% in the past ten or twelve years.

9. The competitive weakness of this country makes our economy stand like an island plateau against the pounding waves and tidal flows that beset it from all sides. The natural sequence will be a leveling process that will continue, unless it is halted, until we are level with the sea.

FALSE ASSESSMENT OF OUR COMPETITIVE HANDICAP

The competitive situation is serious indeed but is insulated against a remedy by the policy-makers who stubbornly refuse to accept irrefutable facts or insist on evasive interpretations. They will not believe or purport not to perceive that payment of an average industrial wage of $3 per hour in this country demands that our factories be several times as productive as their foreign rivals if they are to compete with them. With the exception of Canada, the highest foreign industrial wages will do well to equal 40% of our $3 level, while in many instances the gap is much wider. The difference in cost, now that our average duty on dutiable items is about 10% on foreign value, and destined to drop to about 7%, must be bridged by a productivity lead of sufficient magnitude to offset the foreign advantage. (For the industrial wage rate of the United States see Current Survey of Business, United States Department of Commerce, September 1968, p. S–15).

It is a favorite but false indictment of American industries that cannot compete with imports to say that they are inefficient. This indictment comes quickly to the tongue of those who continue to see in a free or liberal trade policy the future and the hope of this country's economy. The falsity of the indictment is indeed immediately established when in the next breath those who so eagerly accuse our industries of inefficiency insist that foreign competition is no danger because low foreign wages really reflect the low level of productivity abroad, which is to say inefficiency. We cannot be both too inefficient to compete and at the same time so far ahead of other countries in productivity that their low wages avail them nothing competitively because of their own greater inefficiency.

It was also a favorite and equally false assessment of the competitive situation to say that it was not our high-wage industries that were vulnerable to imports but rather our low-wage or labor-intensive industries. Our high-wage, capital-intensive industries, such as steel and automobiles, were among our leading exporters, thus demonstrating that high wages represented no wage handicap.

The vacuity of this claim has in recent years been demonstrated for all to see. In both automobile and steel our export position has collapsed and we have become net importers of both products. The same is true of other high-wage industries. Whether an industry is "capital-intensive" or "labor-intensive" does not alter the fact that employee compensation is in each case the major element of cost. "Capital-intensive" industries merely spread their costs over a larger number of successive steps of manufacture, as in automobile manufacturing. The Detroit cost, as the Pittsburgh cost in making steel, is only a part of the cost that extends back to mining, agriculture, processing, fabricating, transportation, insurance, financing, warehousing, and all else that is involved in production.

Yet, even as these pillars of economic theory have been knocked out from under the edifice, the economists steadfastly refuse to face reality. They are so inseparably wedded to their vested mental interest that mere facts produce no effect toward relinquishment of their untenable position.

These many years, as just noted, the economists have been at pain to say that our higher wages are attributable to our higher productivity. Therefore, they say, it is wrong to maintain that low foreign wages confer a competitive advantage on foreign producers. Only a rather obtuse mind would fail to perceive the truth of the theory, according to these intellectually elite.

Now that facts to the contrary notwithstanding prove that other countries do enjoy a decisive competitive advantage over us these same economists duly take refuge in charging our industries with inefficiency despite the higher wages they pay—yes, even though high wages, by economic theory, reflect high productivity. By their measure our high-wage industries should have been invulnerable to import competition. The facts have been quite the opposite.

Their edifice having collapsed they seize on other arguments, as previously observed.

The fact is, of course, that considerable discrepancies in wages and costs among nations can and do persist *because free competition no longer exists*. The numerous interferences with the free market that impede free competition were instituted generally with the ardent support of the economists who, when it suits them, like to play as if the assumptions on which they lean so heavily, such as the play of free market forces, were still in operation.

The thrust of their untenable but stubborn contentions is that industry, agriculture and labor of this country are to be exposed to highly-advantaged foreign competition despite the heavy competitive handicaps loaded on the domestic producers by a hundred legislative enactments many of which soon came to rest on production in the form of higher costs.

What is the purpose of such a policy? Is it to disperse our capital to the four corners of the earth? Is it to restrain wage pressures coming from labor?

OPTIONS FACING DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

What, indeed, are the options of industry when it is confronted by import competition that captures an increasing share of the American market year after year?

One option is obviously that of investing abroad. This step has helped in two respects. (1) It has enabled American companies to supply from within some important foreign markets that would otherwise have been lost. (2) It has in many instances increased exports of machinery, equipment and sometimes semi-manufactures and parts, purchased by the foreign subsidiaries or branches.

On the other hand, some of the slow-down in our commercial exports may be attributed to the very act of supplying of foreign markets from within rather than exporting the finished goods from here. To that extent there has been a transfer of jobs or potential jobs from here to foreign countries. Jobs that do not materialize in this country add to the problem of unemployment. We need many hundreds of thousands of new openings to absorb the large numbers of new workers who come on the labor market each year. If potential jobs are transferred abroad the employment opportunities here naturally shrink by that much.

Also, in some instances foreign subsidiaries and branches export back to this country, thus creating additional competition from lower-wage areas. American automobile manufacturers in Europe, for example, sell numerous foreign-made cars in this country; so do American manufacturers of typewriters, transistor radios and other products.

The impact of low-cost products is not confined to finished manufactures, although these predominate today. A number of industries import parts as a means of achieving lower manufacturing costs in this country and thus to fend off eviction from the market for the finished product. It is true that we also export parts, especially for assembly in foreign plants, such as automobiles. Such exports may, however, face a decline since foreign countries have been insistent upon and indeed have required successively the use of higher percentages of locally manufactured parts in places of imports in their native plants.

THE ADJUSTMENT-ASSISTANCE PLOY

In the view of many economists adjustment assistance extended both to labor and to companies or whole industries should compensate for the injury done to domestic industries and labor by imports. Until 1962 it was the national trade policy not to cause injury to domestic industries as a result of larger imports attracted by lower tariffs. In that year the Trade Expansion Act substituted the adjustment assistance program for the peril point and the escape clause which provided a cautious approach to tariff cutting and a remedy for injury.

The justification for adjustment assistance was that the reduction of tariffs and the resulting increase in imports would increase exports. The increase in trade would benefit the whole country. Therefore the public should make good any serious damage done

to industries and employees injured as a result of trade agreements, past and future.

That policy, of course, reflected the peculiar mental seizure or lapse that held and still holds imports entitled to eminent domain in our domestic market, and that they should be allowed to push our industries out of the way. Imports, it would seem, are vested with some mystical virtue that gives them priority over domestic industry and employees. What this special virtue is has never been made known to the public. It is simply assumed. Our own industries, although heavily burdened with taxes and other high costs which were not of their own doing, under the new approach of adjustment assistance were to give way to imports from countries that imposed no comparable burdens on their own industries. The demand was so irrational that the fiction of inefficiency, previously mentioned, was invented to justify condemnation of our industry in deference to growing foreign access to our market. Beyond that, of course, was the concealed but powerful motive to help exports of industries that boasted heavy political muscle.

It developed that the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act were so tightly drawn that none of the score of applicants, including labor unions, succeeded in squeezing through the needle's eye. Not one dollar of assistance was paid in the six years since the law's enactment. The economic distortion caused by the great increase in defense expenditures enabled this country to absorb the great upsurge in imports that would otherwise have worked havoc on numerous industries. Now, however, further absorption will no longer be possible without disruptive effects; and should the economy move back to a peace basis, even if slowly, the exposure that was tolerable during the past few years would become intolerable to a growing number of important industries.

The suggestion is now put forward that adjustment assistance should be made easier to invoke. This suggestion ignores the odd philosophy from which the very notion of adjustment assistance arose in the first place. Legitimate American industry, which pays the high taxes exacted of it, that supports the vast welfare outlays through its high productivity and provides high employment at the world's highest wages, is to move over and make room for imports that achieve their competitive advantage from payment of much lower wages than those required by law in this country and very much lower than the wages above the minimum level paid here. What style of philosophy can so far overlook the fairness of treatment to which domestic industry is entitled, as to advance and support such a suggestion? It represents a philosophy that is essentially hostile to the industrial and economic system that supports the American civilization and the capacity of this country to provide aid to other countries. It demands that American industry be exposed to foreign competition, no matter how injurious it might be, regardless of the competitive handicap under which our industry labors.

Greater efficiency is demanded, as already noted, even if displacement of workers on a devastatingly large scale is involved. The government would assume the cost burden of retraining and possibly relocating the displaced workers. Such a policy strives for multiple Appalachias.

It is not explained why we owe such disruption of our industry to other countries or why some of our industries should be harshly treated, so that other industries might reap the benefit of greater exports. If the intention is, indeed, to drive industries to more rapid and radical automation it seems to be forgotten that the rate of mechanization is already a source of unemployment and needs no additional stimulation. The notion that displaced workers will soon be absorbed by other industries is belied by the stubbornness of the Appalachian problem. This provides further evidence of the sterility of economic theory when it refuses to take into account all the attendant circumstances that migh upset expectations.

Adjustment assistance has little to recommend it if the condition to be remedied was deliberately brought about by pursuit of a policy that may be expected to produce the condition. Deliberate action that is expected to result in the serious injury of legitimate industry cannot be said to spring from any considerations of justice or from any concern about equal protection of the law. It is in fact a concept that is alien to the system of private enterprise and should be disowned as a legitimate and justifiable part of public policy.

MARKET SHARING AS A REMEDY

Now that the tariff has been virtually dismantled as a means of offsetting cost differences between this country and its competitors, and since the problem of our adverse competitive cost-handicap remains and bids fair to persist, a different remedy is needed to sustain the productive dynamism of this country.

The concept of market-sharing, implemented by flexible import quotas, offers the mildest form of trade regulation consistent with the extensive regulation of the economy as a whole. To free our external trade when the domestic economy is made competitively rigid *vis a vis* foreign production costs is both illogical and unfair. The heaviest cost factors in this country are very rigid indeed so far as competitive maneuvering is concerned.

Wages move in only one direction, and this movement underwrites expanding consumption so long as inflation does not cancel the higher compensation. Wages are entitled to rise as productivity increases.

