

Pellegrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7823. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sajjan Gangappa Chikkannaiah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7824. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Bonfantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7825. A bill for the relief of Tomasso Masella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 7826. A bill for the relief of Patricia Gail Dennis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 7827. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amin Fuleihan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 7828. A bill for the relief of Helle Bergh Kristensen Jonas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7829. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Piccirillo, his wife, Emma Piccirillo, and their children, Mario Piccirillo and Daniel Piccirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7830. A bill for the relief of James Howard Giffin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7831. A bill for the relief of Silvio De Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7832. A bill for the relief of Yasuo Kayaba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7833. A bill for the relief of Takayuki Yoshida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7834. A bill for the relief of Ronald Gordon Bullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 7835. A bill for the relief of Diana Margaret Westley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 7836. A bill for the relief of Mila Sabio Infante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 7837. A bill for the relief of Colie Lance Johnson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7838. A bill for the relief of Julian Maisterrena Iturralde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7839. A bill for the relief of Jesus Agner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 7840. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Graceffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7841. A bill for the relief of Isidoro Albino and his daughter, Antonina Albino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7842. A bill for the relief of Audrey Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7843. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7844. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Vindigni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7845. A bill for the relief of Miss Matrika Nicholas Vassiliadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 7846. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Francisco Mejia-Murillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7847. A bill for the relief of Serafina Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7848. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Halm Ribak, and their children, Amikam, Dvora, and Sara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7849. A bill for the relief of Raja Butros El-Qare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7850. A bill for the relief of Maria de Jesus Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 7851. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romeo D. Uy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 7852. A bill for the relief of Eric Declan Horgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 7853. A bill for the relief of Kam Tak Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7854. A bill for the relief of Wilda M. Kilburn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 7855. A bill for the relief of Michelina Cinotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7856. A bill for the relief of Franco Geralmo Giraudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7857. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Macaudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7858. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Riccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7859. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Sari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7860. A bill for the relief of Michele Sorbara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 7861. A bill for the relief of Thelma M. Parong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7862—A bill for the relief of Fe Fajardo Villanueva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

64. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Congress of Micronesia, relative to an appropriation for the support of Micronesia by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. Also, petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. Also, petition of Clarence Martion, Sr., Washington, D.C., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

67. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Columbus, Ohio, relative to John Brown; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. This year is the 51st year after the nation-state was proclaimed in 1918. For 22 years the Republic of Lithuania flourished culturally, intellectually, and politically.

This progress was cut short, however, by forced occupation by the U.S.S.R., under whose oppressive and tyrannical domination the people of Lithuania still suffer.

It is particularly important, in view of the dedication of the United States to the right to freedom and independence, that we stand today to commemorate the day when Lithuania was a free and independent nation, to reaffirm our support for justice, and to keep alive the spirit and hope for the day when Lithuania and all captive nations will once again enjoy the exercise of the principles of liberty and self-determination.

The memorandum from the Lithuanian Christian Democratic Union Central Committee is an eloquent expression of the courage, ideals, and goals of the Lithuanian people, and it is an honor to include it here:

LITHUANIAN CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC UNION MEMORANDUM

To the Honorable Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives:

Today marks the Fifty-First Anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, once an ancient civilization, whose roots reach to the second century and its kingdom to the thirteenth; that of a nation whose political, economic and social record was as distinctive as it was progressive. It is tragic therefore, that this anniversary is overshadowed by the brutal fact that Lithuania today bears the heavy yoke of Soviet imperialism.

Acting in conspiracy with the Nazi regime—see "Nazi-Soviet Relations 1939-1941", excerpts attached—the Soviet Union broke four major bilateral treaties:

1. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of March 3, 1918 in which the Soviet Union forever renounced all claims to Lithuania.
2. The Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, which defined the common boundaries.
3. The Non-Aggression Pact of September 28, 1926, which was later extended to 1945.
4. The Soviet imposed Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939.

On June 15, 1940, with the above treaties in full force and effect, the military forces of Soviet Union occupied the territory of Lithuania, and two days later repeated the same attack against the Republics of Latvia and Estonia. Occupation was followed by systematic terror and violence. Religious and political persecutions culminated in mass executions and deportations to the Siberian wastelands. Many sources place the number of such Baltic victims at the one million mark.

Several weeks later, the Soviets staged mock elections and as the result of these, forcibly incorporated Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics into their slave empire.

On July 23, 1940, the United States denounced this aggression, and all Administrations since then have affirmed this stand and have opposed this brutal invasion and forced annexation.

It is difficult to conceive that during the present rise of many former colonies to their rightly deserved national independence, a shroud of silence is maintained about Lithuania and the other Soviet occupied countries whose traditions of statehood reach back for many centuries.

It is even more difficult to conceive that all the international crimes committed by the Soviet Union are still not rectified, nor the criminal punished. It is indeed a crime in itself that Krenelin is still permitted to indulge in international rape, as in the case

of Czechoslovakia just a few short months ago.

It is time to raise such questions before international forums and to seek condemnation of the Soviet Union for its genocidal actions. It is also time to investigate the illegal seizure of Lithuania and the other countries of Eastern Europe and to thoroughly study the prevailing conditions in these countries, the results of which should be made public.

At this time there is a plan submitted by the Honorable Frank Annunzio, U.S. Representative from Illinois, in a form of H. Con. Res. 81, which "Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

We ask all of you to support this Resolution. It is one definite way in which you can help us in our fight for liberty and justice.

Very respectfully submitted.

A. J. KASULAITIS,

President, Central Committee.

K. ALGIMANTAS PAUTIENIS,

Chairman, Commission on International Relations.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND WEAR MEDIC ALERT EMBLEM THAT SAVES LIVES

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of pride to me that my district is the home of the Medic Alert Foundation, a charitable, nonprofit organization dedicated to the purpose of saving lives.

This is accomplished by indestructible metal emblems worn on the wrists or necks of some 300,000 persons in the United States and other countries. On the emblem is noted some hidden or special medical problem for which they require certain treatment or care. It also carries the Medic Alert serial number of the wearer and the telephone number of Medic Alert's headquarters in Turlock, Calif., where medical records of each member are on file. Thus, in an emergency, they are saved from the wrong treatment or people who assist them are alerted to their need for specialized care.

This lifesaving organization was founded by Dr. Marion Carter Collins, a resident of Turlock who attended high school there, went on to Stanford University and Northwestern University Medical School, then returned to Turlock to operate the Lillian Collins Hospital with his father, also a physician. He founded Medic Alert Foundation after his daughter Linda nearly died from a severe anaphylactic reaction to a tetanus antitoxin skin test. In 1964 he retired from medical practice to devote full time to Medic Alert. He and the foundation's directors serve without remuneration.

This is a dramatic story, Mr. Speaker, and I am confident you and our colleagues will be interested in the following brief article from the Stockton, Calif., Record of January 4, giving a few striking examples of how Medic Alert has saved the lives of people who might have died but for the bracelet on their arms:

THE TINY TAG THAT COULD SAVE YOUR LIFE
(By Dick Kleiner)

One day in 1953, a teenage girl in Turlock cut her finger. Because of that incident,

today more than 300,000 people believe their lives may have been saved—or may someday be saved.

The girl's name is Linda Collins. When she cut her finger, 15 years ago, she was taken to a hospital where the attending physician gave her a routine patch test, before administering tetanus antitoxin, to see if she was allergic to that serum. She was, in fact, so allergic that the patch test alone put her in a coma for four days.

A full shot undoubtedly would have killed her. Her father and her mother naturally worried that someday a doctor, unaware of her deadly allergy, might give her such a dose. Any parents would worry. But Linda Collins' father was a doctor—Dr. Marion Collins—and he worried with direction.

He thought of devising some methods of warning any police or doctors who might treat Linda in the event of an accident. He knew a card in her wallet might not be discovered until too late. He knew the girl's vanity would not stand for a tattooed notice.

Then came the idea which has become the Medic Alert Foundation—a bracelet tag with the words, "Allergic to Tetanus Antitoxin" engraved on it.

More than 3,000 people a month now join Medic Alert, and wear tags around their wrists or necks. These warn of many potential dangers—diabetes, epilepsy, various allergies, heart conditions, neck breathing, hemophilia, even such items as that the wearer is a scuba diver (and could fall victim to the bends as long as two hours after he leaves the water) or that he wears contact lens (which must be taken out before they scratch the retina).

Medic Alert today is a big organization. What started out with one member—Linda Collins—has grown.

Dr. Collins and his wife used to do all the work themselves, in their playroom after he finished his day's calls. Now the foundation has a neat yellow building catty-corner from Turlock's town hall, with paid workers and many local volunteer ladies going through the mall and filling the orders and engraving the bracelets.

Each tag contains information as to the wearer's condition—so it is readily noted in case of emergency—plus an identifying number and the telephone number of Medic Alert. If the wearer is in an accident, the doctor who treats him can call for more information, which is kept on file in a fireproof room here.

The highway patrol in Montpelier, Vt., called about No. 147868—and learned what medication the diabetic was taking. The Los Angeles police department called about No. 253321—another diabetic with specific medication requirements.

The police in Washington, D.C., called about No. 253932—and learned that the child having convulsions at the swimming pool was an epileptic, and what to do about him. A doctor in London, England, called when No. 153324 collapsed on a London street—and found out about his allergies.

Chester L. Watts, executive director of the nonprofit foundation, says their work is twofold—educating the 40 million people who should wear some warning on their persons about the foundation, and simultaneously educating law enforcement personnel and medical people to look for the Medic Alert tags.

The organization has uncovered a new kind of hypochondriac—which might be termed jewelry hypochondriacs. They want to wear a tag, even without any dangerous condition. One woman applied for membership and requested that her tag read: "Patient Takes Bile Salts." The foundation turned her down.

A new wrinkle is a tag which reads "Organ Donor." These are supplied to people desirous of giving one or more of their vital organs for transplanting. If these people become accident fatalities, the doctor at the scene can call Medic Alert and learn which of their organs can be used for transplanting.

More information about joining Medic Alert can be obtained directly from the foundation, Turlock, California, 95380.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Because of the continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union, the only country in which Lithuanians were unable to commemorate this event was Lithuania itself.

It was in 1918 that the Lithuanian nation declared its independence. This was a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination—from 1795 to 1915.

Lithuania was occupied by the Germans during the First World War, but after two decades of independence, it again fell under Russian domination when it was occupied by the Red army during World War II.

It was declared a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since then, it has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component Republic.

The United States never has recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania or the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia.

Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian extraction are among our most patriotic citizens. Let us join them in hope that their homeland will again be an independent nation.

NONPROLIFERATION TRAP

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, retired Gen. Thomas A. Lane has written a column which all Americans ought to have the opportunity to read and in which he correctly denounces the proposed so-called Nonproliferation Treaty as a "fraud" and a "trap."

In the hope that more citizens of this country will have the opportunity to read the general's views on this subject, I am submitting it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—In debate on the Johnson pay raises for the federal elite, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield asked, "Are we mice or are we men?" The majority showed they were mice in the way they went after the Johnson cheese!

Now we have a new measure to test the qualities of the senators. The vote will have special significance for Republican senators because the Johnson Non-Proliferation

Treaty has been indorsed by President Richard Nixon.

While Democrats held the White House, Republicans were free to vote their convictions on important policy issues. They could all be patriots. Now that they are receiving guidance from the White House, Republican senators must decide whether the party or the country comes first. Will they compromise their convictions to accommodate the White House influence?

The Non-Proliferation Treaty is a good test because the issue is so clear-cut and because President Nixon has come down on the wrong side of it. The national interest calls clearly for rejection of the treaty.

This treaty is a fraud upon the American people. It pretends to serve peace; but it increases the prospect of war by disarming the West without corresponding restraint of the Communist powers. The central Soviet objective in this treaty is to deny nuclear weapons to West Germany. Secondary targets are Japan, India and Israel. The treaty does not disarm any Communist powers.

This treaty provides specifically that the signatory powers shall not do what the Soviet Union did in Czechoslovakia. We have long known that the Soviet Union regards these treaties as scraps of paper to mislead the ever-trusting West. How can American leaders, in the face of such a breach of the treaty before it is signed, pretend that such immoral contracting helps the cause of peace? It is clear that they strike these postures only to deceive the American people and not with any expectation of restraining Soviet aggression.

What aberration of political strategy dictated the Nixon commitment to this treaty on the eve of his trip to Europe? Why didn't he wait to talk with his allies before taking the leap? His action signals to Europe more plainly than words could do: "I am standing with Britain against the interests of the continental allies." Who told the President that this action would help him to heal the rift in the Atlantic Alliance?

Free Europe is now a weak aggregation of independent and competing powers. It has a potential to become through union a superpower matching the United States and the U.S.S.R. Soviet leaders fear this development and do all they can to prevent it. They prefer to have weak neighbors. And how could they hold their satellites with a free superpower next door?

Britain also fears the unification of continental Europe. For 400 years, the cornerstone of British policy has been the balance of power, the division of Europe. So Britain works assiduously to stir the jealousies which will be a barrier to union. In this matter, Britain is in league with the Soviet Union.

But European unity would serve U.S. interests and the cause of peace. A strong Europe and a secure Europe. It will not need the billions of dollars which the United States has been pouring out to protect a weak Europe. No longer will the people of Europe be under the threat of conquest and dependent upon U.S. protection.

Why then is the United States playing the lackey of Britain and the dupe of the Soviet Union? Why doesn't it listen to the allies who are standing face-to-face with the Soviet threat? West Germany has opposed this treaty and surely will not sign it. Does President Nixon propose to join Britain and the Soviet Union in condemning West Germany? He does so when he indorses this treaty.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty was a pending issue of international policy which offered President Nixon opportunity to demonstrate that grasp of foreign policy which he had claimed and the people had allowed. It gave him a signal occasion to correct the Johnson error and fulfill the people's hopes. His blundering approach to Europe in this matter, his adherence to the dogmatic John-

son pursuit of detente, do not augur well for U.S. success.

If President Nixon is going to be so easily led by Britain, he is not going to be respected by France and West Germany. He will encounter the very obstacles to allied harmony which effectively stymied the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

The Senate must save the President and the country from such a disaster. It must reject the Non-Proliferation Treaty and invite the President to try some new initiatives in foreign policy.

TEENAGE VOTE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, among the latest issues promoted to foster discontent and grievance is that of a right to vote for 18-year-olds.

Emotion notwithstanding, the issue of voting age addresses itself to the legislatures of the respective States and not to the U.S. Congress.

A frequent retort of the draft dodgers and draft card burners, despite their inconsistency, is: "If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote."

Yet, those fighting for their country are not the vocal group—their great numbers are overseas and probably denied the chance to politic and would not be able to vote even if given the right. It is hard enough to get mail, let alone to mark a ballot when you are in a foxhole dodging bullets.

On the other hand, the antiwar people—the card burners and those disloyal youth—some on our campuses and some in Canada and Sweden dodging the draft—would be available to participate in elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think two recent occurrences point up apparent discrimination favoring the domestic guerrilla troops over our country's servicemen.

Men in the U.S. military are prohibited from participating in politics—even to the extent of placing a bumper sticker on their automobiles; while on the other hand, the Supreme Court has licensed the pacifist-extremists to wear political armbands to class.

Right to vote because old enough to fight? Why not a suitable compromise—give the right to vote to every 18-year-old serving honorably in the U.S. military and those 18 and over honorably discharged.

If it is no longer to be age that determines the voting qualifications, let us at least set them at responsibility and loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following news releases:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1969]

ARMY ORDER BANS POLITICAL BUMPER STICKERS FOR SERVICEMEN

(By Bruce Galphin)

A Nixon bumper sticker—or maybe even one touting "Snoopy for President"—could get a GI in trouble under a new Army policy amendment.

The policy, promulgated earlier this

month, adds this to its list of forbidden political activities:

"Display of political stickers is prohibited on automobiles operated by members of the Army while on active duty."

Does that include a wife's car or a father's when the driver is an Army man?

Does it apply only when he's on base, or on assignment, or in uniform?

The Pentagon declined to comment on specific examples.

NOT FEASIBLE

"It is not feasible to speculate as to all the possibilities that might arise with respect to the interpretation of a regulation," an Army spokesman said in an official statement. "Such matters will always have to be decided on an individual basis, based on the circumstances in each case."

But it did appear that the Army man could be in violation even driving around town while wearing civilian clothes. A person is on active duty, the Army spokesman explained, "when in full-time military service of the United States."

Technically, even Reservists and National Guardsmen on two-week active training duty would be covered.

But, the Pentagon said, "the matter of imposing this restriction on two-week active duty training personnel is a matter to be decided by the local commander."

Reservists who serve only on weekends are exempt from the prohibition, the Army said.

DENIES POLICY SHIFT

It insisted that the sticker ban "does not represent a change in policy, but is a specific enumeration of what was considered to be inherent in the general policy in effect."

That policy, the Army explained, allows private expression of political belief, but not active political management or efforts to influence elections.

To the Armed Forces Journal, however, the Army's sticker ban is "insulting . . . ridiculous . . . picaresque."

In its Feb. 22 issue, the Journal contends editorially that "what is involved is a very basic rule of democracy which says: Don't meddle in the private lives of citizens."

"And doesn't the Army's policy discriminate against a serviceman's wife, or his son or daughter, by denying them so common an expression of political choice?" the editorial asks.

"This," says the Journal, "is not the way to go about building the all-volunteer armed force President Nixon has been talking about."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 25, 1969]

PEACEFUL PROTESTS IN SCHOOLS UPHELD

(By Morton Mintz)

The Supreme Court, saying that the right to free speech cannot be denied "at the schoolhouse gate," yesterday upheld the right of five Iowa students to wear black armbands in classrooms as a passive silent protest against the war in Vietnam.

In a 7-to-2 decision, the Court said that a student's rights—in the classroom or anywhere else on campus—permit him to express opinions on controversial subjects so long as there is no collision with the rights of others.

But, Justice Abe Fortas said for the Court, any conduct that for any reason "materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder . . . is, of course, not immunized by the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech."

In the Iowa case, Fortas emphasized that by wearing armbands the students had done nothing that was even "potentially disruptive" and had engaged in a protest closely akin to "pure speech." He disclaimed any connection between the case and regulation of such things as hair styles and skirt lengths.

STARTED IN 1965

The case began in December, 1965, when a group of adults and students decided to publicize their objections to the war and their support for a truce by fasting on two non-consecutive days and by wearing black armbands.

Learning of the plan, principals of the Des Moines Independent Community School District adopted a policy that a student coming to school with an armband would be asked to take it off and, if he refused, would be suspended.

A few days later, a few students wore armbands at school. They were sent home and told they could return only without the armbands. The students came back after New Year's Day, when the protest period had expired.

Four of the students were the children of a Methodist minister whose salary is paid by the American Friends Service Committee—John Tinker, 15, Mary Beth, 13, Hope, 11, and Paul, 8. A fifth was Christopher Eckhardt, an 11th grader whose mother, an official of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, had been the hostess for the meeting to plan the protest.

The fathers of the students sought an injunction restraining the school authorities. A Federal Court denied the petition. It said that with the war in sharp controversy, the authorities had acted reasonably to prevent disturbances.

The fathers appealed. The case brought an even split in the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. This affirmed the court below. Last year, the Supreme Court agreed to review the case.

Yesterday's decision, which reversed the Appellate Court, was concurred in by Justice Potter Stewart. He said, however, that "I cannot share the Court's uncritical assumption that, school discipline aside, the First Amendment rights of children are co-extensive with those of adults."

For the majority, Fortas said that the five students were an inconsequential proportion of a school population of 18,000, and that the authorities significantly did not forbid the wearing of all controversial symbols, including "the Iron Cross, traditionally a symbol of nazism."

CAUSED DISCUSSION

The students "neither interrupted school activities nor sought to intrude in the school affairs or the lives of others," Fortas said. "They caused discussion outside of the classrooms, but no interference with work and no disorder . . . Our Constitution does not permit officials of the State to deny their form of expression."

Asserting that mere "apprehension" that there may be a disturbance is "not enough to overcome the right to freedom of expression," Fortas said that "State-operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. Students in school as well as out of school are 'persons' under our Constitution."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians everywhere in the world, except in Lithuania itself, joined in celebrating the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania this past Sunday. Unfortunately, the people within Lithuania were unable to celebrate because of continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia last year was a dramatic reminder of the identical invasion and occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States in 1940. In both instances Soviet aggression was unprovoked, and in flagrant violation of existing treaties and international law, and against the will of the people.

Despite condemnations of the occupation by free world nations over the years, the Soviet Union still forces Lithuania and its people to suffer oppression and exploitation under despotic Communist rule.

Today I join my colleagues in the House in restating our intention to continue to exert strong and steady pressure upon the rulers of the Soviet Union to liberate these captive nations. We renew our demand that Soviet armies, police, and ruling apparatus be withdrawn from Lithuania so the people can freely elect a government of their own choosing in accordance with the Atlantic and United Nations Charters, and the principle of self-determination the Soviets so loudly demand for people outside the Communist sphere. We urge restoration of freedom and independence for Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all other captive nations.

A VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer was impressed enough with the final story written by one of its reporters prior to his departure from Vietnam that the paper reproduced that report and circulated it.

After reading what Plain Dealer correspondent Michael D. Roberts filed on December 15, 1968, I can understand why the newspaper was impressed.

Some of the observations Mr. Roberts makes relate to things we have heard and read before about the war in Vietnam. But the totality of what he has to say strikes me as frank and poignant. To quote a current cliché, Mr. Roberts "tells it like it is."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD, and I hope that my colleagues will have the time to read Mr. Roberts' piece:

VIETNAM, 1968, IS TIME FOR ANGER

(NOTE.—Michael D. Roberts, Plain Dealer correspondent, sums up in this dispatch the overall conclusions he has drawn from nearly a year's service in Vietnam.)

(By Michael D. Roberts)

SAIGON.—It is difficult to feel sadness on leaving Vietnam. All the sadness you could muster has long been expended—uselessly, you might add.

The thing you can do is lament the dead and those who are going to die in this place of confused torment.

The feeling most prevalent, though, is anger—not an anger derived from a political philosophy or a fervid moral movement, but an anger based on realism.

This anger is directed at the Vietnamese

and American governments and those who represent each in their particular endeavors in the orchestrated mess called the Vietnam war.

And the others—the Vietnamese people and the American soldiers—well, they really have no control over what happens to them, and need an element of luck to duck at the right moment. You can sympathize with them, admire them and wish them luck. After they are dead you may lament them.

A new President will now confront the cursed ways of this war, and if he is not deceived perhaps he can help bring peace to the countryside and joy to the people.

But to do this he must be tough and wise and stop playing "let's pretend" with the South Vietnamese Government (GVN) and recognize what it is and what it has not done.

In many ways the GVN, masked behind its democratic drapery, is as much of a hindrance as the Viet Cong when it comes to joy and freedom for the people.

It is neither responsive to the people it represents nor viable enough to stand on its own. Directed largely by military personalities, the GVN goes its own way and in a carefully masked drama gives us the impression of being democratic. It is a hollow impression.

Most knowledgeable Vietnamese who care enough to be interested will tell you about the great election we forced the GVN to hold in the fall of 1967.

"The election was the biggest fraud," said one student. "It is common knowledge among the people that many soldiers voted twice. That many people long dead had cast ballots is quite amusing to many of us."

But since the election and the writing of a constitution, Americans here have looked upon the evolution of democracy in almost a reverent manner.

"Why, I'm not worried about a coup," said an American adviser in Vung Tau. "They have a constitution now. After the election why should there be a coup? It is a practicing, living democracy now."

The fact that the GVN is a thinly disguised tyranny that closes newspapers with flimsy explanations, harasses those who would dare to speak out in public, and takes from the people in the form of corruption is usually overlooked.

Outwardly, the GVN appears to be laboring to develop a war-torn nation, but inwardly its officials, products of a system that has become part of this nation's blood, continue to grow wealthy from the ways of war, corruption and the American dollar.

Given peace tomorrow, the GVN would only have to face another armed group preparing to rid the land of oppression.

The oppression comes first, rebellion follows and the Communists fill the vacuum and provide an added spirit, eventually taking the leadership of the entire movement and making it theirs. This is a possible pattern of insurrection.

As long as the GVN continues to treat the people in the present manner communism will always have a point from which to commence.

Legions of naive, ambitious and plainly stupid Americans have unwittingly aided the GVN. Our government attempted a revolution here which was of such magnitude that it became an impossibility from the start because of the character of the people and the nature of the GVN.

Our government, under the impression that American money and men could eventually transform this land into a democratic society, gave the GVN its head. Because of the United States, the GVN had power and we really had no control over this power, which, of course, was ours from the beginning.

Never before has our government fought such a war. In response, it has sent American civilians and leaders of such naive quality that one's teeth grate in frustration.

U.S. AID employes, people who are asked

to function in important jobs—jobs that require immense skill and understanding—arrive daily to collect substantial salaries and live in air-conditioned comfort. They arrive without skill or understanding.

Some go to the district and provincial capitals to serve in various advisory roles. Many who are sent to advise are recent college graduates who previously never held jobs and are avoiding military service. Others are former military men, usually retired, who were passed over on the promotion lists.

This is not to say that the civilians who serve as advisers are all inadequate, for there are some outstanding people here, but even they are stymied by the atmosphere and events that take place around them.

One adviser, a young man who is capable and knowledgeable, blames the military for many ills and refuses to mingle with the rest of the men on the advisory team who are all military.

His attitude is one of disgust toward the Army—disgust because the Army seems indifferent toward the Vietnamese people.

"I have as little as possible to do with the military," this adviser explained.

Whether he knows it or not, this adviser is dulling the effectiveness of his particular team. True enough, the military does not exhibit the same zeal as the young adviser, but he refuses to see reality and try to make the team work.

On the other hand, the military often manifests contempt for the civilians, who are sometimes viewed as "do-gooders" with no business to be cluttering up a war zone.

Since the job of fighting this type of struggle is complex, the experience and knowledge of those who have mastered a small part of it is invaluable. But by and large, many of these people give up in disgust at the leadership, which tends to give in to the Vietnamese pressures at nearly every turn.

The matter of corruption alone is of such staggering magnitude that the mind reels when it confronts only a small part of it.

And the Vietnamese people laugh—oh, how they laugh!—at the Americans who are innocent of the corruption that surrounds them. The Vietnamese people know all and see all. They are the last to be fooled by the stories of improvement and progress that we praise the GVN for making. Obviously, we are the first to be fooled.

We have done so much for the Vietnamese that they have simply stopped functioning. We advise on everything, we finance most things and we do the heaviest fighting. The Vietnamese government spends its time talking about how it is not going to talk to the National Liberation Front, a confrontation that will have to take place if there is to be peace.

While South Vietnam's large and questionable army moves about the countryside deploying in maneuvers of eluding and engaging, our military is expected to do more than fight.

The truth is that the military has been asked to do too much in Vietnam. Soldiers are expected to be politicians, good humor men, development specialists, doctors, psychologists and just above everything short of the good fairy.

If you have ever had anything to do with an infantry unit that has seen combat day in and day out, you can understand the ridiculousness of this. Men tense and tired from combat are apt to look upon any Vietnamese with suspicion and ill feeling.

However, the military in Vietnam cannot go uncriticized. Gen. William C. Westmoreland with his vocal optimism, his search-and-destroy methods and his massive use of firepower left the military effort open to the attacks of skeptics.

But in many ways the military has done its primary job in Vietnam. It has killed

Viet Cong and North Vietnamese soldiers. It is even getting better at the job. What else does a military do?

The longer you are here, however, and the more closely you examine the enemy and the politics, it becomes increasingly evident that the military operations are superfluous because the "other war" is being fought like a delay-and-withdraw action. Because of the ineptness of the GVN, Viet Cong are manufactured daily.

Our participation in the "other war" has been less than brilliant.

Men were assigned to Vietnam as leaders in this program and came to build personal empires of such bureaucratic magnitude that it took elaborate charts to find out who was responsible for what.

Robert W. Komer, now U.S. ambassador to Turkey and a former Central Intelligence Agency man, came to head up our efforts in this area.

On paper, the way Komer likes things, he had great qualifications. He had good schools behind him, good experience and was generally considered a good administrator. Fine.

But Komer did not listen to his people in the field, many of whom he classified as malcontents when they complained of failures. He would urge them to "get on the team."

A cheery, ebullient sort, Komer told his people to listen to the GVN and do it their way. After all, it was their country.

Komer was fair game for the press which constantly attempted to put him on the defensive at his news briefings. These were almost always concerned with his evaluation system for pacification, a computerized system that analyzed security in the countryside.

"It is the only measurement," he would say in defense. Yes, it was the only measurement that could be worked out on the computer, but there was always the feeling that advisers' reports never quite made it to the final input. Things may not be so good out in the districts, yet by the time Saigon produced the final reports they looked good on paper.

And what about the U.S. advisory system, which has worked so long and so hard with the Vietnamese military and civilian forces?

Despite all the cheering and applause from many American advisers, who must rely upon good efficiency reports for promotion, progress among the Vietnamese armed forces is largely hope and a supply of better American arms.

Since almost all advisers, be they civilian or military, have rather limited tours of duty in specific assignments, their Vietnamese counterparts have gone through a dozen or so.

In many instances the adviser does not advise at all. He sometimes asks, sometimes begs, sometimes cons and most times functions as a line of supply or a communications clerk.

Many Vietnamese commanders, district chiefs and province chiefs have served in the environment of war for so long that it seems impossible that an American officer with no command of the language or, in many cases, no previous combat experience is really going to advise them.

Advisers do not even have the power to control American goods and materials that are sent to help the war-stricken people.

The advisory effort in name has dwindled to the static stage. Vietnamese counterparts have learned to rely too much on U.S. support as provided by an adviser who thinks that he is doing his job by making the aid available. Vietnamese leadership, as bad as it generally is, needs to regain personal initiative.

No one fools the Vietnamese people. When they are helped they know where the help comes from, and our help does not make them view their government with any more respect.

The advisory program needs re-evaluation. It would be the first step in making the Vietnamese realize that the "other war" must be fought by themselves for it is a war in which we are altogether too ineffective.

The problem of the South Vietnamese military is one that will tax the minds of our leadership for some time. The Vietnamese soldier sees how the American fights. He sees the artillery, air strikes and massive helicopter support. He is not interested in fighting without these and where, after we withdraw, is he going to get them?

Westmoreland tried to make the war as easy as possible on the GI. He always said let machines do the job to save men's lives, which was admirable enough. But the South Vietnamese are men, too. Where does their future lie?

The naive Americans are perhaps the most dangerous. They truly believe because they cannot see. The adviser in one seacoast town was oblivious of the fact that the yearly budget was being held back and lent out at a high rate of interest and then, suddenly, spent at a terrific pace at the end of the fiscal year.

"I don't know why they've spent only 20% of the budget in 10 months," he explained to a reporter. "I think it's because they have been having a difficult time getting the books straightened out."

His assistant, younger and more alert, explained later: "It is being lent out at as much as 50% interest on a loan that has to be paid back in 10 months."

"Why didn't you tell your boss?"

"I've told him a couple of times and he refuses to believe me. He says we have to listen to the Vietnamese."

A Saigon official laughed over the lending incident. "At least they are not stealing it," he said.

Americans are naive in other ways.

In a province west of Saigon, an area heavily infested with Viet Cong, the American advisers are quick to extol the virtues of the province chief, who is better than most but still is not beyond applying the con.

Several nights a month, the province chief, buttoned up in his armored car, travels with a musical band to a hamlet where the people are brought together to listen to entertainment and a speech from their leader.

The American leadership views this as quite wholesome. It is just the kind of thing Bob Komer would have in his backyard. The province chief gains prestige through this action because the Americans like it and in turn the GVN is impressed because the United States is much easier to deal with in this particular province.

So on the face of it the rice paddy variety shows are very good. The province chief displays his contempt for the VC by spending the night in the village. On paper it is a brave and bold gesture.

Since most Americans cannot speak Vietnamese, however, they do not realize one thing. The people in that particular hamlet are terrified.

Even though the province chief, who appears to be quite unconcerned about the VC, has set up night ambushes and defensive positions around the hamlet with nearly a battalion, the people fear that his foolishness is simply inviting a Viet Cong attack.

"I have talked with some people from one hamlet," a Vietnamese friend said. "The mother's fear for their babies when the musical show comes. All the people are cold with fright. They wish the colonel would stop trying to impress the Americans."

If you are sitting in Saigon reading reports and evaluating this activity, all would appear quite progressive. The province chief is attempting to pacify his province; he is out showing the flag and he is working. His counterpart seems to be doing well, too.

No one evaluates the people's feelings. Did you ever have a good time while waiting for

a mortar attack? This never occurs to the Saigon officials, whose secretaries often enjoy salaries and benefits equal to those of a company commander.

The game goes on.

Most Americans in Vietnam see our effort for what it is, most recognize the GVN as despotic. To discuss this with them in Saigon is old hat; you give an example and they can give you two back.

Westmoreland could never understand the press in Vietnam. He tried to be friends, tried to use public relations to win their understanding.

Westmoreland did not lie. But what he faced in the press corps was an independent agency that could go anywhere in the country and see anything it wanted to and talk to anyone who cared to comment.

The difference between the press and the government was that the press listened to what everyone had to say. It was not that U.S. officials did not tell the truth. It was just that they did not know any differently themselves so they took the word of the GVN or of whoever could identify progress.

But when these same people who talked to the press tried to talk with the government, people like Bob Komer did not always have time to listen. Ambassador Komer wanted to listen only to those things that told of progress. To speak otherwise meant that you were not doing your job.

Barry Zorthian, the former leader of the Joint U.S. Press Mission, another bureaucratic empire of questionable worth, returned home after a long tour in Vietnam and criticized the irresponsibility of the press.

To a degree Zorthian was right. Some poor reporting is coming out of Vietnam. But the U.S. Government accredits as a journalist just about anyone who would like to attend a war.

These persons flock in without any previous journalistic experience. They are accredited as free-lancers.

"Oh, this is my first writing effort," a young man said the other day. "I'm just here to make some money and see a little war."

A beautiful school operator came over to film a documentary. Red Cross girls return to become journalists and even a matronly woman with nothing other to do was accredited. She asked meekly:

"Please can you tell me when the tour is going out to the war?"

And strangely enough, when the free-lancers find out, as most eventually do, that a war does not necessarily make you an Ernest Hemingway and that it takes money to live even in Saigon they can get an assignment from our government that will pay them a few hundred dollars.

They are paid well to write insipid feature stories that neither will see print nor represent good propaganda. Our conception of propaganda is air-dropped leaflets that the Vietnamese use for toilet paper or peanut wrappers.

Yes, Barry Zorthian is right. There is a problem with the press, largely because the government was too timid to keep Vietnam from being a playground for would-be writers.

A lot of good is to be found in Vietnam, mostly good people. Outstanding Americans and equally outstanding Vietnamese labor daily together, endure the hardships and dangers and build binding friendships and mutual respect through their toils.

The men who extend for more duty deserve credit for they discount the odds that are made by the Viet Cong and the politicians. Not enough can ever be said about these people.

Often it is best not to mention the good Vietnamese for their government does not like to hear what they have to say. But they are the victims of politics and the times and they are the ones who suffer the most.

Both governments, reigned over by the

single-mindedness of their leaderships, struggle on. The Americans look for progress during their tour so they can come home to a promotion while the GVN leaders immerse themselves in the joys of new-found power, unwilling to face reality.

That the writer has been unfair in his portrayal is acknowledged. He is unfair because he does not have the answers to these agonies, but apparently neither does any of those in power.

But first we have to acknowledge our mistakes before we can correct them. The question is whether our leadership is ready to do so.

That is why anger overcomes sadness in Vietnam.

COMPREHENSIVE WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT BILL

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with my colleague (Mr. McCARTHY) and 22 other Members, a Comprehensive Water Quality Improvement bill which includes many of the provisions of the water pollution control legislation passed by both bodies of Congress during the last session. Unfortunately, the differences between the two bills were not resolved before the end of the session, and new legislation is therefore necessary.

The major provisions of the bills passed during the last session dealt with oil spillage, control of pollution from ships and boats, acid mine drainage, thermal pollution and a new method of financing to permit maximum use of existing funds. This bill incorporates those provisions with some minor changes regarding financing.

The intent of the legislation is to permit communities to finance the Federal share of the cost of waste treatment works with repayment assured from the Federal Government. This would be achieved through the use of contracts between the Secretary and the localities. The total amount of contracts will represent not more than twice the amount appropriated for grants in fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971. Authorizations are set by existing law at \$700 million in fiscal year 1969, \$1 billion in fiscal year 1970, and \$1.25 billion in fiscal year 1971. The contract will obligate the United States to pay, over a maximum period of 30 years, the grant covering the Federal share which would be subject to the same percentage limitations now applicable to direct grants.

A major addition to this bill is the inclusion of authority to finance basic sanitary sewers in the Water Pollution Control Act for the first time. Assistance for the construction of such sewers is now authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, but inadequate appropriations have been harmful to efforts to control water pollution—the rapidly growing suburbs have not had adequate funds for installation of lateral, or basic sanitary sewers rather than cesspools or other temporary disposal systems.

By placing grants for lateral sewers, interceptor sewers, and treatment plants under the administration of one Federal agency—the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—this bill introduces a unified or systems approach to water pollution control. Administration of the program is simplified and some of the overlapping paperwork will be eliminated for local sewer authorities. The bill provides adequate funding for lateral sewers for the first time, authorizing \$500 million in fiscal year 1970 and \$700 million in fiscal year 1971. As Mr. McCARTHY points out, it deals directly with the problem of pollution in our suburbs, where we are experiencing explosive population growth.

In my judgment, we must act now to meet our water pollution control needs. This is an important step toward restoring the quality of our waters.

ALCOHOLISM AND ADVERTISING

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, today, nine of my colleagues and I introduced a bill to bar advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television.

We take this step advisedly, aware of the objections that will be raised by those who see such legislation as an infringement on free speech; conscious of the chorus of objections that will be raised by beer and wine advertisers. Those who manufacture and sell what is generally termed "hard liquor" do not advertise on these media. I mention our awareness of the objections to this approach, at the outset, Mr. Speaker, because I want it understood that in introducing this bill we have balanced these objections against the multiplying magnitude of the problem of alcoholism in our society. It is our conclusion that action is needed. It is our conclusion that existing evidence, at least, supports the modest assertions: that children are deeply influenced by radio and television advertising; that wine and beer advertising account for a significant amount of radio-television advertising; and that this advertising may create tastes and predispositions in children who are unable to objectively appraise the content of such commercials.

It is our hope that this legislation and the dialog which it will engender will focus attention of all the Congress on the problems of alcohol and alcoholism. You might say we wish to use this bill as a prism through which we can filter the problem of alcohol and alcoholism, as a means for identifying the several shadings of the problem.

The discussion which will surround this bill will of necessity answer two questions. The first: What is the nature and scope of the problem of alcoholism? This interrogative must be answered before we can proceed to addressing ourselves to the second and the immediate question posed by this bill: What responsi-

bility does the Congress have to take affirmative public policy action to find a solution to this problem?

In launching this bill and the dialog which I hope will accompany it, let me offer for the consideration of all who would participate a thought-provoking article. It was written by a leading student of alcoholism, Dr. Max Hyman. The article follows:

[From the American Journal of Psychiatry]
THE MYTH OF SOCIAL DRINKING

(By Max Hayman, M.D.)¹

(NOTE.—The author casts doubt on three well-accepted myths: that social drinking is a definable entity, that it is not harmful, and that it is helpful. While he notes that there is no definitive proof that social drinking is either harmful or helpful, the flimsiness of the evidence in its favor should act as a spur to further investigation. He calls for a comprehensive, objective study similar to the Surgeon General's report on smoking.)

If one looks down the row to the 15th person in an average audience, that person will be an alcoholic. If one counts down to the fifth person, this one's life will be adversely affected in one way or another by an alcoholic. If you now look at the intervening persons, the fourth will be an abstainer and the rest will drink varying amounts of liquor. Again, every fifth person will be a heavy drinker, and if the audience is composed of doctors, one in 100 will be lost to the profession because of drinking. Furthermore, an unknown number will be handicapped in their work because of drinking.

Most of the research on alcohol and alcoholism has dealt with differences between alcoholics and nonalcoholics; very little has been involved in the differences in drinking behavior among the various types of "social drinkers." This is rarely spelled out by investigators, and we must try to deduce from their data what the frequency of social drinkers in pathological behaviors might be.

In a report from the Stanford Research Institute it was noted that 11 percent of auto drivers at any time have been drinking, that the estimate of the number of drunk driving offenses each year is in the hundreds of millions, and that less than one individual in a thousand is apprehended. Winek noted that 20 to 40 percent of accidents can be attributed to alcohol. Alcoholics constitute a substantial proportion of these statistics, but a large percentage of individuals actually come from the ranks of social drinkers. Popham has shown that one can be an alcoholic with the equivalent of six drinks of whiskey a day or less. This can be no more, from the viewpoint of quantity, than the amount consumed by many of the 20 percent of the population classed as heavy drinkers.

Such figures, underlining both the quantity and quality of the drinking done under such an embracing term as social drinking, appear to indicate that the division between social drinking and alcoholism—for so long consciously or unconsciously taken for granted—may instead be nebulous or nonexistent. So firmly entrenched is the belief in its existence, however, that it has transcended the limits of logic and reason and has become established in the mythology of our time.

¹ Dr. Hayman is a Research Psychiatrist at the Alcoholism Research Clinic, Department of Psychiatry, University of California at Los Angeles School of Medicine, and Director of Education and Research, Compton Foundation Hospital. His address is 969 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024.

This work was supported by the Division of Alcoholism, Department of Public Health, State of California, and by the Compton Foundation Hospital (Vista Hill Psychiatric Foundation), Compton, Calif.

In attempting to assess the more recent data on this subject, therefore, we will consider social drinking under the broad category of myths. Like all myths, this particular one is more easily described than defined, but we will use it in the sense of a statement, idea, or attitude strongly believed but without sufficient data to support it. From the title it is apparent that this essay is polemical and partisan. However, in a society where abstainers are considered a "deviant minority" (with the connotation of abnormality), it is not unwarranted to examine the "other side" of social drinking.

MYTH 1: SOCIAL DRINKING IS A DEFINABLE ENTITY

Definitions of alcoholism itself are vague and imprecise. The World Health Organization calls it "any kind of drinking that goes beyond the traditional and customary and dietary use or ordinary compliance with the social drinking customs of the whole community, irrespective of the etiologic factors leading to such behavior, and irrespective also of the extent to which etiologic factors are dependent upon heredity, constitution, or acquired physio-pathologic and metabolic influences."

Such vagueness highlights the infinitely more difficult problem of defining social drinking. We often assume it to mean the opposite of asocial, problem, excessive drinking, or alcoholism, but if we follow it to its ultimate conclusion it may include anything from the single drink to celebrate Christmas to a state of alcoholic coma whenever two or more people congregate. To paraphrase Humpty Dumpty in *Alice in Wonderland* "social drinking means just what I choose it to mean—neither more or less." There would be considerable objection if we defined social drinkers as all those drinkers who have not been formally diagnosed as alcoholics, but this is hardly more imprecise than most attempts at defining social drinking. Such vagueness leads us to overlook the seriousness of the problem.

Social drinking and moderate drinking are often equated, but moderation is as difficult to define as social drinking. One man's moderation is another's excess, and King agrees that moderation, in this context, is the greatest example of contemporary, undefined ambiguity. He further adds that terms like social drinking and normal drinking are in reality value judgments. Moderation has been held up to man as the ideal approach to life since time immemorial and its virtues may indeed be irrefutable, but as a practical guide for the individual it is useless. Boundaries are too indistinct by which to chart a course, and the drinker too readily interprets moderation as moderate drunkenness. This recalls the alcoholic, pressured by his wife, her mother, and his physician to abstain completely. "I don't mind total abstinence," he said to me, "as long as it's done in moderation."

While it would be absurd to label the Christmas celebrant as a problem drinker, there is an increasing gradient to the heavy "nonproblem" drinker who has had an arrest for drunk driving ("just an accident"), or a fight ("it could happen to anyone"), or missed work ("it wasn't the liquor—it was something I ate"). The concept of social drinking adds these rationalizations and leads to cultural denial of problems until the magnitude becomes so great that to do so would be an utter dissipation of rationality.

One definition of alcoholism (a rather satisfactory one clinically) is "loss of the power of choice." I would suggest—even challenge—the social drinker to stop drinking and observe his own feeling of loss and dependency, his rationalizations, and, so frequently, a return to old habits of drinking. This can be an excellent gauge of one's dependency on alcohol.

In the minds of most people, consciously or unconsciously, there is a qualitative differ-

ence between social drinking and alcoholism and a belief that social drinkers consume alcohol for different reasons than alcoholics. This is open to considerable question, for there is no evidence to permit this conclusion. Drinking may be the reflection of a universal desire, a regressive longing for infantile pleasures in all of us. The difference often is in the amount of alcohol necessary to achieve such a state. Williams has shown that alcohol provides relief of anxiety and depression both to problem and nonproblem drinkers, but problem drinkers appreciate it more.

MYTH 2: SOCIAL DRINKING IS NOT HARMFUL

Except for such "deviant" groups as the Prohibitionists and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the general public accepts the view that social drinking of alcoholic beverages is not harmful. On the whole this view is shared by medical practitioners, and it is significant that more than 80 percent of all physicians (as large or larger a percentage than can be found in any group) drink. Depending on the degree, their own drinking may lead to underdiagnosing alcoholism, distorting attitudes to patients' drinking, and recommendations to drink or not to drink on the basis of their own habits rather than the condition of the patient.

The literature on the harmlessness of drinking is too voluminous to evaluate in detail, but the claims have been covered quite adequately by several recent volumes: *Alcohol and Civilization*, edited by Lucia, especially the paper by Dock; *Social Drinking*, by Lolli; the "Symposium on Alcohol and Food in Health and Disease," published in the *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*; and, particularly, *Alcoholic Beverages in Clinical Medicine*, by Leake and Silverman. We might include *Liquor: The Servant of Man* by Chafetz, but he specifically eliminates accuracy and scientific treatment as a goal in his volume. Leake and Silverman make a serious attempt to evaluate all the available data on the chemistry, pharmacology, toxicity, and other clinical aspects of alcoholic beverages. They list over 400 references: alcoholologists owe them a debt of gratitude for performing this formidable task. Leake and Silverman state that abstainers can live happily and healthfully without alcohol and moderate drinkers can live happily and healthfully with alcohol. The former statement, although it appears self-evident, is often denied; the latter is open to considerable question.

Writers on the effects of alcohol state that it is not harmful when used in "moderate or prescriptive doses" and emphasize that only low blood levels are permissible. This, by consensus, is in the area of one or two drinks, or .05 mgs. percent. In actual practice it is easy to go over the borderline and it is a rare social drinker who does not go over this tenuous line on occasion. Innumerable social drinkers go over the line regularly or on many occasions. The heavy drinkers mentioned by the California Drinking Practices Study and by Mulford would certainly have regular blood alcohol levels of over .05 mgs. percent.

Indeed, most of those in the "frequent moderate" group of drinkers—that is, those who drink one to four times weekly with more than two drinks at a sitting—would be included among those who drink more than recommended by the above writers. Together they make up 36 percent of the sample of the California population. We must conclude that the range between toxic and so-called therapeutic doses of alcohol must be a very slender one. If any other drug were used to induce the effects of ordinary intoxication, it would automatically be considered a dangerous drug, and more than two drinks would be considered excessive.

Lolli does not minimize the toxic effects of alcohol, but Dock states it is one of the least toxic tranquilizers. He suggests that American physicians do not use alcohol as a

therapeutic agent because no detail men push it as a medication; he feels that physicians are prejudiced against prescribing alcohol because of a hangover from the prohibition era.

Short-term effects of social drinking

There is fairly general agreement that two to three ounces of 80- to 90-proof liquor produces a blood level of .05 mgs. percent. It is less generally agreed that above this figure, efficiency in various respects is impaired. The individual who can still perform fairly well with a high blood alcohol level is more likely to be an alcoholic. One study concluded that a statistically significant proportion of drivers responsible for accidents had blood alcohol levels in the .03 to .05 mgs. percent range. It was found in another study that 69 percent of 653 drivers killed in single-vehicle accidents had been drinking; sixty percent had blood alcohol levels of .10 mgs. percent or higher. It is likely that the 17 percent who had blood alcohol levels in excess of .25 mgs. percent were alcoholics. A good proportion of the remaining 83 percent were likely so-called social drinkers.

There are other statistics which show that traffic arrests and accidents may not be restricted to alcoholics. It is unlikely that all of the 74 percent of pedestrians who were fatally injured in auto accidents and had been drinking were alcoholics, or that the 73 percent of auto accidents caused by those who had been drinking involved alcoholics. Over half of the arrests in California cities (500,000 annually) are for drunkenness. There are 50,000 drunk driving convictions. Even if we take the rather high figures of Selzer and his group for the incidence of alcoholism among these drunk drivers, almost 50 percent would still be classified as social drinkers. Others report even less frequent alcoholism. It should also be noted that many social drinkers who have a respectable appearance are not arrested; they are more likely to be warned and released. They therefore tend to appear in statistics much less frequently than do alcoholics.

Moskowitz and Duprey of the UCLA Alcoholism Research Clinic recently demonstrated that alcohol interferes with the brain's ability to pay attention to several things at the same moment. They report that the complexities of driving have been vastly underestimated and find that a single alcoholic drink may seriously impair the driver's ability to give attention to more than one concurrent stimulus.

Drew found in simulated driving experiments that there were detectable error scores as soon as there was any measurable quantity of alcohol in the blood (.01 mgs. to .02 mgs. percent); this error score increased proportionately to the increase in blood level of alcohol. If we juxtapose these findings with Williams' report that 90 fraternity men in a social party setting in one hour consumed a mean of 11 ounces of 86-proof whiskey (the liquor was free), we have some idea of what some types of social drinking can do to the driving skills of individuals.

We cannot at this time review the suicides, homicides, carcinomas of the esophagus and mouth, frequency of varicose veins, complications of venereal disease, and many other factors that occur in heavy social drinkers as well as alcoholics. Recently these data have been extended and updated.

Long-term effects of social drinking

It has long been known that the mortality rate among chronic alcoholics is higher than among nonalcoholics. What is less well known is the recent evidence that social drinking also shortens life considerably. This is at variance with Pearl's work in 1926; he found that moderate steady drinkers showed somewhat lower rates of mortality and greater expectation of life than did abstainers, although heavy drinkers had considerably increased rates of mortality and diminished longevity. But he admitted that these

data might not be significant statistically. His "reasonable and proper use" was not quite adequately defined. The study, however, is a careful one and requires replication.

Pearl criticizes life insurance statistics. These are important in that drinkers are followed to the end of their lives, although when individuals wish to obtain insurance they tend to conceal the amount of alcohol they consume; the amount of drinking in actuality may therefore be more than claimed. The data from life insurance statistics, however, are quite consistent and meaningful. With "minimal criticism with respect to the use of alcohol" of subjects who were investigated for life insurance policies, the ratio of actual to expected mortality was 225 percent. Furthermore, in three classes of social drinkers the actual mortality was 281 to 324 percent higher than expected. The figure for "spree drinkers," who were probably alcoholics, was 546 percent of expected mortality.

This incidence has worsened since a medical impairment study in 1929, which showed the mortality rate to be 248 percent of normal for "steady free users" who used one and one-half ounces of alcohol daily without intoxication; 195 percent of normal for those with periodic intoxication; and 331 percent of normal for spree drinkers.

There is an additional report on the findings on mortality claims from 1931 to 1947. This work indicated that social users who were intoxicated for six episodes a year for only a few hours showed a 277 percent higher mortality rate than expected. If 12 such episodes occurred in the year, the mortality rate rose to 287 percent, and if the episodes were weekly the mortality rate was 328 percent of normal. Spree drinkers who were intoxicated for two or three days up to three times a year showed 332 percent excess mortality—482 percent if the episodes occurred more than three times a year. It was interesting to note that former drinkers who had stopped drinking still showed an excess mortality rate of over 300 percent five years afterward.

Mortality rates were higher than expected in the following conditions: malignant neoplasms, arteriosclerosis and degenerative heart disease, cardiovascular disease, diseases of the digestive system including liver cirrhosis, motor vehicle and other accidents, and homicides and suicides.

If we can assume that adverse effects are associated with greater alcohol consumption—and this is certainly indicated by the gradings of the life insurance reports—it follows that the social drinker is heir to all the problems of the chronic alcoholic though to a lesser degree.

Psychological effects of social drinking

Psychological ill effects of social drinking are usually long-term in type. Alcoholics are known to be passive individuals. We generally consider passivity to be a defense mechanism and activity to be the normal method of attaining one's goal. In the psychoanalytic treatment of nonalcoholics as well as alcoholics we frequently note the association of drinking and passivity, and the same loss of aggressiveness, ambition, and drive found in alcoholics can often be observed in many social drinkers. During the course of psychoanalysis many patients who have given up such oral activities as drinking and smoking have experienced a considerable increase in energy and drive.

The "Rule of Abstinence," which refers to the elimination of gratification from the therapist to the patient during the course of psychoanalysis, may produce temporary anxiety but often leads to the abandonment of the gratifications of infantile drives and the substitution of constructive and creative activities. The drinking therapist, and most of us are drinkers, may have a tendency to ignore the regressive and infantile nature of social drinking, which may have caused the patient both direct and indirect damage.

It would be an interesting experiment to apply a version of the "Rule of Abstinence" to a group of social drinkers or even a community with opportunity for adequate expressive outlets and then to assess the changes which occur. Such a procedure might elicit many less damaging substitutes for social drinking. It has not been demonstrated that more damaging substitutes have been selected by alcoholics who have become abstinent.

MYTH 3: SOCIAL DRINKING IS HELPFUL

Alcohol is credited with conferring many benefits upon mankind; these claims require examination. Dock, and Leake and Silverman in their defense of the medicinal use of alcohol claim that it is valuable as a source of food and energy, an appetite stimulant, a digestive aid, an aid in cardiovascular disease, a useful sedative, a fatigue-lifter, and a boon to the convalescent and the aging. They often refer to the efficacy of alcohol in relieving tensions and anxiety and consider it the most commonly used of all tranquilizers. Dock further adds that it has at least a temporary effect in preventing or ameliorating neurosis, has a psychiatric use in catharsis, and can be used to obtain suppressed or repressed data.

We might note in their evaluation of alcohol as a medicinal agent the vagueness of the findings, the scarcity of controlled studies, the impressionistic aspect of many of the studies, and a rather frequent reference to the persistent use of alcohol from antiquity as an index of its value. The merits of alcohol as a quick source of food and energy are negligible in our current society. It is difficult to think of a situation that would require an emergency caloric intake, although emergency fluids, of course, can be life-saving. The importance of alcohol as a valuable food stuff is diminished if we call to mind the fact that for the most part alcohol is manufactured from valuable food stuffs and merely represents a change in the form of the calories it contains. We should mention, however, that Jellinek states that in some poverty areas in the world wine represents the cheapest source of calories.

The evidence for the effectiveness of alcohol in stimulating the appetite appears to have little basis. There is, on the contrary, evidence that appetite and olfactory acuity are reduced as measured by various tests, including the actual amounts of food intake. Furthermore, unless the drinker eats within 15 to 20 minutes he is likely to continue drinking, thus defeating his purpose.

Cardiac benefits are frequently ascribed to alcohol, but there is very little acceptable evidence to support claims that it alleviates angina pectoris or prevents arteriosclerosis. A recent paper indicates, from postmortem examinations, that there is no significant relationship between advanced arteriosclerosis of the aorta and coronary arteries and ingestion of alcohol. There is more evidence available that alcohol affects the heart adversely by increasing the heart rate and producing electrocardiographic changes. Repeated drinking, not necessarily alcoholism, may result in permanent alterations in myocardial metabolism which can lead to the development of irreversible alcoholic cardiomyopathy. Other writers have stated that moderate drinkers can do themselves cardiovascular harm, and alcohol even in moderate dosage may produce tissue changes.

Evidence is accumulating that alcohol directly affects the liver, producing an accumulation of fat in liver cells which precedes cirrhosis. The only way to get rid of fatty liver and prevent possible cirrhosis, several reports indicate, is to stop drinking. Most patients with pancreatitis have been found to be heavy social drinkers rather than alcoholics.

In tests of attention, abstract thinking, learning efficiency, and recall, adverse effects were shown even in cases where blood con-

centrations of alcohol were as low as one part in a thousand, and errors in various skills appear with minimal amounts of alcohol in the blood.

Although no recent studies on the effects of alcohol on intelligence were found, two early papers indicated that the intelligence of children in alcohol-consuming districts was lower than that of children living in areas where no alcohol was consumed. In children from the age of six to 14, scholastic ability varied inversely with the amount of drinking.

While alcohol is still referred to as an excellent hypnotic, it has been too difficult to gauge the appropriate amount. Furthermore, it often acts as an excitant, rather than a sedative, and there are medications of greater value, such as the minor and major tranquilizers, which are less addicting.

Cultural values of social drinking

It has been suggested, especially by Cha-fetz, that alcohol liberates spiritual and artistic powers (this is reminiscent of claims for LSD), is necessary for social interchange among people, is an aid to conviviality, and lubricates the wheels of commerce. Roe, however, found only one of 20 artists who felt it was easier to paint when drinking, and this one stopped drinking six months before the study. Rather than lubricate the wheels of commerce, and I refer to the two- or three-martini lunch, alcohol often derails it. An omnipresent reason given for social drinking is the impossible burden of adjustment which our current civilization imposes. The society is sick, we are told. If so, alcohol has become the medicine of a sick society. The apologist for liquor seems to feel that the world is such a miserable place is intolerable without the gift of alcohol, while the critic feels that since liquor creates so much of the misery in the world it should be entirely eliminated. The pertinent question is: Does social drinking permit us to attack the problems of our society with all our available efficiency and equipment?

The benefits of social drinking

Is alcohol, then, of any benefit whatever? This is possible. Carpenter and his associates, in what appears to be a carefully worked out experimental project, found that with the equivalent of two ounces of 90 proof whiskey subjects were better able to perform higher order problems in calculus than without alcohol. With larger amounts, performance deteriorated. They stated (as opposed to Drew) that unidirectional consequences do not necessarily follow from increasing amounts of alcohol. They suggest the possibility that some people drink to enhance this facilitating effect of alcohol. Carpenter and Ross in 1965 found certain memory tasks were performed better with small amounts of alcohol and worse with larger amounts. Such studies have suggested to Keller that small amounts of alcohol may stimulate some functions, while larger amounts have the frequently described depressant action. Leake and Silverman have stated that alcohol acts as a stimulant on other organs but not on the central nervous system. These findings should be replicated and extended. If they are confirmed it remains to be seen what use can be made of such actions of alcohol.

It has been suggested that blood alcohol levels below .04 mgs. percent are not inconsistent with traffic safety. Indeed, there may be fewer accidents with such a level. Whether this is due to an alleviation of tension or whether there is a stimulatory effect has yet to be determined. This study, which is contrary to other findings, also requires replication and confirmation.

Lolli, who has given us a number of fresh ideas on alcohol and alcoholism, indicts inebriety as a pathway to alcoholism but implies at the same time that it "contributes favorably to an individual's inefficiency when he needs inefficiency in order to foster greater efficiency to come." This is understandable if

viewed in connection with Kris' concept of "regression in the service of the ego," as we have noted elsewhere in connection with drugs.

There is little question that alcohol temporarily relieves anxiety and depression in a considerable percentage of people, but at a certain point (as little as four ounces of whiskey), these symptoms are increased.

There are a number of conditions in which drinking might be helpful and where the potential harm may be negligible. The elderly, who may enjoy drinking and who have no special future to preserve or to enhance and therefore have little need for efficiency, may decide in favor of the assuaging effects of social drinking. If alcohol can ease the suffering of the incurably ill and the dying, it should not be withheld. We should remember, however, that these conditions in a broad sense are also a part of life and we must not deprive these people of a "good death" which can be met with dignity and courage. The rest of us should perhaps await a definitive verdict on the harmfulness or helpfulness of social drinking, or at least restrict ourselves to less than the rather liberal amounts that Terhune has sanctioned in an otherwise conservative paper.

DISCUSSION

The prevalent impression in our society is that social drinking is harmless and may even be helpful. In a current reevaluation of a topic which should be periodically reappraised, there seems to be a better argument that social drinking is harmful. It is true that there is no definitive proof in either direction, but the flimsiness of the evidence that social drinking is an entity, or that social drinking is helpful medicinally, psychologically, or culturally, should act as a spur to further investigation.

The current conception of alcohol damage is shown in Figure 1. Only the alcoholics and a small percentage of "problem drinkers" are included. My own conception is shown in Figure 2, using data on the incidence of drinking from the California Drinking Practices Study. This indicates a far broader spectrum of risk from alcohol consumption.

FIGURE 1.—Current concept of alcohol damage

	Percent
Abstainers	25.0
Nonproblem drinkers.....	68.5
Problem drinkers.....	2.0
Alcoholics	4.5

FIGURE 2.—Revised concept of alcohol damage

	Percent
Abstainers	25.0
Nonproblem drinkers.....	39.0
Problem drinkers.....	16.0
High-risk drinkers.....	15.5
Alcoholics	4.5

The rare or infrequent consumer may drink for the same reason as the alcoholic or the marijuana or LSD user. Since the latter uses are legislated against we still have a Prohibitionist society, but the prohibitions are no longer directed against alcohol. Alcohol is, however, a far greater problem than all other dangerous drugs combined. Marijuana and LSD are the panacea of youth; alcohol, the panacea of the adult. Our own unconscious conflicts about alcohol increase our ambivalence and are interpreted as hypocrisy and lying by our teenagers. This alienates them and enhances their rebellion. In a recent survey of high school students we found that they did not want to be warned against the evils of drinking; they wanted the facts on it.

From the evidence thus far, there seems no disorder for which alcohol is indispensable and no condition in which alcohol is superior to another medication. Keller has expressed this by saying that the alternatives to benefits that can be derived from alcohol are available to those who will choose them.

We should add that it is questionable whether there is any disorder in which alcohol has proven helpful.

There is no suggestion implied that we should return to Prohibition. The psychiatrist is uneasy with authoritarian measures, even though there is evidence that legislative and financial procedures may reduce the consumption, complications, and consequences of alcohol. The taxation of liquor sales for social goals, which appears to have been successful in Great Britain, is a decision for society through its legislators to make. Eliciting the facts and disseminating them is the proper function for the physician, including the psychiatrist.

There is some evidence that accumulation of truths and education of the public has made a difference in both an absolute and relative diminution in cigarette smoking. Furthermore, doctors who have more access to knowledge of the disease-producing effects of smoking have reduced their cigarette use and now only 25 percent of doctors use them.

We cannot say that all who drink are alcoholics. But can we say that those persons are "social drinkers" who have, because of drinking: hurt others by hostile criticism; made unwelcome passes at other men's wives; had unreasonable fights; given their children a model of drunkenness; squandered time needed for constructive pursuits; driven while in a drunken state; had accidents coming home from a cocktail party; impatiently punished their children; or sat detached from wife and children in front of the television set evening after evening in a semistuporous state following several "social" drinks before dinner? We need another category, "antisocial drinking," to replace much of what we call "social drinking."

CONCLUSION

We do not have sufficient facts regarding pathological or social drinking; we must try indefatigably to obtain them. Only with such knowledge can education, persuasion, and thus prevention be an answer to the problems which social drinking raises. We urgently need a comprehensive objective study of "Alcohol and Health" similar to the Surgeon General's "Smoking and Health." Finances should be made available and qualified personnel found who will persevere, regardless of obstructions, to produce an unbiased scientific report. Whether this will change anything we cannot know, but truth, like Freud's description of the intellect, has a soft but persistent voice.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and several of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate, to introduce a bill designating the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., January 15, as a legal public holiday.

Martin Luther King was a man among men. Those of us who lived in his generation can be proud that he appeared on the scene in our lifetime. To the black citizens of this country, he can be likened to Moses who saw the Promised Land but could not pass over the River Jordan. To white America, he is a shining example of what is best in our Nation. He stood, as Gandhi stood before him in an earlier period, as the leading pro-

ponent of nonviolence in our age. A nation like ours, made up of every color and religion, should take note of those spectacular men who rise up in a time of trouble to lead us and bring us together. At this point in our history, we have recognized too few such national heroes, and all have been white. It would be a unifying force for white and black alike to recognize in our national pantheon Martin Luther King, and to set aside his birthday as a public holiday devoted to the reconciliation of the races.

FATHER OF OUR COUNTRY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, lauding Washington and the principles on which he and others of the Nation's Founding Fathers launched the Nation, in Civitan International's annual tribute to the Nation's first President and general, Sunday, Civitan International President Eddie Lunn, of Nashville, Tenn., called for the realization and practice of citizenship responsibilities to balance the privileges obtained from that citizenship, and the great heritage enjoyed. He spoke at Civitan's annual pilgrimage to Washington's Tomb at Mount Vernon, an event annually sponsored by Civitan's Mount Vernon club and participated in by Civitan's Chesapeake district and its international leaders. The Lunn address was a major enunciation of Civitan's appeal and demand for good and responsible citizenship and an end to chaos in America.

The pilgrimage procession, from Mount Vernon's main gate to the tomb, was led by President Lunn; Vincent R. Dalfonzo, of Baltimore, governor of the Chesapeake district, and William Leshner, president of the Mount Vernon club. They had an honor escort of Miss Mount Vernon 1969 and her two Civitan princesses, the Misses Cynthia Jean Lilley, Kathleen Perka, and Rebecca Keim, and the Mount Vernon Guard. The Guard is a revolutionary marine-uniformed youth honor unit sponsored by the Mount Vernon club. The Mount Vernon club en masse, its ladies, many Chesapeake Civitans and their ladies and International groups joined in the formal procession to the tomb.

Fife and drum musical features by the Guard, during which International, district and club wreaths were laid on the Washington bier and a brief speaking program were highlighted by the Lunn address. He said:

REMARKS BY EDDIE LUNN, PRESIDENT, CIVITAN INTERNATIONAL, GEORGE WASHINGTON TOMB, FEBRUARY 23, 1969

First in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen. This description of the man whose memory we commemorate today was made by General "Lighthorse" Harry Lee in a eulogy on George Washington, December 26, 1799. On the 237th anniversary of his birth at a shrine dedicated to his memory, we pause to pay

tribute to the man whom we identify as the Father of Our Country.

George Washington had faith in God and in himself. Early in life he acquired the magic of method. During the long and trying period in which he played the stellar role in the unfolding of our national drama, his character was displayed in all its grandeur, he was the patriot without reproach.

The first official record of the observance of his birthday states that, at Valley Forge in the winter of 1778, in that bleak winter and in the biting cold, the Band of the 4th Continental Artillery marched from their barracks to his headquarters to serenade their Commander-in-Chief. For many years the character of Washington has seemed to be suave rather than the mantle of almost legendary aloofness. His outstanding abilities and natural endowments were patent. His personality seemed to be staid by old portraits of Washington which showed him as a grave and dignified gentleman, grand but remote. Modern research has uncovered other interesting facts about his character. It has discovered that he was a genial gentleman with a hearty laugh, an excellent sportsman, fond of fox hunting, and a hot tempered antagonist in a worthy cause.

We proclaim George Washington as first in war, because the very first battles that were fought in freedom's defense and for the cause of freedom in behalf of the United States of America came to a successful conclusion because of the dedication to service, the tenacity to pursue a dedicated course, the ability to inspire men to go beyond their normal measure of capacity in order to achieve a job well done, his sense of honesty and integrity which could be believed and depended upon by all who served under him and likewise by all who opposed him. Early in his life as a soldier, when George Washington entered the House of Burgesses at the close of the French War, a vote of thanks was passed for his valuable services in the field. The young soldier hesitated in making a reply, and then the speaker of the House, Mr. Robinson, came to his aid by saying, "Sit down, Sir, your modesty is equal to your valor and that surpasses the power of any language that I possess."

Typical of his devotion and dedication to a cause was exemplified when on June 16, 1775, John Hancock of Massachusetts, presiding in the absence of Peyton Randolph of Virginia, stated that he had "the order of Congress to inform George Washington, Esq. of the unanimous vote in choosing him to be General and Commander-in-Chief of the forces raised and the forces to be raised in defense of American liberty. The Congress hopes that the gentleman will accept."

Standing before the members of Congress in a scarlet and blue uniform of a Colonel of the Virginia Militia, George Washington drew out a sheet of paper and read a statement: "Mr. President, though I am truly sensible of the high honor done me in this appointment, yet I feel great distress for my consciousness and my abilities and military experience may not lead me to equal the extensive and important trust. As to pay Sir, I beg leave to assure the Congress that as no pecuniary consideration could have tempted me to have accepted this arduous appointment, I do not wish to make any profit from it."

First in peace, the stature of the man was most typically put forth, perhaps the magnanimity of his soul is nowhere better expressed than by his own words addressed to his troops after Cornwallis's surrender at the battle of Yorktown in the first flush of victory—"My brave fellows, let no sensation of satisfaction for the triumphs you have gained induce you to insult your fallen enemy. Let no shouting, no clamorous or huzzing increase their mortification. It is sufficient for us that we be witness to their humiliation. Posterity will huzza for us".

In the moment of victory over a staggering enemy in a war incredibly fought with an appalling lack of equipment, with an appalling lack of clothing for his men and even the food necessary for their sustenance, this man, the first in peace was able to make this type of statement.

First in the hearts of his countrymen. George Washington, above all, was a Christian gentleman. Very generally recognized as a lover of the land, a farmer, a sportsman, a patriot, a perfectionist in any detail, a man of great physical stature, sufficiently able to sell a silver dollar across the Rappahannock River, with an abiding sense of humor, extremely fond of children. The man who had three positions which were of the utmost importance to all of the people of history. First, he served as Commander-in-Chief of the first American Army; secondly, as President of the Constitutional Convention, at a meeting of 55 of the wisest men in the country to design the guidelines by which you and I are and became free citizens. Last, certainly not least, was being the first President of the United States of America.

Possibly the greatest sustaining force in allowing this man to dissipate with the utmost of success and dignity, all of these positions, was his abiding faith. In his first inaugural address, George Washington made this statement: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty being who rules the Universe, who presides in the council of nations, whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to this charge. No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States of America. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

A man of many firsts, I think above all and the greatest first that George Washington would first recognize was that first of all he was an American and that he enjoyed the great privilege of being an American Citizen and that he was willing to give of himself to make this citizenship have the high value that you and I take so lightly today.

In his farewell address to Congress, George Washington stated, "the name America, which belongs to you in your national capacity must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discrimination. You have in common cause fought in triumph together, the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils and of joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes." To be an American is a great heritage, a great privilege and yet with privilege goes responsibilities. We owe to ourselves, to posterity and especially to a man whose memory we commemorate today that we will live as true Americans. I think that if we could hear a voice come from within this shrine today, the question would be asked of us: "Americans, Americans, what are you doing to my beloved America?" As we see chaotic conditions in America today, as we see desecration of the privilege of being an American Citizen, as we see the flag trampled in the earth, I think that George Washington's anxiety in this particular cause would know no bounds.

I believe, that if we were in a position today to answer, though the words may not be heard, the purpose would be defined so as to clearly be understood by all, both in and out of America who would attempt to

lessen the high values that we place upon our citizenship. I think our answer to Mr. Washington today would be:

Sir, we here today with a new design for dedication, with a new concept of freedom, with new determination, with the help of God, assure you that from this day forward, we here highly resolve that we will place a new value on the citizenship that we enjoy, on the freedoms that we enjoy, and from this day forth purpose to the end that they will be exalted to the high position to which this privilege is entitled. That we might say in years to come, that the Government of the People, by the People, and for the People has not perished from the earth.

THE STRUGGLE FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congress once again has before it legislation designed to provide badly needed reforms. During the last Congress, after lengthy study, a similar proposal was introduced and passed the Senate by a vote of 75 to 9. At that time the House failed to act and now we find it necessary to begin all over again with the task of implementing truly meaningful reforms. H.R. 6278 contains a series of proposals which, if enacted, will permit Congress to regain a position alongside the executive as a coequal branch of the Federal Government.

Our colleague, DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, has written an article on congressional reform for the February issue of *New City* magazine. I include the manuscript at this point as an excellent analysis of the pending bill and as a reminder of the lengthy and careful deliberations that have gone into its preparation:

THE STRUGGLE FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM THE LONG DAY

The House chamber was quiet except for the drone of the Reading Clerk's voice as he continued the reading of the previous day's journal. A Congressman from the Far West rose to his feet:

"The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?"

"Mr. BURTON of California. To merely bring the attention of the House to the hour of 5 a.m. having arrived. I was going to make the point of order that the House was asleep, but I shall not make it."

A few hours later, an Alabama Congressman rose to make a parliamentary inquiry. His question to the chair was, simply, what day was it!

By anybody else's calendar, it was Wednesday, October 9, 1968. As far as the U.S. House of Representatives was concerned, however, it was still the legislative day of October 8, the House having been in continuous session since noon on Tuesday.

By the time the House finally adjourned, more than 32 hours after it had convened, all records had been broken for consecutive roll calls, and we had just completed the longest (or perhaps the second longest—the record is not clear) continuous session in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives.

What was it all about, this Long Day?

Contrary to what some television networks reported, and some newspapers said, it was

not about S.J. Res. 175, the resolution to suspend the equal time provision of the communications law to permit televised debates between major candidates for President in 1968.

WHY THE EQUAL TIME BILL?

Granted, the equal time bill was the pending order of business, and it is easy to see how the story of October 8-9, 1968, could have been misconstrued. Under the rules of the House, which are quite specific in these matters, it is impossible to explain what you are doing during the time quorum calls, objections, and other parliamentary moves are being made. The framework for such parliamentary moves allows no opportunity for discussion.

The equal time bill was important because it was a pending order of business. We had selected this bill as a proper vehicle to carry forward our 11th hour battle over what the *Long Day* was about: the struggle to get the House to take action on two pieces of reform legislation that had been pending for more than a year—a legislative reorganization bill to bring about some badly needed modernization of the Congress, and a "clean elections" bill to overhaul the antiquated laws dealing with campaign spending.

The equal time bill was a logical vehicle because (1) it was timely, (2) its subject matter was relevant, particularly to the campaign spending bill, and (3) the majority leadership wanted this bill badly enough to possibly wish to avoid pointing up its opposition to the two reform bills. If successful, we could have avoided having the Congress finish for the year without dealing with these two important pieces of reform legislation.

Both reform bills had occupied the daily attention of a small group of Republican Congressmen since September 10. (In addition to Rep. Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, ranking House Republican on the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and Rep. James C. Cleveland of New Hampshire, a member of both the Joint Committee and the House Administration Committee and chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform, the group included Reps. Clark MacGregor and Albert Qule of Minnesota, Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa, Rep. Bill Brock of Tennessee, Rep. Rogers Morton of Maryland, Reps. Robert Taft, Jr. and Charles Whalen of Ohio, Rep. Barber Conable of New York, Rep. George Bush of Texas, Rep. Edward G. Blester of Pennsylvania, Rep. John Dellenback of Oregon, and Rep. William Steiger of Wisconsin and myself.)

Both of these reform issues had occupied the attention of many of us for a much longer period of time, going back to previous Congresses. Now, with only a few weeks remaining before the 1968 elections, the House was trying to mop up already long delayed appropriations and other matters and adjourn without giving consideration to either of the reform measures.

THE SEPTEMBER PROJECT

On September 10, 1968, a small group of my colleagues and I announced at a well-attended morning press conference:

"If Legislative Reorganization and Election Reform legislation are not passed by the House this year, both bills will have to begin again the long, torturous legislative road in both Houses. It would mean that it would be 1971 before many of their provisions could be implemented. The Congress cannot wait. The American people should not allow such a delay. We need these bills to effectively do our job. We need them before adjournment.

On Wednesday, September 11, a group of Republican Congressmen will engage in a series of parliamentary moves which will have the effect of altering normal proceedings of the U.S. House of Representatives. Our purpose is not to be disruptive. Our sole purpose is to dramatize the need for House

consideration, and hopefully, House action, on both of the reform bills before adjournment. As members of the minority party, we recognize that we do not have the votes to pass these bills alone. But we are not asking that they be passed specifically in the form in which they have been reported, or in the more extensive form recommended in the Republican minority views which are contained in the reports accompanying both bills. All we are asking is that the House be given the opportunity to express its will on both bills, under completely open rules so that meaningful debate can be conducted and amendments offered."

Later in the day, under special order following the completion of the day's legislative business, we expanded on our plans and hopes to get action on both reform measures before the 90th Congress closed up shop. (Summaries of the provisions of both bills, chronological legislative histories of both bills, and other background information can be found in the Congressional Record of this date.)

On Wednesday, September 11, we carried out our plan to focus attention on the Congressional and election reform bills by delaying routine actions in the House until the defense appropriation bill was actually ready for consideration.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

A little-known procedure of the House called Calendar Wednesday permits standing committees to call up certain bills that have not been scheduled for action by the Rules Committee. The procedure can be cumbersome in that it provides for the committee to be called in the alphabetical order in which they are listed under House rules. The Ways and Means Committee, for example, gets no turn at bat until the 19 committees which precede it under the rules have been called. This circumstance is mitigated by the fact that once a committee has used its turn, it does not get another opportunity until the "call" has gone full cycle. However, if some committees decide to engage in a conspiracy of obstruction, the procedure can be used to defeat the very purpose for which it was designed. We met this kind of fate in our attempt to use Calendar Wednesday to call up the election reform bill.

On Thursday, September 12, Rep. Clark MacGregor objected to the usual request for unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday so that this procedure would be available to us the following week. It did not take the Democratic leadership long to remember how many "cats and dogs" could be brought to the floor on a call of the committees under Calendar Wednesday. By Tuesday, September 17, it was clear that other committees would bring enough of these bills to the floor to prevent the call of the committees from ever reaching House Administration, the parent committee of the election reform bill, before adjournment. (In the Congressional Record of this date can be found a list of bills eligible under Calendar Wednesday, together with relevant historical data and the disappointing story of our attempt to use this procedure to get action on the election reform bill in the closing days of the 90th Congress.)

ADDITIONAL EFFORTS

In view of the fact that the Rules Committee held original jurisdiction over the Congressional reform bill—if the Committee was not disposed to schedule the bill under normal procedures, it would hardly be likely to ask for consideration of the bill on a call of committees under Calendar Wednesday—other procedures would have to be applied against this bill.

One of the efforts we made to get the Congressional reform bill to the floor was to write a letter to the Speaker urging his cooperation and assistance in scheduling the measure. Writing a letter is not, of course,

a parliamentary procedure, and in spite of the ordinarily compelling force of 134 signatures on this one, it prompted no more than a polite and belated "thank you" response.

On Wednesday, September 25, we again debated the Congressional and election reform issues under special order. The following day I objected to certain bills, one of them a bill to assist older Americans, being scheduled under unanimous consent ahead of the reform bills. The same day, Rep. Tom Rees (D.-Calif.) placed on the desk a petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the Congressional reform bill.

A discharge petition requires 218 signatures for action. It is another extraordinary procedure of the House that provides a means of bringing to the floor a bill which has been bottled up by the Rules Committee. It has been tried only a few times in the history of the House and has been found to be successful even fewer.

There is good reason for the general reluctance of Members to sign a discharge petition: once the procedure became common, there is no practical limit to the number and kind of bills that might be brought to the floor by the Discharge Calendar. Then, of course, the procedure would cease to exist as an extraordinary remedy against parliamentary abuse.

Still, the failure of this discharge petition was equally disappointing to Rees and some of his fellow Democrats and to those of us on the Republican side of the aisle.

(Readers interested in a more detailed chronology of the September Project can find in the Congressional Record, volume 114, part 24, page 31919, an index to the daily issue of the Record from September 10 through adjournment.)

A brief history of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress

On March 11, 1965, for only the second time in its history, the U.S. Congress created a special joint committee "to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." (S. Con. Res. 2, 89th Congress.)

Resolutions to create the joint committee had passed both houses without a single dissenting vote. I was one of the Congressmen who had originally introduced resolutions for this purpose. The joint committee was established, and an equal number of Republicans and Democrats from the House and Senate were appointed. One of the rules later adopted by the joint committee precluded it from making any recommendation that had not been endorsed by a bipartisan majority of the members of the committee from each house.

Immediately following the establishment of the Joint Committee, the Planning and Research Committee of the House Republican Conference appointed a Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform "in part to assure that every significant aspect of the operation of the House of Representatives would be studied and to serve as a reservoir of recommendations should the Joint Committee fail to report out a comprehensive set of proposals for modernizing the machinery and strengthening the role of Congress in the twentieth century." (From the Introduction, by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, to *We Propose: A Modern Congress*, by Rep. James C. Cleveland et al., McGraw-Hill, 1966.)

On May 10, 1965, the Joint Committee began hearings on the operations and problems of the Congress. The committee eventually amassed a printed record in excess of 2,300 pages, including testimony of more

than 200 witnesses, more than 100 of them Members of the Senate or House of Representatives.

In addition to supplying witnesses for the Joint Committee, the Republican Task Force simultaneously was researching Congressional procedures and organizational problems both independently of the Joint Committee and at times in cooperation with it and other groups, such as the American Political Science Association's Study of Congress group.

Sixteen months after its creation, on July 26, 1966, the Joint Committee issued its Final Report containing more than 100 recommendations for improvement in the operation and procedures of the U.S. Congress. These are lumped under the general headings of "The Committee System," "Fiscal Controls," "Sources of Information," and "Congress as an Institution." (Although the Final Report itself is now nearly extinct, the extracted recommendations can be found in the daily Congressional Record of September 25, 1968.)

Bills were introduced in the Senate by Sen. Mike Monroney (D.-Okla.) and in the House by Reps. Tom Curtis and Ray Madden (D.-Ind.) in the 89th Congress, and attempts were made in both bodies to get action on the reorganization question before adjournment. In the House, the House Republican Policy Committee in particular called for action on the bill, citing the importance of getting the legislation enacted in time to put the improved provisions into effect in the new Congress. The 89th adjourned before action was taken in either chamber.

Revised bills (to correct dates and minor original errors) were reported and introduced early in the 90th Congress, and on January 25, 1967, the Senate began debate on S. 355, "To improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government." After 18 days of debate, stretching over a period of several weeks, the Senate passed, by a roll call vote of 75 to 9, an amended bill. With a few exceptions, the amendments tended to be technical in nature, many affecting only the Senate. In substance, the bill as recommended by the Joint Committee was still largely intact.

On March 9, the Speaker referred the Senate-passed bill to the Rules Committee in the House, despite the efforts of a bipartisan group of House Members of the Joint Committee to prevail upon him to follow the precedent of the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act in reporting the bill directly to the Committee of the Whole, thus avoiding the possibility for the Rules Committee to bury the legislation.

On April 10, the Rules Committee opened hearings on the reorganization bill. In a wave of generosity, the committee thereupon suspended further hearings on the bill without even completing the testimony of the first witness, Ray Madden, co-chairman of the Joint Committee and one of the Rules Committee's own!

On May 10, exactly one month after the Rules Committee's Great Hearing Day, the House Republican Policy Committee issued a statement similar to the one it had issued in the previous Congress urging action on the reorganization bill without further delay.

Then began a series of behind-the-scenes attempts to water down the Senate-passed bill, along with sincerely motivated efforts by individual Congressmen—notably Dick Boling (D.-Mo.) and Ogden Reid (R.-N.Y.)—to "write a better bill."

On June 22, Rep. Tom Curtis, who more than any individual deserves the title of "father of reform in the House in the 1960's," rose on the floor of the House to disclaim any participation by Republican Members in the attempts to redraft the Senate-passed bill. Exactly one month later, Rep. Jim Cleveland reactivated his Task Force on Congressional

Reform "to put pressure on House Democrats to report out" the Senate-passed bill.

In the following days, Curtis, Cleveland, and other Republican Members found opportunities to comment on the reorganization bill nearly every day. Finally, on October 11, the House Republican Conference, which consists of every Republican Member of the House of Representatives, voted *unanimously* to adopt a resolution calling on the leadership to schedule the Senate-passed bill without further delay under an open rule for debate.

The first session of the 90th Congress ended without a whimper from the leadership, much less a bang, on the question of reform.

As the second session of the 90th got under way, Cleveland opened fire on the floor of the House as Minority Leader Gerald Ford used a portion of his nationally-televized response to the State of the Union Message to call for action on the reorganization bill.

By March, the leadership was disclaiming opposition to Congressional reform legislation, but still there was no bill on the floor. In an effort to enlist public support in the struggle, the Republican Task Force mailed to the editor of every daily newspaper in the country, the radio and television stations that carry editorials, to columnists, and to the legislative assistants to every Member of the House, as well as to the Members themselves, a complete, detailed description of the provisions of the Senate-passed bill, together with comparative provisions in other bills and a chronological history of the legislation. There was a brief stir of interest in the House corridors, and a handful of reporters made inquiries.

On August 7, in Miami Beach, the National Republican Convention adopted in its 1968 platform plans calling for enactment of both "clean elections" and Congressional reform legislation. And this brings us to the start of the September Project, with which I began this article.

WHO IS THE OPPOSITION?

My purpose in projecting this brief flashback has been to provide a setting for the question: Who is the opposition? I remember the mixture of anger and frustration I felt when I posed this question on the floor of the House last September:

"We have been waiting for some clue from the Speaker, from the majority leader, from the leadership on that side of the aisle that they might be willing to bring to the floor these two pieces of legislation. We have no desire to disrupt or disturb the proceedings of the House. We have been willing to cooperate and we have been looking for cooperation from the other side. We have used most of the procedures that are available to the minority Members of the House of Representatives.

"There is one procedure remaining, and I, for one, intend to use it; namely, the discharge petition. Unfortunately, we have still received no signal, no clue—no cooperation from the other side of the aisle.

"It is interesting, too, because, as I have talked with various people on the other side of the aisle, I have frequently had them say to me 'I am for that bill,' or, 'I am for the other bill.' And I say, 'You know, that is passing strange, because I am for it, too. I have gone around on the minority side and talked with Members in the minority. I have visited with them and I have found that most of them are for it. It kind of makes you wonder. I know I am not running this place. I know the minority side is not running this place. And if the people on your side are for the bills, too, it kind of makes you wonder who is running this place. Somebody must be running it. Somebody has to be keeping those bills in the committee. Somebody has to be against them or they would be scheduled on the floor, because when everyone is for a bill, it does come to the floor!'"

What is in the bill, that it should have been so strongly resisted all this time? Let's have a look.

Title I attempts to carry out most of the Joint Committee's recommendations for improving the committee system. At mid-twentieth century, the committee system is the bulk of the legislative process and therefore the prime place to begin the task of modernization. Fully one-third of the Joint Committee's recommendations are directed to gearing up the standing committees for better performance of both their legislative and oversight functions.

Changes in committee procedure that would be brought about by enactment of the reorganization bill include opening more committee meetings and hearings to the public, allowing television and broadcast coverage of committee hearings under certain conditions, providing a right of the minority to call witnesses in order that all sides of a question may be presented and heard, and requiring annual authorization of funds for committee staffing. The rights of all members of a committee to file dissenting views in a committee report would be protected, and the right of equal time in debate on conference reports would be assured.

One important section of Title I overhauls the concept of legislative oversight by spelling out specific responsibilities of the committees to review the operation and administration of laws and programs under each committee's jurisdictional purview.

Another section places realistic limitations on the number of committee assignments a Senator can have at any given time.

One of the best provision in this title, in my opinion, would prevent any measure from coming to a vote in either house until the committee report and printed hearings, if any, are available for at least three calendar days exclusive of weekends and holidays.

The hallmark of all of these provisions is common sense. The wonder is that we have struggled along for so long without making most of the changes contained in Title I.

Title II strengthens Congressional control of the government's fiscal operations by requiring the executive branch, in cooperation with the Government Accounting Office, to establish a standard system of classifying expenditures, activities, and budget information of all government agencies, by requiring improvements in the budget document itself, and by providing for cost effectiveness analysis prior to decisions on renewal of appropriations. Under Title II, the Appropriations Committees to both houses would be required to receive testimony from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers within 30 days after submission of the annual budget.

Consistent with the improved operating procedures of other committees, the Appropriations Committees, too, would be required to open hearings to the public unless those hearings involved national security matters.

Other changes made by this title involve more uniform distribution of GAO reports, greater participation in the appropriations process by the legislative committees through a projection of costs on new legislation, review of fixed obligation and grant-in-aid programs, and authorization of programs in such a manner that they will be subject to annual appropriations review.

Title III provides better sources of information for committees and Members of Congress by shoring up the staff resources of all committees. The professional staff would be augmented to provide a guarantee of professional staff assistance for minority members upon their request. The committees would be authorized to employ outside consultants and to approve supplemental train-

ing for members of the permanent professional staff.

Second only to the committees as an independent fact-finding arm of the Congress, and often superior to the committees in researching certain areas of concern, the Library of Congress has been taken for granted by Members of Congress who appreciate and use heavily its vast resources and expert personnel without any knowledge of the Library's problems. One important section of Title III is directed to the Library's Legislative Reference Service, authorizing it to augment its staff by use of outside consultants and research organizations on a temporary basis, providing better liaison between the Service and committees of both houses, and requiring the Joint Committee on the Library to exercise more careful attention to needs and problems of the Service.

Title IV brings about a number of changes in the Congress as an institution. First and foremost in this portion of the bill is the creation of a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. As noted earlier in this article, only twice in its entire history has the U.S. Congress set up a special committee to study the operation and organization of the legislative branch in relation to its changing responsibilities. Until the middle of this century, it may well not have been necessary to have a continuing study group to monitor the workings of the legislative process. But with the growing multitude of problems faced by today's Congress, and the increasing complexity and interconnected intricacies of those problems, we can no longer afford to let the cobwebs accumulate for a general housecleaning every twenty years. I can remember several occasions when Tom Curtis, who is responsible for so much of the Joint Committee's effective work, remarked: "Don, if we had made no other recommendation—and I think we did make many good recommendations—than this one to establish a continuing Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, we would have taken a meaningful step forward in the direction of modernizing this institution."

In the revised reorganization bill which will be introduced with the opening of the new Congress, we will have added significant duties to those already imposed on the new Joint Committee in the Senate-passed bill.

Other provisions of Title IV require Senate and House pages, who may now serve in these positions at the ripe old age of 14, sans supervision! to be of college age, take post office patronage out of Congressional hands, require Congressmen to disclose the real salaries of their office staff personnel by changing the "basic" figures to gross figures, and by authorizing officers of the Congress to require competent performance of duties by employees of the Congress.

Title V strengthens the Federal Lobbying Regulation Act in the following ways: (1) by broadening its scope to require registration by individuals and organizations who solicit or receive funds and have influencing of legislation as a "substantial purpose," (as contrasted with the "principle purpose" definition of the current law), (2) by requiring more complete disclosure of expenditures for influencing legislation, (3) by transferring the responsibility for the maintenance and publication of lobby registration records from the offices of the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate to the General Accounting Office, and (4) by making stringent requirements for disclosure of arrangements for contingent fees for purposes of influencing legislation.

SUMMARY AND PROSPECTS

The Joint Committee's recommendations were aimed at making Congress more efficient and better informed. Legislation of the scope encompassed by the reorganization bill is bound to contain some flaws, and there is obviously room for disagreement over the

specific language contained in this section or that clause. There is rarely an ideal solution to any problem. In Congress, the effort to reach a skillful compromise is our *modus operandi*.

But is there any excuse whatever for not even scheduling the reorganization bill for floor debate and consideration? In the total record of our efforts, and it is a very solid and consistent record, we have never asked for more than the opportunity to have the Senate-passed bill on the floor for consideration under an open rule. But as we noted in the opening sentences of our press conference statement last September:

"We live in an era of change. Whether that change will be wild and erratic or thoughtful and responsible depends in part on the U.S. Congress.

"Recent events in our country, as well as throughout the world, have emphasized the critical need for democratic institutions to keep abreast of the times. The institutions which must deal with the problems of today and tomorrow must be as modern as the problems, or we run the risk that individuals within the society will seek means other than the traditional democratic processes of finding answers to their problems."

By the time this article is published, the "Raiders," as those of us in the forefront of the battle of the Long Day were characterized by several newspapers last fall, will be back in action on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, pressing for consideration of both Congressional reorganization and election reform legislation. Unlike last fall, we will have a full session ahead of us, hopefully an aroused press behind us, and a real chance for bipartisan success in enacting meaningful reform laws.

THE FEDERAL PRIVACY ACT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with a number of my colleagues, the Federal Privacy Act, which was originally introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Briefly, the bill, if enacted, would safeguard the privacy of individuals by insuring that they be apprised of records concerning them which are being maintained by Government agencies.

There are presently 20 Federal agencies which collect information about individual citizens, but, in most cases, we Americans are not aware of the detailed personal files being maintained. The provisions of the Federal Privacy Act would require each agency maintaining such records to notify individuals of the information on file. The agency would be forbidden to disclose any information on file without the permission of the individual concerned; and a written record would be kept, showing the names of all those who inspect a given file.

An individual would, of course, be allowed to examine his own record and have copies made at his own expense, and to supplement his file with information he might deem pertinent for the record. This would make it possible for him to correct any errors or explain any extenuating circumstances surrounding his actions.

In my judgment, this bill is an important step toward making American citizens aware of the extensive files which are maintained on nearly all of us, and enabling us all to prevent the calamities which can result from errors in such records.

A HUMAN APPROACH TO THE
SYSTEMS APPROACH

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Ida R. Hoos is a distinguished research sociologist currently working at the Space Sciences Laboratory of the University of California in Berkeley. She has acted as a consultant to the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the California Personnel Board. She received her Ph. D. from the University of California, is married to Dean Sidney Hoos, and is the mother of two children.

I recite such seemingly irrelevant detail because of the subject matter of her contribution to the Forum in the February issue of *Datamation*. Her article is practically guaranteed to infuriate many influential individuals for she has the temerity to suggest that systems analysis is not exactly divine revelation, that systems analysts may occasionally deviate from a course of pure truth and unblemished beauty, and that the application of procedures which are successful in military and space planning does not instantly produce paradise in other areas.

Mrs. Hoos captures in pristine prose what many would regard as the central fallacy in escalating the use of systems analysis:

By concentrating on minuscule portions or isolated variables simply because they are quantifiable, the technique may actually lead to results which are irrelevant and inappropriate. Assignment of social costs and social benefits is an arbitrary matter, and even dollar cost/benefit comparison is a matter of interpretation.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to introduce the article by Mrs. Hoos into the RECORD at this point. "A Realistic Look at the Systems Approach to Social Problems" may help to clarify just what we can expect from systems analysis and may help to avoid expensive mistakes as we fulfill our legislative duties. The article follows:

A REALISTIC LOOK AT THE SYSTEMS APPROACH
TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS

(By Ida R. Hoos)

An era characterized by bigness—big budgets, big business, big government, big explosions—of population, information, and technology—provides an environment hospitable to the growth and development of the big, total approach. Such is systems analysis, with its components and companions, cost/effectiveness measures and program planning/budgeting. These methods, utilized and refined in military and space missions, have gained favor for the apparent tidiness with which they have achieved management marvels. For this and other reasons to be mentioned later, systems analysis has come to be accepted as a nos-

trum for all manner of social ailments, and the market for socio-economic systems is booming. At present receiving one dollar out of every five in the U.S. Budget, socio-economic programs, by 1975, will account for one or perhaps two out of every four dollars. With the federal investment in urban renewal for 1968-78 amounting to \$250 billion, predictions that the market for urban civil systems will reach somewhere between \$210 and \$298 billion by 1980 may prove accurate.¹

The prospect of so bountiful a market is enticing, and prospectors of remarkable diversity as to discipline, background, and competence are converging on it. There are aerospace and aviation firms, computer manufacturers and their multifarious subsidiaries, electronics companies, management consultants, appliance makers, directory publishers, and university-based entrepreneurs. Prominent among the contenders for contracts are the nonprofit but highly profitable "think tanks," with their in-house experts and on-tap consultants and their proliferating satellites with unpronounceable acronyms. They are all competing energetically to bring what journalists enthusiastically hail as "the powerful tools of technology" to bear on matters concerning the commonweal.

The forensic is familiar: A nation that can send men to the moon should be capable of closer-to-home accomplishments. All we need to do is to apply our scientific know-how to the analysis and solution of social problems with the same creativity we have applied to space problems.² This type of argument is persuasive on several counts: first, the prestigious origin and logical, scientific aura of systems analysis, and second, the growing recognition of the need for better planning, organization, and management of social affairs. A brief review of the genealogy and current conception of the systems approach will adequately illustrate the first point. Charles J. Hitch, whose imprint on this methodology is so great that it is sometimes called "Hitchcraft," described systems analysis as a direct lineal descendant of World War II operations research.³ O.R. was used to solve tactical and strategic problems of a military nature; systems analysis uses the same principles but has wider range and scope. It encompasses (1) a more distant future environment, (2) more interdependent variables, (3) greater uncertainties, (4) less obvious objectives and rules of choice.⁴ Impressive as to historical background, systems analysis, with its heavy reliance on models and mathematical computations and manipulations, has special appeal in an era characterized by a universal craving for certainty and orderliness.

This yearning underlies the present impatience with traditional approaches. Juxtaposing the duplication, confusion, and disarray of current public administration with the rationality and neatness of program management to be realized from application of the "revolutionary concepts," proponents of systems analysis make a strong case for their wares. And there is no gain-saying the fact that social problems beset us: urban blight deepens and spreads; pollution of air, water, and land proceed at an awesome pace; crime rates soar; arteries and facilities for air and ground travel are dangerously clogged. In one way or another, these problems ultimately become the business of government, already regarded by many as too big to be potent and too trapped in a bureaucratic maze to respond effectively.

Since 1964, when the state of California pioneered by hiring aerospace engineers to help solve problems of public concern through systems analysis, many public officials, from county to Congress, have chosen the same vehicle on the high road to grants and contracts.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Can we assume from the vast expenditure of public funds and mobilization of motley systems experts that we will now witness a diminution of the inefficiency, ineptness, and uncertainty that plague planners of public programs? The question deserves serious consideration, for there are signs that the incoming administration in Washington will be especially receptive to further involvement of the private sector in public affairs. Its managerial techniques will be given full play. We may find it useful, therefore, to note the factors surrounding the adoption of systems analysis in the social arena. Four are especially important: historical antecedents and scientific attributes, already mentioned briefly, and political and economic circumstances. Because of the admirable eschewal derived from its association with defense and space achievements, systems analysis has enjoyed almost total immunity from the critical evaluation to which some other methodology might have been subjected. And yet, to judge from recent discussions,⁵ the DOD model may not be optimal for military, let alone other kinds of decisions. Government officials struggling with program budgeting as decreed by President Johnson are learning, the hard way, that the circumstances governing and the criteria for judging effectiveness in the DOD resemble not remotely those prevailing in matters for social accounting.

Since, however, the same assumptions, rules, and courses of action that appeared so logical and scientific in their earlier context are being transplanted bodily, they deserve scrutiny. First and foremost, there is the assumption that because the word system can be used for everything from atomic weapons delivery to anthropotomy, the same analytic tools can aid in understanding all of them and the same type of remedies can be applied to their malfunctioning. There is the related assumption that since large scale, complex systems have been "managed" by use of certain techniques, then social systems, which are often large and always complex, can be "managed" in like fashion. This presupposes similarity of structure, with social systems reducible to measurable, controllable components, all of whose relationships are fully recognized, appreciated, and amenable to manipulation. To the extent that these are fallacies, they must be attributed to semantic impoverishment. Moreover, the very characteristics which distinguish social from other species of systems render them resistant to treatment that tries to force them into analytically tractable shape:

1. They defy definition as to objective, philosophy, and scope. For example, what kind of definition of a welfare system can be regarded as valid—that which encompasses the shortcomings of other systems, such as health, education, employment, or the one which focuses on individual inadequacy? A definition depends on the point of view and the ideological posture. The system looks very different to the administrator, the recipient, the black power monger, the social critic, and the politician.

2. "Solution" of social problems is never achieved. You do not "solve" the problems of health or transportation. Consequently, where you start and where you stop is purely arbitrary, usually a reflection of the amount of money the government has to fund the particular analysis.

3. Despite the semblance of precision, there are no right or wrong, true or false solutions. Consequently, it is presumptuous to label as wrong anything being done now and right that which looks good on paper. By concentrating on minuscule portions or isolated variables simply because they are quantifiable, the technique may actually lead to results which are irrelevant and in appropriate. Assignment of social costs and social benefits is an arbitrary matter, and even

dollar cost/benefit comparison is a matter of interpretation. There are no ground rules for identifying the Peter being robbed and the Paul getting paid. It should here be noted that anyone can join the popular sport of knocking bureaucracy; playing utopian games is easy.

Corollary to the assumption that systems analysis can improve the state of the art of public program planning is the notion that the "systems expert" is a past master of advanced concepts on all fronts. He often ascribes to himself a clairvoyance denied specialists in the subject area, for, with the greatest of ease, he hurdles 1984 and designs year 2000 plans. As though by his own original discovery, he brands present practices as fragmentary and duplicatory. This situation he corrects by an unfurling of flip charts, a dubbing of labels in bank boxes, and an affixing of arrows on the flow diagrams. He deplors the lack of information and proposes a data bank to capture every last bit. After an exercise in present-day serendipity now known as "playing around with some models" and a series of optimistically-called "progress reports," time and money will have run out. The air may be no safer to breathe, urban ills no less crucial, but conclusions and recommendations, like campaign speeches, will ring with truisms and promises: (1) Present planning is wasteful and ineffective; (2) the prescribed course of action is more systems studies which will harness huge reservoirs of talent and put to use the "powerful tools of technology" and produce knowledge and understanding. Anyone who has reviewed systems reports cannot fail to recognize the pervasiveness of the "Perils of Pauline" feature, which may be intrinsic to the nature of the technique.

This hard look has fallen on the technicians as much as the technique and necessarily so, for the two are inextricably intertwined. What the analyst conceives as the system is reflected in its definition, its objectives, its interfaces, its significant variables, its relevant data. The methodology of systems analysis supplies the form; the analyst, the content. The inputs which he selects become determinative. That he chooses to omit certain phenomena because of his own bias or because they resist quantitative treatment may be far more crucial to society than his model, but neither the technique nor the technician has use for them. It is precisely because of the centrality of his role that the analyst should possess a deep and sensitive understanding of the social matter with which he is engaged. Unfortunately, this is seldom the case. On the contrary, "expertness" is an *ad hoc* affair, with titles bestowed to suit the contract in hand. The casting of characters reminds one rather uncomfortably of the Puritan who marched around the fort in a succession of hats to fool the Indians. Lacking in orientation and without an appropriate frame of reference, such an analyst substitutes ignorance for objectivity and banal generalization for total system comprehension.

If anyone is surprised at the discovery that the emperor, for all his multi-million-dollar wardrobe, goes naked, that may well be because oversell dominates every stage of the system analysis, from proposal to final report. The "expert" appears in many forms—as undersecretary of a government agency, as think tanker, as advisor to contracting agencies—but always as a salesman in disguise. He testifies at Congressional hearings; he delivers keynote addresses at meetings of all kinds of professional groups. His presence at the latter is strictly that of the fox in the henhouse, for he invariably predicts growing complexity ahead and promulgates the notion that nothing short of the powerful tools of his technology will suffice to handle the problems. He may occasionally offer the modest disclaimer that systems analysis cannot solve every problem, but he ear-

nestly implores his listeners not to throw out the baby with the bathwater, or the egg with the eggshells. The rules of his game are simple: one for the money, two for the show. The name of the game is self-perpetuation, the stakes are high, for systems business is booming, here and abroad.⁶

Economic considerations on the part of all participants keep the game going. The prosperous and growing community of problem solvers is apparently more concerned with obtaining more contracts than with improving the state of the arts or of the nation. There is a serious dearth, among practitioners, of critical evaluation. Apparently, no one with sufficient claim to systems expertness to preach or practice the technique would be so rash as to shoot down the goose that lays the eggs, especially when they are golden! The moral problem of the profession as expressed by C. West Churchman has been delicately sidestepped in pursuit of the objective not to do better, but to do more. The political arena in which the game is played discourages rigorous review, since large sums of public money are involved. In their expenditure, everyone must look good. No official is so possessed of the death wish as to admit that the venture was anything but successful. Consequently, every aspect of the transaction, quite irrespective of its true color, comes through tinted with a glow of success.

The mixture of salesmanship and politics may, ultimately, undermine the state of the art, for short-run, pervasive zeal for self-perpetuation practically guarantees stagnation. With little benefit of feedback from earlier experience, the same level of sophistication remains, with the same shortcomings, the same deficiencies, the same old excuses. Conceptual and methodological mutations are needed in order to create a tool useful in social planning, but these cannot occur unless there are open channels of inquiry and assessment free from public relations embellishments.

Such evaluations are not the private preserve of any one professor or any particular discipline. Nor need they be considered the bailiwick of any one sector. There is an important role in the process of social accounting and planning to be played by professional persons, whether in the employ of government, industry, universities, or elsewhere. In every system study, the close and constant involvement of individuals expert in the relevant disciplines is absolutely essential. Every major problem facing urban society today is multifaceted in nature! Economic, political, and social rationality must all contribute to developing a viable model, for human and social values are at stake as old problem areas are subjected to new modes of treatment. Understanding calls for knowledge on many fronts. Highly desirable, indeed, would be a creative synthesis achieved through a genuine multidisciplinary approach. It is interesting to speculate on the extent to which systems analysis will be the means to an end of such a synthesis.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Finance Magazine, January 1968. Staff, V-P Marketing, North American Aviation, *The Economic Business Spectrum as Related to National Goals—Identification of New Business Opportunities*, 1967.

² Statement by Senator Gaylord P. Nelson, *Congressional Record*. Proceedings and Debates of the 89th Congress, First Session, Oct. 18, 1965, No. 194.

³ Charles J. Hitch, Royal Society Nuffield Lecture, London, Oct. 25, 1966.

⁴ This comparison was made by Albert Wohlstetter in "Scientists, Seers, and Strategy," Columbia University, Council for Atomic Age Studies, 1962, pp. 36-7 (unpublished paper).

⁵ James R. Schlesinger, *Systems Analysis and the Political Process*, RAND Paper P-3464, June, 1967, pp. 14 ff. See also Hearings

before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, Second Session, Part 2, May 28, 1968.

⁶ Daniel S. Greenberg, "Consulting: U.S. Firms Thrive on Jobs for European Clients," *Science*, Vol. 162, No. 21, 1968, pp. 986-7.

INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to salute my good Estonian friends, many of whom reside in the Greater Cleveland area. We are this week commemorating the 51st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Estonia, an independence which was extinguished under the combined forces of communism and Nazi Germany in 1940, and, since the end of World War II, under the Soviet Union.

It is remarkable that the human spirit, the craving for liberty, can survive under totalitarian conditions such as have been inflicted on these proud people. But survive it does. Heikki A. Leesment, president of the Estonian National Committee in the United States, writes to me:

At this anniversary all Americans of Estonian descent feel duty bound to call the attention of all peace-loving free nations to the continued forcible ruling and colonial exploitation of Estonia by the imperialistic Communist conspiracy called the Soviet Union.

This I have attempted to do in my House Concurrent Resolution 59, introduced on the opening day of this Congress, which calls upon the United Nations to insist that the Soviet Union abide by its charter commitments on national self-determination and colonialism. I am distressed that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has scheduled no hearings on my legislation, and I wish once again to raise my voice in behalf of all the captive nations who would benefit by adoption of my resolution.

I urge those who share my fervent hope that independence will be a reality for Estonia and for all nations now under Communist domination to call for immediate consideration of this resolution, full text of which follows:

H. CON. RES. 59

Whereas the United States of America was founded upon and long cherished the principles of self-determination and freedom; and

Whereas these principles, expressed in the sovereign quality of nations, are the very reason for the existence of the United Nations, as set forth in the charter of that world organization; and

Whereas the United States and all other members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves to make these principles universal and to extend their benefits to all peoples; and

Whereas, on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was accepted both by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, defining said rights as relating to citizens of all member states; and

Whereas, since 1918 Soviet communism has, through the most brutal aggression and

force, deprived millions of formerly free peoples of their right to self-determination; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has unanimously expressed in Public Law 86-90, approved July 17, 1959, its revulsion at the continued enslavement of the peoples of Eastern and East Central Europe who were described by the said public law as captive nations; and

Whereas the Hungarian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Carpatho-Ruthenian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, East German, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Albanian, Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian peoples may only look to the United States and the United Nations for the restoration of their national self-determination and political independence; and

Whereas the member nations of the United Nations have failed to bring before the General Assembly for successful discussion the problem of self-determination and political independence of the peoples of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, despite the numerous resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly, Russian occupation troops are still maintained in Hungary and the issue of their removal has not come up for discussion in the Assembly since 1962; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States and to the perpetuation of free civilization that the nations of the world act in concert through the forum of the United Nations in demanding national self-determination and political independence for the peoples enslaved by Communist governments; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America, in article II, section 2, vests in the President of the United States the power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties and to appoint Ambassadors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to instruct the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to request at the 1968 session, that (1) the United Nations insist upon the fulfillment of its charter provisions based on self-determination of all peoples in the form of the sovereign equality of states and condemnation of colonial rule; and (2) the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its United Nations membership obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations through the withdrawal of all Soviet Russia troops and agents from other nations now under Communist rule and through returning to their respective homelands all political prisoners now in prison and labor camps; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is further authorized and requested to use all diplomatic, treaty-making, and appointive powers vested in him by the Constitution of the United States to augment and support actions taken by the United States Ambassador to the United Nations in the interest of self-determination and political independence of these nations.

EMPLOYEE AND MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, of all the aspects of postal reform being studied in Congress, one of the most urgently needed is a fair and equitable employee-management relations system within the Post Office Department.

Postal labor-management relations should have an established structure for grievance procedures and bargaining rights, but Executive Order No. 10988 governing these regulations, by its very nature, obstructs the creation of an impartial third party appeal system.

The lack of a channel of appeal and communication is one of the greatest causes of frustration, distrust and low employee morale in the Post Office Department. Moreover, poor labor-management communication has a direct causal relationship to the quality and effectiveness of the postal service.

The bill I have introduced provides the means to correct this inequity in our postal system by establishing machinery for the compulsory arbitration of disputes. It also guarantees the right of representatives from both labor and management to testify, to question, and to cross-examine witnesses without fear of reprisal or intimidation.

An independent labor-management relations panel is created to oversee and mediate labor-management problems. Both sides are given the opportunity to discuss the issues and problems at hand.

Greater communication between labor and management in the Post Office Department can materially strengthen the vitality and effectiveness of the postal service.

By establishing clear-cut guidelines and standards for both labor and management, this bill sets up a modern and dynamic employee-relations mechanism based on the principle of free and open avenues of communication.

This is accomplished without threatening the Federal laws which prohibit strikes in the Government service.

I earnestly hope that my colleagues in Congress will give this bill the close study and attention that it deserves.

Fair and equitable labor-management standards are an important key to high employee morale and greater effectiveness in the operation of the U.S. Post Office Department.

THE 10-PERCENT SURTAX

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a fellow Minnesotan has written me in regard to the 10-percent surtax. He is Mr. Brian Wright Catlin, of St. Paul, and he has asked me to share his views with my colleagues in Congress. His letter follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1969.

HON. ODIN LANGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Nation does not need a ten per cent surtax as long as plainly marked property of the United States is publicly sold in the black market on the streets of Saigon, a civilian technician is punished for revealing the theft of millions of dollars worth of gasoline and equipment, Vietnamese Generals grow rich in corruption, War on Poverty funds are scandalously wasted, there is money to loan to foreign governments who repay

their debts only with insult and ridicule, and there is money to double the salaries of Legislators who permit all of this.

We, of the Land of the Ten Thousand Lakes, find it more realistic and practical to plug the leaks in our boats rather than to pledge our incomes as security for the purchase of expensive pumps.

Those who have done so have found that the additional strain widens the seams and further weakens a rotten bottom.

We respectfully request that our Representative deliver this message, verbatim, in a speech on the Floor.

Sincerely Yours,

BRIAN WRIGHT CATLIN.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

ABM SYSTEM: IT WILL NOT WORK

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing issues facing this session of Congress is whether or not this country ought to go ahead with the Sentinel ABM system.

Last year I joined with a group of Congressmen in unsuccessful efforts to delete \$387 million earmarked in the fiscal 1969 appropriation for the development of the system. Many distinguished scientists and defense experts agree that ABM is an unnecessary military expenditure.

The following article from the February 15, 1968, issue of the New Yorker magazine presents a most persuasive argument against the building of such a system. Its point is simply that the system, as designed, cannot possibly work.

I would draw particular attention to the conclusion that should the ABM system go forward, the military-industrial complex is heading, perhaps, toward its first major defeat at the hands of public opinion. I commend this article to my colleagues and present it for inclusion in the RECORD:

If only it worked, the anti-ballistic-missile system, or ABM, would be the most triumphant development in military technology since the atomic bomb. It would make America a bombproof fortress, insuring that future world wars, like the past two, would be fought on someone else's territory. Unfortunately, however, almost no experts believe that it will work. And last week the Administration halted the Pentagon's enthusiastic rush to construct ABM sites, giving President Nixon time to decide whether he wants the ABM at all.

When Secretary of Defense McNamara announced the decision to go ahead with the Sentinel ABM system, he said that the ABM could not possibly defend us against the large Soviet striking force but would be useful against a far smaller Chinese attack. We can assume that the narration by the war-game computers goes something like this: The Chinese, maddened by hatred or frustration, launch a few dozen missiles against a United States whose certain retaliation will destroy most of China. The oncoming missiles are picked up by the Perimeter Acquisition Radar (PAR) when they are still more than a thousand miles away. A Spartan missile with a nuclear warhead is then launched. It is guided by the shorter-range Missile Site

Radars (MSR) toward the hostile missile. When the interception is made, the Spartan explodes destroying both itself and the attacker. If a Chinese missile slips past the Spartan, a shorter-range Sprint missile, situated near the PAR, will intercept it before it destroys the radar. The surest way to nullify such a defense is simply to overwhelm it. If more missiles are shot at, let us say, New York than there are Spartans or Sprints to defend the city, an H-bomb or two is certain to get through. And that is enough. Since the Russians already have a large and growing missile fleet, and can build more missiles cheaper and faster than we can defend ourselves against them, McNamara and President Johnson decided not to go ahead with an anti-Soviet system. Instead, the Sentinel was designed, to defend us against an attack by the Chinese in the years between the present, when they have no missiles, and that unpredictable but rapidly approaching time when they, like the Russians, will have enough to drown a defense. To defend ourselves against an irrational suicide attack by the Chinese might possibly be worth five or ten billion dollars if the Sentinel system did not have so many other defects and uncertainties.

The physicist Hans Bethe, among others, has pointed out that it is relatively simple to devise decoys and "penetration aids" to fool the radar and divert the intercepting missiles. Such devices are fairly cheap, are easy to design, and are well within the present reach of Chinese technology. Moreover, the recent Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering for Strategic and Space Systems, Dan Fink, has said, without being refuted, that the defensive radar itself could be partially blacked out by the radiation occurring when a Spartan or a Sprint explodes; to deal with this potential defect, it may be necessary to redesign the Sentinel system so that the radar operates at a different frequency. Even new design may not give complete protection against radiation blackout. Also, since the Sentinel detects enemy ICBMs while they are high above the atmosphere, it may be possible for the enemy to circumvent the Sentinel by firing nuclear warheads on a lower trajectory from a submarine or a ship. All these deficiencies, as well known to the Chinese as to us, make it highly unlikely that the Sentinel can defend us against an enemy that is serious about getting through. Nor can we test this highly complex system under simulated combat conditions, since to do so would require exploding nuclear warheads in the atmosphere and that would violate the test-ban treaty. Objections to the Sentinel, however, go well beyond an attack on the system's effectiveness. Despite our denials and our logic, Soviet military planners will undoubtedly assume that the Sentinel is designed for them and will press even harder to increase their stock of offensive weapons. We will then be under pressure to build more missiles of our own. Thus the nuclear-arms race will be given another upward push. And when it is all over we will still be able to blow each other up, just as we are now. Besides, the Sentinel system will require a loosening of a historic restraint—the principle that only the President can make the decision to fire a nuclear weapon. Between the moment the PAR sights a hostile missile and the moment a Spartan is fired to intercept it, only five or ten minutes can elapse. Since it is not realistic to require a Presidential or Cabinet-level decision in such a short period, the authority to fire will necessarily be delegated to a field commander, or to an automatic computer, which can digest and analyze data even faster than a general. Yet it was only five years ago that the country as a whole, and the Democratic Party in particular, was horrified by Senator Goldwater's suggestion that he might delegate nuclear authority to field commanders.

Another objection has arisen out of the Army's strange decision to place several

Sentinel sites near big cities. Since even the shorter-range radar covers several hundred miles, a missile headed for Boston could be intercepted just as easily from a potato field a hundred miles away as from the nearby suburbs of Reading and North Andover, where the missiles will in fact be placed. Such placement makes the chosen cities top-priority targets for attack. Furthermore, there is a remote but finite chance that a Spartan or Sprint warhead might explode by accident, destroying everything within a distance of five or ten miles and causing heavy damage for a far greater distance. It has been argued that placing the Sprint missiles near a city offers the additional protection of a possible last-minute interception. (This contention does not apply to Spartans.) The argument seems more like a rationalization than a reason, since the basic purpose of the Sprint is not to defend cities but to protect the long-range PAR, and only the handful of cities that have PAR will also have Sprints. It is hard to believe that Boston, Seattle, and Detroit have been honored with a defense while almost every other American city—including Washington, D.C.—has been deprived of whatever protection the Sprints will give. Also, it has long been known that anything like Sprint protection can be nullified by exploding a large thermonuclear bomb upwind and beyond the reach of short-range defensive missiles, thus sending a cloud of radiation over a city supposedly defended by the missiles.

There is, however, one assumption that makes perfect sense of the choice of sites: that this is not an anti-Chinese system at all but the first step toward the large, more-than-forty-billion-dollar anti-Soviet system that was publicly rejected by Secretary McNamara and President Johnson. For the logic of such a system requires "point" defense around every major city (along with a large fallout-shelter program) to render it effective. Many of the most fervent advocates of ABM in the Senate have not concealed their conviction that the Sentinel makes sense only if the system is to be expanded, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is known to share this belief. Secretary Laird hinted that this is the intention when he defended the Sentinel as a possible bargaining counter in talks with the Russians. Yet if, as our government has said, the Sentinel is worthless against the Soviet Union and has been designed only for China, it is hard to see why it would add to our strength in any United States-Soviet negotiations. Perhaps this is only an instance of last year's non sequitur's becoming this year's cliché.

The approval of ABM and the initial appropriation for its construction came in an election-year atmosphere, when many political figures were reluctant to challenge those who said the system was needed for the national security. Now the election is over. Land for sites has been taken and cleared. The citizens of the chosen cities have been stirred to awareness that they may soon have nuclear missiles in the neighborhood. As is noted elsewhere in these pages, there have already been meetings of protest in the Chicago and Boston areas. In the last week or two, more than a dozen Senators, of both parties, spoke against the ABM and asked the Administration to stop the preparation of sites pending a full review by Congress and the President. In response to these requests, to mounting public opinion, and to the inner doubts of the Executive branch, Secretary Laird last week announced that nothing more would be done until such a review had been completed. No one can predict the final decision. But one thing is clear. If the ABM goes forward, the military-industrial complex is headed toward a serious confrontation, and, perhaps, its first major defeat at the hands of public opinion. Indeed, it may already have lost.

SURMOUNTING CAMPUS CHAOS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the most difficult challenge facing the Nation's colleges and universities this winter is the problem of student disruption and unrest. Unless we learn to deal meaningfully with this problem, the potential for more violence will increase.

Just as the mayors of our cities are grasping for the methods of crowd control and maintenance of order that will reduce the chances of violent confrontation, so are the administrators of our great colleges searching for what needs to be done on the campus. Clearly the cry for participation and communication by and between students and administrators cannot be overlooked or swept away.

This week some top school administrators and Government officials are focusing on alternative responses to the problems on campus. First, Governor Knowles, of Wisconsin, has discussed some of the lessons to be learned from the confrontations of student radicals at the University of Wisconsin. Father Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University and a long-time member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has spelled out the guidelines for discouraging the substitution of force for rational discussion at Notre Dame. Finally, President Nixon is lending the suasion of his office to the efforts to avoid the diminution of academic freedom by those who use coercive methods against the rights of the majority of college students.

There are no simple solutions to this phenomenon, but I include these articles and statements as part of a continuing effort to call to the attention of my colleagues the problem and the need for guidance:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 3, 1969]

HOW TO DEAL WITH CAMPUS CHAOS—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH THE GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN

(NOTE.—A federal grand-jury investigation of campus riots and their leaders is advocated by Wisconsin's Governor Warren P. Knowles in this interview with editors of "U.S. News & World Report.")

Other ways to clamp down on lawless students are spelled out by the Wisconsin Governor. They include new State laws to enable college officials to keep undesirables—and their sound trucks—off the campus; greater effort by Federal Bureau of Investigation and local lawmen to get evidence for prosecuting ringleaders of violence.

Q. Governor Knowles, what is really behind these campus troublemakers?

A. I think the hard core of the radicals who appear to take over campus demonstrations seems intent on destroying the system of higher education, and on using university campuses as staging areas for the spread of their own political philosophy. I think that this philosophy, which condones violence and disruption and which disregards the rights of other students, is incompatible with the foundations of our democracy.

Sometimes it is almost a conspiracy—apparently—that is involved in this whole mat-

ter of the disruptions and in the leadership of the disturbances on campus.

Q. Conspiracy to do what?

A. I believe that there is in existence a total nationwide pattern. These disturbances are not here at Wisconsin alone. Violence has happened at Columbia. It has happened at Duke. It has happened at Chicago, and the University of Illinois, and Iowa State, and on the West Coast at Berkeley and San Francisco State.

We do see some insidious outside influence involved in many of the activities on campuses. We must show the people who attempt to cause these disorders that we are not going to tolerate anything that affects our ability to operate a successful and outstanding academic institution.

Q. How do you do that?

A. I would welcome the calling of a federal grand jury to identify the real disrupters—the real troublemakers who are known not only throughout the United States but internationally. I think it is high time that we clamp down on this type of individual, whose purposes apparently involve subversion, revolutionary tendencies and tactics. These people are not just dealing with local problems in the area of equal opportunities and civil rights—which we protect here in Wisconsin.

We recognize everybody's right to due process of law. But when it is shown that an individual has precipitated riotous conduct through inflammatory statements or incendiary action—that he is involved in a crime—then that individual must expect to be punished, just like anybody else who violates the law.

Q. Do you think additional federal laws are needed?

A. I would think that at the present time we have adequate laws for calling grand juries at both the federal and State levels. But I believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, local law-enforcement officers—and even military intelligence—must make a greater endeavor to pinpoint the individuals who are precipitating this kind of disruption and disturbance. Once they are identified and the evidence is there, our system of government and our Constitution provide adequate means of prosecution.

Q. What about State laws through the legislature? Are you planning anything there?

A. I have proposed a series of four bills:

One of them provides for a period of ineligibility for readmission to the university after conviction for a crime related to a campus disorder.

A second provides that anyone suspended must have permission to return to the campus. Those who did so without permission could be charged with criminal trespass.

A third, in connection with the faculty, would provide a review of the status of anyone convicted—again providing for due process by the faculty committee, by the administration and by the board of regents.

Then, I have proposed a bill to deal with one of the things that has been very troublesome—the question of the use of sound-amplifying equipment by demonstrators. It is very evident that this is not one of the normal or ordinary facilities that one brings to an academic course on campus. It is equally clear that the use of such devices to direct and conduct riots and demonstrations is not within the ordinary process of either State law or university rules and regulations. I think it is high time that we deal with this sort of thing.

Q. What is the status of these bills?

A. They are just about to be introduced in the legislature.

We recognize that, insofar as the State is concerned, it would be inappropriate to panic—to attempt to introduce legislation which might clearly be unconstitutional.

We have had the advice of some of the best minds of the faculty, the members of the

bar associations, members of our own legislative teams and my executive staff.

I believe that these four bills which we propose to introduce will have a beneficial effect—in making it understood by faculty and students alike that we are running an educational institution, and we are not going to tolerate anything that is going to disrupt or interfere with the rights of the majority who are there for the purpose of getting an education.

Q. What about the suggestion that has been made that officials ignore these campus uprisings, hoping they will just go away?

A. Problems of this nature don't go away. They have to be dealt with.

Now, some people say they have to be met with toughness. I don't agree with that. But they have to be met with firmness. Our various educational institutions—no matter where they are—must not be taken over by any group of individuals for purposes other than education.

Those of us who are in positions of political leadership and those who are on faculties must co-operate with law-enforcement agencies to see that we preserve and protect the rights of the majority.

Q. Was that why you called out the National Guard?

A. The use of large numbers of police or of National Guard troops is only an emergency measure intended to protect the lives and property of our citizens. My purpose in using the Guard and the police is to keep the buildings open—not shut down, as some of the disturbers would like to see. The great majority of students want to attend classes. Well, they are not going to be intimidated.

If we are going to keep the university open while activists attempt to block the doors and passageways, then we must use whatever force is necessary.

We must recognize that there is a realistic desire on the part of the black community to achieve certain goals for members of their race. There is a great deal of sympathy on the part of the majority of students for the cause of black people and other minority groups. There is a sympathetic desire to help the black students to attain their goals. But you don't do it by closing down the school.

The major solution to these problems is the need to improve communications with these serious, idealistic young men and women. They must become aware that their government shares with them their concern and their ideals and their goals.

As Chancellor Edwin Young has indicated, they must be alerted to the multitude of activities that are being carried on by the University of Wisconsin and by governmental agencies to achieve mutual goals. Now, these processes do not bring instant solutions.

We must get these young people involved in the processes of government so they are full participants in the effort to improve society, to expand opportunity—and to protect the rights of the individuals.

Q. Governor, do you think there is a danger that if all this troublemaking continues, the people—or the legislature—might cut off funds for the teachers or for the State schools?

A. I would say that this is going to be one of our very serious problems.

For instance, let me point out to you that in Wisconsin, 66 cents out of every dollar of our State budget is spent on education. The taxpayers are really fed up with paying their hard-earned money to subsidize disruptive students. Most of the blacks on campus have additional loans and grants to take care of their education.

Taxes are high—and there is a general feeling that a small number of students are precipitating this trouble and wasting the taxpayers' money.

Certainly, I would not like to see this type of feeling permeate our legislature. But the legislature is finely attuned to the viewpoints of the public—they keep their ears to the

ground—and we know from past experience that sometimes when the public is totally aroused, the legislature gets the message very rapidly.

I have been convinced for a long time that our problems with the minority groups—the blacks, the Spanish Americans, the Indians and other groups—are not half as much racial here in Wisconsin as they are economic.

In order to resolve this situation, we must think in terms of necessary education to provide opportunities for the unemployed and unemployable to take part in our labor force. And when they are able to earn a good living, they will then be able to buy housing, they will be able to support their families, they will be able to enjoy the benefits of living in a State such as this that has many assets.

Education is the very cornerstone of all social and economic growth. It is the passport of each individual to his individual success. And it is the only hope we have for preserving and protecting our system of democracy.

Q. Are you saying that if these agitators cause the legislature to cut off funds, they will be foreclosing these individual opportunities you mention?

A. That is my fear. I would certainly hope that the legislature would not let the small numbers of people who are involved prompt it to react against the support necessary to continue to expand the educational opportunities for the citizens of our State.

TROUBLEMAKERS: A MINORITY

Q. In the present atmosphere, is education still possible at the University of Wisconsin?

A. Yes. There is no question but what in the present climate you will find that, out of 33,000 to 34,000 students, 80 per cent of these students are going to classes. They are in lecture halls. They are in laboratories. They are very much disturbed about the disruption which exists—caused by the small number of people involved.

Of course, there is a sympathetic group. And certainly we have had marches. I have seen high-school students and others—those who want to be where the action is—marching along with the militants who are leading these demonstrations. But it isn't fair to say this is representative or that the university is not functioning.

If you were to get at the very roots of this whole problem, you would find that very few students are actually involved. Our State is a conservative State, basically. These people who are here who live in Wisconsin come from conservative homes. They are good Americans.

Now, there are many onlookers and hangers-on involved. There are those who think that being in the forefront of a nationally recognized disruption—the thought that they might get on television or see their picture in the paper—is something they find rather amusing.

Here is an example of what I mean: The other day one of the professors told me that a young girl walked up to one of the National Guardsmen—a handsome young man standing at attention—and she said, "You should be on our side."

The Guardsman replied, "Young lady, I am on your side—if you only knew it."

So, you see, this is illustrative of the fact that there is not total recognition on the part of some of the student body that law and order must be preserved.

Q. Governor, since there is this hard core of troublemakers among students and faculty, can't the university just get rid of such people—expel them or fire them?

A. Actually, the university—at my suggestion, in connection with student-body activities—has adopted a set of guidelines: rules, regulations or codes of conduct and discipline. They could enforce these.

The same is true under the disciplinary procedures for faculty members.

The university does need, however, a little more support in the way of legislative action.

And, therefore, I have made some recommendations to the legislature which will still preserve the right of the student body and the faculty to institute disciplinary measures where necessary.

Q. Has the university done anything about punishing any of these troublemakers?

A. We have instances where troublemakers have been suspended. I can think of at least three or four instances where, after due process and after a hearing—even though those accused did go to the federal and State courts to try to block action—the faculty suspended individuals who had caused disruption or violence, and who had taken part in unlawful conduct on campus.

But, again, one thing that really bothers in this whole area of civil processes and due process at the educational level is the problem of proving intent. As I said, sometimes it appears to be almost a conspiracy to disrupt, and we do see some signs of insidious outside influence involved in many of the activities on the campus.

Q. Why doesn't the university just throw these people off the campus wholesale?

A. The difficulty in doing that is tied closely to interpretations of "due process." Each time the university administration attempts to take forceful, direct action against disruptive students, a challenge is raised in federal court. Almost without exception, the court has prevented the university from taking direct action—by issuing an injunction based on a challenge relating to due process.

In other words, the court insists that any action to suspend or expel a student be processed through the administrative machinery established by the board of regents for such disciplinary purposes.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1969]

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

Following is the text of Mr. Nixon's letter to Father Hesburgh:

"DEAR TED: I share your concern over the recent disorders that have paralyzed campus after campus across the country in recent weeks, and I want to applaud the forthright stand you have taken.

"As you know, the issues raised by the protesting students range from minor reforms within the academic community to major concerns of national policy.

"But the means some students—a small, irresponsible minority—have employed reflect an impatience with democratic processes, an intolerance of legitimately constituted authority, and a complete disregard for the rights of others.

"Violence and vandalism have marked many of these protests, and the rights of the majority of the students have been grossly abused.

"If the integrity of our universities is to be preserved, then certain principles must be re-established and certain basic rules enforced. Intimidation and threats remain outlaw weapons in a free society.

"A fundamental governing principle of any great university is that the rule of reason and not the rule of force prevails. Whoever rejects that principle forfeits his right to be a member of the academic community. The university administrator who fails to uphold that principle jeopardizes one of the central pillars of his institution and weakens the very foundation of American education.

"I have directed the Vice President in meetings in Washington this coming week with the Governors of the 50 states to discuss what action, consistent with the traditional independence of American universities, might be taken at the state and Federal levels to cope with the growing lawlessness and violence on our campuses. I would appreciate it greatly if you would take the time to give him your views on this matter.

"With warm regards,

"Sincerely,

RICHARD M. NIXON."

FINE CALENDAR OF ARTISTIC AND MUSICAL EVENTS AT NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in March the National Gallery of Art offers a rich array of artistic and musical events for the enjoyment of the American public. It is a pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this interesting schedule:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, MARCH 1969

Rembrandt tercentenary: To commemorate the 300th anniversary of the death of Rembrandt van Ryn, the National Gallery has assembled from its extensive holdings an exhibition that will be shown on the Main Floor from March 16 through May 11. Included are 23 paintings, more than a dozen drawings, and a selection of 77 of the most distinguished prints from among a collection of several hundred. An illustrated catalogue is available at \$3.00 with introduction by Egbert Haverkamp-Bergmann, the Dutch painting and print authority and Kress Professor-in-Residence at the National Gallery.

J. M. W. Turner: Continuing on the Main Floor is an exhibition of 16 paintings by Joseph Mallord William Turner from the British collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. A catalogue is available with introduction by John Walker and text by Ross Watson. 10" x 7½", 32-pages, 16 black-and-white illustrations. \$2.75 postpaid.

A. W. Mellon lectures: Jacob Bronowski of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies continues the eighteenth annual A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, Art as a Mode of Knowledge. Concluding lecture is March 30.

Film showings: "The American Vision," a survey of American painting, written and directed by J. Carter Brown, is shown in the auditorium each Saturday at 2 p.m. 35 minutes.

Recorded tours: The Directors Tour. A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director. The portable tape units rent for 25c for one person, 35c for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

Tour of Selected Galleries. A discussion of works of art in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last approximately 15 minutes. The small radio receiving sets rent for 25c.

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 12 noon to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the building and to all scheduled programs.

Cafeteria hours: Weekdays, Luncheon Service 11 a.m. to 2 p.m.; Snack Service 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays, Dinner Service 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 2

Painting of the week*: Botticelli. "Giuliano de'Medici" (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 9. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Light in Painting: Expression and Illusion." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as a Mode of Knowledge: The Speaking Eye, the Visionary Ear."

* 11" x 14" reproductions with texts for sale this week—15¢ each. (If mailed, 25¢ each.)

Guest Speaker: Jacob Bronowski, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4. Sunday concert: Helena Costa, Pianist. East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 9

Painting of the week*: Corot. "Agostina." (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery 93. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Rembrandt's Contemporaries outside Holland. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as a Mode of Knowledge: Music, Metaphor, and Meaning." Guest Speaker: Jacob Bronowski, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Claudia Hoca, Pianist. East Garden Court 8.

All concerts with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MARCH 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 16

Painting of the week*: Reynolds. "Lady Caroline Howard." (Andrew Mellon Collection) Gallery 59. Tuesday, through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Rembrandt's Contemporaries in Holland. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as a Mode of knowledge: The Act of Recognition." Guest Speaker Jacob Bronowski, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: The Ellsworth String Quartet, East Garden Court 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737-4215, ext. 272.

MONDAY, MARCH 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 23

Painting of the week*: Gian Antonio and Francesco Guardi. "Erminia and the Shepherds" (Alisa Mellon Bruce Fund) Northwest Stairway. Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Rembrandt's Approach to Nature." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as a Mode of Knowledge: Imagination as Plan and as Experiment." Guest Speaker: Jacob Bronowski, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Joyce Castle, Mezzo-Soprano, Larry Graham, Pianist, East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, MARCH 30

Painting of the week*: Fetti. "The Veil of Veronica" (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 34, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: "Rembrandt's Approach to History." Rotunda Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Art as a Mode of Knowledge: The Play of Values in the Work of Art." Guest Speaker: Jacob Bronowski, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, Conductor, East Garden Court 8.

OUR ENVIRONMENT IS
CONTAMINATED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the November-December 1968 issue of *Wildlife News*, published by the Arizona Game and Fish Department, carried an excellent article entitled "Our Environment Is Contaminated." This article clearly documents the point that pollution of the land, air, and water has gotten so far out of hand it is essential that concerted action be taken by all elements of our society if we are to survive.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the information provided by *Wildlife News*, I include the text of the article in question at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR ENVIRONMENT IS CONTAMINATED
POLLUTION—PART 2

The "death" of Lake Erie, smog-ridden cities, blighted crops, polluted water and wildlife—these are examples of what blundering mankind has done to his planet. Pollution-induced, oxygen-starved Lake Erie gives predictions of a similar fate for all of this nation's surface waters.

Who would believe North America's five fabulous Great Lakes—containing one fifth of the world's supply of fresh water—could become seriously polluted? Not only is the shoreline polluted, but over one fourth of Lake Erie is now without oxygen. (The oxygen is removed by bacteria feeding on the wastes.) This vast reservoir of oxygenless death, in the middle of the lake, is a virtual underwater morgue. All useful water life has been smothered by the immense blooms of green and blue-green algae feeding on the nitrogen, phosphorus and other waste products dumped into the lake directly, or flushed in by polluted rivers and streams. What does all of this do to the fish and associated wildlife? It's almost too late. There's not much fish and wildlife left to worry about.

A slug of cyanide or other harmful chemical discharged into a river, flows along for many miles before dissipating. It kills thousands of fish as it flows downstream.

The pollutant passes a given point in the river in a few minutes, but its effects may be felt for years. When the scourge has passed, the stream must be repopulated, not only with fish, but with the aquatic food they eat. It takes several years for the progeny to grow up and for the water to regain its natural balance. This is assuming, of course, that the stream doesn't get new supplies of pollutants in the meantime.

Actually, a gradual increase in pollution may slowly kill off the fish population in such a way that the dead fish or the decline in numbers is not noted. The fishery is destroyed without exciting public protest because few people realize what is happening. In some streams—in the East particularly—the destruction of fishing grounds has proceeded at such a slow pace over such a long period, that people have long since forgotten that fish were once abundant.

Just as too much sewage, smog, etc. can destroy water and air and eventually dependent animal life, if the whole environment is overloaded, natural purification processes cannot keep ahead of the load. There is a saturation point; it has been reached in many areas of the world!

Visitors to famed Niagara Falls are often

offended by the stench of sewage and paper-mill waste flowing over the falls.

The U.S. Public Health Service labels Atlanta's water and sewage problem "critical." It adds, however, that it is typical of conditions prevalent throughout the entire country. If you want more vivid examples read U.S. Congressman Jim Wright's book, *The Coming Water Famine*. But don't read it before dinner unless you have a cast-iron stomach.

Is it any wonder that the typical drinking water supply of many U.S. cities is described as "a brown diluted soup of dead bacteria preserved in chlorine"?

"Our continued survival" depends upon solving the problem of whole environmental pollution, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall told the National Petroleum Council in 1967.

"This is a strong statement," Udall said. But, he added: "... we must restore our air and our water resources to some tolerable state of purity or we shall as a nation surely suffocate in our own effluvia."

The once beautiful Mississippi River is now referred to by some as "the colon of Mid-America." During the fall of 1966, a noted group of conservationists inspected the Mississippi by boat, in the vicinity of St. Louis. They were shocked to see more than 100 pipes pouring untreated sewage directly into the Mississippi.

Water samples taken from the river below St. Louis were found to be so toxic that even when diluted 10 times with clear water, fish placed in the mixture died in less than one minute! When samples were diluted 100 times the test fish still perished within 24 hours.

From St. Louis southward, the Mississippi is so bad that state health departments and the Federal Public Health Service have posted signs forbidding people to even eat lunches along the banks of it, let alone go wading in the water, or to water ski. The concentration of infectious bacteria in just the spray from the river, when deposited on a person's face or on lips, can cause typhoid, colitis, hepatitis, diarrhea or infections in the blood stream.

Since the turn of the century, the volume of municipal wastes discharged into water-courses has increased more than 200 percent while industrial pollution has risen nearly 3,000 percent.

"No country in the history of the world," said Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, "has destroyed its natural resources at a rate comparable to the destruction now going on in the United States."

"In the last 100 years this country has destroyed more of its resources than the entire world has in the past 1,000 years. We destroyed the forests, the rivers—there is not one watershed in the United States that is now un-polluted—and we are rapidly destroying the lakes."

Senator Nelson predicted two years ago, in 1966, that unless corrective measures are taken, our useable water reserves "will be used up in ten years!" (Newark, New Jersey, *Star Ledger*, August 23.) Suppose Senator Nelson is wrong, and it takes 15 years instead of ten. Wonderful! Now we only have 13 to go, and if we wait that long to do something about it, it will be too late.

Similar conditions exist on the other side of the globe. The beautiful natural harbor in Sydney, Australia, is now contaminated.

"Name your disease," reported the *Australian International News Review*. "With very little effort you can catch it merely by going swimming anywhere inside the harbour itself or almost anywhere along the coast for 20 miles above and below the city."

As if dirt, sewage, silt and chemical pollution of our waters wasn't enough, the temperature of the country's lakes and streams are rising. The most important reason for

this is that a growing and expanding industry is using more and more water for cooling purposes in its manufacturing processes and then returning the water to its source at higher temperatures. Another reason is that cultivated fields have been replacing forests, reducing shade, and including more rapid runoff and greater siltation. These phenomena are called thermal pollution.

Many of the country's trout streams are approaching borderline temperatures. A rise of only one or two more degrees in some areas of the country will mean the end of trout for that area. Water temperatures are becoming so high that even the more desirable warm water fish—sunfishes, bass and crappies, for example—are being affected.

"Our physical environment, sad to say, is being contaminated faster than nature and man's present efforts can cleanse it. We must reverse this process of deterioration before it is too late," said Dr. Samuel Lehner, a vice-president and director of the world-famous Du Pont Chemical Company. His statement was in the keynote address on the opening day of the National Pollution Control Exposition and Conference held at Houston, Texas, April 3-5, 1968.

Never before had such a broad-based conference on pollution control convened. It had 2,000 delegates from all across the nation. U.S. Congressmen, Public Health Service spokesmen, leading state and municipal pollution control officials, top level representatives from private industry, nearly 100 manufacturers and distributors with the latest pollution control equipment on display—all were in attendance.

The facts presented at this conference should shake the last ounce of complacency out of anyone who still naively believes that dirty air, polluted water, and all other types of environmental contamination are "nuisances" which can be passively tolerated.

The Assistant Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Richard A. Prindle, told this to the conference: "The deterioration of our environment is a problem so vast and urgent that anxiety about it must not be confined to elected officials, professionals, health workers, and conservationists. Every level and facet of citizenry is affected and must be concerned."

Congressman John Blatnik of Minnesota was asked at this conference whether or not every major river system in the United States is plagued with pollution.

Representative Blatnik's reply: "Practically, yes."

Blatnik is a pioneer in water quality control legislation, authoring the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. In this capacity as Chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, Representative Blatnik has toured every major harbor and inland waterway in America. The conditions of this nation's waters wherever he went are, as he put it: "simply horrible."

How much would an all-out assault on pollution in only America cost?

Hold on to your chair! If all forms of pollution were to be tackled, the combined industrial, municipal, state and private expenditures could rise as high as 10 billion dollars a year for the next 20 years—or a total of 200 billion dollars—and that's if we stop polluting, now. That's just to clean up the mess we have already. If man had acted more responsibly in the first place, we wouldn't be in this pickle today.

Enough on water pollution, let's get back to our air problems, as if water and hydrocarbons weren't enough.

It has been reported recently that the contamination of the air in Los Angeles may be approaching the limits of physical tolerance by man.

White-collar workers in West Germany's heavily industrialized Ruhr district are accustomed to carrying an extra shirt with

them to work. The first one will be gray after half a day in the area's polluted air.

A smog-aggravated respiratory ailment, "Tokyo-Yokohama asthma," affects thousands in that giant Japanese megalopolis. Oxygen tanks have been installed at busy Tokyo intersections for use of traffic policemen who must stand for hours in the swirl of auto exhaust fumes. Every half hour the men have to take an "oxygen break."

The atmosphere over a number of South American cities is becoming increasingly contaminated. Major problems already exist in Sao Paula, Brazil, and Santiago, Chile. Potentially major problems are expected in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in the near future.

In Madrid, Spain, the pall of smoke and dust is sometimes so great it is difficult to see from one side of a thoroughfare to the other.

Polluted air is not just a threat to living things. It even destroys metal and stone! Four ancient Greek bronze horses in Venice's St. Mark's Square are being eaten away by polluted air. So is the famed "Cleopatra's Needle" in New York City. This monument successfully withstood more than 3,000 years of wind-driven desert sand in Egypt. New York's air is simply more than it can take!

No death certificates have ever cited "smog" as a cause of death. Yet U.S. Surgeon General William H. Stewart reported on April 19, 1967, there is "compelling evidence" that air pollution is killing and disabling Americans in every area of the nation.

In testimony before a Senate subcommittee, Dr. Stewart revealed scientific studies have linked pollution to such diseases as cancer, the common cold, emphysema and chronic bronchitis.

We produce power plants and automobiles which envelope our cities in smog.

We synthesize and disseminate new insecticides and did it well before we learned that they also kill wildlife and might, yes, just be harmful to PEOPLE.

We produce synthetic detergents and put billions of pounds of these chemicals into surface waters—before we realized that they would pollute water supplies because natural bacterial action cannot break down their chemical bonds to disperse them harmlessly into the environment.

We are now spraying herbicides (plant killers) on an unprecedented scale in Vietnam—and here also in the United States. There are no assurances that we know their long-term effects. Concern over the use of herbicides as defoliants in the war has been expressed. Among biologists, there is a general concern over the ecological after effects and it has been suggested that these applications should be studied so there might be some sort of guideposts to future chemical applications. Would it be out of the realm of possibility to think that we have produced another DDT-type chemical, only this time instead of accumulating in animals (including ourselves), we're going to accumulate (poison, pollute—take your pick) the junk in all plant life?

We build aluminum cans and plastic bottles which defy destruction. They have become "royalty" in the dumps, along highways, and in wildlife habitat, litteral "king-of-heap" existences. It has been suggested that Man's eras should be summarized as: the Stone Age, then the Bronze Age, the Iron Age, the Space Age . . . and now the Garbage."

In 1901, an engineer wrote: "In no branch of municipal service has so little progress been made in the U.S. as in the disposal of garbage." Today, the techniques of waste disposal are still fearfully outmoded. They "represent little advancement beyond the technology of the garbage pail, the trash can, the open dump, and the obsolete incinerator," says Wesley W. Gilbertson, Pennsylvania Director of Environmental Health.

Garbage removal alone has become an immense challenge to industry and management. The solution to this huge problem of garbage removal is considered "difficult." It is in reality tiny compared to the fact that we as humans are running out of clean water and breathable air.

Professor Percy H. McCauhey of the University of California testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee, June 29, 1965, that: "Our heritage of wastefulness is derived from an economy which now demands that the volume of waste be constantly increased in order that the economy itself be maintained." We are going to smother in our waste to live.

Apart from minor improvements during the past 50 or 60 years in the ways we handle domestic wastes, American cities rely chiefly on two classical methods for disposing of it.

The sanitary landfill is an important refinement of the open dump where trash is haphazardly piled up and burned, with all its attendant dangers and nuisances. In a landfill, wastes are pushed into deep pits, laid down evenly, or placed in trenches, then covered over each day with a blanket of soil. Properly operated, this is clean, causing little or no air pollution or health hazard.

Incineration is the second method most widely used for garbage disposal. The main benefit from incineration of wastes is the reduction of volume. However, the residue of 20 percent or more must still be disposed of. Incineration is considerably more expensive than landfilling, usually running \$7 or more per ton, while landfills cost from 75 cents to \$5.00 per ton depending on dumping area available. Incineration also requires a large capital investment and is a major contributor to air pollution.

There is often a vicious circle in waste disposal systems. In 1967, New York, plagued by air pollution, passed an ordinance requiring large apartment buildings to clean up their 4,000 incinerators. Many of the owners balked, saying they'd rather put their trash out in cans and let the city take care of it. The already beleaguered Sanitation Department objected that it had neither adequate facilities nor disposal sites. The additional volume seemed destined for the edges of the Pelham Bay estuary on Long Island Sound. This brought a cry from the city park commissioner and conservationists. The area is a wildlife and fish sanctuary and one of the few remaining unspoiled shorelines in the region. But the area is "spoiled," and badly, when compared to our Oak Creek Canyon which itself is becoming "unsightly."

It has been estimated that New York will run out of landfill space altogether in four to eight years. Philadelphia has been short of space for decades, and consequently incinerates 90 percent of its wastes, with resulting air troubles.

There's also more to the solid waste dilemma than the 185 million tons of municipal wastes generated each year. Industrial wastes are measured in the many hundreds of millions of tons annually—waste rock, mill tailings, slag, ash, processing residue and the like. Many materials, of course, are salvaged and reused, but much remains to be dealt with—add more than a billion tons of agricultural wastes each year plus much logging debris, field crop residue, animal manure and carcasses.

Discussing the 700 million tons or so of animal wastes produced each year, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman said: "The disposal facilities to cope with the staggering amount of animal wastes from highly concentrated feeding operations (feedlots) just don't exist." Freeman made his comments February 2, 1968, to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Natural Resources Committee.

Additional comments on agricultural wastes came from the April 1968, issue of the Missouri *Conservationist*. It stated that

these type of wastes were a "largely unrecognized problem. Missouri has about as many pigs and cattle as people—four million. Yet the animals produce sewage equal to that produced by 40 million people! It's clear that any efforts to clean up our own wastes will be largely cancelled by an army of well-fed farm animals."

Special problems in removal and disposal are posed by atomic wastes. Just considering radioactive fallout from the atmosphere: a recent report states that fallout from past nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere will continue to increase each year until 1975. This rate is based upon the assumption there will be no more nuclear explosions. A risky assumption, indeed.

In any case, this nation's solid wastes alone clearly pose a major threat to the environment. As congress has noted, they "result in scenic blights, create serious hazards to the public health, including pollution of air and water resources, accident hazards, and increase rodent and insect vectors of disease, have an adverse effect on land values, create public nuisances and otherwise interfere with community life and development."

As was stated in the first part of this article, when the aspects of just water pollution are totally known, they are found to be too closely related to air and little pollution. Unfortunately, knowledge of these leads to others.

We haven't even touched on the subject of food additives—the artificial sweeteners, the preservatives, the stabilizers, emulsifiers and so on. Suffice it to say that some 2,400 food additives are in commercial use today! About 400,000,000 pounds are used each year in the U.S. alone. That's about three pounds of chemicals per person, per year. Many are admittedly of unknown or questionable nature.

What does the future hold? What are the prospects for major break-throughs in our sluggish, outmoded and in some cases non-existent strategy for dealing with the growing pollution crises? Industry, as a whole, has written a dismal record regarding pollution. The public doesn't seem to want to be bothered with such seemingly mundane problems as garbage collection and wildlife habitat pollution.

And when the values and merits of a particular type of health-hazard waste we're talking about overlaps more on government, industry, farmers, private citizens, or "that other country," you can rest assured that the buck will be passed and little if anything will actually be accomplished toward the reversal of the problem.

The expression, "Technology created pollution. It can also solve it," has been heard long enough. The question is: When?

When will technology ("industry," if you please) suddenly change? When will pollution producers comply 100 percent with regulations and common sense, instead of waiting to be practically bludgeoned into action on nearly every single issue? When will the general public demand a cease and desist and get it cleaned up attitude?

Will the hoped-for and talked about new advances in science and technology clean up our polluted world to the extent that we can once again breathe clean air, drink pure water, eat uncontaminated food, or know that our wildlife is not going to be polluted out of existence?

"Fraid not! So far scientists do not intend to do any of that.

A recent report on waste management and control issued by the committee on pollution of the National Academy of Sciences stated:

"The right amount of pollution must be planned with criteria set somewhere between the ideal of complete cleanliness and the havoc of uncontrolled filth."

The so-called "right amount" of pollution, this report continued, "involves a calculable

risk to society. It depends on where we are, what use we want to make of the environment, and quality of cleanliness for which we are prepared to pay."

Are we willing to accept this decision on the part of the "scientific" community? Are you willing to accept the opinion of a national news magazine which recently claimed that in the search for pollution solutions, "there is no point in attempting to take nature back to its pristine purity."

Why no? Why shouldn't our environment be clean—totally? Why should we have to tolerate a "little bit of filth?"

Pollution is serious. We cannot run off to the woods and hide from it in all its forms and its effects anymore. There is now so much that it follows us. The burden of new and noxious substances which we carry as permanent constituents of our bodies—strontium 90 and other man-released radioactive elements including lead, mercury and DDT, all are increasing.

We have compiled a record of serious failures with our environment and should the causes of all pollution not stop, completely—come to a screeching, skidding halt within the next few years—more cars, more people, more smog, more pesticides, more chemical wastes, more animal and human wastes, more mounds of garbage and just plain tons of junk are going to entirely pollute our own environment. It will not take any more than 10 years at the present rate.

We as humans are destroying or contaminating every essential element for keeping ourselves alive: air, water, plants, animals the very ground beneath our feet. Absence of any one of these essential elements means the end for us. The end! Period. No arguments.

We had better get off our elbows, posteriors and high-and-mighty-attitudes and onto our knees for some answers. Scoffing will not change the facts. It's already the beginning of the end, and at the rate things are going, not many are going to make it to that promised second beginning.

We have very nearly polluted ourselves and civilization as we know it out of existence.

"... I brought you into a plentiful country, to eat the fruit thereof and the goodness thereof; but when ye entered, ye defiled my land, and made mine heritage an abomination."—Jer. 2:7 (Also Ezek. 5:11)

CONNECTICUT'S NEW DEPUTY BANKING COMMISSIONER

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief article which appeared in a recent issue of the Hartford Times regarding former State Senator Maurice J. Ferland, of Danielson, Conn.

"Moe" Ferland, as he is affectionately known throughout eastern Connecticut, was recently named deputy banking commissioner for the State of Connecticut. He served in the State senate for six terms with great distinction and was the author of many worthwhile bills enacted by the State legislature.

I extend my best wishes to him upon the assumption of his new office. He is a man of integrity and ability, and I feel sure that he will fulfill his new duties in

a responsible and successful manner. The article is as follows:

FERLAND NAMED BANKING OFFICIAL

Former Democratic State Sen. Maurice J. Ferland of Danielson was sworn in this morning as deputy state banking commissioner.

The oath of office was administered by Banking Commissioner Philip Hewes before a group of Ferland's relatives and friends during a brief ceremony in the commissioner's office.

Ferland, who served six terms in the Senate, five of them as chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, succeeds Reinhard J. Bardeck of New Britain to the \$20,500-a-year job. Bardeck is retiring after 40 years with the banking department.

Ferland, who heads an accounting firm as well as an office supply business in Danielson, did not seek re-election last year. Succeeding him as senator from the 29th District was Atty. Thomas E. Dupont, also of Danielson.

Legislation which Ferland introduced during his years in the upper chamber benefited eastern Connecticut in many ways.

Among other things, his bills resulted in the construction of the Danielson Airport and the installation of lights for night flying, the construction of Harvard H. Ellis Technical School, construction of a new superior courthouse in Putnam, the acquisition of Wauregan Lake and Ross' Pond in Killingly for recreation purposes, a multi-million dollar expansion of Eastern Connecticut State College in Willimantic, funds for a new athletic field at Ellis Tech, the construction in Putnam of a center for the mentally retarded, the establishment of a Department of Motor Vehicles branch office in Putnam, the reconstruction of Maple Street in Killingly, funds to assure the turnpike connector from Killingly to the Massachusetts state line would be a four-lane limited access highway, and a bridge spanning Route 6 in Danielson.

His major piece of legislation, however, was his bill creating the Connecticut Industrial Building Commission. The commission was set up with a revolving fund to insure first mortgages on new or existing buildings devoted to industrial activity.

THE GRAPE DEBATE: BOTH SIDES OF THE ISSUE

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the widespread publicity being accorded the California grape boycott is arousing the interest of many Members of the House and of citizens across the country.

The Washington Post recently performed what I believe was an exceptional public service by devoting several columns of space to signed articles on this subject by the gentleman from California (Mr. Sisk), and by Cesar Chavez, the director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

Because of the complexities of the grape industry, I believe it is imperative that we achieve maximum feasible understanding. To assist in bringing this about, I include the full text of both of these articles in the RECORD, as follows:

To BUY OR—
(By B. F. Sisk)

(NOTE.—Mr. SISK, Democratic Representative from the 16th District of California

since 1954, Sisk represents Fresno and Merced Counties and was one of the organizers of what is now the liberal Democratic Study Group in the House. His office reports that the AFL-CIO voting record, the last time they added it up, gave Sisk 70 "right" votes and only two "wrong" ones.)

The great California grape boycott is rapidly assuming the proportions of a national psychodrama. It is on the "must" list for everyone who fancies himself a defender of the poor.

The public debate over the boycott thus far has been couched in the terms of a classic labor-management dispute: wages, working conditions, oppressive management, labor bossism, and on and on ad nauseum.

The real issue is not whether farm workers should have the right to organize (they should—and they do, under existing law); or whether management should pay an adequate wage (it should); or whether there should be clean drinking water and latrines in the vineyards (there should be).

Neither is the issue whether the boycott is a proper strike weapon (it is). Or whether informational picketing is a proper way to get the issues in a dispute before the public (it is).

The issue is whether this boycott, directed at the people this boycott is directed at, is defensible by any standard of common decency. It isn't.

In the eight counties that comprise California's San Joaquin Valley, there are between 8000 and 9000 grape growers. By far the vast majority of them either dry their grapes for raisins or sell their grapes to the wineries. Only a relatively small percentage of them grow grapes for eating as fresh fruit—table grapes, in other words.

Although it is not always a simple matter to shift from wine or raisins to table grapes, it is always a simple matter to shift from table grapes to wine and, in some cases, raisins. Because the table grape is so readily salable to the winery, the grape boycott is not really a boycott against table grape growers, but against the growers of all California grapes—whether the grapes are for wine or raisins.

All over the United States, the impression has been created that in order to put an end to oppression in California agriculture, the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee is engaged in a titanic struggle with all of California's grape producers ("Don't Eat California Grapes," say the bumper strips). "Delano" has come to mean almost as much to present generations as The Alamo or Valley Forge meant to generations past.

DIRECTED AT LARGE GROWERS

The fact of the matter is that the grape strike which precipitated the boycott is directed at a handful of large California growers, many of whom operate out of the financial districts of Los Angeles and San Francisco and some of whom don't know pruning shears from a hacksaw.

On the other hand, there are literally thousands of other farmers—men with callouses on their hands and mud on their boots—who also grow grapes but who are not now negotiating with the Farm Workers Union, have never been asked to negotiate with the Farm Workers Union and are not now and never have been engaged in any kind of a labor dispute with any union.

Furthermore, under pending legislation to place farm workers under the National Labor Relations Act—which is strongly supported by the Farm Workers Union—the vast majority of the grape growers would be exempt because they are too small to be covered.

In the eight counties on the map, there were 8686 farms growing grapes in 1964—the latest year for which official Census Bureau information is available. The average size of those 8686 farms was 48 acres. These figures refer to growers of all kinds of grapes—for wine, for raisins, and for fresh consumption.

In Kern County, the southernmost of the eight counties and the locale of practically all of the disagreements between the Farm Workers Union and the growers, there were only 193 farms and their average size was 251 acres. Less than 3 per cent of the grape growers in the San Joaquin Valley are in Kern County—and their farms are five times the size of the other 97 per cent.

The disparity between the Kern County grower and other growers is even greater when you take into account only those 2071 San Joaquin Valley farmers growing varieties of grapes especially well suited for fresh consumption. The 95 per cent of the table grape growers outside Kern County averaged 36 acres each, while the 5 per cent in Kern County averaged 219 acres—six times the size of the farms in the other seven counties.

Even in Kern County, where the farm union organizing drive has been concentrated, not all of the ranches are big. Nevertheless all of the evils of large scale corporate farming—either real or imagined—are being portrayed by boycott supporters as being general throughout the San Joaquin Valley. Small growers as well as large are being attacked in an indiscriminate campaign that is the very antithesis of the justice which the Farm Workers Union purports to seek.

SMALL FARMERS SQUEEZED

Furthermore, when you total up the tonnage of table grapes in the eight counties, you find that Kern County growers raise about 23 per cent of the total output. In other words, in order to get jurisdiction over farm labor employed by 5 per cent of the table grape growers who produce approximately 23 per cent of California's table grapes, the farm union is willing to destroy the other 95 per cent of the growers who raise the other 77 per cent of the crop!

And the economics of the California grape industry further aggravates the injustice.

The wine and raisin marketing situation—both domestically and world wide—is such that a relatively small shift in tonnage from one use to the other (diverting table grapes, for instance, into the wineries) can cause wide swings in the price of wine and raisin grapes.

The cost-price squeeze being what it is, the smallest shift in grape prices can bankrupt the small farmer. To the big operator with adequate reserves or to the corporate farm, this merely means a lower profit this year with a dip into the reserves to keep the operation going.

Historically, the fresh grape tonnage has been the smallest. Wine takes the biggest tonnage by far because it is traditionally the outlet for grapes that don't find their way into either the fresh or raisin markets.

In 1967, for instance, nearly 1.5 million tons of grapes went to the wineries, nearly 760,000 tons were dried for raisins, and slightly over 400,000 tons went into the table grape market.

The significance of this to the farmer who raises grapes for wine or raisins is enormous. If the boycott succeeds (which it hasn't up to now), the tonnage of fresh grapes that cannot be sold will have to be diverted to either the raisin outlet or the wine outlet—most likely the latter. This additional tonnage can break the market and mean anything from serious financial losses to absolute bankruptcy for thousands of grape growers who do not even grow table grapes.

It is probable that in some ways, the grape boycott has been a blessing in disguise because now, at least, millions of people are aware that there is such a thing as a fresh grape. The publicity about the boycott has brought table grapes more publicity than the industry could ever have obtained through normal promotional channels. However, the amount of false and misleading information that has been disseminated about the California grape grower is tending to influence many people who have not

taken the trouble to inform themselves of the facts. If the boycott is only moderately more successful than it has been, it could spell disaster for the grape grower if there is a bountiful crop this fall.

CRITICIZING THE BIG OPERATORS

The refrain of the farm workers is not unlike the refrain sung over and over by the critics of public assistance programs: the big operators, some of them at any rate, are scoundrels, therefore all farmers are scoundrels. It bears a dismal similarity to assertions that because some welfare recipients are cheats, most are probably cheats.

It should be emphasized here that the California grape industry is one of few in the country that is not heavily subsidized. Supporters of the boycott regale their audiences with stories of multimillion dollar farm subsidies but carefully neglect to point out some pertinent facts:

The big subsidies in the San Joaquin Valley are paid under the Federal cotton program. There is no subsidy program for grapes.

The multimillion dollar subsidies which have been so well publicized in recent years are not paid to the thousands of small farmers who grow California grapes. There is admittedly some common ownership between the large-scale cotton operators and the large-scale grape growers, but by what tortured logic does this justify an attack on the small-scale grape grower?

Finally, a word or two must be said about the grape grower as a person, because these are people, not corporations or machines we are talking about.

Of the farmers in the 16th Congressional District of California (which I represent), 1 out of 4 has only an eighth grade education. Two out of those 4 have a high school education. Only a small fraction has completed college.

More than half the farms in the 16th District sold their entire farm output in 1964 for less than \$10,000. Using the Department of Agriculture rule of thumb that the farmer spends two dollars for every three he gets for his crop, this means that more than half the farmers in the 16th District made less than \$3,300 from a full year's farming operations.

(Considering \$3,000 as the poverty level, we must conclude that the grape boycott is aimed directly at a great many people who are bordering on poverty.)

More than three out of every four farmers in the 16th District of California had to work off the farm to supplement their income, and those who worked off the farm, two-thirds earned more than \$3,000 during the year in off-farm jobs.

They have worked hard for what they have, through good times and bad. For many, all they have to show for a lifetime of labor is a modest home and a big debt. They don't mind this, because they've been able to give their children a better life than they had, but they resent the abuse and vilification which has been heaped upon them by labor leaders, public officials, college activists and a host of other citizenry who seem unwilling to take the time to find out just exactly what the implications of the boycott are.

"Long live the cause" is the battle cry of the boycott supporters. To which I would add, "if the cause is just."

NOT TO BUY

(By Cesar Chavez, director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO)

In nearly every major city of the United States today there are California-based union farm workers. They are there, they hope temporarily, to promote the boycott against California grapes and to seek broad understanding and support from the consumer community.

They are far from their homes and most of their relatives. They are away from their

friends, living new lives in strange places under extremely difficult conditions. Why do they do it? Because there is no other way forward! The alternative is to stand still, and in so doing to hand down to their children the same bleak frustration of their lives, with no security, no dignity and very little hope.

The consumer boycott is the only open door in the dark corridor of nothingness down which farm workers have had to walk for so many years. It is a gate of hope through which they expect to find the sunlight of a better life for themselves and their families. To get from where they are to where they want to be, they must go together. They must organize, and for workers that means to unionize.

This is not the first effort to unionize among farm workers. It is simply the first one that has succeeded, and it is succeeding, slowly but surely. To understand the significance of the progress that has been made, one only needs to know that previous efforts of farm workers ended in bitterness and often bloodshed, crushed beneath the boots of the extremely wealthy and powerful agriculture interests in the West.

A reasonable person might ask, "Aren't there legal procedures for determining the rights and the wishes of workers with respect to having unions?"

The answer is "Yes" for millions of American workers—but not for farm workers! They are specifically excluded from the coverage of the Federal law that assures and protects the rights of other workers to organize and to bargain collectively. The same person might say, "But surely some reasonable procedure could be worked out to determine the wishes of the workers and give them some equal treatment where these rights are concerned?"

Such a proposition sounds reasonable. As a matter of fact, hundreds of priests, rabbis, ministers, professors, industrialists and others have thought so, and have offered their services as third party participants. The employers have turned down every such offer.

Denied the protection and procedures under the Federal law and faced with the growers' refusal even to discuss the matter of union recognition, the workers were forced to choose between striking and crawling. They say they will no longer be the last vestige of the "crawling American." They struck.

COURTS WENT INTO ACTION

The built-in pitfalls of farm-labor strikes became immediately apparent. Local courts, free to take jurisdiction of each and every complaint against the union, went into action. Judges and public officials who have long been a part of the power structure in agriculture-dominated communities, are "soft" on growers. Injunctions were quick and devastating.

The gates that the injunctions opened in the picket lines were soon filled with masses of strike-breakers—green-card visa holders from Mexico with easy entrance into the United States because of the laxity of the Government in enforcing its immigration policy. The green-carders flooded the strike-bound fields, often in buses provided by growers and escorted by local police, ready and willing to compete against and undercut their brothers because of economic conditions in Mexico that make U.S. farm wages, however miserable by American standards, look very, very good.

Faced with such limitations on the strike's effectiveness, the farm worker reinforced his strike activities by introducing the boycott, which he realized was his last best hope of success, not by choice but by process of eliminating the other alternatives where unfair and inequitable treatment jeopardized any chance of real success.

The current boycott was started well over a year ago against one company, Glumarra Vineyards Corporation in the Bakersfield area

of California, probably the Nation's largest shipper of fresh table grapes. To frustrate the boycott the Giumarra Company started shipping its grapes in cartons bearing the labels of its competitors. Whereas Giumarra normally shipped under a half dozen labels, suddenly there were 50 or 60 labels available to them, lent by their "competitors." Under such conditions the union had no alternative but to include all of the "competitors" in the boycott . . . thus the action against all California grapes.

That is where it stands today and that is why California farm workers—Mexican-American, Filipino-American, Negro-American and "Anglos"—can be found in Boston, New York, Washington, Chicago, Cleveland, Seattle and the other big cities, rallying support for the "Don't Buy Grapes" campaign.

They have really been forced there by a Government policy which denies them equal protection of the law as American workers but gives them special services as non-American strikebreakers. They have been forced there by a community of growers whose mentality is reminiscent of the bitter anti-union days of the 1930's and who simply refuse to recognize the rights of workers to do anything but serve them at their convenience and on their terms. Not only do the growers enter into a near-conspiracy with each other, they openly enlist and welcome the aid of traditional right-wing anti-union organizations such as the John Birch Society, the National Right-to-Work Committee and the American Farm Bureau.

Some public officials from the very area of the dispute who have "supped at labor's table" in the past have turned their backs on the farm workers to keep their lines tight with the local power structure and are championing the cause of the growers in some of the legislative halls of the Nation. With the dispute consuming much of the interest of the Nation for the past three years, the Congressmen whose two districts embrace most of the area of the dispute have not taken one single affirmative step to contribute to a solution other than championing the cause of the growers and joining them in the dream that some time they'll wake up and find things like they were in the "good old days."

MASSIVE RESISTANCE

The resistance to the farm-workers' organizational efforts has been massive. Numerous lawsuits, totaling millions of dollars, have been filed against the union. There has been constant harassment in the courts, both through civil suits and action by local constabulary. Dealing in double standards doesn't bother the growers a bit! The National Labor Relations Act protects both employees and employers. The industry is fighting bitterly to prevent the farm workers from being covered by that part of the law which protects the workers' rights. Yet the growers have instituted several massive legal cases with the National Labor Relations Board to force coverage where the rights of the employers are concerned.

Propaganda campaigns have been instituted by the growers and their friends that portray the farm worker union as weak and unable to attract farm workers to membership.

All of these anti-union smear campaigners who argue that farm workers don't want to organize are actively opposing legislation to extend the Federal law to cover those farm workers so they can vote their true feelings in secret-ballot Government-conducted elections.

The Farm Bureau and the right-to-workers smear the boycott by saying that the issue in the boycott is "compulsory unionism," and that the boycott is to try to force unionism on workers who really don't want it. The

facts are that not a single grower of table grapes has ever been presented any demand at any time by the union which would require any worker to join the union. The only demand is that the companies agree to sit down and discuss ways and means of recognizing the union and then make plans to enter into negotiations.

Phony wage data and economic statistics are part of the resistance propaganda. The growers and their supporters quote California farm wages as the best in the Nation—piece work averages of \$2.50 per hour. They fail to mention that these are wage statistics that are built up during long hours at harvest peak under optimal piece-work conditions. Neither do they mention the fact that frequently the mother and father are the payroll statistic but all their children may be in the field picking with them and having their production credited to the parents, thereby inflating the wage rate.