Taxes are high and quite rigid and going higher if State and local taxes are taken into account, as they must be. The only opening of any significance therefore lies in the possibility of increasing productivity per man-hour; and, as previously noted, this can be accomplished almost exclusively by reducing the number of workers required per unit of output.

Yet such increase in productivity will not improve our competitive posture toward imports *unless wages are not allowed to rise in proportion*. If wages rise in proportion to the increase in productivity the competitive advantage is automatically canceled.

Therefore those who demand "higher efficiency" in our industries (even though we are productively the most efficient in the world) as a means of remaining competitive or as a means of recapturing our competitive position are committed to frozen wage levels. They cannot in all good conscience insist on supporting a liberal wage policy in this country and at the same time demand higher productive efficiency as a means of meeting import competition. They, of course, wish fervidly to pose as friends of labor while promoting a policy that would strip labor of its compensation for increasing productivity, since increasing productive efficiency as a means of fending off rising imports would lose its effect if wages should increase in proportion.

If, however, ceilings should be established over imports at certain recognized levels that would accord to imports a liberal share of the domestic market, and permit them to increase in proportion to the expansion of the domestic market, the sting of unfairness would be taken out of import competition. Imports would be regulated in keeping with regulation of the domestic economy. They would not have a license to benefit from a competitive advantage that rests in numerous instances on nothing more inspiring than the payment of a level of wages that if paid in this country would subject the employer to a legal penalty. Imports would not enjoy an open field on which to run wild regardless of the havoc they might inflict. Imports would be brought under the restraints that have deprived our industries of competitive flexibility except at the expense of employment. They would not be permitted to exploit the competitive handicap that public policy, supported by a generation of electorate preferences in this country, has placed on our productive enterprise.

They would nevertheless have liberal access to the richest market in the world.

CONDEMNATION OF IRAQI GOVERNMENT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all men of decency and justice were horrified and stunned by the recent action of the Iraqi Government in the hanging of 14 alleged spies. This bizarre and grotesque display of injustices and cruelty should and must be condemned by all men who treasure a life and faith of their own choosing. The recent hangings by the Government of Iraq have stifled such freedom. One of the most important and vital tenets of our Government is the first amendment which safeguards every citizen's right to choose his religion and express himself freely. We, as citizens of the United States cannot ignore this serious travesty of our most precious ideals. The great and General Court of Massachusetts has passed two similar resolutions condemning the action of the Iraqi Government. I submit these resolutions for your consideration and for the consideration of my colleagues. Acts against the lives and freedoms of our fellow citizens of the world should not be ignored.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROTEST THE RECENT PUBLIC HANGING OF NINE JEWS BY THE IRAQI GOVERNMENT AND EXERT HIS INFLUENCE IN STABILIZING THE CURRENT CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Whereas, United States Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, has expressed this nation's sense of outrage over this week's barbaric public hangings of fourteen Iraqis in these words: "The spectre of mass public executions is repugnant to the conscience of the world"; and

Whereas, the atrocities have heightened tensions in the Middle East and greatly increased the threat of war; and

Whereas, The Jewish community of Iraq is now no more than 2500 souls in the total population of more than 8,000,000 for that country and yet 9 of the 14 Iraqis executed were Jews, suggesting, as Pope Paul has pointed out, racist motivation; and

Whereas, If world opinion is quickly mobilized, further hangings may be forestalled; and

Whereas, These savage acts are shockingly violative of all standards of justice and principles of compassion for which the Commonwealth has stood since its founding days: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the President of the United States to formally protest the recent public

hanging of nine Jews by the Iraqi government and to use his powerful office in an immediate attempt to stabilize the explosive crisis in the Middle East; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, January 30, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTIONS PROTESTING THE BRUTALITY OF THE IRAQ GOVERNMENT IN HANGING NINE JEWS

Whereas, The Massachusetts House of Representatives learned with horror of the brutality of the Iraq Government in hanging nine Jews, citizens of Israel; and

Whereas, The Iraq Government, by this wanton and inhumane act not only stands condemned in the eyes of free men everywhere but precipitated a tinder box crisis that could very well lead to a confrontation between the nuclear powers and eventual destruction of all mankind: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the President of the United States to use the full weight and power of his office in assisting to stabilize this serious situation in the Middle East, guarantee the rights of all nations however small and their people to live, prosper and survive in peace and to lodge a formal protest with the Iraq Government against this barbaric act; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations be requested to immediately consider this inhumane act by the Iraq Government, assess responsibility and guarantee to Israel and its citizens protection against the aggressive and lawless acts of its neighboring nations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives in Congress representing this Commonwealth and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

House of Representatives, adopted, January 29, 1969.

WALLACE C. MILLS,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

LITHUANIA

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1969, Lithuanians throughout the world observed the 51st anniversay of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. The only country in which they were unable to commemorate this memorable event was Lithuania itself.

The courageous citizens of Lithuania established an independent nation on February 16, 1918. They dedicated their nation to the democratic principles which we in this Nation hold so high. For a brief period they were able to practice these principles not only within their boundaries but also in the international community as a member of the League of Nations.

On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was involuntarily declared a constituent Communist republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The people of Lithuania suffered severely during the war years under both the Russians and the Nazis. It is most fitting that we pay tribute to their strength and will in the face of overwhelming force 20 years ago. It is equally fitting that we recognize that these brave people have been the victims of oppression since the end of the Second World War.

At this 51st anniversary of their independence, all Americans should join the many Americans of Lithuanian descent to commemorate that occasion.

COMMENTATOR PUZZLED BY NIXON START

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Washington observers are patiently awaiting the end of President Nixon's honeymoon period.

Certainly, when President Nixon becomes subject to the necessary appraisals of his policies, it is well that the commentary be balanced between Nixon supporters and the professional anti-Nixon barrage which will soon be heard from.

One stanch Nixon supporter is Walter Trohan, the eminent Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, who in a very searching commentary Friday, February 7, raises a few interesting questions:

COMMENTATOR PUZZLED BY NIXON START

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—More in sorrow than in anger, this commentator is beginning to find himself puzzled by Richard Nixon's start in the Presidency.

This commentator was among the first columnists, if not the first, to predict Mr. Nixon would get his party's nomination in 1968. I scolded former President Johnson for what I considered a below-the-belt attack in the 1966 congressional campaign and applauded Nixon's restrained and statesmanlike reply.

In general, the Nixon start has been good. The appointments have been generally commendable. The approach has been businesslike rather than dramatic. The programs are deliberate rather than startlingly new.

Yet there would seem to be some cause for uneasiness. During the campaign, Nixon promised to clean out the state department. He said he would cut into the third and fourth levels.

He pledged himself to restore Otto F. Otepka, a state department officer who was hounded and harassed because of his efforts to deny clearance to appointees regarded as security risks. Otepka is still out in the street, while Idar Rimestad, a man dedicated to keeping him out, has been retained as deputy undersecretary for administration.

FOGGY BOTTOM PRAISE SURPRISING

Secretary of State William Rogers has assured members of Congress that Rimestad's retention is only temporary, but he is being retained altho he has not had long and invaluable experience in the post. And Charles W. Yost, a long-time member of the state department establishment, was named ambassador to the United Nations rather than some deserving Republican. Even more surprising, the post was offered to Hubert Humphrey, the defeated Democratic Presidential candidate; Sen. Eugene McCarthy [D., Minn.]; and Sargent Shriver, brother-in-law of the Kennedys. All turned it down. None of these would signal any policy change.

Even less understandable, perhaps, is the praise Nixon heaped on the state department staff when he called on his round of federal establishments. No less enthusiastic praise has been heaped on others of the entrenched Democratic party. This also contrasted sharply with his call for change during the campaign.

Nixon unwrapped his war on crime in the capital which stressed more policemen, more judges, a new courthouse, more public defenders and supporting personnel. There was nothing new in the anti-crime package. It's not clear how he'll get 5,000 policemen, when the force is running 1,000 under its present quota of 4,000 men.

Democrats have long been meeting any kind of problem by creating more and bigger jobs. Nixon may need more police and more judges, but his package could be no more than another rosy-hued promise that will fade in performance. Also he is being urged to propose a billion dollar program of aid for city schools, largely for blacks.

HOME PROBLEMS NEED ATTENTION

Some are concerned about Nixon's hurry to hit the junket trail. With barely one month in the White House he plans to be off to Paris, Bonn, Brussels, Rome, and London trying to charm foreign leaders and revive the fading North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Perhaps Nixon, who built himself into Republican nomination contention by making himself an expert on foreign policy, thinks he can succeed where other Presidents failed, but it will take a lot of doing. He can hardly expect to charm Charles de Gaulle—or Harold Wilson, for that matter.

Nixon is going to rise or fall on what he does at home. It would seem that he will be reelected in 1972, but not if he goes chasing rainbows in foreign skies. What Americans want is some sort of house cleaning at home and a slowing down of spending, taxes, regimentation, and government power.

PROPOSED POWER DAM ON NEW RIVER BY APPALACHIAN POWER CO.

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of constituents of mine who reside in Ashe and Alleghany Counties, N.C., is the proposed power dam on the New River which will necessitate the taking of property of many of them. The pools which these dams require will flood literally hundreds of acres of excellent farmland, making it necessary for these folks to relocate elsewhere. My people have taken this situation pretty much in stride; however, they have looked to these reservoirs as avenues for development of recreational areas. It has been most disappointing to them and to me to realize that the

Appalachian Power Co. intends to control the water levels of both pools of water with drawdowns during strategic "recreation periods" of such volume as to make them unusable for these purposes.

I recently held office hours in both Ashe and Alleghany Counties and interviewed some 300 individuals practically all of whom spoke with concern of this situation. Because I agree with them wholeheartedly and feel that North Carolina's natural resources should be preserved for North Carolinians, I have addressed the following statement to the Federal Power Commission, which agency held hearings last week on the question of whether or not Appalachian Power Co. should be issued a permit for the construction of this dam:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILMER D. MIZELL, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REGARDING PROPOSED POWER DAM ON NEW RIVER BY APPALACHIAN POWER CO., FEBRUARY 12, 1969

Gentlemen, I have just finished holding office hours for two days in Ashe and Alleghany Counties, North Carolina, where I had the opportunity to personally interview some 300 people. These two counties in my District provide part of the site for the power and flood control dams proposed by the Appalachian Power Company. I would like to pass on to you the concern of these people regarding these dams as expressed to me.

There are two major points of concern which have been impressed upon me:

1. The effect upon Sprague Electric Company's plant near Lansing, and

2. The fluctuation of the pool during the recreation season.

Sprague Electric Company's plant employs 15% of the labor force in the area; therefore, it makes a vital contribution to the economy of the area. Together with the citizens of Ashe County, I was relieved to learn that anticipated problems did not materialize when Appalachian Power Company and Sprague Electric Company reached an agreement.

The matter of drawdown of water is proving to be a major concern. It is contended that the natural resources of North Carolina above all else should be protected for the benefit of North Carolinians. Since this taking of Ashe County and Alleghany County property and resources for the purpose of creating power for sale in other areas does not in itself benefit residents of this area, then the people look to the resultant lake for the development of recreational opportunities. They would like to have some assurance that the lake will be maintained during the recreation season which extends from April 15th, the beginning of the fishing season to October 15th at a level of no more than a two foot drawdown. It is further desired that the water level should never exceed a five foot maximum drawdown.

For the most part, those who are having to sell their land and relocate have indicated a desire to resettle in the same vicinity, and would like to receive sufficient compensation for their property to permit them to buy land comparable to that which they sell. When you consider that their land is of the finest farm land, this is not an unreasonable request.

Another concern is expressed by those who own lake-front property. They would like to see the restrictions placed on the buffer zone around the lake enforced by the county governments of Ashe and Alleghany Counties rather than by the Appalachian Power Company.

It is further desired that a firm commitment be made both by the State of North Carolina and the Federal Highway Commission for an extensive road building and road improvement program for the area. This would insure that the proposed state park and lake are made more easily accessible as tourist attractions for those who travel the scenic Blue Ridge Parkway and for local residents who wish to enjoy these facilities. Dollars spent on such roadways would be a good investment for these roads, would do a great deal to insure development of the area and provide a boost to the local economy.

The residents of Alleghany County have expressed great concern over the tremendous drawdown proposed for the lower reservoir which Alleghany County borders. It is proposed that the drawndown amount to the astonishing figure of 40 feet! This practically eliminates development around the lower reservoir and certainly limits the possibility of its being used for recreational purposes. It is urgently hoped that this drawdown be reduced to one-half of what is presently proposed.

It is further believed that special emphasis should be placed on reducing pollution downstream by those responsible for this condition so that fewer and fewer quantities of fresh water will be required from the storage area upstream for the purpose of flushing out pollution. Also, a fair share of the responsibility of flushing pollution from the Kanawha River should be shouldered by those causing the condition.

If such pollution is eliminated, we can look forward to a time in the not too distant future when this reservoir will be a beautiful lake for development of recreation in the forms of boating, fishing, swimming, etc., rather than a mudhole for tadpoles. One-half of the proposed drawdown will insure this, and consequently, I am in full agreement with the residents of Ashe and Alleghany Counties in their insistence on this point.

If you authorize the building of these dams, I beseech you gentlemen, to honor the simple and humble requests of these proud and hard-working mountain folks whom I am honored to represent in this Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

WILMER D. MIZELL,
Congressman, Fifth District,

HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today's article in the New York Times on "Hunger in America" points out that "by some official estimates there are at least 6 to 9 million Americans for whom hunger may be almost a daily fact of life."

I only hope that my colleagues are following this highly enlightening series. It is to our ultimate benefit as a Nation that we begin to address ourselves to the scope of this problem:

HUNGER IN AMERICA: MISSISSIPPI DELTA

(By Homer Bigart)

YAZOO CITY, MISS.—"They aren't starving, really, but they are undernourished as hell."

Dr. Aaron Shirley, a Jackson pediatrician and civil rights leader, made this diagnosis during a recent visit to Negro homes in the Delta.

The degree of hunger among Delta Negroes has been a political issue ever since April, 1967, when Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York and Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania toured the Delta and reported that many people were "slowly starving."

Indignant denials came from the white establishment. The general response was "we treat our niggers fine," Dr. Shirley recalled. Gov. Paul B. Johnson Jr. reportedly described as "fat and shiny" every Magnolia State Negro that met his eye.

The issue flared up anew after a team of doctors headed by Dr. Raymond M. Wheeler of Charlotte, N.C., reported to the Southern Regional Council a widespread and "desperate" need for food and medical care.

The Federal food programs were not only inadequate, they said, but were run by local authorities with flagrant political or racial bias. The doctors' indictment was harsh: "It is unbelievable to us that a nation as rich as ours, with all its technological and scientific resources, has to permit thousands and thousands of children to go hungry, go sick, and die grim and premature deaths."

Though many people may think first of Mississippi when the subject of hunger comes up, the state actually has a good record of participation in Federal food programs. Every one of its 82 counties is enrolled in either food stamps or direct commodity distribution, a better record than New York, where six counties (Sullivan, Rockland, Putnam, Chenango, Ontario and Otsego) do not participate and have no plans for joining the food programs.

Nor are the Delta counties the hungriest in the land. Stomachs of reservation Indians are probably emptier more often than stomachs of Delta blacks.

No one knows how many Americans are chronically hungry. The best educated guess comes from Dr. Thomas E. Bryant, assistant director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for Health Affairs.

According to Dr. Bryant, there are 12 to 15 million "hard-core poor." The "hard core" are defined as those families with an annual income of less than $2,000, based on a family of four. Since the Department of Agriculture estimates that a family of four must spend $1,284 for an adequate diet, Dr. Bryant concludes that a family earning less than $2,000 would find it impossible to buy enough food to meet minimum nutrition standards after meeting other essential human needs.

At present, the food programs of the Department of Agriculture reach about 6,333,000 persons, many of whom are better off than the "hard-core poor." So, by some official estimates there are at least six to nine million Americans for whom hunger may be almost a daily fact of life.

NEWSPAPERS COVER WALLS

It was cold and rainy the day Dr. Shirley led a visitor into a back-street shack where a Negro couple and several children were huddling at a fireplace. Most of the windows were plugged with cardboard, which rattled dismally against the wind and rain; old newspapers covered the walls.

Eight children were counted in the room and Dr. Shirley, poking carefully into a pile of ragged, musty quilts, found two more infants asleep in the bed. He said the woman had given birth to triplets four months before; one died at birth, and one of the survivors had nearly expired of diarrhea and was just back from a Jackson hospital. The infant was almost certain to get diarrhea very soon again under these living conditions, the doctor said.

The family was unable to get on the welfare rolls because the husband was considered able-bodied. He earned $100 last month, but now, in midwinter, there was no farm work available. The family had nearly used up its food stamps, all that was left was sweet potatoes, condensed milk and grits, the mother said.

Dr. Shirley examined the babies, calling attention to the lack of subcutaneous tissue on their tiny arms and legs. "They need protein, calories and iron," he said.

"Too many people sleeping in that bed," the woman muttered from the fireplace.

"If I can run across a baby bed, I'll get it to you," Dr. Shirley promised.

BUDGET IS DESCRIBED

In another shack, where daylight could be seen through a corner rathole, a mother with seven children, living on social security payments of $95.40 a month, described her budget. She had to make a cash contribution of $38 to obtain $96 in food stamps and "I run out of food in the third week." Her rent, she said, was $16 a month, plus $5 or $6 for gas, plus $8 for lights and $3 for water. That left about $25 for all other essentials—clothes, soap and supplemental food to get eight people through the rest of the month.

Occasional housework for white families paid $3.50 to $5 a day, she said, then she had to hire a baby sitter. Baby sitters charge 50 cents a head, and with four children under six years that would come to $2, leaving $1.50 to $3 for the day's work.

"If you could get a job would you work?" Dr. Shirley asked.

"I sure would," said the mother emphatically. "I never want to be on welfare, period."

"That's the tale you always hear in town: 'They don't want to work,' " Dr. Shirley said.

Negroes who get sick in Yazoo City are sent to the Afro-American Hospital, a county-supported institution that cannot afford a pathologist nor even a laboratory technician.

There, Dr. Cyril A. Walwyn, the director, contended that hunger in the Delta was not decreasing, as most whites insisted; he had seen too many pot-bellied worm-infested youngsters.

"I feel they are slowly starving," he said. Dr. Walwyn was one of the six doctors who wrote the Delta hunger report.

"I have a quarrel with the welfare people," he continued. "They just don't care. Often they show a patronizing attitude toward the poor. If I am not as suppliant and cringing as they think I should be, they won't give me help."

Driving back to Jackson, Dr. Shirley said: "Black people have changed. A lot of the old fear is gone. But people are still dying unnecessarily of disease and poor nutrition has contributed to their dying."

CHANCES ARE DIMINISHED

"A baby's chances of recovering from pneumonia or severe diarrhea are diminished considerably if he's undernourished. So this kid will die, and its listed on the death certificate as diarrhea. Now, this kid didn't starve to death. But if he'd been in fairly good nutritive status he wouldn't have died."

Dr. Shirley said he had seen people eat almost anything they could chew, including tar from telephone poles—"they say its good for the gums"—and even clay. Pregnant women, especially, would pop a piece of earth in their mouths, explaining they "had a taste for it."

"And they might get some essential minerals out of it," he said.

Describing the plight of thousands of Delta families displaced by the mechanization of cotton plantations, Dr. Shirley said he sometimes wondered if Negroes were not better off in slavery days.

"In open slavery times human life was of some value," he mused. "If master paid $100 for a man he'd see that his property was well taken care of, just like a prize bull. But now the black people are no longer on the plantations. There is no feeling of responsibility toward them, no need to help them."

Dr. Shirley, as head of Mississippi Action For Progress, a Head Start program, recently received $106,000 from the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide free food stamps for the desperately poor of three counties—LeFlore, Scott and Claiborne—where the situation was called "critical."

But he accused the state Welfare department of trying to frustrate the effort by refusing to accept checks in payment for the stamps, even though the checks were backed by special cash deposits in the county banks. Meanwhile he had helped some families out of emergencies by giving them cash.