California farm wages are the best in the Nation next to Hawaii and Hawaii's agricultural workforce has a greater degree of unionization than any state. California wage levels in agriculture have risen at a faster rate in the past eight years than in any other comparable period in history. It goes without saying that they have also outdistanced every other state's rate of farm labor wage improvement. It is interesting to note that those years are exactly the period of the union organizational effort in California.

The facts are that by management's own admission a healthy, energetic, highly skilled grape harvester getting the maximum hours among all grape workers and working under the best of conditions can expect to make between \$3000 and \$3500 per year. Those are poverty level wages and he is the elite—the cream of the crop—with respect to earnings. Imagine how it is with the others.

In reality, whether the wages are more or less has little to do with the real issue, which is: Do farm workers have rights similar to those of other workers, or are they to be relegated to second-class citizenship simply because they are farm workers?

NO SANITARY FACILITIES

Besides, there are some issues that override even the economics. The bad practice of inadequate or no sanitary facilities for workers, toilets in the fields, is an issue of great importance to the workers, for their own personal dignity as well as for the conditions wherein these foodstuffs grow.

Even more critical is the question of the pesticides and chemicals which, we are convinced, are at the base of the increased number of skin afflictions and respiratory problems we are discovering among the field workers. There are many who feel that the protection and welfare of the consumer is also a matter of concern. Yet the growers refuse to talk to the workers about the pesticides and chemicals.

Growers like to convey an image of little family-operated farms of few acres, struggling against great odds to eke out a living from the soil. The 1964 Census of Agriculture shows 81,000 farms in California; 49,000 of them hire no outside labor. So 60 per cent of the farms have no labor and are not involved in this matter. These farms average less than 50 acres and their total acreage is only 5 per cent of California's agricultural land.

However, less than 6 per cent of California's farms constitute 75 per cent of the land! Add to this picture the fact that California agriculture is big business. Gross agricultural income in 1966 was a record \$3.95 billion. Since then that annual figure has grown to exceed \$4 billion. California agriculture and related industries, by their own testimony, account for 33 per cent of the jobs in the State.

Arrayed against this wealth and this power are the farm workers. Their average income is less than \$1400 per year. They are lucky to have a year or two of high school education. The educational attainment level of their children is one of the lowest in the Nation. The health levels of the children and the women is far below national averages. Their housing and living conditions are substandard. Many of them have problems requiring legal assistance; frequently they need medical attention.

So they are trying to do something about it. They are not doing it by seeking charity. They are not begging at the welfare office. They are not, like many of their employers, lobbying the halls of Congress with their gold-plated tin cups asking to be paid for not growing crops. They are trying to do it in the way that millions of other Americans have shown is the right way—organization, unionism, collective bargaining.

If there is any doubt as to how great the American people have reacted to the plight of the farm worker, just remember—only if the boycott were succeeding would the powerful union-hating elements be joining with the growers to crush the farm workers.

MEDIA VIOLENCE AND ITS EFFECTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recently the Monterey Park Californian printed two excellent articles reporting the remarks of actor Don Murray at the seventh annual Edgar Cohn Memorial Lecture Series. At that time Mr. Murray urged a national study of the effects of violence as shown in the mass media. As there is now pending before the House a resolution, which I introduced on January 9, to establish such a study, I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues:

COHN LECTURE SERIES BEGINS: TV GUN-FIGHTER SPEAKS AGAINST MEDIA VIOLENCE

Actor Don Murray will speak out against violence and the manner in which it is depicted in the first program of the seventh annual Edgar Cohn Memorial Lecture Series Sunday night at 7:30 at the Bruggemeyer Memorial Library, 318 S. Ramona Ave.

Murray, who portrays a gun-wielding bounty hunter on the widely acclaimed television program, *The Outcasts*, will discuss "Our Violent Generation." He will emphasize the manner in which violence is portrayed on television, in motion pictures and in printed matter.

He will be introduced by Wayne Kelly, president of the Monterey Park Friends of the Library which sponsors the series of lectures and panel discussions.

Tickets for the five-program series are on sale at the library and by board members of the Friends of the Library. They will also be sold at the library Sunday night. Prices are \$7.50 for a family ticket and \$5 for a series single admission. Tickets for individual programs are \$1.25 for adults and 50 cents for students.

Murray's list of acting credits encompasses the stage, screen and television. He co-starred with Marilyn Monroe in "Bus Stop" and was also featured in "Bachelor Party," "Advise and Consent," "A Hatful of Rain," "The Plainsman," and other films.

His career was halted for some 18 months when he refused to take roles in movies or on TV which he felt glorified violence.

"I finally decided my individual protest had too little effect," he told Hal Humphrey, television columnist, "You have to have a platform of success from which to speak if people are going to follow you, and I didn't have it."

It was then that he took his present role in *The Outcasts*. On the television show, which has received favorable comment from many television reviewers, he is paired with a Negro bounty hunter.

"The Outcasts may be contributing to the violence on TV," he said, "but I believe this is offset by white-Negro relationship."

Murray said he believes the three networks and the League of American Theaters should set up rules on violence, even if this means the end of *The Outcasts*.

Other programs in the lecture series will be two panel discussions and a talk by Art Seidenbaum, Los Angeles Times columnist, on the Generation Gap, and a speech by Reuben Salazar, Los Angeles Times reporter and foreign correspondent, on the emergence of Mexico.

ACTOR CHIDES WASHINGTON ON TV VIOLENCE HEARINGS

Actor Don Murray urged a national study of the effects of reporting violence in the press and portraying it in the entertainment world.

If it is found harmful to the public, it should be subject to censorship, he told more than 100 persons who braved a rainstorm to attend the first program of the seventh annual Edgar Cohn Memorial Lecture Series, which began Sunday night at the Bruggemeyer Memorial Library.

The star of stage, screen and television expressed his views on violence and sex as portrayed in films and television in a lively lecture and question-and-answer period.

He deplored what he called tokenism in Washington where problems are shunted aside rather than attacked, he said. Through committee hearings, politicians, Murray said, try to give the impression that they are attempting to solve problems when in reality they prefer to avoid them.

This tokenism, he insisted, should not be used to determine whether violence as reported and portrayed is harmful to society. A scientific study should be made, he urged. If violence is harmful, censorship should be imposed.

It could mean that violence would continue to be reported in the press, but that the details might be reduced or eliminated. Similarly, plays and movies glorifying violence might be banned. Murray said he did not believe that the public was affected differently by real violence as reported by the press and violence as seen in movie or television drama.

Sex, he said, should continue to be truthfully portrayed in movies. But, Murray said, what often is called sex in movies is really sadism.

Campus revolutions are not in themselves harmful, he asserted. But closing classrooms defeats the purpose of education which outweighs student protest.

Murray said he was puzzled that the vast majority of students is "disinvolved" in the campus unrest, yet it allows a small minority to close a school. He refused to take a position on whether the dissidents on campus were right or wrong because he is an outsider who has not studied the issues.

The lecture series will continue Feb. 16 when a panel of high school students will discuss "What's Wrong With Our Parents?" Tickets can be purchased at the library.

The series is sponsored by the Monterey Park Friends of the Library.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING FOR SEX TEACHERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, according to New York University reports, sex education instructors must qualify by undergoing sensitivity training, perhaps to become desensitized to morality to escape their guilt in using little children as guinea pigs for the new sex revolution.

I not only do not want any of these zombies teaching my children—I will even refuse to let my children associate with their victimized pupils.

Strange that none suggest sex education classes for the mommies and dads who, in turn, could be encouraged to give a healthy explanation of sex to their own children. Or would this restore the American tradition of parental authority and supervision—the real target.

If it were not that this training is being financed by the taxpayers, under the auspices of a large university, the entire matter could be dismissed as a sick, sordid cult.

Are the American people expected to discard the teaching of morality in favor of the teaching of perversion?

Mr. Speaker, I place an Associated Press news release for February 21, at this point in my remarks:

SEX EDUCATION TEACHERS TAKE SENSITIVITY COURSE

NEW YORK.—An anxiety-struck teacher lay on his back in the center of a suburban basement. Eleven teachers sat around him, half crying, their thoughts reaching out to the supine man as he related one heart-breaking story after another.

Finally, the anxiety attack subsided and the teacher returned to his usually composed self as he was rocked like a baby in the arms of the group's instructor, Dr. Tom McGinnis, a New York University psychotherapist.

It was part of a program of sensitivity training, designed to release them from their anxieties and help them to be better teachers of a very sensitive subject, sex education. Eventually they will teach it to equally sensitive pupils, those in elementary schools.

The man who experienced the prostrating self-revelation entered the marathon session displaying a normal demeanor. During the 15 hours that followed, he was broken down by fatigue and the prodding instructor. His areas of self-doubt and fear were exposed and he experienced an overwhelming, cathartic release of memories of terrifying deaths and illnesses. When it was over he felt limp, but purged.

The sensitivity training is a major part of a new course—the nation's first master's degree program for teachers of elementary school sex education.

At the same time the teachers are getting a strong foundation in substantive courses of anatomy and health education. The sensitivity training is aimed at releasing them from their own psychological problems.

"We see sex education not only as understanding where babies come from but how people see themselves," said McGinnis. "Once you get your mask off, people are free to be positive."

As Dr. Marian Hamburg, the founder of the program, explained, no amount of intelligent discussion will compensate for the unconscious statement of a teacher's real feelings.

"Sex education is not an isolated entity," she said, "but part of a person's total entity—how a teacher wears clothes, an old-maidish air, how she relates to the principal. All this figures into the way a teacher relates to pupils."

Now with parents clamoring for sex education in the schools "teachers are experiencing some of the same personal anxieties that the parents are," said Dr. Hamburg.

"Everyone, of course, has somewhere to pass the buck, teachers included," she said. "And their scapegoat is the teacher preparation institution. Their complaint is that they were not prepared to handle sex education."

Dr. Hamburg decided NYU was the place for the buck passing to stop.

Armed with the fact that only eight per cent of the institutions preparing teachers have courses in sex education, she convinced the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to finance fellowships of more than \$4,000 for each of the first 20 students.

The fellows were selected to represent a cross-section of teachers in terms of age, sex, marital status and geographic location. Half are from the New York City area, the others are from all parts of the country.

And more important, said Dr. Hamburg, when the year's work is completed, July 1, their school administrators have agreed to add sex education to the curriculum.

SPANISH DOVER THRIVES ON SELF-IMPROVEMENT

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the concepts of self-help and involvement in programs designed to aid minority groups and the poverty-stricken have become reality in the town of Dover, N.J.—and with spectacular success.

The leaders of the Spanish-speaking community in Dover, which is in my congressional district, have been conducting a broad program of self-help that has resulted in a bright hope for the future for the more than 2,500 Spanish-speaking residents of that town.

Involvement is the key to a large part of the program's success. Actively participating in and supporting the program are various levels of municipal government, schools, churches, and everyday citizens willing to volunteer their time and energies in behalf of those willing to help themselves.

The core of the program is the Dover Neighborhood Center, operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Among its many activities, the center has established a relationship with more than 50 industries in the area with the prime goal of placing newcomers to the community in meaningful employment.

The many areas in which this self-help program is involved—and, in which it has achieved great success—were outlined in an article in the Newark Sunday News of February 23, 1969, by staff writer Robert Mitchell.

I should like to insert this article in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SPANISH DOVER THRIVES ON
SELF-IMPROVEMENT

(By Robert Mitchell)

DOVER.—The large Spanish-speaking community in this Morris County town is an enthusiastic minority with good reason—mutual encouragement.

Self improvement efforts being guided by leaders of the 2,500 Puerto Ricans and several hundred other "Hispanos" here are being matched by help from others in and around Dover in a fashion that is propelling them into being productive citizens with a future.

While Puerto Ricans by the nature of their language problem, economic background and sheer numbers, are the principal beneficiaries of the civic action, the programs are open to all.

The mutual-help program has expanded to involve not just the Office of Economic Opportunity, which is at its core, but also various levels of municipal government, schools, churches and citizens willing to volunteer time and effort in behalf of those willing to help themselves.

ENGLISH CLASS AT LIBRARY

Among latest programs are two at the Dover Free Public Library. One is a class in English composition, complementing a course sponsored at the Dover Adult School by the Board of Education. The other is a new class in preparation for high school equivalency examinations.

Francisco De Jesus of 45 West Blackwell St., director of the Dover Neighborhood Center run by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and D. Stuart Smith Jr. of 297 Perry St., personnel administrator at New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. Laboratories at Murray Hill, are typical of area attitudes.

De Jesus is an energetic 25 year old, perhaps a man who could be considered the unofficial "mayor" of his people. Like any mayor, he has his sights set on a good education, good jobs, fair housing and recreation outlets for his constituents.

"Dover is a nice place to live and we are doing our best through the center to even make it better," De Jesus said. "The big thing is education . . . getting all of our people trained to speak and understand English and getting as many as possible to earn high school diplomas or their equivalent."

BELL EMPLOYEES HELP

That's where the community-minded like Smith step into the picture. Smith is coordinating 27 Bell employees, engineers, mathematicians, accountants, economists—who are voluntarily serving as instructors for five English classes three nights each week to help the Spanish-speaking population learn the language. With each class lasting two hours, that is 30 volunteer man hours each week.

The "school" is held in rooms made available by the First United Methodist church and St. John's Episcopal Church. The volunteer school graduated 44 last year and now has Spanish-speaking people from nine different countries providing an enrollment of 100—most of whom, of course, are from the town's Puerto Rican population.

"Newark and New York waited too long to help people like this and now they can't help enough," De Jesus says. "I don't want that to happen here. I want to be part of this community and do my share and I think if we attack the problems now, we can do something and make all useful before the problems get out of hand like in the big cities."

The center, opened in a Blackwell Street store, has developed a working relationship with about 50 area industries since it was established 19 months ago. It makes its prime role the task of placing newcomers in gainful employment to make all self-supporting.

"I think it is tremendous," De Jesus said.

"When the center was not here, people came from the island and they had no place to go. It's doing a lot of good. Last year we placed about 700 people in different jobs."

Most Dover's Puerto Ricans come from the city of Aguada, hoping to find jobs that are lacking there. They are following in the footsteps of predecessors who first came to this area during World War II to work the truck farms at Great Meadows and the mines around Dover, all knowing work was available even if none could speak English.

"We know they can get better jobs with an education and knowing how to use and talk English," De Jesus said. "One of our biggest problems is keeping boys and girls in school after they reach 16 and their parents want them to go to work to help support large families."

APPROACH TO TEENS

This is where the Neighborhood Center has steered extra effort to help. Education is the theme of its Teen-Age Club where all sessions, including dances, begin with a speaker or educational program and the prime requirement for membership is enrollment in school.

"If they quit school, they have to quit the club," De Jesus said. "Education is everything to them."

Carlos Figueroa, 27, of 79 East McFarlan St., assistant director of the Neighborhood Center and son of the former mayor of Aguada, also is wrapped up in the effort that has the Teen-Age Club mushrooming with 75 members in its few short months. He, too, sees it as a way to encourage education that could lead to the development of leaders and needed professional people from within the Puerto Rican community.

Mayor Edward R. Horan, a recent speaker at a club dance, and other town officials are happy with the fact that club activities also help keep teenagers occupied and off the streets.

Horan, other officials and businessmen also are happy with the fact that all center programs are helping to keep unemployment in town at a bare minimum.

Extra help toward this end comes from the Dover Child Center at Grace Methodist Church, where mothers can leave youngsters between the ages of 3 and 5 to free themselves for employment.

That center, open to all at nominal charges, is operated with funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Inter-Church Group of Mendham and local donations. It currently serves 11 youngsters, and expects many more as its work becomes known.

To bolster spirits and develop community interest, an effort is now being planned to establish a gymnasium for after work exercise and play. Spanish-American Boy Scout Cub Pack 15 is working on a charter issued Jan. 19. A 4-H Club is being organized by Sonya Valenzia of 53 Randolph Ave. and educational trips are run periodically to major points of interest.

What's more, Juan R. Lorenzo of 247 East Blackwell St., a social worker and interpreter in the Dover school system, keeps the Spanish-speaking population interested in and aware of all going on about them with his weekly radio program over Radio Station WRAN. Lorenzo's program, a 90-minute feature since Dec. 1, also includes interviews and educational material each Sunday evening.

BILINGUAL REPORT CARDS

The school system for several years has stressed the second language program, bending over backward to minimize language barriers to equal education for all. Report cards and special notices to parents are bilingual.

The town's special services, again open to all needing them, get heavy use by the Spanish-speaking population. These include medical and dental clinics sponsored by the

Board of Health, as well as fulltime sanitary inspection services.

A long, simmering controversy over housing appears on the way to happy resolution, with a rent subsidy program. Under this, new housing will be available to those about to be displaced by extensive urban renewal which would wipe out the old Dickerson Street area that is now the heart of Spanish Dover.

Summing up, those close to what's going on look with particular pride on whole-community involvement, in which volunteers do so much, and those who are in a paid status render service far beyond the call of duty.

CHRISTMAS PARTY A HIT

They are still talking about the children's Christmas party last December. The prime movers were De Jesus and Figueroa. The OEO paid for food. The Methodist Church of Rockaway and Picatinny Arsenal employees gave toys. The First Methodist Church of Dover provided the location, and its high school Sunday School class members cooked and served the hamburgers and hot dogs.

The payoff: Nearly 200 happy children, mostly from Puerto Rican families, showed up and had the time of their young lives—most of them eating both hot dogs and hamburgers and singing their heads off in both English and Spanish.

BRUCE R. SEAMAN, HAWAII FINALIST IN VFW HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH CONTEST

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the final judging in the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliaries, will be held in the Nation's Capital next week.

This year's finalist for the 50th State is Bruce R. Seaman, student body president of Aiea High School, on the Island of Oahu, and I wish to extend to Bruce warmest congratulations on an excellent speech.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend also the VFW for sponsoring the Voice of Democracy contest and providing the opportunity for young Americans to express their feelings on "Freedom's Challenge," this year's theme. It is my understanding that more than 400,000 high school students throughout the country participated in this year's contest.

It is with considerable pride that I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Bruce's award-winning presentation, which not only speaks well for the youth of Hawaii, but also for the youth of the entire Nation:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Bruce R. Seaman)

Look about you. Everywhere you will see that Americans are demanding more of their government and of their Constitution. Students are demanding freedom of speech in many forms; minority groups are demanding freedom to protest; some citizens are even demanding the freedom to destroy.

But, if you listen more carefully, you can hear, or perhaps feel, another demand. It is

not a demand by Americans, but a demand of Americans. This is the challenge of freedom, a challenge all but lost in the din of protest and of selfish demand. This is a challenge to all Americans and especially to our youth, but it is hard to define.

Thomas Paine attempted a definition in *The Crisis*: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it." This is part of the challenge. To support freedom, we must strengthen our democratic society. We must assert ourselves as individuals. We must think independently and act rationally. We should learn to appreciate our heritage. But this is an oversimplification. There are other, less obvious, aspects to this challenge.

John Gardner, former Cabinet Secretary and now head of the Carnegie Foundation has said: "Part of our problem is how to stay awake on a full stomach. Can we as a people, despite the narcotic of easy living and the endless distractions of a well-heeled society, respond with vigor and courage and dedication to the demands that history has placed upon us?" Freedom thus challenges us to resist the complacency that leads to stagnation. The desire for improvement and the imperative need to actively strive for something better are prerequisites for progress, and we must not lose them.

Furthermore, the challenge of freedom is not limited to our own country. The concept of a government based on liberty is one that is foreign to most people of the world. Freedom is regarded as impractical and undesirable. Americans, therefore, are challenged to show the world that our system is workable. We are called upon, perhaps only by a feeling of moral responsibility, to demonstrate our faith in our ideal of freedom and to show it as a workable and desirable way of life.

Meeting these challenges of freedom requires not demands but dedication. Meeting the challenges does not require the reorganization of our government. Our republican democracy has proven capable of withstanding external and internal challenges for nearly 200 years. The challenge of freedom calls upon us to completely realize the potential of our present system. This can be done only at a personal level. We must first realize that the challenges exist. Then each individual should realize the personal responsibility he has in meeting them.

Youth has the greatest responsibility in this respect. At the time of our lives when we possess an open-mindedness—an ability to learn from the past and still aspire for a better future, we must critically examine our free society and determine our role in insuring its continuation.

This, then, is the challenge of freedom: a personal responsibility to support liberty, to strive to improve our national life, and to prove to the world that a democratic system is a practical and a beneficial system under which to live.

John Gardner says of this challenge: "It is hard for Americans to realize that the survival of the idea for which this nation stands is not inevitable. It may survive if enough Americans care enough."

Freedom challenges us not to demand, but to care.

THE NEW TECHNOLOGY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the new technology should become an invaluable tool for the Congress to employ and thereby reassert its diminished position

vis-a-vis the executive branch, no matter which political party controls the Presidency. Mr. Robert Chartrand, of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service's Science Policy Research Division, has written an extremely lucid paper on the subject of the new technology, including a historical review of scientific management and planning-programming-budgeting system—PPBS. It is most useful and I commend it. I include it in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:

INTRODUCTION

The scope and complexity of the problems confronting the Federal Government of the United States have caused the decision-makers of the executive and legislative branches to search for more effective management mechanisms. The leadership of the Nation, in having to cope with the benefits and problems of the "technological revolution," continues to work to fulfill two basic goals: the maintenance of national security against external and internal pressures, and improvement of the level of subsistence for all members of the population.

During the past quarter-century several significant technological achievements have taken place, altering our way of life and the context within which we must plan for the future. Among these were the development of nuclear energy, the ability to penetrate space, and the advent of automatic data processing. All facets of society were affected by these and other new tools and techniques. Not only did Federal, State, and local governments but the private sector as well have to evaluate their ability to incorporate the new technology into their routine.

Illustrative of the growing concern about technology and society was the passage of Public Law 88-444 which provided for the establishment of a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, comprised of eminent leaders from the public and private sectors. In reflecting on the interplay between technology and the needs of our civilization, the Commission report proffered the philosophy that:

"Technology has the potential, whose beginnings we already see, to realize a persistent human vision: to enlarge the capacities of man and to extend his control over the environment."¹

Because of the rapidity with which new tools and techniques are invented and assimilated, man often has a more tenuous control of his environment. In past eras, change could be accommodated more leisurely. Today, our institutions, mores, and laws are feeling the effect of accelerated change. Since man often cannot adjust quickly enough to prevent harmful disruption, balances of power or public program responsibility may be unsettled. In this environment and with the complexities manifest in such a situation has emerged the so-called "systems approach."

What is the systems approach? While there are many definitions, a succinct statement might say simply that it is a method for considering a problem area as a totality, with procedural guidelines established that will maximize performance-cost efficiency after analyzing various alternatives. Inherent in the utilization of the systems approach is the availability of information on priorities. This information, whether narrative in form or of statistical content, is an absolute prerequisite for the decision-maker.

The Federal Government has seized the initiative in grasping the systems approach and applying it to real world problems. Lessons learned in industry as long ago as the

Footnotes at end of speech.

late nineteenth century have been restudied and adapted for agency use. The man-machine techniques and human procedures integral to systems analysis and operations research have been augmented in the last two decades by the creation of new "tools," evidenced in the development of data processing equipment. Legislative branch perception and utilization of the new technology will be discussed within the context of executive branch development of a working, multi-agency PPB System.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: BEGINNINGS IN INDUSTRY

In the beginning, a man named Frederick W. Taylor possessed the conceptual capability to theorize and then put into practice many of his ideas about improving human performance in a given work environment. Even more importantly, he recognized the wrenching effort which any such change had on human elements of the system: manager, foreman, worker. The time studies undertaken by Taylor and companion efforts by Frank and Lillian Gilbreth in motion study analysis proved to be of inestimable value to industry and the Nation as a whole.² It should be noted that Taylor's emphasis on creating an organization element dedicated to operational analysis, while much maligned in those early years, finally was comprehended and made an integral part of the corporate structure.

The first recorded example of applying the principles of scientific management to government operations at the local level was in 1940 when Phillip Murray, head of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Morris L. Cooke, former director of the Department of Public Works in Philadelphia, prepared a report entitled "Organized Labor and Production," in which the responsibilities of management and labor in striving for optimum productivity were identified.³

While the management of production efforts received primary emphasis, the focus was broadened to include sales, engineering, and the financial activities of the corporation. With profit as a motive and corporate performance as a basis for evaluation, planners and budgeteers designed, tested, and sometimes abandoned such prediction and review mechanisms as trend lines, economic graphs, statistical charts and synoptic narratives, general studies, and rudimentary intrasystem analyses. A number of powerful companies such as General Motors, DuPont, and Westinghouse applied some of the new techniques in the operations and program budgeting areas. Executives began to view the full range of line and staff activities as interrelated elements of the corporate whole.

The outbreak of World War II brought many changes. The use of military technology (e.g., radar) caused British scientists to reexamine existing ways for designing, testing, and implementing new systems. Interdisciplinary teams were assembled and their performances thoroughly assessed. "Operational research" gradually was accepted and applied to an increasing number of areas by Americans, Canadians, and British alike. A vital by-product was the training of significant numbers of analytical personnel.

Peacetime reconstruction and reconversion brought many opportunities for applying skills acquired and techniques polished to private sector projects. New problems beckoned, and the scientists and engineers often were encouraged to test new tools and techniques. The mid-forties also witnessed the creation of prototype computers. Increasingly, these devices afforded the pioneering systems analysts and operations research specialists with capacious memories, undreamed of manipulative flexibility and speed, and a promise of even more miraculous performances to come. So great was the ability of

these equipments to store, correlate, and retrieve selectively both narrative and statistical data, however, that claims concerning their ability to "think" were forthcoming which could not be substantiated.

Quantification of essential information may be useful, and much has been said about the proper structuring and titling of such data. It must be fully understood that computers and quantitative methods are not, in and of themselves, decision-makers. Perhaps more accurately they have been termed "aids in illuminating the issues."⁴

Far-sighted individuals in the Federal Government saw a need for a new type of institution in the period of spectacular innovation and implementation following the Second World War. Defense planning required long-term, complex, often innovative studies of high consequence to the Nation and the world. In this setting the RAND Corporation was founded, in 1946, and has produced such national figures in planning, programming, and budgeting as Charles J. Hitch, Alain C. Enthoven, and Henry S. Rowen. Their impact on the national scene is exemplified by the establishment of PPBS in the executive branch and continuing emphasis on improving authorization and appropriations functions within the Congress.

PLANNING-PROGRAMMING-BUDGETING IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The systems technology which had been nurtured in the academic and industrial arenas became an acknowledged part of Federal management during the administration of President John F. Kennedy. The Department of Defense (DoD) had need of new and improved means of solving the multitudinous problems within the aegis of that establishment. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara was acquainted with the proven utility of systematic quantitative analysis in industry, and immediately took steps to apply the tools and techniques to departmental activity areas. Charles J. Hitch was appointed Comptroller, and was vested with the authority and responsibility for converting DoD practices and procedures to a more up-to-date mode.

While purists often argued about the differences between "systems analysis" and "operations research," Hitch chose not to, and set forth this often quoted definition of the former term:

"Systems analysis at the national level . . . involves a continuous cycle of defining military objectives, designing alternative systems to achieve those objectives, evaluating these alternatives in terms of their effectiveness and cost, questioning the objectives and the other assumptions underlying the analysis, opening new alternatives, and establishing new military objectives."⁵

"The Planning-Programming-Budgeting System" (PPBS) was developed featuring four distinctive characteristics:

1. It focuses on identifying the fundamental objectives of the Government and then relating all activities to these (regardless of organizational placement);
2. Future year implications are explicitly identified;
3. All pertinent costs are considered; and
4. Systematic analysis of alternatives is performed. This is the crux of PPBS. It involves (a) identification of Government objectives, (b) explicit, systematic identification of alternative ways of carrying out the objectives, (c) estimation of the total cost implications of each alternative, and (d) estimation of the expected results of each alternative.⁶

Although there were instances of human reluctance and procedural barriers, DOD elements increasingly incorporated systems techniques into many facets of their operations. Finally, it was determined at the high-

est level of Government that PPBS should be placed in effect in selected executive agencies and establishments. Figure 1 presents a listing of agencies required, and those encouraged, to establish a formal Planning-Programming-Budgeting System. This was accomplished in October of 1965 by a directive from President Johnson to the Bureau of the Budget, which issued Bulletin No. 66-3.⁷

FIGURE 1.—Originally appeared as exhibit 1 in Bulletin No. 66-3 to the heads of executive departments and establishments

A. Agencies To Be Covered by the Preview

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of Defense—separate submission for:
Military functions (including Civil Defense).
Corps of Engineers, Civil functions.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Department of Housing and Urban Development.
Department of Interior.
Department of Justice.
Department of Labor.
Post Office Department.
Department of State (excluding Agency for International Development).
Treasury Department.
Agency for International Development.
Atomic Energy Commission.
Central Intelligence Agency.
Federal Aviation Agency.
General Services Administration.
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
National Science Foundation.
Office of Economic Opportunity.
Peace Corps.
United States Information Agency.
Veterans Administration.

B. Other Agencies for Which a Formal Planning-Programming-Budgeting System is Encouraged

Civil Aeronautics Board.
Civil Service Commission.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Federal Communications Commission.
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
Federal Power Commission.
Federal Trade Commission.
Interstate Commerce Commission.
National Capital Transportation Agency.
National Labor Relations Board.
Railroad Retirement Board.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
Selective Service System.
Small Business Administration.
Smithsonian Institution.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Early in 1966, a Supplement to Bulletin No. 66-3⁸ was promulgated which delineated the procedures to be followed in implementing PPBS. Two forms were identified as essential to the success of PPBS: the Program and Financial Plan, and the Program Memorandum. The Program and Financial Plan provides a listing of program outputs—these could be "services" or "equipment"—and program inputs, which are denoted as items of cost or related financial data. The Program Memorandum contains detailed narrative and statistical data on each program identified in the Program and Financial Plan, and is issued on an annual basis. Bulletin No. 68-2⁹ was issued July 18, 1967, replacing Bulletin No. 66-3 and its supplement, and provided additional direction to departmental heads in implementing PPBS.

Strenuous efforts have been made to orient and educate managers, staff, and line personnel in the Executive Branch elements regarding the role and characteristics of PPBS. The United States Civil Service Commission sponsors a continuing series of semi-

nars for selected personnel, and individual agencies undertake special in-house training. Featured in the courses are a presentation of the origins of program budgeting—in the War Production Board in 1942,¹⁰ and as noted in industry—and the day-to-day problems faced by PPBS personnel who are dedicated to making the new system work.

A useful adjunct to the utilization of management science techniques within the Federal framework has been the extensive acquisition of automatic data processing equipment by various Executive Branch components. The June 30, 1967 computer inventory indicates 3,000 units;¹¹ ten years earlier the total was 160.¹² Procurement and operating expenses for the Federal ADP equipment during the fiscal year 1967 approximated 1.2 billion dollars.¹³

CONGRESSIONAL VIEWS OF PPBS

Although the promotion of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System has received a full measure of recognition within the executive branch, interest in the systems approach has been modest in the legislative branch.

Perhaps the first formal acknowledgment of the importance of PPBS by a Congressional entity took place during the hearings of the Special Subcommittee on the Utilization of Scientific Manpower (Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, chairman) of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in May, 1966. In connection with S. 430, the Scientific Manpower Utilization Act, Senator Nelson sought to draw upon the experience of Alain C. Enthoven, DOD Assistant Secretary for Systems Analysis, and Henry S. Rowen, Assistant Director, U.S. Bureau of the Budget. In referring to the significance of PPBS, Senator Nelson noted that lessons could be learned from the functioning of the new system, and that—

"The problems faced by this Nation at the State, regional, and national level in the field of education, welfare, conservation, transportation, pollution, urban planning, and land use control . . . are certainly no less urgent or complex than the problems faced by the Defense Department."¹⁴

The testimony of Messrs. Enthoven and Rowen reinforced the belief of the Special Subcommittee that selected techniques and systems design concepts developed within the PPBS context could be useful in other problem areas.

Congressional concern regarding the criteria and procedures used in expending research and development funds, and more than incidentally the growing impact of PPBS, was reflected in the 1967 report entitled "Federal Research and Development Programs: the Decisionmaking Process," prepared by the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. The report noted that the defense, space, and atomic energy developmental activities have drawn heavily on systems analysis and systems engineering. While mathematical techniques and computers have been used in many instances, there are decided limitations to these aids. Charles Hitch and others stressed that: ". . . There is nothing inherent in the programming system [of defense] or in systems analysis that calls for down-grading military judgment or for relying on computers for anything other than computation."¹⁵

Also active in conducting exploratory hearings in the PPBS area was the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. In opening the hearings in August of 1967, chairman Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington stated that ". . . our Senate subcommittee has had a continuing interest in the role of budgetary process in helping plan and control national security policy."¹⁶ He then went on to say that the subcommittee could assist in a "frank stock-

Footnotes at end of speech.

taking of the benefits and costs of the planning-programming-budgetary system."¹⁷ Lengthy testimony was presented by Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Dr. Enthoven, and proved useful in providing explicit responses to the questions of the subcommittee on matters of PPBS policy, control, evaluation criteria, and individual agency experience.

Five committee prints were prepared by the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations dealing with various aspects of "Planning-Programming-Budgeting: These were published during 1967 and 1968, and were entitled: "Official Documents," "Initial Memorandum," "Selected Comment," "PPBS and Foreign Affairs," and "Budget Bureau Guidelines of 1968."

In September of 1967, the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee convened a series of hearings entitled "The Planning-Programming-Budgeting System: Progress and Potentials." The chairman, Senator William E. Proxmire of Wisconsin, described the concern of his group in improving management in government. Noting that Federal components are responsible for handling approximately 175 billion dollars annually, he went on to say:

"Certainly at a time when approximately 30 percent of our national income flows through the public sector, it is of the utmost importance that our policymakers be armed with the best possible tools for evaluating the effectiveness of our public programs and expenditures."¹⁸

It was pointed out that the intrinsic worth of PPBS is open to controversy, with proponents of the system claiming "that for the first time it provides decision-makers with a rational basis for choosing between alternative policies" while critics "view PPBS advocates as a new breed of technocrat who think the computer can take the politics out of decision-making."¹⁹ The hearings featured testimony by representatives of such civilian agencies as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. State and local applications of PPBS—e.g., Wisconsin, New York City, and Vermont—were discussed, and future applications of the PPB approach were noted by government and university witnesses.

There are increasing signs that the members of the Congress are becoming more and more aware of the impact of the systems technology on fiscal planning and other critical activities within the private sector, as well as its effect on sub-Federal governmental groups. A number of respected leaders in the public sector are writing and speaking about the responsibility of business, industry, and the universities for further introducing and experimenting with new methods and devices in such public problem areas as transportation planning, pollution control, and urban renewal. Also, a realization is developing on the part of the Nation's leadership that the computer and its ancillary devices, the mathematical models, the charts and other manifestations of the systematic approach, can serve a purpose, but the ultimate responsibility resides with the human who must make the judgments. Dr. Donald N. Michael underscored this position when he said:

"In all, top leadership in many organizations will find that while the computer relieves them of minor burdens, it will enormously increase the demands on them to wrestle with the moral and ethical consequences of the policies they choose and implement."²⁰

Congressmen and executive branch decision-makers alike have become cognizant that the unprecedented pressures of our age demand imaginative and forceful corrective action. The ultimate effect of PPBS on Con-

gressional authorization and appropriation functions will not be known fully for some time to come, but a state of readiness is required for all concerned.

SUMMARY

From its origins in the last century in private industry, the systems approach has evolved in many environments and now appears in many forms. Private industry gradually learned, through time and motion studies, to revamp production procedures, and subsequently applied the new thinking to management planning, engineering, and marketing operations. In the period prior to World War II, military planners identified the need for different, better developmental techniques. From that point in time forward, systems technology has been employed heavily in defense and space activities.

Within the United States Government, the careful delineation of decision options and the use of structured logic have been employed upon occasion during the past several decades. It was not until the early 1960's, however, that a full-fledged effort was made within the Federal establishment to utilize the systems approach. The success of the Department of Defense in the early 1960's in developing a Planning-Programming-Budgeting System resulted in a 1965 Presidential directive causing numerous other executive branch elements to adopt formal PPBS guidelines and procedures.

Acceptance of the Federal Planning-Programming-Budgeting System has continued to increase with the passage of time and the accrual of experience by the participants. With the training of significant numbers of agency personnel at all grade levels, understanding of the objectives and procedures of PPBS has been enhanced, and the role of the new system as a contributor to efficiency is accepted. Finally, there is an increased awareness that the new series of national tasks and problems require precision planning and budgeting, and that these can be achieved through the PPBS operation.

It is now recognized by agency program specialists and Congressional staff personnel responsible for handling authorization and appropriations information that the new tools and techniques can be useful. The multifaceted systems approach offers many opportunities for conceptualizing alternative solutions to a given problem. Some of the techniques and man-machines procedures are quite simple, others more sophisticated.

The selection of innovative mechanisms cannot be performed without a careful scrutiny of all the requirements of all categories of system users. The key decisions to be made by Congressmen and heads of executive departments are based upon requisite information that has been collected, filtered, structured, collated, and processed according to pre-delineated guidelines. This information then is considered in the light of national goals and other non-technical considerations by the decision-maker. It is within this operational framework that the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System has proven in many instances to be a valuable asset to the leadership of the Nation.

FOOTNOTES

¹ National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. *Technology and the American economy*, v. 1, Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., February 1966, p. 73.

² Barnes, Ralph M. *Motion and time study*. London, John Wiley & Sons, 1955, p. 12-16. Also see Taylor, F. W. *The principles of scientific management*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1911, 77 p.

³ Niebel, Benjamin W. *Motion and time study*. London, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1955, p. 8.

⁴ Novick, David. *Origin and history of program budgeting*. Santa Monica, the RAND Corporation, October 1966, p. 9.

⁵ Hitch, Charles J. Plans, programs, and budgets in the Department of Defense. *In Operations research*, January-February, 1963, p. 8.

⁶ Hatry, Harry P. and John F. Cotton. Program planning for state, county, city, Washington, State-Local Finances Project of the George Washington University, January 1967, p. 15.

⁷ Executive Office of the President. Bureau of the Budget. Planning-programming-budgeting. Bulletin No. 66-3 to the heads of executive departments and establishments. Washington, October 12, 1965, 13 p.

⁸ Executive Office of the President. Bureau of the Budget. Planning-Programming-Budgeting. Supplement to Bulletin No. 66-3, Washington, February 21, 1966, 31 p.

⁹ Executive Office of the President. Bureau of the Budget. Bulletin No. 68-2 to the heads of executive departments and establishments: Planning-Programming-Budgeting (PPB), Washington, July 18, 1967, 25 p.

¹⁰ Novick, *op. cit.*, p. 2-5.

¹¹ Executive Office of the President. Bureau of the Budget. Statement of Phillip S. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the Subcommittee on Government Activities, Committee on Government Operations, on data processing management in government. Washington, July 18, 1967, p. 8.

¹² Executive Office of the President. Bureau of the Budget. Inventory of the automatic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. Washington, July 1966, Chart 1, p. 7.

¹³ Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget. Statement of Phillip S. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

¹⁴ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Special Subcommittee on the Utilization of Scientific Manpower. Scientific manpower utilization, 1965-66. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee (89th Cong., 1st sess., May 17, 1966), p. 145. [Remarks of Senator Gaylord Nelson].

¹⁵ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs. Federal research and development programs: the decision making process. Thirty-fourth report by the Committee on Government Operations (89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966). House report no. 1664, p. 7. [Quoting C. J. Hitch].

¹⁶ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations. Planning-programming-budgeting. Hearings before the Subcommittee (90th Cong., 1st sess., August 23, 1967), p. 1. [Remarks of Senator Henry M. Jackson].

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ U.S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee. Subcommittee on Economy in Government. The Planning-programming-budgeting system: progress and potentials. Hearings before the subcommittee (90th Cong., 1st sess., September 14, 1967), p. 1. [Remarks of Senator William E. Proxmire].

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 1-2.

²⁰ Michael, Donald N. Some long-range implications of computer technology for human behavior in organizations. *In The American behavioral scientist*, v. 9, April 1966, p. 35.

DEPLOYMENT OF SENTINEL ABM BUYS VALUABLE TIME FOR PEACEFUL NEGOTIATION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the pending controversy regarding deployment of

a Sentinel ABM system deserves the earnest attention of all Members of the Congress.

Our first responsibility as National Legislators is to provide adequately for the national defense, including, of course, defense against enemy nuclear attack.

While extensive research and development have been carried on, the decision to deploy a Sentinel ABM system recognizes the real threat of a surprise Chinese nuclear attack, of which the Red Chinese would be capable in the mid-1970's.

More than a year ago, the Department of Defense recommended deployment of the Sentinel ABM system, a decision in which the Congress has concurred. Questions regarding the location of the 15 projected bases have revived the issue of the efficacy and wisdom of such a nuclear defense system.

An objective discussion of this subject appeared in the February 9, 1969, issue of the Chicago Sun Times. This authoritative article is outlined by Prof. Lawrence H. O'Neill, a professor of electrical engineering at Columbia University.

Professor O'Neill's article emphasizes that a Sentinel ABM system can be effective for a generation or more against Chinese offensive nuclear weapons launched from the Chinese mainland.

Professor O'Neill's objective discussion of this subject of great current interest is as follows:

THE WEAPONS RACE—BUYING TIME
(By Lawrence H. O'Neill)

I am an engineer by education and background and I have had a great deal of experience with the military technology of the United States. But before I was an engineer, I was a human being, as indeed I still am and it is impossible to contemplate the proliferation of nuclear arms throughout the world exemplified so ominously by the Chinese acquisition of such arms without feeling the deepest concern.

We engineers and the military people who direct us and the scientists who furnish us basic knowledge can offer mankind, at best, a sequence of palliatives that reduce the dangers of nuclear war to some unknowable extent but we cannot put an impenetrable shield over the heads of man.

During the years of Soviet and American standoff, the Soviet government and our own have each acquired a nuclear arsenal and systems of weapons delivery which assure that if either suffered a nuclear attack, the victim could impose unacceptable damage in a retaliatory strike upon the original aggressor. We believe that this situation of mutual deterrence has been an important factor in preventing the use of nuclear weapons in war during all of the turbulent years since 1945.

We have made it, in the understatement of several millennia, "irrational" for the United States or the Soviet Union to attack the other with nuclear weapons. The possession of those arsenals of retaliatory weapons has also had the effect of causing the two great powers to move with great caution and restraint in matters of vital interest to the other.

With passing of the years, a kind of almost comfortable acceptance of our relationship with another, generally hostile, nuclear armed power has occurred. The passage of time has created some confidence that our situation is stable, that inhuman as it is to deter each other with threatened mutual destruction, neither power is likely to do the things that will bring such destruction about.

The imminence of China's possessing a small but significant force of nuclear armed

missiles, and conceivably aircraft, changes the situation quite substantially and changes it for the worse. We and the Soviets have each learned to live prudently in the presence of the other's power of destruction. As the number of participants in such a process increases, the chances for blunders or dangerous adventures increase. Moreover, the logic of the deterrence process becomes much more complicated as the number of participants increases.

Solving the increasingly complex problems arising from the existence of three great nuclear forces is a great need of our time. Technology is only peripherally involved in the problem. Essentially, the problem is a political one. Its ideal solution is obvious but seemingly tragically unreachable very soon. That solution, of course, is to replace the processes of threats and armed confrontations by a reasonably just and viable system of law accepted and obeyed by all nations.

In the meantime, military technology and the industry that applies it can help to buy time to be used in solving the deterrence problem. In using military technology in this way, however, it is important to avoid steps that might trigger an uncontrolled arms race ending in catastrophe.

As I see it, the United States is, and for the foreseeable future will remain, invulnerable to a Chinese ICBM attack. I believe that the Sentinel system which is soon to be deployed (Sec. of Defense Laird said Thursday the project is being reviewed), * * * a missile attack upon the United States. I believe that for some years, perhaps three to five after the Chinese first deploy a missile force—assuming, as is by no means certain, that they deploy a force of intercontinental range—the Sentinel will be able to intercept and destroy every, I said every, Chinese weapon launched against the United States. I expect that in a subsequent period of about five years technically feasible and practically achievable advances in the technology applied in Sentinel will sustain its ability to destroy all Chinese weapons that might be launched against us, even though the Chinese employ penetration aids in their force.

In the long run, of course, as Chinese weapons technology progresses and their industrial base expands, the weapons-dominated part of the strategic relationship to China will become similar to that with the Soviet Union. If we are fortunate by that time, perhaps 20 years in the future, the governments of the world will have devised reliable ways of controlling nuclear force which may be quite common.

Thus, in my judgment, Sentinel will provide reliable protection of the United States from Chinese missile attack for a decade or somewhat longer. But it obviously will not be able to do more than that. The problem that the United States will encounter—that China can threaten our allies or friends with nuclear attack—will not be solved by Sentinel.

Moreover, Sentinel tends to complicate our efforts to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic offensive and defensive forces. Sentinel is designed to protect the United States against missile attack using limited numbers and rather simple technology. It is not very effective and is not intended to be very effective against a massive attack employing advanced penetration aids such as the Soviet Union could make.

Nevertheless, it will be a missile defense system in being. It will, I think, inevitably tend to force Soviet planners to increase the size or penetration capability or both of their forces. Moreover, they will be aware of the possibility that Sentinel could be improved to reduce the ability of the Soviet strategic offensive force to attack the United States.

One lesson stands out clearly from our experience with the technology of modern strategic offensive and defensive nuclear

weapons. These weapons are far too dangerous to exist in the same world in which men live. Ridding ourselves of them is an objective rivalled in importance perhaps only by the need to bring the population and resources of the world into better balance.

The great enemy of progress toward elimination of the dangers of nuclear arms in China, in the Soviet Union, in the United States or anywhere else in the world is simplism.

We must not think, as some do, that evil men or moral dullards took us to where we are because they were contemptuous of human values. On the contrary, we have armed to protect in our society the finest political achievements of mankind, the institutions that most strictly proclaim our recognition and respect for man's special dignity.

It is the tragedy of our race that we have found nothing else adequately capable to protect our institutions. To believe that our tragedy is the result of conscious evil or moral torpor is to accept what is obviously not true that our fears are paranoia and the finest institutions conceived by man are not, in fact, endangered.

Neither must we think that in weapons we can find ultimate security and justice. Weapons can serve but one rational purpose to provide to men of good will the time they need to rid the world of weapons.

A LEGISLATOR FOR ALL SEASONS

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have read with appreciation and with pride the very fine comments of Bruce Cossaboom which appeared in the Armed Forces Journal of February 15 about our distinguished and able colleague from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT. This fine statement contains the thoughts of a great many people who are privileged to know Congressman BENNETT and to share in the regard expressed for the high caliber of his work and character. I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A LEGISLATOR FOR ALL SEASONS

If Congress were composed of 535 Charles E. Bennetts, Capitol Hill would be a constituent's dream but a muckraker's nightmare—a monotonous scandal-free hotbed of integrity, industry, ability, and dedication to the best interests of the American public.

One-time Eagle Scout, Sunday School teacher, successful lawyer, amateur historian, WWII hero, and first Chairman of the first ethics committee in the House of Representatives, Congressman Bennett is one of the most admired and respected legislators on the Hill. He personifies "The Case For Congress," if anyone does.

This is undoubtedly the reason why the 58-year old Representative from Florida's Third District since 1949 (and sixth-ranked Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee) was selected by Committee Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (D-SC) to take on one of the most significant jobs to be given any Congressman in many a day—Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Sea Power. Under the broad charter of responsibility given the Bennett panel by Chairman Rivers, moreover, the group may yet come up with the solution to the "U.S. Maritime Mess"—the term now is almost a cliché.

Representative Bennett accepted the task with characteristic modesty, commenting

that its sheer magnitude and complexity made him feel "humble and inadequate."

The most industrious researcher, however, would be hard pressed to find someone with less cause for feeling "humble and inadequate." A far better description of Bennett appeared last fall on one of his reelection campaign fliers: "A man of action who gets things done."

As with everything else in his life, Bennett takes his job as a Congressman with deadly earnestness. Possessor of a prodigious ability to work, he now holds the all-time voting record for a member of Congress, not having missed a roll-call vote in the House for nearly 18 years (the string started 4 June 1951).

He achieved this feat, moreover, despite the fact that he must walk with a cane as a result of polio contracted as an Army captain leading Philippine guerrillas during the War. (In the spring of 1968, to make matters worse, Bennett suffered a broken leg, but continued on crutches to make all roll-calls—much to the chagrin, perhaps, of more able-legged but absentee colleagues.)

Bennett's attendance record, moreover, is matched by performance. He has compiled an impressive list of legislative achievements in both the military and nonmilitary fields:

In the last Congress he was instrumental in getting passed bills requiring a long-needed codification of the UCMJ, and creating a Judge Advocate General Corps for the Navy.

In earlier sessions, he fathered the hostile fire pay statute, and saw the Pentagon adopt two others of his many legislative proposals—educational and physical training for draft rejects (Project 100,000), and riot control training for the National Guard.

BUCHER OVERCAME MANY OBSTACLES TO GAIN NAVAL COMMAND

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out many times regarding the handling of the *Pueblo* matter.

I have received hundred of letters from Nebraskans and others who feel as I do that the present proceedings have the appearance of an attempt to let the *Pueblo's* captain take the rap for higher officials who sent him on a mission with an ill-equipped vessel and without proper contingency planning.

Mr. Speaker, we in Nebraska claim that man, Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher, as our own—one who overcame many obstacles to gain command in the U.S. Navy.

The following article, which was written by Arnold Garson and appeared in the January 29 issue of the *Omaha World-Herald*, gives an idea of just what this man, known as Pete to his friends is made of. I commend it to your attention:

IN 4 SHORT YEARS AT BOYS TOWN PETE BUCHER ESTABLISHED A HOMETOWN

Officials at St. Joseph's Orphanage in Culesac, Idaho, spent seven months trying to get young Lloyd Mark Bucher admitted to Boys Town, where they said he would be happiest.

Commander Bucher, skipper of the United States intelligence ship *Pueblo*, now is the central figure in a Naval court of inquiry investigating the vessel's capture by North Korea last January. Bucher's statements at the inquiry have aroused interest and sym-

pathy throughout the country. This is the story of his years in Omaha.

Records show that Bucher arrived at Boys Town September 25, 1941, at the age of 14.

Four years later, when he left Boys Town to enlist in the Navy, Bucher had left indelible impressions on classmates and instructors. And Boys Town had provided Bucher with friends he would always stay close to.

"It was his only real home," said Msgr. Nicholas H. Wegner, Boys Town director.

Classmate Harlan Vogt, who now lives at 11925 Skylark Drive, remembers Bucher as a gregarious youth who displayed leadership abilities almost from the day he arrived.

STOOD OUT

Vogt said Bucher served as a class vice-president, as a "commissioner" in charge of a residence hall, and as a battalion commander in Boys Town's short-lived ROTC program.

"His congeniality made him stand out. He was well-liked and others followed him easily," Vogt said.

Maurice (Skip) Palrang, who began coaching football at Boys Town in 1943, the first year Bucher was eligible for the varsity team, described Bucher as a "great team leader."

"He was enthusiastic and peppery and one helluva football player," Palrang said. "He was the finest downfield blocker I've had in 26 years at Boys Town. The only man who came close to him in downfield blocking was Glen Heppburn," the Omaha Mustang who died last fall.

Bucher has credited Palrang as having the greatest single influence on him at Boys Town. "He, more than any other single individual, has contributed to my outlook on life, my compassion for other human beings, my desire to win, my desire to make America come out on top," Bucher said recently.

Palrang recalls one game when left tackle Bucher, who stood 5 feet, 10 inches and weighed about 160 pounds, threw downfield blocks that enabled Boys Town to get four touchdowns on long runs.

The coach also recalls that Bucher was one of the few members of the 1943 team who understood the Chicago Bears T-formation which Palrang tried to install at Boys Town.

CHOKED UP

Monsignor Wegner said that years later Bucher would become quite emotional when recalling his Boys Town days.

One such occasion was the Boys Town athletic banquet in 1958. Bucher, then in the submarine service, was invited to speak.

Henry Straka, Boys Town public relations director, recalled the event: "For quite a long moment, he just stood there without saying anything. He seemed choked up at the idea of being called back here to speak."

Monsignor Wegner recalled a similar experience in May, 1967, when the *Pueblo* was commissioned at Bremerton, Wash.: "He broke down when he began talking about Boys Town. He tried to express his gratitude publicly. It got the best of him."

Boys Town file No. 03448, marked "Bucher, Lloyd (Pete)," reveals that Bucher got average grades in high school. He barely passed beginning Latin, but excelled in mechanical drawing.

Bucher has said he adopted the nickname "Pete" because he was impressed with Pete Pihos, an all-American football player at the University of Indiana in 1943 and later an all-pro end with the Philadelphia Eagles. Bucher's friends have known him only as Pete.

Bucher left Boys Town to join the Navy on October 2, 1945, during his senior year in high school. He earned his high school diploma in 1947, through correspondence.

He was discharged as a quartermaster second class in 1948 and returned to his native

Idaho, where he took a job as a bartender and coached midget baseball and football in his spare time.

CONSTRUCTION JOB

By the spring of 1949, he was back in Omaha, working on construction jobs and planning to enter the University of Nebraska in the fall.

On a 1949 visit to Boys Town, Bucher renewed acquaintance with Charles T. Mitchell, a former Boys Town classmate who has worked in the publications shop at Boys Town since graduating.

"We used to get together about every week end until he started school. We'd go to baseball games—the old Omaha Cardinals—or to high school football games," Mitchell said.

"I used to watch him work sometimes. He looked like an octopus when it was busy," Mitchell recalled.

In the late summer of 1949, Rose Delores Rohling and her oldest sister, Angela, came to Omaha from their home in Jefferson City, Mo.

The Rohling sisters found lodging with Mr. and Mrs. Fred W. Martin who had advertised a room for rent. The sisters got jobs as long-distance telephone operators with Northwestern Bell Telephone Company.

Mrs. Jeanette Maier, now of 2409 North Fifteenth Street, also worked at Northwestern Bell. She helped arrange a blind date for Rose and Pete, who was a friend of some boys she knew.

LOVED SCIENCE

Pete and Rose began dating regularly. They were married in a Catholic church in Jefferson City, Mo., in June, 1950, and moved into an apartment in Omaha at 3844 Hamilton Street. Pete continued to commute to his classes at N.U., while Rose kept her job at Northwestern Bell.

Charles Mitchell got married the next year and the Mitchells and the Buchers got together often on week ends. They played hearts, bridge, cribbage, but mostly just talked, Mitchell said.

"Pete loved to talk about science, if any one would listen. One night he got to talking about how industrious ants are and he went on 'til 3 o'clock in the morning," Mitchell said.

In 1952, shortly before their first son was born, the Buchers moved to Lincoln.

Bucher was graduated from N.U. in June, 1953, and was commissioned as an ensign in the Navy through the ROTC program. Naval ROTC and the G.I. bill had helped pay the costs of Bucher's college education.

Bucher's first assignment was to technical school in Glenview, Ill. He was then assigned to the USS McKinley.

In 1955, he attended submarine school and later served on three submarines: the *Besugo*, *Calman* and *Ronquill*.

Bucher spent about half his time at sea during the late 1950's and the 1960's. His family made its home in California during these years. The Buchers now have two sons, Mark Stephen, 16, and Michael Francis, 14.

In January, 1967, Bucher was sent to Seattle, Wash., to oversee the conversion of the *Pueblo* from an Army freighter to a sophisticated electronic surveillance ship.

Then a lieutenant commander, Bucher told his friends the ship was to be used for geological surveys and that he was well-suited for its command, having studied geology at N.U.

When Monsignor Wegner attended the commissioning ceremonies, he was told by an admiral that it was a one-in-three-thousand chance that Bucher—a man who had not attended the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.—would get such a command.

Bucher was born September 1, 1927, in Pocatello, Idaho. His mother died at childbirth and he was put in the care of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. Bucher.

The Buchers adopted Lloyd February 27, 1928. Mrs. Bucher died about a year later. Lloyd was sent to a children's home in Boise, Idaho, where he lived about three years, before going to St. Joseph's in Culesac.

Fred Martin, now of 8407 Pacific Street, met Pete Bucher in 1949.

"I remember thinking what a dignified fellow he was when I met him. He was slow and deliberate in everything he discussed. He's not an impulsive type of man and he weighs things carefully before taking action."

MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY AND THE HAZARD OF OVERSHOOTING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent resolution by the Michigan United Conservation Clubs regarding the Migratory Bird Treaty and the hazard of overshooting and excessively liberalized waterfowl hunting privileges for Indians and Eskimos granted by the Dominion of Canada.

I also insert an excellent article appearing in the fine outdoor publication, "Outdoor Life," setting forth with great clarity the reason for the resolution and the hazard to our continental migratory waterfowl resource from possible unwise liberalization of shooting privileges for natives of the far north.

Vigorous action by all persons interested in our great continental resource of migratory waterfowl is needed to prevent this unwise step, properly feared by conservationists in America, from becoming a reality.

The resolution and article follow:

MICHIGAN UNITED CONSERVATION CLUBS, RESOLUTION REGARDING MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY

Whereas it has come to our attention through an article in the February issue of Outdoor Life magazine entitled "Conspiracy in Canada?" that the Cabinet of the federal government of Canada now has under consideration an Order in Council that would grant greatly liberalized waterfowl hunting privileges to all Indians and Eskimos; and

Whereas enactment of such an order would violate and seriously undermine the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916 between Canada and the United States, the cornerstone on which all waterfowl conservation programs in both countries rest; and

Whereas such action would mean a return to spring shooting and would have disastrous consequences for waterfowl populations; and

Whereas Canadian natives not living in remote and undeveloped areas have no need for such liberalized hunting rules; and

Whereas the Federal action has been considered in secrecy, without adequate consultation between the Cabinet, Provincial governments and conservation organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of Michigan United Conservation Clubs strongly urges the Congress, the wildlife officials and the State Department of this country to take prompt action seeking to delay until full and open discussions can be held, and also urges that the proper authorities of our Government make known their opposition to any action on the part of the Canadian government that will result in unilateral abrogation of the Migratory Bird Treaty.

[From Outdoor Life, February 1969]

CONSPIRACY IN CANADA?

(By Jerome J. Knap and Ben East)

OTTAWA.—The Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916 between Canada and the United States, and the Migratory Bird Convention Act that grew out of it, are the cornerstone of waterfowl conservation in North America.

Is that treaty about to be violated and the cornerstone badly cracked by the Government of Canada?

There is good reason to believe that the answer is yes. As this issue of Outdoor Life went to press, the Canadian Cabinet here was considering an Order in Council that seems sure to be enacted in one form or another. This action would give all Canadian Indians and Eskimos the right to kill migratory gamebirds on reservations and "all unoccupied crown lands" (such crown lands would take in huge tracts in the north of Canada) with little restriction on bag limits or the time of year. In all likelihood the order will have been passed by the time you read this.

Perhaps the most important provision under the Migratory Bird Treaty was the one that ended spring shooting in both countries, by banning waterfowl hunting between March 10 and September 1. The proposed order almost certainly will seriously weaken that restriction. In the past there has been talk of allowing native hunting as late as June 1, a change that would permit extensive spring shooting. Inevitably, any substantial liberalization will open a Pandora's box of problems.

Shockingly, too, such action will have been taken without anything like real consultations between the Canadian Government's wildlife officials and their counterparts in Washington, or even in the provinces of Canada itself. Many Canadians are ashamed that their national government would conspire to violate an international treaty, and these same Canadians are worried about what the development will mean to the future of duck hunting.

UNUSUAL SECRECY

Rarely if ever has a major conservation matter been considered in such an air of hush-hush secrecy as has surrounded this one. In December, shortly before the Canadian Cabinet recessed for the holidays, a rumor swept through sportsmen's circles that the order would be passed within hours. Protests poured into Ottawa, however, and that action did not transpire.

At this writing no one has been able to find out when final action might be taken. Neither have worried conservationists been told anything about what regulations are contemplated.

OFFICIALS CANNOT COMMENT

Government officials, questioned on what the order would finally provide, said they could not comment. Refusing to be quoted by name, they admitted only that the government is examining the conflict between the regulations laid down in the Migratory Bird Convention Act and earlier rights granted to the natives in Indian treaties.

The strict secrecy surrounding the whole affair, plus the unwillingness of anyone to predict when the order might be acted on, hinted strongly at a high-level conspiracy, politically motivated. Obviously, if action could be taken before sportsmen and the general public learned the details, anybody who opposed the breaching of the 1916 treaty would be confronted with an accomplished fact.

The proposal, coming at a time when duck and goose populations are already hard pressed and when hunting seasons and bag limits on many species have been sharply curtailed, aroused widespread concern among sportsmen and conservationists on both sides of the border.

It is not new. It first came up two or three years ago, at the instigation of increasingly

militant Indian groups who charge that today's hunting laws conflict with rights granted them in old treaties and proclamations. The proposal was shelved then because of public opposition.

In the past year, however, Indian and Eskimo spokesmen have continued to press claims that they were guaranteed rights to take migratory birds for food without regard to the rules laid down under the treaty.

In actual practice, the treaty's restrictions have never been enforced against natives who live by hunting and trapping in undeveloped areas. The Crees of James Bay, for example, have shot ducks and geese whenever they could and in whatever numbers they needed. Law-enforcement officers have looked the other way.

But the Supreme Court of Canada recently ruled that the natives must abide by the Migratory Bird Convention Act. Perhaps for that reason, the Indians and Eskimos are pressing more and more strongly to have what they consider their ancient rights clearly spelled out by law. The current Order in Council proposal is the result of this pressure.

Few Canadians object when natives of the Far North, living by trapline and gun as their ancestors did, take what waterfowl they need for food. The rub is that many Indians and Eskimos believe that the ancient treaty rights apply to every native, regardless of his location, job, or economic status. They have been encouraged in this belief by certain federal civil servants.

SOME NEED GENEROUS LAWS

Those who oppose granting more sweeping hunting rights to all natives concede that Indians and Eskimos living off the land in undeveloped areas need generous regulations that will permit them to carry on their traditional way of life within the law. But they point out that the problem for those living in developed areas is quite different.

At the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference in 1965, Arthur Laing, then the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (now the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development), with jurisdiction over migratory birds, made a blunt statement on Indian hunting rights.

"We do not deny," he said, "to any Indian living in a traditional fashion the game he may need for sustenance. But I don't see how we can hope to manage wildlife for the future of all Canadians, or even for the Indians in certain critical situations, if the activities of any significant number of people are forever beyond control."

"Where Indians have had the opportunity to develop the same skills as their neighbors and have pursued a similar course into the present age, as I believe they all must eventually do, I see no reason why they should not join in measures to insure that crops of wildlife are available throughout our lifetimes and for successive generations."

Along the same line, Richard C. Passmore, executive director of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, had this to say in a recent letter to Laing's successor, the Honourable Jean Chretien:

"While this Federation is in complete sympathy with those Indians who live off the land in remote and undeveloped areas, and we urge that the law be changed in their favor, we cannot stress too strongly our absolute opposition to granting similar privileges to every Indian in Canada, regardless of his way of life."

It is clear that the granting of almost unrestricted hunting rights to all the natives of Canada, as seems to be under consideration, would have disastrous consequences for waterfowl populations.

EFFECT ON SEASONS, LIMITS

The country's 300,000 Indians and Eskimos, who are only 1½ percent of the entire population, now take an estimated 20 percent of

the annual waterfowl harvest. If their hunting regulations were substantially liberalized, they could easily increase that figure to 50 percent or more. And since a big share of this kill would consist of spring birds, the results would almost surely affect seasons and bag limits in both Canada and the United States, and could well put certain species in grave jeopardy.

Indian and Eskimo hunters, for example, could exert pressure on black-brant populations if spring shooting were allowed. Many of the brant bagged would be paired birds, and the survivors would arrive on the breeding grounds too late to remate, nest, and hatch young. So if even only one brant of a pair was killed, the increase of the pair for that year would be lost.

Or consider mallards. In recent years their population on the marshes of Manitoba has declined sharply. What would be the effect if wide-scale spring hunting by Indians was added to other unfavorable factors?

FIVE REASONS AGAINST

In his letter to Minister Chretien, Passmore listed five reasons that the Canadian Wildlife Federation is unalterably opposed to the proposed changes.

1. Any widespread liberalization affecting Indian and Eskimo hunting rights would violate the Migratory Bird Treaty. Repudiation of this treaty by either Canada or the United States would reduce waterfowl-management arrangements to chaos.

2. Migratory gamebirds have been the subject of vast research over several decades and as a result have come under complicated management programs throughout North America. Regulations are designed annually to strike a fine balance between production and total mortality. To introduce an uncontrolled harvest by Indians would undo years of cooperative effort by federal, state, provincial, and territorial governments and by sportsmen and conservation groups. Some species and the waterfowl population of some regions would almost certainly be endangered.

3. It would be difficult to overestimate the level of antagonism that would be generated by the discriminatory regulations proposed. Sportsmen and other conservationists who have worked for decades to conserve waterfowl are not likely to stand idly by while this precious resource is destroyed by unregulated shooting. There would almost certainly be international repercussions that would hinder the efforts of private groups now working to preserve waterfowl-breeding habitat in Canada.

4. While the Canadian Federal Government holds the major responsibility for managing migratory birds, provincial and territorial governments have always shared much of the burden of this task. It is unfortunate that Ottawa should make major changes without full consultation with, and the concurrence of, such other governments. We are not aware that any such consultation at ministerial level, has taken place.

5. The regulations proposed are highly discriminatory as between Indians and other Canadians. Such discrimination is surely not in the best interests of the natives themselves.

Passmore's opinions deserve the most serious consideration. Before assuming his present position as director of Canada's leading conservation organization, he was a highly respected wildlife manager. The federation he now heads is the voice of all organized sportsmen and conservation groups in Canada.

It also represents three other influential affiliates: the Canadian Audubon Society, the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fishery Biologists, and the Canadian Chapter of Ducks Unlimited. With such membership, the Federation voices the opinions of professional wildlife managers and conservationists as

well as of sportsmen and amateur naturalists.

DUCKS UNLIMITED VIEW

Ducks Unlimited in Winnipeg has stated similar concern. Angus Gavin, the general manager, believes that the extension of extra-liberal hunting privileges to Indians in settled areas would quickly generate serious public-relations problems locally, nationally, and internationally.

In addition, he warns that spring shooting would have grave consequences for waterfowl, both directly and indirectly. Even the knowledge that such shooting was being permitted would have an immediate and drastic effect on the public support available for organizations dedicated to the preservation and increase of wild ducks and geese.

Ducks Unlimited reiterates the point that no one can rightly object when northern natives take waterfowl for food in time of need, under proper regulations, but it insists that the government should explore the ramifications thoroughly before extending this privilege to all Indians and Eskimos regardless of need or location.

Sportsmen and conservationists in the United States were quick to join the chorus of protest. Said Tom Kimball, director of the National Wildlife Federation in Washington, in a blunt statement to *OUTDOOR LIFE*.

"The granting of any special waterfowl-hunting privileges to any segment of the population, contrary to the provisions of an international treaty, raises a serious question whether any wildlife species that migrates between countries can be preserved for the enjoyment and benefit of future generations."

DUCKS A TEST CASE?

Militant statements made by both Indian and non-Indian spokesmen for native groups indicate that in reality the question of Indian and Eskimo rights to hunt migratory birds at any time of year, in open defiance of the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916, has been chosen as a test case, to put the relationship between the government and the native peoples on trial before the country.

It seems highly unfortunate that the hard-pressed waterfowl resource of North America, already facing more than enough difficulties, should be made a symbol of alleged mistreatment of native people.

As Paul Murphy, executive director of the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, sums it up: "If the Canadian conscience is bothered by unfair treatment of our Indians, real or imagined, our wildlife heritage should not be offered as penance."

GEORGE WASHINGTON TRADITIONS IN UKRAINE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding authorities on the history of Eastern Europe is Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, Ph. D., Catholic University of America, who has just prepared a study published by the Shevchenko Scientific Society of New York entitled "George Washington Traditions in Ukraine."

I feel that insertion of this material into the RECORD at this point is quite timely since we have just commemorated the birthday of our first President.

The material follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON TRADITIONS IN UKRAINE

In my book, *Shevchenko Meets America*, Marquette University, Slavic Institute, 1964, which contained a preface by my distinguished colleague, Alfred Sokolnicki, I discussed on pp. 26-27 (footnote 17) the Washington traditions in Ukraine.

Evidence for the existence of a cult of George Washington in Ukraine is to be found in the *Diary* of Mrs. P. Rozciszewska of the Klevan province:

"May 21, 1827—I also visited the Trzeciak family in Yaropovci. What a beautiful garden they have! Trees, flowers, and a beautiful setting. Mrs. Trzeciak showed me Washington's beloved tree—the *Bignonia Catalpa*. The hapless Muravjov always used to doff his hat before the tree, saying that one must pay homage to the tree of the great man . . . Alas, a few steps away grow tall cypresses and frowning pines, and they remind one of this splendid young man and his unhappy fate. Together with Mrs. Trzeciak, we wept there, moved by the remembrance of him and by our grief."

Who was the Muravjov mentioned in the *Diary*? Serge Muravjov-Apostol (1796-1826) was a descendant on his mother's side of the Ukrainian *Hetman*, Danylo Apostol. Educated in Paris and St. Petersburg, he played a leading role in the conspiracies of the "Union of Liberation" and the "Southern Society." As a colonel of the Chernyiv Regiment, he headed its mutiny and, after the failure of the Decembrist Revolt, was sentenced to death together with Ryleev, P. Pestel and Michael Bestuzhev-Riumin (1803-1826), who was a second lieutenant in the Poltava Regiment and liaison to Polish revolutionary societies.

About the tree mentioned in the *Diary*, I wrote:

"*Bignonia Catalpa*, the supposed beloved tree of Washington, was brought to Europe from North America and was widely cultivated in Poland and Ukraine. It is a decorative tree with bell-shaped flowers."

But neither the noted historian of Marquette University, Rev. Raphael Hamilton, S.J., nor I could locate in the U.S. any material to justify the East European traditions connected with this tree. I added:

"We could not find any material to support this East European tradition that this tree was in fact a beloved favorite of Washington. We assume that it was brought from America to Poland and Ukraine and that here developed the legend by association: American Tree—Washington's Tree. Perhaps the following explanation can give some direction. For it we are indebted to our distinguished colleague, Rev. Raphael Hamilton, S.J. professor of history, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin:

"In 1932 the Bicentennial Commission, appointed to celebrate the birth of George Washington, had extensive research done which was published as: 'Honor to George Washington and Readings About George Washington.' There on pages 97-98 Father Hamilton found that the only tree which the Commission is sure was planted by Washington and which still flourishes on the grounds of his home, Mt. Vernon, is a magnolia tree which the dictionary establishes to be very much the same as the *Bignonia* tree. Both have large decorative leaves and white, pink or red blossoms."

Teaching now in Washington, I availed myself of the opportunity to investigate the question on the very spot, Mt. Vernon: Had the *Bignonia Catalpa* Tree any link with George Washington or his home, Mt. Vernon, or is all merely an East European, Polish-Ukrainian legend? The Very Rev. Constantine Berdar, Rector of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary in Washington, D.C., was my good guide and helper, and twice we inspected the Mr. Vernon Gardens. In a shop on the grounds I bought a series of publica-

tions, among them: *The Mount Vernon Gardens, a brief description of their origin and restoration, complete plant lists, plans and other illustration.* This is a publication of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the United States, Mount Vernon, Virginia, 1960.

Among "Trees and Shrubs, A list of the trees and shrubs collected and planted by General Washington, which are represented in the general plantings," page 23, is: *Catalpa Tree—Catalpa Bignonioides.*

Therefore, summing up: 1. There can now be no doubt that the East European Washingtonian traditions are no legend but are based on the fact that this tree was a favorite of Washington and was in fact planted by him in his Mt. Vernon Gardens. This proves that Washington at least "liked this tree." 2. According to the aforementioned booklet Washington was in contact with French and German gardeners who could have brought its seeds to Europe. Cultivated on the estates of the nobility in Eastern Europe, this tree eventually reached Ukraine.

In the background of the Washingtonian symbolism of this tree was surely the great popularity of the American War of Independence and of George Washington, the man, among the Polish and Ukrainian gentry families on the right bank of the Dnieper in Ukraine at the beginning of the nineteenth century. As a quarter of a century later the Ukrainian Decembrists (Decembrists) organized their rebellion against the Czar in Kiev Province, Washington and the political regime in office in the USA were looked upon as ideals. Washington was the hero, and the pattern of the American regime in some parts and ideas were integrated into the project of state reforms which were discussed in the conspiratorial circles of the Southern Decembrists. The *Diary of Mrs. P. Rosciszewska* confirms this.

But there is a continuity of Washington and American traditions in Ukraine. The Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, a conspiratorial organization which emerged in Kiev twenty years later, propagated the ideas of a federation of all Slavic nationalities according to the pattern of the USA. In this way the name of George Washington again became a banner.

The national bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861), was associated with this group. He formulated modern Ukrainian nationalism by expressing the longing for the coming of "Washington's just and new law," also for the Ukrainian nation.

The American Ukrainians erected in the capital of the United States, Washington, D.C., a monument of Shevchenko on 22nd and P Streets, N.W. It was unveiled by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on June 27, 1964.

And thus the circle of Washington traditions closes: the gardens of Mt. Vernon to the Washington traditions in Ukraine and back to Mt. Vernon by way of this monument.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.
ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI.

ISSUES OF "PAPERS" PUBLISHED

1. Bohachevsky Daniel, J. U. Dr.: Problems of Ukrainian Learning Abroad (In Ukrainian). Lew Vasyl, Ph. D., Prof.: Folklore in the Almanac "Rusalka Dnistrova" (In Ukrainian) (1958).
2. Ostapiak Mykola, Prof.: Isolating the Virus of Asian Influenza from Samples of Gargling the Throat and Autopsy Material (In Ukrainian) (1958).
3. Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.: The Impact of the "Sputnik" on the English Language of the U.S.A. (1958).
4. Bohachevsky Daniel, J. U. Dr.: The Ideological Fundamentals of "The November Awakening" (In Ukrainian) (1959).
5. Jaszczun Vasyl, Ph. D.: Religious and

Moral-Ethical Tenets of Taras Shevchenko (In Ukrainian) (1959).

6. Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.: J.S.C. De Radius, an Unknown Forerunner of Comparative Slavic Literature (1959).

7. Nazarko Ireneus, OSBM, Ph. D.: Metropolitan Julian Sas-Kullovsky (1828-1900) (1959).

8. Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.: Shevchenko and the Jews (1959).

9. Mackiw Theodore, Ph. D., Prof.: Mazepa (1632-1709) in Contemporary German Sources (1959).

10. Vytanovych Illja, Ph. D., Prof.: Social and Economic Tendencies in State Policies of Ivan Mazepa (In Ukrainian) (1959).

11. Luciw Luke, Ph. D.: Academician Prof. Stephen Smal-Stocky (In Ukrainian). Wozniak Michael, Acad., Prof.: Stephen Smal-Stocky and Franko (In Ukrainian) (1959).

12. Manning Clarence A., Ph. D., Prof.: The Role of Mazepa in Eastern Europe (1960).

13. Kamenetsky Ihor, Ph. D.: Origins of the New British Imperialism (1960).

14. Krawciw Bohdan: Fedkovich in the Latest Literary Publications (In Ukrainian) (1961).

15. Pavlovych Petro: The Shevchenko Heritage and M. Kotsiubynsky (In Ukrainian) (1961).

16. Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.: Discrimination and Bias in Two UNESCO Publications (1961).

17. Pap Michael S., Ph. D., Prof.: Ukraine's Struggle for Sovereignty, 1917-1918. (1961)

18. Smal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.: The Hetman Mazepa Traditions of the Ukrainian National Government of 1917-23. (In Ukrainian). (1961)

19. Lysiak Roman, M.D.: Role of Non-Tyroxine Protein-Bound Iodine in Idiopathic Erythema Multiforme. (1961)

20. Kovaluk Jeannette-Yaroslava, B.A.: Shevchenko and Pan-Slavic Ideas. (1962)

21. Holiat Roman S., Dr.: Short History of the Ukrainian Free University (1964)

22. Sokolyshyn Alexander, Dr.: The Appearance of the Apostol and the Primer 390 Years Ago in Lviv—Western Ukraine (In Ukrainian). (1964).

23. Collection of Papers, honoring Prof. C. A. Manning (1964).

24. Emal-Stocki Roman, Ph. D., Prof.: Beginning of Fight for Rebirth of Ukrainian Statehood. (1967).

25. Ostapiak Mykola, Prof.: The Synthesis of Prof. Volodymyr Brygider's Scientific Work. (In Ukrainian). (1968).

26. Kysilevskyj Constantine, Ph. D., Prof.: Peculiarities of the Shashkewych's Language. (In Ukrainian). (1968).

27. Hordinsky Bohdan Z., Dr.: Terpenes in the treatment of Cholelithiasis and Hypercholesterolemia. (1968).

DR. H. GUYFORD STEVER MAKES EXCELLENT STATEMENT

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent statement which Dr. H. Guyford Stever, president of Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh, made today before the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics during the hearings on H.R. 35, the proposed institutional grants bill.

Dr. Stever is well qualified to give testimony on this topic and, as always, his remarks are interesting and to the point.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. H. GUYFORD STEVER, PRESIDENT, CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY, FEBRUARY 25, 1969.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased and honored to have the opportunity to comment on H.R. 35 proposing a national institutional grants program to be administered by the National Science Foundation.

As a member of the Advisory Panel to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have often had an opportunity to express myself to you on a wide range of subjects. It is therefore pleasant to be back to speak about your proposed national institutional grants program, a program which I think is badly needed, and if put into effect will have a major beneficial effect on science education and academic research.

In the Declaration of Purpose of H.R. 35 there are summarized the reasons for and success of support of science and scientific research by the Federal Government. With these I agree. I agree also with the statement that "continued advance requires the development, maintenance, and expansion of vigorous research and instructional programs in the sciences at institutions of higher education throughout the nation." I would like to enlarge on the role of research and education in the universities as it relates to the whole spectrum of science.

Science research in the universities is the seed corn of science in two different senses. First, basic research is at the beginning of the long and complex process by which new knowledge is discovered and shaped into the innovative end-products and processes which are the practical output which this bill H.R. 35 seeks to produce. And, second, the research laboratory in the university is the educational cradle of the scientists, engineers, technologists and other practitioners who will carry on the chain of research, development, engineering, and production in the future. I do not claim that the university is solely responsible either for basic research or for the development of scientists and engineers in their careers, but it carries the major share of these loads.

May I delve deeper into the role of basic research in the complex process of turning out innovative gains for society. It is not a simple chain reaction of a researcher turning up a fact on theory which is passed on to an engineer to use to design something to be turned over to industry to be made. No advance is made in a pure form; an idea is worked over by colleagues, by further checking in literature, by reporting and discussion in meetings and conferences; it is checked in different ways by other laboratories. Universities provide for scientists a setting for the kinds of laboratory work, the library and computer resources, the setting for meetings and conference of the ideas, all of which are needed in this research process. Universities also provide the freedom of action and the long-term jobs needed for the research scientists to function optimally.

Practical men responsible for action in a society sometimes get impatient with basic research, feeling that the payoff is not soon enough. Good research results last a long time and have impact far into the future. A recent study provides an interesting analysis of the relative roles of basic, nonmission research, mission-oriented research, and development and application leading to innovations of use to society. It is entitled "Technology in Retrospect and Critical Events in Science" conducted by researchers at the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute and supported by the National Science Foundation. I commend it to your attention.

This study investigates the important fore-running scientific events to the five following innovations: magnetic ferrites; video tape recorder; the oral contraceptive pill; the electron microscope; and matrix isolation. It is interesting that most key events, about 70 percent, lay in the field of basic non mission research, with 20 percent in the mission-oriented research and the remaining 10 percent in development and application. The interesting part of the forerunner key events in basic research is that they are spread broadly over more than the fifty years preceding the innovation, with a peak between 20 and 30 years. As one might expect, key mission-oriented research events do not spread as far back into history and continue to grow in number as the date of innovation is approached. The same is true of the key forerunner events in development and application, with an ever sharper concentration in the near past.

So patience is required. We in this generation are living off the basic research done in the centuries behind us. I think we owe it to the next generations to supply them with some basic research results. The universities better than any other institutions, though not exclusively, understand the long range nature of research and have the needed patience.

So too do the universities address this problem of preparing the young for careers. This is the first and most important mission of the university. In science, though part of this job is the research in the laboratory using operating funds often received from a project grant, it is only part of the young scientist's education. Getting the right science students into place in the laboratories and giving them all aspects of their education is also a complex problem which our universities address. In the educational aspects of science in the university, the actual research project is only a part, and the other parts have to be carried out with high quality as a goal.

Now to H.R. 35, the institutional grants bill. All of this business of large-scale support of academic science is less than a quarter century old. Naturally you in government and we in the universities have not yet arrived at the perfect system but have been slowly evolving a system of support. Let's remind ourselves of one outstanding success—the project grant. I have viewed this from the standpoint of a grantee, a government servant, and an academic administrator; and I conclude, as do my colleagues with whom I have checked, that the high quality of American science is in large measure due to the system developed by NSF, NIH and numerous other agencies of the use of peer judgment in selecting the best projects. Whatever we do with other means of supporting academic science, let us not weaken that.

Wisely the whole state of health of academic science has been explored recently. This bill; the recent report of the National Science Board entitled "Towards a Public Policy for Graduate Education in the Sciences;" the testimony of Dr. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, to this subcommittee; the report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and other studies have addressed the broader needs of university science.

All are discovering that the central university, the science department, the professor-project researcher, and the student, all face serious problems of support, and should be getting it. This bill H.R. 35 points at helping outside the project grant. I thoroughly endorse it. It will enable universities to upgrade the general facilities supporting science—that is, the labs, libraries, computers and other general equipment; it will enable universities to direct some research support in new directions important to society as a whole, such as urban problems, or important to a state or region, or important to the

strength of the institutions themselves: it will enable the university to help the young, very promising scientist who has not yet got into the main stream of the project grant system.

Any university deserving of a grant will use all its intellectual assets, faculty, administration and others, to determine the best use of these funds.

The means proposed in H.R. 35 of determining the distribution of the funds seems reasonable to begin with. It gives help to the university which has already proven its quality by the magnitude of the current project grant budget; it helps the university which can attract the graduate students; and it helps the universities which are starting the young undergraduate students along the path toward science.

Is this the best mixture of criteria? It is a reasonable one, and we can perfect it as time passes. The important thing to us is, *let's get started.*

I do urge this committee to continue to explore all the areas of Federal support for science education and academic research—that is in projects, institutions, departments, facilities and equipment, and student aid. I am confident that such continued attention will yield significant results, and strengthen an already good field of American endeavor—its academic sciences.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my thinking with you.

SHADY DEALS SHAKE AID

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the columnist Richard Wilson, of the Cowles Publications, properly calls attention to some of the corruption that continues to infest the foreign aid program as administered by the Agency for International Development in Vietnam.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Wilson will go further and review the administration and effectiveness of hundreds of millions of dollars spent by AID in other countries around the world, including the Central and South American areas.

The article by Columnist Wilson follows:

Thomas Edison Higgins, an enterprising citizen of Tampa, Fla., had by his own admission "only 38 cents in my pocket but a quarter of a million dollars worth of letters of credit" by courtesy of the Agency for International Development.

Higgins managed to convert this credit into cash by supplying an equivalent amount of battery additive, deemed by the U.S. Bureau of Standards to be worthless, to South Vietnamese who yearned to prolong the life of their storage batteries by 10 years.

In the process, however, Higgins had to forward 56 percent of his take to a numbered Swiss bank account on behalf of a mysterious Dinh Xuan Thao as instructed by the Higgins South Vietnamese agent, Doanh Tin Cuoc. Dinh Doanh, or both, had arranged the deal with Higgins, who had a son in South Vietnam to see it through, and the U.S. taxpayer financed the whole operation by which the life of South Vietnamese storage batteries was not much prolonged.

All this and much more is cited by a Senate committee as a classic example of kickbacks, rake-offs and shady deals through which great amounts of federal funds have been siphoned off in uneconomic, illegal or corrupt

practices in suppling South Vietnam with commodity imports. In another case, ampules of water taken from the seas off Puroto Rico were shipped to South Vietnam as "biocean" for the relief of nausea, skin disorders and other ailments apparently immune to the vast amount of sea water surrounding Vietnam.

Some of our best pharmaceutical companies have been involved in government financed transactions requiring kickbacks and payoff, all in the spirit of the ancient oriental commercial vices, and how many tens of millions have gone down the drain nobody knows.

It is enough, however, to make all who know about it ill beyond relief from biocean. The Agency for International Development claims to have corrected some of the conditions permitting wily South Vietnamese agents to split their fees with government officials and swell their own numbered Swiss bank accounts.