The main complaint about the Federal food programs in the Delta was that they simply were not reaching the most desperately poor.

MYSTERY FINALLY SOLVED

Even though the minimum cash investment for food stamps by the poorest families—those with an income of less than $20 a month—had been reduced from $2 to 50 cents, there were still hundreds of families that couldn't raise 50 cents.

It had taken former Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman several years to solve the mystery of why the number of participants in food programs always dropped sharply whenever a county switched from free distribution of Federal surplus commodities to food stamps. Finally, some of his aides went to Mississippi and brought back the startling news: "There are families existing with no discernible income."

Today, families in the food stamp program complain that the amount of monthly food they obtain usually is exhausted after the third week. A board of inquiry headed by Dr. Leslie W. Dunbar, executive director of the Field Foundation, and Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president emeritus of Morehouse College, and sponsored by the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty, an organization with the backing of the United Auto Workers, reported a year ago that the money value of the stamps fell "consistently and deliberately below the amount necessary to secure a minimally adequate diet."

This indictment was substantiated last month when a preliminary report of the National Nutrition Survey, the first scientific attempt by the Federal Government to measure malnutrition in the United States, called the food programs inadequate.

In Greenville, Mrs. Frances Young said she had to feed herself and nine children on $118 worth of food a month purchased by stamps for which she paid $33. Her monthly income was $55 from Aid to Dependent Children, plus $50 sent by her elderly daughter in Detroit. Total, $105.

Rent took $25 a month, she said, and bills were overdue for gas, electricity and water. She had doctor bills totaling $233.

AGED LIVE IN CABINS

"I can't feed this family," said Mrs. Young despairingly. "We have pinto beans and bread. That's all for supper."

"And this here's what I'm sweeping with," she said, wrathfully snatching up a stringy broom worn down to a final clutch of straws.

But at least the Youngs were better off than some aged and lonely Negroes that remained in rural cabins after their youngsters had gone North to find work. The only nursing home for Negroes in the area burned down on Jan. 18, killing seven of the aged and destitute, including an old woman who had been restrained by chicken wire because she was senile.

The whole town was shocked, but no one, white or black, could find it in his heart to blame Carrie Weaver and her husband Wash, who ran the firetrap. After all, the victims had no other place to live.

Wash Weaver told of finding old Ann House, who must have been 80, he said, lying helplessly in her cabin, wasted down to 100 pounds because no one had brought food.

"She must have been layin' on the floor for days," Wash Weaver said. "I had to cut her clothes off with a knife."

Mrs. House was one of the fire victims.

Down in Isaquena County, one of the poorest counties in the Delta, Mrs. Unita Blackwell, a leader of the Freedom Democratic Party, said a few more commodities had become available under the direct distribution program but that people still weren't getting a balanced diet from the free surplus foods. (The Agriculture Department offers each county a choice between a free but very limited commodities distribution and the stamp program; no county can have both.)

Mrs. Blackwell was worried about the children.

"Grown folks have been hungry a long, long time," she said, "but the kids just got here and we don't want them mixed up with blood disorders. If you can't get enough food, your brain won't work."

There are two developments in the Delta that promise better times.

A distinguished biracial group of Mississippians, including Dr. Temple Ainsworth, former president of the State Medical Association, and the Right Rev. John Allin, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Mississippi; Dr. Robert E. Carter, dean of the Mississippi School of Medicine, and Dr. Albert B. Britton, a leading Negro doctor in Jackson, have proposed Federal funding for a crash program to lower the infant, maternal and child mortality rates in five Delta counties.

Delta counties have a history of the highest infant mortality rate among Negroes in the country—72.7 per 1,000 live births in 1965. The maternal death rate among Negroes was 25.1 in the same year.

The biracial committee proposes as a "short-term objective" a 20 per cent cut in the excessively high infant, maternal and child mortality rates in the five counties—Sharkey, Issaquena, Holmes, Humphreys and Washington in the first year. Health services in the counties would be strengthened, scores of midwives and health aides trained and sanitation improved. The committee asked the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare for $3,405,000.

Some Negro leaders, including Dr. Shirley, have criticized the project, saying it would be dominated by whites. The committee is composed of five whites and four Negroes.

PROJECT IS EXPANDED

The other development is the further expansion of the Tufts Delta Health Project, sponsored by Tufts University, in Bolivar County.

Convinced of the "enormous futility" of trying to tackle health problems without changing other aspects of Delta life, such as housing, employment and education, Jack Geiger, director of the project, and other leaders, are now helping Negroes operate a farm cooperative, rebuild houses and plan Negro enterprises.

With guidance from the Government of Israel—Zev Barash, representative of Histadruth in New York City, has sent several Delta Negroes to Israel to study farm cooperatives there—the project has formed the Northern Bolivar Farm Cooperative, which last year grew over a million pounds of produce on rented land. Starting with 120 acres, the cooperative hopes to expand to 500 acres this year.

CANNERY FOR "SOUL FOOD"

There are tentative plans for a $400,000 cannery that would process "soul food" for the ethnic market, such as collards, gumboes and mustard greens.

Meanwhile, Dr. Roy Brown, associate professor of pediatrics and preventive medicine at Tufts, and Dr. Florence Halpern, a psychologist from New York, are surveying the medical and social backgrounds of 400 Negro children up to age three.

Dr. Brown and Dr. Halpern are convinced that Negro children brought up in the Delta already suffer brain retardation because of crushing poverty before they are old enough—three—to enter the Head Start programs.

"One of the things that pulls them down is the lack of verbal stimulation at home," Dr. Brown said. "Perhaps we should bring them into Head Start programs at three months, instead of three years."

THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY MARKS START OF 55TH YEAR

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we stand today at the threshold of the 21st century. Modern technology has enlarged the scope of our lives and has brought us to the brink of super sophistication. Through our mastery of science, we foresee the creation of the very best environment in which man can live, and we strive now to offer the good life to all our people. A very important part of this search for the ideal existence is man's fight against disease.

It is universally understood that all the discoveries of man will not make life beautiful without the gift of health. Without health, the individual cannot appreciate nor enjoy the environment which his skills have created. Thus, public health is as much a concern of government as it is for the research specialist who seeks the answers to still unsolved medical problems.

A campaign that has been waging for many years is that of cancer control. As in other fields of discovery, we have accomplished much. One in three lives attacked by cancer can now be saved. Uterine cancer deaths, once the chief cause of cancer death in women, have been reduced by 50 percent. It is now known that lung cancer is a largely preventable disease since most lung cancer is caused by cigarette smoking. Surgery, radiation, and chemotherapy are now able to reclaim lives which only a short time ago would have been lost to cancer.

But sadly, the task is not completed nor do we see a conquest immediately in sight. There are still long hours of research yet to be conducted, new controls yet to be established against this disease. The American Cancer Society, a nonprofit volunteer organization beginning its 55th year in the service of the public, is in the forefront of the struggle.

Making those stricken with cancer as comfortable as possible is a major task of the American Cancer Society. The New Jersey Division, a most active arm of the national organization, has the support of more than 50,000 volunteers. In order to aid cancer patients, the Division has organized a homemaker service, nursing service and a motor corps to transport patients to doctors and clinics. The Division also offers payment of medications and treatments for medically indigent patients. For those cured cancer patients, there is a rehabilitation program designed to aid the individual in his readjustment.

Yet another phase of the Society's program is that of public education. The ultimate conquest of cancer will come from discoveries of ways of preventing the disease. Until that day, we must rely on early discovery and proper treatment to effect the recovery of those with cancer. In this respect, the public education program of the Society is perhaps the most important, for by teaching people cancer's seven warning signals and by encouraging annual physical checkups, the Society is assisting the medical profession in combating the disease in the best possible way.

An essential phase of the New Jersey Division's public education program is the annual George E. Stringfellow Cancer Editorial Contest which has been conducted since 1947 and is named for the first president of the Division. The support that the Division receives from the State's newspapers is incalculable, for by contributing an original editorial on the subject of cancer control, the press is able to bring the topic of cancer to the forefront of public awareness.

Armed with cancer facts, people can act to protect themselves and lower the cancer toll. The New Jersey Division is grateful to the press for its continued support of the contest and proudly announces the winners of the 1968 George E. Stringfellow Cancer Editorial Contest.

In the daily category the winner is "Why Die Needlessly?" written by Mr. Frank Hires, of the Atlantic City Press, Atlantic City, N.J.

First place in the weekly category is "Not With Statistics," written by Mr. Marlin S. Morgan, of the New Jersey Herald in Newton, N.J.

The editorials follow:

WHY DIE NEEDLESSLY?

(By Frank Hires, Atlantic City Press, first-place winner, daily)

"Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'It might have been.'"

Stating it negatively, about 100,000 Americans will die this year of cancer—many of them quite needlessly.

They just won't do anything about it.

One of the most valuable services rendered by the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society is the emphasis it places on public education and information.

It stresses the Society's message that having cancer does not necessarily mean one is going to die. Thousands and thousands of persons could be saved if they simply sought early diagnosis and treatment.

Cancer can be cured, but it's not the sort of thing of which you can say, "If I just ignore it, maybe it will go away."

It won't.

The widespread antipathy to obtaining medical treatment in cases of suspected cancer has caused the Cancer Society to conduct a public opinion survey to find out how people regard cancer and the idea of a yearly checkup.

Naturally, important as this information and warning system is, it is not all that the Cancer Society does.

For a few examples, here in New Jersey, the Division's 21 county chapters during the past year made nearly a million cancer dressings for more than 2,000 patients, provided transportation for more than 400 patients, paid for more than 2,000 Visiting Nurse Association visits, paid for medications for nearly 900 persons and provided rehabilitation services for nearly 900 patients.

All this, plus a professional education program and various other services, costs a lot of money. The Society is presently carrying on its annual drive for funds, and we can think of no better investment than whatever number of dollars you can give.

Remember, also, that the Cancer Society wants you to keep in touch with your physicians, just in case you might have developed cancer. So far as we know NO ONE is immune.

We hope the test shows up negative, and we hope you remember to contribute. You'll be helping someone.

And as the safety experts tell drivers—the life you save may be your own.

NOT WITH STATISTICS

(By Marlin S. Morgan, New Jersey Herald, first-place winner, weekly)

Except to accountants and editorial writers striving to make points, statistics are boring. Figures are cold and meaningless because, for the most part, they fail to relate intimately to the human beings they represent.

For instance, these are statistics:

Currently there are about 22,000 cancer deaths annually of patients aged 15 to 44. Cancer is the leading cause of death among women aged 30 to 54. More than half of all cancer deaths last year were among persons over 65. More men than women died of cancer last year, and this has been the case since 1949. The ratio in 1968 will be about 55 men to 45 women. This year cancer will take the lives of approximately 4,500 children under the age of 15. More than 50 million Americans now living will eventually have cancer.

Those are the negative statistics. Then there are the positive statistics:

About 200,000 Americans will be saved from cancer this year. In the early 1900's few cancer patients had any hope of cure. In the late 1930's fewer than one-in-five was being saved; today the ratio is one-in-three. There are 1.4 million Americans alive today who have been cured of cancer. An additional 700,000 cancer patients diagnosed and treated within the last five years will live to enter the ranks of those who are cured.

These statistics, all supplied by the Sussex County Chapter of the American Cancer Society, give us a calculated picture of what the dread disease is doing to our population. And if you stop and analyze the figures, you will find that the picture is not all black, that there is hope.

But all this tends to leave one cold and disinterested. It is when you start to think of cancer in connection with your loved ones and yourself that the message really reaches home. It becomes meaningful when you stop and think of the number of people yon know personally who are suffering from cancer; when you think of the members of your family who have died from cancer. These are not statistics; these are people who lived and loved, laughed and cried, and who, in one way or another, touched your everyday life.

And when you move cancer from the statistical to the personal, you become conscious of an implacable—but not insurmountable—foe. Then the fight takes on a personal meaning, and one is spurred to enter the fray personally.

The front line of defense is your local Cancer Society Chapter, where your funds to aid in research and education are needed and your services as a volunteer will be welcomed with open arms. At Chapter headquarters, 113 Spring Street, you can convert your personal feelings into personal action. The Society can't fight cancer with statistics, but it can with the financial support and personal aid of all of us.

NIXON CONVINCING IN TELEVISED CONFERENCE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Richard Wilson:

NIXON CONVINCING IN TELEVISED CONFERENCE

President Nixon obviously has nothing to fear from televised news conferences. There was no reason to suppose that he would show up unfavorably in this media which he knows how to use effectively to establish regular communication with the American people.

The appearance of candor and rationality, coupled with granting the honest intentions of questioners even when they may seem hostile, mark the difference between a convincing and an unconvincing press conference. Nixon, gaining from long experience, lacks nothing in these respects.

There will come a time when he will have to say more but for a while, if he does not have all the answers, he cannot be accused of evasion or dissembling. What the President obviously knows for sure is that he must appear to be telling as much of the truth as the national interest will permit. He has scored high in this respect also, not hiding his reason for holding off on ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty and the beginning of talks on missile limitation, nor his continued opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations.

The President's vagueness on methods of curbing crime and halting inflation are understandable at this stage, but it came through clearly enough that he will do something in both fields.

Nixon's predecessor has revealed in writing a farewell analysis of his administration for the 1969 Brittanica Book of the Year what he now realizes was a shortcoming of his administration.

Ex-President Johnson says that if he had it to do over again he would try "to establish better rapport with the communications media." Actually it was not for lack of trying to get his story across through the communications media. No president ever tried harder.

* * * * *

Nixon on the tube and off the tube are about the same, and so there will be no trouble in this respect; the "real" Nixon goes on television, not a distorted facsimile. The same qualities which make Nixon persuasive in his realism at small gatherings or in face-to-face discussions are visible on TV. If, in the end, he fails to communicate it will not be because there is some other Nixon imprisoned somewhere in the works of the TV receivers.

Nixon is much better in this respect than he was during the 1960 campaign. Maturity has been good to Nixon and final victory has given him the assurance he may have lacked at an earlier stage in his career.

With all of Nixon's improved techniques, however, neither an Inaugural Address nor a televised news conference have revealed the lineaments of his policies except in the most general terms.

The "new tactics" at the Paris Peace Conference have not yet become visible; the "fine tuning" of the economy cannot yet be sensed; the new approaches which will cause the Russians to talk about political settlements as well as missile limitation have not been outlined. The City of Washington is hopefully waiting to be made an example for the Nation on how to control crime.

But it was generally judged in Washington, even among Nixon's political opponents, that his measured pace is appropriate and in tune with the times, and most of his prospective critics seem willing to give him plenty of time.

THE CORPORATE FIEFDOM

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. William F. Bell, of Lenox, recently brought to my attention a most interesting article about the problems of Appalachia. Because of the importance of the subject matter, I would like to include "The Corporate Fiefdom" by Harry M. Caudill, which was published in the January 24, 1969 issue of Commonweal, in the RECORD:

THE CORPORATE FIEFDOM

(By Harry Caudill)

Bubbling with enthusiasm and filled with grand visions of the impending Great Society, Hubert Humphrey declared during the 1964 campaign that poverty would be driven from America in ten years, and when he signed into law the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, Lyndon Johnson grandiolquently told the 15,000,000 inhabitants of long stagnant Appalachia to take hope. "The dole," he effervesced, "is dead!"

In the last four years life has improved a little for most people in the poverty-plagued Appalachian highlands. Construction of a network of semi-modern highways has been commenced and a string of new vocational schools has been opened for unskilled mountain youths. In Kentucky and West Virginia, poorly supervised works programs—the "happy pappies"—brought some money to empty pockets and new color to the sallow cheeks of many children. Since the advent of medicaid and medicare health standards have improved markedly for thousands of elderly, disabled and dependent people (gains which have been accompanied by many abuses and some shocking debasements of medical ethics).

But in resource-rich Appalachia the dole is not dead and poverty still grips the isolated farms, remote hamlets and shabby towns. The flicker of hope that came in 1964 has died and the old patterns of life continue: the able and discerning flee to the cities and the rest sink into deepening apathy and resignation. And well they may, for the forces that rule their homeland are too powerful and cunning to be resisted. Amid the misery of Appalachian poverty those forces find the meat of prosperity and riches.

The opening words of the report by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission (1964) provide an insight into the territory's vast potential: "Appalachia has natural advantages which might normally have been the base for a thriving industrial and commercial complex. Below its surface lie some of the nation's richest mineral deposits, including the seams which have provided almost two-thirds of the nation's coal supply. The region receives an annual rainfall substantially above the national average. More than three-fifths of the land is heavily forested. Its mountains offer some of the most beautiful landscapes in eastern America, readily lending themselves to tourism and recreation."

Nevertheless Appalachia has enjoyed no normal development of its gargantuan stores of natural wealth. More than 90 percent of its mineral reserves are absentee-owned—held in fee by oil, gas, steel and coal corporations whose principal offices are nearly always outside the mountains. Bought for a pittance in the nineteenth century from ignorant and impoverished highlanders, Appalachian fuels and ores have provided much of America's industrial and military muscle. In the last 85 years, half a trillion dollars worth of raw wealth—coal, oil, gas, limestone, marble, cement rock, copper, iron ore, timber—has been hauled out in a process that brought enormous benefits to the rest of the nation and ever-deepening crisis to Appalachia itself. Today, the huge mineral fields remain in economic and political bondage—fiefdoms of a few score corporations in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York. The extractive industries are practically the only private employers in dozens of counties and, by judicious use of political muscle, manage to control the public payrolls as well.

Eastern Kentucky, the sickest part of sick Appalachia, illustrates with grim clarity the horrible cancer fastened on much of the region and its people by a combination of absentee exploitation and venal government. The map of this once magnificent corner of America is sprinkled with the names of such industrial giants as Ford, International Harvester, U.S. Steel, Republic Steel, Bethlehem Steel, Occidental Petroleum and Columbia Gas. Less famous entities include American Associates, Ltd., Elkhorn Coal Corporation, The Big Sandy Corporation, Virginia Iron, Coal and Coke Company, the Penn-Virginia Company and the Kentucky River Coal Corporation. The two latter companies are almost certainly the most profitable investor-owned corporations in America, retaining as net profit *after taxes* some 61% of gross receipts and paying about 45% of gross receipts to their shareholders.

Great or small, these firms are the masters of Appalachia and their hold on Kentucky is especially tight. The state house and court houses reflect their policies. Governors appoint their officers and friends to the governing and advisory boards of state colleges and to the agencies that manage most of the state's affairs. County Judges appoint their representatives to local taxing bodies—a practice that keeps revenues so low that Perry County is currently paying only 5% of the cost of operating its schools. Well-heeled lobbies dominate legislative corridors so completely that Kentucky's tax structure is a medieval nightmare, totally unbelievable in its oppression of the numerous poor for the benefit of the robber barons. The state levies a 5 percent sales tax on food, clothing, medicines, fuel, building materials, coffins—on every item the ordinary citizen uses between the cradle and the grave. But it exempts diesel oil for locomotives, concrete blocks for oil and gas, and all coal burned in the colossal steam plants operated by T.V.A. and electric power corporations and co-ops! Thus it shamelessly taxes bread for little children and exempts coal for big power plants. It applies to family automobiles and farm trucks but exempts bull-dozers, power-shovels, augers and "continuous miners" used by the coal industry, some of which sell for hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Kentucky tax-collector's net was woven with immense ingenuity to catch the little fish and let the big ones swim safely through its meshes.

Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana has introduced a bill that would correct many of the grotesque tax inequities that have plagued Appalachia for so long. The measure would levy a federal severance tax on all minerals mined in America with full credit allowed the taxpayer for severance taxes paid

to the states. Since each state would surely impose severance taxes under these circumstances, the legislation offers a huge windfall to Appalachia. Under it, for example, West Virginia would collect about $45,000,000 annually and Kentucky would receive about $25,000,000. But the governors and U.S. Senators of these states have said no word in support of the proposal.

Eastern Kentucky is still the domain of laissez faire where nineteenth century indifference to human welfare reigns unchecked and, apparently, uncheckable. Profits are habitually placed above lives—a concept that has strewn the land with widows and orphans and made the funeral business a lucrative one indeed.