AID is due for credit on this but not for acting as swiftly as it might have, and not for failure to recognize corruption when it saw it. There is an all too prevalent a tendency to write off corruption as a condition of the mysterious East which no amount of Yankee rectitude will ever correct.

The American pharmaceutical companies seem to have fallen willingly enough into the Oriental vices which does not speak well for their officials either, particularly since some of the bigger companies didn't really need the business.

Potentially harmful antibiotics were shipped and sold under conditions suggesting that their use would be uncontrolled. And there is little doubt that large quantities of antibiotics, more than the Quakers will ever supply to Hanoi, passed through the hands of the thousands of little men in Saigon who are in the import trade into the hands of the Viet Cong. The American taxpayer has been supplying medicine to the enemy, and undoubtedly a great deal of other useful material.

The Senate Government Operations Committee cannot get on too soon with an inquiry into practices in the AID program all over the world. Venality and the willingness of some Americans to cooperate with it is not confined to the South Vietnamese.

Opposition has developed to this worldwide inquiry which the committee proposes to undertake because, as Sen. Jacob Javits of New York seems to fear, it may adversely affect a program which he thinks is vital to U.S. foreign policy and peace in the world.

As every year has passed, Congress has become less convinced that foreign aid is vital to U.S. foreign policy. The committee's worldwide investigation, if it reveals venality on the scale of the import program in South Vietnam, could deliver the death blow to foreign aid in its present form. There is increasing public disillusionment which supports the senate committee's determination to force the discarding of obsolete programs and inefficient and inadequate theories and practices.

CONNECTICUT VOICE OF DEMOCRACY ESSAY

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the winner of the Voice of Democracy Essay Contest in the State of Connecticut this year is a young man from my congressional district, Mr. Dennis Hanover, of Colchester, Conn. He is a student at St.

Bernard's High School at Uncasville, Conn.

The Voice of Democracy Contest is sponsored each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. This year's theme was "Freedom's Challenge" and over 400,000 students throughout the country participated in the contest. The winning contestant of each State is brought to Washington during the first week of March where the final winners are chosen for the five top prizes, scholarships ranging from \$5,000 to \$1,000.

We in Connecticut extend congratulations to our State winner and our very best wishes that he will succeed in winning also one of the five scholarships. His essay reads as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Freedom's Challenge is to end the alarming spread of violence in America. This is the greatest single challenge facing the United States today. We must learn how to live in peace with our fellowman for it is only in peace that freedom may flourish. Truly the most difficult task for any man is to turn the other cheek—not to strike back when he is hurt—some men say this is not human nature, yet isn't this what we have all yearned to have the courage to do? It takes far more courage to stand and take abuse than to pick up a stone. This is "freedom's challenge".

For the most obvious example we look to the ghetto and to the race riots that have become almost second nature to us—we have horribly enough conditioned ourselves to accept this degradation of a suffering people and we are no longer concerned—ghetto people are striking out at a society that has done nothing to help cure their ills. It is little wonder that fire and unleashed violence have become the only answers. We must not close ourselves to their plight. What we need now is not aid or money, but compassion, brotherly love. This is "freedom's challenge".

Violence has become the American pastime, not only in the ghetto do we find this awful problem, but everywhere. Our most successful sports are violent, our entertainment is violent, our children are raised to enjoy and practice violence—in brief—our lives are violent. We see violence all around us—in our schools—in our homes—and even in our churches—where and when will it end? It will end when men learn to live as brothers and to forgive their fellowman's faults and mistakes—or it will end with the collapse of America and our liberty. This is "freedom's challenge".

During the Democratic convention the entire nation was placed at ringside to a most senseless battle between students and police. This was perhaps the first obvious violence and savagery that they had ever been subjected to. This opened many eyes and ears to the troubles that plague us and threaten to divide our country. The breach is growing rapidly and it must be closed in order to have peace. This is "freedom's challenge".

Perhaps now we will see a change. We want to see America get excited about the quest for peace. Peace is vital for freedom to survive—and only in freedom can we live peacefully. We did not act on the Kerner report and yet it told us we are on the verge of violence so great that it may destroy the American dream. This is "freedom's challenge," to stop the violence ruining our country.

America has responded well to the call many times in the past. If we realize that this violence is such a call, we will have won the first crucial battle. To end it will result in peace. To continue fighting will result in discord so great that we may never recover—we will never be the same. Which is better? The challenge of freedom is never easy, and

for the most part, it is very difficult—but nevertheless—"freedom's challenge" is to stop the violence in America. Peace and freedom are one in the same. Whether we solve this problem will determine the future of America's freedom. This is "freedom's challenge."

RESOLUTION ON PORTUGUESE COLONIES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ adopted a resolution condemning Portuguese colonialism. The resolution expressed support for "the legitimate claims of the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea Bissau." And it called upon the U.S. Government to implement an arms embargo on Portugal and to terminate American use of Portuguese bases.

In a background note on the resolution, the church explained:

This is a rather unique and frank declaration in church circles, stating as it does the legitimacy of violent revolution to shake off colonial control and to move towards self-determination and independence. It is equally important as a pointer towards "the unknown war" which is raging in the Portuguese colonies and a reminder that America is standing solidly on the wrong side, the Portuguese side, in this struggle for self-determination in the colonies. It is a further reminder that America used force in the 1700's to break away from Britain and a plea to understand that Africans have not resorted to violence with glee but as a last resort.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Portuguese colonies of Africa (Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau) remain the last major European colonies of that continent;

Whereas the United Nations has repeatedly condemned Portuguese colonialism, has judged those colonies to have the right of self-determination, and has called upon Portugal to permit free elections in those colonies, and Portugal has steadfastly refused;

Whereas the racism which Portugal practices, keeps 97% of the African inhabitants illiterate and allows fewer than 2% to enjoy the rights of full citizenship.

Whereas the racism of Portugal cooperates with and contributes to the illegal independence of Rhodesia and the apartheid policies of South Africa by providing trade outlets and essential oil pipelines for the former, and cheap slave labor for the mines of the latter;

Whereas the United States provides arms through NATO and economic assistance through private investment to support such a Portuguese regime as it fights against national freedom-fighters;

Whereas the Board of Missions of the United Methodist Church of America has already stated in its January 14, 1968, statement that one of its legitimate roles is to support African movements which seek to change the present political situation;

Whereas the struggle for self-determination in the Portuguese colonies is similar to the thrust for independence of America against Britain, and

Whereas this struggle for self-determination in African colonies has culminated in the establishment of 36 independent countries since 1957,

Therefore be it resolved that the CCSA of the United Church of Christ, standing in opposition to all forms of colonialism, particularly condemns Portuguese colonialism and the self denial of self-determination for all its people, pursuant to the United Nations Charter;

Be it further resolved that the CCSA of the UCC supports the legitimate claims of the liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau,

Be it further resolved that the CCSA of the UCC call upon the United States government to implement an arms embargo upon the government of Portugal and terminate its use of Portuguese Bases.

LINCOLN DAY SPEECH AS DELIVERED BY GOV. JACK WILLIAMS, OF ARIZONA

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech given in Phoenix, Ariz., on February 12 by the distinguished Governor of Arizona, the Honorable Jack Williams. I consider it to be one of the finest Lincoln Day speeches I have ever heard and so feel it should be shared with all the Members of Congress. The speech follows:

LINCOLN DAY SPEECH AS DELIVERED BY GOV. JACK WILLIAMS OF ARIZONA

We are here in the observation of a ritual which has become commonplace in our society—to mark the anniversary of the birth of one of our national heroes.

We have gathered to honor a most uncommon man.

Abraham Lincoln was born into a world so vastly different from the one we now occupy it stretches our imagination to even visualize how things were in that ninth year of the first decade of the Nineteenth Century.

Kentucky was a wilderness. The elements, the Indians, the isolation were a never ending threat to survival beyond our ability to comprehend.

We are all familiar with the external aspects of the Lincoln legend. We know the hardship he suffered. We know his struggles to overcome the environment of his childhood. We know of the defeats and disappointments he endured as a young man. We know that he failed in his first try for public office, that as small town storekeeper and country lawyer he never earned more than a very modest living. The more elegant of his contemporaries were amused by his awkward manner and homely appearance.

A Lincoln of Illinois would not have been selected by his neighbors as the man most likely to succeed in this world, and yet today the world pays him homage and reveres his memory.

What then do we find so memorable in the life of this homely, plain-spoken child of the western frontier? As partisans we are proud of Lincoln as the first Republican ever to be elected President of the United States. But this fact alone has little to do with our affection for Lincoln. Indeed, it is the fashion nowadays to cynically downgrade our public figures. By today's standards Abraham Lincoln was a hopeless square.

All across this land, and indeed through-

out the world, Democrats and Republicans, Protestants and Catholics, Jews and Gentiles, agnostics and atheists, blacks and whites, sophisticated intellectuals and beginning students confess the inherent worth of the life of Abraham Lincoln.

Our age is caught up in uncertainty in every discipline . . . in medicine, in economics, in physics and mathematics . . . our traditional understandings are being challenged, and in some cases destroyed. The new theology says God is dead, and yet the life of Abraham Lincoln is a testament to his faith in the benevolence of a loving, all-powerful creator. The new morality, which substitutes relative values for absolute standards, has enlisted adherents in every segment of our society. But the words of Abraham Lincoln reveal an unshaking acceptance of a standard of right and wrong based on the Ten Commandments.

Are we then assembled purely for sentimental reasons? To make an outward and visible demonstration of our nostalgic regard for certain antiquated standards no longer applicable or practical in our complicated, technological world?

I would challenge that notion and suggest that we are here tonight hoping to recapture, to reestablish that basic faith of Abraham Lincoln which enabled him to guide the republic through its most perilous period.

As the old absolutes of our physical world have been challenged and overwhelmed by the new scientific truth, as we have grown in affluence, as our technology has triumphed over our environment, discipline has disappeared. Today's man knows so much about so many things, believes so implicitly in the inevitability of change, he no longer understands himself.

We rationalize the lack of direction in our society by saying that all our problems are new, have never been encountered by man before. We look back on the simple agrarian pursuits of our ancestors and think how easy it was, how safe to be alive before the discovery of the atomic weapons and the guided missiles and the chemical destroyers. And in our discomfort and our loneliness and our alienated condition the simple words of Abraham Lincoln inspire new hope. The record of his life provides inspiration.

In a world distinguished by pride and arrogance we are irresistibly attracted to the humility of Lincoln's life.

Confronted with an event which threatened to destroy the Union and bury him in the rubble, the saving grace of Lincoln's humor emerges to temper the tragedy of the times.

At one time General George B. McClellan, then Commander of the Union forces, was conducting a waiting campaign. He was so careful to avoid mistakes that little headway was evident. President Lincoln wrote him a letter:

"My Dear McClellan . . . If you don't want to use the army, I should like to borrow it for awhile . . . Yours Respectfully, A. Lincoln."

Just after the battle at Gettysburg had been fought Lincoln sensed an opportunity to end the war by driving hard against Lee's rear. A swift and daring attack might do it. As Commander in Chief of the Army he ordered General Mead to pursue. A friendly note in the President's handwriting accompanied the instructions:

"The order I enclose is not of record. If you succeed, you need not publish the order. If you fail, publish it. Then if you succeed, you will have all the credit of the movement. If not, I will take all the responsibility."

It is probably true that more words have been written about Abraham Lincoln than about any other figure in American history. There is an endless supply of anecdote to illustrate his warm, compassionate humanity,

and the temptation to spend our time together recalling these pleasant memories is almost irresistible. To do that and no more would, I suggest, be a disservice to the man who is the inspiration for our meeting.

We are the inheritors. It is our task to draw upon the wisdom of the past and apply it judiciously to the problems of the present and future. We must not avoid that responsibility.

We understand the more things seem to change the more they remain the same. We know the great challenging questions of Lincoln's time confronts every generation.

What sort of structures in the world of economics, politics, education and social relations can we construct and support in order to guarantee that each individual human being on this earth may enjoy equal opportunity, encounter equal justice, be safe in his person and his property, endowed by his creator with a unique personal dignity.

Lincoln said, "With malice toward none, with charity toward all . . . let us have faith that right makes might . . . and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

The American dream was born in the minds of the founding fathers who having suffered personally the tyrannies of the old world proclaimed their new and revolutionary concept of what a government should be. At Gettysburg, Lincoln said, ". . . Of the people, by the people, for the people."

As a nation we were born on the battlefields of the revolutionary war. We have grown and prospered as have no other peoples on this earth. Succeeding generations gave their lives to preserve our liberty. And at this very moment American boys are dying in battles being fought eight thousand miles from our shores named after cities and places most of us can't pronounce. And here at home the demonstrators disrupt the college campuses. Riots disfigure our cities . . . with looting and burning and bloodshed.

In history Abraham Lincoln emerges against the tragic background of a war between the states. And the American Revolution continues. It is a battle for the minds of men. As they rejected the tyranny of the English crown, so do we reject the tyranny of those concentrations of power which would deny individual dignity, restrict opportunity and make justice the servant of power and privilege.

Today our campaigns are waged with persuasive words, with doctrine and ideology calculated to attract a people seeking earnestly to establish a better society.

At Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln said, "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

I would suggest that tonight in this second month of the seventh decade of the Twentieth Century, we, the servants of freedom are likewise engaged in testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can endure.

The passions and the prejudices of the present moment are not so easily identified as they were in Lincoln's day. But surely we have learned from our participation in World War I and World War II, in Korea and in South Vietnam that tanks and guns and bombs alone cannot neither produce nor maintain the peace we seek.

Surely we have learned that expanding federal power, unlimited Federal spending and well-intended federal legislation alone cannot create the kind of society described by the Constitution of the United States—"One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Surely we have learned that the bountiful affluence of the Twentieth Century, the increased production, the improved transportation and communication cannot alone accomplish our objective.

In despair, in a desire to avoid responsibility, in feelings of inadequacy and impotence some nations have accepted the notion that by investing government with absolute authority equity can be achieved . . . man protected . . . and the fruits of his labor equally divided. That dismal experiment has demonstrated that if you protect all men from their folly, you raise a nation of fools. If you permit government to divide the fruits of man's labor, government gets the fruits and man provides the labor. Communism isn't good enough for mankind because it says: Trust your life to the state and that will be your reward . . . and thus destroys all hope and all freedom and the truth that man is a child of God who must be placed in charge of his own destiny.

We had our experiment with the communal type of living at the Plymouth Colony, and you remember that the people nearly starved to death because incentive had been destroyed.

We are appalled at the excesses of a hedonistic society, which having rejected all restraints, appears intent upon worshipping before an altar on which the candles are self-indulgence, alcohol, drugs and unrestrained sexual promiscuity.

I am sure that most of us have driven across that great bridge which arches over the Golden Gate in San Francisco. Unconcerned, we whiz along at sixty miles an hour, blissfully unafraid of the icy water, far, far below us. There is no danger . . . we can't fall off . . . we are protected by the railings on each side.

I would suggest to you that if the railings were removed, none of us would cross that bridge at sixty miles an hour. We would creep along, filled with fear and uncertainty.

Isn't it true that in our cynical debunking of morality and religion—isn't it true that by adopting the permissiveness which has permeated our society we have removed the railings?

We know, you and I, that man is not perfectable on this earth, that in every age there have been rogues and sinners and scoundrels. And yet, mankind held noble aspirations, reached for the stars, dreamed the impossible dream, sought for the unachievable objective . . . and in the seeking somehow society was improved.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about Abraham Lincoln was his common sense.

Today you can get an expert opinion on just about any subject, but common sense is lost in the shuffle.

Today we have expert opinions on the dangers of cigarette smoking and also a subsidy to promote the growth of more tobacco as a crop.

We have experts who say marijuana is harmless and other expert opinion to the contrary.

Yet common sense tells us we don't want our kids to become addicted to any dope.

We have experts who insist that capital punishment is no deterrent to murder, and yet we had as violent an outbreak of homicide in our land last year as in all our history, but not a single person was executed.

Experts tell us how to train our children, and common sense tells us that the permissive philosophy has sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind.

Experts are continually coming before us through our mass media urging the practice of using the government of the United States as a means of preying upon the majority interests of the country.

No matter how wild the idea, there is an expert who can be found to espouse it.

We feel vaguely ill at ease before this massive onslaught of expert opinion, which con-

tributes to such things as the one-world conspiracy, the slick-procommunism and surrender to the USSR theme, devious disarmament, liquidation taxation, crazy spending, labor-union piracy, politicalization of education, political exploitation of the minorities, defaults in economic leadership, full-employment hypocrisy. Social security frauds, gold and silver brigandage. The Vietnam red herring. The destruction of the scorpion, subsidies to Castro communism . . . and I could go on and on, and you could add to this list.

National politics have been moved about as far away from common sense as is possible.

This has been brought about mainly by taking away the common sense of initiative, responsibility, and authority for conducting affairs of all the people locally.

An attempt to vest power in the federal government has been made and has been given every reasonable opportunity. It, however, has turned out to be a complete failure. Under such circumstances, the direction of future policy, if it is to respond to the real meaning of the November mandate must be toward restoring the initiative and responsibility to people and local communities.

Back to common sense. Back to speaking softly, but carrying a big stick. Back to fiscal sanity. Away from funding a national revolution on the streets and on the campuses with taxpayers' dollars.

Detoqueville warned us of the species of oppression by which democratic nations are menaced. Such a government seeks to keep its manhood in perpetual childhood. The government chooses to be the sole agent and the only arbiter of happiness. It provides security, foresees and supplies necessities, facilitates pleasures, directs industry, regulates the descent of property, spares all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living.

Such a power he warned compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people till the nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid animals of which the government is the perpetual shepherd.

If we are to learn anything from the lesson of the life of Abraham Lincoln, surely it must be this: common sense, a personal dedication to noble aspirations, a personal commitment to observe the eternal standards of right and wrong, a personal compassionate interest in the needs of others.

It is improbable that you and I will ever be confronted with the dramatic challenge and magnificent opportunity presented to Abraham Lincoln when he was nominated by the Republican party to serve as President of the United States. But I am equally persuaded that the troubles of this present time will never disappear until we, as individuals, humbly acknowledge our total indebtedness to God who created us, and being guided by the example he set before us, fashion our lives and our governments and our institutions so that they shall become an instrument of his will.

As Lincoln stood in Springfield, Illinois on February 11, 1861, called to depart that place and assume new responsibilities. . . .

So I suggest you and I stand in the middle of the magnificent material achievements of the Twentieth Century and are called to depart from the present and face the future—to find a renewed purpose and a renewed inspiration.

Do you remember the words Lincoln used on that occasion? Let me repeat them for you:

"No one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting," he said. It takes courage to leave our comfortable, accustomed surroundings and established situations. Then he continued, "To this place and the kindness of these people I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born and one is buried."

Lincoln added, "I now leave . . . not knowing when or whether ever I may return . . . with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington."

What was the task resting upon Washington? It was your task today, to build a government which would serve society and provide peace, justice and the blessings of liberty to his posterity.

Let us then, as the people of our particular political party, aware of past failures and determined to correct those errors, reestablish the guard rails to protect us from danger. Let us reaffirm our allegiance to those absolutes which if man can never achieve, he must forever pursue. George Washington said the indispensable supports of government were religion and morality. We now know that a government which gives only lip service to mankind's guiding principles can neither sustain its people or survive in our time.

We are the inheritors of the most noble concept of the function and duties of government ever presented to a people. Let us then unite, determined to protect, preserve and enhance this heritage.

As workers in the Republican party—let us make it the party of common sense. Realizing that after the election of 66 and 68 we have the people's mandate to govern. Let us resolve to govern well, because if we cannot accomplish this; and faced with the failure of the opposition party, perhaps the hippies and the yuppies may be right . . . we have no governing group and if that is the case we plunge the whole civilized world into the darkest of all dark ages, where tyranny gives way to anarchy and man becomes worse than a beast. This is your task and mine. And I am confident, we are worthy of the challenge and capable of the trust.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY DESECRATED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the birthday of our first President, George Washington, has been celebrated in many ways by many thankful free Americans.

President Washington—always first in peace or war—and foremost in the hearts of his countrymen has now become a target of the anti-American culture movement.

But George Washington's memory will live on—an inspiration to free men.

As the Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius said:

If a man stand beside a stream of pure water and curse it, the spring will not cease to send up pure water.

Mr. Speaker, I place Martin Weil's report from the Post for February 23 at this point in my remarks:

PUPPET SHOW TELLS OF RACISM OF
COLONIALS

(By Martin Weil)

Three busloads of Junior Village youngsters celebrated Washington's birthday yesterday by watching a puppet show in which General Washington spurns the efforts of black men to join the Continental Army.

Only after the British tried to get the slaves to fight on their side, did Washington accept Negroes on his side, according to the playlet staged at the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

The youngsters watched the puppet show attentively. After Washington expressed his

doubts about the fighting ability of black men, the 120 children listened quietly as he was reminded that the first man killed in the Boston Massacre was a Negro and that Negroes had fought at Concord.

But the youngsters appeared more vocal in their enthusiasm when some of them were permitted to touch and hold the puppets.

In addition to watching the puppet show, written and staged by Rose Brown of Rockville and four of her children, the youngsters ate cookies, drank punch and made a quick tour of the Corcoran's controversial 31st Biennial show.

James Harithas, the Corcoran's director, who invited the youngsters and guided the tour, said the gallery is concerned with introducing Junior Village children and other community groups to its exhibits and facilities.

In a long, well-ordered column of twos, the children, aged 8 through 11, wound rapidly through the show of brilliantly colored nonrepresentational paintings.

Stop here for a second, Harithas said before one canvas. "It hurts your eyes to look at it," he said appreciatively.

"It doesn't hurt my eyes," one youngster said.

Harithas told him he was a pretty tough kid.

THE DECLINE IN AMERICAN SEAPOWER

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, several editorials in the Bakersfield Californian, concerning the steady decline of the U.S. seapower, were recently brought to my attention. I commend to my colleagues the reading of these editorials.

The House Armed Services Committee has recently printed a special report prepared by the American Security Council entitled "The Changing Strategic Naval Balance: U.S.S.R. versus U.S.A." This report deals with the Soviet thrust for dominance on the high seas, and paints a bleak picture of the U.S. strength.

Based upon the knowledge that the U.S. naval and maritime power has declined in recent years, there is a definite need for a review of U.S. needs in this area. We must not lose sight of the fact that our strength at sea is important to both our national security and the American economy.

The greatness of the United States in the coming years may depend on how well the oceans are made to serve the American people.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Bakersfield Californian,
Jan. 9, 1969]

UNITED STATES SLIPPING BADLY AS SEA POWER

There is optimism that President-elect Richard M. Nixon will champion legislation to return the United States' military and Merchant Marine seapower to its former plane of superiority. As this year begins, the Soviet Union is making a bold bid to become this planet's ruler of the oceans and seas.

To be considered seriously is legislation offered last Friday by Congressman L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., which, if approved, would authorize construction of \$3.8 billion worth

of Navy ships in the year starting July 1. Included would be a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, two nuclear-powered guided-missile frigates and three nuclear-powered attack submarines.

The United States Navy suffered critically during former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's tenure in the Johnson Administration. If Nixon doesn't act to beef up Uncle Sam's naval fleet in the next four years, this nation could well meet the fate of proud Britain which once boasted mastery of the seven seas.

[From the Bakersfield Californian, Nov. 15, 1968]

U.S. SUPREMACY ON SEAS CHALLENGED

President-elect Richard M. Nixon, presently laying plans for diplomatic strategy, would be advised to take note of the Soviet Union's ominous warning this week that challenged the United States Navy's 6th Fleet activities in the Mediterranean Sea.

Boldly declaring the Soviet Union a "Mediterranean power" and maintaining the Russian fleet is in the strategic sea as "a certain guarantee of peace and security in the area," Vice Adm. Nikolai Smirnov falsely charged the 6th Fleet was in the Mediterranean Sea "in order to be prepared to strike blows from the sea and air against enemy targets using nuclear and conventional weapons."

The Soviet Union has placed approximately 60 warships in the Mediterranean Sea. The lucid facts: Russia today possesses the most powerful maritime fleet on this planet's oceans and seas; and the Soviets' military seapower is second only to the United States.

The Kennedy-Johnson administrations shamefully have permitted the United States' Merchant Marine to drop far behind those of other nations. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara pooch-pooched a complete nuclear-powered United States Navy. This republic, approaching the time of presidential transition, stands in danger of losing military supremacy in seapower.

Let us hope President-elect Nixon will give priority to rebuilding the United States' crippled Merchant Marine and to streamlining and updating the Navy's men-of-war. The Bakersfield Californian urges Nixon to heed the Navy League's persistent plea to bolster this country's merchant and military fleets. The Soviet Union's pointed warning should not be taken lightly.

[From the Bakersfield Californian, Jan. 27, 1969]

EARTH'S OCEANS "GO BEGGING"

Most Americans, understandably thrilled by the United States' successes in space adventures, perhaps unwittingly are ignoring the importance of this planet's oceans and seas. Worth serious consideration is this recent opinion by Charles F. Duchein, president of the Navy League of the United States:

"Your fabulous California Gold Rush of '49 is now exploding to the entire world of water. The modern gold rush of today is toward the challenging last world frontier—the oceans. Our fast-moving 20th Century industry depends increasingly on strategic materials carried overseas in ships. We are tampering with the long-term prosperity of this nation through our vacillation and neglect of what can be the chief stimulator of the national economy—the foundation for our future prosperity and this is to rebuild our maritime posture to a position of world preeminence."

Duchein paid high tribute to the American Merchant Marine for satisfactorily meeting the 10,000-mile sea lift requirements for the Vietnam war. He cautioned, however, that the second "hot spot" would stretch United States merchant-marine ships beyond the elastic limit.

Suggesting that Uncle Sam take "a page out of the bold aerospace industry's promotional book to regain No. 1 global maritime

position, Duchein recommended this five-point program:

The formulation of national maritime policy providing incentive to gain a competitive maritime position on the oceans of the world. The failure of the federal government to formulate basic policy, in Duchein's opinion, is the most critical element in cleaning up "the mess in the Merchant Marine."

The United States must orient its national strategy to the oceans of the world—just as the Soviet Union has done in recent years.

The United States must go after the merchant-marine market by building a minimum of 100 ships a year for at least the next decade.

Oceanic education should be fostered in American school systems to provide youth a good subject grounding in the oceans as they now receive in the land environment. The Sea Grant College program should be pursued with the utmost vigor to mobilize the best minds in this nation—with the scientists, scholars and students pursuing diligently oceanic solutions to the pressing problems of state.

A Maritime Manhattan Project should be created to stimulate revolutionary maritime technological advances in sea-based systems.

The Bakersfield Californian concurs with Duchein that Earth's oceans and seas are not being given proportionate priority in research and development programs subsidized by tax dollars.

Life on this planet in the next 100 years could well depend on development of the abundant natural resources contained in the Seven Seas. The oceans and seas contain an untapped reservoir of potential food sources. An impressive example in recent years is the processing of hake—commonly known as trash fish—into protein food which today is providing life for many impoverished peoples.

Man's knowledge of the oceanic environment indeed is limited. The Nixon Administration, this newspaper believes, should give oceanic research the same priority as the costly space projects. The new President, moreover, should take a hard look at the shoddy condition of this country's Merchant Marine which Lyndon Johnson neglected so shamefully.

FILM ON GREAT SWAMP GETS OHIO STATE AWARD

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last September former President Johnson signed into law a bill to designate the Great Swamp, of Morris County, N.J., in my congressional district, as wilderness. The affixing of the President's signature to this legislation culminated a 10-year effort on the part of thousands of persons to afford the Swamp the highest protection possible.

The North Jersey Conservation Foundation, which played a leading role in these efforts, cooperated in the production of a color television documentary as part of their program to bring the unique natural wonders of the swamp to the attention of the public.

I am pleased to report that this documentary recently won the 1969 Ohio State University award for excellence in educational, informational, and public affairs broadcasting.

I should like, at this time, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a news article

which appeared in the Evening News of Newark, N.J., on February 21, 1969, concerning this award:

FILM ON GREAT SWAMP GETS OHIO STATE AWARD

NEW VERNON.—A half-hour color television documentary program on the Great Swamp of Morris County has won the 1969 Ohio State University award for excellence in educational, informational and public affairs broadcasting.

A segment in the weekly "New York Illustrated" series on Channel 4, WNBC-TV, New York, the program originally appeared on June 15, 1968. It will be re-run tomorrow at 7 p.m. on Channel 4.

In the program, narrator Bill Ryan recounts the history of the swamp and successful efforts by conservationists to set it aside as a national wildlife refuge and national wilderness area, protecting it against destruction through developments.

The award, sponsored by the Institute for Education by Radio and Television at Ohio State, was in the local programming category. The program was produced in cooperation with the North Jersey Conservation Foundation, Morris Township, the organization which spearheaded saving of the swamp.

Sharing in credits for the award were producer-writer Marc Brugnoni, director Roger Shope and photographer Church Austin, all of the WNBC News and Community Affairs Department.

IRAQI SCAPEGOATS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article, one of a series being written from Israel by an American correspondent, gives a stark picture of the recent tragedy in Iraq where 14 "spies" were publicly hanged. Miss Carol Kovner, managing editor and foreign correspondent for Kovner Publications, Los Angeles, is to be commended for this stirring on-the-spot report. The article follows:

IRAQI SCAPEGOATS: 14 BODIES SWING AS MOB SCREAMS IN BAGHDAD (By Carol Kovner)

A sad spectacle out of the Dark Ages . . . 14 bodies swinging from a public gibbet to satisfy a screaming mob summoned by the one modern reminder in the whole proceeding, the radio.

It happened in January in Baghdad and Basra, names that have always called up images of the Arabian Nights and flying carpets, glittering palaces and genies in magic lamps.

Now Baghdad will bring to mind the insane screaming overheard on Arabic radio, of a mob in the throes of a deliberately incited blood lust.

Middle-Eastern observers say that the 6-month-old Baathist regime in Iraq is using the old Israeli spy scapegoat game because it is feeling shaky. Of the 65 remaining "Israeli spies" being held for trials coming up, one is Dr. Abdul Rahman el-Bazzaz, a former Prime Minister, and another is a former Defense Minister, Major General Abdul Aziz el-Uqeili. Sufficient grounds for the suspicion even among Arab countries that the Iraqi government is using the coming trials as a means of getting rid of political opponents. Arab political opponents.

The mad dance of thousands around the

hanged bodies, 9 of whom were Jews, shocked the world and brought protests and demonstrations against the Iraqi government in several countries, and memorial services for the victims in Israel by Iraqi Jews.

Pope Paul thought the question of racism was raised because of the 9 Jews executed from a remnant community of 3000 where all are under close supervision and curfew, if not house arrest. The United States protested the manner of the hangings; the "spectacular way" in which they were carried out seemed designed to "arouse emotion."

There is a concerted effort by Israel underway to rescue the Jews of Iraq and other Arab countries. There have been no air attacks as has been repeatedly reported by Iraqi radio. The goal is to prevent further trials of Jews and further executions and to seek their exodus from countries where they are persecuted, says a Foreign Ministry spokesman, not to endanger their lives more.

There are 8,500 Jews remaining in Egypt, Iraq and Syria. In Egypt the 1000 Jews are no better off than in Iraq; practically all heads of families are in prison without trial, leaving their families without protection and livelihood.

Originally the Jews who elected to stay in Iraq were in partnership with Arabs, or had property and businesses they did not want to leave, the last of a thousands-year-old community. They felt they were safe as they were "unpolitical," as one condemned boy shouted before he was dragged out of a closed courtroom in a recently released Arab TV newscast of the trials.

Ezra Haddad, an Iraqi immigrant living in Israel, told a Histadrut Executive meeting Feb. 2, "We loved that land in which we lived a thousand years and more before the first Arab ever set foot there. For generations we lived with the people of Iraq, sharing our destinies, working for the development of the land. And this is our reward . . ."

Like all the Arab countries, Iraq could be a great and rich one, with its oil, its agricultural potential, abundant water, and human resources. But, again like most of the Arab countries, it is in a political quagmire. Getting rid of former Prime Minister as "Israeli spies" and holding mass public hangings of Jews before crowds drummed into savagery will only offend the world opinion that the Arab world is trying to capture.

In Nazareth, Israeli Knesset Member Seif ed-Din Zuabi strongly condemned the hangings and other crimes which he said had been going on in Iraq a long time. Mr. Zuabi drew a parallel with Israel, where even the lives of terrorists who come to kill and destroy are spared. (His wife, a fascinating and charming woman, has dedicated herself to improving the lot of Arab women in the Nazareth area. She is a "suffragette", although a devoted mother of six, and encourages girls to take jobs outside their villages and to take an interest in their community.)

There have been severe disturbances in Gaza in recent weeks, especially since three young women went on trial for espionage and membership in the Palestine Liberation Organization. In spite of all the stonings, blown-up vehicles and mass demonstrations of young school girls (the latest technique of the terrorist groups is to use school girls for their public demonstrations because they know the Israeli soldiers will not move against them as they would men or boys), the trial was conducted fairly. The girls went wild, however, the last day of the trial and they were hurt; 95 were injured, 20 still in hospital with fractured ribs, bruises and shock.

The three women were given short sentences which were then commuted by Tat-Aluf Mordechai Gur, Military Governor of the Gaza Strip and Northern Sinai. He acted on appeals for clemency on the grounds of economic hardship and the women were released after only 27 days in custody. They signed a statement before their release that they

would be of good behavior and a bond of IL25,000 was put up by their parents, their headmistress and the mayor. Two of the girls were students and one was a teacher.

Or take Kantara on the Suez Canal in the occupied territory of Sinai, where the inhabitants have come under fire from Egyptian guns. They begged the Egyptians through the Red Cross to let them cross the canal into Egypt and never received an answer to their plea. They borrowed army loudspeakers from the Israel Defense Forces and shouted their request over the water. They were ignored.

Finally they were resettled at Israeli expense in "Operation Lifesaving" at El Arish where homes and jobs were provided for them. The 75-year-old mayor thanked the military governor of El Arish over and over for taking in his people, 855 of whom 200 were children. The town is empty now and quiet, but on one day last September over 10,000 shells were showered upon their own people by the Egyptians. That is why they had to move.

There is great agitation for authorizing a UN international inquiry into Israel's treatment of Arabs in occupied territories. Israel refuses unless the inquiry also goes into the treatment of Jews in Arab countries.

The 9 Iraqi Jewish citizens hanged in fabled Baghdad and Basra should serve as a reminder that Jews may still die for being Jews in Arab lands . . . but in Israel, Arabs are not condemned for being Arabs.

GILBERT TELLS NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF ESTIMATE THE NEEDS OF HIS DISTRICT

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, with permission, I wish to include in the RECORD my statement before the New York City Board of Estimate hearing on the capital budget for 1969-70. I urged the allocation of adequate funds for new school construction, community and health centers, park and recreational improvements, headstart, and the model cities program. And I specifically stressed the Bronx's need for better street lighting and more police protection. These are all items of great importance to me and my district.

My testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACOB H. GILBERT, 22D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, BRONX, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF ESTIMATE HEARING ON CAPITAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1969-70

I am Jacob H. Gilbert, Member of Congress, 22nd Congressional District, Bronx, New York. I am appearing in support of additional school construction and other needs of the residents of the Bronx. In my opinion, the Borough of the Bronx continues to be the "step-child" Borough for the allocation of Capital Budget funds. The time is more than appropriate for the Bronx to benefit from a more fair and adequate share of Capital Budget funds. We can, and must, eliminate overcrowding, short sessions, and split sessions in our schools. We must stop short-changing our school children and preschool children, and provide them with adequate classroom space, libraries, and other facilities for proper education. In addition, we must have more Community Centers, recreational facilities, better street lighting and adequate police protection.

The Community Planning Boards, civic or-

ganizations, and representatives of the various communities have met and have come forth with requests and suggestions for the needs of the Bronx. Since my Congressional District comprises about one-fourth of the area of the Borough, I want to speak specifically of those items within my District, comprising areas of the South Bronx (including Hunts Point and Longwood), portions of Morrisania, Crotona Park, Tremont, West Farms; the Soundview-Bruckner-Claason Point communities, and Pelham Parkway. There are, of course, many other needed items which overlap and affect not only my Congressional District, but those Districts adjoining mine. They are all improvements necessary to make the Bronx a better community in which to live—some urgently needed now and others we must plan for now to keep pace and meet the demands of our growing communities.

First, I want to discuss needed projects for the South Bronx, and especially for the Hunts Point and Longwood areas.

The New South Bronx High School and Community Center, for which the site has been selected should be funded immediately so that construction can begin without further delay.

The New Lincoln Hospital is of paramount importance to the residents of the South Bronx; the patient load is staggering since the closing of St. Francis Hospital. I was recently advised by Dr. Bernard Bucove, N.Y.C. Health Services Administrator, that the New Lincoln Hospital "has top priority and is being expedited on an urgent basis." Although it is to be built by the State, monies are required from the Capital Budget to repay the State for funds advanced.

Funds for the Hunts Point Neighborhood Family Care Center (also included in projects to be constructed by the State Mental Hygiene Facilities Improvement Corporation) are requested to repay the State.

I urge that funds be provided for the Model Cities Program, which is most important if we are to rebuild ghetto areas. On the Federal level, as U.S. Congressman, I shall continue my efforts to secure additional Federal funds for this program.

An academic high school to serve the Hunts Point Community is requested. Students who wish to attend a high school from the Hunts Point area must travel either to Morris or James Monroe High School, both overcrowded. I strongly urge allocation of funds now for a new Hunts Point High School and Community Center.

And I add my voice to the request of the community for funds for site acquisition for a new Primary School in the vicinity of Hunts Point Avenue and East 163rd Street, to relieve the severe overcrowding in nearby schools.

Funds are needed and should be provided for Head Start Centers at the several selected sites in the Hunts Point-Longwood communities. This program has proved its usefulness, and we should provide for the large number of youngsters now unable to benefit because of lack of facilities.

In the Morrisania-Claermont-Crotona Park communities, funds are requested for construction of an addition to Morris High School, for which site acquisition and planning funds were approved last year. This school is seriously overcrowded. And I urge funds for site acquisition for new Intermediate School 196.

Additional family day care centers are urgently needed. I join the many other voices of the community in requesting funds for the construction of Family Day Care Centers, especially in the Morrisania Health District. Locations near where the families live are important to provide proper care for children of working mothers.

I ask funding for the rehabilitation of Crotona Park, to include new lighting, bicycle paths, a skating rink, and the other needed improvements.

A Crotona Park Community Mental Health Facility is requested, and I urge the acquisition of a site, for which funds are already available.

I now want to briefly go over needed items in the Tremont-Belmont-West Farms communities—

Monies are needed and requested for the acquisition of a site and design for Intermediate School 194 in the Tremont area, where we have the shortest school sessions and the largest number of children of the entire Borough.

I strongly urge the inclusion of funds in the Capital Budget for a new Library in the vicinity of 183rd Street and Belmont Avenue, and for the rehabilitation of the Southern Boulevard Malls to include benches, trees, and sidewalks, water fountains, and other repairs.

I recommend a Community Center at the site of Old Borough Hall, or to be located at one of the two other suggested sites.

Within the Soundview-Bruckner-Clason Point communities, I urge the following which have been requested:

Funds for furniture and equipment for Intermediate School 174, for which construction funds were made available in the 1968-69 Capital Budget.

Priority should be given to construction funds for Primary School 182, for which site acquisition funds have already been made available. Over 2,000 new housing units in the area make it obvious the school will soon be needed.

Construction funds for an addition to Primary School 93. Here, too, additional construction bringing many new residents into the area, make planning for the addition a priority.

Soundview Park must be developed and improvements provided to make it a safe and useful recreational facility. I urge design plans and other action to accomplish this, for which I understand the Capital Budget contains the funds.

The area urgently needs other recreational facilities, such as a Community Center. Funds are requested for conversion of an abandoned bowling alley into a community center and to expand facilities at James Monroe Community Center.

I ask that funds be included for a Little League Field at Metcalf and Story Avenues.

The Soundview-Bruckner area is one of tremendous growth, and one of the most urgent needs is a New Hospital. Residents must use Jacobl Hospital, requiring triple fare, and where the patient load is already severe. I urge that funds be made available in the Budget for an immediate study and prompt action in this regard.

For the Castle Hill Community, the following projects should be included in the Capital Budget for 1969-70:

Funds for books, furniture and equipment for the Clason Point Library.

Construction funds for a Neighborhood Family Care Center to be located on a lot on Watson Avenue between Beach and Taylor Avenues.

Additional recreational facilities in the area north of Bruckner Boulevard, such as vest pocket parks; a swimming pool on a city-owned piece of property near Watson and Rosedale Avenues; monies for lighting the park at Watson and Rosedale, and a Little League Field to replace the one destroyed by reconstruction at Chatterton and Bruckner Boulevard.

Construction funds are requested for the James Monroe High School addition; and construction of Northeast Bronx High School and Community Center should be expedited. Additional funds are requested for furniture, books and equipment.

And once again, the request is made for monies for Castle Hill Park development and for additional facilities, including a gymnasium and the Castle Hill Houses Community Center.

I add my request to the following items for the Bronx Park-Pelham Parkway communities:

The North East Bronx High School and Community Center, already mentioned.

Funds for additional Senior Citizens facilities in Pelham Parkway; construction of a community center for the young; and modernization of Bronx Park's easterly section, with additional lighting, water fountains, a roller and an ice-skating rink.

Improvements in the Pelham Parkway Little League Field: better lighting, improved lavatory facilities, other repairs.

Funds for the modernization of Christopher Columbus High School, to include additional lockers, a swimming pool, and needed painting of the building.

Pelham Parkway Station, utilized by many area senior citizens, needs an Escalator.

Funds are requested for the completion of the municipal parking lot on White Plains Road and Brady Avenue, a highly populated commercial area.

And last, but not least, I want to make a strong plea for funds in the Capital Budget to provide more adequate street and park lighting, not only in this community, but in all the areas I have covered in the Bronx, comprising my 22nd Congressional District and adjoining areas. More police protection, especially foot patrolmen and better street lighting are the requests I hear most frequently from my constituents. We must provide adequate funds for these two items, which are deterrents to crime.

ANTISMUT LEGISLATION

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to curtail the sale and pandering of pornography to juveniles. This legislation is patterned after the New York State antipornography law which has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The material being sent through the mails today to unsuspecting individuals has become more and more voluminous in recent years while the degree of blatant filth used and depicted in these materials has become indescribably disgusting.

I certainly do not want to set any moral guidelines for this Nation but something must be done. I believe most people know right from wrong. Most people can also tell smut and filth when they see it.

Not a week goes by that someone does not send me some advertisement for salacious material which he received unsolicited. Most often the question asked of me is: "Congressman, it is bad enough that I have to receive this unwanted filth but what would happen if my young son or daughter received something in the mail like this?"

The Supreme Court has held that "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press." In April of 1968 the Court held in Ginsberg versus New York (390 U.S. 629), that a New York statute was constitutional which prohibited the sale to persons under 17 years of age materials defined to be obscene to them even though the same material might not be obscene to adults.

This bill is patterned after the New York statute.

The bill would prohibit the dissemination of books, magazines, movies, and other materials in interstate commerce which are considered to be harmful to persons under 18 years of age.

The solicitations which these smut peddlers previously used were vulgar and suggestive, but the ones sent out today are blatantly pornographic and filthy. I believe this legislation will curtail the flow of this material to young persons.

Penalties under the bill include fines up to \$5,000 and prison sentences of up to 5 years.

REMARKS OF JOHN W. GARDNER,
CHAIRMAN, THE URBAN COALITION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 22, 1969, the Creve Coeur Club in my hometown of Peoria, Ill., held its 71st Annual Washington Birthday Dinner. The roster of speakers at this prestigious event over the years represents a veritable "Who's Who" from the political and business communities.

Our speaker this year, the Honorable John W. Gardner, Chairman of the Urban Coalition and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, continued this tradition of the club in presenting only the most outstanding leaders of our country.

Almost 1,000 of our community's leading citizens were present to hear Mr. Gardner's frank and candid appraisal of the problems confronting the country with regard to finding solutions to the tremendous difficulties in our cities, both large and small, all over the country. I include the text of Mr. Gardner's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, CHAIRMAN,
THE URBAN COALITION

Let me begin with a bit of history.

The time is June 1776. The scene—a second floor parlor in the brick home of a young German named Graff, at the southwest corner of Market and Seventh Streets in Philadelphia.

There shortly after the eleventh of June, beginning perhaps on the eleventh, the lodger who occupied the second floor of Graff's home began to draft one of the great documents in our history.

The lodger was, of course, the tall, lean thirty-three year old Virginian, Thomas Jefferson.

The document was, of course, the Declaration of Independence.

The second and most famous sentence in the Declaration, as it stands in the final version, reads: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

True to our modern temper, we have dissected the famous sentence, debated it, and impugned it. I myself have questioned it, defended it, argued over it and written about it. But the dignity of the sentence remains. To me nothing can detract from its beauty, nothing can detract from the significance for

Americans of the moral strivings reflected in the sentence. It is the most seminal sentence in the history of American values.

But we must not let our admiration blind us to certain facts. After the great words were written, 89 years passed before we abolished slavery in this land of the free. Another half century passed before we enacted effective legislation against child labor. It wasn't until 1920 that women were allowed to vote. It wasn't until 1954 that the Supreme Court ruled against segregation. And even today human potentialities are warped and stunted in our slums.

The story of our failures and partial successes in the 192 years since the Declaration is more than a story of the slow approach to an early goal. Not only is our practice becoming in some respects more compatible with the Declaration, our moral insight concerning the goal itself is in some respects deepening. We understand more now than we did then about the implications of those truths that were thought to be self-evident.

One of the things we know now is that there are other and perhaps more stubborn obstacles to individual fulfillment than the tyranny and oppression that preoccupied our Founding Fathers. The other obstacles are poverty, ignorance, disease, discrimination, mental or physical illness or incapacity, and so on. And these cannot be removed by mere assertion of unalienable rights, nor even by legally certified freedoms.

The most exciting declaration of our generation is the assertion that we must seek to remove *all* of these obstacles. Indeed we are now engaged in an unprecedented attack on all the conditions that prevent the full and free development of individual potentialities.

When we get down to the practical realities of that task—improving our schools, eliminating poverty, combating mental illness, eradicating discrimination, we find ourselves engaged in a hard and unglamorous business.

And in that hard and unglamorous business, the most difficult, most frustrating and most desperately important task is to accomplish the kinds of changes in institutional structures that will permit significant social progress. If you doubt the difficulty of that task, have a look at the fate of Congressional reform in the 90th Congress. Or the fate of several recent attempts to modernize State charters. Or attempts to modify zoning regulations or building codes. Or efforts to redesign the clanking archaisms of municipal government.

Those of us concerned with the problems of the cities face such questions of institutional change constantly. But today we face another kind of problem that really can't be wholly blamed on outworn institutional structures.

Today one of the gravest handicaps to the local community, one of the things that prevents it from pursuing any of its purposes effectively, is the fragmentation of the community itself—and the fragmentation of community leadership.

I saw this at first hand when, as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, I had to visit all of our major cities—and many not so major. I found that the typical American city was split up into a variety of different worlds that were often wholly out of touch with one another.

The suburbs were out of touch with the central city. Business, labor and the universities were three wholly separate worlds—as far apart as worlds can be. City Hall was usually out of touch with the ghetto and often out of touch with the ablest and most influential people in the city. The most ominous rift, of course, was the rift involving the white and black communities.

As I traveled around, I observed that these fragmented worlds were often terribly ignorant of one another, and that the ignorance

bred fear, and the fear bred hostility. These cities were not communities. They were encampments of strangers.

Is it surprising that cities so fragmented have great difficulty in solving their problems, great difficulty in even formulating their problems? Long before the riots, it was apparent to everyone who studied these matters closely that communities so riven could not weather a storm without cracking wide open.

The storms came—and they cracked wide open. One after another. Like all structures under stress they cracked along the lines of their internal weaknesses. The rift between black and white communities was usually the main issue but when the city tried to pull itself together to face that issue, it found its capacity to do so greatly diminished by the other rifts within the community—between business and labor, between suburb and central city, between police and citizen, between young and old.

Nothing is more clear than that no major city can or will solve its problems without first repairing some of those devastating gaps in communication.

In some respects it is harder to accomplish that repair after the troubles that have occurred. In some respects, of course, it is easier. Some people respond to trouble affirmatively, redoubling their efforts to act constructively. But others, both black and white, respond to the interplay of violence and counter-violence with deepened anger, fear, hostility and a desire to strike back.

We shall see a good deal more of these emotions before we're through. But they won't solve a thing.

Sooner or later we are going to have to sit down together and figure out how we can create communities that we can all live in, all believe in, all be proud of, all defend.

The sooner we get on with it the better. The Urban Coalition was formed precisely with that task in mind.

After the riots in the summer of 1967, a group of outstanding leaders in American life came together to form the Coalition.

The members of the Steering Committee included leading mayors, business leaders, labor leaders, leaders from the black community and religious leaders.

I emphasize the importance of the coalition principle. Some people think of the Coalition as just another organization tackling the tough urban problems of the day. But it is unique. Our distinction is that we bring together segments of American life that do not normally collaborate in the solution of public problems.

How does the Urban Coalition—local or national—differ from other organizations? First, we are not sponsored by one constituency. We are not a businessman's organization, nor a governmental organization nor a minority group organization. Our sponsoring constituency includes all significant elements in the community.

Second, we do not focus on a single problem—unemployment, race conflict, good government, welfare—but are concerned with the whole range of problems.

It is precisely this comprehensiveness of constituencies and functions that is our greatest strength—but it also makes it hard for people to understand our role. In this society, everyone is keyed to specialization. When Americans become concerned about the community they typically join with others of their own group (e.g., businessmen with businessmen) to form a special purpose organization.

And that's fine. But the special purpose organizations proliferate endlessly and still there is no organization designed to pull the whole fragmented community together—until an urban coalition is formed. A fragmented community cannot eliminate the senseless duplication of functions and agencies. An effectively functioning urban coalition can help the community correct that problem.

That larger goal is infinitely more important than all of the specific projects that local coalitions undertake. It is a goal that can never be accomplished by the innumerable single-purpose organizations concerned with employment, education, discrimination, and so on. Nor can it be accomplished in a city that is paralyzed by the rifts I described earlier.

Once the significant elements in the community begin to work together, once they begin to think as a community and act as a community, all kinds of things are possible. Then they can give city government the kind of intelligent support it needs; they can make the needs of their city felt at the state and Federal level; they can see how all the various Federal, state and local programs fit together; they can provide strong citizen support for Federal programs that are working and strong citizen criticism of those that are not working.

And most important of all, perhaps, they can look ahead.

The Urban Coalition has come a long, long way in its short 18 months of life. A year and a half ago it was no more than a group of men with a deep concern for their country and an idea of how they might be helpful.

Today we have 42 local coalitions. As in the case of the national, each local organization includes representatives from a variety of leadership segments in the community—the mayor, business, labor, minority groups and religion. And we encourage the participation of other relevant elements—the universities, the schools, the press, the professions.

The coalition principle requires that minority groups be represented in the effort to solve community problems. And such representation is itself a step toward solving the toughest problem of all—effective dialogue between minority communities and the dominant elements in the city.

The national organization leaves it entirely to the locals to determine priorities. The local coalitions make their own decisions as to what problems they want to tackle. The principle of local decision is extremely important. We are a grass roots organization or we're not anything.

But the problems the locals turn to are fairly predictable. They turn to the things that worry them the most—unemployment, housing, education, race conflict, black entrepreneurship, police-community relations and so on.

I will not burden you with a recital of the achievements of the locals, but they have gotten into an extraordinary variety of activities. They have formed venture capital corporations to assist black businesses, launched significant housing ventures, supported important new educational activities such as the Street Academies, set up youth councils, tackled local problems of race conflict and so on.

Why has the Urban Coalition grown so rapidly? How is it able to enlist the time and energy of the most able and gifted people in the country? How has it been able to establish itself so quickly as a significant landmark in our national life?

To me, the answer is very simple. It is an idea whose time has come. Neither in our cities nor in the nation as a whole is there any other instrumentality that undertakes to bind together all the various segments of national leadership. It provides a grass-roots network in which all segments of our national life can collaborate in shaping the future of their communities. It links the public and private sectors. It links national and local levels of action.

It involves two basic principles. One of them is the principle of coalition. As I pointed out earlier, most of our cities are very badly fragmented. And the fragmentation makes it almost impossible for the city to tackle any of its problems effectively.

We can correct that fragmentation; we can correct it through the process of coalition.

By doing so, we can again create coherent communities that can tackle their problems with vigor and commitment.

The second principle is grass-roots leadership. We believe that people must care about their own communities. They cannot imagine that their communities will remain healthy if they turn their backs on elementary civic duties. If I may speak plainly, the tradition of local leadership is badly decayed in this country, and a great many of our ablest citizens have paid little or no attention to the fate of the city in which they lived or worked. We can change all that. We can revive the tradition of civic responsibility.

I do not believe that in the years ahead there is going to be any rest for those of us who care about the wholeness and health of this society.

It may be, of course, that in the years ahead, moral progress will be swifter than we think. It may be that the human race, which for 10,000 years has been so uneven in honoring its ideals, will suddenly change when the generation now under 30 takes over. But it may not. We must face that dreadful possibility.

Before the Constitutional Convention in 1789 George Washington is said to have made the statement, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

When I was a young man that seemed to me, and it still seems to me, a noble proposal. But as a youth, I was also attracted by its seeming simplicity. Life hadn't yet revealed to me how difficult it is to raise any kind of standard, nor for that matter how hard it is to be wise and how very hard to be honest—hard all the days of our lives.

I believe that Jefferson erected such a standard when he inserted into our first great national document a memorable expression of what has proven to be the most enduring values in American life.

We have been faithless and faithful by turns to the ideals Jefferson expressed. We have interpreted and re-interpreted his words. Our understanding of the values underlying them has evolved and deepened. Yet we are still struggling to do justice to the vision, heartened by a few successes, ashamed of many failures and alarmed by present perils that seem to threaten the vision. Perhaps that is simply a description of the reality surrounding all moral striving.

A set piece of social philosophical debate is the question of whether evil exists in man or in his institutions. It is a sterile debate. We are imperfect creatures and have created imperfect institutions.

But we are imperfect creatures who dream of something better. And that is relevant too. I believe that we can come very close to that something better provided we accept continuous striving ("eternal vigilance," in the old phrase) as a condition. Both man and his institutions must be under constant pressure to meet moral standards.

If we could stamp out prejudice today, it would begin to take root again tomorrow. If we could bring our institutions to a perfect pitch of vitality and creativity today they would start to decay tomorrow. That's our situation. We just have to keep at it.

We're going to have to drop the long-established habit of taking our system for granted. We have a wonderfully complacent notion that if each of us minds his own business well, the system will take care of itself.

But it isn't taking care of itself. We're going to have to do something we haven't done since the late 18th Century when a lawyer named Jefferson, a planter named Washington, a printer named Franklin, a banker named Morris and others of varied occupations made themselves experts in statecraft in order to found a new nation. So must a lot of us today think hard about how our nation can be made to work.

We're badly out of practice. But we had better start.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared her independence. The 51st anniversary of this declaration was commemorated less than 2 weeks ago. On February 24, 1918, just 8 days later, the Republic of Estonia proclaimed her independence and will likewise observe the 51st anniversary of the occasion this month. Due recognition of these solemn events should serve to focus world attention on the threat that the Communist regimes of the world pose to the struggles of newly emerging nations which seek self-determination, as well as those that already exist but which must rely upon their alliances with the free nations to preserve their sovereignty and independence.

Unfortunately, the proximity of the Baltic States to the Soviet Union laid them open to the ruthless imposition of incorporation into the U.S.S.R., thus subverting their short-lived freedom from outside domination. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, comprising the Baltic States, share a common bond in spirit and purpose to rejoin the community of free nations of the world, an aspiration that was once realized and one which is now the driving force behind their appeals for moral and political support. Our stake in keeping this spirit and hope alive is no less than a reaffirmation of our own way of life, the principles to which we dedicate our lives.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I include a letter I received from the president of the Estonian National Committee in the United States.

THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
New York, N.Y.

HON. JOHN E. HUNT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Americans of Estonian descent in the United States will celebrate the 51st anniversary of independence of the Republic of Estonia proclaimed on February 24, 1918.

After the outbreak of the Second World War, Estonia and the other Baltic States, Latvia and Lithuania, became victims of the conspiracy of the totalitarian imperialistic powers, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, and were forcibly incorporated into the USSR. The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors was the first step westward in a ruthless march against Europe. The beginning of today's international tensions and threats to the peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States of 1940.

At this anniversary all Americans of Estonian descent feel dutybound to call the attention of all peace loving free nations to the continued forcible ruling and colonial exploitation of Estonia by the imperialistic Communist conspiracy called the Soviet Union.

We are convinced that the rejoining of Estonia and the other Baltic States into the free community of nations will also serve the vital interests of the United States. Therefore, we consider it to be important that this great nation as well as the population of the presently captive Estonia be kept aware of the continued willingness and determination of the United States Congress and Government to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of Estonia.

All greetings, statements, and messages to this effect on occasion of this great Estonian memorable day will be read at the solemn commemorative meetings of Estonian-Americans held in this country, and published in the Estonian-language press.

Very truly yours,

HEIKKI A. LEESMENT,
President.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT REGARDING FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARDS TO OKLAHOMANS

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 24 Freedoms Foundation At Valley Forge announced awards given by it to 17 patriotic Americans who had written outstanding essays including the subject "A Free Ballot—A Free Country." Two of these awards went to fellow Oklahomans, one, to my constituent, Lt. Col. William R. Ellis, a native of Hugo, Okla.; and the other to my former constituent, Capt. Ed Wheeler now of Tulsa, Okla. I am proud of the talent displayed by these Oklahomans and I congratulate them on the awards which they have received. At this time I submit a copy of their essays for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A FREE BALLOT—A FREE COUNTRY

(By Lt. Col. William R. Ellis)

In our great Republic we are blessed with a free ballot established by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. Thus by exercising our free ballot under the laws of our free country we are doing a great deal for our nation and for ourselves.

The Communists and Communist front organizations have conducted an extensive campaign to divide the United States of America and undermine our efforts and the efforts of the free world in combating the expansionist efforts of Communism in Vietnam. Our honest law-abiding American citizens have sat passively by while this small but well organized minority has been very effective.

In the wake of the recent unprovoked aggression against Czechoslovakia by a group of Soviet-led Communist nations, more and more loyal and dedicated Americans are now raising their voices against this well organized minority within the United States that seeks to divide us against ourselves.

When young Thomas Jefferson sat in a small, hot room in Philadelphia in June 1776 and prepared the first draft of the Declaration of Independence, he knew that the men who dared to sign that immortal document would be risking their lives when they signed it. But sign it they did, just as we must now stand against those who would divide and destroy our American way of life.

The words of Patrick Henry fall on deaf ears in 1968, mainly because we have been spared tyranny and oppression in our homeland—thanks to the valor of our forefathers. It was Santayana who said, "A nation that does not know history is fated to repeat it."

The time has come for all Americans, who respect our laws and are loyal to the Constitution, to stand up and be counted as our forefathers have done before us.

How can we stand up and be counted? Part of the answer is to VOTE. After all, we have a Free Ballot—a Free Country; let's do our share to keep it that way!

A FREE BALLOT—A FREE COUNTRY
(By Capt. Ed Wheeler)

DEAR SON, as I gazed through the antiseptic glass wall in that hospital waiting room to see you flail the air in youthful protest, I thought of the future and the long journey ahead of you.

I thought of the wonders of which you will learn, the happiness that you will experience, the tears of sadness and heartbreak that will roll down your cheeks and the strength that you will develop as you progress down the highway of life.

I have only a few precious moments before I must leave on a trip that will take me a long way from my newborn son and his mother. Someday I hope you will understand that I had to leave to do a job that had to be done. An assignment that far too many of my generation refused to do for selfish reasons, but an undeniable obligation that will determine whether a people—very much like you and me—will be granted the opportunity to survive in their environment without being subjected to an oppressive system forced upon them by an invader.

Because the possibility exists that we may not be privileged to know and love one another, I have to take this opportunity now to convey to you the one principle by which I have lived—love of my country and all that my country represents as the hope for an oppression weary mankind.

When you grow tall and strong, when you begin to chart your own course and take your place among your fellow man, I want you to take a moment one day and examine all that surrounds you. Reflect on the majesty and abundance of the land in which you live. Think of the freedom of movement you have, the liberty of expression and the unlimited opportunities open to those who have the courage to take advantage of the occasion.

But more than anything else son, I ask you to look upon the greatness of your country, and because of those who have gone before and in tribute for what they did, love her deeply, sincerely and beyond the capacity of the shallow-citizen or professional-patriots.

Hold her close, revere her and defend her from her enemies—both foreign and domestically bred.

And although you may never be called to the sound of her drums, you must continue the fight for her or she will wither and fall under the onslaught of the vultures and wolves who have hovered over her and surrounded her since her birth.

Preserve her freedom and you will preserve your own. For your rights are her rights, your vote is her vote and your voice—her voice . . . for you are part of her. So son . . . whatever may be wrong with her, is wrong with you and it will be up to you to correct it.

I charge you with that responsibility.
All my love,

YOUR FATHER.

WASHINGTON SHORES RECREATION ASSOCIATION

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to report on a successful fundraising drive that took place in my district. I am especially proud in that this campaign was organized and completed within our black community in Orlando, Fla., raising over \$125,000 for a badly needed community center.

The leaders of our black community felt that too many times people ask for

help without first trying to help themselves. The easy way is to complain about the problems but not take any action. The easy way is to sit back and seek Federal and State aid. The easy way is to expect something for nothing.

This was not the approach taken. Instead, the Washington Shores Recreation Association was formed. A vigorous door-to-door campaign was organized. When the drive initially fell short, instead of giving up, efforts were redoubled and success finally achieved after long hours of work.

It is refreshing in today's society to know that initiative and independence are still a vital part of the American way of life. Opportunity is everywhere. It is waiting for those who have the courage and dedication to seek it out. I am proud of the members of the Washington Shores Recreation Association. I am proud that they are constituents of mine and that I am part of such a community. I hope that their efforts will serve as an example to all Americans. I know they did to me.

FFA—AN OPPORTUNITY

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, FFA clubs throughout the United States provide an opportunity for youth in agriculture to learn, to do, to earn, and to serve.

Future Farmers of America celebrated FFA Week, February 15-22. Their theme is "FFA—An Opportunity for Youth."

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I place in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Cullman Tribune, a newspaper serving Cullman County, in my congressional district. This editorial adequately spotlights the work of FFA. In my opinion, FFA deserves our unqualified thanks and support.

The editorial follows:

FFA—AN OPPORTUNITY

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.

Experiences 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 estab-

lishing chapter goals, and just as important—helps accomplish them. Many typical chapter activities include earning their own resources and providing community service.

Future Farmers of America are celebrating FFA Week, February 15-22. Their theme—"FFA . . . an opportunity for youth."

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.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT DUMPS SCIENTIST WHO CRITICIZED EXTRAVAGANCE

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth Cook of Lebanon, Ind., one of our Nation's top military scientists, some time ago was discharged from his job under very mysterious circumstances.

For over a year now I have tried to help Mr. Cook in his attempt to get a formal hearing before the Civil Service Commission. But every time I thought there was a chance for a hearing, the door closed on me.

I hope that every Member of Congress will take the time to read the following newspaper story which appeared recently in the Hearst newspapers throughout this Nation.

After you read this story I know that many of you will start to ask questions to the Civil Service Commission and the Defense Department.

The article follows:

HOW KENNETH COOK WAS RAILROADED: DEFENSE DEPARTMENT DUMPS SCIENTIST WHO CRITICIZED EXTRAVAGANCE

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

WASHINGTON.—The Air Force has drummed out a civilian missile scientist on a mental disability retirement even though the top Air Force psychiatrist said they had no "sound medical basis" in the records to do so.

Still, the case of Kenneth S. Cook, 55, might have been buried in conflicting medical views if he had not charged that his retirement only gathered steam because he refused to change study data critical of a projected multi-billion dollar, pet Air Force weapons system.

The truth of this charge cannot be determined because both the Air Force and the Civil Service Commission have denied the stocky, balding weapons analyst a formal hearing.

They have also refused Cook a hearing on other peculiar gaps in the case which, even in the kindest light, evokes a picture of interagency back-scratching plus outright misrepresentation.

For the University of Indiana master of science it has meant loss of his \$16,152 a year job, the damaging label "paranoid personality" and the \$9,000—his life savings and then some—he has spent fighting back.

Worst of all for him, his \$297 a month pension cannot possibly cover a court fight—his final appellate battleground. And he is too broke to get medical checkups for a mild diabetic problem.

The Civil Service won't even let him see much of his file, contending that its medical statements—most of which he has gotten

through doctors and friends on Capitol Hill—would upset him.

"I'm too dumb to quit," said the World War II Signal Corps officer. Psychiatrists he enlisted to help him fight the bureaucracy agree he should get a job back, but even they call him rigid and obstinate. That's what has kept him going.

The national import of the Cook case lies in mounting charges that the Defense Department is ralloading out dissident employees—those who blow the whistle on such things as oil theft in Thailand, phony department figures on aircraft cost, awesome contract frauds.

The Cook case's combination of denial of due process and possible defense cover-up has prompted letters to the Civil Service and to others from Sens. Clinton Anderson (D-N.M.), Sam Ervin (D-N.C.), and John McClellan (D-Ark.). Constitutional Rights Subcommittee Chairman Ervin wrote then Civil Service Chairman John Macy:

"It would appear from the record that officials at Holloman Air Force Base (N.M.), displeased with Mr. Cook's policy criticisms of their operations, may have taken advantage of the many loopholes in the laws and regulations affecting the rights of individuals in retirement actions."

Among the many questions raised by the case are:

Why did the Air Force and Civil Service override Lt. Col. Paul Grissom, top Air Force psychiatrist? He wrote that Cook's Air Force psychiatric evaluation reports "do not support the conclusion on any sound medical basis that Mr. Cook was incapacitated for performance of his duties set forth in his job description."

Why did the Air Force, Civil Service and Defense Department insist in letters to Capitol Hill, and in the one case to Vice President Hubert Humphrey, that they had thoroughly investigated the case? Calls by Hearst Newspapers to Cook's civilian boss, Dr. Gerhard Eber; the psychological evaluator, retired Lt. Col. Herbert Reynolds; and the medical doctor who initiated the case, Lt. Col. Dwight Newton, brought statements that not one of the agencies' investigators had contacted any of them.

Why did the Civil Service retire Cook without checking out his contention that a clique at Holloman was prejudiced against him? Hearst Newspapers found from a base directory that the military superior with whom Cook clashed lived one door away from Dr. Newton, who as base hospital head put the medical case in motion. Dr. Newton acknowledged that he and the superior, a lieutenant colonel, were friends and that he had once gotten a local district attorney to drop a delinquency charge against the superior's son. Dr. Newton said he had acted in accord with medical ethics in the Cook case.

Why did Civil Service officials assure a House Civil Service Investigator that then Civil Service Chairman Macy had interviewed Cook? The two men never met. The non-existent interview was used as a reason for a committee staffer to recommend no committee action on the case.

Why in a 1968 letter to Vice President Humphrey, did the office of the Air Force secretary assure him Cook's "security clearance was not withdrawn," thus making Cook appear to be a liar for saying it had in his own letter to Humphrey? A "for official use only" Air Force document in 1967 says plainly "on Nov. 22, 1966 . . . Mr. Cook's security was withdrawn."

These are glaring holes among others discovered by congressional probers and by Hearst Newspapers. All are documented in official files or were confirmed by direct interviews.

As to Cook himself, his ordeal began in 1965 when he was working at Holloman on secret projects relating to anti-ballistic missile defense systems, particularly against submarine-launched missiles.

Listed in "American Men of Science" since 1955, he had come here with a record of more than 15 years as a physics professor and weapons analyst with the military and with North American Aviation.

In March, 1965, his data was ready for printing, but his civilian boss, Dr. Eber abruptly rejected it and indicated that Cook should rewrite it to change it by what Cook said was "180 degrees," according to Cook.

Dr. Eber calls the altering charge "complete nonsense." Reached at Holloman where he still works for the Air Force, he said the Cook data was not in an acceptable form.

In July, 1966, Cook's draft of another report on destruction of long-range missiles by using non-nuclear warheads was turned down both by Eber and by Cook's military superior. They refused to forward it to the Pentagon, said Cook. Dr. Eber said the report was not consonant with other Air Force data and thus was not included in the final report.

Whatever the facts of these cases, the conflicts grew between Cook and his military superior. For example, Cook said the officer told him and other subordinates to vote against the judge who handed his son's delinquency case. Cook contended that the superior caused him problems about getting leave when Cook's father was critically ill.

An effort by Hearst Newspapers to reach the superior in Thailand, his present post, failed. The telephone operator said there was no commercial service to the base, some 350 miles from Bangkok.

Cook also said that the superior ordered him to resign or transfer, a charge that Civil Service general counsel Anthony Mondello said was mentioned in the Cook file. Mondello conceded that the superior had not been questioned on this—and several other Cook allegations—as an effort to get to the truth of the clash between the two men.

In October, 1966, Cook wrote a letter over his superiors' heads to Brig. Gen. Ernest A. Pinson at the Air Force's aerospace research office in Arlington, Va. He bitterly complained that his military superior at Holloman was a "farce." The letter was later described at Cook's medical board hearing as "rather bizarre."

In November, 1966, Cook's bosses at Holloman lifted his security clearance and they initiated denial of his in-grade pay increase in December, 1966, according to Holloman records.

Cook's military superior went to Dr. Newton, the base hospital head and the superior's neighbor and friend and made his complaints against Cook, Dr. Newton said. Newton said he sent Cook to Lt. Col. Herbert H. Reynolds, now retired, a psychologist, friend of Newton and social acquaintance of the military superior of Cook. Reynolds evaluated Cook.

Both Newton and Reynolds—who was reached at his job in Ft. Worth, Tex.—said their mutual military and social ties with Cook's military boss did not affect their dealings with the civilian scientist.

Based on the results of the Reynolds examination and an examination of Cook by Capt. Martin Reite, a psychiatrist, an Air Force medical board was convened on Jan. 25, 1967, for Cook.

The board, made up of Reynolds, two psychiatrists and two other doctors, all Air Force officers, said:

"Mr. Cook is suffering from a . . . paranoid personality pattern, chronic, severe . . . should be retired for medical reasons."

Cook, who contends there are 120 separate errors in the medical board summary—which Reynolds said was agreed to by the board unanimously—then began his two-year fight. He consulted civilian psychiatrists.

Dr. George M. Schlenker, of El Paso, said Cook "may be paranoid tinged" but was neither potentially dangerous nor a security risk. He urged the Air Force to find a use for his "talents" and "experience."

Another psychiatrist, Dr. W. Thomas Holman, of Las Cruces, N.M., said he disagreed sharply with the Air Force, saying Cook had the sort of "obsessive-compulsive personality" that drives many "outstanding individuals (to) great feats on behalf of mankind" and is actually a "valuable" trait. He found "no abnormal content of thought" in Cook and urged he be sent back to work, with a pay raise.

The sheaf of medical reports finally was sent by the Air Force to its top psychiatrist, Dr. Grissom, who did not diagnose Cook but said the records "disclose no evidence of a psychotic or severe chronic neurotic condition." The board's diagnosis of "paranoid personality" describes a personality pattern but not a disease, he said.

Cook's superiors split with several of his colleagues in their views.

Dr. Eber, as one example, said the Air Force had been just to Cook. Retired Lt. Col. Bob Whitfield who worked with Cook, said the Air Force "machine-gunned" him. Whitfield said the Air Force had taken advantage of the ease in carrying through a mental disability retirement as compared with a retirement for cause."

"He is a victim of the big machine that rolls over little people," said Whitfield. The Civil Service agreed that it was easier to get people out with a mental disability retirement, but counsel Mondello—who came to the commission after Cook was retired—said the case was handled properly.

Defense Department contentions that they checked out the case carefully leave something to be desired. Assistant General Counsel for Manpower and Reserve Affairs Frank Bartimo said he had "relied" on Deputy Assistant Secretary James P. Goode, of the Air Force, who told him the case had been thoroughly investigated.

Bartimo acknowledged that he did not know and could not recollect asking Goode whether witnesses for Cook were queried. And Goode declined to go explicitly into what he had done in the way of investigating.

But Whitfield said neither Goode nor Bartimo's office—nor any defense agency investigator ever asked for his views of the case.

There was a final irony.

Under pressure from Capitol Hill, the Civil Service put through a reform last May that now would give Cook a hearing. But they did not hold up retirement on Cook the four months it would have taken to make him eligible for his hearing, even though the reforms were in the works.

Now the defense agency and the Civil Service who have left Cook with \$297 a month—minus hospitalization insurance which Cook says is deducted against his will—advise him to get a lawyer and take it to court. His mother is 75 and he can no longer send her money. His insurance has lapsed.

His case is the sort of precedent-making one that could go all the way to the Supreme Court—at a cost of hundreds of hours in time and thousands of dollars in cash. For these reasons, the advice of the two giant federal agencies appears to be both empty and cruel.

SUPPORT OF HOOVER COMMISSION STUDY

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Federal Government needs drastic modernization and the most effective way of achieving urgently

needed improvement is a Hoover-type commission aimed at greater efficiency and economy in U.S. Government operations.

As one of the cosponsors of a bill that calls for improving the organization and management of the Federal Government, I believe that expansion of U.S. programs and personnel has been so rapid and extensive, duplication, inefficiency and unnecessary costs have resulted.

I am confident that a comprehensive study conducted by a bipartisan 10-member commission would streamline Federal operations and ultimately save billions of dollars in U.S. costs.

The two Hoover Commission studies of 1947-49 and 1953-55 proved to be of substantial value and benefit, the latter producing savings estimated at \$7 billion in Federal expenditures. Because almost 14 years have passed since the last commission, I know that another one would provide much greater savings.

I would also like to point out that the majority of the recommendations made by the two commissions were implemented: 72 percent of the first Hoover study and 64 percent of the second investigation were adopted. These commissions are an excellent investment in better Federal Government and should operate periodically—perhaps every 5 years—instead of waiting for heavy clamor by newspapers or the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list just a few of the improvements that resulted from the commissions, just to show that the studies were really fruitful.

The first Hoover Commission reorganized the State Department to clarify responsibilities, improve communications, and so forth; created the General Services Administration, leading to modernized purchasing, inventory control, and records management; reorganized the Post Office Department to reduce waste, delay, and duplication; ended political appointments in the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and established a more systematic classification and pay scales of Federal employees.

The second commission reorganized and unified the Department of Defense; modernized the budget system; improved coordination and expediting of research programs; and simplified governmental paperwork.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am deeply concerned about mounting U.S. costs. The Appropriations Committee on which I serve cut Federal costs by about \$14.5 billion in the 90th Congress, but I believe that more savings and greater efficiency would be achieved by another Hoover Commission. I hope that legislation authorizing this is passed in this session.

LEGISLATION TO HONOR DR.
MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my distinguished col-

league from the First District of Michigan, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, JR., in introducing legislation to honor a great American—Dr. Martin Luther King.

The bill being introduced today would designate the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as a Federal public holiday and would be a fitting tribute to this outstanding leader. It would serve as a reminder to future generations that in the midst of the chaos and turmoil of this decade, there was in our midst a man of compassion, nonviolence, and brotherhood.

From the time in 1955, when he helped to organize his angry, excited brothers in a peaceful boycott after the arrest of Mrs. Rosa Parks in Montgomery, Ala., Dr. King endured violence, misunderstanding, and hate, from Negroes and from whites, as he continued to spread the doctrine of nonviolence throughout our land. He was bombed, spat upon, ridiculed, and finally killed. His death was the violent manifestation of the hate he fought so bravely to dispel.

He was a man who loved his fellow man, and who regretted profoundly that that all men did not love and trust one another. He influenced his countrymen through his words, his deeds, and his example. He directed his followers in Montgomery through 382 days of a bus boycott which was successful. He supported the freedom rides through the South in the early years of this decade to draw the Nation's attention to the reality of discrimination. He led the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in a continued effort to improve the relations between the races of America.

He joined the march on Washington in 1963 in support of the civil rights bill then pending in Congress. He told the 250,000 marchers assembled at the Lincoln Memorial of his dream that:

One day this nation will rise up . . . that one day in Alabama . . . little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

In 1964, when he became the 12th American and third Negro ever to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, he said:

I do not consider this merely an honor to me personally, but a tribute to the discipline, wise restraint, and majestic courage of the millions of gallant Negro and white persons of good will who have followed a nonviolent course in seeking to establish a reign of justice and a rule of love across this nation of ours.

He fought for peace, and for brotherhood, and for the elimination of poverty. He fought for love, and he was killed in hate. In 1955, after his house had been bombed, he said:

I want it to be known the length and breadth of the land that if I am stopped, the movement will not stop. If I am stopped, our work will not stop.

We cannot forget this unique, this very special man. We must not allow his dream to go unfulfilled. Let us make a Federal public holiday of the birth date anniversary of the man who taught us lasting lessons in brotherhood and justice.

JOYCE LARKIN'S LAST COLUMN

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of Wisconsin's most colorful and outspoken smalltown newspaperwomen died on January 13, 1969. She was Joyce Larkin, former editor and copublisher of the Vilas County News-Review, Eagle River, Wis.

I knew Joyce Larkin personally for many years, and always respected her. Her greatest interest was in the field of politics, but she had a keen understanding and interest in conservation and wildlife.

It think it is appropriate to have printed in the RECORD her last column which deals with her religious philosophy and pride in her Irish heritage.

The column follows:

GENERALLY SPEAKING: THE GREAT MIRACLE
OF THE 20TH CENTURY

(By Joyce Larkin)

For the first time in 6,000 years, estimated age of the appearance of man in time, three men got close enough to the moon to send back photographs of it. What is equally important, they sent back photographs of the earth too, which no one has ever photographed, and mankind saw how little this globe looks turning around and around in the vastness of space.

In this editorial, the writer may go out as far in space as the astronauts did, because there is a significance to me in their adventurous and glorious journey into infinity, eternal and incomprehensible, and all that attended it that you may not feel. It took God six days to make the world and only a day longer to bring the astronauts so near the moon and to inaugurate the era of flights through space that lies ahead. Never before has man flown through endless space at such phenomenal speed and without the gravitational pull of the earth.

If you were to enumerate the "firsts" the astronauts accomplished and their effect on our lives, it would fill a very big book. These were not simple "firsts", but fantastic ones, so strange and unbelievable that only God could be the director behind these achievements, and only God could have stood over that room where all the mathematics were worked out and inspired the men and women to go beyond their human talents to find the right answers that made that flight to the moon possible.

Certainly there were dangers on the flight. We were told of three. It seems to me there were hundreds of dangers every second, but, as the critical points were ticked off, the dangers were achieved and passed without effort and successfully. If any of the three points had not been negotiated, the astronauts would have sacrificed their lives, so that others in the future, with the knowledge gained, such another attempt would be successful.

Much of the flight is like the story of Christmas. There's the star (the moon). There's the Three Wise Men (the astronauts). And where did these Three Wise Men lead us? To God. In the eternal and all-pervasive silence of the Universe, the astronauts read from the one book, the Bible, for these were reverent and humble men, one of them a lay preacher. And there was the tenseness and then the great rejoicing as the astronauts returned to earth.

God, Himself, is all-good, all-wise and all-knowing and He loves all men, but most of

all He loves the good, humble, generous and magnanimous, and in them He manifests himself. He made that trip to the moon and back and everything went off like clockwork, from lift off to getting to the moon, to circling it ten times, to getting out of the moon's gravitational orbit and into the earth's atmosphere to "splash down."

These three men and all the workers could have said, "Look what we have done, made a machine that did fly to the moon and back. We are bigger and better and more wonderful than anyone, because who has ever before done his?" The astronauts didn't say this nor the people with them. They went to church. They thanked God for giving them their talents, their brains and their strength and patience and endurance. No, there was not an agnostic in that capsule and on the ground. They even acted more like spectators, because, as things clicked off, they would say, "It worked perfectly, or without a fault or hitch." It was as if someone else did it and they were filled with wonder.

Nothing impressed the people of the Christian world, and even those not Christians, as the reading of "In the beginning God created the heaven and earth." It was a reminder of their great feat, but that God did even more. It was a reminder that God is the great last hope away from them by insisting that God is dead. This is evil and diabolical. Russians have been trying to get to the moon. No one knows how many lives have been lost in their experiments, but if they make it, the significance will be lost, because the people who embrace and trust God will have been there first.

Being Irish, and mystical, I believe God is on our side, since he has made it possible * * * creator, and He made man, and gave him the power to create a machine capable of flying around the moon.

Among the many miracles of that flight, there was one little one, hardly noticed, given little space in the newspapers. One of the astronauts developed a cold. In the talks from the capsule to central control, the illness was diagnosed as "flu" and fear was expressed the others would become infected and then re-infect each other. By the next day the illness had disappeared.

In this world, there are many small, dark evil clouds, but the biggest one that hangs over the world is Russia, a great blot on the universe. This country has captured millions of people and enslaved their spirits. Its philosophy is that man is supreme and that man can do anything that God can do. Indeed, it has crushed the spirit of independence and desire to be free out of the people it enslaves. * * * He also made that flight to the moon, because America needed a miracle now. He selected three reverent men and they sent back a message to millions of waiting Americans that touched their hearts and awakened and deepened their belief and trust in Him. Many vowed they would give Him a place in their lives and accept Him as their daily companion. It was a great spiritual awakening, and all of us will feel it all our mortal lives.

God lives.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I announce that the winning contestant for the State of Tennessee in the Voice of Democracy contest

conducted each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is one of my constituents from the Ninth District of Tennessee. The speech by John Durham, of Memphis, and a student at West Side High School, points out man's greatest challenge at this time in history: freedom's challenge. John Durham's speech is included here as an inspiration for all Americans:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By John Durham)

There is told the story of a businessman driving with a lumberjack in a jeep up Mt. Cushman in Vermont. Near the top of the mountain the businessman noted some six-inch seedlings. He asked the lumberjack when they would be large enough to be used as lumber, the lumberjack replied: "In the year 2015 A.D." Since that was far beyond his span of years, the businessman asked him why he had planted these trees and the lumberjack's reply "Because my grandfather had planted some on the other side for me." So it is with us—the 20th century American citizen. Our forefathers took the time to plant the seeds of freedom, justice, and equality. It falls upon our shoulders to cultivate these ideals and to plant further so that the generations who follow will live, grow and develop in a world of freedom, a challenging world of freedom, one in which all men can enjoy the rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and that today in a society such as ours is the Freedom's Challenge—freedom: a strange sounding word, it is a sensational feeling, an intangible spirit that has moved nations, guided destinies, stirred the hearts of millions, seen cries of revolutions and challenged the toughest of dictators and despots. Freedom is like a broad highway with many crossroads and detours. The crossroads and the detours are slavery, anarchy, dishonesty, deceit, avarice and lawlessness. These crossroads lead to sorrow, misery, failure and degradation. But the main road is the way of free men. This road leads to honor, respect, success and contentment. Some say the challenge today is far greater, more complex, and above all, unique, and yet, if we look back to the past we can see that the challenge is not new but the present is really the past made over. For example: Socrates, whose name we hold in reverence today was murdered by the Athenian people for seeking them to lead them to think for themselves. Galileo was imprisoned because he paid the penalty of loving truth more than public opinion. Roger Bacon upheld the cause of scientific research against unnumbered persecutions. Francois Voltaire, Thomas Paine, Nathan Hale, Abe Lincoln, Paul Revere, Patrick Henry, George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, Martin Luther, Winston Churchill, Thomas Jefferson, Sir Thomas More, and scores of others have followed in demonstrating that free minds and free lips were necessary, in order that men might grow and learn and civilization continue.

These men tested freedom, believed in freedom, and were willing to maintain freedom, sometimes even at the price of death. As Patrick Henry once said, "Look to the past for guidance in the future." We can see that today we cannot shrink from our responsibility of defending freedom—in such trouble spots as Vietnam, Berlin, Africa and Czechoslovakia. How can we defend freedom? How can we challenge these competitors? By arms when it is attacked by arms, by truth when it is attacked by lies, by democratic faith when it is attacked by authoritarian dogma . . . and always in the final act by dedication and faith. Today, as in everyday—as in every generation since our country's founding there are those who are seeking to destroy our land, our government, our way of life—the draft card burners, demonstrators, militants, student strikers and

rioters—but they must not have the final word . . . the test of democracy is the freedom of criticism and the amount of freedom which any nation has is a true measure of civilization and the outcome of this struggle depends largely upon the people now living in this world—upon us—we must not shrink from our responsibilities.

Perhaps the seedlings we told about will grow strong and have enough nutrients to survive storms and fires and then our side of the mountain will be green and beautiful—and as we grow strong in knowledge, brave in our American heritage, then we will survive the storms of hatred and the fires of fear in our time and our side of the mountain—the United States will stand green with promise and beautiful to all the world. This is the challenging world which we face today in 19(68-69). We must today resolve to answer the challenge, fulfill our responsibility of which all the world hinges, Freedom's Challenge.

A FORTHRIGHT VIEW ON THE MILITARY DRAFT

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I have been sincerely impressed with the high quality of public discussion concerning the future of the Selective Service System. A number of very articulate arguments have been made in behalf of proposals for placing military service on a voluntary basis. A number of arguments, to me even more persuasive, have been made against the adoption of such a system. No spokesman has been more forthright in advocating reforms in the Selective Service Act while seeking to maintain the concept of national service than Maine's Senator MUSKIE. In a recent speech at Miami University in Ohio, Senator MUSKIE presented his views to an audience most immediately affected by present and future Selective Service policies. Columnist Joseph Alsop has recently taken note of Senator MUSKIE's remarks. While I do not endorse Mr. Alsop's criticisms of those who protest military service or the war in Vietnam, this column does point out the wisdom of Senator MUSKIE's position on the draft. I insert Senator MUSKIE's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with Mr. Alsop's column, which appeared February 26 in the Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1969]

LITTLE-NOTICED MUSKIE SPEECH WISELY URGES DRAFT RETENTION

(By Joseph Alsop)

Facing a university audience, forthrightly calling for continuation of Selective Service, and getting the warmest applause for so-doing, might be described as an unlikely feat. Yet just this feat was pulled off by Sen. Edmund Muskie, in a too-little-noticed speech at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. Sen. Muskie did not claim perfection for the draft as it now operates. In fact he called for almost exactly the same reforms in the Selective Service System that Sen. Edward Kennedy has more recently proposed in a newly submitted bill.

It was notable that Muskie chose his first university audience since the election to de-

clare in favor of continuing the draft. And his tone of cool, long-headed national-mindedness was ever more notable.

"We have (always) insisted," Muskie remarked, "upon civilian control of the military. The relationship of the ordinary soldier to society is crucial in maintaining such control. Under our present system, his commitment to the military is limited. He will soon be replaced by someone else, and the goal of his military career is the end of his service."

"When and if a soldier becomes more concerned with self-perpetuation of the Army than with going home, society loses its control over the military. A volunteer army is a professional army, and the goals of a professional soldier are military."

"A professional soldier has a limited relationship to society outside his professional career. He has a limited commitment to a civilian life to which he does not expect to return. So long as the professional soldier is part of a larger, citizen army, the problem is limited . . . (but in this matter) the entire relationship of military service to our society could be at stake."

There was more of the same sort, all on the same level of calmly thoughtful forthrightness. To those who have taken the trouble to see the war in Vietnam at first hand, everything that Muskie said will seem both wise and profoundly important.

In Vietnam, we have a citizen army, although with professional officers, largely professional NCOs, and a certain percentage of long-service men at all levels. Yet one of the really ironic comedies of the war has been the oft-repeated attempt, by antiwar newspapermen, to solicit antiwar talk from this citizen army. Unprintable remarks about "the peace-creeps back home" have been the standard response.

Even with this citizen army, in fact, it would be pretty dangerous for President Nixon to accept defeat in Vietnam. Fortunately, the President has no notion of doing anything of the sort. But if he did so, there would surely be a very bitter reaction, perhaps even capable of warping our basic political pattern, from most of the men who have made such great efforts and sacrifices in the Vietnamese war.

Change that citizen army to a volunteer, or professional, or mercenary army—call it what you will. The political risk would then be very great indeed, in these times which call upon this country to maintain massive defense forces, year after year.

It is intensely reassuring that both Muskie and Kennedy, the two leading Democrats of the younger generation, have had the guts and good sense to see these points. In doing so, they have defied the silly left-wing fashions of the moment.

President Nixon, in contrast, is committed by his campaign statements to end the draft at some unspecified time in the future. If that should prove possible to do. But it now is likely to be proved impossible to do, by all sorts of weighty arguments.

The latter is the sensible interpretation, at any rate, of the appointment of a new commission to study reform or replacement of the Selective Service System. The commission was launched, and its members were named, by Nixon's extremely able Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird.

Reportedly, Secretary Laird's chosen commission chairman is his best predecessor of the Eisenhower years, former Secretary Thomas Gates. Gates is not what you would call a strong end-the-draft enthusiast. In truth, this new commission can be rather confidently expected to come to about the same conclusions as the earlier, Democratic-named commission. This group, headed by one of the truly wise liberals, Burke Marshall, recommended reforming but continuing the draft.

And that Pentagon estimates for the extra cost of wholly volunteer armed services run

from \$7 billion to \$14 billion a year, with the higher figure more probable. You can see, then, why the Nixon Administration, Kennedy and Muskie are likely to agree in the end, albeit with due deliberate speed.

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, OXFORD, OHIO, FEBRUARY 17, 1969

I am speaking to an audience of college students for the first time since last year's campaign, but I want you to know that the hiatus was not due to unpleasant memories.

On the contrary, some of my most refreshing experiences during the campaign were with college audiences.

Now, during the campaign, this usually was as far in my prepared text as I was able to proceed.

If that heckler in the back row would like to come up and speak for five minutes. . . .

But the campaign is over, and most of the heckling has stopped.

In many ways, it was not a pleasant campaign.

The apathy and indifference of one generation produced a political process that was largely unresponsive to the next.

Emotion-charged issues made accommodation and compromise difficult for some and unacceptable for others.

And for many Americans easy answers were attractive in the face of difficult and complex problems.

Although the campaign is over, I am afraid that the fundamental social and political issues which provoked the divisions remain unresolved. Now we must deal with them.

One issue which is uppermost in your minds is the question of military service and the draft. Many of you feel—and with good reason—that the present system and its procedures are unfair and have little relevance to your goals and motivations. You want to serve your country, but many of you are convinced that there are more productive ways to serve.

On the other hand, in the present state of the world, and for an unpredictable time into the future, America must have an armed force; and American citizens must somehow staff it from among their own numbers.

In other words, American citizens must be prepared to fight for those values they consider worth fighting for; and this will require a military organization staffed by American citizens.

The problem is, "How do we organize it and how do we staff it?" If the solution to the problem need only reconcile the necessity of a military force with the aversion of some to military service and the draft, then a volunteer army is the obvious answer. In other words, we would simply pay enough to attract enough of those who as a consequence would be willing to spend their lives in military service.

But is this easy answer good enough? The easy answers of the past are the root of present dissatisfactions.

In other words, American citizens must be prepared to fight for those values they consider worth fighting for; and this will require a military organization staffed by American citizens.

Are you satisfied with so narrow an examination of this question? Fundamental ideals of equality and justice are at stake. And our democratic traditions and ideals have no small bearing on our answer.

We have not cherished a military force as a hallmark of our society. We have simply recognized it as a necessary function of government, at least for the foreseeable future. We have believed that its responsibilities must be limited, and that its position must be subordinate to civilian control.

We have developed this tradition and have insistently maintained it because, out of the experience of mankind, we have come to believe that the preservation of democratic ideals and institutions can be af-

fected by the relationship of the military to the rest of society.

And so we have insisted upon civilian control of the military. The relationship of the ordinary soldier to society is crucial in maintaining such control. Under our present system, his commitment to the military is limited. He will soon be replaced by someone else, and the goal of his military career is the end of his service.

When and if a soldier becomes more concerned with self-perpetuation of the army than going home, society loses its control over the military.

A volunteer army is a professional army, and the goals of a professional soldier are military.

A professional soldier has a limited relationship to society outside his military career. He has a limited commitment to a civilian life to which he does not expect to return. So long as the professional soldier is part of a larger, citizen army, the problem is limited.

There is still another point.

A volunteer army may be more than professional or mercenary. Its creation may cost us more than civilian control of the military. The entire relationship of military service to our society could be at stake.

Historically, the citizen army of the United States has been a responsibility which all American men have had to face. Not all men have been chosen, and not all men have had to serve. But the distinctions have never been based on race or economic condition. At least, that is what we have intended.

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service recognized these ideals. Its Chairman, Burke Marshall, said that the Commission's objective was to "Find the means of securing the manpower needed by our national security in a manner as consistent as possible with human dignity, individual liberty, and fairness to all citizens."

That Commission rejected the suggestion that the draft be eliminated in favor of a volunteer professional army.

It concluded that such a system would probably cost too much money and would not provide large enough numbers of men in times of crisis. More importantly, however, it also concluded that such an army could become a mercenary force unrepresentative of the nation.

I want to underscore those last few words—"unrepresentative of the nation." A professional army would attract those who could not otherwise find employment. We would force upon the poor by the use of pecuniary incentives the responsibilities which the affluent could afford to avoid.

It would, in some respects, be comparable to the purchase of substitutes which flourished during the Civil War.

There is more to equality than equal opportunity. Equality also involves an equal responsibility to the society. Should not military service in a democratic society be a responsibility unrelated to economic status?

Black Americans re-enlist in the army at a higher percentage than whites because there is less opportunity for them if they return to civilian life. Could not the billions of dollars which we would spend to create a professional army be better spent equalizing the opportunities of civilian life?

There is one other point involved it seems to me; and that is the uses to which our armed forces may be committed in the future.

If we have a volunteer professional army, made up of those paid to devote their lives to military pursuits, will there be a temptation to use it more freely, or, at the very best, will its use be less inhibited as an instrument of national policy, than that of a draft citizen army?

One lesson I suspect we have learned out of our Vietnam experience—and actually, I think it was embedded in our tradition be-

fore—is that a draft citizen army (pulling citizens out of their private lives to bear the burdens and sacrifices of war) imposes, or is more likely to impose, restraints upon the policy-makers. The purposes for which it can be used must be such as can command solid and widespread public support.

Such restraints may well be less restrictive in the case of a volunteer professional army. And let us not overlook the possibility that a military action begun with the volunteers may assume dimensions requiring recourse to a draft to meet the emerging manpower needs of an escalating conflict, and we will be back where we started.

There is, of course, another argument for the volunteer professional army which ought to be discussed in the context of the point I have just made. It is the argument that, with a higher level of professional training, and with less turnover in the field (because of the present rotation policy to spread the risks of exposure to combat), the army would be more effective. Such greater effectiveness, it is said, would have enabled us to handle the Vietnam problem with fewer men and possibly to have ended it sooner.

Again the question arises, however—might there not be greater temptations to use such a force?

These are all serious questions we should ponder thoughtfully before opting for the volunteer army as the easy answer to the military service problem.

On the other hand, simply opting for the draft over a volunteer professional army does not automatically satisfy our doubts about its equality and fairness.

The draft, as presently operated, is unfair and unjust:

The draft boards themselves are not representative. Over one-fifth of the members are over 70. Only 1.3 percent are black.

The appeals procedure is sadly inadequate. A draftee seldom knows what his options are, or who to turn to for help and counsel.

The present system of selecting the oldest first disrupts a young man's life from the time he is 18 until he is 26. He faces eight years of uncertainty as to when—or whether—he will be called for induction.

Finally, the methods and criteria for selection are not at all uniform, and have questionable relevance to the nation's needs and purposes.

The entire system needs to be changed.

First, 4000 local boards with almost that many different procedures and classifications are unnecessary. We should create regional selective service boards whose members have a better understanding of the problems of their constituents, and who more accurately reflect the region's population.

The boards should be strengthened by the adoption of uniform national standards, more adequate appeals procedures, and a greater effort to inform the draft registrant of his status and the timing of his induction.

Second, all men eligible for the draft should be selected by lottery at age 19, by the fair and impartial random selection recommended by the Marshall Commission.

Finally, when he is selected, the draftee should be allowed to choose among several options for national service—military and otherwise—which have been determined to be relevant to the needs of the nation.

Pre-selection deferments should be limited to strict criteria of health and occupation, but post-selection choices should be as broad as the needs of the country require and the imagination of our young people permit.

There is an enormous force for good among American youth today, and there is no reason why this force should be discouraged by lack of opportunity.

When we broaden the choice of service, we must broaden it for all Americans. We cannot permit an educated elite to escape mili-

tary service, dooming the poor—black and white—to its limited opportunities.

Developing service alternatives open to all young Americans will require imagination and initiative. Much of that responsibility will be yours.

Alternative national service should be as open as military service. And its tasks should be no less taxing.

Its aims must not be subject to question or doubt. We should not create a haven for draft-dodgers, a program providing for two or three years of fun, or a series of make-work projects.

We have seen the successes of the Peace Corps, the Teacher Corps, VISTA, and some of the programs of the war on poverty. The young people who made those programs successful have not found the going easy. But they have found that a vigorous commitment to real change in the lives of individual people can—bit by bit—bring about a real change for the better in the world.

If young Americans are willing to make this commitment, they should be encouraged.

We believe in the value of the commitment, and we shall encourage you—

To participate in a system of national service which recognizes that military service is only one alternative;

To develop these alternatives;

To make the choice as to how you can best contribute; and,

To help mount a broad attack on the roots of poverty and deprivation at home and abroad.

It is time for all of us, I think, to broaden our perspectives in this area.

Although military security is a major element of national security, the two are not synonymous.

Security comes from the development of a life for all people which affords each citizen the chance to reach his own greatness. It comes from the development of a society where we help one another in a mutual involvement which goes beyond charity.

It is important that we achieve this kind of society, but how we achieve it is also important.

Our aim is to help people of all nations secure this life, but not to secure it for them.

So our efforts must be consistent with our objectives. Our priorities and our policies should be examined and questioned.

Does our national security depend only on our military strength?

Does a volunteer professional army meet the tests of equality and human dignity?

Individual citizens—particularly you young people—must participate in the search for the right answers.

You have questioned the present system and doubted its relevance.

You have seen the effects of apathy and indifference.

The present system has not been satisfactorily changed because those who have objected have never cared enough to suggest alternatives which meet the tests we cannot avoid—tests of equality and justice.

I think we have the makings of legitimate alternatives before us. But we have to make some choices.

The responsibility to help make those choices is now yours. I hope you will set a better example.

A NOBLE AND NEEDED ACT

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my full

and complete support of the action taken by President Nixon and Postmaster General Winton M. Blount to remove all postmaster and rural carrier appointments from politics.

For years I have introduced such legislation, as have a number of my colleagues. Approximately 3 weeks ago, I publicly announced my intention that all postmaster appointments in Michigan's Eighth Congressional District would be on merit and not by political choice wherever and whenever possible.

I think it would be of interest to all Members to see the public reaction to that announcement. I am inserting three newspaper articles and conclude with a telegram that I dispatched on February 5, 1969, following the joint announcement by President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount. I would point out, in conclusion, that I have received many telephone calls from the district in support of my stand on postmaster appointments, along with numerous letters. I remain convinced that the vast majority of our citizens favor a nonpolitical course in postmaster appointments.

I again extend my congratulations to the President and the Postmaster General. They have shown great political courage and a sincere desire to improve our postal service. The articles follow, along with the telegram:

[From the Saginaw News Jan. 30, 1969]

HARVEY PROPOSES NEW POSTMASTER SELECTION PLAN

U.S. Rep. James Harvey, R-Saginaw, proposed today that Saginaw's next postmaster be selected from within the ranks of supervisory career postal employees at the Saginaw Post Office.

This method would replace the nationwide custom of choosing a postmaster via the political "spoils system."

Under the Harvey plan, the U.S. Post Office Department would have the responsibility of selecting the postmaster as certified by the U.S. Civil Service Commission concerning his qualifications. The President would as before, nominate the candidate to the Senate for confirmation.

Harvey was scheduled to announce his proposal at a Saginaw press conference this morning, but bad weather canceled his flight from Washington.

He sent this statement to The News:

"Since the election, much has been said and written about postmaster appointments in Michigan's Eighth Congressional District with particular interest centered on Saginaw.

"In the past several weeks, I have conferred with officials of the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department.

"I have also conferred many times with Robert W. Grant Jr., Saginaw County Republican Committee Chairman. From the beginning we agreed that if politics could be eliminated from the postmaster appointment, that was the route we wanted to take.

"I would like to emphasize at this point that it is not my intent to cast any personal character reflections on our present acting postmaster, Melvin Muehlenbeck, who was selected by the Saginaw County Democratic Committee to serve as acting postmaster. He has served four years in this capacity and failed to achieve confirmation despite the fact that his political party held the White House, the Post Office Department, and the votes of the U.S. Senate.

"The political system employed for postmaster appointments can be a cold, harsh experience—and an unpredictable one. This, to me, is an excellent example why politics should be taken out of the post office.

"Perhaps the decision which now has been reached is not perfect. It may have a flaw unknown to us at this time. Nonetheless, we are convinced that it is a vast improvement over the past and present political spoils system which is used primarily to pay off political debts.

"We want efficiency and a business-like operation in the Post Office Department. In the eight years that I have served in Congress, I have received more complaints about mail service than anything else. I hasten to add that this is not a reflection on our dedicated postal workers. On the contrary, it's a result of the system where political consideration comes first.

"Therefore, I am recommending to the President, Sen. Robert P. Griffin and Postmaster General Winton Blount that Saginaw's next postmaster be selected from within the ranks of supervisory career postal employees at the Saginaw Post Office.

"The United States Post Office Department will have the responsibility of selecting the postmaster as certified by the U.S. Civil Service Commission as to qualifications. The President then will be required to nominate the candidate to the Senate for confirmation.

"I feel that this proposal is completely consistent also with my past and present position of introducing legislation to take politics out of the appointment of Postmasters. Just

"Personally, I am convinced that eventually we will get all such appointments out of the this week, I reintroduced the bill. political arena.

[From the Saginaw News, Jan. 31, 1969]

HARVEY LEADS WAY FOR POSTAL REFORM

Rep. Jim Harvey may have disappointed a few waiting with baited breath here Thursday for word on who was about to come up with the Saginaw postmaster nomination. Not us.

Instead, Rep Harvey, who was unable to get here for a scheduled press conference, sent word that if he has his way the next postmaster is going to be selected from the ranks of supervisory career postal employees at the Saginaw Post Office.

Moreover, the responsibility for picking that man will fall to the U.S. Post Office Department which will be advised to make its selection on the basis of Civil Service certification of his qualifications. From there the nomination would be passed to the President and sent to the Senate for confirmation.

This, in substance, is the recommendation Harvey has made to the President, Sen. Robert P. Griffin and Postmaster General Winton Blount. It is to be hoped that those in higher echelons will lend a receptive ear to Harvey's request. It would be small enough reward for the 8th District congressman who has long fought for postal reform and who, now being in a position to do something about it, demonstrates his sincerity.

The Harvey plan for Saginaw's next postmaster appointment carries larger implications than that, however. It strikes the first mighty blow to take the job of postmaster out of politics and put it where it belongs—in the hands of a career postal worker who has advanced through the ranks to supervisory level.

Harvey is proceeding on the not so novel assumption that any man who has come up that way is bound to have a grasp of the business of handling the mail, a professional interest in its attendant problems and that just possibly he might be bringing some creative ideas to the job. He has been saying as much for a long time. So have we in clear recognition that time has long since gone for postmasters' chairs to be doled out as political debts marked "paid."

The plan, whatever its present imperfec-

tions, ought to prompt the Senate to act more speedily on the question of confirmations with greater assurance and without political overtones.

In trying for what appears to be a Saginaw test case in reform appointment, Harvey's intent is clear. If reform can begin in Saginaw and prove successful, it will catch on and eventually remove the last vestiges of politics from postmasterships. Every career worker ought to applaud the effort.

Those who have worked with Harvey in formulating the plan—from County GOP Committee level to Civil Service and postal authorities—deserve thanks.

When Mr. Nixon tapped Mr. Blount for the postmaster generalship, Mr. Blount pledged to do everything within his power to put the U.S. postal service on a business-like basis. Rep. Harvey has given him an opportunity to begin that job where we have said it must begin—at the top.

[From the Flint Journal, Feb. 4, 1969]

MAIL SERVICE SHOULD BENEFIT

Removing politics from the Post Office is a noble cause and U.S. Rep. James Harvey of Michigan's 8th District deserves commendation for doing his part to achieve that goal.

Harvey, a Republican, is recommending that Saginaw's next postmaster be selected from the ranks of the career supervisory employees of that city's Post Office.

That, of course, is the way it ought to be everywhere—although the mere thought of such a practice becoming widespread is likely to be rather disturbing in some political corners.

Harvey observed that in his eight years in Congress he has received more complaints about mail service than on anything else. He doesn't blame this on the postal workers, but rather on a "system where political considerations come first."

He holds that once the postal system is recognized as a business operation, "then we will receive improved service." The first step, he continued, is to eliminate politics in postmaster appointments.

In agreement with him on his position, Harvey pointed out, is Robert W. Grant Jr., chairman of the Saginaw County Republican Committee. This is significant because Saginaw's acting postmaster was selected by that county's Democratic committee, but never confirmed by the Senate. Now that Republican Richard M. Nixon occupies the White House, the door would be open for appointment of a loyal Republican as Saginaw postmaster.

Harvey made what seems to us to be an especially important point when he expressed the hope that going to the career ranks will make a solid contribution to the morale and dedication of postal workers, and entice them to stay in the postal service.

Post Office workers need to know that politics will not bar them from rising to postmaster positions.

FEBRUARY 5, 1969.

I am immensely pleased with the joint announcement Wednesday afternoon by President Richard M. Nixon and Postmaster General Winton M. Blount to remove all postmaster and rural carrier appointments from politics. This, I am positive, will be an extremely popular decision and will be warmly received by all citizens.

As one who has sponsored such legislation in Congress for the past 4 years, I am very proud that the new administration would take such prompt action early in its term.

My only reservation, but certainly not a serious one, is the fact that the open competitive examinations for the larger post offices will not include written examinations.

It was chiefly for that reason that I have recommended that the postmastership in Saginaw be filled from within the ranks of career postal employees.

However, there will be complete uniformity with the Civil Service Commission conducting all examinations and I will accept their final evaluation and judgment.

(According to the Post Office Department, written examinations are not required for post offices in Saginaw and Port Huron, both class I operations. Nor are examinations required at two of the smallest class 4 post offices, Forestville (Sanilac County) and Bach (Huron County). Written examinations will be necessary at all other post offices in the Eighth District.)

The important point is that the day of the political postal appointments has finally arrived at the "dead letter window." We can all be thankful because, as postal patrons, we are going to be the chief beneficiaries.

JAMES HARVEY,
Representative.

INCREASE PERSONAL EXEMPTION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to raise the personal income tax exemption over a 3-year period to a maximum of \$1,000 with an intermediate step increase to \$800 in the first and second years.

A review of the legislative history of the personal exemption confirms that my reasons for this legislation are consistent with the purposes for which it was initially allowed. The exemption was provided for in the first tax law, the Revenue Act of 1913, subsequent to the adoption of the 16th amendment which authorized a Federal tax on incomes. At that time, there was a \$3,000 exemption per individual taxpayer plus an additional \$1,000 for dependents, regardless of number.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the prevailing opinion of the time was expressed by Representative Alexander Palmer, a prominent Member of the House and later Attorney General of the United States, when he said:

(W)e ought to leave free and untaxed as a part of the income of every American citizen a sufficient amount to rear and support his family according to the American standard and to educate his children in the best manner which the educational system of the country affords. . . .

As the needs for revenue grew, the personal exemption decreased in an inverse proportion, until taxes from income became the largest single source of Federal revenues. Thus it is evident, rightly or wrongly, the revenue needs of the country have been the controlling factor in setting the level of the personal exemption. For your review, the following is an extract from a chart, prepared in 1964 by the Joint Economic Committee, showing the basically downward progression of the level of the exemption from 1913 to 1965:

THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM, 1964—FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL
INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS, 1913-65

Income year	Personal exemptions				
	Married (dependents)				
	Single	No.	1	2	3
1913-15	\$3,000	\$4,000	4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
1916	3,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
1917	1,000	2,000	2,200	2,400	2,600
1918	1,000	2,000	2,200	2,400	2,600
1919-20	1,000	2,000	2,200	2,400	2,600
1921	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1922	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1923	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1924	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1925-28	1,500	3,500	3,900	4,300	4,700
1929	1,500	3,500	3,900	4,300	4,700
1930-31	1,500	3,500	3,900	4,300	4,700
1932-33	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1934-35	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1936-39	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700
1940	800	2,000	2,400	2,800	3,200
1941	750	1,500	1,900	2,300	2,700
1942-43	500	1,200	1,550	1,900	2,250
1944-45	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500
1946-47	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500
1948-49	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1950	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1951	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1952-53	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1954-63	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1964	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1965	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000

¹ If net income exceeds \$5,000, married person's exemption is \$2,000.

Source: Treasury Department, Office of Tax Analysis.

The current \$600 exemption was first adopted in 1948, following World War II, which at that time, was an increase of \$100 over the then prevailing level of \$500. It was argued by the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder, that—

Under this bill, personal exemptions are increased by \$100 to compensate for a calculated \$100 decline in the purchasing power of the average income after taxes during the past 2 years (1946-47).

He went on to say that in consideration of the emergency wartime needs:

It was . . . recognized that the \$500 per capita exemption system would endanger the health and living standards of large segments of the population if retained for many years.

If this argument was true then, and there is little doubt it was, it is certainly applicable today. The consumer price index for all items since 1948 rose 44.6 percent through 1968. The highest increase is reflected in a 107.7-percent jump in medical care while the lowest increase falls in the category of apparel and upkeep at 26.4 percent. For reference, the cumulative percent increases of the Consumer Price Index for all major categories from 1948 to 1968 are as follows: Food, 35.3; housing, 49.2; apparel and upkeep, 26.4; transportation, 67; medical care, 107.7; personal care, 52.1; reading and recreation, 45; and other goods and services, 56.7. Putting the price index increase for all items in terms of dollars and cents would mean that a dollar worth 100 cents in 1948 was worth only 69 cents in 1968 or a reduction of almost one-third in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no question in my mind that the middle-income wage earner is protesting for tax relief and it will not suffice to merely close the loopholes benefiting those in the higher income brackets if reforms do not affect the middle and lower income pocketbooks. I am pleased that comprehensive hearings on tax reforms are now

underway and I urge that every due consideration be given to an increase in the personal exemption which will more accurately reflect the actual costs of living. To use the personal exemption as an economic tool to curb inflation or fatten the Federal purse is deceptive. These objectives can and should be accomplished, if necessary, by adjusting the income tax rate so that the taxpayer can relate tax policies to the economic objectives which they are designed to achieve.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND REGIONALISM: PATTERN DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the obvious thing about the pattern of local government in New York State is simply that it does not make sense. At the last count in November 1966, we had exactly 8,890 units of local government, including counties, cities, towns, villages and special districts, representing a ratio of one local government unit for each 200 of our population.

The total cost of local government will amount to \$8½ billion this year, and based on the scale of annual cost increases in recent years, by 1970, just 3 years from today, the total annual cost of local government operations in our State will exceed \$10 billion. Manifestly government costs of such astronomical figures are worthy of microscopic scrutiny by the taxpayer to determine whether he is getting decent services for his tax dollar and whether he can get those services at a lesser cost.

A taxpayer making such an examination will find an incongruous pattern of chaos and confusion in our local government structure. Our counties are superimposed upon municipalities, which in turn overlie sanitary and water districts, which may or may not be superimposed upon towns and villages. These local government units enact laws, impose taxes, issue permits, borrow money, fix speed limits and engage in a myriad of other governmental activities.

In contrast to normal standards of business efficiency, this pyramid of local governments is a blueprint for governmental chaos. Within a single county, police protection is provided by a welter of police forces each of which is lacking crime laboratories, communications systems and other equipment and facilities essential to modern, scientific crime detection procedures. Seepage of sewage, detergents, and other contaminants from cesspools and septic tanks jeopardize the water resources of an adjoining area. Garbage disposal districts compete with each other for dumping areas in a era of shrinking land availability.

Moreover, these government units incur increased costs for doing individually what can best be done collectively. Each

unit does its own purchasing losing the benefit of quantity discounts. Each sends out its own bills for taxes and for payment of services, making it impossible for them to achieve the economies and efficiencies which flow from the use of computers. Each of these units bear the cost of reporting, accounting and hiring and training of personnel. A piece of equipment urgently needed in one village for road repairs stands idle in a neighboring village.

The anachronisms of local government have long been decried and the urgent need for reform has long been apparent. The waste, duplication, overlapping and inefficiency of local government has long been under fire. As far back as 1930 Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt called for reorganization and asserted that we then had in the State more tax collectors than the number of soldiers engaged in the Battle of Thermopylae.

The reasons for concern in this area of government activity are manifest. They lead to inequities of tax burdens and differences in the example, the population of the tricounty capital district—Albany, Schenectady, Rensselaer—is about the same as Suffolk County. There are 17 police districts in this area. A single police district in Suffolk County covers 90 percent of that county's area. The cost of police protection in this area costs \$5 more per person, amounting to about \$3,000,000 annually for police protection than the people of Suffolk County.

Westchester County received 75 percent of its water supply from city of New York reservoirs. Yet the county has within it over 150 water districts. It is hardly surprising under the circumstances that the water rates in Westchester County are among the highest in the State.

The years since the end of World War II have witnessed an endless proliferation of special districts, as a result of population movements. During the decade from 1955 to 1965, the total population of all the cities in our State remained virtually constant at slightly over 10 million, with a minor decline of about 100,000 city dwellers.

On the other hand, during the same 10-year period, the total population of unincorporated areas increased from 3,375,000 to 4,942,000 in 1965, an increase in population of more than one half million or almost 50 percent. So special districts were created to provide water, sewers, street lighting, police and fire protection and other services. Since the population trend continues along the same lines, we will be obliged to add more and more of these special districts.

A special census taken in 1966 in parts of the tri-county area discloses that population trends here are in line with the statewide pattern. Substantial population gains show up in the towns coupled with declines in the city areas. According to these up-to-date census figures the population in the town of Colonie increased 20 percent since the census of 1960; the village of Colonie increases 21 percent and Menands Village 26 percent.

In neighboring Saratoga County the

town of Clifton Park registered a gain of 88 percent in population and the town of Halfmoon made a 53 percent gain.

POPULATION DECLINE

For the State as a whole, within the areas covered by the 1966 census, cities suffered a population decline of 3.6 percent while towns showed an increase of 17 percent, villages 7.7 percent, and unincorporated areas 20.3 percent.

With population moving in huge numbers to our towns, villages, and unincorporated areas, it is clear that our local government structure can properly meet the needs for water supply, sewage, and functions, it is becoming increasingly clear that the local taxpayer can no longer afford to support the waste and inefficiency which go hand in hand with the proliferation of these units.

CALL FOR CHANGES

Under the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the Association of Towns, meeting in New York City, called for changes in the State constitution to give broader taxing powers to towns and to increase the capacity of the towns to borrow money. Adoption of these resolutions by the Association of Towns followed an address by former Lt. Gov. Frank C. Moore, who estimated that the total cost of local government in the Nation will reach \$75 billion in 1970 and \$108 billion in 1975.

If we are to maintain in the State of New York our present system of local government, where we pile layer upon layer upon layer of local government organizations, then it is very difficult to disagree with the Association of Towns that they are in urgent need of greater flexibility in the management of their fiscal affairs, if they are to provide the people the services they need and demand.

In 1965, the total revenues of all towns amounted to \$320 million, an increase of over 135 percent in the decade from 1955 to 1965. During this 10-year period, assessments of fully taxable property in garbage disposal, police and fire protection, transportation and realistic traffic controls. With many of our towns and villages having a population fewer than 1,000 it becomes impossible to plan for and finance these services properly, particularly when the entire planning process is bedeviled by jealousy and rivalry among the local government units.

Moreover, the prospects for financial aid for proper planning is jeopardized by the multiplicity of these units. Federal planning funds under the demonstration city program are restricted to applications from regional planning units. State funds for planning of water resources or for sewerage disposal similarly require applications from areas broader than those now encompassed by existing local units.

With a single parcel of real estate subjected to five, six, or more separate taxes to support local government, the towns increased from \$7 to \$11 billion, and real estate taxes increased by 127 percent. During the same period town indebtedness has increased more than 200 percent. Despite these increases, the Association of Towns insists upon greater taxing

power and increased borrowing capacity to support a system which it outmoded, inefficient, and unsupportable.

In addition to increase local taxes, local governments are substantially subsidized by Federal and State aids. During the past 3 years the Federal Government appropriated a total of \$40 billion in various aid programs, a sum greater than the total Federal budget 20 years ago. The State budget for the coming fiscal year as submitted by Governor Rockefeller proposes an appropriation of \$2.668 billion for local government purposes as against only \$1.972 billion, exclusive of capital construction, for state purposes. The proposed appropriation for local government assistance reflects an increase of \$265 million over the current year.

Three years ago, the Association of Towns claimed that local government operations could be made more effective if the towns were given greater home rule powers. The legislature responded affirmatively to this request. Out of a total of 931 towns in the State, in 1965 the towns passed a total of 127 laws and in 1966 a total of 218 laws, meaning that most towns passed no laws during that period. While a proliferation in the enactment of laws is no more a consummation devoutly to be wished than a proliferation of local government units, the failure of most towns to enact any laws reflects a perfection in town government which defies human intelligence.

The survival of these local government units in the face of persuasive testimony to their inefficiency and waste reflects a nostalgic regard for the simplicity of early town government, where presumably every citizen could participate freely in that decisionmaking processes of government. The simple fact is that such a democratic process in its ideal state never existed and conditions today make it impossible.

It is, of course, true that in larger governmental units, the potential for citizen participation in the formulation of policy necessarily declines. Thus the problem of creating patterns of local government units large enough to be efficient without depriving its residents of a sense of participation and responsibility is indeed a complex one. Yet there are ways of achieving both desired ends.

Consolidation of local units is an obvious technique for bringing sense to local government without impairing citizen participation, particularly in areas where expertise is an essential ingredient for efficiency such as sewer planning and construction.

I am confident that efforts to reform local government will begin to bear fruit within the next 2 years, in response to taxpayers revolt against mounting costs of local government. For some years the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which includes in its membership U.S. Senators and Representatives, Governors, mayors, and county officials, has done a splendid job in the formulation of programs and legislation to bring rhyme and reason to local government operations.

I have introduced in the State legislature a number of bills recommended

by the Commission dealing with water resources planning, sewerage disposal and consolidation of special districts.

Last year the Committee on Economic Development, under the leadership of Marion F. Folsom, of Rochester, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration, has aroused widespread public demand for local government in a report which described the present local government organization as a major national crisis.

THE CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Children's Protection Act of 1969, legislation to further protect the Nation's 56 million children from unsafe toys and other objects commonly used by children.

This legislation was recommended to the Congress this week by the National Commission on Product Safety, a Commission established by action of the 90th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the legislation which established the Commission, a panel charged with conducting a wide-ranging investigation into the potential danger of products sold to the public.

I am pleased too at the diligence and speed with which the Commission is doing its job, as demonstrated by this week's interim report on the hazards of toys.

The statistics on children's accidents are appalling:

Each year more than 15,000 children under the age of 15 are killed by accidents. More than half of them are under the age of 4 years.

Another 17 million are injured.

Many of these deaths in injuries result when toys of a dangerous nature are placed in children's hands by unwarned parents or relatives.

Because of present deficiencies in the law, we pay a terrible price in suffering every year. How long can we—or will we—tolerate this?

In the foreword to its report, the Commission noted:

In the course of its investigation, and as a result of public hearings, the Commission has become acutely aware of grave inadequacies in the protection of children against death and injury from hazardous toys and articles intended for use by children.

Because of this, the Commission felt it imperative to file an interim report and suggest immediate legislation, rather than waiting for its final report.

I have introduced the Child Protection Act in response to that interim report. I believe that it is important that the Congress act quickly in order to protect our children, to show our concern for safety of all consumers, and to demonstrate our support for the work being done by the National Commission on Product Safety.

We established the Commission, now we must respond to its findings.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation recommended by the Commission and which I have introduced today is needed to correct major deficiencies in the Federal Hazardous Substances Act as it pertains to toys and articles for children's use.

The Commission points out that "hazardous substances," as defined in the act, covers a rather limited number of potential sources of danger. In fact, the categories of toy hazards against which the Hazardous Substances Act provides protection are limited to two: the danger from pressurized toys and flammable toys.

The Commission found that there are three specific categories of hazards not covered by the Hazardous Substances Act. These are electrical, mechanical and thermal hazards.

These hazards—

According to the Commission—
are associated with sharp or protruding edges, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, electrical shock, and electrocution, heated surfaces and unextinguishable flames. . . .

It is the tragic fact that these hazards, in the words of the Commission, "appear to predominate in the statistics associated with toy related injuries."

Mr. Speaker, we are well aware that modern technology has provided many new and beneficial articles for our use.

We have learned how to manufacture new and imaginative toys, alluring to youngsters. But we have not yet begun to make them absolutely safe. Some are terribly dangerous.

Let me give an example from the Commission's report.

There are now on the market children's stoves which may be plugged into a standard house current—110 volts—and which warm up, providing a very realistic effect so the child can cook "just like mommy."

But some of these appliances heat to extraordinary temperatures—up to 660° Fahrenheit—which is hot enough to fry young hands and arms unless the heating element is properly shielded.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission's report also tells of a toy car with steel fins that could cause a serious puncture wound; a blowgun dart that 10 children accidentally inhaled, steel tip and all, into their lungs; a child's doll with a spiked mechanism that was exposed when the outer casing was broken; a bird-like missile that became a dangerous projectile; explosive devices that blind; cribs that become death traps for infants.

This is just a sample.

In the Commission's words, the Hazardous Substances Act "is silent as to these fundamental kinds of hazards."

I submit that the Congress cannot remain silent in the face of this evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend that the text of the bill introduced here today be the last word on children's safeguards. It may well be that this legislation will be improved by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I hope that hearings can be held at an early date so that any necessary changes

can be made and the legislation enacted into law.

I note too that the Commission sees this legislation as a "standby measure," warranted at this time because its implementation may immediately curtail this accidental carnage inflicted upon our children.

While I feel this legislation should be enacted promptly because of the immediate protection it would afford, Congress should be thinking seriously about substantially tougher legislation to insure the protection not only of children, but of the American public.

We may have to consider in the future the very mechanics of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, one of the major consumer safety laws now on the lawbooks.

The Commission points out that this legislation does not change the enforcement procedures of the act, nor does it affect "the underlying philosophy of post-market control."

By post-market control, the Commission refers to the fact that the Federal Government can only intercept dangerous products after—and I emphasize the word "after"—they have been manufactured and sent to the seller.

In many cases a dangerous product is sold to unknowing buyers before the Government acts to remove it from store counters. I am sure we have all heard radio broadcasts warning of dangerous objects which were sold before the Government ordered a halt to sales.

I believe that the Congress will have to give this factor consideration in the future, and I anticipate that the Product Safety Commission will have some recommendations in this regard.

In the meantime, I hope that Congress will move swiftly on the Child Protection Act of 1969. This issue has been placed before the Congress. The danger is evident; the need is urgent.

Children need this protection. Their parents demand it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Child Protection Act of 1969 at the close of my remarks, along with the introduction of some pertinent excerpts from the Commission's report:

H.R. 7606

A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the Children's Protection Act of 1969.

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES ACT TO ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, AND THERMAL HAZARDS OF TOYS AND OTHER ARTICLES INTENDED FOR USE BY CHILDREN

SEC. 2 (a) Section 2(f)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 (f)(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(D) Any toy or other article intended for use by children which the Secretary finds pursuant to the provisions of section 2(q)(1) of this Act meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) (iii) or (iv) of such section."

(b) The matter of preceding the semicolon in clause (A) of section 2(q)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(2)(q)(1)(A)) is amended to

read as follows: "(A) any toy, or other article intended for use by children, which pursuant to a determination made by the Secretary (i) is a hazardous substance, or (ii) bears or contains a hazardous substance in such manner as to be susceptible of access by a child to whom such toy or other article is entrusted, or (iii) is otherwise hazardous because of the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, or (iv) may cause substantial personal injury or substantial illness by, during, or as a result of foreseeable use of the toy or article, even if unintended by the manufacturer, where such injury or illness is attributable to electrical, mechanical, or thermal aspects of the design, processing, or assembly of that toy or article.

(c) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(r) The term 'electrical' means of or pertaining to the flow of an electrical charge or to electrons in motion; the term 'electrical hazard' means a condition or circumstance such that substantial personal injury or substantial illness from electric shock or electrocution may be caused during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable use.

"(s) The term 'mechanical' means of or pertaining to the design, construction or structure of a substance; the term 'mechanical hazard' means a condition or circumstance such that substantial personal injury or substantial illness may be caused during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable use because of sharp surfaces or protrusions, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, or other mechanical means.

"(t) The term 'thermal' means of or pertaining to the transfer or manifestation of heat energy; the term 'thermal hazard' means a condition or circumstance such that substantial personal injury or substantial illness may be caused during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable use of articles: (1) which contain heated surfaces; or (2) which if ignited burn so intensely that (A) extremely high temperatures are reached, or (B) they cannot be readily extinguished by means ordinarily at hand."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC 3. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY— INTERIM REPORT RECOMMENDING ENACTMENT OF THE CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

FOREWORD

The National Commission on Product Safety, created by Public Law 90-146 (81 Stat. 466), is currently conducting a comprehensive study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products. In the course of its investigation, and as a result of public hearings, the Commission has become acutely aware of grave inadequacies in the protection of children against death and injury from hazardous toys and other articles intended for use by children.

It is the belief of the Commission, on the basis of its findings, that existing legislation in the form of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 *et seq.*), as amended by the Child Protection Act of 1966 is in critical need of amendment to provide protection for children against hazards not now subject to regulation. Specifically, the Act should be amended to allow for protection against hazards which are electrical, mechanical, and thermal, or which arise from or are attributable to these aspects of the design, processing, or assembly of a toy or other article intended for use by children.

Pursuant to Section 2(c) of Public Law 90-146, the Commission is to transmit to the President and to the Congress such interim reports as are deemed advisable in carrying out its statutory mandate. The Commission believes that recommendations of the kind set forth in this report are warranted at this time, as a stand-by measure, because their implementation may prevent or alleviate occurrences of accidental death and injury caused by hazardous toys or other articles intended for use by children during the course of the Commission's study.

The Commission will be continuing its review of unreasonably hazardous household products and of federal, state and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against such hazards. It intends to continue its consideration of the problems of hazardous toys and other articles intended for use by children as part of this general review. Moreover, in recommending this limited substantive amendment to the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, the Commission wishes to make it clear that it has not made any determination or evaluation as to the operation of that Act; nor is the Commission prepared at this time to endorse the processes, enforcement procedures, or underlying philosophy of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act.

Any such determination at this time would be premature in view of the Commission's ongoing study of the adequacy of industry self-regulation and the suitability of other means of affording protection to consumers.

FEDERAL HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENTS

A. Purpose

For the purpose of giving the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the regulatory apparatus needed to deal appropriately with certain hazards of which this Commission has become aware, the Child Protection Act of 1969 would amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act. The proposed amendment to that Act is limited to hazards associated with toys and other articles intended for use by children.

At present, the relevant section of that Act is section 2(q) (1) (15 U.S.C. 1261 (q) (1)) which reads as follows:

"The term 'banned hazardous substance' means (A) any toy, or other article intended for use by children which is a hazardous substance, or which bears or contains a hazardous substance in such manner as to be susceptible of access by a child to whom such toy or other article is entrusted; . . ."

Limiting the application of that subsection, the term "hazardous substance" is earlier defined in Section 2(f) (15 U.S.C. 1261 (f)) as:

"1. (A) Any substance or mixture of substances which (i) is toxic, (ii) is corrosive, (iii) is an irritant, (iv) is a strong sensitizer, (v) is flammable, or (vi) generates pressure through decomposition, heat or other means, if such substance or mixture or substances may cause substantial personal injury or substantial illness during or as a proximate result of any customary or reasonably foreseeable ingestion by children.

"(B) Any substance which the Secretary by regulation finds, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a), meet the requirements of subparagraph 1(A) of this paragraph.

"(C) Any radioactive substance, if, with respect to such substance as used in a particular class of article or as packaged, the Secretary determines by regulation that the substance is sufficiently hazardous to require labeling in accordance with this Act in order to protect the public health."

Accordingly, toys or other articles intended for use by children may be banned if the category of hazard involved is essentially of

a chemical nature (toxic, corrosive, irritating, sensitizing), or is otherwise hazardous because flammable, pressurized, or radiational. In the narrow area of toys, it is the Commission's opinion that the chemical-type hazards are not nearly as relevant as in other product areas. The clear exception would be chemistry sets, but these are specifically exempted from the banned toys section by subsection 2(q) (1), with a proviso to the effect that ". . . the Secretary by regulation, (i) shall exempt from clause (A) of this paragraph articles, such as chemical sets, which by reason of their functional purpose require the inclusion of the hazardous substance involved, and which bear labeling giving adequate directions and warnings for safe use and are intended for use by children who have attained sufficient maturity, and may reasonably be expected to read and heed such directions and warnings. . . ."

Similarly, toy hazards are not likely to be of a radiational nature for reasons that are clear.

Thus, the categories of toy hazards against which the Hazardous Substances Act provides possible protection are effectively limited to two: pressurized and flammable.

On the basis of evidence submitted to the Commission at its hearings in New York City on October 21 and 22, 1968, and in Boston on December 17 and 18, 1968, as well as from information collected in the regular course of its study, the Commission believes that the categories of hazards relating to toys and other articles intended for use by children should be extended and expanded to include three additional categories of hazards; namely, electrical, mechanical, and thermal. Of the articles to which reference was made at those hearings, or toward which the Commission's attention has been directed, an overwhelming number appeared to constitute hazards of a kind not presently dealt with by the terms of the Hazardous Substances Act. That is, hazards associated with sharp or protruding edges, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, electric shock and electrocution, heated surfaces and unextinguishable flames—and the untold aggravation, injury, and death attributable thereto—have been pointed out to the Commission, and these hazards in fact appear to predominate in the statistics associated with toy-related injuries. Yet the Hazardous Substances Act is silent as to these fundamental kinds of hazards.

C. Effect of amendments

Amendment of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, in the manner and form indicated above, could be accomplished without any significant change in the basic structure and application of that Act. The amendment expands the number of categories of hazards, but only with respect to toys and other articles intended for use by children. It does not affect other products. Except with respect to children's articles, the term "hazardous substance" still refers only to those substances which are hazardous under the existing Act because they are toxic, corrosive, irritating, sensitizing, flammable, pressurized, or radiational. The added categories of electrical, mechanical, and thermal hazards are each separately defined and pertain only to toys and other articles intended for use by children. The enforcement procedures of the Act remain unchanged, as does the underlying philosophy of postmarket control.

The Commission intends to address these issues comprehensively and exhaustively at future hearings and throughout its tenure, prior to issuance of a final report to the President and to the Congress.

D. Background and need

While product-related injury statistics for children are not generally categorized in

terms of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, the figures that the Commission has found point to the existence of a major problem. The Commission is apprised of the following facts:

Of the nearly 56 million children under 15 years of age in the United States, more than 15,000 of them die each year from accidents at a rate of 28 per 100,000 population. This figure is higher than the deaths from cancer, contagious diseases, heart diseases, and gastroenteritis combined.

More than half of the children who died as a result of accidents in 1966 were preschool children (birth to 4 years).

Another 17 million children annually are injured severely enough to restrict normal activity or require medical attention—a rate of 300 per 1,000 population.

With respect to stationary recreational equipment used by younger children, annual injury estimates are exceedingly high: swings, 500,000; slides, 200,000; seesaws, 50,000, etc. Injuries involving mobile equipment are estimated each year to total 1,300,000 with 1 million of these attributable to bicycles (including 120,000 fractures and 60,000 concussions), and another 100,000 related to tricycles.¹

Hearings were held in New York City on October 21 and 22, 1968, and in Boston on December 17, 18 and 19, 1968. The following is a brief summary of the testimony received during the course of the hearings:

Dr. Phillip R. Lee, the then-Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in discussing the existing enforcement authority under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act, pointed up the limitations of that Act. Alluding to the banning provisions of Section 2(q) (1), he emphasized the restrictions arising from the use of "hazardous substance" in Section 2(f). . . .

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

ARNOLD B. ELKIND,
Chairman.
EMORY J. CROFOOT,
HENRY A. HILL,
SIDNEY MARGOLIUS,
MICHAEL PERTSCHUK,
HUGH L. RAY,
DANA YOUNG,
Commissioners.

STUDENT UPRISINGS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the RECORD a column by Drew Pearson expressing the viewpoint that the limit had been reached with respect to patience in handling the small minority of troublemakers on our college campuses all over the country.

In the Sunday, February 23, 1969, edition of the Washington Post another column by Mr. Pearson makes the charge

¹"Estimates of Injuries From Consumer Products," Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Injury Control Program, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service), prepared for the National Commission on Product Safety, October 1968; Iskrent and Joliet, *Accidents and Homicide* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1968); "Accident Facts, 1968 Edition," (National Safety Council); "Accidents in Children," (American Acad. of Pediatrics, 1968).

that there is definite evidence of a link between all the turmoil and uprisings which are so common today on American campuses.

I ask that the Pearson column appear at this point in the RECORD, together with an editorial from the Washington Star of February 22, 1969, lauding the President of Notre Dame University, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, for his "no-nonsense" policy of dealing with trouble of this kind.

The above-mentioned material follows:

BLACK STUDENT UPRISINGS

(By Drew Pearson)

CHICAGO.—There is a very definite evidence of a link between the uprisings that are sweeping American campuses. But rather than any Communist link, the connection appears to be between black students, with rumblings of anarchism in the background. The fact that the student rioting has been inspired largely by black students has led to unfortunate repercussions—an increase of George Wallaceism, Ku Klux Klanism and more white backlash in the North. This is why the majority of Negroes are so sour on the protests of the black student minority.

The original source of black extremism has been traced to the inflammatory speeches of Stokely Carmichael, who has now ducked out of the United States; Eldridge Cleaver, now an exile from parole violation; and LeRoi Jones, the Negro novelist. All three have goaded Negro students to assert themselves and claim their rightful place in society by any means necessary. They have argued that without violence, the power structure would never give up the power that allegedly has "kept Negroes in chains."

Another black militant who spread seeds of campus unrest was Nathan Hare, a former assistant professor of sociology at Howard University, where last year he tried to oust the Negro administration of the largest and most efficient Negro university in the world. This year he was asked not to return. He transferred to San Francisco State College where he became "coordinator of black studies" and has since been arrested. Ever since his transfer, San Francisco State has been in turmoil.

Another instigator of turmoil for turmoil's sake has been George Mason Murray, minister of education of the Black Panther party and an English teacher at San Francisco State. When, last Oct. 24 at Fresno State College, he openly advocated the killing of "slave masters" and named as among the masters President Johnson, Chief Justice Earl Warren and Gov. Ronald Reagan, California State College trustees investigated and then suspended Murray. This suspension has been one factor behind black rioters at SFSC.

Also behind the San Francisco State turmoil is the "Socialist Workers Party," which is on the Attorney General's subversive list. It has helped to rally the support of more than 40 colleges, universities, high schools and other organizations behind the San Francisco strike.

The manner in which black militants have worked together was illustrated at Cheyney State College in Cheyney, Pa. In late November, 1968, nine Negro students were expelled after a heated argument as to who would be selected for inclusion in "Who's Who Among College Students."

Out of the clear blue a busload of 25 students from Federal City College in Washington arrived in Cheyney about 1 p.m. Dec. 9. Shortly after 3 p.m. that day, a group of 100 students from Cheyney State and Federal City entered the administration building, forced their way into the president's office and demanded that nine expelled students be reinstated.

When this was refused, they broke windows and overturned furniture and statues. Then the Federal City College students left for Washington.

At nearby Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania, the chief Negro student leader is Clinton A. Ethridge Jr. of New York City. Helping him, though not a student, has been Samuel Reginald Jordan Jr., a Negro, who while at Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pa., last spring was arrested for possessing fire bombs and a loaded revolver. He was convicted, but he is free on bond awaiting appeal.

He was active in the lockin at Swarthmore's admissions office, which continued until Swarthmore president Courtney Smith, who had been conducting all-night sessions with the black militants, died of a heart attack.

At the same time as the Swarthmore strike, Negro students seized control of the main switchboard at Brandeis University outside Boston. Some of the Negroes involved had been at San Francisco State College.

Shortly before Christmas, students at Le Moyne College in Memphis, Tenn., engaged in three days of minor disturbances in protest over the way grades were computed, with the usual demand for more black history courses. They also demanded the end of required attendance at student convocations.

To foment the strike, the Invaders, a black extremist group in Memphis, appeared on the campus, intimidated students and attempted to convince them that they needed outside help whether they wanted it or not.

Almost every case of student unrest this winter has originated with a black extremist minority making almost identical demands for more admission of black students, regardless of their scholastic ability.

A VOICE OF REASON

It had to come eventually and at last it has—a word of common sense on student violence by a man in a position to follow up his words with action.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, has announced a policy of short shrift for disruptive demonstrators on campus. "Anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion, be it violent or non-violent, will be given 15 minutes of meditation to cease and desist." Then, if the disrupter does not have a student identity card, he will be arrested for trespass. If he does have a card, he will be expelled from the university.

This simple, direct approach to the problem has been lacking on campuses from coast to coast with the deplorable results we see at San Francisco, Chicago and here in Washington. "Without the law," the president observed correctly, "the university is a sitting duck for any small group from outside or inside that wishes to destroy it, to incapacitate it, to terrorize it at whim."

The priest made it clear that "we welcome and protect orderly dissent, but we're not going to let anyone destroy the place."

Encouragingly, within 24 hours after Father Hesburgh's announcement, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the right of colleges to expel students for riotous conduct, a giant step of legal clarification, since the students in question, expelled from a state university at Nashville, had claimed their conduct was an exercise of freedom of speech as constitutionally guaranteed.

Notre Dame University has had relatively few disruptive demonstrations. The new policy announcement apparently is in response to the actions of a small group of students three months ago in blocking access to the campus to recruiters from Dow Chemical and the CIA. It is probable that there will be fewer disorders under the new policy.

REPORT TO A SLEEPING SON

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 2d Lt. Michael L. Dewlen, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, has been awarded the Silver Star Medal, posthumously, for heroic achievement against the enemy in Vietnam. Mike's father, Al Dewlen of Amarillo, Tex., wrote his "Report to a Sleeping Son," which recently appeared in the Amarillo Globe-News, and also is being published in the March issue of Reader's Digest.

I have asked and have received Al Dewlen's permission to enter his "Report to a Sleeping Son" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure this father's tribute to his son and his bravery in gallantly giving his life in the service of his country will serve as an inspiration to all of us in these troubled times.

The article follows:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Sunday News-Globe, Jan. 12, 1969]

REPORT TO A SLEEPING SON: THIS, MY SON, IS HOW IT WAS, AND IS

(By Al Dewlen)

(NOTE.—On June 11, 1968, at the age of 24, 2nd Lt. Michael L. Dewlen, USMC, was killed in Vietnam. In the June previous he had graduated from Baylor, married pretty Lynn Nowlin of Vernon and donned the uniform of the Marine Corps. Mike was the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Al Dewlen, 4605 Matador. As a youth he had been a leader and outstanding athlete; president of his Amarillo High class, captain of the Sandie football team and regular on the baseball team. At college he earned a starting position on the Baylor football team. Now his young widow is teaching at Vernon, and she and his parents have had six months to look back on the great tragedy of their lives. His father, the respected Amarillo author, reflects some of this thinking and raises some questions any parents of a young son in these days might ask.)

It was Friday, 5:15 p.m., cloudy and still hot as I drove in from the barber's. I noticed that most of our neighbors were standing out in their front yards, but I missed recognizing this as unusual. Pretty Mrs. Kelley, her children clinging tightly to her, raised her hand as I passed. I waved back, turned into the drive and continued on into the garage. I was standing over my workbench, debating which of the endless drudges of household upkeep deserved first claim on the remaining daylight, when someone called my name. In the doorway I saw a preacher I scarcely know, a man you never met, and I suppose I was annoyed.

He said, "Come here a minute, please." Then, more firmly: "I want you to come with me."

I took my time going out to meet him on the driveway. It was as I reached him that I saw your mother coming from the house. She had left the door ajar as she never does, and was hurrying toward me. Nothing about her looked right. As I stood gaping at her, the minister began tugging on my arm. It seemed he was bent on dragging me ahead to some horror I still had the option to reject, and I resisted him. Then Jean took my hand. I felt her trembling. Every detail of her appeared fatally altered; there was the impression of calamitous change, final, entire. My impulse was to shout at her, to demand that she restore for me the smile she had

worn when I left her an hour before. I cannot be sure, but I think that with first sight of her I must have known about you. Nevertheless, I asked, "What has happened?" and she answered, "Mike has been killed."

How can I tell you how much like death was life at that instant? I remember picturing you as clearly as ever I have seen you, in all the ways I've ever seen you—as a fat baby drooling on my shoulder, as a little leaguer straining to throw down to second base, as a rugged softie sobbing from the sight of a starved dog, as a furious half-pint clansman wading in because your dad was in a fight and getting whipped, as the fiery captain of those good football teams, as the tall embarrassed boy trying to show grace while accepting those trophies and certificates, I saw you grown, a man blooming with pride in the Marine Corps uniform, so strong and tough and openly sentimental; and I thought, You, Mike, shot down in battle?—it was preposterous, a lie. That you could die at all was unthinkable; that you could have lain dead four days without our having known it or sensed it or dreamed it, was not possible. But there was Jean, wavering before me as the wreckage a woman is when she has lost her only child, and I could lay hold of nothing to fend off belief.

The agony was utter, crippling. I was unable to take your mother in my arms, or even to speak to her. I remember a moment in which I saw you without life, not teasing or laughing, but cold and still, and out of my guts sprang an awful rancor toward God. I wanted to summon Him down to be battered with this rage and pain; I wanted to force Him to account for this disastrous mishandling of your trust and of our daily prayers for your survival.

"It's Mike," Jean said. "They do mean Mike, and he is dead."

I shook free of the preacher and we went into the house. Lynn was waiting. A while earlier she had been talking about your first anniversary, just three days away. This sweet and lovely miniature had sent you a piece of your wedding cake, saved in the freezer as a surprise for the occasion, and she had been much concerned that the mails might mash it. Now she stood wide-eyed and lost at the center of the room. Beside her were the Marines—Maj. Dale Dorman, whom you once pointed out to me as the perfectly correct Marine, and M. Sgt. Del Taft, who helped out that day we arranged your transportation to Vietnam. They met me with quiet expressions of regret and the gentle warning we should not cling to hope. There was no mistake, they said. Your war was over.

Time passed before I could react enough to gather in our women, yours and mine. I held them like a pair of broken dolls. Poor grey Maggie fell into a quivering panic, dangerous for a dog of seventeen. It was as though she grasped she would be living out her days in a sad house, that she understood she would not again be smuggled into your bed.

How could she, or I, have outlived you when you were meant to inherit us?

Soon the telephone was ringing. People came flooding in. Dishes of food appeared on the cabinet, flowers popped up from the floor and it had begun, the terrible two weeks of wet pillows, of escapes to the closet for private grief, of alternating collapse and recomposure so critical it menaced even the will to accept the next breath, while we awaited the return of your body from Da Nang.

It is difficult to tell you about those weeks, or to as much as separate one day from the other. Your mother dwindled by fifteen pounds. I experienced sudden savage fantasies wherein the Communist who killed you materialized in opportune reach of my hands. Daytime, Lynn made herself the angel of our consolation; at night she lay crying in your bed.

Jean never slept. She would lie staring at the darkness, remembering the mother

things, taking tearful inventory of the treasures she had been storing in her heart since the morning you were born. Sometimes, exhaustion stunned me into periods of stupored rest, and they were hateful. At each awakening the news struck me afresh, as if with every sunrise you died again, right before my eyes. Everything prompted us to recollection. Your dog scratching at the back door, your clothes hanging in the closet, your fishing and hunting gear piled about. In the kitchen doorframe were the pencil marks recording the stages by which you grew. We heard you in our talk, through the ridiculous nicknames and lighthearted phrases you invented and installed so deeply in the family language that how hard as we tried, we could not avoid them. Hundreds of people called to speak well of you. There were mountains of mail, including two fine letters from the President. And, because Lynn and your mother agreed I should, I got myself together amid all this and wrote your eulogy.

Remember the talk we had, the day before you shipped out? "I expect to be back," you told me. "But if I should buy the farm, I want to be buried as a Marine." Make it short and simple, you said, "and in my dress blues."

This was how we did it. You had Marines, like gleaming statues, as an honor guard, Marines as pallbearers. There was a rifle volley, and taps, at the cemetery. You would have been pleased with the conduct of your women: your mother controlled, keeping her head high; Lynn wearing the dress you liked best and looking indescribably beautiful with those mute tears streaking her cheeks as she accepted, in the place of a husband, the flag off your coffin.

Much later the details came to us. On June 9, they tell us, the battery was helio-lifted south and east from Khe Sanh, out from under the daily shelling tormenting that rat-infested trash heap, and put down on a ridge squarely astride the Laotian border. With you went two battalions of sweeping infantry in an operation named Robin South. The mission, they say, was to sever the infiltration routes feeding toward Quang Tri, and to mount an offensive relieving the pressure to Khe Sanh during its evacuation.

It was Indian country, a known NVA stronghold which had not been intruded on since the days of French control. Like the other 'Chin-Strap Charles' of C Battery, 1st Battalion, 12th Marines, you swelled with pride over having been chosen to make a fire base out of a spot so hot it was designated Landing Zone Torch. Indeed, the whole operation appears to have been the sort you had longed for. "I'm tired," you had written, "of granting Charlie the first lick. I'll be glad when we go on the offensive instead of merely counter-attacking and killing these stragglers while the main force gets away."

You learned immediately that you had been set down in the middle of a powerful enemy concentration. Along with the called shots, you were firing on NVA troops moving in plain sight over the surrounding hills. Your infantry protection was compelled to claim key terrain beyond the range of rapid support, and your six 105's and seventy-five Marines stood vulnerable and isolated in a sea of elephant grass. While the CO hustled at establishing a defense, you, as executive officer, commanded the firing. You worked the crews in shifts around the clock, expecting an attack while you exulted in the commendations pouring in on the effectiveness of your gunnery.

At 1:30 a.m. on the second day, the enemy assault began. With heavy mortar and automatic weapons fire came an infantry force of perhaps a battalion and a sapper platoon. They blew a .50 caliber machine gun sky high off your perimeter, penetrated the position and were creating havoc among the guns before anyone could assess what was happening. A few NVA reached the foxholes and jumped in. Hostile and friendly were sud-

denly intermingled, and confusion swept the ridge. The battery, your fellow officers say, appeared doomed.

You were napping in the exec's pit when it started. Armed only with the Gold Cup .45 I had given you at Christmas, you dashed downslope under fire, gathering men as you went. You mustered just four. With these you charged the breach in the perimeter, leaping directly into the enemy. You fought it out hand-to-hand in blind darkness through a desperate half-hour. They tell us you prevented capture of the guns, that you wrung organization out of chaos, got the battery to fighting. They say you changed the probable massacre into an astounding triumph.

It was a burst from a Russian AK-50 sub-machine gun, fired from a scant fifteen feet away, that cut you down. Another of your party died with you, the rest fell wounded. But you had won. In the small arms fight you had killed 28 of the NVA. Thereafter, making use of the time you bought them, the men turned the 105's around and brought them into action, getting off 200 beehive rounds which accounted for an additional 150 of the enemy.

You would like knowing the battery has received special commendation; that its men declare you saved their lives; that they requested and held a memorial service for you; that they nominated you for your citation and decoration. How splendid of you, my son, to have given yourself as you did; to have willed us this boundless piece of gallantry as your estate. Thinking on it helps ease the awareness of how those bullets blew apart the bright life-plan you had built and kept with Lynn; of how there died with you a thousand family dreams, among them our promise of grandchildren.

We pore over this final report card with vaulting pride. But your marks have not surprised us. Bravery was like you. I remember it manifest in you always, from the time you took on that formidable neighborhood bully, on through the blood and bruises of a hundred football games, into those later courageous hours when you stood alone in allegiance to standards long since ditched by others of your generation. I recall with shining clarity that cold Sunday in December when you led us, your family, on a walk through Arlington; when you wept at the changing of the guard, when you spoke among the graves of the greatness resting there with those who had died, enchanted and believing, under the flag of the United States and in devotion to its causes.

Thinking of you as you looked and talked that afternoon—oh, the attitude wasn't new; the newness lay in the maturity and solemn certainty with which you expressed it—I am compelled again to the question that has twisted inside me like a dagger since the moment I knew you were gone. Did not we, it asks, we, your parents, point you toward this death? Didn't we, out of our own unqualified love of country and rigid definition of duty, actually rear you to die at war?

Perhaps we did. From the first we poured you full of the American glories. We taught you reverence for the flag, the law, the traditions and institutions. We imparted to you an unequivocal confidence in the system, trained you to the habit of everyday joy in your citizenship. We encouraged your development into an aggressive competitor for excellence in a free society. We saw to it you would regard the defense of your homeland and the support of its commitments as a privilege, and we approved of how your career intention always included a time for the military as a mandate of conscience, an essential of your self-respect. The way things came about, it is unlikely you would ever have been drafted. But there was never a doubt you would volunteer. Nor was there much doubt, in view of your automatic compulsion to make the first team, that you would serve as a Marine.

Lately your mother and I have awakened at night to wonder if every teaching you had did not somehow move you toward the cruel appointment you kept on that ugly Asian hill. We deliberately cultured in you the presently unfashionable belief that each person is responsible for himself, that a man is the fabricator of his own consequences. We told you failure is a personal affair, not to be laid off on poverty or wealth, associates or influences, or, worse yet, to be blamed on the remainder of mankind. You listened well. You accepted yourself as what you had to work with, granted yourself no excuse, disciplined your life into its appropriate seasons. The meaningless bypaths the professors so blandly and inanely justify in youth as a 'search for identity' or the 'effort to relate' never attracted you. Nor were you seduced by the 'new morality', which you recognized, despite its elaborate cloakings, as in truth just a cheap amorality. You accepted the student's role as one of learning, not once misconstruing it as a franchise for the destruction of order, the denial of history or the dismantling of authority.

It was natural, then, that you should have considered Vietnam not debatable. That your country had pledged itself was sufficient. You reacted exactly as other young Americans preceding you by a quarter of a century had responded upon hearing of Pearl Harbor.

So, you were orthodox. In a sense, I suppose, you belonged to the prior generation. Many of your contemporaries must have thought you a hopeless non-swinging, a well-groomed heir to their arch-rival establishment, while we applauded you. But on that unendurable Friday, with the terrible cost of our handcrafted patriotism there before us in the cemetery, we had to ask ourselves whether we had meant what we preached; whether we would continue meaning it down through the bleak years to which your passing has condemned us. If granted a second chance, would we repeat the course? Or would we find ways to permit and justify, consent and retract, knowing that the resultant irresponsibility might, like a foul-smelling serum, save your life?

To answer we looked about us at others of your age. We considered the man in our end of town (you knew him) who ducked into teaching, marriage and parenthood while broadcasting each venture as part of a strategy for frustrating the draft. We regarded those hiding in eternal scholarship, fleeing to Canada or burning their cards and defying prison under a rationale of a love cultism that has obsessed them only with the adoration of themselves. We took into account the pot and LSD sets; the peaceniks and raceniks and mobniks lollygagging along in the degenerate fads of a bogus intellectualism, conforming to filth, reveling in a sophomore complex fixed on them like the acne of a lingering adolescence. We considered the in-fragrant flower children rotting in their own imagined sweetness, the yuppie packs catering that America is two hundred years mistaken, the whole miscellany of people who can celebrate only the hormones by which they amass hair, whose sole product is division, whose single attainment is the encouragement of the enemy that killed you, and we became too sick to go on.

No, my son. We could not have given you an exempted conscience, could never have consigned you to the company of these. We prefer this tearful sorting out of your things, this sorrowful laying away of your expectations, these brokenhearted pilgrimages to your grave. We would do it again. Yet, even in your transcendence, you are owed a score of apologies.

We are sorry that when you died there existed behind you no national resolve to win. It shames us that while you expended your blood for sane Americans, only insane America was flourishing. We hate it that your sacrifice goes little noticed and unpraised by a liberal press choosing instead to sponsor

the street radical and to euphemize treason as 'the peace movement,' mass criminality as 'demonstration,' and exhibitionistic anarchy as 'protest' and 'dissent.' We apologize for abiding the kick-seeking 'new left' with its spewing seditions, for tolerance of government that woos the insurrectionist and is only unnerved by any reminder of your kind; for the souring churches, the orgiastic disemboweling of the heritage, for the tribes of fools swarming your sweet land like ants in the sugar—yes, I beg your forgiveness for everything that enfeebled America during your brief days of manhood and your instant of dying.

Along with these regrets, I confess there is anger. You have purchased me the right to it. It sends me bellowing out of my plane in the obedient silent citizenry where the blames are conveniently dumped and into a new radicalism of my own. I think, Mike, that I have become dangerous. They shall not mutilate the flag in my sight; they'll not sing their Ho Chi Minh chant in my hearing. . . . They shall not sack your street, nor mock your widow. I'll allow no one to belittle or slander you, or even forget you. I give you the promises you must already have known I would make, and I swear to them.

There remains, then, just this. How, my son, do I say farewell?

The willow, the one you joked of as our "family tree" that gay day we made such ceremony of planting it, withered and dropped its leaves the week after you died, as if June were autumn. But the chrysanthemums sent us in memorial are doing well out under the north eave where we put them, and it appears they are near blooming again. We wear our gold stars for you, we have left your boots in the corner, we have hung your sword on the wall. We are keeping fresh the good memories, and more often now, as we speak of you, it is with joy. The three of us who loved you and buried you, thank you forever.

America has had no better than you. And you were ours.

Goodbye, Mike. Goodbye.

VIETNAM ESSAY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a young man from my district recently wrote an essay on Vietnam which has been accepted for publication in the Chicago Tribune. It seems to me that this young man, Mr. James Baker, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, has taken a very mature approach to the problem of serving his country. The advice he offers to his contemporaries is excellent, and I commend him for it. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article from the Mount Pleasant News regarding the essay which Mr. Baker wrote:

JAMES BAKER, JR., RECEIVES CHICAGO TRIBUNE RECOGNITION

James Baker, Jr., 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Baker, has written an essay on the Vietnam War entitled "Saigon Tech or —" which has been accepted for publication by The Chicago Tribune on Sunday, March 2 or Sunday, March 9.

Baker, a senior at M.P.H.S., was informed by long-distance telephone Tuesday. On Wednesday morning, he and Mrs. Evelyn Traut, his teacher of Vocational Writing, were interviewed via telephone by Miss Genevieve Flavin, editor of The Voice of

Youth Column in which his essay is to appear. At this time, Miss Flavin invited him and Mrs. Traut to be guests of the Tribune at a luncheon to be held at the Chicago Lake Shore Club on May 10.

Among Baker's other interests are National Theatrics, track, M.Y.F., and he was the recipient of a KXGI scholarship to the journalism workshop in the School of Journalism at the University of Iowa this past summer. In addition to Jim's other activities, he has a job at Hy-Vee after school and on Saturdays.

Other English teachers of Baker at M.P.H.S. have been Roger Williams, David Giese, Mrs. Barbara Anderson, and Mrs. Louise Clark.

The essay written in response to an editorial which had appeared in the Tribune:

"SAIGON TECH" OR—

"Graduation from high school or college presents a major obstacle in the lives of many young American males. It is at this time that they are faced with the Selective Service System and classification or reclassification, as the case may be. Reclassification may prove to be a one-way ticket to 'Saigon Tech' and, quite possibly, a quick trip home in a metal box.

"With this thought in mind, we must make a major decision. Shall we, as the law demands, submit ourselves for induction, or shall we resist—possibly going to Canada or jail—or shall we seek the status of conscientious objector? This is not an easy decision to make; rather, it is one that takes a great deal of thought.

"We must attempt to consider and evaluate all the facts as we seek to determine whether the Vietnam War is justifiable. What are our obligations to America? Do we have the obligation to stand up for its security as well as its prestige? But what of the moral obligations to ourselves? These must be considered as well.

"In all actuality, there are only two clear-cut decisions that can be reached. Either to be inducted or to appeal as a conscientious objector. This is a very delicate issue to study to determine the answer, but in the end we will invariably reach the decision that is correct for us. If the government calls, I shall go. Though I may disagree with our policies on some issues, America means a great deal to me. Many young men of previous generations as well as my own, have died to preserve our freedom. The most I can do is the same."

PLANS FOR ELIMINATION OF AIR POLLUTION

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the General Motors Corp. and the management of the Defiance, Ohio, plants of Central Foundry Division have unveiled a tremendously ambitious project which they have undertaken to abate air pollution. This project is vital to the public interest.

Speaking to officials and civic leaders in Defiance, Ohio, on February 18, 1969, Elmer E. Braun, divisional general manager, and Thomas E. Smith, manager of the Defiance plants, reported that high-energy Venturi scrubbers will be installed on two plant No. 1 cupolas. Plant No. 2, newest of Central Foundry's iron foundries, was equipped with modern effluent controls when built in 1966.

Braun said that the new Defiance project is in keeping with the General Motors

Division's policy of eliminating or effectively controlling air and water pollution problems by applying the latest technology.

Braun said:

The new type scrubbers have demonstrated the ability to surpass existing codes and will make a dramatic improvement at Plant No. 1.

Planning and facilities engineering for the project have already been completed, and the ordering of equipment has begun.

Smith said:

By April, we hope to break ground for the caissons needed to support large (1750 h.p.) fan motors which are part of the air cleaning systems.

Completion of the project is scheduled for early 1970. The current project is the third major step taken by the Defiance plants to preclude air and water pollution.

Smith noted:

First, when Plant No. 2 began operations in the summer of 1966, a high energy scrubbing system was an integral part of the single cupola installed in that facility.

Step number two became a reality last fall, when we assisted with the clean-up of the Maumee River by creating a new 30-acre secondary settling basin and recirculating system for river water used to cool plant equipment. And, of course, the project we are now undertaking with two Plant No. 1 melting units will effectively control the release of effluent into the atmosphere from that source.

At present, effluent from plant No. 1's cupolas is controlled by "wet caps" at the top of the cupola stacks which spray exhaust gases with water. In so doing, 40 to 70 percent of the dust particles contained in the effluent are removed.

With the new system, hot effluent will be cooled as it passes through a curtain of water in a new type cupola cap, then pulled into a high-energy scrubber where it is accelerated and bombarded with large volumes of water. Dirt particles are settled out while clean air and water mist pass into a mist eliminator unit and eventually into the atmosphere. The new system is expected to remove more than 98 percent of the solids from the effluent.

Mr. Speaker, I commend General Motors Corp. and the management of the Defiance plants of the Central Foundry Division for undertaking this project and would urge other foundries to undertake similar projects with the abatement of air pollution as their objective.

A BILL TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1933

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the basic Agricultural Act of 1933 in order to provide the safeguards from subsidized imports that was the original intent of Congress at that time.

A portion of the 1933 act was devoted to providing machinery for a complete study of those imports which are deemed to render ineffective, or materially in-

terfere with any Federal farm program. The route was for the Secretary of Agriculture to call this to the attention of the President and cause an immediate investigation by the U.S. Tariff Commission. Upon receipt of this investigative report, the President may take action to restrict the imports. In other emergency situations, the President may act before the recommendations are returned from the Commission.

There are other specified routes of getting studies, and the hope of some relief, from other laws. For example, investigations and recommendations from the Tariff Commission can be secured by petition of either branch of Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee or by the President under the Tariff Act of 1930. Under the provisions of the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921, the Secretary of the Treasury can require action of the Tariff Commission. Other instigators for hearings, studies, and reports from the Tariff Commission are authorized in the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. This law allows petition from any industry, firm, or group of workers who fear any probable impact from imports of any article as to constitute the threat of serious injury to the petitioning industry or firm or workers.

It is interesting to note that industry and workers, other than agricultural, have a guaranteed route of getting some hope for immediate relief simply by petition.

I wish this avenue was as open to organizations and to producers of farm products. Therefore, my bill, in which I have the coauthorship of my colleagues from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN and Mr. QUIE), my colleague from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), and my colleague from Wyoming (Mr. WOLD), attempts to provide a portion of this accessibility by agricultural producers by giving the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the authority to get such a study by the U.S. Tariff Commission. In addition, the bill provides for petition to the Tariff Commission by the Governors from at least five States. This, I believe, is a sound provision and will provide that necessary safeguard for those specialized farm commodities which may be clustered in several States.

The changes that I have recommended, does not take away any present authority, nor will it weaken any present structure or function of government. It does provide a realistic and needed procedure for the two congressional committees who are first contacted by farm producers, to bring the current problem to the Commission's attention.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SPEECH OF MISS NANCY HAIGWOOD OF NEWPORT, R.I.

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, annually the Veterans of Foreign Wars con-

ducts a Voice of Democracy Contest for the youth of our country. The title of this year's competition was "Freedom's Challenge" and I am pleased that a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Nancy L. Haigwood, of Newport, R.I., was the winner in my State.

I was much impressed with this young lady's dissertation and following is the content of her speech:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Nancy Haigwood)

Several years ago when my family was in Thailand, we were living south of Bangkok where there were very few Americans. On one particular day I remember a United States submarine made a brief stop at the Royal Thai Marine Corps base. It was not the submarine which sparked our interest, for certainly we had all seen subs before. Still, we eagerly rushed to the dock to stand for a protracted moment with tears stinging our eyes. They were not tears of disappointment, because the vessel stood there clearly. In one rushed second we all realized how long it had been since we had seen the tri-colored stars and stripes, and we watched proudly our fluttering flag on top of the submarine.

At that instant I realized how proud I was to be an American—how proud I was that I had accepted freedom's challenge. Since then I have become even more aware of the need to instill the feeling of freedom's challenge in all citizens, reminded daily by the symbol of the flag.

To understand what the challenge is, let me quote from Albert Camus, "Freedom is nothing else but a chance to be better." A chance to be better—what possibilities that phrase contains! The flame of freedom burns in our souls. As it remains, so does the will to better ourselves. Especially as a nation, we have always accepted freedom's challenge. On the world scene, the nations which have a great deal, the so-called "have" nations, want to keep the status quo. On the other hand, the "have not" nations are constantly building and changing. The United States is unique in this respect: we have a national tradition of faith and progress even though we have been classified as a "have" nation for more than half a century.

Since the birth of our nation we have had a sensitivity to the "have nots" both at home and abroad. This is freedom's challenge. As the dynamic leader of the free world, we have always supported the principles and ideology of democratic society. Since progressiveness often causes upheaval, we must understand that many of the national and world crises of today are necessary. Progressives are not disturbed by today's problems because they can see far enough ahead to know that for a problem to be solved, it must first be uncovered. They simply are wise enough to realize that we are in the uncovering stage. There is a consistent effort on America's part to meet freedom's challenge by seeing the unrest and bringing the problems out into the light. Then, and only then, can they be mastered and can improvements be made.

Along with this chance to be better—as characters, as citizens, as nations, as a world—goes the responsibility of freedom's challenge. The tale has often been told of the little Dutch lad, Peter, who stuck his finger in the dike to save Holland from flood. Here is a fine example of the responsibility each citizen has—to accept the defense of freedom when freedom itself is challenged.

We can accept freedom and responsibility ourselves by obeying current laws. If we disagree with them, we must work to change them by means of our elected senators and representatives. On the community and school levels, we can support projects and, again, offer suggestions for improvements. It is a challenge to obey a law one does not believe in until it can be revised and amended.

The flag which stirs our hearts is the symbol of freedom's challenge. Just as the various strong fibers are woven into the material for the flag, so the strong characters and moral courage of each individual citizen weave the pattern of the American people. Three striking colors together make up the flag. In the nation, too, a mixture of creeds, religions, and races is the backbone of America's vitality. Even though over the years the nation, as the flag, has become occasionally tattered by war and unrest, sometimes frayed by distrust, each succeeding generation has had the courage to reweave the ruined parts.

Freedom's challenge is not one to be met haphazardly. It must be a conscientious effort on our part. Let us not be disheartened by change for the better when it involves unrest. However, it is our responsibility under the challenge to reevaluate change which is not for the benefit of our nation. Freedom's challenge is to try to be better, and what can be better than to reach for the stars, the pure white stars flying on a background of deep blue truth. So look to the stars the next time you view our flag; and promise yourself that you will meet freedom's challenge.

BRIBERY TRIAL IN NEW JERSEY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I hope that many of my colleagues read the astounding account of a recent bribery trial in New Jersey that was carried on page A3 in the Washington Post on February 24, 1969. Seldom, if ever, have I seen described such a naked case of "money in politics." The Post reporter, Morton Mintz, has written a clear, highly readable account of the trial that is both fascinating and frightening. I particularly point to the brutal passages in the article quoting the remarks of John E. Toolan, an attorney representing one of the defendants in the case.

In all candor, none of us can claim to be unfamiliar with the hazards of financing campaigns. Nor can we claim to be uneducated in respect to the baleful influence tainted money has had upon politics and politicians. Many of us have long advocated revision of campaign financing statutes so as to provide realistic expenditure ceilings backed by strong provisions for enforcement and disclosure. We must institute campaign financing reform before the country is confronted with more proved evidences of monstrous abuses and our political system suffers further blows and loss of esteem.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, but no less importantly, this trial should enable us to see the full scope of the cry for law and order. The most recent presidential campaign contained considerable denunciatory oratory about "crime in the streets." Quite properly, our streets should be safe at all times and for all persons. But this bribery trial should inform us that lawlessness is not confined to the pool halls and the ghetto streets. It may be found in the offices of high public officials and in the board rooms of corporate America. And that deserves severer censure.

The article follows:

NEW JERSEY CASE: NAKED CORRUPTION OR PRACTICAL POLITICS?

(By Morton Mintz)

In Federal Court in Newark, N.J., today, an obscure local politician, two business executives and three corporations will seek a new trial in one of the most remarkable cases of "naked corruption" ever exposed.

That phrase—"naked corruption"—was used in court last month by Herbert J. Stern, a special attorney for the Justice Department, to describe payments of \$110,000 by the Colonial Pipeline Co. (and its agents) to Robert E. Jacks, president of the Municipal Council of Woodbridge, N.J.

Stern called the payments a "bribe" by Colonial to get a building permit and right-of-way for the largest privately financed construction project in history—a \$400 million pipeline which carries 40 million gallons of petroleum products a day 1600 miles from Houston, Tex., to the New York harbor area.

Jacks' lawyer said the \$110,000 was simply "political money and it takes an awful lot of political money to run a political organization in a community of a hundred thousand people."

Lawyers for Colonial had still another version of the transaction. The corporation and its officers, they insisted, had been the victim of an extortion plot by Jacks and Woodbridge Mayor Walter Zirpolo.

A jury on January 23 returned guilty verdicts against six defendants:

Council President Jacks.

Colonial Pipeline, which is owned by nine oil companies with combined asset of \$35 billion—American, Cities Service, Continental, Gulf, Phillips, Sinclair, Socony-Mobil, Texaco and Union.

Colonial's president in 1963 and 1964, when the payments were made, Ben D. Leuty.

Karl T. Feldman, who in the payment period was Colonial's executive vice president.

The Bechtel Corp., a San Francisco construction firm with 10,000 employees and annual sales of \$750 million, one of the contractors on the pipeline.

The Rowland Tompkins Corp. of Hawthorne, N.Y., another contractor on the Colonial job.

"Rarely if ever," Prosecutor Stern told the jury before it returned the verdicts, "has the United States been able to pull back the curtain and to display before you or any jury the kind of naked corruption that we have displayed in this case, the intimate details of corrupt public officials met and joined, furthered and promoted by big businessmen who were equally corrupt for their own reasons..."

The curtain-pulling Stern described was the result of an accident. In the course of an investigation of union racketeering begun by the Labor Department, FBI accountants stumbled across a mysterious \$20,000 check for cash issued by the Bechtel Corp. in 1963. The name on the check was that of Basel C. Licklider, a Bechtel employe.

The Justice Department subpoenaed Licklider to testify before a special grand jury in May, 1966. A day before he was to appear, his lawyers revealed that Bechtel, acting for Colonial, had conveyed \$60,000 in cash to Mayor Zirpolo and Council President Jacks.

With this startling new phase of the investigation opened up, the Justice lawyers learned a month later that another \$50,000 had been paid to the Woodbridge officials in 1964 through the Rowland Tompkins Co.

As the investigation continued, two facts were established:

That the \$50,000 paid to Jacks and Zirpolo in 1963-64 had obtained for Colonial a building permit for 22 big storage tanks in Woodbridge.

That the \$60,000 paid in 1964 got for Colonial vital pipeline easements through five city-owned lots in Woodbridge.

The question then became a matter of

definition. Was the money a "bribe," a "political contribution," or a payoff to extortionists?

The lawyers involved argued all three versions to the jury.

Stern, the 32-year-old prosecutor, said that "rarely if ever has the United States been able to prove such a deliberate, knowing, intentional and willful flouting of the laws..."