Practically everyone connected with coal—the president of the United Mine Workers, spokesmen for industry, the Interior Department—pointed out that mining is always perilous and that tragedies such as the Mannington, West Virginia explosion must be expected from time to time. Notwithstanding, mine safety became an issue which required some display of interest, so much so that Kentucky's Governor Louie Nunn (who has shown somewhat more interest in mine safety than either of his last two predecessors) invited Ralph Nader, a serious critic of hazardous underground working conditions, to meet with him for a discussion of the situation. But all alike disclaimed any direct responsibility for lax safety laws and the sustained failure to close dangerous pits.

Explosions are dramatic and deadly but the great enemy of miners is silent and hidden. It is dust from coal, sandstone and shale—dust that can coat a man's lungs with mortar-hard deposits, etch them with scars, pit them with sores and turn them a ghastly black. Mining dust produces silicosis and pneumoconiosis (black lung) and turns men into choking, wheezing, agony-wracked relics. There are between 80,000 and 100,000 of such disabled men in Appalachia and twelve thousand or more of them live in Kentucky. This scandal of American industry is all the worse because so little has been done to prevent it.

Insofar as the dust content of the air is concerned, U.S. safety laws do not apply to the "working face," leaving this critical area to the mercies of state-appointed, company-approved inspectors. Consider what happens here when a giant, $100,000 continuous-miner rams its rotating teeth into a five-foot seam of coal and the bands of sandstone and shale that striate it.

Amid an unearthly screech and din the mineral is clawed from the seam, sending it on a conveyor belt to "shuttle cars" lined up behind the miner. The operators of the machine wear electric lamps on their helmets and the machine sprays a screen of water before it, but in moments clouds of boiling dust turn the room as dark as a cave. The brilliant lamps glow a dull yellow, then fade to dim spots of lesser darkness. The sweating men turn black as the coal they mine and the respirators they wear over nose and mouth quickly choke with dust. As the workingmen grope for the controls they shove the respirators aside and gulp in air and death. Nostrils and mouths fill with the fine grit as foremen push them to meet production schedules. The toll is terrible. Dr. I. E. Buff, a cardiologist of Charleston, West Virginia, believes that at least 50 percent of the nation's miners suffer disability from this industrial scourge. Dr. Jan Lieben, formerly Director of the Pennsylvania Division of Occupational Health, has expressed the opinion that a thousand miners are dying of black lung each year in Pennsylvania alone.

Dr. Lorin E. Kerr of the United Mine Workers' Health and Welfare Fund concurs with these breath-taking estimates!

Once contracted, these dust diseases have no cure and virtually, any degree can be totally incapacitating. Only prevention offers any hope at present. Yet neither the rich mining industry, the miners Union (with more than $83,000,000 in its treasury and another $185,000,000 in its Health and Welfare Fund) nor any agency of State or Federal Government has made any serious, sustained investment in research in this vital field. Little Belgium is currently spending much more money than the U.S. investigating prevention and treatment of miners' lung diseases. Great Britain and the Common Market countries combined are devoting fifteen times as much capital to the problem.

It is certain that miners close to the dusty coal face ought to wear air-tight helmets similar to those used by divers, with air pumped to them from safe areas. But as the coal fields fill with dying men and the welfare rolls balloon to support them and their families, H. N. Kirkpatrick, a mine operator who is also Commissioner of Kentucky's Department of Mines and Minerals, spoke for the industry when he told a mine safety conference in Washington on December 12: "Present laws are basically sound." He heaped fulsome praise on mining companies and urged that no hasty steps be taken for fear of their "economically destructive" impact on the industry. Apparently dying miners are quite acceptable, but lessened profit sheets are altogether unbearable.

In eight years as head of the Department of the Interior, whose Bureau of Mines enforces federal safety laws, Stewart Udall witnessed the ruin of thousands of soft-coal-miners. As uncertain a lance as ever entered the lists, he finally, in the last months of his administration, recommended some tightening of the 1952 U.S. Coal Mine Safety Act.

DECENT WAGES AT LEAST

But if Kentucky's large, mechanized mines are dusty and deadly, they at least pay a decent wage under terms of a union contract. Many small "truck mines" hold their poor, unorganized and helpless employees in peonage. The state has a "compulsory" workmen's compensation law which is blandly ignored by scores of operators. When one of their employees is crushed by a slate fall there is nothing for him or his dependents except the humiliation and near-starvation of public assistance. A good many clever operators, however, have managed to carry a sort of grotesque "compensation in reverse." The policies insure the lives of their miners with the company named as beneficiary! Then a slate fall can be both a blessing and a curse. When Clabe Stacy was killed in Perry County, his widow and 16 children were paid $4,000 by the operator—out of the proceeds of a $10,000 policy. And when Pete Enfuss was killed in Letcher County his employer collected $13,500 but paid the widow a mere $4,400. (See Civil Action No. 2847, Letcher Circuit Court, Whitesburg, Kentucky).

Historically, the state's Commissioner of Labor has taken no action to close mines operating without compensation insurance policies. The lame excuse offered for such inaction is the claim that the agency does not know which mines are failing to maintain the insurances. I once pointed out to a Commissioner that existing law requires each operator to file with the Department of Labor notice of his insurance coverage and to obtain from the Department of Mines and Minerals a permit to operate. The two lists, I suggested, could be occasionally compared. However, such comparisons have not been made.

The United States now claims an ever-growing share of the world's coal market while other countries close mines in order to divert their workmen to more desirable tasks. Much of this cheap coal comes from the Appalachian hills in a half dozen states. There the ghastly bill for this industrial and commercial "success story" mounts inexorably. It is manifest in worn, crippled men on canes and crutches, their pale pinched faces peering from the windows of sagging shacks. It stares out of the vacant eyes of hundreds of people lined up at the first of each month to cash welfare checks and receive "food stamps." It springs from regional statistics that chart declining school enrollments, dwindling birth rates and sustained out-migration. It wells up in the dark eyes of Mrs. Clabe Stacy and it rattles in the convulsed coughing of derelicts who only yesterday were diggers of America's coal.

In America, governments have become big business indeed, but not nearly big enough to divorce themselves from an unholy alliance with the mining industries they are sworn to regulate and police. And until they are big enough and determined enough to assure justice and safety to miners and their communities both, poverty and the dole will remain integral parts of Appalachian life while many administrations come and go.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, the 16th of February 1969, the people of Lithuanian descent in the United States and around the world celebrated a day full of special hopes and special memories. That day was the 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as an independent nation.

Regrettably, Lithuania no longer basks in the sunshine of freedom; the dark cloud of naked Soviet imperialism has blackened her land.

The Linden branch of the Lithuanian American Council has been kind enough to send me a letter and copy of resolutions adopted in commemoration of past liberty and condemnation of current enslavement. I am privileged to enter these important documents into the RECORD at this point:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
LINDEN BRANCH,
Linden, N.J., February 9, 1969.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: On Sunday, February 16, 1969, Americans of Lithuanian descent all over this country, will observe the 51st anniversary of the formal declaration of Lithuania as a free nation by the Council of Lithuania, in Vilnius.

This anniversary is of deep significance to all who hope that Lithuania eventually will again reestablish her former place among the free and independent nations of this world.

In commemoration of this 51st anniversary, members of the Lithuanian American Council, Linden Branch, meeting on February 9th unanimously adopted resolutions of which a copy is enclosed.

May we again express our gratitude and appreciation for your past efforts directed toward the eventual restoration of Lithuania's freedom. We would be very grateful if you would continue to remember us and our cause in the future.

Respectfully yours,

VLADAS TURSA,
President.

RESOLUTIONS

Unanimously adopted on February 9, 1969, by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden, N.J., gathered under the auspices of Lithuanian American Council, Linden Branch, for commemoration of the 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence

Whereas February 16, 1969 marks the 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic; and

Whereas Lithuania, the country of our ancestors, once an independent and flourishing republic, recognized and respected by the world's major powers, was invaded and occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940, to this day its people enslaved and subjugated; and

Whereas commemorating the 51st anniversary the feeling of many Lithuanian Americans may well be guided by the words of our President, Richard M. Nixon, expressed in his inaugural speech, that "No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not—to go forward at all is to go forward together"—Therefore, be it

Resolved, that we hereby reaffirm our determination to continue to carry on the effort whereby Lithuania once again shall regain her freedom and rightful independence; and

Resolved, that it is our hope that the representatives of our Government will firmly continue to maintain the policy of nonrecognition of the incorporation by force of Lithuania in the Soviet Union; and

Resolved, that the Government of the United States be requested to take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to reverse the policy of colonialism by Soviet Russia in the Baltic States and bring about re-examination of the Baltic situation with the view of re-establishing freedom and independence to these three nations; and

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Richard M. Nixon; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable William P. Rogers; to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Charles W. Yost; to the United States Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representatives of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Congressional Districts of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer and the Honorable Cornelius E. Gallagher, and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,
President.
MARGARITA SAMATAS,
Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

OUR FOREIGN AFFAIRS MACHINERY

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the institutions of the U.S. Government must continue to adapt to meet the demands of our constantly changing world. Increasingly, one hears the suggestion that there has been a lack of coordination and direction of America's foreign policy. However, before changes of significance are contemplated, careful thought, and study should be given to the impact which might occur whenever a change is undertaken. Fortunately, there has been a great deal of study regarding the Department of State.

It is refreshing to note that Mr. Lannon Walker, a young, and obviously able Foreign Service officer, has written an article, "Our Foreign Affairs Machinery: Time for an Overhaul," in the January 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Walker's call for reform, and his ideas on how to implement the necessary reform are timely and certainly deserve the careful consideration of the administration and the Congress.

The article follows:

OUR FOREIGN AFFAIRS MACHINERY: TIME FOR AN OVERHAUL

(By Lannon Walker)

Recommendations for fundamental reforms in the organization and administration of foreign affairs have been made by high-level committees and task forces on the average of every two years since World War II. Despite the near unanimity of diagnosis, little has been done to deal with the serious problems uncovered; they are still with us, unsolved and debilitating.

Today, the nation may at last be compelled to face up to these problems. The advent of a new Administration, both popular and Congressional disenchantment with the results of America's involvement in the world over the last two decades, and the growing sentiment that we must put our domestic house in order as a matter of first priority, all suggest that the country can no longer afford the inefficiencies which too often have characterized its foreign programs in an era of rising budget curves.

The solution to these problems is not simply "new policies." Foreign affairs are the result of a dynamic interaction among domestic politics, the budgetary process, the foreign policies of other nations, the constraints imposed by the organization of our foreign affairs and the abilities of the people who make up and run that organization. The objects of reforms, thus, become the hierarchy within which decisions are made, the linkages between our objectives abroad and the budget, the way information is handled or mishandled, the manner in which people are organized and their talents developed; these are managerial rather than policy problems.

The reform agenda for 1969 is already apparent. The Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has proposed another public commission to take a fresh look into the foreign affairs process. A group of Republican Congressmen has recommended that a new Hoover Commission be appointed to reexamine the entire structure of the Federal Government. The Brookings Institution and the Institute for Defense Analyses, the campaign task forces and other groups have been examining these problems for months past. And so have the professionals in foreign affairs, the men and women most intimately acquainted with the strengths and weaknesses of the institutions they serve. Their own recommendations are a matter of public record.[1]

So political pressures and ideas for reform have again converged. Only the President, however, has the power to begin the process of change. He must begin immediately after January 20, taking full advantage of those precious "hundred days," or run the risk of being captured by the pressure of other crises as well as by the inertia of the system itself. What should the new President and his Secretary of State be looking for? What are the key problems, solution of which will give them the leverage they require if they are to take control of foreign affairs?

There are two basic problems facing the new Administration: one is organizational, the other involves people.

II

The foreign affairs community today is an "antiorganization." In the years after World War II, successive administrations created new agencies to meet new problems, while established agencies sent representatives abroad for the first time in response to the growing commingling of domestic and foreign affairs. There are, for example, 23 agencies crowded under the umbrella of the American Embassy in Paris, each persuaded that it represents the national interest, many often at cross-purposes with the activities of an agency down the hall. In mid-1968 there were reportedly 56 agencies represented at one or more posts abroad.

This proliferation of foreign affairs agencies and programs since World War II has not provided past Presidents, and will not provide the new President, with the organizational benefits normally associated with decentralization. On the contrary, because the structure has no effective central planning mechanism, because there is no integrative catalyst—other than the President himself—because there is no method for assuring that all resources, all relevant data, insight and expertise are brought to bear on a given problem, the next President will often find himself listening and reacting to the most persuasive (and sometimes merely the loudest) of his advisers.

It will be protested that the system has worked. But at what price? The decentralization of agency budgets—as one example—has led each agency and each program to cry "wolf" at budget time, although in fact the total resources allocated to foreign affairs over the past twenty years should have been sufficient to carry on the nation's business abroad. Instead, opportunities were missed in important bilateral relations, surpluses going to waste in one area while crucial needs for the same goods and services were unfulfilled next door. It is not that the nation's resources have not been properly allocated—they haven't been allocated, distributed and used in a rational way at all. How can the nation do a better job, with fewer resources?

It is neither possible nor advisable to shoehorn all of our programs abroad into a single Department of Foreign Affairs. The disruption of people and the distortion of many legitimate interests would be too great a price to pay for the resulting symmetry. It is possible, however, to get at the real problem—which is not the existence of many agencies with many functions, but rather the way in which their efforts are marshalled in a manner consistent with the national interest.

This organizational dilemma adds up to a crisis of leadership. Or to turn it around, all of these problems could have been solved through effective leadership. Between the end of World War II and the mid-1960s, Presidents attacked the question of leadership in foreign affairs in a variety of ways. During the 1950s there was an attempt to center the coordination of policy and operations in a large staff organization centering on the White House. In the early 1960s the process was radically decentralized, reflecting the desire of a young and energetic President to involve himself in the details of foreign affairs. Neither experiment worked because large staffs insulate the President from advisers, because the President cannot make all decisions himself, and because neither the White House staff system nor personalized leadership attacks the problem of interagency coordination at the operational levels.

The current attempt to resolve the leadership crisis in foreign affairs began in March 1966 when the President ordered the Secretary of State to "assume responsibility to the full extent permitted by law for the overall direction, coordination, and supervision of interdepartmental activities of the United

---

[1] "Toward A Modern Diplomacy," American Foreign Service Association, Washington, D.C., 1968.

States Government overseas. . . ." In addition to this delegation of authority, the President's directive created three levels of organization for interagency decision-making in Washington—at the individual country level, at the regional level and at the Cabinet level of government—all centered in the Department of State.

The theory behind this new organization was that the Government needed a central mechanism which would coordinate programs, resource allocation and planning on an interagency basis. The highest level of the new structure, known as the Senior Interdepartmental Group (SIG), was to ensure that problems were identified before they became crises, to devise plans for a rational allocation of resources and generally to provide leadership for the foreign affairs community. The SIG system in Washington, added to President Kennedy's decision in 1961 to give the Ambassador abroad clear authority to manage all agencies and programs in his country, should have closed the decision-making circuit and given the President a flexible tool for attacking the major inefficiencies of the system. Its forerunner, the placing by President Eisenhower of coordinating responsibility for foreign military and economic policies in the hands of his energetic Under Secretary of State, was working well before President Kennedy abandoned the concept. But the SIG has not yet worked.

It has not worked because the leadership of the Department of State did not *make* it work. The reasons for this failure of leadership are complex. The Under Secretary of State, in addition to his duties as Chairman of the SIG, has had to act as alter ego to the Secretary, testify before the Congress, speak to the American public, attend diplomatic receptions, receive foreign visitors and attend high-level meetings and conferences abroad. And what time he has left has been spent with the inevitable crisis. The Under Secretary simply does not have the time to do the hard-nosed managerial work that would be required to make the SIG system work. With insufficient impetus from above, the lower levels of leadership in the SIG system, the Interdepartmental Regional Groups, have not been fully tested.

To make the system work will involve giving the Secretary of State something he has never had: (a) the ability to produce alternatives to the recommendations of his line subordinates; (b) the ability to plan systematically and to communicate policy objectives to the other agencies in foreign affairs; (c) the ability to ensure that the resources appropriated for foreign affairs are sensibly allocated among often competing programs; and (d) the ability to monitor agency activities to ensure their consistency with policy.

Giving him these capabilities will alter the process of foreign affairs. It will give meaning to the statement by a distinguished public servant that: "The executive function of the Office of the Secretary of State is to see to it that the foreign policy of the United States operates in all its essential parts. . . . This 'general manager' function includes, but is by no means limited to, administration; its primary concern is with the management of substantive policy and its execution." [2]

The Congress complains that the agencies in foreign affairs are overstaffed. The Congress is right. But it is also wrong. It is right in the sense that too large a proportion of the human resources are concentrated on too small an aspect of foreign affairs. Too many people devote their working hours to France, or cultural relations with Africa, or commercial problems in Latin America. Too few people, however, are concerned with the nation's global preoccupations. Too few reflect the Secretary's responsibility to advance the national, as opposed to the regional or the agency interest.

There is nobody available—and it is not the function of the Policy Planning Council—to dig systematically into a staff paper and offer to the Secretary a set of alternatives from which he can choose. Yet choice is one of the very few sources of power available to the Secretary of State, or even to the President.

There is nobody available to the Secretary of State to see to it that agency budgets reflect his policy decisions. Yet "if what management is all about is making and implementing decisions, then the budget is perhaps the most essential management tool." [3]

These considerations suggest that we need to correct the imbalance between the responsibilities the Secretary of State bears and his ability to discharge those responsibilities when the power inherent in information and money resides elsewhere. The responsibility itself is properly centered, and the best way to correct the imbalance was recommended six years ago in the report of the Herter Committee, which argued strongly for the creation of a position, to be called the Permanent or Executive Under Secretary of State, subordinate only to the Secretary and his immediate deputy. It should be the duty of the Permanent Under Secretary to give his superiors the interagency staff capability they do not now possess. He must, among other things, make the SIG work.

Specifically, the Permanent Under Secretary should discharge four principal functions:

He should manage the Department of State and its missions abroad; this is a responsibility no Secretary of State in the postwar period has had time to assume.

He should see to it that staff papers emanating from within the Department and from the other agencies in foreign affairs are not merely special pleading for particular interests or, when they are, that the alternatives are provided and the implications of each choice clearly spelled out.

He should compel the agencies in foreign affairs to engage in joint, systematic planning in the light of *national* objectives.

And he should ensure that resources for foreign affairs are allocated in the light of those objectives and that planning.

While the case for a single budget in foreign affairs is persuasive, Congressional opposition to the concept is still strong; for the moment, we shall have to behave as though there were such an animal. Had we done so over the past twenty years, there might not have been surpluses in one agency and shortfalls in another, or missed opportunities because of bureaucratic rigidity. Indeed, the nation might have found that the funds appropriated for programs abroad were quite sufficient to do all that really needed doing; and we might thereby have avoided much of the current Congressional revulsion to the foreign-assistance program.

The new President must be very clear about the implications of giving the Secretary of State this kind of interagency staff capability. Doing so will alter most of the existing power relationships within the foreign affairs community. Agency heads will argue bitterly against it. When they advance their arguments, the President must recognize them for what they are: the importunings of men who are losing unrestricted license within their fiefdoms—the complaints of those who are being harnessed to larger, national interests.

The Assistant Secretaries of State, too, carry crushing burdens. Rushed from crisis to crisis, they rarely have time to think ahead, plan or manage. When they do, it is too often on the basis of fragmentary information or informed instinct. In only one bureau of the Department of State has there been any real experiment with systematic analysis of policy alternatives, or of relative costs and benefits. The results have been encouraging. They argue for further strengthening of the Interdepartmental Regional Groups (IRG) chaired by the regional Assistant Secretaries and supported by small but potent staffs, and for highly qualified Country Directors capable of coordinating programs across agency lines. The SIG-IRG-Country Director system exists. It needs only to be given tools and marching orders, then put to work.