"Let me suggest to you the reason that these cases are so rare is because the men don't often get caught... the reason they don't get caught is because generally they hide it too well, and if you doubt it... look how well it was hidden in this case," he said.

John E. Toolan, a former New Jersey State Senator representing Jacks, said the "story in capsule" is that "elections in this Nation are run with cash in every municipality, in every county, and everywhere along the line." He continued: "... there is nothing in the law that says that a man can't receive a contribution, a political party can't receive a contribution..."

"How do you think political campaigns are run? Did you ever try to hire a poll worker or a car or get a babysitter for somebody to go out to vote, and think you can pay them with a check on Election Day?"

Political parties spent \$35 million in the last election... Do you think all that money came in checks? Do you think they paid all their bills in checks?

"Every political party must have someone in it who has the capacity to raise money... Bob Jacks was that person in the Woodbridge political organization... Now, this is an oil company coming through. He has to raise money either by going around and sandbagging local people, or you get it on a one-shot deal with some big asset that is coming through, and you take advantage of it..."

"You know, this pipeline business is a tough business... You have to buy or acquire by condemnation, by hook or crook, rights of way..."

"These right-of-way men... have to get people to give them things that people don't want to give them... I don't want to do any injustice, but I don't think you can get a job as a right-of-way man for any oil company unless you had calluses on your conscience because you have to go in and get the job done."

Simon H. Rifkind, a former Federal Judge whose newest partner is Arthur J. Goldberg, the former United States Ambassador and Supreme Court Justice, represented the former Colonial president, Leuty.

Praising Leuty, who now is 66 and retired, as a man of "superlative" character, Rifkind tried to show that the executive had been the victim rather than the perpetrator of a crime:

Leuty authorized the payments... because he honestly believed... that he and his company were threatened with massive injury, amounting to a national disaster... He considered the consequences of having... this great project brought to a halt and decided that the consequences were unendurable, as indeed they were, and he capitulated....

"All of the evidence showed conclusively that what Leuty and his people tried to do was to prevent the officials of Woodbridge from acting dishonestly and illegally....

"Because he did make an honest decision, he did not commit bribery. He did not intend to commit bribery....

"Supposing... your house was burglarized, do you think we ought to punish you?... is that the way we are going to stop crime in this country?"

Rifkind said that representatives of the nine oil companies had entrusted Leuty with the \$400 million pipeline project "because his reputation was as stainless as the very reputation of this Colonial Pipeline is stainless." He identified the owners of the oil firms as "more than one million stockholders, men, women, children, widows, orphans."

Rifkind pleaded with the jury of eight men and four women to lift the heavy burden that events had, for five years, put on "this great, good and creative man" and "to let the sunshine of truth dispel the shadow of this unwarranted accusation."

And, he told the jury, "Yours will be the glory when you wipe the tear off his lovely wife's cheek."

The \$110,000 came to Colonial in three installments—\$20,000 and two of \$15,000 each—for the building permit for the storage tanks, and three more—each of \$20,000—for the easements for the pipeline.

The situation began in 1963 when Colonial was trying to meet a deadline of January, 1964, for completing the world's largest pipeline. (Largely because of resistance in Woodbridge, the deadline was not met and the job was not finished until 1965.)

On Aug. 16, 1963, Fred Stewart, Colonial's right-of-way manager for New Jersey, went to see Mayor Zirpolo.

Zirpolo cited intense public opposition to construction of any more storage tanks in Woodbridge and advised Colonial not to seek a building permit.

Stewart and Zirpolo agreed that above all, what had to be avoided was a public hearing on the desired permit. Such a hearing was required by law.

Stewart testified that Zirpolo told him to go see Jacks, then a stranger to him, at Metro Motors, Jacks' used-car lot.

There, Stewart said, Jacks told him, "You have got to have friends on the Council—friends that will be able to pass this permit for you over the objections of the people."

Stewart left, phoned Atlanta and made a report to Jack Vickery, counsel and a vice president of Colonial.

Stewart told Vickery that Jacks wanted a \$50,000 "campaign contribution" for the permit. But Vickery advised him, Stewart said, "You can't do it. It is illegal—you can't do it, it's illegal—under both Federal and state law."

At the trial, however, then construction manager and now vice president Glenn H. Giles testified that Colonial's subsequent decision was to pay the \$50,000—and the later one for \$60,000 for the easements—through contractors, "because we preferred not to get . . . Colonial Pipeline Co. involved in this" any more than was "absolutely needed."

The first payment for the permit was handed to Jacks on Nov. 7, 1963—two days after he and the mayor were re-elected on a platform of "Tanks, No Tanks."

The second installment followed issuance of the building permit. The third was paid after Colonial got a certificate of occupancy. Colonial made all three installment payments through Rowland Tompkins Corp.

The three \$20,000 payments for the easements—made in three successive months starting in October, 1964—were handled for Colonial by the Bechtel Corp. and the Gates Construction and Gates Equipment Corps. of Little Ferry, N.J.

The Bechtel and Rowland Tompkins Corps. said that in acting as conduits for the payments they had assumed they were on innocent missions. But to give credence to this contention the jury had to believe testimony such as this from William L. J. Fallow, a Bechtel employee:

Following a conversation with Jacks at Metro Motors, Fallow phoned Bechtel vice president Harry F. Waste in Vancouver and Colonial's construction manager, Giles, in Atlanta. Then Fallow flew to San Francisco. He returned with 200 \$100 bills obtained from Basil Licklider, the Bechtel employee whose name was on the \$20,000 check which broke the case.

Fallow next went to a motel room to count out the cash. Then he drove to the Menlo Park Shopping Center in Edison Park, N.J., where the Mayor has a private office. There he met Jacks. Fallow gave him the money. Jacks put the \$20,000 into a desk drawer. No receipt was requested or offered.

After taking Fallow through this step-by-step recital, prosecutor Stern asked if his testimony at that moment remained what it had been—"that it was your understanding that that \$20,000 in cash was going into the Woodbridge city treasury?"

"Yes, sir," Fallow answered.

For the pipeline easement, Colonial executives Leuty and Feldman told the grand jury that Jacks and Mayor Zirpolo solicited \$100,000. But Leuty arranged for negotiations in which this sum was reduced to \$60,000.

The resulting transactions involved elaborate techniques of concealment, including fraudulent invoices, fake bonuses and the use of checks much larger than the three actual payments of \$20,000 each.

Because the sums paid to the contractors for distribution among the Woodbridge officials were declared as income on their books, Colonial had to give the contractors more than \$220,000 to cover taxes on the alleged income.

One of the \$20,000 payments for the easement was handled by Robert L. Bowman, a Bechtel construction manager, and Robert S. Gates, president of the two firms bearing his name.

Gates testified that he wrapped the \$20,000 in \$10 and \$20 bills, in a newspaper and met Bowman at an inn. Bowman counted the money out on a bed, put it in an envelope and gave Gates a check which, because of the tax factor, was for \$42,000. (The discrepancies between the actual cash payments and the check amounts added to the investigators' difficulties in building their case.)

The men lunched. At Bowman's request, Gates accompanied him to the Menlo Park Shopping Center. There, Bowman introduced him to Jacks.

"He told me he was in the automobile business," Gates told the jury. "He gave me his card and told me if I was buying any automobiles or something like that to look him up, and then we gave the money to him, put the money on the table to the best of my knowledge, and Bowman had his briefcase and handed me the envelope and instructed me to give it to Mr. Jacks. I put it on the table and Bowman left and I went out after him."

Explaining how Rowland Tompkins happened to have conveyed three payments for the building permit, lawyer Joseph E. Brill told the jury that president Howard Tompkins, vice president Ralph A. Bankes and the late Roy A. Murphy, merely had performed a check-cashing service to help Colonial get money to Jacks.

The jury deliberated three days before returning its verdicts.

Colonial Pipeline was convicted on all nine counts in the indictment. (Its counsel, Warren W. Wilentz, was the Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate last year but was defeated by the incumbent, Clifford P. Case. Wilentz's father, David, who played a major defense role for Colonial early in the case, is the Democratic National Committeeman from New Jersey.)

Jacks and Colonial executives Leuty and Feldman were each convicted on the two conspiracy counts—one for use of interstate mails, phones and travel to get the building permit by bribery, the other to do the same to get the easements.

The Bechtel and Rowland Tompkins firms were convicted on one conspiracy count each.

The indictment contained seven substantive counts, each involving an interstate trip to deliver cash for the permit or the easements.

Jacks was convicted on one of these counts, Bechtel on one and Rowland Tompkins on four. In addition, each of the Gates firms pleaded guilty before the trial to one of the substantive counts.

Mayor Zirpolo, who became ill early in the trial, faces a separate prosecution. His counsel is Edward Bennett Williams.

Colonial's Giles who was promoted from

construction manager to vice president, was, like Zirpolo, indicted on all nine counts.

But before the trial started on Nov. 13, the Government severed him from the trial in hopes of eliciting testimony against the other defendants. However, he invoked the protection of the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination and refused to testify. Attorney General Ramsey Clark then wrote a letter requesting that Giles be exempt from prosecution.

After the prosecution submitted the letter to the trial judge, Reynier J. Wortendyke Jr., Giles was compelled to testify for the prosecution.

The indictment named as conspirators but not as defendants seven officers and employees of the contractor firms involved in the payments—Banks, Bowman, Fallow, Gates, Murphy, Tompkins and Waste.

The motion for a new trial comes two years and one day after the indictment was returned.

Each defendant faces a maximum penalty on each count of a \$10,000 fine. In addition, each individual defendant could be imprisoned up to five years per count.

CRITICISM OF NATIONAL CHAMBER'S POSITION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL UNJUSTIFIED

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned over the criticism, which I consider unfounded and unjustified, of the selection by Secretary of the Interior Hickley of Mr. James C. Watts for a policy level position in the field of water pollution control. This criticism apparently stems from the erroneous viewpoint of some that Mr. Watts' former employer, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, is opposed to water pollution control legislation. Such a viewpoint is contrary to the facts in that the national chamber strongly supported the water pollution control bill passed unanimously by the House in the last Congress, which legislation would now be law had it not been for the Senate's failure to give its final approval to the bill before adjourning the 90th Congress.

To help set the record straight as to the national chamber's position on water pollution control legislation, I wish to call to the House's attention the following statement made February 11 by Mr. Arch N. Booth, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Mr. Booth's statement speaks for itself and I trust that it will nullify any doubts that the national chamber, and Mr. Watts, strongly support the enactment of effective water pollution control legislation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY ARCH N. BOOTH

The National Chamber's position on water pollution control legislation has been seriously distorted by recent events as reported by the news media. The fact is that the House of Representatives passed an effective water pollution bill last year—the last time such legislation reached the floor of either the House or the Senate—and the National Chamber strongly supported it. The House-

passed bill also had the support of most of the nation's governors.

The House bill would have provided for the financing of municipal treatment facilities, extended federal jurisdiction over oil and hazardous spills, and established laws controlling the discharge of sewage from vessels.

Democrats and Republicans in the House unanimously opposed a Senate amendment that would have given to the Secretary of Interior authority to intervene where a federal department or agency issues a license or permit to a water user. He would have been given authority to control many of the activities in connection with agriculture, irrigation, and industrial and municipal development. This was a deviation from the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Water Quality Act of 1965, and was unwarranted. The National Chamber also opposed the Senate amendments.

Referring to the Senate amendment, a prominent House Democrat, on October 14, 1968, said: "The implications of a basic change in government policy of this magnitude are too great for hasty and ill-considered action at this time. Therefore, this group of Senate amendments should be rejected." A few minutes later, the House, for the second time in eight days, passed, without dissent, an effective and significant water pollution control bill.

Presumably, the critics of the National Chamber's position would also be critical of the combined judgment of the House of Representatives. If this is not the case, then it suggests that some people are playing politics with pollution.

We of the business community are concerned about another implication in the statements reported by the press. It is the implication that the business viewpoint on issues such as pollution abatement is contrary to the interests of the nation. This is a serious implication. It argues that businessmen or others who have represented business interests should not serve in high government posts.

This kind of attitude seems most inappropriate, particularly at a time when political leaders of both major parties are calling upon businessmen to involve themselves more in the complex problems facing the nation and to contribute their resources and knowhow to help solve these problems.

The National Chamber urges President Nixon and his Cabinet to resist in every way pressures that would tend to mute or eliminate the viewpoint of business in the affairs of the Federal Government.

REMARKS OF LEO M. HARVEY AT
THE TECHNION DINNER, DECEMBER
11, 1968, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure recently to attend a banquet in Los Angeles given by the friends of the Technion Institute in Israel. The dinner was in honor of Leo M. Harvey.

The Technion group in this country is composed of people who believe in the value of the technological training provided by the Technion Institute in Israel. These friends of Technion are working to support the necessary expenses of the school and its crucial work in the expanding economy of Israel.

Leo M. Harvey has been a supporter of the Technion since its inception. He es-

tablished a million dollar fund, the proceeds from which are to be used for scholarships to the Technion for young men and women interested in science and industry.

Leo Harvey himself is a remarkable man—he came to the United States from Russia as an immigrant in his youth. He has been shown great capability and perseverance in building an industrial complex which fabricates many types of machines and equipment from aluminum and other metals. His background of more than half a century in American industry and his own innate intelligence is shown in the remarks which he delivered at the Technion dinner in his honor. I commend this man's wise and eloquent statement to my colleagues, as follows:

REMARKS OF LEO M. HARVEY, TECHNION DINNER, DECEMBER 11, 1968, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Friends and countrymen, it is my pleasure to greet you and express my appreciation for the support extended by you to the Technion on the occasion of being an honored guest—permit me to reciprocate the compliment—you are all honored guests.

For thousands of years the hallmark of the Jewish people was education and work "Torah and Avodah."

Leaning heavily on "Torah" (education) from Israel came forth a vision (a creed) which captured the imagination of men all over the world.

This new creed based on moral and ethical teachings of Monotheistic Judaism is the dignity of man. Sustaining this dignity of man by rich and poor, master and slave, served to strengthen the brotherhood of man and alleviate the harshness of man's struggle for existence.

With the renaissance of Israel this great traditional creed continues.

From various institutions of higher learning go forth this ethical message.

The Technion, the major technical university in the Middle East, provides the technological foundation for improving and developing the well-being of man not only in Israel, but through scholarships and technical assistance programs in the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The Technion is a unique educational institution. Its aim in education can best be expressed by the following:

If you give a man a fish, he will have a single meal.

If you teach him how to fish, he will eat all his life.

Our present social order is no more the domain of fiction writers and occasional prophets. It is the domain of science and technology.

To participate in economic well-being, people must learn the technology of material, atmosphere, earth, and ocean.

The technology of space and planets within space.

And above all, the technology of management.

All these subjects are taught by the Technion staff in Israel.

On the list of economic well-being and expansion, education is the most important factor.

To profit by this factor, education and technology must be made available to all without restraint and discrimination.

Nature by itself is clearly democratic. It distributes its priceless gift (brain power) universally.

To sustain full progress we must employ this priceless gift to enable us to escape the tyranny of unconscious forces, and control production by reason and will.

This justifiable expectation of progress, to a large extent, is the art of management.

Management is in the end the most creative of all the arts, for its medium is human talent itself.

The fundamental task of management is to deal with growth and change.

The growth of knowledge is the necessary medium for economic growth in an industrial society.

Management recognizes this as an essential requisite.

Management is the gate through which social, economic and technological change is rationally and effectively spread to society.

The real threat to democracy comes from under management, not from over management.

Technological advances have two bedrock requisites—scientific knowledge and managerial competence.

Israel is a country of scarce, natural material resources.

To offset the scarcity of natural material resources Israel is investing heavily in the most precious commodity the Israeli nation has—namely, human resources.

Israel as a nation, and Jewish people in general, have a goodly portion of human resources.

If the future can be reckoned by the past, the names and numbers of Jews who contributed to the well-being of civilization and humane society as a whole, would be of considerable importance.

I do not desire to exaggerate the share the Jews have in the evolution of the modern world.

I do not advocate the cult of the chosen people "om segula".

I merely wish to name a few giants in social justice, arts, and science: Moses and Isaiah, Jesus and Paul; in modern times, Spinoza and Disraeli, Erlich and Einstein.

True, it is not by giants alone that civilization can be assessed.

Great advances in human progress are the work not of a single genius but of a score of lesser known pioneers from whose work, experience, and failures, the genius profits.

Civilization is a complicated subject, it is in a continuous action and reaction.

Startling results would in most cases be impossible without the painstaking research of scores of humble and unrecorded workers.

The battles may be won by the general. They are fought by the private soldier. And victory is the result of laborious plans of the staff.

It is accordingly a more solid contribution to progress on the part of the humble of the human race if they had performed their duty consistently in the lesser function than if they had contributed the giants of discovery.

The Jewish people have provided both—the workers and the giants.

They formed an integral part of the culture of Europe and have contributed to it incessantly through the dark ages, the Renaissance, and the present time—as scientists, men of letters, as explorers, as pioneers, physicians and philosophers.

Western civilization would not stand where it does today without the Jewish collaboration.

However, this should not be marked as Jewish or non-Jewish, as such contributions are universally human. The Jewish investigators and discoverers have, in many cases, had non-Jewish teachers on one hand, and many non-Jewish pupils on the other.

The Jew in fact is an inheritor of a double tradition.

There is the religious history which germinated on the soil of Israel with a basic belief that man does not live by bread alone.

And there is the political history of the past twenty centuries which has been associated principally with the western world in whose civilization persons of Jewish birth have taken a share worthy of study and respect.

We might say that without *their great influence*, one may imagine that Europe would have remained *pagan*, divided between the immoral deities of Rome and Greece, and bloodthirsty gods of Teutonic Valhalla.

The Latin and Greek genius required the fertilization by Christian religious thought based upon Jewish Monotheism.

Without the invigorating *Judaeo-Christian influence*, Europe might have remained in the condition in which it was left in the dark ages.

It was the spirit of the *Judaeo-Christian* tradition which gave rise to the *Magna Charta* and the bill of rights.

Where and whenever the Jewish influence of the *Judaeo-Christian* tradition was temporarily lost, then even in the contemporary western world, civilization reverted to the inhumanity of man-to-man as witnessed by the disgraceful practice in Nazi Germany.

The caste society of India with its *untouchable millions*, and the Chinese Communist degradation of its people, would not be possible within a framework of the *Judaeo-Christian* values in the brotherhood of man.

It might be worth mentioning at this time that for the sake of promoting a better climate of friendliness between the Arabs and Israelis, the *Israeli* managerial competence should include an active training and educational unit—in order to train and influence the Arab neighbors whose masses have been traditionally mistreated and mismanaged—to the detriment of the greatest number, by religious fanaticism and despotic governments.

Educating the Arabs for a better way of life is a formidable task requiring the labor of dedicated people who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the Arab masses.

This educational process can only succeed if it is done for the sake of freeing the Arab from poverty and degradation to which he is presently chained by antiquated fairy tales of religious beliefs, and the duplicity of present Arab leadership.

In Medieval Arab Spain and Arab North Africa, a golden age flourished in medicine, science, and the arts, between the Jewish and Arab communities.

Such an era can rise again when Israeli democratic procedures and social innovations, coupled with the technology the Technion provides, diffuse throughout the Middle East.

It is the hope that this great influence will radiate not only westward but eastward, throughout all mankind.

Then we will witness a strong, resolute United Nations dedicated to justice and peace.

A United Nations rich with power and devotion, enabling it to settle disagreements between nations at a conference table and not on the field of battle. A United Nations whose fighting tools are reason and international law and not a machine gun and a bomb.

A United Nations where, when a conflict occurs between a small and big nation, the small nation does not disappear.

And when a conflict occurs between big nations, the United Nations itself does not disappear.

Israel today is in a state of crisis.

As is often the case, a crisis is sometimes a blessing in disguise.

The Chinese aptly describe it.

In the Chinese language the word "crisis" consists of two words.

One word means "trouble"—the other "opportunity."

The crisis in Israel may be compared to a coin.

One side of the coin spells trouble, which the Jewish people have experienced for centuries.

The other side spells opportunity—which is a reminder that Israel, with its timely

well-deserved confidence and technical skill will carve out for itself a niche of honor and esteem among the nations of the world.

Israel, a Jewish homeland, the fulfillment of an idea, hope, and prayer of countless generations—truly, greater than the tread of mighty armies—is an idea whose time has arrived.

MARINE, G.I. FROM MARYLAND DIE SAME DAY IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Edward A. Lamb and L. Cpl. Thomas R. Davis, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MARINE, GI FROM MARYLAND DIE SAME DAY IN VIETNAM

A young marine who had been co-captain of his football team in Frostburg, Md., and an Army man from Dundalk have both been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Lance Cpl. Thomas R. Davis, 20, of Loar-town in Allegany county, was hit in the back of the neck by small-arms fire and died January 31, near An Hoa, his family said.

Spec. 4 Edward A. Lamb, of Dundalk, also 20, was killed in action the same day at Tuy Hoa, only a few miles from where his stepfather, SFC Robert L. Dale, was fighting at the same time, the veteran said at the family home, 2513 Yorkway, Dundalk.

Specialist Lamb was born in Charlottesville, Va., and attended Dundalk Senior High School, his mother said. He enlisted in the Army in October, 1967, and was sent to Vietnam the following May 15.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a grandmother, Mrs. Joseph Shiflet, of Charlottesville.

He was a medic in the 173d Airborne Brigade, his stepfather said. "I was only a few miles from him when it happened so all I can say about it now was that he was killed by hostile fire," Sergeant Dale, who recently completed a 10-month tour of duty in South Vietnam, said.

Corporal Davis wrote his family about two weeks ago that he was "getting tired of sitting around and would begin volunteering for patrols again," his brother, Michael J. Davis, said yesterday.

WOUNDED BY SHRAPNEL

"He thought he was fighting a just fight. He felt very deeply about it," his mother said.

In July, he was wounded by shrapnel as he led a machine-gun squad. He was awarded the Purple Heart. He was in C Company, 1st Battalion, 3d Marine Division.

He began wrestling and playing football on the varsity team of Beall High School in his sophomore year. He was co-captain of the football team for three years and co-captain of the wrestling team his senior year.

He graduated in June, 1966, and hoped to go to college, his brother said. He held several jobs, however, before enlisting in the Marine Corps in September, 1967. The following March, he was sent to Vietnam.

Besides his mother and brother, he is survived by two other brothers, John S., of Baltimore, and Gary L., of Loarstown, and a grandmother, Mrs. Clara Cookerly, of Baltimore.

HARBUS NEWS AGAINST ABM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed deployment of the Sentinel ABM system has serious implications. More and more Americans are becoming convinced that the construction of more missile systems—far from increasing the security of the United States—will further escalate an already spiraling arms race.

The alternative to the deployment of an ABM system was clearly spelled out in an editorial which appeared in the February 20 issue of the HarBus, the weekly publication of the Harvard Business School. That editorial calls for an early ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, initiation of arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, and a more open policy of exchange and communication with mainland China.

Community after community in which the Department of Defense proposes to locate these missile installations has strongly protested the construction of missile sites in their community. I urge the Congress to heed the urgings of these concerned citizens and concentrate its energies on finding ways to reverse the arms race and reduce tensions.

The editorial follows:

[From the HarBus News, Feb. 20, 1969]

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: NO ABM

As Editor of the HarBus News, the weekly newspaper of the Harvard Business School, it is my responsibility to communicate to you the paper's position on the Antiballistic Missile System, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, Arms Limitation Talks, and Chinese-American Relations.

These four issues are vital to American foreign policy and cannot be separated, despite the efforts of some journalists, columnists, and politicians to do so.

But discussion must start somewhere, and we will start, as do most others, with the ABM question. It is our position, based on the most expert testimony available to us, that the proposed Sentinel ABM system cannot be justified at present on military or national security grounds.

The primary military justification for the ABM, as put forth by the Defense Department, is defense against a limited Communist Chinese nuclear attack in the next decade. Others contend the purpose is to discourage a Russian attack by matching the Russian ABM system.

Available evidence indicates the above reasoning is not consistent with the facts as the Chinese offensive capability is behind schedule and years away from even being a remote threat to the U.S., and Russian ABM deployment is at best considerably more limited than the proposed Sentinel and not considered by U.S. arms experts to be effective against the most advanced American weapons.

The only possible current justification appears to be on political grounds, and political grounds cannot, in our opinion, justify the expenditure of billions of dollars, escalation of the arms race, deterioration of Russian-American relations, disregard for domestic priorities, and further disruption of world order which might accompany the vigorous deployment of the ABM system.

But military and national security justification for the ABM will inevitably

strengthen over time unless steps are taken now to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, defuse the arms race, and greatly improve Chinese-American relations.

Thus our position against deployment of the ABM is inextricably tied to early ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, initiation of arms limitation talks with Russia, and a new U.S. policy on Communist China including cultural exchanges, ambassadorial talks, and diplomatic recognition in the future.

We ask your assistance in bringing our position to the attention of the appropriate Congressional and executive committees.

PERTAINING TO PORNOGRAPHIC
MATERIAL RECEIVED THROUGH
THE MAIL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is wading knee deep in pornographic muck.

And I am firmly convinced that I speak not only my own convictions, but those of an overwhelmingly majority of those I represent, when I say we are sick of it. It is time to clean up.

Each of us Members of Congress receives constant complaints from constituents who have received unsolicited filth through the mails. Many times the complainant is an outraged parent whose minor child has been the innocent recipient.

Anyone who subscribes to a magazine, a book club, or who orders an innocent piece of merchandise through the mails, is instantly vulnerable to a bombardment of obscene advertisements. One of my constituents ordered flower bulbs from a firm advertised in a highly respected gardening magazine. Her name was sold to a pornographic mail-order house. Through identical errors in the name tapes used by the two firms she was able to establish beyond doubt that such had been the case.

This is only one example, but it is typical. Public Law 90-206, which we enacted in the last Congress, gives recipients of unsolicited objectionable material the right to file a protest with the Post Office, which then orders the advertiser to cease and desist mailings to the protesting individual. We all are aware of the incredible workload at the Post Office, which has hindered it in carrying out the law as quickly and efficiently as we had hoped. Many persons are unaware that they even have this right of protest.

I have long had strong views on the corrupting influence pornography is having on our Nation, particularly our youth.

Last October 15, addressing the Westpark Kiwanis Club, I made the following remarks, which I wish to underscore again today:

The purveyors of pornography and violence even manage to send their ugly merchandise to your homes, unsolicited. And, by virtue of recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, these filth peddlers are riding high, shipping their obscene books and films through the mails to neighborhood bookshops—and, un-

less you object by letter to the Post Office, to your child at home.

In 1964 the Postal Inspection Service reported about 86,000 complaints from persons who had received unsolicited obscene material and some 800 arrests were made.

But during fiscal 1968, only 350 promoters of such smut were arrested and indicted although more than 160,000 citizens complained.

Today we are being deluged with the greatest flood of hard-core pornography ever experienced by any nation and we also are witnessing, not at all coincidentally in my opinion, a total breakdown in public morals and an increase in sexual degeneracy.

Beyond a doubt the 1966-67 Supreme Court decisions relating to pornography were the causative factor which brought about this state of affairs. The Court reversed 23 of 26 state and federal obscenity determinations. The community standards of 13 states were upset. The high court appeared unimpressed by testimony such as that given by an eminent psychiatrist who testified that obscene material can cause criminal conduct—as in the case of seven teen-agers who attacked a 12-year-old girl after reading material which the youths themselves indicated was their book of instruction for the sexual crimes they committed. And the Supreme Court paid no heed to the same psychiatrist's plea that even though pornography may not lead directly to crimes of violence, it misleads youth into believing that promiscuity, perversion and sadism are acceptable standards of conduct.

The first obscenity conviction took place in England in 1688 and when the Founding Fathers came to America they brought with them the Common Law of England including laws against lewd exhibitions and obscene publications. These principles became absorbed into our laws in early American courts. Later they were codified in the laws of Congress and each of the States of our Union. Contrary to what we often hear, they do not reflect the Puritan image—they reflect Judeo-Christian norms respected for centuries for the protection of the family structure and the wellbeing of the community.

The great Judge Learned Hand pointed out in one landmark case, "In this country the jury must determine under instructions where the book is obscene. The court's only power is to decide whether the book is so clearly innocent that the jury should not pass on it at all."

But contrary to nearly two centuries of American juristic precedent, the Nine Men in Washington now have made themselves custodians of the national morality! And they reached their decisions on pornography at a time in our history when juvenile delinquency cases had almost doubled, when juvenile arrests for murder were up 31%, rape, 34%, robbery 55% and aggravated assault 115%!

You can pay a visit to book and magazine stores in the Cleveland area and see what the courts unleashed on our youth. You can open the entertainment pages of newspapers and see the type of films being offered at local theaters. You might even, when you go home tonight, discover that your young son has received unspeakable smut through the mails—unsolicited, of course—from pornographers who seize every opportunity to purchase mailing lists of young people. They've been known to steal such lists from schools, from Scouting headquarters, they prowl through the newspapers for names and addresses of youngsters.

Constituents, quite justly outraged, have sent me samples of the sort of filth their children have been receiving. Their only recourse is to notify the Post Office that postal officials in turn notify the pornographer to cease and desist such mailings under threat of penalty.

I say that is not good enough. Here is what I propose:

Federal legislation should be enacted making it illegal to solicit sales or sell to any minor through the mails or through interstate transport any salacious merchandise. Book and magazine dealers would be prohibited from counter sales of such filth to minors. Motion picture theaters and other places of entertainment would fall under the same strictures.

Even the U.S. Supreme Court, last April, said that laws may be drawn to establish different standards of obscenity for minors. We should proceed accordingly.

And we should enact legislation provided by the Constitution to check and balance an arbitrary judiciary. Article 3, Section 2, says:

"The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Congress, in other words, can through legislation withdraw appellate jurisdiction from the U.S. Supreme Court and return it to the state supreme courts where it belongs. If a state supreme court rules that material is obscene, it is obscene, and the matter ends there. Had such legislation existed in May 1967 the nation might be well on its way to a solution of the obscenity problem—a solution mandated by juries, the conscience of the people, in their verdicts in 26 different obscenity cases. The Supreme Court, as I have mentioned, reversed all but three.

Supreme Court Justice Harlan, the great dissenter, courageously stood by the decisions of the lower courts, upholding them in these brilliant words:

"The domain of sexual morality is pre-eminently a matter of state concern. The Court should be slow to interfere with state legislation calculated to protect that morality. The state can reasonably draw the inference that over a long period of time the indiscriminate dissemination of material, the essential character of which is to degrade sex, will have an eroding effect on moral standards."

Congress appropriated \$640,000 this year for the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Its purpose is "After a thorough study which includes a study of casual relationship of such materials to anti-social behaviour, to recommend advisable, appropriate, effective and constitutional means to deal effectively with such traffic in obscenity and pornography."

I say the effects are self-evident. Citizens are tired of commissions which study and study situations which plainly speak for themselves. The time to act is now—not a year from now or two years from now after the commission has spent a million or two more in tax dollars.

I vigorously support severe penalties for those who send through the mails or through inter-state commerce any obscene, pornographic materials for sale to minors;

I vigorously support laws returning to state supreme courts appellate jurisdiction over state obscenity and pornography cases.

I shall do all in my power to see these laws are enacted.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, on January 3, opening day of this Congress, I introduced H.R. 855, to limit the appellate jurisdiction in obscenity cases to State supreme courts.

And, today, I am introducing the following legislation which would inhibit the rampant abuse of address lists sales to marketers of muck:

A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and

transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4061. Registration of mailing list brokers; furnishing of information with respect to mailing lists

"(a) Each broker engaged in the sale or exchange of mailing lists shall file with the Postmaster General a registration statement, in such form and detail as the Postmaster General shall determine, which shall cover, among other matters prescribed by the Postmaster General, (1) the name under which he is doing business, (2) the scope and general character of the business, (3) the location of his principal business office, and (4) the names and addresses of the directors and the chief executive officers if the broker is a corporation, association, partnership, or other business association.

"(b) Each individual and each corporation, partnership, or other business organization or association using, buying, selling, renting, exchanging, or otherwise making available to others any mailing list shall, on request, furnish to the Postmaster General, in such form and detail, and at such times, as he shall determine, information respecting (1) the name of the individual, corporation, partnership, or other business association or organization, and (2) the identity of individuals having a financial interest in any such organization or association, including the responsible officers and employees thereof. Postal officials, upon request, shall be permitted to examine records and particulars of transactions or mailings pertaining to any such mailing list.

"(c) As used in this section, 'broker' means any person who engages either for all or part of his time, directly or indirectly, as agent, dealer, or principal, in the business of offering, buying, selling, or otherwise dealing or trading in mailing lists owned, rented, or used by another person.

"(d) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section. Such regulations shall provide that a broker shall obtain the written consent of each person to be included on such list before placing the name of such person on such list and that a broker or user of such list shall remove the name of such person from such list on the request of such person."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"4061. Registration of mailing list brokers; furnishing of information by suppliers, buyers, and users of mailing lists."

Immediately below

"4060. Foreign publications free from customs duty."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, relating to offenses against the postal service, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1735. Mailing list brokers, suppliers, buyers, and users

"Whoever, being required by section 4061 of title 39, United States Code, to furnish information to the Postmaster General, fails or refuses to furnish such information as the Postmaster General shall request under such section, or violates any regulation of the Postmaster General under such section, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not to exceed one year, or both."

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 83 is amended by inserting

"1735. Mailing list brokers, supplier, buyers, and users."

Immediately below

"1734. Editorials and other matter as 'advertisements'."

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have written the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary urging that he refer my H.R. 855 to subcommittee for immediate action, and I am hopeful that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will give priority to consideration of the legislation I have introduced today, a bill in which I am pleased to associate my efforts with those of my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG).

It is my hope that a majority of this Congress will take heed of the damage being done by the unprecedented flood of corrupting material sweeping our country. The concern of our citizens is brilliantly expressed in the following article by Russell Faist, of the Catholic Universe Bulletin:

[From the Catholic Universe Bulletin, Feb. 7, 1969]

JUSTICES FOR SMUT

(By Russell Faist)

Members of the Citizens for Decent Literature, one of the last holdouts for decent reading and viewing, have an idea that the only way to stop the flood of pornography in the U.S. is to put some kind of restriction on the Supreme Court justices.

Atty. Richard Bertsch, University Heights councilman and a member of the national legal staff of the CDL, gave the Universe Bulletin a quick review of the situation and some of the reasons for the CDL's position.

"The U.S. Supreme Court," said Bertsch, "was not set up to act as a fact-finding jury. It was established, in fact, to guarantee the rights of individuals and the constitutionality of American law."

And in most cases, he said, it does just that. It may determine that the rights of the defendant were unjustly offended by illegal search or questioning; it may hold that trial procedure did not follow rules, etc. etc.

With one notable exception, it does not weigh the established facts or impose its own judgment for that of juries or judges in the lower courts.

That exception is in appeal cases involving obscenity and pornography.

Here, Bertsch said, the Supreme Court justices constantly push away the community standard rule and impose their own standards. Bertsch says they are not minding their own business when they do just that.

Result over the past two years has been the complete collapse of laws limiting obscenity and pornography. Anything goes in the court's libertine philosophy. Obscenity and pornography are things in the eyes of the beholder.

The only chance a law official has in making such a case stick, Bertsch said, is where juveniles are concerned.

Needed, Bertsch said, is a law that would require the Supreme Court justices to mind to their own business as guardians of constitutionality and not become fact-finding juries.

CDL, with several grants including one from the Reader's Digest, has prepared a 45-minute film to show to legislators on the state and national level in the hope of making the point.

The movie was shown to congressmen in Washington last summer, planted some seeds of thought, but legislators seldom move on their own without public pressure behind them.

The film "Target Smut," is not for the squeamish. It reports on some 20 cases involving paperbacks and films in the past two years, follows them from the lowest court to the appeals court, to the supreme courts in some 10 states.

Then the film reports how the U.S. Supreme Court—acting as fact-finding juries and not appeal courts—reversed all the decisions.

Several movie clips in the film involve sex acts or simulated sex acts. In theory at least the CDL could have been arrested for showing the film before the Supreme Court reversed the state courts.

Here is the core of the problem faced by CDL members: How can you arouse citizens to legal pressures and community actions without offending them? How can you show how bad a situation is without showing how bad a situation is?

"Target Smut" will be shown for the first time in this area Monday night at Independence High School. It is part of an anti-smut program of the St. Michael, Independence, Holy Name Society. Adults are invited.

If you think pornography is just an 11-letter word that really isn't a problem, drop out at Independence High School at 8 p.m. Monday. You may get more than you bargained for.

NATIONALISM HAS SOVIET UNION WORRIED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, an illusion which continues to be propagated is the "unity" of the Soviet Union and its satellite nations. I believe it necessary to remind ourselves from time to time of the great "potential for freedom" within the confines of the Iron Curtain complex. The Soviet Union is not a voluntary blending of states, but a forced fusion of nations, which have been compelled to accept the dictates of the Kremlin, but have not given up their desire for independence.

I call the attention of my colleagues to an interesting article on this subject which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star:

NATIONALISM HAS SOVIET UNION WORRIED

The rising tide of nationalism among the peoples who make up the Soviet Union is causing concern in Moscow. Danger signals are coming in from areas as far apart as the Ukraine on the western border and Tadzhikistan in Soviet Central Asia, as well as from the Baltic Republics, which were annexed by the Soviet Union only during the last war.

In the past, repeated waves of nationalism in the non-Russian areas were suppressed by wholesale deportations, arrests, and purges of party officials who spoke up for the interests of their own nationalities. But now Pravda, mindful of what happened in Czechoslovakia, is handling the Soviet Union's own nationalists with kid gloves—for the time being, at least.

Symptoms of nationalism should not be underestimated, it says, but it also adds—evidently in reply to those who want firm

action now—that it would be wrong to “exaggerate” them.

What are these symptoms? Pravda speaks in generalities. Nationalism, it says, can disguise itself as an attempt to make one's own republic “flourish,” as a desire to “exploit fully” its potential and this takes the form of “disdain for contacts” with other Soviet republics.

Translated, this means that there are Ukrainians, and Tadjiks, and members of other nationalities in the 17 republics which make up the Soviet Union, who want to be masters each in their own house. The Ukraine, with its population of 47 million and an industry that stands comparison with the best in Europe, is still ruled largely from Moscow which decides the policy for the country as a whole, and therefore for each of its constituent parts.

This applies even more to the smaller republics. Yet the Russians, who largely make the policy, comprise only half the country's population.

Nor do the Russians rule the other republics only from Moscow. They hold many key posts in the capitals of the republics, where only the representative positions are reserved for indigenous officials. Pravda admits, in effect, the existence of resentment against this when it deplors “the distrust of cadres of another nationality” which masquerades as “a legitimate urge to cultivate national cadres.”

Thus, when the Party Central Committee in Moscow rebuked last month the leaders of the Tadjik republic for promoting to important posts certain people who were “without the necessary political and business-like qualities,” it was really saying that the Tadjiks had been appointing their own officials to key posts instead of Russians, who were better qualified.

Eight years ago a big purge in Tadjikistan led to the dismissal of the leading Tadjik officials on exactly the same charges, which were accompanied then, as now, by criticism of the prevalence of Moslem customs. The same criticism is repeated now, but it is pitched in a lower key.

In the Baltic republic of Latvia, even the prime minister is making veiled complaints about Moscow's interference with the economic development of his area, but nobody has pulled up short yet. Ten years ago the Latvian deputy prime minister was dismissed with ignominy for the “narrow nationalism” which caused him to seek “the destruction ties” between Latvia and Russia proper. As Pravda now explains, survivals of nationalism are indeed the invisible allies of the Soviet Union's enemies—but this does not mean that anyone who commits nationalist errors may be regarded as an alien character.”

The Kremlin's commendable self-restraint is undergoing its most difficult test in the Ukraine, where a new economic nationalism is beginning to merge with the old-established cultural and the long-suppressed political ingredients to produce what is potentially a most explosive mixture.

The East Europeans, and particularly the Czechoslovaks, have long complained that the imposition on them by Moscow of its own pattern of industrial development, with primary emphasis on heavy industry, has hamstringing their development of the modern industries which are more important today. Now the same complaints may be between the lines of Ukrainian economic journals, which are beginning to hint at the damage to the Ukraine's national interests caused by Moscow's continuing insistence on this policy.

The most important of these, “the economy of the Soviet Ukraine,” notes that for many years “huge capital investments” went primarily into the heavy industry of the Ukraine's old-established industrial centres.

At the same time, the areas which needed new labor-intensive industries to absorb their

surplus manpower, were starved of capital. Now there were “in our republic” whole branches of industry—in chemicals, light industry, engineering—which had still not attained “a satisfactory level of development.” And the magazine complains of the electronics and motor car industries, that is those which really matter in a modern economy.

It lists “the most important products” which, in its view, the Ukraine makes in “inadequate quantities” and which therefore have to be imported from other republics—from metal cutting tools to washing machines and refrigerators. The predominance of heavy industry in the Ukraine used to be something to boast about, but now the magazine reminds Moscow that it played a major role in the development “not only of our republic, but of the entire Soviet Union,” while the Ukraine's labor-intensive industries “lagged considerably behind.”

It is, in short, a cry for more capital, which the Ukraine believes it has earned by its own exertions, and which is being siphoned off to other areas to the detriment of its own population.

It is a cry that is today being heard in many parts of the world, where the rise of regional and national ambitions can hardly be blamed on the Communist mismanagement of the economy.

But in Communist countries, with their ideologically predetermined centralization of economic and political decision-making, this cry has a power and an eloquence all its own. In the Soviet Union, moreover, it combines with the traditional distrust and envy which subject peoples develop for “imperial” rulers, whether they be Russians or Britons. The analogy must not be taken too far, because in most cases the Russians have become integrated in the social fabric of the nations they have ruled to a much greater extent than the British ever did.

In one sense, indeed, this is the cause of the present trouble in the Ukraine, where the Russians comprise a third of the urban population. And in many of the important towns their proportion rises to a half.

It is the rural population, the “Helots,” that is overwhelmingly Ukrainian. The Russian-dominated towns rule the country. They have a much higher standard of living. Much of the teaching is done in Russian, so that Ukrainians in their own country sometimes find it more expedient to send their children to non-Ukrainian schools.

Before the revolution, Ukrainians had to fight very hard for the rights of their own language, so that this struggle became something of a barometer of national feeling.

Now the increasing use of Russian has led to widespread “nationalist” demands that more textbooks, particularly for universities, should be printed in Ukrainian. When the issue was put to the party secretary responsible for ideology, he gave the standard reply that what was important was that technology should develop, “not the language in which the textbooks are published.”

More recently, however, the Ukrainian Party's first secretary, Mr. Shelest, has announced that it was time to compile new textbooks—and most important of all, they must be published in Ukrainian.”

At the same time, the party press keeps calling for a “merciless struggle” against every manifestation of nationalism. It is less than 50 years since the Ukraine boasted, for a brief spell after the revolution, an independent national statehood.

Long after the last war, Ukrainian nationalists, who had collaborated with Hitler in the hope that he might restore the Ukraine's independence, continued to harass the Soviet administration from their forest hideouts.

Today young Ukrainians, in prison for demanding freedom of thought—as the young Russians imprisoned in Moscow—have become nationalist heroes. More Ukrainian textbooks are no doubt welcome, but this is only

a beginning. Politics and language, culture and the economy—all these are at issue now.

Concessions will only lead to further nationalist demands. Repression will only strengthen the nationalist sentiment, in the Ukraine as well as in the other republics.

Nationalism is on the rise throughout the world, but the Kremlin—as its handling of Czechoslovakia shows—is less able to accommodate itself to it than other regimes. If Moscow does not learn the lesson soon, it will be faced with another Czechoslovakia—this time inside the Soviet Union.

WHAT WOULD WE DO WITHOUT AMERICA?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in an age in which patriotism is often downgraded, and large numbers of young Americans find it necessary to march and protest against their own country, it is indeed encouraging to learn of young Americans who have a different feeling. These are young Americans who love our country, who understand its message to the world, and who seek to make it a better place in which to live. In a recent issue, the Council Bluffs Nonpareil published a group of short essays written by fourth graders at the Franklin Elementary School. Their teachers, Mrs. Lois Preston and Miss Loreen Elliff asked them to write on the question, “What Does America Mean To Me?” Under unanimous consent I submit these statements for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they may be shared with my colleagues:

WHAT WOULD WE DO WITHOUT AMERICA?

This is Freedom Week. George Washington's birthday is Saturday—Abe Lincoln's is just over.

The Nonpareil wondered what children thought of their country in light of wars, threats of wars, internal strife, poverty and rising crime.

Fourth graders at Franklin Elementary School in the classes of Mrs. Lois Preston and Miss Loreen Elliff were assigned one morning to write an impromptu essay on “What Does America Mean To Me?”

They did, and those of Joseph Blain, 2715 Avenue F; Mike Weatherill, 2716 Avenue A; Glenda Vanecek, 2932 Avenue A and Richard Heath, 3033 Avenue F, were chosen by Nonpareil editors as highlighting the present American scene.

Two responses asked a question we used as our headline. In the simple language of 9 and 10-year-olds, it makes adults stop and think. Can you answer it?

Here are the essays:

JOSEPH BLAIN

“Hold up that Flag,
Don't let it drag.
Shoot bullets of lead,
For the Green Berets.
Get silver wings,
Don't be ding-a-lings.
Hurrah!
For the Green Berets!

You can win the war.
And tramp through door.
To victory.
In History.”

MIKE WEATHERILL

"What does America mean to me?

"It means Washington, Lincoln, Cleveland, and Johnson. Lou Brock, Mickey Mantle, Bob Gibson, and Stan Bahnsen.

"It means oceans, rivers, lakes and streams. And pop, hot dogs, coffee and cream.

"It's my uncle's shotgun, my grandpa's cigar. My dad broke a window, and my Mom wrecked the car.

"All these things above that you see is what America means to me."

GLENDA VANECEK

"What does American mean to me?

"It means the home of the free and the brave.

"It means this is our country and we have to fight for it even if we don't want to. We like to live in peace not with wars.

"It means we wish riots wouldn't happen. We should respect our country and the lakes and parks.

"We want our country to be a beautiful place, not bloody with wars.

RICHARD HEATH

"America means freedom, it means liberty and justice for all.

"It means loyalty, it means privileges, it means love, it means peace for all. It means beauty, it means The Pledge of Allegiance.

"It means work for our country and its people, houses, animals, and Medicare, water, food and land.

RESOLUTION ON NIGERIA-BIAFRA WAR

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as one of many Members who are concerned about bringing the Nigerian-Biafran war to an end and alleviating the untold suffering there, I call the attention of the House to the following resolution passed by the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ:

RESOLUTION

We call upon the new Administration to utilize every diplomatic resource at its disposal to aid in mediating and terminating the tragic and dangerous Nigeria/Biafran war.

The United States is the only great power that has maintained a relatively neutral position in this conflict and is therefore in a strong moral and political position to appeal to both sides.

However, an initiative must be taken rapidly as the war is beginning to escalate with outside intervention. The greater the threat to human life through starvation and disease in Biafra the greater the pressures for external intervention. Already the French military intervention has created new danger of escalation resulting in further Soviet support for the Federal Military Government of Nigeria.

We commend our Government for its humanitarian concern in the supply of food and planes for transportation through international religious relief agencies. This is a necessary humanitarian action without political implications for either side; but at least a ten-fold increase is necessary before this program can begin to be effective.

We urge our Government to invite both parties to a mediation conference to meet in a neutral area under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State or the Secretary General of the United Nations. United Nations facilities and the cooperation of interested states,

particularly members of the Organization of African Unity should be sought. In addition, the U.S. should declare support for an international arms embargo.

The basis of a settlement should of necessity be a compromise that will recognize the basic interests of both parties. A demilitarized zone should be established under the auspices of the OAU and negotiations begun for a final settlement.

Neutral land and air routes for the supply of food should be opened and policed by OAU states in conjunction with the cease fire.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WHITEHURST

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished Armed Services Committee colleague, Congressman G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, made a number of pertinent observations concerning our sagging national maritime posture and Russia's increasing naval strength, in a recent speech before the Norfolk Jaycees. As a well-known Norfolk news commentator and former dean of students at Old Dominion College, BILL WHITEHURST is an eminently qualified spokesman on foreign affairs and our Nation's ocean strength. His knowledge of Communist naval activities is based not only on extensive research, but also on his personal visit to the Soviet Union and Poland several years ago.

We all share BILL's deep concern over the recent presence of a massive Soviet fishing fleet off the Virginia coast. I understand he personally inspected the area with several other Virginia legislators during the Russian fleet's encampment off our shores. I take great pleasure in sharing BILL's recent remarks with my House colleagues:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WHITEHURST

The appearance of Soviet-bloc fishing trawlers off our Virginia coast dramatizes an issue vital to the Norfolk-Portsmouth area and the national security interests of the United States.

It may be that the Communist fishing fleet is only interested in the fine herring off Chincoteague Inlet. But their presence so near our nation's leading naval center indicates a new Communist strategy of nose-thumbing, harassment and pin-pricking.

We are painfully aware of how small ships of North Korea's "pin-prick" navy, acting, in effect, as proxies of the Soviet Union seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and inflicted humiliation on the United States. The Russians are sailing into new waters and providing naval weapons to associated communist states.

From the Mediterranean to the Sea of Japan, the Russians have pulled some rude and obstructive maneuvers. They have cut into U.S. naval formations. They have steered on collision courses. There is a method to the madness of this seagoing "buzzing". Moscow's naval thinkers are methodically seeking to undermine the world image of the United States Navy and to substitute a fear of spreading Soviet naval presence.

Moscow has linked naval and political operations. They are seeking psychological advantage over us. They want to inhibit our

forces. That was the name of the *Pueblo* game.

Russian naval brinkmanship, the playing around with the 12-mile limit, and Communist efforts to close certain sea areas to American warships illustrate the arrogant and cunning Russian attempts to exploit and destroy the historic freedom of the seas.

The Soviet fishing fleet illustrates the Russian goal of domination at sea. Even if all their trawlers were merely innocent fishing vessels, our interests are threatened. Since 1954 the Soviet Union has invested \$4 billion in its fishing fleet and fishing facilities ashore. Meanwhile, American trawler owners are hard-pressed to find money to build or modernize trawlers. But the Russians are building the latest trawlers costing more than \$2 million each.

In the last year for which figures are available, 1964, five years ago, the Russians were already landing almost twice the total American catch of fish. Moscow has set a goal of 8.5 million metric tons of fish for 1970.

But the Russians are obviously fishing for something more than seafood. Two hundred special oceanographic vessels have been assigned by the Russians to ocean research. Nine thousands of their best scientists are engaged. A worldwide fleet of trawlers and auxiliaries is assigned to work like the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was supposed to have done.

During the recent International Geophysical Year the Soviet oceanographic effort was double that of the United States.

An outstanding feature of the Soviet oceanographic program is the construction of new scientific research ships.

The United States has only about 3,700 people engaged in ocean studies, a little more than a third of the manpower that Russia has assigned. The United States has 50 fewer ships in oceanographic work.

As a newly-appointed Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am beginning my duties with the conviction that the Navy is still our first line of defense. We must consider the full range of Soviet potentialities and possibilities of the 1970's, the coming decade. *Soviet emplacement of nuclear weapons on the seabed is one of these possibilities.*

Recent studies have indicated that Russia might find it strategic to replace land-based missiles with sea-bed bases or underwater silos. Satellite surveillance would be less effective against missile silos on the ocean floor. Such undersea installations would decrease the consequences of a nuclear strike against a missile-armed foe, thus giving the Russians a great advantage.

Even if such undersea installations are merely within the realm of possibility the United States must face the consequences. We must authorize and achieve naval systems for detecting and destroying such offensive bases on the seabed.

America must simultaneously develop new undersea law concepts that would provide adequate security against the establishment of Russian undersea missile bases within range of Norfolk or any other point on our coasts.

I will propose steps to meet the Russian challenge. Russia's change from land power to aggressive oceanic power may lead them to believe that they have found the means of tipping the world power balance in their favor. A gap in naval power cannot be tolerated. It would tempt the Russians to dangerous conclusions. They know very well that after a nuclear exchange, seapower would be the main residual power available.

The new Administration finds that U.S. oceanography has become a national step-child. While we spend more than \$4 billion a year for the space program, the total spent for ocean studies, research and development, is less than the building of a single space vehicle.

It is not enough to say that two-thirds of our Navy is over 20 years old . . . or that only 10 percent of Russians are more than 20 years old. Let us look at the floating junkheaps among the ships we are still using even in the war zone in Southeast Asia. When some are overhauled and sandblasted to remove barnacles, the sandblasting goes right through the hull. The Coast Guard would intervene if this happened to commercial ships. But a plate is welded over old Navy ships and they are sent back to dangerous waters.

Our sailors really earn their pay, patching up our old tubs. Crew facilities are often without airconditioning, even though ships are operating in tropical waters. On one ship, the Armed Services Committee found that only three out of six toilets for 144 men were working. The shipfitters were too busy repairing the boilers to fix the toilets.

The Atlantic fleet and the Mediterranean fleet have entirely too many overaged ships that are not getting the necessary maintenance, let alone total replacements. The Russian navy is spreading its presence, not only in the Mediterranean but into the Indian Ocean. Soviet TU-16 jet bombers fly surveillance over the U.S. Sixth Fleet from bases in Egypt. As the British withdraw from bases East of Suez, the Russians push in. That's what the Middle East crisis is all about. Russia is making a power play to control the oil of that strategic region, to dominate the Suez Canal, to turn the Mediterranean into a Red Sea, and to outflank NATO from the south.

Since the State of Israel, dependent upon the United States and friendly to us, is now in a strategic position at Suez, the Russians have lined up with the Arabs. Moscow sees the destruction of Israel, by political pressure or guerrilla warfare, a major blow at American power in the region. I favor the sale of Phantom jets to Israel because I conceive of Israel as a possible unsinkable aircraft carrier that may prove a vital auxiliary to our Sixth Fleet.

President DeGaulle of France is playing a peculiar game in the Middle East. He is facilitating Russian strategy. The anti-Israel policies of DeGaulle have little to do with anti-semitism or pro-semitism. They are designed to attract hard currency deposits by Arab oil sheikhs to the Bank of France to strengthen the franc and manipulate other currencies including the dollar.

The decline of the franc last year led DeGaulle to a desperate and cynical accommodation with the Arabs and Russians. DeGaulle is irresponsibly exploiting what President Nixon has termed a "powder keg" situation in the Middle East. DeGaulle is jeopardizing the shaky Mideastern balance and risking a world conflagration in a desperate gamble for massive hard currency transfers of Arab oil money from American and other banks.

In the final analysis, America may have to depend upon its own strength and its own ships in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. In the Norfolk-Portsmouth area, we possess the naval experience and technology to far surpass the Russians at sea.

The real issue that I mentioned in my opening remarks is whether the American people are determined to maintain our supremacy at sea by building a more modern Navy. It is the best guarantee for peace. Moscow respects strength and has contempt for weakness.

We could have built a *Pueblo* here that would not have fallen prey to the North Koreans. We have the facilities and the skill to build fast, modern ships that can cope with special circumstances.

It is absurd to permit the Russians to surpass us in oceanographic research, or in any other kind of research. We need ships with adequate speed and facilities so there

can never be another *Pueblo* seizure by a pin-prick Navy. If the Russians are going to harass us, to humiliate us, we should think about humiliating them a little bit.

I can think of no better place than the Norfolk-Portsmouth area for the development of a great oceanographic research center. Naval and civilian enterprise could join together to broaden knowledge and technology.

Let the Russians worry about our trawlers off their coasts. Maybe we would like some of their cod, or crabs, or caviar, or whatever they have on their 12-mile limits.

Let us explore the whole range of possibilities at sea. The last Administration set arbitrary limits on new submarines. They held down our nuclear attack submarine force.

Their record on surface ships left a lot to be desired. Years were lost in the development of a nuclear-powered surface fleet.

The rigid cost-effectiveness formula of Secretary McNamara elevated accounting factors over security factors.

I am extremely interested in new legislation emerging in my committee for the construction of Navy ships costing \$3.8 billion in fiscal year 1970. The naval shipbuilding program amounted to only \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1969.

The new legislation would provide for 19 new warships including one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates, three nuclear-powered attack submarines, and eight destroyers of the latest class; also, 17 new support ships, 21 conversions including six Polaris submarine conversions, and modernization of three missile escorts.

This is but the start of a new modern Navy. The funds would also cover design efforts and purchase of long lead time for further nuclear attack submarines and nuclear frigates.

The implementation of this kind of program would permit the shipbuilding industry to plan for the modernization of facilities. It would be possible here in the Norfolk area to make better long-range plans for utilization of the working force. Long-range plans would enable our Navy to attract and retain the kind of talented men required to design and operate the complex ships required.

The first priority of my Congressional duties in Washington, according to the oath I have sworn, is to defend and protect our nation. My efforts for a new nuclear Navy are totally consistent with this commitment.

Nor can we forget our merchant marine. Four out of five Russian merchant ships are less than 10 years old. Four out of five of our ships are of World War Two vintage or older. The massive expansion of the Russian merchant fleet has military, economic, and political implications. Soviet merchant ships are the decisive factor in the movement of munitions to North Vietnam.

We cannot permit Russia to gain maritime supremacy. Our Government must encourage the builders of merchant ships. This is another priority linked with our defense.

If we are to keep the peace and maintain freedom, our nation must proceed at full speed to augment our sea power.

The trident will not be wrested from America's grasp.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 51st anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. Tragically the breath of freedom that came re-

freshly from Estonia in 1918 was snuffed out by the Soviet Union in 1940.

Estonia, like its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Lithuania, became a captive of Soviet oppression in 1940 after just 32 years of freedom. Yet during those 32 years the people of Estonia made clear their commitment to the principles of freedom and democracy that we, here in the United States, value so greatly.

Thus it is appropriate that out of respect for those principles on which this Nation was founded and out of respect for the many Americans of Estonian descent, that we take the time to recognize the anniversary of Estonian independence. Clearly implied in our recognition of the Estonian Independence Day is our unwillingness to accept as permanent the Soviet occupation of Estonia and our commitment to the eventual renewed freedom of the people of Estonia.

I am proud to join in recognizing Estonian Independence Day and to reaffirm my commitment, shared with my colleagues, to see Estonia free again.

AMENDMENTS TO THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today legislation to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967. This measure is similar to the bills which I and Messrs. HORTON, SHRIVER, and STAFFORD introduced during the 90th Congress.

As you know, my colleagues and I have been extremely critical of the present draft system for some time. Since 1967, we have advocated the development of an all-volunteer military force, which, we believe, can be accomplished within 2 to 5 years. Nevertheless, there are numerous immediate improvements which can be made in the draft laws which will make them more equitable. Some of these changes are contained in the measure which I am reintroducing today.

The main provisions of this bill are as follows:

Requires the drafting of the 19-year-old group first;

Requires draft boards to conform to uniform national criteria for deferments;

Requires the Selective Service System to abide by the recommendations made by the National Security Council on "critical skills";

Removes any obstacle to the President to institute an equitable method of choosing those few who are needed from among the larger available manpower pool, including a system of random selection;

Includes a statement of purpose that the Government would attempt to meet its military manpower needs through adequate voluntary enlistment before resorting to compulsory conscription;

Requires that entrance standards for enlistment be no lower than for the draft;

Allows deferments for students attending junior colleges, community colleges, and similar institutions of learning on the same basis as baccalaureate candidates.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has announced that the committee will hold hearings on the draft laws during this session, and I hope that these proposals will be thoroughly considered at that time.

APOLLO IS PROUD OF APOLLO

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent the following letter to Postmaster General Winton M. Blount:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1969.

Hon. WINTON M. BLOUNT,
Postmaster General of the United States,
Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLOUNT: As representative of a district that includes Apollo, Pennsylvania, I should appreciate your arranging for that town to share in the first-day issue of the commemorative stamp honoring the Apollo 8 Mission. While I am aware that Houston has been designated to handle the issue on May 5, I feel that an Apollo postmark would add inspiration and excitement to the occasion.

Residents of Apollo are thrilled and they are proud to have the only post office of that name in the United States and possibly in the world. By linking this community with the historic mission to the moon, you will pay tribute to a grateful and patriotic people and at the same time assist in perpetuating recognition of and appreciation for our courageous astronauts. What could be more appropriate?

You will be interested to know that Apollo Mayor Duane S. Guthrie has issued a proclamation conferring honorary citizenship on Astronauts Frank Borman, James A. Lovell, Jr., and William A. Anders. Citizens of the town are hoping that their adopted sons will be able to visit there in the near future.

Coincidentally, William B. Smith, Manager of Apollo Manufacturing, Space Division, North American Rockwell Corporation was born in Apollo, Pennsylvania.

Your cooperation in this matter will be deeply appreciated. I will be most happy to lend my efforts and arrange for appropriate ceremony at Apollo providing the necessary approval is received.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—Enclosed is a copy of the resolution passed by the Pennsylvania Senate.

In support of a desire to have the Post Office Department permit Apollo the privilege of the first-day issue, I insert the following documents—"Apollo Salutes Apollo" and a proclamation issued by Mayor Duane S. Guthrie—in the RECORD. I should also like to point out that the Apollo News-Record published a special Apollo 8 edition on December 31, 1968.

The documents follow:

APOLLO SALUTES APOLLO

Whereas Apollo Seven dramatically departed the planet Earth October 11, 1968 and,

Whereas Apollo Seven accomplished its mission of 163 orbits about the planet Earth and,

Whereas Apollo Seven returned to Earth on this 22nd day of October 1968 and,

Whereas Captain Walter M. Schirra, Major Donald F. Eisele, and Walter Cunningham piloted Apollo Seven thru this historical flight and,

Whereas William B. Smith, Manager of Apollo Manufacturing, Space Division, North American Rockwell Corp., Downy, California, was born in Apollo, Pennsylvania.

Therefore, I, Duane S. Guthrie, Mayor of Apollo Borough and members of Apollo Borough Council do hereby declare on this 22nd day of October, 1968 that this historical event be proclaimed as Apollo Seven Week in Apollo, Pennsylvania and, Be it further

Resolved, that this proclamation be recorded in the records of Apollo Borough at a regular Council meeting.

Duane S. Guthrie, Mayor; Everett A. Beck, President of Council; H. Owens Coleman, Vice President of Council; Chas. E. Morgan; Russell Swenson; Lyle K. Ament; Robert J. Jackson; and Dorothy L. Owens, Secretary.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Apollo Eight has historically orbited the Moon and,

Whereas Apollo Eight has returned to the planet Earth this twenty-seventh day of December, 1968 and,

Whereas Apollo Eight accomplished scientific feats, until now unknown to man and, Whereas Colonel Frank Borman, Captain James A. Lovell, Jr., and Major William A. Anders piloted this successful mission.

Therefore, I, Duane S. Guthrie, Mayor of Apollo, Pennsylvania do hereby declare Colonel Frank Borman, Captain James A. Lovell, Jr., and Major William A. Anders be proclaimed Honorary Citizens of Apollo, Pennsylvania.

DUANE S. GUTHRIE,
Mayor.
EVERETT A. BECK,
President of Council.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 the Lithuanian people observed the 51st anniversary of their independence. Sadly enough, this day could not be truly celebrated because Lithuania has no independence, nor has she had since 1940 when she was occupied and annexed by Soviet forces. February 16 was a day of commemoration, however, by Lithuanians all over the world, except in their own country where they suffer the yoke of Soviet oppression, of that great day in 1918 when the Lithuanian Council declared Lithuania to be an independent and democratic nation. That such a time will come again to Lithuania is the hope of all her people, and marks their every effort. Certainly, we paid tribute on February 16, as we do throughout the year, to the courageous Lithuanian people in their struggle to return justice and freedom to their country.

THE TRAGEDY OF OUR TIME: MOST PEOPLE WANT TO LIVE IN SMALL TOWN AMERICA, BUT MUST LIVE IN BIG CITY AREAS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, two recent reports underline the frustration of millions of Americans who are compelled to live in our big cities and metropolitan areas because of the lack of opportunities in many of our rural areas.

One report includes a public opinion poll conducted for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association by International Research Associates of New York City. This poll indicates that 82 percent of the American people would prefer to live in smalltown and rural areas—if they could live anywhere they wanted to live. Only 15 percent chose the big cities.

Other phases of the public opinion poll of a representative sampling of the American public, 18 years of age and over, show that most Americans consider people in rural areas to be warm and friendly, in good health, active participants in community affairs, and honest in their business dealings. A much smaller percentage associates these characteristics with big cities.

It has long been my contention that 70 percent of the American people are crowded into 1 percent of the land area in crowded, congested metropolitan areas because of lack of opportunity in many of our rural areas.

This report confirms this belief.

Another report prepared at my request by the Library of Congress shows that from 1960 to 1965 the metropolitan areas in our big city complexes grew at a rate of 15 percent while the growth rate in rural areas was 3.3 percent.

During this period the farm population declined 4 million as the migration to our metropolitan areas continued. The Library of Congress report cites research by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which shows that this migration includes more than a proportionate share of the better educated and skilled in rural areas—stripping the smalltown and rural areas of much of their leadership and talent.

The report shows also that much of the migration has been to the urban ghettos where the new arrivals increased the intensity of existing problems.

The report concludes that with 5.3 million young men in rural areas becoming members of the work force in this decade—and with farm jobs declining at a rate of 300,000 a year—a total of 550,000 additional rural nonfarm jobs is needed each year if our young people are to be retained in their home areas.

The report added:

The alternative is continued heavy migration from the countryside to the already overcrowded cities.

Failure to act decisively to halt this migration trend, the Library of Congress report continues, will result in a weak-

ening of the economic strength of smaller communities and accelerated out-migration until small towns find it difficult to support public services.

Thus—

The report adds—

the problem is a critical one.

Much progress has been made in our rural and smalltown areas through economic development and a Federal-State partnership for progress. Many large industries are decentralizing their operations because they are finding a more favorable work climate in rural areas—with easier traffic access, a stable work force, pleasant communities with less crime and many other advantages.

But this trend must be accelerated.

In this connection, I have introduced in the House H.R. 799, the Rural Development Incentive Act of 1969, which would provide for tax incentives to encourage rural industrial development. This would help to provide the jobs and opportunities for our young people and slow the trend of out-migration.

In this connection, I am placing in the RECORD an article written by the distinguished syndicated columnist, Mr. Bert Mills, Main Street, U.S.A., which outlines the importance of this approach to the problem:

[From the Covington (Tenn.) Leader, Jan. 16, 1969]

MAIN STREET, U.S.A.—EVINS PUSHES FOR AID TO SMALL TOWNS IN NATION

(By Bert Mills)

Tax incentives to encourage the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industries in rural areas, where low incomes are prevalent or the emigration rate is high, have been recommended to the new Congress by the House Small Business Committee.

Another recommendation is that legislation be passed to enlarge the criteria now determining eligibility for federal aid under the poverty program so as to include out-migration along with low income and the unemployment rate.

These and other proposals stem from the concern of Rep. Joe L. Evins (D. Tenn.), the perennial chairman of the small business group, over the future of small towns and rural communities. Two years ago, he asked a subcommittee headed by Rep. John C. Kluczynski (D. Ill.), to hold hearings on the problems of smaller cities and towns.

The thought was that both the small towns and the major cities would be helped if some way could be found to keep people from leaving the towns for the cities, where they often fall to make their way and wind up as welfare cases. The obvious answer is to provide jobs back home.

Rep. Evins said when hearings began: "We must stem the tide of out-migration. We must strengthen and rebuild small town and rural America. We must assist small business and our free enterprise system to provide the opportunities that will hold our young people in Small Town, U.S.A."

FIGURES MISLEAD

Hearings were held in Washington and in the field in 1967 and 1968. Among the conclusions reached as a result were that the rate of unemployment and the percentage of low incomes in a community can be highly misleading as an index to prevailing conditions.

If a factory in a town closes down, and if its employees cannot find other jobs locally, most of them are likely to move elsewhere. The out-migration reduces the ranks of the

jobless and the community may be unable to qualify for federal aid because it cannot meet the unemployment criteria.

As the report points out, "a town whose inhabitants have moved away has progressed much further into economic malaise" than another community which has high unemployment but whose residents have not yet pulled up stakes and gone elsewhere.

Low incomes can also be misleading when city and rural residents are compared. The cost of living is lower in Small Town, U.S.A. As the report states, "many potential economies exist in smaller towns as compared to their more populous sister cities."

OMBUDESMAN URGED

At the urging of chairman Evins, the Department of Housing and Urban Development recently established an Office of Small Town America. This is a small, pilot program and its fate at the hands of the new administration is in doubt. The Small Business Committee wants it enlarged and "empowered to act in an ombudsman capacity."

The idea is that small towns need a central office within the federal establishment which is a do-everything operation, able to arrange participation in any program, cutting across the departments and agencies, able to guide whether the problem is highways, sewers, law enforcement or any of the myriad areas in which matching funds or grants are available.

The House Small Business Committee is virtually powerless to achieve any of these recommendations. It is a special committee, without authority to originate legislation. All it can do is urge other groups to act on its proposals. Of course, if there is a loud roar of approval from the grass roots, a way could be found to get action.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I am also placing in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which I want to commend and congratulate for its great work in promoting rural growth and progress.

The excerpts follow:

THE NATION'S VIEW OF RURAL AMERICA AND RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN BRIEF

The American public looks upon rural America in very favorable terms, assigning to rural life and rural people most of the classic virtues, and few, if any, faults. These feelings extend directly to the mistaken impression that rural America faces few problems.

The public as a whole has given little thought to the electric power industry in the United States today. The public is generally unfamiliar with even the simplest terminology used to describe the three major types of power suppliers, but, importantly, there is often recognition of concepts, even when terms are unfamiliar.

The public holds a generally favorable attitude toward America's rural electrification program. The great majority of Americans feel that electric cooperatives play a desirable role within the framework of the electric power industry in this country.

These points are discussed more fully below:

RURAL AMERICA—ITS IMAGE

The overwhelming majority of Americans state they have some contact with the small towns and rural areas of the country and hold an extremely favorable image of rural America. When life in the big cities and the rural areas are hypothetically compared, rural life seems to hold all of the classic virtues and few, if any, faults.

People who live in rural areas are believed

to be much friendlier, much healthier, much more honest and much harder working than their city counterparts. They are thought to be free of the tensions and pressures of city living. To a slightly lesser degree, they are believed to be more active in community affairs and to care more about the needs of communities other than their own. Contrary to the standard stereotype, they are felt to have more fun in life than the city dwellers. In terms of his "open-mindedness," the rural resident is ranked on a par with the resident of the big city.

Only in the sense of knowledge and sophistication are the city residents given a decided edge; they are believed to be much better informed about the affairs of the world.

FIGURE I.—Percentages of the American public who choose either the "people who live in big cities" or the "people who live in rural areas" to fit each description

Thinking about the people who live in the big cities and in the rural areas—which do you feel would be more likely:

[In percent]¹

	Big city	Rural	No difference; no opinion
To be warm and friendly to other people.....	7	81	12
To be in good health.....	8	75	17
To be very honest in their business dealings.....	6	65	29
To be the most hard working.....	15	56	29
To get real fun out of life.....	29	53	18
To work actively in community affairs.....	27	52	21
To be concerned about the problems and needs of people outside their own communities.....	30	42	28
To be openminded about other people's opinions.....	35	36	28
To be well informed on what is going on in the world.....	54	19	28
To have a lot of tension and pressure in their daily lives.....	83	5	12

¹ Percentages in tables may not add to 100 due to rounding

This favorable image of the rural person extends uniformly to the conditions of rural life. Most people believe that poverty is to be found in the cities much more than in rural areas and that housing conditions are far worse in the city than in the country. Only on the matter of the quality of educational facilities are cities conceded the advantage, but even here the gap is small.

Only 15 per cent of the American population would prefer to live in large cities. There is grave dissatisfaction among those who already live there—only 27 per cent of the present large-city residents say they live there by choice. In contrast, 70 per cent of those who live in small towns say they prefer to live there; a full 75 per cent of those who live in rural areas are satisfied.

Almost paradoxically, a large plurality of the population believes that the large city is where a young man has the best chance of building a good life for himself. The young themselves reflect this attitude clearly: 55 per cent of those under 25 felt that they should go to the city to get ahead, although only 26 per cent of this same group say they would really prefer to live there.

Apparently the middle road—the small town—represents the true ideal for the average American. It is the small town that is ranked first as a place to live and as a place to raise children. The rural areas come second and the cities a poor third.

FIGURE II.—Percentage of the American population that name one of three types of area as first choice on specific points listed

We've mentioned so far three different kinds of places in this country: the big cities, the smaller cities or towns, and the rural areas. All things considered:

[In percent]

	Big cities	Smaller towns	Rural areas	Don't know; no preference
If you could live anywhere you wanted, which of these would you choose?.....	15	53	29	3
Where do you think would be the best place to raise children?.....	5	53	38	4
Where do you think a young man would have the best chance of building a good life for himself?....	44	29	9	18

THE VIEW OF RURAL PROBLEMS

Despite his stated contact with small towns and rural areas, the average American does not believe rural problems to be as important as others that face the nation. He ranks them lowest in priority among seven major issues and tends to set the problems of the cities at a significantly higher level. Residents of the rural areas themselves tend to view rural problems as secondary in the national context and consider them only slightly more critical than those of the cities.

In terms of possible solutions to community problems—whether urban or rural—the average citizen believes first in the concept of self-help. Only slightly below this in acceptability are solutions that, although sponsored by either government or industry, involve the citizenry and become self-help projects.

Certain slight differences are perceived by the public between the "proper" solutions for urban and rural problems. Private industry is seen as playing a more significant role in solving urban problems than in solving rural problems—probably because of the belief that industry is not as available in the rural areas to help. Perhaps for the same reason, the role of government is seen to be more important, relative to private industry, in rural areas than in urban.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The study is based on a total of 1394 personal interviews among a representative sample of the adult public, 18 years of age and over, throughout the United States.

Approximately one-third of the interviews were held in the major central cities of the nation and another third in suburban areas satellite to these large urban communities. Of the remaining one-third, half were in small towns and half in rural areas. Geographically, interviews were divided among the East, North Central, South and Western United States—the exact number of interviews per section dependent upon the size of the region.

Specific interview points were selected within the framework of a national probability sample, making it possible to project the results to the total adult population of the United States. The results were computer tabulated and broken down by age groups, sex, income level, geographical area, education, political party preference, type of community, and other variables.

Sixty-seven question items were included in the survey questionnaire. They concerned major national issues, attitudes toward various aspects of urban and rural life, and knowledge of and attitudes toward the three major types of electric suppliers. Personal data questions were also included.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD excerpts from the Library of Congress report prepared at my request.

The excerpts follow:

A BRIEF FAVORING TAX INCENTIVES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS—STUDY BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

INTRODUCTION

This paper was prepared at the request of a Congressional office desiring to support the idea of tax incentives for the development of rural areas.

I. THE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM IN RURAL AREAS

The rural areas of our Nation have held their own in population but have grown more slowly than any other sector. Between 1960 and 1965, the greatest population growth, over 15 percent, was experienced in the metropolitan suburbs. The next greatest growth (6 percent) occurred in non-metropolitan towns with over 10,000 population. The central cities in metropolitan areas followed with 3.5 percent. Finally, with 3.3 percent came the "non-metropolitan remainders," or rural areas, consisting of towns below 10,000 population, rural villages and farms.

The slow rate of growth in rural areas was due to a decline of 4 million in farm population during the period and a considerable out-migration from rural areas generally. According to an April 1968 report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, entitled, "Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth," the migrants from depressed areas included more than a proportionate share of the better educated and skilled, leaving behind an overrepresentation of the less productive sector of the work force: blue collar workers, the less skilled, Negroes and the aged. The migrants from rural areas, particularly the less skilled, have migrated to the central cities where they have contributed to the economic and social problems of the urban ghettos. It has been estimated that over one-fifth of the growth of the central cities has been due to in-migration, almost entirely from the rural areas.

The result has been a less-than-desirable rate of economic growth in rural areas. This is so because economic growth is related directly to rates of increase in total population and inversely to rates of increase in the non-white proportion. The ACIR report points out also that rural America is consistently in the disadvantaged position, compared with urban areas, by such indexes as educational and health facilities, housing and income levels.

It has been estimated that for rural America as a whole, about 5.3 million rural young men are becoming adults in this decade as against only about 3 million men who are dropping out of the labor force. In addition, farm jobs are declining at a rate of perhaps 300,000 a year. To compensate, there is need to create each year about 550,000 rural non-farm jobs or jobs accessible to rural residents by commuting. The alternative is continued heavy migration from the countryside to the already overcrowded cities.

A continuation of past trends, according to the ACIR report, will have these results:

(1) a widening gap between the economies of the central cities and their surrounding suburban neighbors, intensifying the problems of the central cities, and

(2) an eventual by-passing of the nation's small urban places to the point where they will be less and less able to offer enough jobs to their residents and those of the surrounding rural areas. This will cause an even greater out-migration from rural areas than we have witnessed in the past. Then these areas will be left with an overconcentration of less productive people and will find it increasingly difficult to support basic public services. Thus, the problem is a critical one.

II. SOME EXISTING PROGRAMS AND NEW PROPOSALS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-27) helped to alleviate unemployment in economically depressed rural areas. It provided occupational training and encouraged the development of physical plant and industrial expansion in an effort to reduce out-migration. By 1965, when it was terminated and basically replaced by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-136), it was credited with some 65,000 new jobs in rural areas.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-4) established a program of cooperative development of the depressed Appalachian region. It is designed to improve the public facilities and service-base of the Region to support private investment rather than directly to finance industries. It encourages coordinated programs for overall development of the region, including highways, health facilities and vocational and technical schools.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-136), provided some regional development for other areas like that for the Appalachian region (the mountainous portions of Missouri, Arkansas and Oklahoma, the Upper Great Lakes Region and portions of New England). It also provided some direct assistance. By June 1968, some 1,300 local areas had some kind of EDA assistance or development program. In about 600 areas some \$560 million had been put into public works projects to improve the infrastructure necessary for business growth. Some 60 percent of the projects and 80 percent of the over \$100 million of business loans went to areas under 10,000 population and to firms employing less than 250. (EDA may lend up to 65 percent of aggregate cost, at least 20 percent must come from private lenders, and at least 5 percent from a State or a public community or area organization). It has been estimated that 70,000 to 75,000 jobs in rural areas have been developed since 1965.

The Department of Agriculture administers many community development programs. These include loans and grants for water and sewer systems, telephone and electric systems, housing, roads, schools, watershed development, flood prevention, recreational facilities, etc. There are also numerous loan programs to strengthen family farms, improve rural communities and alleviate rural poverty. The rural non-farm programs include rural renewal loans to renew the economy of rural areas where family incomes are abnormally low, community facility loans for water and waste disposal systems and community recreation areas in communities up to 5,500 population, rural housing loans, resource development loans, and economic opportunity loans to help low income rural families develop enterprises to raise their level of living. It has been reported that rural electric cooperative associations have created employment for about 30,000 rural residents. Additional employment opportunities were created by the over 300,000 commercial and industrial customers, mostly small businesses, served by REA systems. Electric and telephone systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration work with local groups, generally in locating technical advice or lending sources, to help launch new or expanded industries in their areas. Surveys indicate that from 1961 to 1967 more than 2,700 such enterprises have been launched creating an estimated 216,000 new rural job opportunities.

It is clear, however, that much more needs to be done. In recent testimony, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development and Conservation, Dr. John A. Baker stated that "The rural forces for prog-

ress, who want to help industry thrive in the countryside, are getting organized. In thousands of rural communities, they are putting together their resources, putting their plans on paper and into action. Counties are getting together and working in harmony on a multi-county basis."

The Small Business Administration has a local development company loan program, known as the 502 program. Between 1959 and 1967 a total of 1,556 loans have been made totalling \$305 million. Local groups get together, incorporate, and then raise a percentage (generally 20 percent) of the needed funds from the community. Banks may participate to the extent of 20 to 40 percent of the total and hold a first mortgage on the property. 502 loans can be used only for land, buildings and machinery but not working capital (which can, however, be provided by an accompanying SBA business loan of up to \$350,000). Of the 1,556 loans over 900 were in communities under 5,000 population and over 200 more were in communities of 5,000 to 10,000. About 31,000 job opportunities are estimated to have resulted.

There is some conflict among experts as to the efficacy of industrializing non-metropolitan areas. Some maintain that only industry based on natural resources of the area will be successful and then only until the natural resource is exhausted. Others suggest that industries not based on natural resources can be successful. Research is fragmentary and more is needed. There are some practical indications from existing programs, however, that industrialization of rural areas is worthwhile.

Moreover, States and localities have experienced some success in their industrial development efforts. Thus, the textile industry was attracted to the South from its former base in New England. Not only manufacturing, but services and investment of public funds in government facilities such as schools, research centers and military posts are thought to yield important renewal stimulus.

Compared with the need for an estimated 550,000 new rural jobs annually, the problem, however, is a huge one. It involves, moreover, in addition to problems of financial stimulus by government such as loans, grants and tax incentives, numerous issues of overall planning, the respective roles of governmental and private sectors, intra-governmental cooperation within the Federal Government and intergovernmental cooperation between the various levels of government.

In its report on "Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth" the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended a national policy on urban growth. Such a policy would, among other things, conform governmental institutions to a nation which is no longer primarily agricultural; strengthen governmental institutions in impoverished rural areas, promote equality of opportunity regardless of race; encourage Negro and other migrants from rural areas to move to growth centers outside metropolitan areas; and develop a viable nation-wide pattern of urban growth in a healthy economy—both rural and urban.

The recommendation for a national policy on urban growth was reached after consideration of such negative factors as the waste of money involved in combating inevitable trends, the lack of data on which to base a policy, the practical difficulty of inducing industry to locate where jobs are needed and of inducing unemployed people to move where the job exist; the political difficulty of pinpointing action to limited areas; the healthiness of the natural distribution of people and jobs; the superiority of a frontal attack on the problem of impoverished Negroes; the undesirability of shoring up businesses and government units better left to die; and the likelihood of creating big-spending programs.

The Commission identified national government policies which can influence the

location of people and industry and the resulting patterns of urban growth. These include: policies and programs to neutralize factors producing excessive population concentrations (resettlement allowances, training allowances, interarea job placement information, reduced interstate variations in public assistance eligibility and benefit standards); placement of Federal procurement contracts to foster growth in certain areas; and Federal financial incentives (loans, direct payments, and tax incentives).

The financial incentives, said the Advisory Commission, should encourage business to locate in small rural growth centers and in urban neighborhoods of concentrated unemployment. These incentives would be preferential financing arrangements in the form of below market-rate loans, location cost offsets in the form of direct payments or preferential tax treatment in the form of a Federal income tax credit. If this is done, the dollar amount of any tax credits or preferential financing arrangements should be included for informational purposes in the President's budget. Also the enabling legislation should have an expiration date of 5 to 7 years so that Congress and the Executive might assess the cost and benefits of the subsidy approach.

Thus, we have a tremendous problem requiring over 1/2 million new rural non-farm jobs annually and all efforts to date have fallen short by a considerable margin. Moreover, the suggestions for new approaches still offer no guarantee of fully meeting the need. Consequently, it would be desirable to consider seriously any new policy proposal, including tax incentives. Much experimentation and development may be required, but this should be encouraged in the interest of solving this critical problem.

HON. EARLE CABELL ADDRESSES THE DALLAS RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable EARLE CABELL of Dallas, Tex., delivered the main address at the Dallas Retail Merchants Association, Inc., meeting, February 11, 1969, at the Baker Hotel in Dallas. To coin a much-used phrase of today, Congressman CABELL "tells it like it really is," and I would like to insert his remarks at this point.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE EARLE CABELL, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, BEFORE DALLAS RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION, INC., BAKER HOTEL, FEBRUARY 1, 1969

According to the newspapers, the radio and the television, another session of Congress has started . . . as a matter of fact it is eleven days into its second month. But as many of you also know, very little has happened and we still seem to be facing the same old problems we faced before we changed presidents.

And so today . . . I'd like to do what I can to dig into this can of worms we call Washington and give you some idea of the things that are developing in your principal areas of interest.

As yet, after more than three weeks in office, the basic objectives of President Nixon remain unclear . . . and this is considered wise. He has a tough row to hoe even under the best of circumstances. There are major questions . . . One's that affect us all.

We seem no nearer to peace in Paris than

we did when we were bombing North Vietnam. I sincerely hope that we can reach an agreement there without having to resume the bombing, but I'm ready to advocate that step if it proves necessary.

We certainly are no nearer peace in the Middle East . . . and I cannot believe such peace is possible until the Arabs are willing to meet face to face with the leaders of Israel. But the decision here rests with our chief executive and not with the Congressman from Dallas.

Business continues to expand . . . employment remains full. But inflationary pressures are continuing and I can see no hope of either slicing back or ending the 10 percent surtax at expiration date in June. I sincerely hope so . . . But I am not able to be optimistic.