There is one other function for which the Permanent Under Secretary should assume responsibility. Although the agencies in foreign affairs are beginning to attack the problems posed by the information and communications explosion and are beginning to put the computer to work, the effort is half-hearted. It lacks the commitment of top management. And yet, at a time when newspaper editorials published abroad are frequently available in Washington before they come to the attention of embassy personnel in the capital concerned, it no longer makes sense to devote uncountable communications to duplicating what is known. By the same token, most important economic indicators are available in published form, and the advantages of having them summarized and reported electronically by an embassy abroad are certainly outweighed by the contribution such communications make to the two million copies of embassy messages which are distributed all over Washington each week. Unless we break these outmoded habits, adding computer facilities to the information circuit would be akin to feeding pastry to a fat man.

What is needed, rather, is high-level commitment to an interagency attack on the information problem. The agencies in foreign affairs urgently require answers to such questions as: What information is relevant at various levels of decision-making? Who reports what and why? Where is information stored and how? What is the most efficient method of making it available to users?

III

One of the most perceptive students of governmental organization has said in these pages that: "The plain fact is that good policy demands *both* good men and good machinery. And although it may be true that good men can triumph over poor machinery, it is also true that they are more effective when they work with good machinery." [4] Assuming that the ideas advanced above will move the Government in the direction of good machinery, what can be said about good men?

It can be said that there are lots of them in foreign affairs and that their talents are squandered scandalously.

It need not have been so. The farsighted professionals and members of both Houses of Congress responsible for the Foreign Service Act of 1946 had different intentions. They looked forward to consolidating the principle established in the mid-1920s that a single professional service should represent the United States abroad, a service responsive to the needs of all the agencies in foreign affairs, open to new ideas and talents, and self-improving. Subsequent events have confounded their dream.

As new agencies mushroomed in response to the growth of American involvement in

[2] Paul H. Nitze in "The Secretary of State," New York: The American Assembly, Columbia University, 1960, p. 5.

[3] Melvin Anshen, "The Federal Budget as an Instrument for Management and Analysis," in "Program Budgeting," David Novick (ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965, p. 3.

[4] Senator Henry M. Jackson, "Organizing for Survival," *Foreign Affairs*, April 1960, p. 447.

the world, so did new foreign services created to staff them. And as the traditional diplomats of the Department of State saw their hard-won empire being whittled away by trespassers from Washington, they retreated behind a narrow definition of diplomacy, as fearful of competition as were the "battleship admirals" and "horse-cavalry colonels." The Department and its Foreign Service forfeited an extraordinary opportunity to reach out and draw in the new professionals in foreign affairs.

The existence of many foreign services has inevitably led to interservice competition, even hostility. None of the services is free of petty parochialism. None can be fully credited with serving the national, as opposed to the agency, interest. Differing regulations, assignment policies and perquisites have bred petty jealousies abroad. And agency barriers have become so impenetrable that productive exchange back and forth is all but nonexistent.

As a result, the economists in the Agency for International Development and information specialists in the United States Information Agency have not been able to deepen their understanding of the political constraints on American activities abroad. And the political specialists of the Department of State have often acquired only the haziest idea of the opportunities for advancing American interests inherent in the programs of AID and USIA. Ironically, the near-monopoly of ambassadorial appointments enjoyed by Foreign Service Officers of the Department of State contributed to its sense of éliteness at a time when its real power in foreign affairs was on the decline. The inaccessibility of such positions and the absence of career status have contributed to a widespread sense among officers of AID and USIA that they are, if not actually second-class citizens, at least so regarded by the "senior service." And the experience of the officers in each of the services who are appointed to high executive positions is often pathetically, even dangerously, narrow.

There have been other serious problems, which are particularly evident within the Foreign Service of the Department of State. One, related directly to the growth of competing services arising out of new ideas and new techniques, has been an overwhelming hostility to anything novel. The old ways, by definition, were the best. Another is that in a system threatened with irrelevance and in which the really good jobs are increasingly rare, the race goes to the loner who travels fast, who best manipulates the guild structure for personal ends, who has a friend who can get him out of the unpleasant job. And the collective well-being has gone glimmering: the old esprit de corps is still being invoked, but by the mid-1960s nobody was making a serious contribution to it.

Professionals have concluded that this state of affairs is due in large measure to the erosion of the concept of a unified Foreign Service of the United States. When the Government set out on the meandering paths of separate personnel systems, without a common guiding principle, without a controlling mechanism, it planted the seeds of systemic competition and distrust. The result has been sterile arguments about élitism versus operational effectiveness, and growing irrelevance to the national interest.

As the original concept of a career service designed to serve first the President and then all foreign affairs agencies was progressively eroded, the institutional safeguards which had been provided by the Act of 1946 were destroyed as well. The Board of the Foreign Service had statutorily independent status, much like the Civil Service Commission, to assure common personnel policies and the rational utilization of personnel resources, as well as to safeguard the system from political abuse. The Director General, also independent, was supposed to administer the Foreign Service of the United States. As the concept of a single service broke apart and its remnants retreated behind agency walls, the Board of the Foreign Service, through successive amendments to the Act of 1946, came to serve only a meek advisory role to the Secretary of State. In fact it meets rarely, to fulfill certain formalistic requirements in the promotion process. The Director General today is a title without a function. Without these safeguards, the Foreign Services have drifted without purpose and have been opened to political abuse.

Is such a system worth saving? Or should the new Administration simply scrap it and start again? The consensus of the professionals in all of the principal agencies is that the present system is not worth saving—but that the system embodied in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 is.

The old dream of a single Foreign Service of the United States is still grand. A single service would substitute a unifying for a divisive influence in the conduct of our foreign affairs. It would provide a base sufficiently broad to make sensible personnel planning worthwhile. It would offer job opportunities attractive to the most competent of young Americans and satisfactions to their elders which have not been fully present for years. In broadening the experience of the unusually talented, it would help to create a badly needed reserve of executive talent. And it would at long last lay to rest the sterile argument about whether the nation requires "generalists" or "specialists" in foreign affairs by admitting that both are essential.

Comprehensive legislation setting up a single "Foreign Service of the United States" is not necessary. Enough authority is available now to begin to act as if there were a single service. Several things *are* necessary, however. One of them is to revitalize the Board of the Foreign Service, give it statutory independence, and make it a truly independent mechanism which assures common personnel policies across agency lines in recruitment, training, assignment, promotion and selection-out.

But much more is required than the benefits of flexibility and wider opportunities for assignment and training. The new Administration needs to attack the main failures of the present personnel system and to begin to change the environment and attitudes of the professionals. To prosecute such a reform program in an innovative and imaginative way, the Director General should become the executive agent of the revitalized Board of the Foreign Service. He must use the most modern personnel techniques, including a computer model of the personnel systems with which to test various assumptions and proposed changes in personnel policy. With such a model, the agencies in foreign affairs could, for the first time in twenty years, make decisions on a rational basis about such critical variables as skill requirements, recruitment, training quotas, promotion and egress rates.

IV

Why should a new President concern himself with these problems? The answer is simple: he must ultimately rely on the professionals for the conduct of the nation's foreign-affairs business. At the same time, he requires of those professionals and of the system they serve: (a) that they reserve the most important decisions for him, bringing problems to him before they become crises and providing him with the relevant facts and advice—the present system is not good enough in this respect; (b) that they be flexible, imaginative and efficient in using scarce national resources abroad—the present system is none of these things; and (c) that they produce from within their own ranks the best talent for the critical jobs—they do not now.

The system and the people will produce if the new President understands that reform is not accomplished by the submission of reports, by comprehensive legislation or by delegations of authority. Real reform requires, first and foremost, the will to change and the commitment to clearly enunciated goals on the part of the President and his top appointees in foreign affairs. The President must appoint reformers if he wants reform—and he must fire them if they do not produce. The reformers already have available to them all the resources and legislative authority that they require. The options are not the poles of unordered decentralization on the one hand and total integration on the other. The options, rather, are centered on the practical, yet revolutionary, middle ground of flexibility and innovation—of integrated planning and decentralized operations.

If the new Permanent Under Seceretary and the members of a revitalized Board of the Foreign Service perform their tasks well, they will accomplish three crucial things: they will make the present system work in the most efficient way; they will free the President and the top leadership of the foreign affairs community to concentrate on the really important issues; and they will lay the groundwork for a new system for the conduct of the President's foreign policies.

And, finally, the new President will have a chance to redraw the circle in such a way as to involve the Congress and the American people more significantly in foreign affairs—and make the professional more sensitive to both. There is no reason why the foreign affairs community should be exempt from the drive toward institutional reform that is so clearly moving the country; constructive change in foreign affairs is as crucial to our national health as is the reform of our domestic priorities and institutions. The goal should be ever-improving communication between the professionals and the American people. This, indeed, appears to have been the dream of Representative Wayne Hays, who offered a bill in 1965 which would, among its other provisions, have offered extraordinary opportunities to increase contacts between the professional and the citizen in business, academia and the private foreign-affairs organizations.

As the line between public service and private preoccupations narrows, it must become increasingly possible to trade information and experience back and forth. An automated data system, compatible, in its non-sensitive aspects, with business and university information requirements, would constitute an enormous step in the right direction. So, too, would a systematically enlarged consortium of talent regularly exchanged between the public and private sectors. Each would profit—in the literal sense—by providing its best employees with new experiences.

By the same token, the attitudes which both the Executive Branch and the Congress bring to their monologues on foreign policy must change. The desultory conservations which the diplomat substitutes for "consultation" must be replaced by honest dialogue extended across a widening series of topics. The shoe is clearly on the diplomatic foot to provide an earnest of its intent to develop shared information and reactions. It will be up to both Houses of Congress, however, to undertake the internal reforms of their own which will enable them to play a more vital role in foreign policy decision-making. At the moment, that role is limited to winning minor arithmetic games in budget season—games which focus on "the going rate" and are no substitute for asking tough questions, compelling clear answers and representing the public's interest effectively.

There will be voices speaking across the political divide against any change in the status quo. Yet the new Administration must hear this signal from the professionals. Reform cannot take place without Presidential commitment. Neither can reform happen without the wholehearted support of the people affected by it. This year, the professionals in foreign affairs are ready—even eager—for reform.