President Nixon has promised a war on crime both in the Nation's Capital and around the Nation. His appointment of former Dallas district attorney and former Texas attorney general Will Wilson to the post of national crime fighter has been well received, and Will is off to a good start. But here again it is too early to pass judgement. Other than to say that I have a great deal of confidence in Will Wilson both as to integrity and ability.

There is one significant development already clear. Congress . . . and this is a Democratic Congress, mind you . . . is not sitting by awaiting direction from the President.

In many areas we are finding new ideas developing, new directions being suggested, new programs already being outlined . . . without any impetus from the White House.

It is significant that Congress is taking the bit into its own hands and that we may see at this session, much key legislation originate in Congress rather than in the White House. We also may see something more . . . a President who will consult with Congress, with leaders of both parties there, before he offers suggestions in major fields.

Much of this legislation that is beginning to generate on its own, within key committees, from knowledgeable leaders, is an extension of legislation begun in the past but not yet accepted either by the full Congress nor either by the Johnson or the Nixon administration. A great portion of this developing legislation lies in the consumer field with which you as members of the downtown Retail Merchants Association are most concerned.

As you know, the 90th Congress considered a number of bills designed to protect the consumer from the so-called "ravages" of you merchants, and manufacturers, and parenthetically may I add, milkmen.

The major bill passed was a truth-in-lending bill—the heart of the bill being the disclosure of loan costs including installment payments in the terms of an annual rate in order that potential purchasers of automobiles, home furnishings, and other consumer goods could make proper price and interest comparisons.

Another bill of which you may not be aware that was passed last year was the Monday Holiday Bill. This would shift three well-known holidays—Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, and Veterans Day—to Mondays . . . Washington's Birthday on the 3rd Monday in February, Memorial Day on the last Monday in May, and Veterans Day on the fourth Monday in October. A new holiday—Columbus Day—was set for the second Monday in October. I don't know what Lief Eriksson thinks of that. These holidays are solely for federal workers effective in 1971, but it's hoped States will follow suit. So far, Congress has not seen fit to tinker with Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Year's, the Fourth of July, or Groundhog Day. But all of this is only the beginning.

Miss Betty Furness, the lady who did such a good job of opening ice box doors, has retired from her job as a special assistant in charge of consumer affairs and I have heard

no mention of her replacement in the group surrounding President Nixon.

But there is the promise from at least one Congressman for a bill which would create a cabinet-level Department on Consumer Affairs. This has been suggested before but has not as yet received sufficient support to clear the committee. It will come up again this year, you may be sure!

The same Congressman—Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York—also wants an independent Federal agency to test consumer products and provide them identifying tags. In other words—eliminate brand names in favor of a grade label. I cannot predict where that proposal will land. He also advocates fixed fees for professional and other services.

This is the year that the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965 expires and if the law is not extended or if new legislation is not adopted, we can see the Food and Drug Administration on its own issuing new regulations on advertising and labeling which may be even harsher . . . perhaps a listing of tar and nicotine content on each package of cigarettes sold. This does not disturb me. I've quit smoking.

Much of the additional legislation now being talked among committee members relates to automobiles . . . hearings on the cost of automobile repairs are expected in the Senate and there could be legislation on that matter. There can also be hearings on the safety factors of Volkswagens and other small imports. There is also talk of legislation on automobile insurance, though no drastic action is being expected before the Department of Transportation completes an industry study in 1970. Some have even advocated the Government taking over all forms of casualty insurance. This could conceivably lower rates if they were not keyed to experience. But I'll guarantee you that the net cost to the taxpayer would double what insurance now costs.

There is also possibility of action in these fields . . . hearings into the credit-reporting industry will continue and Wisconsin Senator Proxmire has announced plans for a bill to regulate credit bureaus.

Boating safety, the regulation of door-to-door selling, and several other matters are also on the list.

CAVEAT EMPTOR

As a matter of fact, I have introduced my own consumer bill . . . a resolution for penalizing those who use false advertising to entice potential trade school students to cross the State lines to obtain their education. I am sure you are aware of the bad name Dallas has received in this field after gullible youngsters from neighboring States came here hoping for education and jobs and found the picture was badly represented. The bill has been introduced and I was surprised to discover how many Congressmen from other States were equally concerned with this problem and as interested in seeing it alleviated as I.

This is one of the few bills that I will introduce because to be frank with you we have too many laws now. I sincerely feel that I am rendering a better service to my community in helping to kill bad legislation, and in testifying before committees on subjects of which I have personal knowledge and experience, than in seeking more harassing restrictions on a business community that has built such a magnificent America. The profit system may be obnoxious to some—but I still like it!

These of course are only a few of the more specific issues in which you have an interest . . . and I can assure you many others will hit the newspapers in the weeks ahead.

We are going to have a strong push for industrial safety laws, there will be efforts made either to alter or to dismantle the National Labor Relations Board . . . but so

far we have no clear picture on this . . . I expect labor will try again to enact siting picketing legislation but such a bill isn't given much chance under a Republican administration, especially when it didn't get anywhere under the Democrats . . . and there is some talk . . . but not enough serious talk . . . about some way to avert such major labor difficulties as strikes that tie-up our entire economy.

We shall continue, I feel sure, to do something about our cities . . . and I hope that we can continue to receive further help to maintain the strong downtown area you men have built—most of it without Federal help—over the years.

I know that much remains to be done . . . we are going to need funds for our airport . . . for neighborhood centers . . . for our thoroughways . . . for downtown beautification . . . and for many other services.

In conclusion, let me say there is a great tendency across this country to look at the problems of the cities and to wring our hands. Isn't it terrible? They ask. What can be done?, they say. And the summation usually is: our big cities are in such a mess, there is no way out.

Dallas has a history of worrying about its metropolitan problems. Even before it was a city, Dallas was worried about its obligation to its residents . . . and, therefore, because it was worried, because it tackled its own problems early, and because it was not afraid to take necessary steps early . . . Dallas has done a good job in eliminating or preventing many of the problems other cities are still wrestling with.

During the past week I sat through 10 hours (not all in one day, thank goodness) of a panel discussion of the role of science and technology in the reshaping and rehabilitation of our central cities.

These men came up with some outstanding papers and displayed an amazing awareness of the problems. But throughout the papers and dialogue there was an alarming thread of thought woven into the fabric.

Foremost was the principle that Big Brother (in Washington) knows best and that he should preempt all responsibility and authority. It was a computerized approach but I've never seen the computer yet that could accurately equate human beings. Very little, if anything, was said about municipal governments responsibility and nothing about the responsibility of the individual toward society as a whole.

Their prime cure was a greenback-bandaid plastered over the sore with no effective medication included. There is not enough money in the world available to solve all metropolitan problems. Congress knows that. I know that there will be much debate in Congress over city problems this year . . . model cities . . . urban renewal . . . housing . . . rent supplements . . . war on poverty . . . welfare . . . health . . . education.

We shall see a great many suggestions . . . a great deal of money appropriated. And I can assure you Dallas will get its fair share. But thanks to you gentlemen and to many others like you who have worked hard in the years before you came on the scene . . . the city of Dallas is not in the same desperate ditch as are those other cities who have waited too long and who now look only to Washington for help.

The 91st Congress will be an interesting one . . . I find it difficult today to clearly outline the future ahead of us . . . but I can say that we shall tackle many of the problems that puzzle us, and that the benefits we receive for Dallas will improve a situation that today needs far less improvement than does the situation at any other metropolitan area in the world. Let's keep it that way!

Thanks for asking me to be with you.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians in exile around the globe commemorated the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, and I am proud to join my colleagues in this commemoration.

We are all aware of the sad fate of the young Republic and the terrible misfortunes which befell her people at the hands of the Soviet aggressors. I think, however, that the resolution, which I include below, adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, expresses the feelings of these people, still loyal, after 51 years of oppression, to the aims and goals of democracy. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Unanimously adopted at a meeting of American-Lithuanians and their friends living in New Jersey, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, held on Sunday, February 16, 1969 at St. George's Lithuanian Hall, Newark, New Jersey, in commemoration of the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force in June of 1940; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of the world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or decent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in H. Con. Res. 416 by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and be it further

Resolved, That the pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into serfs on kolkhozes and sovkhoses as well as exploitation of workers, persecution of the faithful, restriction of religious practices and closing of houses of worship, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William Rogers, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Charles Yost, United States

Senators from New Jersey, Members of U.S. Congress from New Jersey, and the press.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY.
VALENTINAS MELINIS, *President*.
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS, *Secretary*.

BAD NEIGHBORS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the militant actions of two of our neighbors to the south over the past week have created considerable indignation throughout the United States. The press has taken a great interest in the latest seizure of an American fishing vessel by Peru and the uncalled for act of harassment by Ecuador that followed the Peruvian seizure and gunfire on another fishing vessel.

It then was with great interest that I read an editorial in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, dated February 18, relating to this subject. It clearly defines my position that Americans fishing in international waters deserve protection by their Government.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that Peru has turned down the proposal that all interested parties sit at the conference table and discuss the subject of fisheries in the eastern Pacific.

For the information of my colleagues, the aforementioned editorial follows:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligence, Feb. 18, 1969]

BAD NEIGHBORS

For several years Peru and other western Latin American nations have engaged in open piracy on the high seas off their coasts, seizing American fishing vessels and holding them for exorbitant ransom in the form of fines.

Last Friday Peru went too far.

Peruvian gunboats fired upon and damaged two American tuna vessels out of San Diego, as the fishing boats attempted to escape from the marauding Peruvians 23 miles at sea.

The outrage expressed by Washington's Rep. Thomas M. Pelly and others in Congress at this latest incident should be shared by all Americans.

These illegal seizures of U.S. fishing boats off the South American coast have persisted for several years. There have been diplomatic conferences, as well as pleadings and warnings from the U.S., obviously without effect on the Latins, who make a preposterous claim to territorial jurisdiction 200 miles off their coasts.

Such a claim has absolutely no standing in international maritime law, which recognizes 12 mile coastal fisheries zones.

Whenever an American ship is seized, the Latins tow her to port and hold her until the U.S. government pays her fine. Typical of the size of the ransoms was the \$202,000 paid to Ecuador last August following capture of four tuna vessels.

While West Coast congressmen and citizens seem to be the only Americans steamed up about the situation, every section of the nation should be angered. The fines come from the pockets of all American taxpayers.

The gunfire episode last Friday has caused Congressman Pelly to reiterate a previous request to the State Department that it station either Navy or Coast Guard patrol boats

on the high seas off the Latin American coast, to protect American fishing vessels.

With the exception of the fishing boat confrontations, we are friendly with Peru and Ecuador and are properly concerned that we remain good neighbors.

But when neighbors start spraying machinegun bullets around the neighborhood, it's time for some police action.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Feb. 18, 1969]

U.S. FISHERMEN SHOULD BE PROTECTED

Squabbles over fishing rights are a familiar part of the maritime scene from the Arctic to the Antarctic. But the use of firearms is something else again.

Peru not only seized one American fishing vessel last week, but fired at several others during a wild chase off Peru and Ecuador.

This most recent incident in the continuing troubles over attempts by Peru, Ecuador and Chile to enforce a 200-mile territorial fishing limit is a part of an overall deterioration in United States-Peruvian relations that also involves Peru's expropriation of an American-owned oil company.

It is time for Uncle Sam to put a stop to the continuing seizures of American fishing boats in international waters and particularly to the use of firearms as a part of what is, in actuality, piracy.

Under the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1968, the United States can reduce foreign aid to the "pirate" nations by the amount of whatever fines are levied against seized American vessels.

The act was applied for the first time last month against Ecuador after another vessel was seized. It should be applied with equal promptness against Peru if a fine is levied against the boat seized last week.

What is even more important, the Nixon administration ought to heed Congressman Thomas M. Pelly's plea that this country provide naval protection, where necessary, to American fishing fleets on the high seas.

CAPT. W. E. JOHNSON

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. W. E. Johnson, an outstanding young marine from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

W. E. JOHNSON, PILOT, KILLED—WRECKAGE OF COPTER FOUND 2 YEARS AFTER VIET CRASH

GREENBELT, MD.—The Defense Department reported the death of Marine Capt. William E. Johnson who was killed over two years ago in a helicopter crash in Vietnam.

Officials informed his wife, Mrs. Barbara Johnson, of Greenbelt, that the wreckage of the craft remained undiscovered until recently. Mrs. Johnson said the Defense Department is investigating the cause of the crash.

A career service officer, Captain Johnson had 13 years' service in the Marines. He was a graduate of Florida State University.

Mrs. Johnson stated that her husband had been "devoted to the Marine Corps and felt a definite need to be in Vietnam."

In addition to his wife, survivors include a 6-year-old daughter, Lori; three brothers, Heyward Johnson, of Havana, Fla., Paul Johnson, of Apalachicola, Fla., and M. Sgt.

John E. Johnson, stationed in Germany, and a sister, Mrs. Frank Edenfield, of Sorrento, Fla.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS: THE OUTLOOK FOR EDUCATION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1968, the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, headed by the distinguished former Governor Otto B. Kerner, of Illinois, now Judge Kerner, released its historic report analyzing the Nation's racial and urban crisis and recommending policies for national action.

The Commission's sober indictment of black-white relations in the United States and its penetrating look at the sores of discontent in the big cities still, 1 year after the report's publication, have profound meaning for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1969, I had the privilege of addressing a luncheon meeting in Chicago which marked this first anniversary of the Kerner Commission report. My remarks were focused on the implications of the Kerner report for American education and the prospects for implementing the Commission's recommendations in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of this address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, OF INDIANA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE KERNER COMMISSION REPORT, CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 22, 1969

One long year has passed since the Kerner Commission tried 'to tell it like it is.' But the grave warning sounded by the historic report of that Commission still echoes, I think we must all agree, with continuing relevance today: "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal."

Let me take a moment today to reflect back on the findings of the Kerner report and then to try to assess the prospects for effective action, on a national scale, toward realizing the Commission's recommendations.

THREAT OF APARTHEID

Apartheid, the Commission warned, is fast becoming a reality in American life. The strife of recent summers has hardened the barriers separating black and white. More and more middle class whites are abandoning the core cities, now rapidly deteriorating into black ghettos. Discrimination in jobs and housing persists, and the economic gap between Negro and white Americans grows wider.

Rarely has a nation been confronted with so stark a portrayal of its most searing dilemma, and the phenomenal sales of the Bantam Book Edition of the Commission Report testify to the widespread and intense interest it has created. The American capacity for self-analysis and self-criticism perhaps reached a peak with this grim survey of the unhappy state of black-white relations in the United States.

But where does the indictment leave us? Where do we go from here? The Commission was as forceful in presenting a course of action as in analyzing the problem.

Rather than retreat to despair after its unsparing survey, the Commission insisted that the pattern can, and, indeed, must be changed. For to pursue present policies will mean only mounting violence, social dislocation and loss of lives, both black and white.

The alternative, said the Commission, is clear: to make the massive investments urgently required on every front in the beleaguered cities of America—investments in more jobs, better schools, modernized welfare programs and decent housing. "The great productivity of our economy, and a Federal revenue system which is highly responsive to economic growth," said the Commission, "can provide the resources."

Certainly, as a nation we have the economic capacity to meet the challenge. The issue is rather one of will and determination—and imagination. We must be prepared to make a commitment of public funds commensurate with the problems we face. For as John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and, as head of the Urban Coalition, an articulate advocate of a greater role for the private sector in meeting the urban crisis, has warned "History is not going to deal kindly with a rich nation that will not tax itself to cure its own miseries."

The Commission pressed a number of objectives for national action in the areas of employment, education, the welfare system and housing. But let me focus on the particular concern of the upcoming issue of the Illinois Schools Journal—education.

STERN JUDGMENT ON AMERICAN EDUCATION

The Commission's judgment on American education was particularly stern: While the public schools have served many communities well, for the children of the ghetto they have largely "failed to provide the educational experience which could overcome the effects of discrimination and deprivation." This failure, the Commission found, "is one of the persistent sources of grievance and resentment within the Negro community."

The results of inadequate education in the ghetto are reflected in the high rate of unemployment and underemployment for Negro youth. They leave the school system ill-prepared to enter the competitive job market, and if they do find employment, it is likely to be in the low-skilled, low-paying sector of the economy.

Moreover, the Commission's findings indicate a close relationship between the poor performance of the schools and civil disorder, for there is a markedly high incidence of riot participation by ghetto youths who have not made it educationally. A survey of riot cities found that the typical riot participant was a high school dropout. Yet the evidence also suggests that those within the ghetto who are most likely to lead active, responsible opposition to rioting have benefited from relatively higher levels of education and income.

The Commission acknowledges, of course, that the schools themselves do not bear the full responsibility for the failure of education in the big cities. The total environment impairs the capacity of ghetto children for achievement in school. The Commission strongly argues, however, that the schools can and must do a far better job in cutting through the effects of discrimination and deprivation in the ghetto community.

TWO KEY EDUCATION STRATEGIES

The Commission recommends two key strategies for improving the education of ghetto children:

First, the Commission focuses on integration as the priority education objective for the long-run. Racial isolation in the schools, it says, is detrimental to the interests of both whites and Negroes; opportunities for interaction between the races must be expanded.

Second, recognizing that the goal of integrated schools will not come soon, the Commission declares that in the meantime, "we

must drastically improve the quality of ghetto education. Equality of results with all-white schools must be the goal.

"We see no conflict between the integration and quality education strategies we espouse," the report continues. "Commitment to the goal of integrated education can neither diminish the reality of today's segregated and unequal ghetto schools nor sanction the tragic waste of human resources which they entail."

SPECIFIC POLICIES RECOMMENDED

The Commission went on to recommend a number of specific policy actions. Let me highlight the major ones:

Vigorous enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to eliminate racial discrimination in northern as well as southern schools.

Sharply increased efforts to eliminate de facto segregation in the schools through substantial federal aid to school systems seeking to desegregate either within the system or in cooperation with neighboring school systems.

Stepped up efforts to improve the quality of teaching in ghetto schools, and in particular, expansion of the Teacher Corps into a major national program.

Extension of quality early childhood education to every disadvantaged child in the country, building on the pioneering of Head Start.

Year-round compensatory education programs to improve dramatically schools serving disadvantaged children.

An intensive national program to eliminate illiteracy and increase verbal skills of ghetto residents.

Enlarged opportunities for parent and community participation in the public schools.

Reoriented vocational education emphasizing work-experience training and the involvement of business and industry.

Expanded opportunities for higher education through increased federal assistance to poor students.

And finally, alteration of state aid formulas to provide more per student aid to districts having a high proportion of disadvantaged school-age children.

IMPLEMENTATION DEMANDS NEW COMMITMENT

Implementation of these recommendations will, of course, require a new commitment at every level of government and in all sectors of the private community. But, as the Commission points out, it is clear that the principal burden for financing this new commitment will fall upon the Federal government. Tax resources at the state and local levels are simply far from adequate to the task.

A national effort is required, and this means affirmative action on the part of both Congress and the national Administration.

It should be noted that Federal education programs enacted in recent years already represent a substantial start in the directions pointed by the Kerner Commission. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee during the past five Congresses, I have witnessed the passage of legislation to support education at every level, from pre-school through graduate school and adult education. In the words of the Kerner report, "This network of Federal educational programs provides a sound and comprehensive basis for meeting the interrelated educational needs of disadvantaged students. We need now to strengthen that base . . . and to build upon it by providing greatly increased Federal funds for the education of the disadvantaged."

What is the outlook for realizing the kind of dramatic commitment called for by the Commission?

First, let me say here that I deeply wish we could be meeting today to celebrate the implementation of the recommendations of the Kerner report, or even to note the fact that the hard-hitting observations of the

Commission had been thoroughly considered and digested by the American people and their government.

NATION HAS SCARCELY BEGUN TO RESPOND

But the fact is, one year after the release of this historic Report, we have scarcely begun, as a nation, even to face up to the hard truths so incisively set forth in that document.

In Congress it is clear that the response to the Commission report has been something less than enthusiastic. Indeed, the initial reaction in many quarters of the 90th Congress last year was controversial and largely negative. Pressed by the budget demands of the Vietnam war and the President's call for a tax increase, many members of Congress turned a deaf ear to suggestions of increased Federal expenditures. Moreover, the sobering indictment of American race relations issued by the Commission was unpalatable to some.

As a result, the constructive policy proposals set forth in the report largely went by the boards in the 90th Congress. In fact, a majority of the 90th Congress, far from embracing the Commission's recommendations and expanding funds for education, chose to cut back money for several crucial education programs.

PROGRESS MAY BE PAINFULLY SLOW

I must therefore suggest that advancement toward the education goals of the Kerner report, from a legislative standpoint, may well be painfully slow in the period just ahead. Political realities, frankly, dictate that progress will be incremental rather than giant-step.

But I can assure you, nonetheless, that many of us in Congress will be doing our best to start moving forward. Let me touch on several major areas in which I hope we will see action in the months ahead.

(1) Right now, for example, the House Education and Labor Committee, on which I serve, is taking up major legislation to extend Federal elementary and secondary school aid, a large portion of which goes to disadvantaged rural and urban areas. These past several weeks we have heard testimony from big-city school superintendents from across the country, all of whom—almost to a man—echo the Kerner Commission in urging vastly expanded Federal funds for compensatory education in ghetto areas. I am hopeful that the Committee will shape the elementary and secondary school bill accordingly.

(2) The Committee will also be taking up legislation determining the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Federal anti-poverty programs. Many tangled issues are involved in this area, and the debate in Committee and in both House and Senate is bound to be highly charged. My hope is that while some adjustments may be made in various phases of the war on poverty, we can preserve the basic thrust and momentum of the over-all effort.

Only this week, I might note, President Nixon sent Congress his own recommendations on the anti-poverty programs. The tone of the President's message and his decision not to dismantle OEO, but rather to spin off certain programs, such as Head Start and Job Corps, to other agencies, were most encouraging—especially in view of the widespread expectations that the President would take a hard line against the war on poverty and seek to retrench, if not eliminate, the OEO programs. And let me here note that I do not at all mean to say that I am endorsing the proposed spin-offs.

(3) The third area I want to mention is higher education—particularly the need to open new channels to greater equality of educational opportunity at the college and university level. This, I might say, was a key recommendation of the education section of the Kerner report.

HIGHER EDUCATION BILL OF RIGHTS

Two weeks ago I joined with a Republican colleague of mine in the House, Rep. Ogden Reid of New York, in introducing legislation which we hope will provide a benchmark for proceeding on this front. The Higher Education Bill of Rights, as we have called our proposal, would expand Federal college student aid programs several-fold in order to remove financial barriers for all qualified Americans seeking a college education.

Only 7 per cent of those now attending college come from families in the nation's lowest family income quartile, while almost half are from families with incomes in the highest quartile. The Higher Education Bill of Rights would work against this inequity. It would make Federal financial assistance available to some 3.6 million needy students in 1971—about 6 times the present number—increasing to 5.8 million in 1977. In addition, it would provide supplemental grants directly to institutions of higher education for meeting the costs of educating the increased numbers of students. The cost of the entire package would be \$5.5 billion in 1971, rising to \$9.7 billion in 1977.

I have no notion that the 91st Congress is going to buy this monumental legislation lock, stock and barrel, but Rep. Reid and I hope it will be a starting point for discussion on what we need to do to achieve real equality of access to higher education while maintaining academic excellence.

The specific provisions of the proposed bill are based on the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, headed by Dr. Clark Kerr. That Commission has focused on two essential goals for American higher education in the years ahead: equality of access and quality of result. And these are the goals which are reflected in the legislation we have introduced.

PRESIDENT NIXON ON EDUCATION

But I want to say here that the progress we make in education does not, of course, rest entirely with the Congress. A great deal depends on vigorous leadership from the Executive Branch and particularly from the new President. In the final part of my remarks, then, let me try to give you an early assessment of where the Nixon Administration seems to be going in the field of education.

Richard Nixon follows, as we all know, two men in the White House who were profoundly dedicated to strengthening the nation's schools and colleges and to expanding Federal support for that purpose—John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Nixon, on the other hand, is a man whose commitment to education is neither widely known nor entirely clear from the record.

NIXON'S EARLY COOLNESS TO FEDERAL AID

His earlier career in the House and Senate and as Vice President provide only scattered evidence upon which to base a judgment of President Nixon's views on education. The record does show, however, that the early Nixon was at best cool to the notion of Federal financial aid to education. Although he voiced his commitment to educational opportunity for all citizens, better qualified and better paid teachers, and the improvement of school and college facilities, he was never a leader in sponsoring or cosponsoring measures to achieve these goals.

On the contrary, with a few exceptions, he opposed education legislation, and he usually invoked the standard conservative argument against Federal aid, namely, the threat of Federal control of the schools.

During the 1968 campaign, Nixon offered no firm indication that his general posture on education had substantially changed. His few statements concerning education were ambiguous on the question of the Federal role in supporting the schools, and on the crucial issue of enforcing desegregation guidelines he seemed clearly to be giving aid and comfort to Senator Storm Thurmond of

South Carolina who had done so much to help Nixon win southern support at the Republican convention in Miami.

All things considered, therefore, it is not surprising that the election of Richard Nixon as the 37th President of the United States has met with considerable disquiet in educational circles. Some educators fear that the Nixon Administration may usher in a go-slow period, putting the brakes on recent progress at the Federal level in education.

CAUSE FOR GUARDED OPTIMISM

But several developments since the November election, I think, give cause for guarded optimism and suggest that at least in the field of education, there may indeed be a "new Nixon."

The President's two top appointments in the education field are especially encouraging.

Secretary of HEW Robert Finch's views on education are largely unknown, but many of us on Capitol Hill have been heartened by some of the new Secretary's initial statements. On a Meet the Press appearance recently, he said that his department's most urgent problem was to come to grips with the needs of elementary and secondary schools—"particularly," he said, "in terms of bringing the disadvantaged into the mainstream" of American education. Nor has Finch made any step toward scrapping the programs enacted during the Kennedy-Johnson years. "Our job," he says, "is to rationalize and implement the legislation now on the books."

NEW COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION JAMES E. ALLEN

The second crucial appointment affecting education in the new Administration is James E. Allen, New York State Education Commissioner, as both Assistant Secretary for Education in HEW and U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Allen is widely regarded as perhaps the ablest chief state school officer in the country, and he is one of the few who has battled against the tendency to let states' rights get in the way of nationwide needs and goals. As the New York Times said, his appointment assures "that the Federal voice in matters of school and race will remain liberal and independent."

Most important, Allen is acutely sensitive to the pressing educational problems of the cities. Only the day after his nomination Allen announced that he hoped to design a program of "massive" Federal aid to urban education and said this would be his "No. 1 priority" as Federal schools chief. Such a program was necessary, he said, "because it left to the states and localities, the problems of urban education will not be dealt with adequately."

NIXON TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION

Another significant development centers on Nixon's own Task Force on Education, which he appointed shortly after the election to investigate short-term educational priorities for the new Administration. Alan Pifer, president of the Carnegie Corporation and a strong advocate of Federal aid, headed the group.

Although the complete findings of the Task Force are not scheduled to be released, newspaper accounts indicate that the Task Force report, submitted to the President in January, was a hard-hitting document that pressed the new Administration to take vigorous action on major needs in education. Like Dr. Allen, and like the Kerner Report, the Task Force urged substantial additional Federal expenditures—at least another \$1 billion a year—on the nation's predominantly black, big city schools.

Moreover, the Task Force bluntly criticized the President for:

One, suggesting during the campaign that he favored replacing current Federal education assistance pinpointed on poverty areas with block grants to the states. Such

a move, said the Task Force, would come "perilously close" to re-opening the church-state issue, which for years helped kill Federal aid to schools.

Two, creating the impression by campaign statements that he would go slow on school desegregation. The Task Force urged Nixon to make "absolutely clear" that he will not "adopt a lower standard" in enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act with respect to cutoffs of Federal funds to schools that refuse to desegregate.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ISSUE

At this point, the Administration's posture on Title VI enforcement is not fully clear. Several weeks ago Secretary Finch incurred a wave of criticism when he postponed a scheduled cut-off of funds to five segregated southern school districts. But just last week Finch denied Federal dollars to three other school districts in Arkansas, South Carolina and Tennessee in a move that strongly indicated that the Administration will not adopt a more lenient school desegregation policy after all.

President Nixon has made no public statements on the recommendations of his Task Force on Education, and there is certainly no assurance that he will embrace their views. Presidential task force reports are sometimes filed away for future reference, resulting neither in new policies nor new legislation.

But Mr. Nixon and his advisers were certainly aware of the views of Alan Pifer and the other distinguished Americans whom the new President appointed to the Task Force. There is basis for hope, then, that the forward-looking proposals of the Task Force will not fall on unsympathetic ears.

NEW ADMINISTRATION'S PRIORITIES STILL UNCLEAR

It is still too early to speak with complete assurance about Nixon on education. But many of us in Congress are encouraged by some of the omens in the opening weeks of the new Administration. We shall, of course, know far more about the President's commitment to education when we see what bills he proposes and how much education money he requests.

Nixon has said in the past that he recognizes the importance of protecting aid to schools and colleges from Federal budget cutbacks. "At budget-cutting time, this is one area that must not be shortchanged," he said last year.

But it remains to be seen how education will fare in the new Administration in competition with other budget demands, such as Vietnam and military spending. Moreover, holding the line against education cutbacks is not enough. For to stand still in education is clearly to lose ground in the fight against poverty and discrimination and to hasten the domestic crisis of which the Kerner Commission warns.

Let me just say by way of conclusion that the next few months will be a time of testing for the Nixon Administration. I should like to express the hope that this anniversary of the Kerner Commission's historic report might signal for the new Administration some of the priorities which it must embrace, not only in education but in other areas of national life, if we are to come to grips with the grave challenges facing this nation.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Reynolds Weiss of Provo, Utah, is the

winner this year for the State of Utah of the Voice of Democracy Contest conducted annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary. He will come to Washington next month to compete with the winning contestants of the other 49 States for one of the five scholarships to be awarded as the top prizes.

I am pleased to insert the comments of this outstanding young American in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His winning speech follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

In 1775, Patrick Henry rose before the Virginia Convention to plead for a cause called liberty. To them he asked, "Why stand here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it almighty God! I know not what course others may take but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

With these words, our ancestors, our forefathers set out upon a grave sea of conflict, to break the bonds of subjection. They gave their lives for a cherished cause; a cause worth fighting for, worth dying for: Freedom.

Today, freedom's challenge is, ironically, different from the challenge we met and defeated those many years ago. The challenge, then, was the oppression of a despotic and arbitrary foreign power; now it is the indifference of a people: a people living too long in the benefits of democracy, once cherished, now taken for granted; a people enjoying personal liberty, yet not acknowledging it; a people magnifying their troubles and ignoring their blessings; a nation of people, free and independent, but seem to advocate mob rule and anarchy; a people who are Americans.

The challenge of freedom is a malignant cancer: starting from a tiny core, it has grown rapidly, unseen, hidden; destroying the very fiber of our society. It is not so much a young man publicly burning his draft notice, but those many who justify his action. Nor is it a militant inciting a riot, the arsonist burning a great city to death, but the so-called Americans who urge them on in their destruction. Freedom's challenge is a woman who is too tired to stand when the flag passes by, the man who's mind is on other things while he merely recites the Pledge of Allegiance. It is not caring when someone denounces these United States of America. It is apathy.

This challenge is very real. It is not a sick minority, but everyone of us. We are all guilty of the highest treason: thanklessness for our liberty, for our democratic way of life, for our freedom. This terrible indifference is all around us. Only we can eliminate it, we must eliminate it. We must seek it out, and destroy it. It is not too late, if we do it now. A new golden era of pride, and freedom can be ours. It will not be easy, but it will be rewarding. We must start with ourselves, and revitalize that old love of freedom and democracy. We must support our government and our president in all that they do. Patriotism must run fervently through our veins. We must protect our freedom; for without freedom there is no life worth living. It must be that we face this challenge and that we defeat it. For the love of independence, for the desire of liberty, for the necessity of freedom, our conscience demands that we destroy this apathy to our God given rights. This we must do, so that everyone of us may reminisce the past humbly, but with pride. So that we can lift our heads high and say, "I am an American." This challenge is before all of us. Why stand we here idle? What is it that we wish? What would we have, freedom or slavery. The choice is simple. It is up to you!

DR. ARTHUR ERNEST MORGAN, A MASTER BUILDER OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for more than a half century, Dr. Arthur Ernest Morgan has given to American life that rare type of leadership which combines penetrating social insight with masterly performance in the public interest. As a young engineer he conducted important drainage investigations, and both designed and supervised land reclamations and water and flood-control operations. He was called by many States to assist with drafting proper legislation for regulating drainage practices. In 1921, as incoming president of Antioch College, he brought into being a program of education which related the social and intellectual development of students through alternating work experience in productive enterprises with study on college campus.

The foresight and skill he had demonstrated in engineering and educational achievements made him the choice for the first chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was in this that he was able to lead the comprehensive improvements of a whole interdependent people in a landlocked river basin. Among the many books he has written, those dealing with the small community reveal his grasp of the importance of this unit in society and in the improvement of society—"The Small Community," "Small Community Economics," "Industries in Small Communities," and "Community of the Future."

As extensive and profound technological changes have occurred in America, his work stands out as highly applicable to many current social problems.

People who live in the Tennessee Valley increasingly recognize and honor him as the leader who laid foundations for ever-widening opportunities and richness of living in the valley region. Honoring him for his creative work is expressed in many ways, as does the article quoted below. It suggests the tremendous meaning of the valley regional development for improving many problem conditions in the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, recently Wayland J. Hayes, professor emeritus of the department of sociology and anthropology of Vanderbilt University, in Nashville, Tenn., prepared an article for publication honoring Dr. Morgan as the first chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Although this article has not as yet been published, Professor Hayes has given me permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to the consideration and attention of my colleagues:

REVOLUTION: FACTORIES MOVE TO THE PEOPLE

(By Wayland J. Hayes)

The concentration and centralization of population which characterize the modern

city are largely traceable to the application of the steam engine to factories and to locomotives guided by steel rails. The considerable weight of this instrument of power combined with the necessity for ready access to fuel and water made its use relatively rigid and inflexible. Machines driven by it had to be close to it and connected to it by shafts and pulleys. When it was applied to transportation maximum efficiency depended upon railroads conforming as nearly as possible to straight lines and level ground. Cities came to be identified as railroad centers even when located at favorable harbors or along deep rivers.

Now, power may be generated and transmitted long distances for quite varied uses. Relatively light weight vehicles carrying relatively light loads of fuel run at high speeds on curved roads to reach high altitudes. Other vehicles fly through the air to carry passengers and freight to many points on the earth. It is no longer necessary, economical, or desirable for people to live in highly congested areas. They will not be compelled to go to the factories; but factories are likely to go to them. The present patterns of human ecology, or utilization of space, is now being changed, and is likely to be quite different by the 21st century.

In the present transition period problems of the modern city may seem even more acute than they ever have been, and some, such as air pollution, organized crime, and violence among conflicting groups may actually reach new proportions. Most of the catalogue of problems repeatedly covered by mass media and shouted by rival politicians have long since been recognized by investigators and research specialists.¹

Of course some problems such as food spoilage, insanitary conditions, and frequent preventable diseases were so glaring that control was sought early in the course of rapid urban growth. But the ties between business and political organization which were exposed by muckrakers at the turn of the century have merely become more sophisticated and renamed as "power structure."

Problems connected with the revolution in human ecology in America might be thought of as commencing with the flow of millions of immigrants from Europe near the beginning of the current century. Later, the mechanization of agriculture freed enough labor for industry and construction work of many kinds to cut off the flow from outside the country. To the increasing number of farm population pushed off the land by the application of efficient machinery, have been added a greater number who have exhausted their soil through poor management, or who have been victims of soil erosion by winds and water. Still others have responded to the mirage of welfare benefits reflected from big cities through rumor. Thus, the competition for unskilled jobs and living space is highly critical for large cities. The time has come for finding means to stop, and even reverse this internal migration to cities.

Within the 20's and early 30's Social Scientists discovered the spatial structure of cities and analyzed the process by which such structure emerges and becomes involved in continuous change. Segregation of people by social class, or other bases for division, marks the modern community from small towns to megalopolis. Business and financial transactions are located at the most convenient spot to serve their purposes and become the center for all later growth. New enterprises

¹ During the second quarter of the current century Robert E. Park led a group of his colleagues and students to make both a detailed and comprehensive study of Chicago. He conceived of the modern city as well as the distinctive areas within it as products of natural growth; which could be analyzed in terms of human ecology and social organization.

are located near the financial centers and further growth results in sub-segregation by which banks, brokerage houses, special types of merchandising and services take their places in functional relation to the whole. Land values may become so high at the center that skyscrapers become economically desirable. All the while there is a push from the center being communicated outward to all areas which have also become segregated in the ongoing process.

Land values next to the business area are kept so high by anticipated business expansion that existing properties are neglected and allowed to drift toward increasing decay. This area just peripheral to the center becomes the most densely populated in the city with poverty as the common denominator for all residents. By crowding many people into a limited number of rooms the rents per person are low but the total income received by landlords is high. In general, people are sub-segregated by such differences as race, ethnic or regional origin, nationality, gang activities, illegitimate business, and so on. In addition to being people of lowest income they are often the least well educated, poorest in physical and mental health, least skilled, and lowest in aspirations and hopes. Until recently this area of transition and social disorganization has been called, slum; but the usage of ghetto, implying forced residence, may gain acceptance.

The slum has always been notorious for violence and the compounding of all social ills. But recently, enough leadership of some groups within the slum has emerged to carry out mass protests of various kinds. These disturb the city as a whole and claim the attention of the general public. Under such circumstances, many remedies are being proposed and some are being tried. Few indeed are the politicians who do not promise to improve the conditions of the poor and control crime. It is not surprising that most of these proposals are concerned with remedies, repairs, and alterations of the city as it has been. It would require a vast catalogue to list the programs and proposals for the "public sector" and the "private sector" to perform.

But there is very little recognition that the very large city, itself, is obsolescent.²

Mechanical means are being employed with the intention of altering human or social relations. Social desegregation is called integration and treated as if the close proximity and mixing of divergent peoples would bring about social unification of society. Segregation of populations, per se, does not prevent achievement of consensus concerning social goals and their realization. It should be recognized that segregation is a process as well as a structure; and that "suburban developments" and decentralized efforts of many kinds simply change the locations of segregation. New housing, whether separate dwellings or apartments, is graduated by costs and income levels rather than any plan for changing social relations.

Obsolescence of very large cities is also indicated by their vulnerability. Although New York City has been so simplified that a moron who is able to recognize the difference between red and green lines, can go long distances by subway and reach a destination he seeks; an organization of a few highly competent experts must keep the complicated operations of the city in balance. A strike or a combination of strikes can paralyze basic services and render populations helpless. An attack from the outside could soon produce so much panic and physical damage as to bring about desolation within a short time.

Striking changes have been under way in the life and structure of cities during the

last generation of its inhabitants. The most impressive perhaps has been the growth of population at the periphery or outer area surrounding the city. This has been due to the "flight from the city" from within, and the migration to the city being arrested within commuter's range or satellite distance. Some of the suburbs have become distinct communities through the development of local institutions and services in accord with the desires and ethos of the residents. But most of them, perhaps, are little more than enclaves of people having similar income levels, but without identity with the people around them or the place they occupy. The housing construction of many suburbs is so cheap and the residents are so near to poverty that they could almost be labeled new slums or slums of the future. Few suburbs, other than industrial, provide the work by which residents exist and most of the bread winners are commuters.

A development coupled with the more rapid growth of population on the outer border of cities is the building of shopping centers. And as these prove successful others are rising further and further out from the central city. The loss of population, merchandising, and services, by the city creates loss of tax support; and central cities are resorting to costly efforts to hold tax paying residents, and to attract as much business from the outside as may prove possible. Efforts to hold or recapture tax bases actually require new public investment. Thus, further taxes are needed and the result may run counter to the end desired. Since greater commuting distances are possible over four lane interstate highways and improved rural roads, people are able to locate their residence in areas with relatively low taxes.

Perhaps the most promising development towards changing the imbalance created by seventy percent of the nation's population living on two percent of the land comes from changing practices of industrial plant location. Factories for making elemental parts are becoming more widely distributed in many regions and places throughout the nation. Assembly lines are being set up in areas where finished products are to be sold and utilized. Factories are not only being taken to the people where they live, but in some instances persons may continue to draw some income from agriculture concurrently with income from industry.

II

We can now focus attention on the Tennessee Valley Region, where the "technological revolution" is so recent that we can get a microcosmic view of alternatives for future industrial development, redistribution of population, and more democratic organization. We can begin at a time when 75 percent of the people live in rural areas and 54 percent on farms. The Tennessee Valley Region was more densely populated than many other rural parts of the United States, and the birth rate was much higher than the national average. Mere subsistence farms devoted to a single cash crop greatly outnumbered livestock and grain farms. Food and feed crops were insufficient to support the Valley's population. Under such economy, incomes were low and dietary deficiencies, much chronic illness, shoddy houses, sordid furnishings, utterly inadequate schools, poor recreational facilities, and insufficient transportation were somewhat comparable to the situation in urban slums. Timber, soil, and mineral resources had been exploited without regard to equity or future welfare of the people. A steady decline in natural wealth was accompanied by a steady increase in population. All the while, most people were unaware of the resource impoverishment going on around them and of the magnitude of their accumulated loss through the years. Their ignorance and limited cultural interests, combined with primitive housing and other facilities left no escape for any ven-

turesome youth except migration to industrial cities.

Then came the nitrate works at Muscle Shoals, Alabama in connection with needs of World War I. Later this factory was reactivated for the experimental development of chemical products especially plant fertilizers, with power coming from Wilson Dam built in 1925.³

After much political haggling and a later deep economic depression, The Tennessee Valley Authority was created by an Act of Congress in 1933 to take over and operate installations at Muscle Shoals and to integrate development of the entire Tennessee River Basin. To achieve such ends multipurpose dams and reservoirs were constructed to provide: low-cost power; a navigation channel from the Tennessee's mouth on the Ohio River to Knoxville, Tennessee, a distance of 650 miles; conservation and development of natural resources; malaria control; and recreational and educational facilities. Thus, foundations were laid and opportunities were made available for people to develop a new way of living if they could learn to use the vast opportunities placed in their reach.

One chapter of the early responses of the people has not been fully documented. It is well known that most of the construction work on dams and auxiliary installations was done by people from the Valley Region. But the first administrative leaders of the vast enterprise had the wisdom to foresee the need for trained technicians if new opportunities were to be fully embraced by the people. On-the-job education was continually kept in mind and workers were given new responsibilities as rapidly as they demonstrated capacity and competence. Evening and night school were set up in work camps for all who volunteered for instruction. The teaching staff itself was composed of volunteers from the highly trained technical staff which had to be brought in from varied experienced sources whether inside or outside the region. Since the Act of Congress did not provide funds for this educational endeavor, those who participated in it did so without financial reward. This phase of the project reflects the creative spirit which pervaded the work done by those who launched the enterprise. One of the anecdotes which survives from the time, is that a very high official told the people that creative living was like measles and had to be caught from others who had it.

Parenthetically, it should be said that not all of the industrial and agricultural development of the Region occurred under the stimulation of the TVA. Kingsport, in Sullivan County, Tennessee was fully planned by John Nolen, laid out in 1916 and incorporated in 1917. It is noted for its pulp and paper mills associated directly with very large book printing and binding operations. Textile mills and plants making brick, cement, glass, synthetic fibers, plastics, hosiery and chemicals are also located there. From the beginning, hospitals, schools, and entertainment facilities in Kingsport were of high quality. The family plan for providing hospital care for workers in the area was one of the earliest experimental ventures of its kind. Bristol on the Virginia-Tennessee line is only a few miles from Kingsport and Johnson City and the three now referred to as Tri Cities, form an industrial gateway to the Tennessee Valley Region.

³ About one fourth of the electrical energy generated in the Region continues to be utilized by defense installations including munitions defense research at Muscle Shoals, Alabama; atomic plants at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; and Paducah, Kentucky; the Air Force wind tunnel research at Tullahoma, Tennessee; and the famous NASA Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Alabama.

² Lewis Mumford in his prophetic book, *The Culture of Cities* has described the "Rise and Fall of Megalopolis" and the "Regional Framework of Civilization."

Although primary attention will be given to industry, it is important to understand the strategic place of agricultural change in the whole Valley Region. Agricultural change was not only important for the sake of improving the income and standard of living of the people, but also for checking the erosion of land for its own productivity and also for protecting streams and reservoirs from silting. The agricultural pattern of growing such row crops as corn and tobacco imperiled the very foundations of the new system being built into the whole region. A wide spread program of establishing grass and growing it for hay and pastures was most vital. Enrichment of the long worn soil had to be built into the program. And all this implied a considerable shift to livestock and dairy production where it had not been widely practiced before. As in all matters of this kind, demonstrations and assistance were placed before the people; but they made the changes through their own efforts. It is a long story but it is based on creative community development. People were given advantageous terms for obtaining agricultural lime and suitable fertilizers. Local agricultural communities throughout the region organized under their own leadership and made plans for comprehensive improvement of all phases of their lives over long periods of time. The results have not only contributed to an improved economy but an improved society with more satisfying social relations.

Of the 201 counties in the Tennessee Valley Region only 35 have waterfronts on the Tennessee River. It is not surprising that these offered the most advantageous sites for industrial development when the landlocked valley was opened to commercial navigation and joined with the combined river system of continental United States in 1945. Since that time 1.3 billion dollars have been invested in 133 private manufacturing plants operating on the river. Over 90 percent of this capital and 68 percent of the employment involved has been devoted to the manufacture of chemicals, primary metals, and pulp and paper. Well over 100,000 new jobs, including trades and services have been created directly or indirectly by these investments.

It must not be understood that rapid and substantial development in the water-front counties has been separated from counties adjoining and extending far beyond. Gunterville, Alabama, for instance, has become an inland port to which and from which commercial products flow in literally all directions. Barges loaded with hundreds of automobiles are met at the dock by motor carriers to distribute them to many parts of the south. Similarly, grain elevators and feed mills receive cargoes of corn, soy beans, alfalfa pellets, and other crops in short supply in the area. These are necessary for adequately supporting the expanding live stock and dairy farming of a number of southern states. The broiler and fryer production which must respond by rapid transit to demands from the Far West as well as the Northeast and Middle West is largely fed through Gunterville and Decatur ports.

Another illustration of the complementary relation between industry located on the river and a vast supporting hinterland is found at Charlestown-Calhoun, Tennessee. The manufacturing of pulp and paper requires a continuous dependable supply of wood from forest to factory. This involved systematic planting, harvesting and transporting trees to provide ample supplies for the paper mills year after year. Such an operation, not only provides jobs for many people in several states, but it goes far to restore forests and conserve soil over a vast area. It is made possible by the combined means of rail, river, and public road transportation. Other ties of industry located on the river with related development as much as 75 miles away can be found in aluminum production at Muscle Shoals, Alabama and at New Johnsonville, Tennessee. Rolling opera-

tions, foil printing, laminating and casting productions are among those also found some distance from the river.

Electric energy is not only generated by falling water at dams, but by a number of coal-fired steam plants as well. Although strip mining has not been controlled, several coal fields in the Region or adjoining it find a market close at hand for maintaining a profitable coal industry in the region. It should be noted also that two large nuclear generating plants, now under construction, round out the picture of a new day in accessible power for development of the Region.

III

Although industrial centers located along the Tennessee River have grown in population much of the essential labor force is made up of persons who commute from varying distances within the Region. This is made possible by the high quality and extensive system of paved roads to be found in the hinterland about the centers. In spite of this fact, many counties are too far from the newly developed places or the metropolitan centers elsewhere in the region to have economical and reasonably attractive access to industrial employment. Furthermore, many highly significant sites for particular types of industry do not receive attention from persons who might have the capital and interest to develop them. The sites selected by industry are often dependent upon promotion by communities who need them. It should be quite obvious that many small and often isolated communities do not have awareness of their resources and certainly have no detailed knowledge of how to inform potentially interested persons.

It was this condition which let 12 public power distributors, either municipalities or rural electric cooperatives, to organize on September 15, 1951, an industrial development association in that portion of North Mississippi served by TVA. Membership was open to any public power distributor in the area and a representative from each of the twelve formed a board of directors. The initial financial support for professionally trained staff and equipment for research, and promotional activity was equitably met. This made it possible for all communities in the area, regardless of size to obtain expert service in analysis of resources and help in promotion of suitable and attractive sites for industry. This Association is known as the North Mississippi Industrial Development Association (NMIDA), and today is supported by 27 of the 28 distributors in the area.

The program for the industrial development association is subsumed under the functions of research, education and information, cooperation, and promotion. By research is meant the assessment of resources a community has to offer as a site for industrial development-location in relation to water and other transportation routes and services; to towns and cities; and to such natural resources as minerals, forests, water supply and soils. Population composition, and its growth or decline along with local and area history must be analyzed. Social institutions such as local government, churches, schools, medical services, communication media should give insight into the cultural tone and local ethos. Of course the business activities and financial status must be fully analyzed. Promotion has to do with arranging the research findings in an attractive brochure and making it available to potentially interested industries. Visits, letters, telephone calls, and tours are used by expert personnel employed as directors of major areas. Member distributors are kept fully informed about all activities of their Association by systematic reports, meetings, and personal contacts. Emphasis is placed upon activities affecting the development of their own communities. The Association also cooperates with chambers of commerce and all private and public agencies likely to have

mutual interests, information, or communication. Cooperation with any educational institution within the area is especially cultivated. Evidence of interest on the part of any reputable and responsible business management is consistently followed to the extent which seems warranted. The final decision of a business concern to locate in a particular community depends on its local leadership and the qualifications and impressions the people are able to offer when they are visited and exploratory negotiations become mutually desirable.

The idea and practice of organizing these professionally staffed industrial development associations has now spread over three-fourths of the Tennessee Valley, an area of more than 60,000 square miles. Of the 122 municipal and cooperative distributors of TVA power in this area 109 are members and actively support five associations. In addition to that of Northern Mississippi, four other industrial associations have been formed during the past five years. Middle Tennessee Industrial Development Association (MTIDA) with 23 member distributors, South Kentucky Industrial Development Association (SKIDA) with 15 member distributors, North Alabama Industrial Development Association (NAIDA) with 24 distributors; and West Tennessee Industrial Development Association (WTIDA), supported by 20 member distributors. Complete organization of the region seems likely in the near future.

Only highlights concerning one member of 109 industrial development associations can be reported here. Cookeville, Tennessee located near the center of the Cumberland Plateau, county seat of Putnam County, is chosen because it has a number of basic similarities to Yellow Springs, Ohio,⁴ a town which has received sociological study.

Cookeville does not have the systematic program of alternating work and study after the manner of Antioch College. But the Tennessee Polytechnic Institute founded in 1916 (now operating as a branch of the University of Tennessee) does incorporate practical and applicable technical training in its curriculum. Even before college work begins "vo-tech" schools on the secondary level make it possible to learn the technique of welding and similar basic skills. Only recently the Fleetguard Division of Cummins Engine Co. looked for a place with strong educational resources relevant to their production of oil, air, and fuel filters for diesel and automotive demands. It is notable that eight of the Fleetguard management staff were educated at Tennessee Tech and 150 of the production workers came from the "vo-tech" schools of Cookeville.

Furthermore, the Fleetguard factory is fairly representative of the high quality of enterprise which develops mutually satisfying relations with the people of Cookeville. The Delman Company produces automotive parts and accessories. The Volunteer Tool and Die Company produces what the name suggests. A further but incomplete catalogue of products include: electroplating, upholstered living room furniture and chairs, plastic football equipment, brushes and brush handles, concrete blocks, charcoal briquettes, and so on. Nineteen new plants and 1367 jobs have been added since 1960.

The quality of life in a community is difficult to assess without actually living in it for some length of time. A few facts may suggest or reflect facets of Cookeville's interests and vitality. As might be expected, the presence of a branch of the University of Tennessee with over 5,000 students and a

⁴ Small city in Ohio analyzed in terms of ethos, process of industrial growth and adaptable practices by Arthur Morgan in his *Industries for Small Communities* published in 1953.

faculty of more than 200 members has a marked influence on the small city. It sponsors music, dance, and drama activities in the community and may have inspired the active amateur theater, which often draws upon regional dramatic materials as well as local talent. Its considerable library reinforces the local public library by making many privileges available to all in the area. Cookeville is unique, perhaps in supporting three weekly newspapers, each with more than 6,000 subscribers, at a time when such papers have been failing and going out of existence throughout the nation. Daily papers are also brought in from Knoxville, Chattanooga and Nashville, some 80-100 miles east, south, and west of what is sometimes called the "Hub of the Upper Cumberland." Lakes and state parks are only a few miles away but, in addition, Cookeville maintains a park of its own. Modern health services are available, including two hospitals. The governing body is of the council-manager type with five members elected for three year terms.

The laborers found at Cookeville and the response they are making seem to support statements by Morgan: "If there is a core of sound, honest, and friendly people, and a persistent spark of inquiry and adventure, then all the rest can be added in due course. . . . Men's creative capacities commonly lie dormant until their social and economic setting provides both a pattern and a stimulus for action." Some managers coming into Cookeville have said: "The native aptitude of our workers here in Middle Tennessee has made it possible for us to cut the training time and costs by 40% over other facilities in another section of the country."

"Our turnover and absenteeism rates have been amazingly low. The workers here seem to lack the 'itchy feet' of their counterparts in some sections. The actual manhours of our plant here far exceed those of similar plants in other sections and industry in general,—last year, for example, our absentee rate was 1.6. This year it is 1.7. We would have had an even lower rate had we not had employees out with prolonged illness."

"Production figures of our new plant in Middle Tennessee surpass those of our old location by a full 25%."

"The working people of this area have an old fashioned idea—a day's work for a day's pay."

"Our concern has been very happy here. The people and the region are so attractive that I hope to retire here."

COUNTIES WITH CITIES

Type of counties	Rural	Urban	Metropolitan
Number counties	133	26	11
Plants	1,722	923	1,563
Investments	\$931,710,000	\$798,009,000	\$665,411,000
Jobs created	140,326	66,428	62,341
Total population	2,236,935	1,215,856	1,895,757

It is evident that more jobs have been created in the 133 rural counties than in the 37 urban counties where population is highly concentrated. It is also clear that gross investment in plants and the number of plants is higher than in either classification of highly urban counties. It is not surprising, however, that the low-wage industries and those requiring less skilled and trained workers—those in apparel and furniture making—are dominant in the rural counties. These are paid less than \$5000 per worker whereas those in chemicals receive more than \$7000 per worker and those employed in primary metals and pulp and paper manufacturing receive earnings above \$6000 per worker. But the important fact remains that factories are moving to the rural places and the people do not have to move from their

IV

Lest there be over simplification, it must be understood that modern megalopolitan growth and the imbalance of human ecology in our time is not entirely, due to the correlation of industrial, rail, and commercial centers near the beginning of the 20th Century. The patterns were laid at that time by people leaving their agricultural and hand craft production to go where new factories provided a better life through machine production and widening possibilities of trade. The concentration and centralization of population seemed rational, utilitarian and survivalistic at the time. But growth has continued long after any one of these criteria is met. In fact, the opposite is true. Further migration of people from marginal land or places with limited educational or vocational opportunity has ceased to be rational or utilitarian; and it certainly does not contribute to human or cultural survival.

One of the clues for understanding the continuous irrational growth of cities, regardless of their size, may be found in the stereotyped notion that growth in numbers is equivalent to growth in prosperity and progress. Another clue is suggested by Ralph Linton's dictum in his *Study of Man* that man tends to elaborate certain culture patterns as ends in themselves without regard to their utility or injury.

The extraordinary transformation of opportunities and the achievement of higher qualities of living by people living in the Tennessee Valley Region may represent a change which will spread to other areas. If so, a more even distribution of population might become established and many of the problems now associated with very large urban concentration would disappear. Such an ecological balance would seem rational and utilitarian. And, under modern threats of violence from within and without, such a change would appear to improve prospects of survival.

The recent experience in the Tennessee Valley may prove to be the wave of the future. For the years 1958-1966 rural counties with their largest cities having less than 10,000 population were compared with standard Metropolitan statistical Areas (SMSA) and with urban counties having their largest cities in the 10,000-50,000 class with respect to numbers of new and expanded manufacturing plants, investments by class of industry, and jobs created. The totals may be shown most clearly in tabular form:

low yielding agriculture to some city in the hope of obtaining a better level of living.

In longer time perspective the picture of industrial growth from 1929-1966 in rural areas shows employment expansion from 221,600 persons to 682,000, an increase of 208 percent as compared with 78 percent for the nation. This greater number and variety of job opportunities, including the concurrent growth in trades and services, brought about a phenomenal increase in income and purchasing power. During this period the income received by individuals rose from \$1,666,000 to \$13,732,000, or 777 percent compared to a national increase of 578 percent. Per capita income increased from 45 to 70 percent of the national average during the period.

One of the major tests of the matter under consideration is found in the relations of em-

ployment and population. The current decade is the first time total employment, including agriculture, has grown faster in the Valley than in the Nation. Employment on farms has been decreasing faster than the country as a whole for a long time—60 percent from 1929 to 1960 compared to 48 percent for the nation. Concurrently, the rate of population growth has been below the national average every decade since 1900 with the exception of the depression decade of the thirties. From 1930 to 1967 the Region's population gain was only 36 percent compared to 61 percent for the nation. These population changes were the result of natural increase and migration of persons primarily in the 20-24 age classifications to industrial centers in other parts of the country. Migration into the region is now exceeding outmigration for the first time as job opportunities have expanded recently and rapidly. Net migration from the Region apparently has stopped. If the factors which brought this change about continue to operate with job opportunities becoming even more varied and income levels rising, a genuine contribution to ecological balance will be achieved. The rural-urban populations within the region seem likely to maintain their present balance.

What of the future? Will young people wish to spend their lives and work in the Tennessee Valley Region? As their level of living rises will their standards of living move beyond "creature comforts" and "mass entertainment" to creative endeavors of high quality? Answers to these questions may be suggested by the way of life which has been emerging. In the first place the Tennessee Valley development has been built upon an idea, or vision of the river and its valley as "a unit from its source to the sea." Every part is interdependent with every other part—physiographically, biologically, and sociologically as a habitat for man. Development of one part must be integrated with that of other parts of maximum values of any part is to be realized. People learned this through demonstrations. Reversing the process of erosion of land by reforestation, and establishment of pastures, was first demonstrated and then adopted as opportunity. This learning through demonstration, or actually, through experimentation and testing became a wide spread pattern. The people of the Region found greater scope for their initiative, energy and talents.

Furthermore, they learned the effectiveness of managing their own affairs through social organization. Agricultural improvement along with enrichment of home life was realized through community and neighborhood planning and appropriate division of labor. Only by organizing electric cooperatives were many people able to get the revolutionizing applications of electric energy to their productive work and comforts of living. In the process they learned their own powers of managing public affairs. The catalogue of achievements by the people might be extended indefinitely and would include greater knowledge and realization of conditions essential to health and the establishment of health services. The combination of man-made lakes with the setting of mountains and hills results in scenic grandeur for literally millions of people to enjoy. The varied enjoyment afforded by these lakes does not require detailed description to be understood and utilized.

The operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as an instrument for the unitary development of a watershed area reaching into seven states has required a high degree of understanding and agreement on the part of local, state, and federal administrations of government. The policy of creating increasing opportunities for all people has been the keystone for success of the venture. Just as people with intelligence, integrity, and pride have been grasping the new opportunities

afforded them; so, have their local and state governments accepted an increasing role in mutual support of such public interests as control of water pollution, strip mining; beautification of highways and parks; and forest fires; and so on. The several state institutions of higher learning have been extending their opportunities through branches made accessible to people within commuting distance. The curricula of these institutions are increasingly designed to provide knowledge and skills for varied types of work students desire to enter; as well as for creative understanding through literature, history, social studies and fine arts.

From one point of view the multiple and unified development of patterns of living in the Tennessee Valley Region may be regarded as an experiment or demonstration on a grand scale. It is being followed as a model for development in many parts of the world.

It provides an alternative for the overbuilding of cities and the ecological imbalance of population in the United States. Arthur Morgan, with the combined insight of engineer-sociologist-educator, in his book, *Search for Purpose*, pointed out the highly significant results which flow from changing existing currents of attention and purpose of men. As First Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority he was instrumental in demonstrating this principle.

THE WELFARE SPIRAL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sunday American carried an excellent editorial on the rising crises in the Nation's public welfare program.

I was particularly pleased to see this highly respected newspaper support a uniform, nationwide standard for relief payments.

I have long advocated this approach as one way to slow down, or maybe even stop, the huge migration of impoverished families to the large cities seeking the higher welfare payments usually paid by urban communities.

The editorial follows:

THE WELFARE SPIRAL

A court ruling that eliminated Illinois' one-year residency requirement for welfare payments a year ago already has cost the state an additional 10 million dollars, according to Gershom Hurwitz, assistant public aid director. The announcement, hardly a surprise, verifies gloomy predictions by state officials when the court decision was made.

The number of new cases added to welfare rolls each month has risen from between 160 and 170 cases a month to between 250 and 300 cases a month since the requirement was eliminated.

This new load imposed on an already overloaded state welfare program adds urgency to an argument we've been setting forth here for a long time: Uniform national welfare standards are needed to save Illinois—and other states which pay high relief allotments—from a constantly rising influx of relief recipients, worsening urban poverty and the further crowding of already overcrowded slums. A way must be found to keep the welfare migrants at home, and perhaps tempt back to their homes those who have been lured to the cities.

Illinois is attractive to destitute southern families both because of its high public-aid standards and because it's easy to get to. Of

only five states that average more than \$200 a month in welfare payments to families, Illinois is the only one not on the northeastern seaboard. Of the six states which average less than \$100 a month, four—Texas, Arkansas, Alabama, and Mississippi—are within relatively easy travel distance, even for the poor. Mississippi, at the bottom of the list with monthly payments of \$34.90, led the Illinois caseload increase last December.

A nation-wide standard of relief payments now has been proposed by Robert H. Finch, secretary of health, education, and welfare. It's imperative, we think, that the federal government give this program the highest priority.

Gov. Ogilvie has gone a step further and suggested that the entire program be underwritten by the United States. That is a reasonable proposal; it goes hand in hand with uniform standards. But the standards themselves are the minimum needed.

Wiping out the residency rule may have changed the very reasons poor people once had to migrate to Chicago. Members of the Chicago's American staff have learned during several investigations in the last seven years that the most alluring prospect in Chicago, as far as the southern poor were concerned, was job opportunity. In too many cases, the lure turned out to be false. Large families arrived in Chicago; the father, unable to get or hold a job, drifted away, leaving wife and children to the benefits of A.D.C.

The massive increase in welfare cases indicates the lure now is even stronger—instant money by court order. If the city's problems are not to become insoluble, the magnet must be turned off.

STAMP TO HONOR 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to announce that today I have introduced a bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the golden anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., on July 16, 1969.

The goals of this federation are to elevate the standards for women in business and the professions, to promote the interests of business and professional women, to bring about a spirit of cooperation among business and professional women in the United States, and to extend opportunities to business and professional women through education along lines of industrial, scientific and vocational activities.

We in the U.S. Congress applaud these objectives and feel strongly that the contributions to American society which the federation has made, through its many National, State, and local scholarship programs for young women interested in business and professional careers and through the civic involvement of its members, deserve nationwide recognition.

As it would be particularly fitting that on the 50th anniversary of its founding the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs be honored with a commemorative stamp, I urge the Postmaster General to approve the issuance of such a stamp.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a young lady from my district, Miss Hope A. Little, of Belle Vernon, Pa. She submitted the winning speech in the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual Voice of Democracy Contest for the State of Pennsylvania. This award entitles Miss Little, along with the winning contestants from each State, to be brought to Washington for the final judging in this contest; five scholarships will be awarded as top prizes. Over 400,000 schoolchildren throughout the country participated in this competition.

Miss Little's essay on the theme "Freedom's Challenge" is worthy of our notice, and I commend it to my colleagues, as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Hope Little)

Through no merit of our own each of us has been given one of the greatest gifts on earth, the gift of American citizenship. A gift so rare only two hundred million people out of three billion possess it. A gift so coveted that thousands of people annually leave their homes, their friends, and all they have known to journey to America and become citizens.

Surely no people of any other time in any other land have been so blessed, so fortunate, and yet so ingrateful. Considering that the Russian revolution ended in a Communistic government, and the French revolution was followed by a dictatorial ruler, America was surely fortunate in that her revolution brought a democratic form of government. However, with all of our freedoms and rights, it is we Americans who express the least gratitude. Russia, with its overpowering dictators, has never seen a premier assassinated. America, which has been blessed with wise, honest leaders, has had four of her presidents die at the hands of assassins. Last spring we saw the French people riot for two weeks producing merely two fatalities. But in America a man peacefully runs for public office and he is shot down; another speaks of Negroes and Whites walking hand and hand and he too is slain. We are accepting a philosophy that says, "If you don't like something, burn it. If you don't like someone, kill him."

It has often been said that violent movies and television programs have a militant affect on children. But when will people realize that the most violent programs are the news-casts which show stores being looted, draft cards being burned, and the American flag being desecrated? To prevent these incidents from being shown would be Hitlerism; but to regain respect for the flag and to reestablish the honor connected with military service would be the American Dream.

A Greek philosopher once said, "A government is a success only when all citizens take part in its affairs. Whenever one person says, 'The government is of no concern to me', then that government is a failure." Yet in a recent election 42% of the qualified voters did not exercise their precious right to select the leaders of our nation. In other words, 42% of our citizens said "The government is of no concern to me." According to this Greek philosopher our government is a failure; not because its leaders have been poor or its military weak; but due to the fact that its citizens have been indifferent.

What can one person do? One seventeen year old French girl, Joan of Arc, is credited with holding the English from invading her homeland. One man named Hitler is responsible for the death of one million people. One woman had prayers removed from public schools. These people have one thing in common. They stood against immense opposition to prove what one lone pilgrim could accomplish.

Our most powerful enemies are not in Moscow or Peking. Our toughest enemies exist on the Texas prairie, in the Allegheny Mountains of Pennsylvania, and in the metropolitan areas of California. They thrive in ghettos. They lurch in filthy alleys.

These enemies—ignorance, greed, sloth, cowardice, prejudice, and apathy are the enemies that can conquer our republic, but only if we let them.

To defeat these enemies demands bravery for a silent revolution must begin in which each American examines his conscience and learns to stop finding the qualities that divide Americans, but rather to find those qualities which unite us. It will take courage, but America can be the land of the free only as long as it is the home of the brave.

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the United Church of Christ Council for Christian Social Action adopted what I consider an excellent statement on Vietnam. This statement articulates clearly the need for a reduction in the level of hostilities and the concurrent need to proceed with the negotiations in Paris.

I feel this statement is a constructive contribution to the debate on American policy in Vietnam and commend it to my colleagues' attention. Under leave to extend to my remarks, I therefore wish to include the statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

(Adopted by Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ, February 3, 1969)

We welcome the emphasis which President Nixon placed on the attainment of peace in his inaugural address. We believe he was accurate in stating that because the people want peace and the leaders are afraid of war, "the times are on the side of peace," and that America now has "the chance to help lead the world at least out of the valley of turmoil."

The acclaim given at home and abroad to the President's peace theme shows the widespread support he has to move forward in this "era of negotiation." We join in that support and urge prompt action in the most pressing of the negotiations, namely, those dealing with Vietnam.

While the talks continue in Paris, violence and suffering continue in Vietnam itself. We cry out in anguish over each day of delay. We deplore the continued destruction of the Vietnamese people, their children, their land, their culture as well as the loss in American lives. This level of violence is detrimental to a peaceful settlement.

We wish to add to our general support for the President, these specific suggestions:

First, *negotiate, unilaterally if necessary,*

with the North Vietnamese. It is with Hanoi that agreement must be sought for the withdrawal of troops. We believe our Government has been unduly deterred by the footdragging of the Saigon Government. They are the beneficiaries of tremendous American sacrifices, but it is not for them to decide how and when the United States reduces its efforts there. It is important to recognize the self-interest of Saigon officials in the U.S. presence, and to realize that the United States must make its judgment independently.

Second, *begin troop withdrawal, with or without the consent of the Saigon Government.* We believe a significant consensus has been reached in this country favoring a de-escalation in Vietnam, and the beginning of withdrawal of U.S. troops. We share this conviction. This means that the U.S. Government should notify the Saigon Government immediately of this intention in order to give it opportunity and time to adjust itself to the new realities, and if it wishes, to make accommodation or arrangements for internal peace with the divergent forces within South Vietnam. Time is short. These arrangements should be concluded without further delay.

Third, *work for the active participation of all divergent groups in the South Vietnamese political arena.* We believe our Government should strongly recommend to the Saigon Government that political prisoners be released from jail. Many persons in South Vietnam are represented by neither the National Liberation Front nor the Thieu Government. It is quite likely that only these people in a "third force" can bring stability to that unhappy country by providing a catalyst around which the divergent elements in the population can form a viable government. And it is quite possible that any future economic aid the United States might give would be wasted unless a broad national government can be established which should include representation of diverse interests, not excluding the National Liberation Front.

Fourth, *use multi-lateral channels for post-war reconstruction of all Vietnam.* We dare not forget that when the killing has stopped and the immediate suffering has been mitigated, the road to reconciliation is long and the task of reconstruction is massive. We urge the President and Congress to offer ample resources, working through multi-lateral channels, to press forward with haste to bind up the wounds of all the peoples in Vietnam.

With this statement of support and commendation, we wish the President God speed in his quest for peace.

NONBILL, NONACTION PAY RAISE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received earlier this month—a letter that speaks for itself:

SCHWAN'S TRAILER PARK,
Ithaca, N.Y., February 8, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBISON: I am a partially disabled ex-marine attending Cornell University under the GI Bill of Rights.

Please submit a non-bill to the Congress so that my disability award and educational allotment will be increased by 41% upon non-action by the legislature.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. ROWE, Jr.

FREEDOM DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to observe the 15th anniversary of Freedom Day, January 23, the people of the Republic of China held a mass rally at Taipei, Taiwan, with our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN H. BUCHANAN, of Alabama, as principal speaker. I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the program of the rally in Taiwan and include the program as part of my remarks in the RECORD:

PROGRAM OF THE RALLY

1. Messages from H. E. President Chiang and from H. E. Presidents of Republic of Korea, Republic of the Philippines, and Republic of Vietnam; and from Foreign Minister Choi Kyu-Kyu-hah of Republic of Korea and Ambassador Walter D. McCaughy of the United States.

2. Address by Chairman Ku Cheng-kang.

3. Speech by H. E. Vice President C. K. Yen.

4. Speech by U.S. Congressman John Hall Buchanan

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MESSAGE TO THE MAO-SUPPRESSION AND NATIONAL SALVATION RALLY ON THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM DAY JANUARY 23, 1969

Fifteen years ago, more than 14,000 former prisoners of the Korean War repudiated the Chinese Communists and chose to be free. This momentous decision gave rise to the Freedom Day movement of free China. As a result of the efforts of the anti-Communist people of the world and the unanimous resolution of the Second Conference of the World Anti-Communist League, this movement has now assumed international significance. New energy has been injected into the historic undertakings of opposing slavery and defending freedom. We ourselves have assumed a large share of responsibility in the struggle for human liberty. The regime of Mao Tse-tung is the source of the evils that threaten man's right to be free. The snake is killed by striking at its head and the weed is eliminated by pulling it out by the roots. So it is that the establishment of the Mao-suppression and National Salvation United Front on the occasion of Freedom Day is a matter of great importance.

With the tides of freedom surging ever higher, the Peiping regime is on the edge of collapse. The radiance of humanity enlightens the world and the victory of our National Revolution of *San Min Chu I* (Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People) is in sight. History's iron law that freedom will vanquish slavery is in the process of being borne out. However, the wicked Mao knows that he is isolated internally and externally and at the end of his rope. He is therefore engaged in a last-ditch struggle of trying to amend the Chinese Communist Party charter and to convene the "ninth party congress", hoping thereby to conceal the failures of his "cultural revolution", "rebellion" and "power seizure". But the oppressed people of the mainland and the Party members who have been so long deceived are now alert to Mao's intrigues of "grasping Party members" and "deceiving those outside the Party". They are ready to use tactics they have learned in the course of the struggle and will "raise high red flags to oppose red flags". The bitter experience of Mao's attempts at vengeance and liquidation will be applied as people and Party members become the vanguard of an all-encompassing rebellion that will bury Mao.

Regardless of party affiliation or occupation, all of the Chinese people should now rise up to perfect our Mao-Suppression and National Salvation United Front and march forward together under the flags of *San Min Chu I* and the National Revolution. Our anti-Mao and anti-Communist comrades are imbued with the spirit of ethics, democracy and science. In their political, economic, cultural, military or social posts, they are now prepared to contribute their wisdom and their energy in implementing *San Min Chu I*, in developing Chinese culture and in saving, recovering and reconstructing their country. As they endeavor to fulfill their duty, all of the people will rise up in total mobilization. Chinese at home and abroad will be united spiritually and will expedite a rendezvous of anti-Mao and anti-Communist people and military forces both in front of and behind the enemy. That will mark the end for the chief enemy of freedom.

As Freedom Day develops, we shall unite with all freedom-loving peoples and with all the forces of liberty and righteousness to be found in the world. Together we shall liberate those who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain and restore their freedom. We should also exert ourselves to frustrate the international counter-current of Communist appeasement. With a single strategy and concerted actions, we shall bring lasting peace to the world and realize the noble ideal of one great commonwealth set forth in our *San Min Chu I*.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT
PARK CHUNG HEE OF REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"On the historic occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of Freedom Day I would like to join my fellow countrymen, the people of the Republic of China and those patriotic freedom fighters who have so valiantly chosen freedom, in expressing my warmest congratulations and best wishes. I also join you in renewing our resolution to carry through our determined campaign for the preservation of freedom. It is most gratifying to witness that our indomitable spirit in which we have jointly pursued the path to freedom is today diffusing itself through even the iron curtain and bamboo curtain and that the comradeship which has been knit closely between our two people in the course of waging our long and hard fight against our common enemy is providing a strong spiritual fulcrum to us as we continue to struggle for our common goals. On this occasion, we again join your people and free peoples throughout the world in pledging anew that we will stand even more closely in our march forward toward freedom and justice until this planet in which we live finds itself clear of an evil destructionist force called communism."

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT
FERDINAND MARCOS OF REPUBLIC OF THE
PHILIPPINES

On behalf of my country and people, I extend to the people of free China my warmest greetings on the 15th Anniversary of Freedom Day. The heart is indeed stirred by the event 15 years ago, when 14,000 Chinese who have long labored under the lash of communism, obeyed the instincts of freemen and daring all dangers, broke through the bamboo curtain to reclaim their dignity as human beings, the Filipino people have a long tradition of democracy and our history has recorded our many battles for freedom. Today we are deeply irrevocably committed to the free way of life, which others before us have defended with blood and sacrifice. It is our fervent hope that in a time not too distant all peoples can live in peace and freedom. Even as the 14,000 Chinese Communist soldiers who have elected to become freemen now live an unfettered life. As you celebrate Freedom Day, we pledge anew our continuing support of all endeavors of free peoples to

repudiate aggressive, oppressive Communism and bring about a world at peace and unified in freedom.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT
NGUYEN VAN THIEU OF THE REPUBLIC OF
VIETNAM

As you commemorate this great historic Anniversary when fifteen years ago 22,000 Chinese and Korean POWs under the custody of the United Nations Forces in Korea chose freedom in spite of Communist coercion and intimidation, the Vietnamese people, fighting on the frontline of the Free World, deeply share your pride and your hopes.

The fact that the so-called "volunteers" that Communist China sent into its aggressive war in Korea, refused to return to their homeland after the war was over, shows most eloquently the emptiness of the Communist claims of peaceful intentions and of the popular support they pretend to have in the areas under their dictatorial control.

Since that momentous Freedom Day fifteen years ago, millions of others everywhere in the world, in various Continents, have likewise chosen freedom whenever they were given a chance to do so.

In Viet Nam, after the 1954 Geneva Agreements partitioned the country and placed northern Viet Nam under Communist rule, nearly one million people in North Viet Nam chose to abandon their homes and their ancestral lands to seek refuge in the South.

In the past years, after Communist North Viet Nam intensified its aggression against the Republic of Viet Nam and sent armed troops to invade South Viet Nam in violation of the Geneva Agreements, over 90,000 Communist troops chose to abandon Communist ranks to rally to the side of freedom. This not only testifies in a dramatic fashion the physical presence of the Communist aggressive forces coming from the North, which the Hanoi regime always denies, but also repeatedly confirms the deep aspirations for freedom of all men everywhere, and the abiding attachment to the spiritual values of our ancient civilizations throughout Asia.

Free men everywhere appreciate highly the efforts of your Committee in keeping alive the flame of hope in the hearts of all the unfortunate people now suffering under Communist slavery.

On this occasion, I send you my best wishes and warm congratulations.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY FOREIGN MINISTER
CHOI KYU-HAH OF REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"On the joyous occasion of your freedom day, I wish to extend to your excellency, on behalf of the government and people of the Republic of Korea, the most heartfelt congratulations. I take this opportunity to make our renewed determination to smash the Communist expansionism in Asia. Please accept my best wishes for the sustained progress and prosperity of your great nation."

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY AMBASSADOR
WALTER P. MCCONAUGHY OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA

Fifteen years ago this month, 14,000 Chinese prisoners of war in Korea who had selected freedom rather than return to Communist oppression began to arrive in Taiwan.

Much has happened during those fifteen years. In contrast to the turmoil on mainland China, remarkable progress has been achieved by the Republic of China under the inspirational leadership of President Chiang Kai-shek, and the Government of the Republic of China is now able to extend the fruits of the lessons it has mastered to many other countries of the Free World. In contrast to the discredit which the mainland regime has brought upon itself in the international community, the standing of the Republic of China among the free nations of the world has never been higher. Our two governments have been joined even more

closely in working for peace, freedom and prosperity for all mankind.

In all the long years of bitter confrontation between the forces of communism and the Free World, there have been few events which more dramatically illustrated the shining truth that men when allowed a free choice will seek the path leading to freedom, liberty, and justice. The United States Government is pleased to participate in the celebration of that most significant occasion, which is important not only in itself but as a symbol of man's never ending search for freedom.

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN KU CHENG-KANG

This is the fifteenth anniversary of Freedom Day token of mankind's bright future. We who are meeting here for its commemoration are very much honored by H. E. Vice President C. K. Yen who will address the Rally, and by the Honorable John Hall Buchanan, Congressman of the United States, Mr. Kang Ye Muk from the Republic of Korea, and Mr. Phan Van Xuong from the Republic of Vietnam for having travelled from afar to join us. On behalf of the Rally, may I express to them my heartiest welcome and appreciation.

In the past fifteen years, the Freedom Day movement, a symbol for mankind's struggle for freedom, has been growing and expanding, and is now supported by the U.S.A. and other countries outside of Asia. The World Anti-Communist League meeting in Saigon last December further accepted the 23rd of January as a World Freedom Day, making it a common standard for mankind's struggle for freedom against enslavement. This is the new and added significance for our gathering this year.

The Freedom Day movement has been treated with such respect because of three important factors Freedom Day represents, all of which are vital to the victory of freedom.

First because it represents the determined fight made by the 22,000 Chinese and Korean ex-POW who in defiance of Communist brainwashing and pressures elected to turn their backs on the Communist Party and choose freedom.

Secondly because it brings to our mind the historical fact that the United Nations was able to assert justice on an international scale to stand firm on the principle that repatriation of the prisoners of war had to be based on individual volition.

Thirdly because it reminds the world of the active support given by the governments of the Republic of Korea, the U.S.A., and the Republic of China to those 22,000 brave men in their struggle for freedom.

And it was precisely the combination of these three factors which wrote that glorious page in mankind's fight for freedom against Communist enslavement: determination in fighting, firm adherence to principles and giving active support from without. These three precepts courageously employed will make it possible for the camp of freedom and justice to defeat the forces of Communist enslavement in the battle raging even today. May I offer my thinking on these precepts.

With regard to determination in fighting, the first step is to convince the world that Freedom's victory is a certainty. We must persuade the world to look closely at the ebbing of the Communist movement and the splitting up of the Communist camp, so that the fear of Communist might be eradicated. Freedom can be enjoyed only by those who have fought and are fighting for. For the safeguarding of the freedom we now possess and for the restoration of freedom to those who have lost it, we have to fight Communism courageously. Many have struggled against Communism behind the Iron Curtain to escape to freedom. But the situation today has become appropriate for more active methods, that is to say, for fighting against

Communist behind the Iron Curtain. As the former Red Guard members, the intellectuals and the Communist cadre are now being purged by Mao Tse-tung, we send our call to them and to other people to join the united front against Mao advocated by President Chiang for the rescue of the nation, so that the intellectuals can join force with the peasants and workers and the urban resistance can link up with that in the countryside. Presently we shall see resistance moving from scattered attempts into an unified effort, and from the political to the military front. With help from us, the forces of resistance shall one day destroy the Communist camp from within.

With regard to the adherence to firm principles, the Free World should be brought to realize that we should not permit coexistence with enslavement for ever. If we can only watch as bystanders as more than one-third of the human race continue to be enslaved, and as free countries are subject to Communist infiltration and subversion, the freedom we do possess now will be under serious jeopardy. Appeasement policies must go. The illusion of peaceful coexistence must be removed. And in negotiating with the Communists, the freedom world will do well to depend on strength and courageous action to uphold the principle that all mankind should share freedom, without any concessions that might compromise the principle. In the Paris peace talks, the U.S. and the Republic of Vietnam, we are confident, will adhere to these principles and meet with true success.

With regard to giving active support to the freedom fighters, we submit two points, both of them vital; that the Freedom must give moral and substantive support to every freedom movement behind the Iron Curtain, and that the countries in the Free World must cooperate closely in coping with the common threat posed by the Communist camp. The United Front against Mao, which is advocated by President Chiang, is to give strong support in action to our compatriots fighting for freedom on the mainland. This Rally is held here today to further the movement of this United Front. We hope fervently that the spirit of the movement will grow throughout the world so that the fighters of freedom everywhere will unite to defeat the Communist forces.

With respect to mutual support and cooperation in the Free World, the primary task is to expedite the forming of regional security organizations as basis for a world united front against Communist enslavement. Asia's need is especially urgent here. Last year at the annual conferences of both the Asian Parliamentarians' Union and the World Anti-Communist League, my advocacy of a regional security organization for the Asian and Pacific Area met with support from all the delegates. It is becoming increasingly clearer that the strength of the nations in the region must be developed to remove the source of disasters therein and to safeguard the independence, freedom, prosperity and peace of the individual nations.

The world desires peace and mankind requires freedom. Unless freedom is enjoyed by all mankind there will never be true peace in the world. Fifteen years ago, those 22,000 Chinese and Koreans so attained the freedom they were denied, scoring a great victory against the Communists. Today the very same precepts will help us fight for mankind's freedom to create peace for the world.

VICE PRESIDENT YEN CHIA-KAN'S ADDRESS TO THE MAO-SUPPRESSION AND NATIONAL SALVATION RALLY ON THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM DAY, JANUARY 23, 1969

Today marks the 15th anniversary of Freedom Day. Just 15 years ago, 14,000 former prisoners of the Korean War made their unprecedented, sagacious and greatly courageous choice between freedom and slavery and between the brightness of day and the

darkness of night. Determined to cast off their shackles, these brave men received the righteous support of the free world and succeeded in returning to their free fatherland. This magnificent feat has added one of the brightest pages to the history of man's struggle to survive in freedom. For these reasons, we decided—at the first rally celebrating their freedom—to designate January 23 as Freedom Day. The objectives are to strengthen the anti-Communist forces of the world and bring them together in a mighty movement to destroy the Iron Curtain and liberate enslaved peoples everywhere.

The courage of these 14,000 freedom fighters reflected man's unshakable aspirations for freedom and ceaseless antagonism toward tyranny. The momentous goals of Freedom Day constitute an expression of the free world's determination and confidence that justice and human rights will prevail. Our Freedom Day movement subsequently has brought an enthusiastic response and strong support from Asia and other parts of the world. Freedom Day is now a symbol of the world anti-Communist movement. With constant enlargement and expansion, the Freedom Day spirit has become a towering beacon for the enslaved people and a weapon that can penetrate the Iron Curtain.

Encouraged by the Freedom Day movement, many people have succeeded in breaking through the Iron Curtains of both East and West during the last 15 years. More than 150,000 refugees from the Chinese mainland have made their way by air and sea to freedom in Taiwan. More than two million escaped to other places in Asia. These escapes testify to the profound influence of the Freedom Day movement in the anti-Communist struggle.

This growing importance led the Second Conference of the World Anti-Communist League, meeting in Saigon last month, to designate January 23 as World Freedom Day. The day thus acquires a deeper significance in anti-Communist history and is assured of further growth of the potential of generating an overwhelming anti-Communist tide throughout the world.

As yet we have not completed the task of tearing down the Iron Curtain and freeing the enslaved people of Asia. The anti-Communist war rages on in our region. Nevertheless, the situation is becoming more favorable to us and to the rest of the free world. We are moving toward unity while the Communists know only schism and disruption. Our chances of Iron Curtain destruction and of the liberation of those behind it are improving day by day.

Celebration of World Freedom Day and establishment of the Mao-Suppression and National Salvation United Front involve much more than our own survival and progress. We are also fulfilling our obligations to the causes of world peace and human freedom. I should like to make these three points:

First, the world's worst "hell on earth" is the Chinese mainland, where Mao Tse-tung's tyranny and fanatical ambitions have not been curbed by internal turmoil. President Chiang Kai-shek has told us that the center of gravity in world affairs is in Asia, that the root of Asian evil is on the Chinese mainland and that mankind cannot escape from wickedness until the evil Peiping regime is destroyed. We must solemnly acknowledge that the suppression of Mao for the salvation of the country is our inescapable responsibility. Chinese at home and abroad, in front of and behind the enemy, will respond to President Chiang's ringing summons. They will join the alliance in both spirit and in action. So it is that we shall forge our united front for Mao-suppression and national salvation, overthrow the Peiping regime and restore liberty to the hundreds of millions of our mainland compatriots.

Second, we shall remind our democratic allies that we have reached the dividing line

between day and night in the world anti-Communist struggle. We must not lose this golden opportunity for the expeditious strengthening of the world anti-Communist front and for the unifying of our global strategy. Marching shoulder to shoulder, we shall take the strong actions that are necessary to pull down the Iron Curtain and bring about the earliest possible liberation of our compatriots. Additionally, we shall heighten our vigilance against Communist peace traps, thereby assuring that the tens of thousands who have given their lives to resist Communist aggression in Korea and Vietnam shall not have died in vain.

Third, we call once more upon the countries of the free world to provide humanitarian support and relief for refugees from the Chinese mainland. We join in expression of hope that overseas Chinese everywhere will unite together and accept their share of responsibility for assisting compatriots who escape from Communist tyranny.

The supreme objectives of Freedom Day and the Mao-Suppression and National Salvation United Front are both the extinction of the Communist threat, the freeing of those who are enslaved and the bringing of permanent peace to the world. I call upon my fellow countrymen and all the freedom-loving peoples of the world to grid themselves in courageous determination and march resolutely forward to victory in this most decisive battle of human history.

SPEECH BY U.S. CONGRESSMAN JOHN HALL BUCHANAN

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: We are gathered on this Freedom Day to commemorate the courageous act of 22,000 men; 8,000 of Korea and 14,000 of China, who when given the choice as prisoners-of-war, chose freedom. We are gathered also to commemorate the larger truth that wherever men are given the choice, they will choose freedom. Those of us who have joined hands and hearts together as the forces of freedom upon our troubles there, must recognize that the force with which we are confronted in our time is very strong. The world Communist movement controls in its varying forms more than 25 percent of the earth surface and more than 1 billion of the world's people. In Asia, in Africa, in Latin America and in Europe, although there is division within the Communist world, between the two giants of that world, the Soviet Union and Red China, nevertheless, they are joined in one purpose—to replace our governments of freedom with their way of tyranny and they are active all over the world toward that end. In Latin America, Fidel Castro works to subvert the Western hemisphere and as promise to bring us one to many Vietnams. In Africa, both the Communist government on the mainland of China and the Soviet Union has worked feverishly to subvert and to bring the nations of Africa within their orbit if they can. In Europe, we have witnessed the sad fate of the people of Czechoslovakia and indeed of all the captive nations in Eastern Europe and here in Asia, we have witnessed the threat of the government on the mainland of China, and the active present war of aggression of North Vietnam. As you have stood courageously through the years against that great Communist power which has enslaved so many of your compatriots upon the mainland, as the people of the Republic of Korea stood firm against the aggressor of North Korea and of Red China, even now the people of the Republic of Vietnam stand firm against the aggressor. They have formed in the midst of their day of trouble a constitutional republic. They have elected a free government of the people. They have elected a parliament which is dedicated to the proposition of protecting the people of the Republic of Vietnam against the aggression. And with our continued help, I am certain they shall suc-

ceed in their high purpose of conserving their freedom.

Confronted as we are by the great challenge of world Communism, let us look at the contrast between that way of tyranny and our way of freedom. I can think no greater illustration to that contrast than those of you who live in Taiwan under the government of the Republic of China as contrast with those who suffered under the government of Mao upon the mainland. What is the contrast between the condition of the people of China under these two regimes? Here you live in freedom upon the mainland there is only tyranny. Here you have made great economic, scientific and industrial progress. There the great leap forward became instead a leap backward. And the cultural revolution has resulted in further destitution and disillusion. Here you live in growing prosperity for all your people with real land reform and with the opportunity for all to participate in economic and scientific progress and here you have, like the carp who swam up stream to the cliff through the dragon's gate to become the dragon you have worked together to create something of value upon Taiwan. As the oyster takes the adversity of the grain of sand and perfects it into the value and beauty of the pearl. So you have here conserved that which is of value, of great value and Chinese art and culture and built upon it new achievements as an expression of what the great people of China can do when they are permitted to follow the way of freedom. In vivid contrast to this subversion of Red China, of Africa, and of Asian Nations, you have rather turned in aid and assistance to help them to achieve. You have given leadership to the mutual defense of Asia and provide a large part of the whole for regional development and regional partnership in mutual defense. You may be assured that my country will continue under its new administration the firm friendship which exists between our two Republics. We will continue our mutual defense treaty and will continue to work as partners in Asia for the development and toward the freedom of all its people. What will be the outcome of the great struggle between the forces of freedom and tyranny in our time? May I say it is my confidence that time shall come when the great people of China shall be united again not under the government of Mao or any of his associates but as the Republic of China in the tradition of Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek, your great leader. What shall be the outcome of the larger struggle around the world? I believe that its good is by its nature stronger than evil. As it is in the nature of light to cast out darkness so that it is in the nature of freedom to overcome tyranny and that freedom shall live and not die in our time and the wave of the future lies not with the Communists or with the tyrants but with the forces of freedom in our world. As the mighty eagle, the symbol of my Republic, was born not to drabble in the dust but to fly, so the creature man was born to be free.

Let us therefore with hope and high courage labor together toward that day, toward the time which shall surely come when for all mankind the long night of tyranny shall come to an end and men shall walk together in the light of a new day of freedom.

PVT. LOUIS V. ALBI, JR., KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Louis V. Albi, Jr., a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in

Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY SOLDIER, PRIVATE ALBI, JR., IS KILLED IN VIET COMBAT

Army Pvt. Louis V. Albi, Jr., 25, of 1637 Lochwood road, has been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Albi served with the 82d Airborne Division near Saigon. He was attached to Company B, 2d Battalion, 505th Regiment and worked at the unit's fire base loading artillery.

He enlisted in the Army in November, 1967, after working for a time as a cutter in a tailor shop. He had been in Vietnam for eight months.

He graduated from the eighth grade at School No. 32, Guilford Avenue Elementary School.

Surviving are his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis V. Albi; four brothers, Lino Albi, Rudolph Albi and Remo Albi, all of Baltimore, and Mario Albi, serving in the Navy; and two sisters, Mrs. Angelina Fantom, of Baltimore, and Mrs. Eleanor Holloper, of Ontario, Oreg.

JOINT STATEMENT URGES BROAD-ER FEDERAL SUPPORT OF COLLEGES

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, recently the Great Lakes Colleges Association and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest issued "A Joint Statement on Federal Support of Higher Education." The statement represents the views of 22 private, primarily undergraduate, institutions which are noted for maintaining high quality education.

The statement makes the following points, among others:

First. The entire national complex of higher education will require continued and increased Federal support if this country is to meet its clear educational needs in the decades to come.

Second. The report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education cited in the statement, presents a broad, bold plan which our member institutions endorse.

Third. The undergraduate sector of the educational complex has received a disproportionately small portion of Federal support even though it is the sole source of students who enter graduate programs.

Fourth. Little focused attention has been given to the special—and expensive—efforts of certain institutions which maintain high quality programs, and which send a disproportionately high percentage of students into training for the professions.

Fifth. Although the actions of the Congress in support of the natural sciences are to be applauded, the lack of adequate support for the arts, humanities, and certain of the social sciences has and will progressively create serious imbalances.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the two associations have appointed a joint committee on national policy. The four members of this joint committee, all distinguished college presidents, are: President Landrum Bolling, Earlham College; President James P. Dixon, Antioch College; President Sidney Rand, St. Olaf College; and President Miller Upton, Beloit College.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that many Members of the House will be interested in the "Joint Statement on Federal Support of Higher Education," I include this statement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A JOINT STATEMENT ON FEDERAL SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION BY THE GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION AND THE ASSOCIATED COLLEGES OF THE MIDWEST, JANUARY 1969

We, the member colleges of the *Great Lakes Colleges Association*¹ and the *Associated Colleges of the Midwest*,² sharing the nationwide concern for further development of the most effective national policy in support of higher education, wish to record our judgment concerning certain major principles which should shape that policy and some of the central provisions which should be incorporated into legislation to implement national policy.

Basically, we endorse the fundamental objectives stated in the recent *Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*³ which calls for expanded and diverse programs of federal support for American colleges and universities in order to accomplish the twin top-priority purposes of improving the quality of higher education and providing genuine equality of opportunity for our young people to acquire it.

We strongly support the emphasis which the Carnegie Commission gives to the desirability of large-scale and diverse types of direct assistance to students. This, we believe, is essential if we are to carry through national objectives for promoting the personal advancement and social contribution of the needy and the disadvantaged. Such assistance should include work-study grants, scholarships, and loans.

We endorse the recommendation that institutions which accept federally-aided students, in keeping with some formula similar to the one which obtained in the original and highly successful GI Bill of Rights program, should receive direct federal institutional grants. Recognizing that institutions with students who receive partial support from educational opportunity grants have added seriously to their financial burdens, we urge the provision of adequate funds, again as recommended by the Carnegie Commission, for matching grants for non-federal support of students in addition to federal opportunity grants.

We endorse the principle implicit in the proposal for the creation of the National Student Loan Bank to offer all students, re-

¹ *The Great Lakes Colleges Association*: Albion College, Antioch College, Denison University, DePauw University, Earlham College, Hope College, Kalamazoo College, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Wabash College, College of Wooster.

² *The Associated Colleges of the Midwest*: Beloit College, Carleton College, Coe College, Cornell College, Grinnell College, Knox College, Lawrence University, Monmouth College, Ripon College, St. Olaf College.

³ *A Special Report and Recommendation by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibilities for Higher Education*. McGraw-Hill, December 1968.

ardless of need, the opportunity to ease the burdens which fall with increasing severity on a very large cross-section of American families with children in college. The American traditions of self-help which have so long influenced our approaches to the financing of higher education still have validity, but they need to be adapted to our times and to the realities of our inflationary economy.

We wish further to record our strong endorsement of the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission that a significant portion of federal support should be channeled into efforts to improve the *quality* of education, including the development of new and improved processes and techniques of education and the upgrading of programs which have fallen behind. In such efforts at educational improvement we would urge that all areas of learning in our colleges and universities be eligible for support in the interest of maintaining a healthy and creative balance in our academic and intellectual life.

Taking note of the possibility that the current Congress and the new national administration may propose additional legislation concerned with higher education, we wish to call attention to certain areas of education which need particular attention:

1. We feel that *undergraduate* education should receive greater support than it has had up to now. This is not to argue against the large support which has gone and must continue to go to graduate study and research. It is to say that there is a serious deficiency in support of undergraduate education.

2. We feel that the *social sciences, humanities, and the fine arts* require special increases in support. Again, this is not to argue against the understandable large assistance support for work in the *natural sciences*. It is simply to emphasize that there is an evident danger, if not current reality, of serious imbalance in our institutions due to marked inadequacies in support for these other fields.

3. We feel that, within some formula of fairness, equity, and open opportunity for all institutions, there should be provision for "bonus" support for demonstrably outstanding achievement in the quality of education.

We are aware of the fact that H.R. 35 (National Institutional Grants Program, introduced by Representatives Miller and Daddario) is receiving active consideration in the Congress. During the deliberations over the merits of this proposed legislation, due consideration should be given to these possible revisions which, we believe, are in consonance with recommendations of the Carnegie Commission:

(a) Recognition of the number of students who *graduate with majors in the sciences* as the primary basis for the awarding of grants to institutions.

(b) Some provision for supplementary grants to institutions related to the number of their graduates who *continue with professional and graduate study in the sciences*.

(c) A provision that some significant portion of the total federal support for the sciences incorporated into this bill should be allocated as *direct aid to students, with appropriate matching grants to institutions*.

We further call attention to the fact that by its limitation to support of the "sciences," important as it is to have increased financial assistance for science education, H.R. 35 perpetuates and accentuates the developing imbalance among departments and programs in higher education. We would urge, with Representative Daddario, that some attempt be made to provide appropriate and comparable federal support for other academic departments and programs not now covered in the present bill.

AQUANAUT CANNON A HERO— DESERVING OF HIGH AWARD

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure in submitting for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which tells of the dedication, the contributions, and the final great sacrifice of Berry L. Cannon, an aquanaut who lived in Panama City, Fla., and who worked in the oceanographic program at the Navy Mine Defense Laboratory there. The editorial appeared in the Panama City News-Herald, one of Florida's truly outstanding publications. Lawrence Gibb is publisher and Mike Darley is editor. I endorse the editorial in its entirety:

AQUANAUT CANNON A HERO—DESERVING OF HIGH AWARD

Man's pathways of progress have invariably been marked along the way by the grave stones of uncommon men.

These intrepid explorers and pioneers have shared certain identifying denominators: courage, dedication, humility, dynamic drive, and an abiding love for their God, their fellow men, their families, and the goal for which they sought.

Over the seas and across the lands, they pursued a better life and more abundance for those who remained behind; all too often to be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice attended only by the hovering Valkyrie.

The latter day quest of limitless space has already added three astronauts to the select society of Valhalla.

And now, the depths of the seas—which hold out the golden promise of wealth and plenty to a burgeoning humanity—have claimed their first heroic explorer, Aquanaut Berry L. Cannon.

He would deary this praise. In fact, Berry Cannon might shed a tear at having been taken away from the task before its completion. He might even smile quietly, and find a sad amusement at being cast as a member of the exclusive club of explorers and pioneers who have died for daring to blaze new trailways.

He was doing his job. He was doing it well. Berry Cannon was a master at his trade and profession, and he asked nothing more than this; to do his job and do it well.

But those of us who remain to benefit from his courageous work owe him something. We owe him due recognition as a hero, for that he was.

Berry L. Cannon knew hardship and heartache in his personal life. He knew the personal sacrifice of loneliness at being called away from his beloved family—Mary Louise, Patrick, Kevin and Neal—for what must have seemed endless weeks and months in the saga of Sealab.

His dedication took him away from his beloved Florida in pursuit of education and preparation to participate in the enormous Sealab undertaking. He worked and studied and grew in proficiency and expertise, and finally achieved his berth as one of the select few to earn the title, "Aquanaut."

Then it happened. With a moment of achievement at hand, and inches away, in the black silence of a distant sea, death denied Berry L. Cannon the satisfaction of seeing the most adventurous Sealab experiment, yet, begin.

His massive contribution to the project remains. His memory is with his family and

friends to be cherished and recalled for all time.

His assignment will be taken over by another, and the project will go ahead, for this is a fact of life, and the way Berry Cannon would have willed it.

He has been memorialized by his Church, by his Panama City station, the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory, and by the Navy at large with the final salute at the brink of the grave.

We strongly feel that certain things remain to be done:

That the citizenry of Panama City (perhaps under the auspices of the Bay County Ministerial Association) conduct a fitting memorial to this man for his achievement and sacrifice that appear to extend far beyond his brief 33 years;

That the Congress of the United States consider a fitting award or medal in posthumous recognition of his bequest to the nation and its people;

That consideration be given and action taken to rename "Princeton Circle" where he lived as "Berry L. Cannon Circle;"

That the Sealab III Experiment be permitted to continue without undue delay and pursued to the achievement of the glorious promises it holds;

And that each of us bow a moment and say a prayer of thanksgiving for having been privileged to be served by such a man, and for the family which remains, that they may find comfort at this hour of tragic loss.

Though we're certain a Benevolent Creator has already said them to Berry L. Cannon, may we too say with deep sincerity, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report on a large meeting held in the great county of Rockland, N.Y., on Sunday, February 23, 1969. The meeting was held in the Spring Valley High School, and the audience overflowed the auditorium and occupied the gymnasium as well.

The meeting was called to express a great concern about the dangerous situation in the Middle East and more specifically to express the feeling of kinship, support, and solidarity with the State of Israel. Speeches were made in which the fundamental point was made of our continuing interest and relationship and friendship with the State of Israel. I, myself, was pleased to be present and speak of the need of our constant support for this small, struggling nation—democratic, stable, cultured—as a matter of fact, a bright light in a dark area. The meeting culminated in a fine resolution which was presented to me which I am pleased to include in the RECORD and bring to the attention of all the Members of the Congress. I commend it to your perusal:

We, Citizens of Rockland County, assembled here this date, being mindful of ominous developments and continuing turmoil in the Middle East,

And concerned over penetration of this area by forces that promote communism, undermine democracy and threaten the long-term interests of the United States,

And being, moreover, deeply concerned that the democratic State of Israel be supported in its struggle for survival and its quest for a just peace with its neighbors,

DO Respectfully Resolve and Hereby Petition the President of the United States and The Congress, for reasons of morality, historic justice and our own vital interests, to assist and help preserve the democratic State of Israel; and to this end, to enable her to procure such aid, defensive arms, and other requirements, as are necessary to her existence and survival as a bulwark of democracy in the Middle East.

Dated: Spring Valley, New York, February 23, 1969.

CAPT. FREDDY McFARREN SERVES WITH DISTINCTION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Capt. Freddy McFarren gave a television interview some weeks ago in Vietnam, he had no idea it would become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the official record of the U.S. Congress.

McFarren, of Cleburne, was interviewed some weeks ago for station KRLD in Dallas and station WBAP in Fort Worth, by their correspondents in Vietnam.

The television airing of the interview might have passed unnoticed except for the home folks, except that Captain McFarren was wounded on the day the Dallas station showed the interview. That led to a story by Linda Hines in the Cleburne High School paper, which was sent to me because I appointed McFarren to West Point 6 years ago.

Some of America's finest young men are today serving their country honorably in Vietnam. We hear and read so much about the young people who disdain honor, duty, and patriotism, but too little about the majority who do believe in these basic strengths of our country. I would like to pay tribute to one of these brave men, Capt. Freddy McFarren, of Cleburne, Tex., who serves as an example of devotion to his ideals. It was my privilege to appoint him to West Point in 1962.

I would like to quote from a feature story in the Cleburne High School newspaper, written by Linda Hines. The story told of television interviews with Captain McFarren on stations KRLD and WBAP. A few quotes from the story will best serve to illustrate that some of the Nation's finest and brightest young men choose careers of service to their country. Following are some of those quotes:

McFarren has twice been decorated by the South Vietnamese. In addition he has received the Combat Infantry Badge and the Bronze Star. . . .

On the same day of the television interview, Captain McFarren was wounded. . . .

McFarren preferred combat-duty working with soldiers in the field (to desk duty). When wounded, he had been in the field over six months. . . .

McFarren planned a military career from an early age. He entered West Point, June 28, 1962. . . .

Captain Freddy McFarren volunteered to go to Vietnam. He felt it his duty. . . .

While in Cleburne High School, McFarren was President of the National Honor Society. He was a member of the Key Club, Student Council, Math Club and A.B.C. Club. He was vice president of his Junior Class and treasurer of his Sophomore Class.

I hope Captain McFarren's wounds do not end his military career but if he does leave the military, I am confident of his success in any field he chooses.

CHANGE FISCAL YEAR TO OCTOBER 1-SEPTEMBER 30

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 of this year I introduced H.R. 6529, which would change the Federal fiscal year to an October 1-September 30 basis. According to an article written by Mr. Leslie Carpenter for the February 23 Washington Star, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) has indicated that he is considering a similar measure. As chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON speaks with experience and authority. I concur with his position that a fiscal year ending later in the calendar year would give Congress much-needed time to complete appropriation bills. In order that all Members of Congress might benefit from Mr. MAHON's opinion, I would like to introduce at this point the article written by Mr. Carpenter:

House Appropriations Committee Chairman George H. Mahon, D-Tex., is convinced the federal fiscal year will have to end later in the calendar year than June 30—as it now does—if financial chaos is to be avoided.

But before he proposes legislation, he wants to finish a study of all the complications that could result.

For example, more than half the states are on a July 1 to June 30 fiscal year, just like Washington. They probably would change if Washington did.

As more new spending programs are written into law, Congress needs additional time to finish appropriations bills. For years, Congress has been missing the June 30 fiscal year deadline on some money measures, and the situation has been steadily getting worse.

ONLY ONE BILL PASSED

Except for supplemental money bills—applying to the preceding fiscal year—Congress in 1968 had passed only one major appropriations bill by June 30.

That one provided money for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the White House executive offices. All other departments and agencies had to go into the new fiscal year without any definite idea of how much money Congress was going to give them to spend.

Mahon is thinking of an Oct. 1-Sept. 30 fiscal year, but confides it might make more sense to conform with the calendar, starting off as late as Jan. 1.

Making the problem worse now is the shift in political control at the White House.

No Cabinet officer or agency head is yet ready—in late February—to tell Congress how much money he wants because the Nixon administration has reached no final decisions on amendments to the Lyndon Johnson budget.

The only business the House Appropriations Committee has been able to transact this winter has been with the federal judiciary, which is independent of Nixon's executive branch and handles its own money requests.

SPECIFIC FIGURES AWAITED

Once Nixon appointees are ready to talk specific figures, appropriations bills should move faster in Congress this year.

LUCRETIA C. MOTT

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session, January 3, 1969, I had the distinct pleasure of participating in a most stimulating and thought provoking memorial service for Lucretia C. Mott. This service was held in the crypt of the Capitol and was sponsored by the National Woman's Rights Party, of which Mrs. Emma Guffy Miller is president. Mrs. Miller presided at the service, and by her comments throughout the program, added immensely to its depth and meaning.

The primary purpose of this service was to honor Lucretia Mott, who was one of the founders of the woman's rights movement in this country, and one of the movement's most articulate advocates. The program was even broader in scope, however, and it served to remind us once again of the goals of the National Woman's Party, and the wonderful work which it has accomplished on behalf of women's rights.

Mr. Speaker, the memorial service was of such a high caliber that I would like to share the remarks made during the service with my colleagues. The proceedings were as follows:

LUCRETIA MOTT MEMORIAL SERVICE, THE CAPITOL CRYPT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 3, 1969

Welcome: Mrs. Emma Guffy Miller, President, National Woman's Party.

Presentation of Colors: Joint Armed Forces Color Guard (please remain standing); The National Anthem.

Yesterday: "The Enlightened Woman," Barbara Ireton, Legislative Chairman, National Organization for Women (NOW); presentation of Red Carnation.

Introduction of Honored Speakers: Mrs. Miller.

"Lucretia Mott: Her Contributions to Women," The Honorable Fred Schwengel, Iowa.

Other presentations from Congress: Mrs. Mary Brooks, Assistant Chairman, Republican National Committee.

Mrs. Joe Chittenden, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell, President, Federation of Republican Women's Clubs.

Today: "The Action Woman," Frances McDowell, Airline Stewardess; introduction of Action Women Representatives; presentation of Red Carnation.

Tomorrow: "The Whole Woman," Lisa Bingley, Student; presentation of Red Carnation.

Closing Remarks: Mrs. Miller, "The Equal Rights Amendment"; The Battle Hymn of the Republic.

Our special thanks to the following for their support of the Memorial Services: Hon. Fred Schwengel, Hon. Eugene J. McCarthy, Hon. Edmund S. Muskie, Hon. Catherine May, Hon. Martha W. Griffiths, Hon. John J. Sparkman, Hon. Frank J. Horton, Hon. Robert Dole, Hon. Florence Dwyer, Hon. Gilbert Gude, Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, and Hon. James B. Allen.

Floral arrangement presented by Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson, the White House.

ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN THE LUCRETIA MOTT MEMORIAL SERVICE IN THE CRYPT OF THE CAPITOL, FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1969

Alpha Kappa Alpha, Miss Valerie Chase.
American Newspaper Women's Club, Mrs. Mary Smith.

Capitol Hill Restoration Society, Honorable Fred Schwengel.

Democratic National Committee (Women's Division).

General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Joe Chittenden.

Crupeo Espanol, Miss Consuelo Reyes-Calderon.

National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Mrs. Ruby Kendrick.

National Association of Women Lawyers, Miss Maurine Abernathy.

National Association of Women Legislators, Miss Louise Gore.

National Federation of B&PW Clubs.

National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell.

National League of American Pen Women, Inc., Miss Cecelia Fine.

National Organization for Women (NOW), Barbara Ireton.

National Society of Daughters of American Revolution, Mrs. Douglas Dyer.

National Woman's Party, Mrs. Mary A. Birkhead.

People's Mandate Committee, Miss Mabel Vernon.

Ladies Grand Army of the Republic, Mrs. Henry E. Ewing.

Republican National Committee, Mrs. Mary Brooks, Assistant Chairman.

Society of Friends.

Soroptimist International, Miss Ella Werner, National Officer; Miss Dorothy Foster, District President.

St. Joan's Alliance of Catholic Women, Miss Sylvia Radyx.

United States Daughters of 1812.

United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Richard Purdue, D.C. President.

Veterans of Foreign Wars (Women's Auxiliary), Mrs. Bonnie Moore.

Women's Bar Association of D.C., Miss Maurine Abernathy.

Women's Christian Temperance Union, Mrs. Mildred B. Harmon.

Women's Division of the Metropolitan Police, Lt. Jayne T. Rich.

Women's National Farm & Garden Association, Mrs. Roger Coustry, President; Mrs. Louis M. Dent, V.P., Virginia; Mrs. Meta Grace Keebler.

Women's National Press Club, Miss Margaret Kilgore.

Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights.

Women's Medical Association (American).

Zonta Club International.

Veterans of the Civil War, Mrs. Charles M. Barud.

LUCRETIA MOTT AND HER CONTRIBUTIONS
HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

Born in the year of 1793, when the nation was four years to live to year 1880 or 87 fruitful years of service to humanity. She was a Quaker by birth and conviction. Her intelligence and capabilities assisted her in becoming a preacher and a great teacher.

Lucretia Mott was the real founder and the soul of the woman's rights movement in America and England. She was the outstanding feminine worker in the struggle to rid our country of slavery. She advocated labor unions in a day when they were almost unknown and generally considered illegal. She proscribed war and worked diligently for liberal religion. For the true religion—the religion of concern with action.

A woman of rare refinement, yet she was not afraid to challenge the evils of her day, or to speak upon the public platform, an act then considered unwomanly and indecent.

These achievements, combined with her undeniably beautiful character and innate spirituality, is why she is known as the "Greatest American Woman." No woman in American history ever combined so many outstanding talents or participated influentially in so many varied movements, and with such grace of charm, as Lucretia Mott. She was great in deeds, great in womanhood, and great in those attributes of femininity that women strive for, and men demand.

In her many controversies she never lost the poise of womanly dignity. She was always essentially true to her sex. We are told she grew old beautifully, so that every wrinkle in her face was the accolade of Time in the ripeness of experience.

In her day, America, as now, was rocked with a great economic problem—slavery—defended as entrenched greed always is defended. America had its nation-shaking disputes over the Constitution, its vigilantes, and a Supreme Court controversy that came to a climax with the Dred Scott decision. America, then as now, had its conservatives, reactionaries, radicals, liberals and that inert mass of people who talk up progress until suddenly they discover it cannot be accomplished without ridicule and sacrifice of social and business prestige, where-upon they become suddenly very "Sound" in their views and adhere to old abuses.

Our Nation needs today the enlightened liberalism, a spirit of moderation, the sanity, and the sincerity of purpose of this great woman who did much, the women of America, the right to go upon the public forum to discuss living issues of our century. Let us not fail as carriers of the responsibility she entrusted to our hands.

Theodore Tilton, a great journalist of the Civil War period said, "In the same sense in which the greatest man ever produced in this country was Benjamin Franklin, the greatest woman ever produced in this country is Lucretia Mott."

Sensing problems of her time she became a leader and abolitionist. She organized the Female Anti-Slavery Society and became its leader. She journeyed to London, only to be refused admission as a delegate to the World's Anti-Slavery Convention because of her sex. She then went to Elizabeth Cady Stanton in Seneca Falls, New York to organize and began to work for Women's Rights movement.

On religion she boldly prophesied the coming of the day when there would be a universal religion. The Great Spirit of the Indian, the Quaker, the Blessed Mary of the Catholics, and Brahma of the Hindoo would she prophesied eventually to become the same thing. When this was accomplished she said, "There would come such a faith, and such liberty, as should redeem the world."

She would recognize the grouping of churches today and welcome the change. How she would have gloried in that day when all religious leaders joined in the famous march from the Washington monument to the Lincoln monument to hear Martin Luther King utter those famous words "I had a dream."

I gladly join all of you today to honor this

great pioneer. This great female character has had a wholesome influence on the lives of millions in her time and millions since her active life was stilled by death. She belongs here in statue form so we may be reminded of the great spirit that should burn in our heart and minds today.

As a paraphrase from the words of Lincoln, Here truly is a character and life "to hold against the sky to match the mountain and the sea."

I am glad to have the honor to join you in doing honor to her and to be with you as you seek to make other men wiser and better.

THE ENLIGHTENED WOMAN

(Speech delivered by Barbara Ireton, National Organization for Women, and chairman of arrangements committee for the Lucretia C. Mott Memorial Service, sponsored by the National Woman's Party, Capitol Crypt, January 3, 1969)

On July 14, 1848, the Seneca County Courier carried the following announcement: "Woman's Rights Convention: A convention to discuss the social, civil, and religious condition and rights of women, will be held in the Wesleyan Chapel at Seneca Falls, New York, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 19th and 20th of July, current. The public generally are invited to be present when Lucretia Mott of Philadelphia and other ladies and gentlemen will address the convention."

This meeting was years in the dreaming; only three days in planning. Within those few days, however, Lucretia Mott and the "other ladies and gentlemen" made exhaustive research into documents to guide them in writing the declaration of sentiments and resolutions they wished to present.

The reports of Peace, Temperance, and Anti-Slavery conventions were examined, but all seemed too tame for the inauguration of the rebellion these women planned.

But, as is often the case, the most profound ideas can be stated in the simplest words. And, in fact, the perfect declaration had already been written and was waiting, with very little change, for the women's use. It read: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights . . ." We all know these familiar words—but this was the first time they had ever been applied to the other half of humanity—to women.

At this first women's convention, Lucretia Mott presented 12 resolutions, all of which were adopted, and which make me proud to be one of her spiritual and actual descendants. Judge for yourself how revolutionary her sentiments were in 1848—and in 1969:

"Resolved, That such laws as conflict in any way with the true and substantial happiness of woman, are contrary to the great precept of nature and are of no validity.

"Resolved, That all laws which prevent woman from occupying such a station as her conscience shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature, and therefore of no force or authority.

"Resolved, That woman is man's equal—was intended to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

"Resolved, That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live, that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position, nor their ignorance, by asserting that they have all the rights they want.

"Resolved, That inasmuch as man, while claiming for himself intellectual superiority, does accord to woman moral superiority, it is preeminently his duty to encourage her to

speak and teach, as she has an opportunity, in all religious assemblies.

"Resolved, That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behavior that is required of woman in the social state, should also be required of man, and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

"Resolved, That the objection of indelicacy and impropriety, which is so often brought against woman when she addresses a public audience, comes with a very ill grace from those who encourage, by their attendance, her appearance on the stage, in the concert, or in feats of the circus.

"Resolved, That woman has too long rested satisfied in the circumscribed limits which corrupt customs and a perverted application of the Scriptures have marked out for her, and that it is time she should move in the enlarged sphere which her great Creator has assigned her.

"Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise.

"Resolved, That the equality of human rights results necessarily from the fact of the identity of the race in capabilities and responsibilities; And finally

"Resolved, That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women, and for the securing to woman an equal participation with man in the various trades, professions, and commerce."

Let me quote now from Richard Nixon's writings: "Today, it is accepted as a matter of course that men and women have an equal electoral franchise in this country and that American men and women have an equal voice in choosing President, Congress, and state and local governing officials and bodies. But the task of achieving Constitutional equality between the sexes still is not completed. It is my hope that there will be widespread support for the Equal Rights Amendment to our Constitution, which would add equality between the sexes to the freedoms and liberties guaranteed to all Americans."

TEXT OF REMARKS OF HON. FRANK HOETON, OF NEW YORK, NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY'S LUCRETIA MOTT MEMORIAL SERVICE, CAPITOL CRYPT, OPENING OF THE 91ST CONGRESS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1969

This month, the new Administration and the Congress will embark on a new search for the solutions to the problems which plague our world and our country. We embark on this search armed with the purpose to afford progress through equal rights and opportunity to all citizens.

As the history of this nation has unfolded under our enlightened constitutional democracy, we have proven ourselves to be the nation best able to progress in the field of equal rights. A great share of this progress has been brought about through the efforts of the National Women's Rights movements—including the Women's Rights Party.

Today, Americans have become accustomed to thinking of equal rights movements solely in terms of civil rights for minorities, or rights of the poor, the underfed, the undereducated, and the less fortunate members of American society. There is no question that upgrading the rights and opportunities of these people carried the highest of priorities. But we cannot for a moment forget that the drive for the rights of an important majority in America is still incomplete. The fight begun by my fellow upstate New Yorkers, Lucretia Mott and Susan B. Anthony, to win equal stature for America's women is still being fought. I was proud as Congress convened one hour ago, to contribute to this fight by again introducing the women's rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

While America's women were given suffrage under the 19th Amendment, and while Title

VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 extends fair employment protection to women, there is a final step to be taken. Today, in 1969, there is nothing in the law or the Constitution to extend to women full equality of all rights, both civil and political.

Too few of us are aware of the distressing limitations on women's rights imposed by some states and localities, where women are discriminated against on juries, in property rights, and in making crucial legal and custodial decision concerning their own children.

Increasingly, these injustices are vanishing as America realizes that our potential cannot be fulfilled without utilizing the full abilities of every citizen without discrimination. Today, there are more women in American graduate and professional schools, more women pursuing full-time careers, more women actively involved and concerned about the politics and policies of our Nation. Many women's rights groups have turned their emphasis to urging "woman involvement" in the problems and solutions of present day America.

One such group which has gained national acclaim, is the "Woman Power" movement, begun in my own District in Rochester, New York, by the wife of a distinguished University President. The Woman Power advocates have concentrated on winning reform of our outmoded draft laws, and on urging a national service foundation which, through VISTA, the Peace Corps and other groups, would involve all the youth of America, men and women, in the pursuit of prosperity and equality for all.

Mrs. Marcia Ellingson, the founder of the Woman Power movement, typifies the drive and the concern that marks American womanhood today. She testified before the Platform Committees of both parties last summer—urging a more meaningful role for women in the life of this nation, and a more modern concept of service for our young people.

Mrs. Ellingson and her followers are beneficiaries of the great work that was done by those who met in 1848 at the first woman's convention in Seneca Falls, New York. Lucretia Mott, whom we honor here this afternoon and whose women's rights amendment I am pledged to support, has left a mighty mark on the evolution of American society toward one of equal rights, equal opportunity, equal participation, and equal recognition for every American, regardless of race, creed, religion, or sex.

I am proud to participate with you today to honor this great American, and to pursue her goals in the Congress.

REMARKS OF MRS. JOE D. CHITTENDEN, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, AT THE LUCRETIA MOTT MEMORIAL SERVICE, JANUARY 3, 1969

Mrs. Miller, ladies and gentlemen, the President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Walter Varney Magee, regrets so much that she is unable to be here today. But I bring you her greetings and her message that the General Federation of Women's Clubs joins you in memorializing a great woman whose contributions to the betterment of womankind provided the basic structure on which we continue to build today. For all women to be accorded equality of rights under the law would complete the dream Lucretia Mott envisioned so long ago.

The members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs pledge their continuing support of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

REMARKS BY MRS. LUCILLE SHRIVER, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, WASHINGTON, D.C., AT THE LUCRETIA MOTT MEMORIAL SERVICES, JANUARY 3, 1969

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and the Business and Professional Women's Foundation

feel very much "at home" in a group gathered to pay tribute to Lucretia Mott.

Her biographers tell us that her flaming determination to secure equal rights for women was kindled when she took her first job as a teacher—and immediately discovered that she would receive half the pay of the men teachers at the same school.

That was the beginning of the campaign for equal pay and equal opportunity which she waged until her death—and the 180,000 members of BPW are continuing that same campaign today.

Many laws have been passed, many barriers have been overcome since Lucretia Mott's day. But in 1969—as in 1830—it cannot be truly said that women have an equal chance for advancement or receive an equal reward for their skills.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs is 49 years old, and for 49 years it has been an ardent advocate of the equal rights championed by Lucretia Mott. Since 1933 we have supported the Equal Rights Amendment and today passage of that amendment has first priority in our legislative activities.

Lucretia Mott's goal has not yet been completely attained. But neither has it been forgotten.

SPEECH ON TODAY'S WOMAN'S ROLE IN SOCIETY
(By Frances McDowell, stewardess)

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to have the honor today of representing the stewardesses in our nation at this ceremony in gratitude to the National Woman's Party for their support to the stewardesses in obtaining the right to continue working after marriage, as well as the many other equalities obtained during the last few years.

I have always observed if a man is afraid to carry a lady's heavy bag or to shed a tear because of the danger of appearing feminine. A real man is a man who is confident of his own self-image as a man and whose masculinity is not threatened so easily by this, by competition of working women or women who are successful in some way. Man and woman can never really compete if each will only recognize the difference is not in what each does, but in the nature and how it is done. Men and women do not feel or appear alike while doing similar things, carrying a bag or flying an airplane. If men and women would, both, recognize this fully, man would be freer also, as he would not confine himself to certain careers only because those he might like to consider are considered "feminine." These ideas are outmoded and must be forgotten if we want to erase some of our unnecessary pressures, fears and problems and fully enjoy the free society that we want to see exist.

As the pace of society accelerates and changes all aspects of the world, it naturally and inevitably affects the woman's role. Man and woman, both, must understand the reason behind these changes before we can accept and adjust to them. Looking over the last 20 years we observe the increase in variety of products and services. This also created a greater variety of work. Technological changes and the need for greater efficiency resulted in a greater specialization of jobs. Rather than one worker turning the crank, pressing the buttons, managing the office and selling the products, the tasks had to be divided, each one doing one very specific work. More jobs appeared and a greater variety: women had to be included in a greater percentage in the labor force to fill the new requirements. Many types of jobs are not suited to many men or are not desired by them. This is equally true of women.

A wife who works or participates in society can be a better companion for her husband since she understands the business world he faces every day and, therefore, communicates with him better and is more un-

derstanding of him. She continues to be interesting to her husband if she has an interest of her own to share and discuss with him and a chance to grow and develop with him rather than be a mere extension of her husband. Any man would certainly prefer a wife he respects and he can only continue to respect her if she progresses and develops her character and person as he does. Even the children are better prepared for life in today's world if their mothers give them an opportunity to be with other people when they are young. It is quite a shock to a child who was sheltered for years by his mother's company almost exclusively to suddenly be independent at a certain age, 18 or 21, and capable of handling the cruel world. Children may be better balanced if they spend a more equal amount of time with mother, father, friends, relatives. Parents will be more balanced, too.

Too much of any one thing has rarely proven to be good. Ideally, husbands and wives would each work 20 hours per week and men and women would share in bringing up children, decisions on household matters and equal leisure time with their family, friends and alone. Finally, a woman, also a complete human being with brains, memory and flexibility, will respect herself more and be a better contribution to society if she is allowed to be as free as a man in career choice and opportunity, and every aspect of her life without being considered "unfeminine" doing certain types of work. In the end, men and women will both be freer and happier. Let's hope this will come about during our generation. Thank you.

TOMORROW'S WOMAN

(Talk delivered by Lisa Bingley, 13-year-old student at Gordon Junior High School, Washington, D.C., before the Lucretia C. Mott Memorial Service, Capitol Crypt, Friday, January 3, 1969)

When my older brother asked my mother why she bothers with equal rights for women, she told him that if she were a man, she'd be earning more money for the same job—and it would be easier to send him to college. My brother, Tony, said "Keep at it, Mom. Get equal rights—I need them, too!"

But, I don't need an explanation about equality for women. Because I am tomorrow's woman. In eight years, when I am old enough to vote, I want the full rights and privileges of a citizen of the United States.

I hope, when I'm grown up, that women will have won these rights. I hope that I will be able to earn equal pay for equal work. I hope that I won't have to face laws that discriminate against me, just because I am a woman—laws that restrict me in what job I hold, how much I can work, and for how many years I choose to work. I hope there won't be any more laws restricting women in property rights, inheritance rights, pension and retirement rights, the right to eat in all public restaurants—and even the right to fly on United Airlines' "Executive Only" flights—now barred to women. I hope, when I'm a grown-up, that I—and all women—will have won the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, now guaranteed just to men by our Constitution.

But if we haven't won these rights by then, time I'm 21—I'll continue to fight for them—because I'm already a feminist, and I have started my battle against discrimination, even thought I'm "just a mere girl."

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED JANUARY 3, 1969, AT MEETING IN CRYPT OF NATIONAL CAPITOL IN CELEBRATION OF BIRTHDAY OF THE GREAT SUFFRAGE PIONEER, LUCRETIA MOTT

I move that this gathering, with representatives present from organizations numbering approximately 10 million women, re-

quest the Chairwoman of the meeting, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, to appoint a committee to express to our newly elected President, Mr. Nixon, our hope that he will put the full force of his Administration back of the pending Equal Rights for Women Amendment, and that he will do all in his power to secure its passage by Congress, and its ratification by the States, thereby establishing Equal Legal Rights for Women throughout our land.

(Resolution presented by Mrs. Butler Franklin, Vice Chairman, The National Woman's Party.)

AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, to modify the Hickenlooper amendment which presently requires the suspension of aid if American property is expropriated without compensation within 6 months of seizure.

We are now facing, in Peru, one of the most serious crises because of this amendment. Its application there may further result in repercussions throughout Latin America of such gravity that no one can really predict the full consequences.

I will not review the details of the seizure last October 9 of certain assets of the International Petroleum Co.—IPC—a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey. The insistence of IPC that our Government invoke the Hickenlooper amendment and the position of the present Peruvian Government in this dispute propel our Government toward, first, suspension of aid and of Peru's sugar quota; then, a retaliatory seizure of an immense American copper company in Peru; and, finally, fiscal, economic, and political disaster for that country and for our interests there and perhaps throughout the hemisphere.

The arguments against the Hickenlooper amendment are more persuasive today than ever. This amendment:

First. Cripples the President's ability to control or even influence events which, in Peru, now rush toward disaster.

Second. Deprives the parties in a dispute of time to exhaust the remedies of negotiation since such negotiations start, as in the IPC case, with a revolver in the hand of one participant, that is, Peru.

Third. Places the interests, and the property, of a single American company of whatever size and whatever behavior, above other considerations of national interest.

Fourth. Makes an AID-recipient government a hostage to whatever dissident elements within the country seek its downfall. A state or even local government could seize property—this has already happened in Brazil—even when the national government opposed such action. But the whole country pays, through aid suspension, for the seizure.

Fifth. Ignores and confounds what we have always insisted about our aid programs; that they are not expressions of generosity, nor payments for quiescence but rather attempts to protect our own interests by promoting stability and development abroad. To suspend aid in pique or anger or frustration, as this amendment demands, is to demean our international goals which our aid program supports and expresses.

My proposal allows the President to waive the suspension of aid when he finds and reports to Congress that such waiver is in the national interest. It allows what the Constitution demands; that the President take responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs.

I traveled last year to Peru as a member of the Government Operations Committee. I returned impressed with the enormity of our economic investments in Latin America—and specifically, in Peru—the imbalance in our meager efforts to assist and encourage the progressive elements throughout the continent.

I anticipate a dramatic increase in our role in that continent's fate. Our need is to proceed with sensitivity and understanding—which we have often lacked—in these countries with whom we share so much and whose development and good fortunes are tied so intimately to our own.

WORLD MOURNS ESHKOL

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Levi Eshkol, Premier of Israel, is a sad blow to the cause of freedom and justice in the war-torn Middle East. I join with my colleagues in Congress, and all Americans, in mourning the death of this valiant and effective fighter for his people.

Mr. Eshkol has been Premier since 1963. He led the Israel Government during the 1967 crisis in which it was threatened with annihilation by its enemies. Under his leadership, Israel made a miraculous effort and defeated the threat by a far larger and superior force.

Although his health has suffered from the tremendous strain of leadership in these perilous times, Mr. Eshkol never faltered in his service to the Jewish people. He continued as a uniting figure in the Israel political arena even after a previous heart attack served warning of the dangerous toll his devotion was taking on his health.

As a master at working out compromise agreements among the various factions in the Israel democracy, Mr. Eshkol knew no peer. He was looked up to by one and all as one under whom all others could unite. He served in this capacity at a time when these talents were sorely needed, and were indeed mandatory if Israel were to surmount its internal divisions and meet the challenge from outside.

His loss will be sorely felt, and I call on all Jews in Israel and elsewhere to

maintain their courage despite this tragic death. We must continue to build on the legacy left for us by the great and wise leader of his people, Levi Eshkol.

**MORE ON CONSOLIDATION OF
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the other day I called the attention of our colleagues to the splendid report made public by the President's National Commission on Urban Affairs under the chairmanship of the distinguished former Senator Paul Douglas. I should like today to draw further upon my experience and studies of local government in New York State when I served as chairman of the assembly committee on local finance. I think it most urgent that we follow through on the recommendations of the President's Commission to adopt the techniques of Federal fiscal aid programs to encourage consolidation of local governments. The structure of local government in New York State is a clear reflection of local government forms throughout the Nation. To the extent that the situation in New York cries for reform so there is equal necessity for reform throughout our Nation.

There are 931 towns in New York State. Their range in population and in area runs to extremes. The town of Hempstead in Nassau County has a population of 800,000, larger than the population of every city in our State except New York City, and larger than the population of every county except Erie, Westchester and, of course, Nassau Counties. At the other extreme is the town of Morehouse with a population of just 65 souls.

Similar extremes are reflected in the size of towns. The town of Webb contains an area of 466 square miles, an area approximately two and one-half times the size of Rockland County, the State's smallest county. At the other extreme is the town of Green Island, which is so small that it is measurable only in acres. In any event, it contains less than a square mile.

The job of establishing a pattern of town government, which will meet the needs of the people living in units so diverse in size and in population is of such monumental proportions that it makes child's play of Hercules' task of cleaning out the Augean stables.

And if just the range in population and size does not raise sufficient problems to try men's souls, then there are certainly other complexities that will. The boundaries of towns and the basic pattern of town government were established just at the turn of the 19th century. That means you must clear away the accumulated carbuncles, decay, and obsolescence of over 160 years and disturb interests that have become nested

in the waste and inefficiency of a government structure that falls far short of meeting the needs of its residents in this jet age.

The record of this failure is in fact written by the towns themselves. In order to provide water, sewer, fire protection, street lighting, refuse removal, and other services, the 931 towns by a process akin to parthenogenesis have given birth to 3,800 special districts. In 1965, the total cost of these special districts amounted to \$85 million, representing 25 percent of all town government costs, and increasing at a faster rate than the costs of the other town government functions remaining in the balance of 75 percent.

Since World War II as cities declined in population, villages generally increased in population with the greatest increases taking place in unincorporated town areas, a trend which is likely to continue in the years ahead. As a result of the trend to town residence, we have a complex system of a very large number of units whose number increases every year forming a network of overlapping, duplicating governmental bodies, performing many services in a totally decentralized and uncoordinated manner adding annually to the burdens of local taxation unable to mobilize sufficient resources of talent and equipment needed to cope with the problems of our times.

Again, the towns are the best witnesses of their failure to respond adequately to their burgeoning powers. Of the 931 towns in our State, only 490 towns have planning boards, only 278 towns have zoning ordinances, and only 255 towns have both planning boards and zoning ordinances. The inevitable consequence is inadequate controls over land subdivision, inadequate controls over planning for water, sewers, transportation, and other services essential to a viable community.

Consolidation of local governments into more rational administrative units is clearly among the first orders of business among the States. The Federal Government should properly employ some of its resources to stimulate and encourage such consolidation.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1918, the independence of the Republic of Estonia was proclaimed, and on this date in 1969, we and Estonians in exile are commemorating the 51st anniversary of this declaration. I am honored to join my colleagues in commemorating this occasion.

The Estonian War of Independence lasted from 1918 to 1920, and the Estonians fought valiantly against the Soviet invaders. The Soviets, unable to win a decisive victory against the Estonian Army, began a program of insidious propaganda and infiltration against the

independent Estonian Government. Finally, in 1940, Estonia was forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R., despite the heroic efforts of her people to avoid this alliance.

The mass deportations, executions, and the attempted dissolution of the proud Estonian culture and history are well known to us all. It is a pattern the Soviet Union follows in dealing with small countries on its borders, and is apparent throughout Eastern Europe and the Baltic States. That this is still the Soviet Union's *modus operandi* today certainly becomes obvious, when the events which occurred in Czechoslovakia are viewed with an eye toward the past experiences of these unfortunate Baltic States.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the goals and efforts of the Estonians still in Estonia and those in exile in free nations around the world, will give the citizens of our country an example in patriotism to follow in these troubled times.

**STATEMENT BY HON. EDWARD I.
KOCH, ON S. 1, THE UNIFORM
RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND
LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT
OF 1969**

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement I delivered today before the Senate Government Operations' Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on S. 1, the proposed Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1969.

My major interest in this legislation rests in that portion of the bill relating to relocation assistance. At this time the Federal Government is employing different criteria for its treatment of people and businesses displaced by Federal construction. In some instances it provides relocation assistance and in other cases, it does not.

Presently, about 500 of my constituents are faced with eviction from their homes to make way for a new Federal office building. And because it is the Post Office Department that is involved—and not the State or city of New York, private enterprise, NASA, the Bureau of Public Roads, or the Defense Department—the residents are not receiving any help whatsoever from the Government in their frantic attempts to relocate. Needless to say these people sorely need and deserve our help. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act, when enacted will make for the future our relocation policies at last humane and our actions uniform.

I am concerned, however, that the Senate bill as now written will not cover those presently under the gun of eviction. Therefore, I have recommended some changes so that the Murray Hill tenants and others similarly situated

across the country will be covered by the new law when it is enacted.

I hope that the Congress will act promptly in rectifying the inequities that we have allowed to exist for too long.

My statement before the Senate subcommittee follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. EDWARD I. KOCH, OF NEW YORK, ON S. 1, THE UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT OF 1969, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

I am pleased to appear here today in support of S. 1 and to speak specifically about Title II providing uniform relocation assistance to persons displaced by the acquisition of property in Federal and Federally assisted programs.

This legislation is long overdue. Surely, it is time that the government meets its responsibility of assisting persons to relocate after displacing them for a public project. This Committee knows that many states and localities have already imposed upon themselves by law relocation assistance to tenants affected by their condemnation proceedings and have long required such help from private enterprise engaged in demolition projects. The federal government recognizes its similar obligations in three situations: when NASA, the Highway Department and the Defense Department condemn and demolish they do pay relocation stipends. And so, this leaves the federal government operating, in a strange way, helping some of its citizens and turning its back on others. Can anyone of us explain to a family being uprooted because of a post office demolition why it is that they receive no help yet if they were in the path of a roadway they would be helped?

I speak to you now of 175 families that are about to be thrown out of their homes by just such a post office project to make way for the new Murray Hill Post Office in Manhattan. In fact, the families already have received notices to vacate by March 1st but by the grace of the Post Office authorities may remain to June 1969. They are people who in many cases have lived their entire lives on the site, and they are at the lower end of the economic scale and are those who need our help most.

The Murray Hill tenants are in many cases elderly or parents of large families for which it is terribly difficult to find new apartments in New York City where the vacancy rate is less than 1%. These people need help, both in finding a new home and in financing their move. And yet, they are receiving none.

To add to the inequity, a few years ago these same people saw some of their fellow citizens suffering the effects of demolition and living in other parts of town receive federal stipends and help with their relocation when the Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Morgan Post Offices were constructed. It has been more than difficult to explain to these tenants in Murray Hill that other tenants, otherwise similarly situated, were eligible for stipends because the buildings were being constructed by private enterprise on a leaseback arrangement with the federal government.

To help make the government's acts rational and understandable to its citizens, S. 1 is sorely needed and its sponsors and this Committee must be applauded for considering this legislation so early in the session. However, not to damn the legislation with false praise, but rather to strengthen it, I should like to point out some defects in the bill.

Under Section 253, S. 1 reads, "This title (meaning title II) and the amendments made by this title shall become effective one hundred eighty days after the date of its enactment."

The 175 families (including about 500 people) on the Murray Hill site in New York City would not be eligible for assistance under such a date. It would be a savage act on the part of the government to enact a law long overdue and not include those who are now most in need of its coverage. These people already have their eviction notices and demolition is scheduled to begin on July 1st of this year.

And so, I ask your Committee to consider making special provision for those persons presently living under the gun of eviction. Surely, the Murray Hill tenants and others similarly situated need not be required to suffer needlessly—a humane federal government should not, and I believe will not, withhold its help from these people, when a simple change to make the law effective immediately upon its passage would cure that problem.

Further, the language of the bill suggests that the time of *property acquisition* is pivotal in determining whether the displaced persons are eligible for assistance. In Section 211(f) which covers supplementary payments to tenants unable to secure a dwelling in a low rent housing project (and most of the Murray Hill site tenants will not be eligible for New York City Housing Authority facilities) the bill reads that a tenant will secure assistance under the law providing that "such dwelling was actually and lawfully occupied by such individual or family for not less than ninety days prior to the initiation of negotiations for acquisition of such property." In addition, under Section 215, "Fund Availability," the bill reads, "Funds appropriated or otherwise available to any Federal agency for the acquisition of real property or any interest therein shall be available also for obligation and expenditure to carry out the provisions of this title."

The problem with this, Mr. Chairman, is that the Murray Hill site was purchased by the Post Office Department in June 1962! Common sense, a practical application of the law, and an even handed policy of dealings by the government with its citizens would require that provision be made to cover those instances in which land has already been acquired. I am sure that the Murray Hill site is not unique in this respect and that there are many other sites across the country which have already been acquired with residents still living on the site.

In addition, in the future there will be site acquisition long before tenants and businesses have to be displaced. Look how long it has taken the Post Office to get underway with the Murray Hill construction: seven years. While I can understand that persons who have moved into a building for only a few months before it is torn down ought not to be eligible for stipends, it would be reasonable, I submit, to cover those who moved in some reasonably long period of time before demolition. In any event, the critical date should be demolition and not acquisition.

I would recommend that the general funding of the relocation assistance program should come from funds made available for acquisition of property, but that actual demolition of the site buildings be made the determinant for eligibility. Secondly, I ask the Committee to consider adding a specific authorization to cover those cases in which the land has already been purchased so as to cover this Murray Hill site and other similar situations.

A corresponding bill will be introduced on the House side by Chairman George Fallon and I am pleased to be a co-sponsor. I stand ready to do whatever would be helpful to move this legislation along. Indeed if it is to have any meaningful application to the people living in Murray Hill it must be passed prior to July 1, 1969.

UNIQUE PROGRAM FOR AMERICAN SERVICEMEN STARTED AT QUINCY COLLEGE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a unique project sending extensive radio tape programs to servicemen in Vietnam was started last fall at Quincy College in Quincy, Ill. Tapes of popular music and comments of interest to our men in far away Vietnam have been prepared by disk jockeys and staff members of Quincy College intramural radio station WWQC and sent to USO centers and hospitals in Vietnam. The Student to Servicemen program conceived by returned Vietnam Army veteran, Rodney Hinkamper of 627½ Lind, Quincy, Ill., has passed its 6 months of service mark and has received many commendations from servicemen and USO organizations in Vietnam.

Mr. Hinkamper was stationed at Cam Ran Bay in Southeast Asia and experienced firsthand that there was a general hostility toward American college students because of campus disorders being strongly emphasized in the service newspaper, Stars and Stripes. He, along with his fellow soldiers, also found a dearth of popular music, so much a part of their lives back home.

Mr. Hinkamper sought the help of WGM's Bob Joye to begin a continued program of furnished taped entertainment for the men in Vietnam. Receiving encouragement and help, he also elicited the aid of the college station. The college students seized upon the opportunity of unusual service, following a radio station staff meeting.

Advising the program are the Rev. George McDevitt, O.F.M., assistant instructor of speech and the Rev. Donald Werr, O.F.M., director of public relations.

Throughout the week, programs are being recorded and sent on to the anxious military listeners under the project title, "Student to Servicemen."

Letters of appreciation are beginning to return from the men. For example, SP/4 Kenny Hemming of Quincy wrote:

There is a guy in our barracks who has a recorder and we've all been listening to it all night. The songs are really great. Thank you so much for spending so much time making it. You don't know how nice it really is to get songs that are actually popular back in the world.

The program has already proven to be a tremendous morale booster, and it is hoped that a far-reaching consequence will be a better feeling between servicemen and students.

College organizations helping to sponsor the project are: Student Senate of Quincy College, Individual Students and Friends of Quincy College, and the Quincy College Data Processing Center.

The student to servicemen program, as it is entitled, has expanded during

the past 6 months. This program includes the recording of popular music by Quincy College coeds who act as disk jockeys for these tapes on Sunday mornings. During this time a master tape is produced and then duplicated on a copier providing 16 copies which are distributed to all USO's in Vietnam, and other numerous copies for individual requests.

The success of this program has been made possible through the efforts of Quincy College students and Quincy citizens. As one soldier said in a letter of thanks to WWQC: "It makes a better home away from home."

The following letters testify that the Quincy College student to servicemen program is not only a success in itself, but also contributes directly to maintaining and improving the morale of our boys in the frontlines in Vietnam:

JANUARY 30, 1969.

HELLO RODNEY: I would like to thank you, Quincy College, and the Student to Servicemen Radio Tape Club for the tape I have received. It was very much appreciated and enjoyed by all of us here in Chu Lai. Tape recorders are prevalent in our company so it was no trouble getting it played. I think that a tape with Top Hits on it are the most popular as some of us don't get a chance to hear the radio because of unusual working hours. It seems that someone constantly is playing that tape. It's a very patriotic thing you are doing bringing us these tapes. Thanks again.

Sincerely yours,

Sp/4 DOUGLAS RUFF,
126th Sup & Ser Co., APO S.F. 96325.

UNITED SERVICE

ORGANIZATIONS, INC., AN-KHE,

APO San Francisco, October 26, 1968.

Mr. BILL LAWTON,

Station manager, the Studios of WWQC
Quincy College, Quincy, Ill.

DEAR MR. LAWTON: Our most sincere appreciation is extended to you and all involved in producing the pre-recorded tape we recently received.

Morale is a major factor over here, and these men deserve support from back home. The men here often read only the headlines of the hometown newspapers sent to them. They see college students protesting the war; they see draft dodgers rioting and burning their selective service cards; they see people their own age rebelling, being unfaithful to and unloyal to the very cause which they are fighting to preserve. Our congratulations is in order to you and the students of Quincy College for restoring some faith in these young, hard working Americans over here.

After only two short days of playing your tape over our P.A. system, we have received numerous requests to play the tape over again. Many of the men have their own recorders, and ask to borrow the tape so they may reproduce it for their personal use. The choice of music (current trends) is terrific, as is the use of a female disk jockey.

Our USO is located in Vietnam's Central Highlands, and the majority of the 600-800 men we serve daily are from fighting units just in from an operation in the field. These are the men who need your help and ours!

UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
FREEDOM HILL, DANANG,
San Francisco, January 5, 1969.

STUDENTS TO SERVICEMAN PROGRAM,

Radio Station WWQC,
Quincy College,
Quincy, Ill.

DEAR FRIENDS: We wish to express our sincere appreciation for the gift which you directed to us for our servicemen in Vietnam.

Gestures such as this are certainly "living proof" that the people at home really care about our young men and women in the service of their country.

For your information, all gifts are either directed to various military units, to hospitalized servicemen, or they are distributed in our U.S.O. Club.

On behalf of these men, please accept our grateful thanks.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL S. KRAFT,
Associate Director.
CAROL K. QUINN,
Associate Director.

P.S.—I heard the Christmas tape, enjoyed it very much especially since one of the girls live in Anchorage, Alaska. I just finished a two year tour with the Armed Services YMCA. Wish I were back there. What was her name, maybe I knew her.

USO,

January 22, 1969.

DEAR FRIENDS: Just a short but sincere "thank you" for your Christmas Tape. They were not the easiest things to come by over here.

Trying to keep two tape recorders going with Christmas music presented a problem—and you helped us out a great deal. "Outstanding!"

Thank you again.

CAROLYN MAXEY.

USO, CHU LAI,
APO San Francisco.

WWQC RADIO,
Quincy College,
Quincy, Ill.

DEAR MR. WEISS: I hope you won't mistake my delay in responding to your tape as a show of ingratitude or lack of enthusiasm.

Having been squared away after my first R&R, I would now like to take a second here to say that I found your tape to be just great. Or as the men would say, "outstanding" "number one!", "real decent".

I couldn't say what the men enjoyed more—the good selection or the girls' voices.

A very warm "thank you" to the students of Quincy College for remembering our men in "Nam".

Do hope to hear from you again!

Sincerely,

CAROLYN MAXEY,
Associate Director.

KISSINGER'S FOLLY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an informative statement by a foreign minister of a former non-Communist country gives an interesting analysis of what we can expect from the togetherness of the State Department, which Z. A. Rust suggests is a road to destruction.

I include an editorial and Mr. Rust's article from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader for January 23, in the RECORD: [From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Jan. 23, 1969]

KISSINGER'S FOLLY

At the top of our back page today is a devastating analysis of the type of gobbledygook and nonsense that President Nixon's personal adviser on foreign affairs has proposed over the years.

One sometimes wonders whether these

Presidents ever read the record of their appointees.

It would be hard to see how anyone who had looked into what Henry Kissinger has written and said in the past could ever have appointed him to any post of any serious consequence.

The article at the top of our back page today is written by one of the most interesting figures of diplomatic life of the 20th Century. For reasons of personal safety and modesty, he prefers to write under the pen name of Z. A. Rust. Actually, Mr. Rust legitimately bears the title of Prince and has served his nation as foreign minister and in other diplomatic posts through the most dangerous and difficult events of the 20th Century.

He has seen his country overrun and taken over by the Communists. He has seen his own castles and lands seized and is forced to wander on the face of the earth. Based on his own bitter experience, Z. A. Rust would like to warn happy-go-lucky, innocent American leaders, and the American people as a whole, who are quite sure that nothing like this could ever happen to them. Mr. Z. A. Rust has seen in his own country the dreamers and the theorists who were sure communism was mellowing and that there was no intent to conquer any lands outside of Russia.

The fancy theories of Professor Kissinger and reality are poles apart, as Z. A. Rust shows very brilliantly in his article at the top of our back page. Be sure to read it today. Ponder it. The hour to bring about the survival of this nation is very late indeed.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

ACADEMIC GOBBLEDYGOOK VERSUS REALITY: THE ROAD TO DESTRUCTION

(NOTE.—"Z. A. Rust" offers some penetrating comment on Pres.-elect Richard M. Nixon's choice of foreign policy advisors and the philosophies which they represent.)

(Z. A. Rust is the pen name of a veteran European diplomat who has served as his nation's foreign minister and participated in all the great crises of World War I and World War II. Communism is no theory to Z. A. Rust. He has seen his country overrun by the Communists. He has seen his castles and his lands confiscated. He and his wife, the Princess, have been in stinking jails from which they were lucky enough to escape with their lives. Z. A. Rust would like to warn the free world of the realities of the Communist menace before it is too late.)

(By Z. A. Rust)

One of those syndicated columns which have helped so much in spreading among American public opinion the idea of a tamed communism, cured of its dreams of messianic and military world-conquest and amenable to association and co-operation, has expressed its discontent and its worries with President-elect Nixon's choice of Mr. Richard B. Allen as a senior staff assistant to the "highly respected" Dr. Henry Kissinger, of Harvard, President Nixon's foreign policy adviser.

Nothing good could be expected, argue the two associated opinion-builders from the brush of such conflicting policies as Professor Kissinger's "sophisticated and adult" anti-communism and that of the Cold War vintage of Mr. Allen, a man who belonged to the American Security Council, a hard-line anti-Communist propaganda instrument, and who in a recently published essay used such moth-eaten and wild witch-hunt rhetoric as shown in the following quotations:

"We are faced by an implacable and self-declared enemy whose aims are unlimited, who seeks the destruction of the American way of life."

"Specific attention must be given to intellectual and university groups in this country and abroad at which Communist propaganda

is aimed and in which considerable gains have been already recorded."

We did not need the recent article of Professor Kissinger in the "Foreign Affairs" quarterly to learn what sophisticated anti-communism means, we have followed this brand of policy since Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and the Marshall Mission to China, through the first Communist onslaught on Czechoslovakia, the Geneva Conference of 1953 which gave half of Indochina to the Communist Empire, the Camp Davids, the Vienna and the Glassboro chummy meetings, the Bay of Pigs betrayal, the unbelievable hoax of Cuba's "debombing," the "pacifying" unilateral Rostow-McNamara disarmament both conventional and nuclear. Then there were the so called intellectual exchanges of students and professors with Communist countries, the Pueblo affair, and so many other episodes of the co-existence and rapprochement era.

Now we watch for the advent of their new product the lunatic non-proliferation treaty and new disarmament understanding in spite of all those other treaties violated already by the Soviets, and despite the second rape of Czechoslovakia.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We must nevertheless be grateful to the learned professor for having acquainted us in his articles in "Foreign Affairs" and "Look" with the latest recommendations of the sophisticated anti-Communist school he represents as they concern the Vietnam War, they are consistent, we are told, with the professor's policy toward Europe and will not differ very much from the advices he will offer President Nixon on those burning problems.

Professor Kissinger's analysis and suggestions form, to our opinion, an elaborate and confusing maze of contradictions, unintentional double-talk, wrong premises, evasion of issues, false dilemmas and unwarranted hypotheses. These are the unavoidable by-products of the master-lie in which the Western politicians and opinion-building mediums have progressively entrapped themselves in the last 50 years. Their theory is that communism is not what it seems that it is not using the methods it actually uses, that its motivations are not what they are, and that it does not pursue the objectives it really pursues.

DECEPTIVE FRAME

Consequent with this deceptive framework for his argumentation, Professor Kissinger treats the Vietnam question as an isolated problem, unconnected with any global, permanent and, until now, unconquered onslaught of the Communist forces against the independence of nations and the liberty of man. Persisting in his analytical disconnecting methods, Professor Kissinger recommends what he calls "multilevel negotiations" as the best means for liquidating honorably the Vietnam affair. Contrarily to a multi-millenary experience, so fittingly summed up in the Klausewitz postulate, War and Politics seem to be absolutely unrelated for this Harvard professor. The Vietnam negotiations therefore have to be conducted on two totally different levels: the military and the political, the United States to find the military solutions in discussions with North Vietnam, and South Vietnam to find a political arrangement in discussion with the Viet Cong and the NLF.

As if the presence of the United States troops in Vietnam had no national security, national responsibility and national high interest motivations, the solution Professor Kissinger offers, is the withdrawal of the United States forces, the same solution that was required by Mr. Clifford, the menacing Defense Secretary, and by Mr. McGovern the insulting senator. "Mutual withdrawal," of course, negotiated between Washington and Hanoi, while Saigon, which the departure of

the North Vietnamese forces would have left in a vantage position, will discuss with its Communist enemy "The internal political and administrative structure to be developed in South Vietnam." The learned professor does not recommend, but does not rule out a coalition government with Communist participation.

ANOTHER ASPECT

All this could be perfectly consistent with the artificial political substratum in which Professor Kissinger moves with so many other advisors, analysts and experts of Harvard or Yale persuasion. For unsophisticated observers however, the situation the United States is facing in Vietnam has quite another aspect and other dimensions:

(1) The American troops are not in Vietnam for the questionable pleasure or fighting a deadly and treacherous enemy, but because of the responsibility of the United States as a member of a defense regional organization, as the principal promoter of the Geneva 1953 Vietnam arrangement, and as the begetter of Communist China.

The United States troops are in Vietnam because abandoning it to the giant Communist enemy would mean, on the long run, abandoning all American positions in Asia and the Far East. It would be the last blow to the prestige and influence of the last non-Communist big Power. President Markos, from the Philippines, has told us where he would look for new friends in such a case.

(2) "Mutual withdrawal" of United States and North Vietnam Troops is only an euphemism for the final United States unilateral stampede. The enemy knows very well, and Professor Kissinger ought to know also, that no United States troops withdrawn will ever be sent back to the Asiatic battlefield and that whatever the length of the "staged withdrawal" of the United States troops, once withdrawn they will be on the other side of the Pacific while the North Vietnam forces will still be where they were when they started their last aggression.

(3) It is obviously not true that the mutual withdrawal of the United States and North Vietnam troops will leave the South Vietnamese government in a better position to negotiate an arrangement with its enemies. Such a statement could not be rationally substantiated and Professor Kissinger had to contradict himself when in another part of his expose he observed that "it is beyond the imagination that parties that have been murdering and betraying each other for 25 years could work together as a team giving joint instructions to the entire country." Or does the learned professor contemplate a new partition of the "entire country?"

(4) Abandoned, with its forces only, to the whims of its enemies, which are not North Vietnam only, as Professor Kissinger asks us to believe, but all the Communist world with the tremendous power of Soviet Russia and Red China, Saigon will be finally forced to surrender and the whole of what had been Indochina will be submitted to the endless and abominable regime implicit to every Communist domination.

Professor Kissinger's solution for ending the war in Vietnam has in any case one merit. It is perfectly consonant with the way this war has been waged: in the strict limits desired and permitted by an enemy whose headquarters are not in Hanoi but in Moscow and Peiping. That is why we must congratulate President-elect Nixon for having provided for an optional program in foreign policy matters also, by appointing unsophisticated Richard W. Allen as head staff-assistant to sophisticated Professor Kissinger.

Unsophisticated anticommunism is not, of course, Mr. Allen's invention as will be shown by the following quotations of a highly respected churchman and of three illustrious soldiers who had the opportunity to study

the common enemy from better viewpoints than a university pulpit.

From Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York:

"Sooner or later, we who are free and have been marked down for slavery will be drawn into the line of the Communist juggernaut. On this score let us have no illusion. We stand under the same sentence of death that has already been meted out to the free people of those countries that are now enslaved by Soviet Russia."

From Lord Alexander of Tunis, British War Minister:

"If Britain and the United States fail to play the part forced upon them, the Western Christian Civilization, as we know it, will be submerged and disappear."

From General Douglas MacArthur:

"The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appeal or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe."

From General Claire Lee Chenault:

"I seriously doubt that Russia will make anything more than probing skirmishes in Europe until the Asiatic front is secured . . . this, then, are the stakes for which we are playing . . . if Russia's Asiatic flank is secured and American air power pushed beyond a critical range, then the way will be opened for new and powerful ventures in Europe."

When those earnest warnings were bestowed on us, Soviet Russia was not the first nuclear power of the World but a backward second, neither was she the sole possessor of the fractional orbit space bomber which can drop its nuclear charge on any target on earth by radio signals. She had not pushed her warships up to Gibraltar and her divisions to the Bavarian borders. The Kremlin had not transformed Cuba to a Soviet beach-head 90 miles from the United States shores, while engaging them in another no-win war thousands of miles from those shores.

Africa had not become a Sino-Soviet powder barrel, nor South America the happy hunting grounds for Castro-Guevara guerrillas. Infiltration and corruption had not yet contaminated the youth of the free nations in a moronic and rebellious fifth column, and the enemy agents had not already infiltrated our spiritual sanctuaries, the last bulwark of the Western defense.

UNLAWFUL CONDUCT OF STUDENTS ON CAMPUS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the reports which are reaching the Members in increasing volume are only a partial assessment of public reaction to persistent student violence at our colleges and universities, it must indeed be viewed with considerable indignance that the crisis has been allowed to evolve into almost total chaos. Perhaps chaos is a foregone conclusion, for in compromising the principles of lawful conduct, in whatever field of endeavor, educational administrators have found that a middle ground for reasonable and responsible agreement is of little consequence if only one party to the conflict is willing to yield.

In the final analysis, it might even be suspected whether the rash of student

activists really want to seek a rational compromise on educational objectives or provoke a confrontation with lawful society designed to destroy existing educational systems, and even more, our democratic institutions. I believe there is ample evidence to tip the balance toward the latter. Not long ago, a group of militants presented the administration of the University of Wisconsin with a list of "nonnegotiable" demands—hardly conducive to reaching any sort of agreement. At the Berkeley campus in California, the hotbed of student revolution, one protest leader in pressing demands threatened that, "If necessary, we'll destroy the entire university. If necessary, we'll destroy the entire Government."

While it is true the number of militants and student radicals still comprise a relatively small minority of the total student population, the threat posed by this well-organized minority can no longer be dismissed on that ground. The pattern of anarchy at the hands of the few across the country is as serious as the attitude of permissiveness makes it. Certainly, public concern should not be viewed as a meddling into the internal affairs of our publicly supported educational institutions.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has a vital stake in the outcome of the current confrontations which have already jeopardized the continued operation of many institutions. The influence of Government should be twofold. First, every ounce of public support must be marshaled through the elected and appointed public officials of Government to enhance and encourage the exercise of the existing prerogatives of educational administrators to deal firmly with those whose conduct interferes with the lawful functioning of the institution in a manner that paralyzes its educational responsibilities. Second, Government should provide the means, through enabling legislation when necessary, to deprive such persons of public funds, for it is clearly not in the public interest to support any unlawful activity.

While legislation has already been enacted to accomplish the latter, no doubt its effectiveness is negated for lack of concerted attention to the former. Then, too, the question as to whose responsibility it is to judge conduct is not the least of the obstacles. I believe the unlawful conduct of students on campus should no more be insulated from the judicial process than the lawbreaker on the street.

Although news articles abound on campus disorders, two of recent date are the more noteworthy by their emphasis on curbing the anarchy by the few through the established institutions of law enforcement and justice. We might well ask ourselves why some college and university administrators still refuse to use the sanctions at their disposal, and I believe columnist James J. Kilpatrick sums it up concisely in his statement:

The problem lies . . . in the absence of leadership among the law-abiding students, professors, administrators, alumni, and public officials.

Following are the complete texts of these columns:

CXV—299—Part 4

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 8, 1969]

COURT DRAWS THE LINE ON UNIVERSITY SIT-INS

(By Charles Bartlett)

DENVER, COLO.—An appeals court here has taken a meaningful step toward nailing down the prickly questions of what goes and what does not go on a college campus.

In upholding the University of Denver's right to move swiftly last April to stop a student sit-in, the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals has enunciated a landmark challenge to the temporizing tactics with which officials in many other universities have met disruptions by the students.

The court found nothing to "lend credence to the hypothesis that these students have a constitutionally protected right to close the doors of the university in order to enforce their demands." The appeal of the 39 students against their suspension was dismissed by the federal court.

This verdict marks the complete acceptance of the precipitous response by Maurice B. Mitchell, a spirited recruit to campus life from the business world, after a group of students launched a protest over a minor issue of student government. The disruption had barely begun when the students were officially expelled so that the city police could come in and take them off the campus. The incident ended before it had gathered momentum.

"The proper length of a sit-in is five minutes" Mitchell told a group of educators recently. "Anyone who tolerates interference with the operations of the university beyond that time is rationalizing against a background of fear that I don't understand."

The reactions to Mitchell's counter-activism illustrates a tightening attitude toward campus militancy. Student applications for the university are up 42 percent this winter and money-raisers for Mitchell's mushrooming private institution have raised as much in the past six months as they did in the previous twelve. Forty percent of the university's student body comes from the East.

Mitchell had arrived at the university less than a year before the trouble flared. A veteran of many media enterprises, he had spent most of his career as an official of Encyclopaedia Britannica and five years as its president. He accepted the invitation of the trustees of UD because he wanted to go where the action seemed to be.

He is a promising blend for university life at this juncture because he combines the toughness which he acquired in business with the empathy of a long commitment to liberalism. His distaste for being pushed or threatened is mixed with an anxiety to let the students be heard and a readiness to let the SDS attempt to enlarge its toehold in campus life.

Mitchell discerns many superior qualities in the modern young but he is ruthlessly blunt in exposing the curious vein of charlatanism which mars the spirit of protest. "Those kids want to be martyrs," he observes, "but they want to be thrown to toothless lions."

He warned the protest leaders last April that if they staged these sit-ins, they would be severely punished. "That's preferable to slavery," said one of the leaders. Mitchell dispatched a faculty leader who had been close to the protesters to calm them down. The man came back and reported no success.

He told Mitchell, "You can't talk to anyone who thinks he's Jesus." A lesson of the experience for Mitchell is that it is almost hopeless to try to negotiate one of these confrontations. Kids reach for nonnegotiable issues and they say, "You won't listen to us," when they mean, "You won't give us what we want."

Mitchell believes that universities like Brandeis and Columbia have been drawn into serious conflicts because their officials paused

while they tried to find a middle ground that doesn't really exist. "You can't compromise," he maintains, "while adversaries reach for your jugular."

The chancellor argues that the young militants are playing a tough game which is predicated upon their feeling that the university is a "sucker trap," a device developed by the principal components of the affluent society in order to perpetuate themselves. It is a game stimulated by newspaper accounts of student militancy in other places and by an anxiety to avoid the great sin of apathy.

The campus seems calm today but Mitchell knows the spring may bring another test. If it comes, he will greet it in the spirit of a man who does not intend to yield to threats.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 23, 1969]

CRACKDOWN TIME FOR YOUNG FASCISTS

This much, at least, can be said of the disorders that plague our college campuses: The time for temporizing with young Fascists has passed. The time for mounting a counter-offensive is at hand.

Too many months already have been wasted in trying to reason with unreason. Nothing more can be gained by excesses of "understanding" and of "tolerance." The line is clear—everyone comprehends it—between peaceable protest and lawless anarchy. Not one more word needs to be said on that point.

Consider the incredible situation that has developed from attempts at appeasement: Mere handfuls of militant students, backed by some unhinged professors, have been permitted absolutely to disrupt the education of thousands of law-abiding students whose rights have been wholly ignored. These militants have seized buildings, destroyed public and private property and committed repeated acts of criminal violence.

The militants do not lack for leadership. At most campuses, the revolutionaries are led by SDS—Students for a Democratic Society. What a travesty upon semantics is here! A "democratic" society is the last ambition of these totalitarian gangs. They cannot be distinguished from the booted student Nazis of Adolf Hitler's day.

The problem lies rather in the absence of leadership among the law-abiding students, professors, administrators, alumni, and public officials. What in the world is wrong with them? Are they gutless? Afraid? Apathetic? It is absurd to suppose that the 99 percent of the students who want a peaceful education are incapable of dealing with the one percent whose purpose is deliberate disruption.

But it ought not to be the responsibility of the nonviolent students to protect their rights with fists and clubs. Such protection is the duty—the primary duty—of the presidents, trustees, and the established agencies of law enforcement.

When do they stop playing pat-a-cake? It ought not to be a matter of great difficulty to obtain TV tapes and motion picture film of the terrorist groups. Such evidence, one assumes, would establish actions and identities beyond a reasonable doubt.

If the violent demonstrators turn out to be students, the course ought to be clear: Expel them. If they are non-students, the course is equally clear: Arrest them; take them to court; prosecute to the limit of the law. This same clear-headed policy should be applied to those professors who aid and abet the violence: Fire them. Fire them out of hand, and turn a deaf ear to blubberings of "tenure" and "academic freedom."

Timid voices may be heard to say that such an approach would "destroy a university." Nonsense! It is only in this fashion that a true academic community may be preserved. Let the motto be carved in stone: The essence of freedom is order. Discipline is the foundation of learning. Without order, without discipline, the educative process falls to the level of children's games.

A number of university administrators understand these elementary truths. At Notre Dame, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh has issued a notice that rings of his determination to act decisively against violent disturbance. Any student or professor who seizes a building at Notre Dame will be given 15 minutes "of meditation to cease and desist." Those who pursue their criminal course will then be suspended, expelled, or arrested. Thereafter, "the law will deal with them."

This is the only approach to be taken now. There is, of course, a companion effort that has to be exerted also—to anticipate trouble, to remedy valid grievances, to maintain clear channels for the effective handling of requests and complaints. It is merely common sense to pursue policies of fire prevention. But the greater need at the moment is simply for the restoration of order; and this cannot be accomplished by "negotiating" with young extortionists.

PESTICIDES AND MAN'S ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the January 1969 issue of *American Forests* carries a most thoughtful article by Mr. David H. Jenkins, entitled "Pesticides and Man's Environment." Mr. Jenkins gives particular attention to the dangers of persistent pesticides, such as DDT, carried into Lake Michigan by waters draining from four States. So that my colleagues may be aware of the dangers posed by pesticides to fish and wildlife, as well as man himself. Under unanimous consent I include the text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

PESTICIDES AND MAN'S ENVIRONMENT

(By David H. Jenkins)

We, as conservationists, see two major obstacles standing in our way to the good life on a sustained basis. One, in spite of the Pill, and in spite of the coming second and third generation missiles for population control, we will have more people to the point of desperation.

Obstacle two. The environmental pollution that all of us have created and will create; the natural pollutants from carbon dioxide to coliform bacteria, and the products of our exploding technology—persistent chemicals, radioactive wastes, aluminum sardine cans, and a host of last-forever materials that we have created on one hand while we practice planned obsolescence on the other. Why doesn't someone come up with a car body that disappears at the end of the guarantee period even without the use of road salt!

We conservationists are not directly concerned with obstacle number one, except as individuals. Any married couple with more than 1.7 children has already added to the problem. Readers can put themselves in the proper category here.

It is to the problem of the alteration and degradation of our total environment that we conservationists must address ourselves because if we don't, no one else will, or at least to date they haven't been concerned to the degree that we think they should.

What is a pesticide? This is putting it pretty simply, but a pesticide is a chemical that is used to kill or get rid of anything you don't want—weeds, rough fish, fungi and mold, insects, rats, and sea lampreys. This is too broad a subject and I couldn't cover it

properly—it would be like trying to read *Playboy* magazine with your wife turning the pages. Our main concern here is the insecticides—the bug killer, and not all of them—only a few.

We clearly recognize the tremendous value of pesticides to our health, our comfort, and our prosperity—to food production, to industry, and the home. We can live without them, but not very well. We are concerned for the most part with only a few of these pesticides, the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons—those that persist in the environment, spread rapidly over the earth, and are concentrated a thousandfold or more in the tissues of living things, the effects of which are just now beginning to be detected and understood.

Let me share with you one experience that we have had recently in Michigan. It involves persistent pesticides and it involves a big chunk of our real estate.

At the risk of sounding like a Chamber of Commerce spokesman I want to point out that Michigan is blessed with lots of "fresh water" and I quote those last two words.

We have more shoreline than any other of the "lower 48" states and more fresh water within our boundaries than any other state, but we see something bad happening here and we want to pass on this warning to you.

Waters from one third of the land area of four states drain into Lake Michigan. The lake itself measures 22,000 square miles with 1,600 miles of shoreline, and is nearly 1,000 feet deep. Some 80 percent of the shoreline has potential for outdoor recreation and the variation in habitat makes the lake inherently capable of supporting a wide range of aquatic life. It is significant as both a sport and commercial fishery.

Lake Michigan is a principal source of drinking water—1.5 billion gallons daily. Industry uses another 4¼ billion gallons. It is a major international seaway.

Now, Lake Michigan lies off to the side of the main stem of water flow through the Great Lakes, like an appendix. Water circulates within this appendix, but discharges very little out through the Straits of Mackinac—only about one percent of the total lake volume per year. This means that any stable, persistent substance that finds its way into that lake is going to be there for a long, long time. And that is just what is occurring right now with certain persistent, chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides.

What happens when these toxic substances—virtually insoluble in water—begin to accumulate? Recent findings show that DDT was the most probable cause of the death of nearly one million coho salmon fry hatched in state fish hatcheries from eggs from Lake Michigan nurtured salmon. Many Lake Michigan fish now have DDT levels up to 10 parts per million. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration permits 7 parts per million in beef and pork. There is already talk of the FDA establishing limits on fish and if they do it will surely "change the water on the minnies."

Where have these pesticides come from? Within the Lake Michigan watershed, including two of the major metropolitan areas of the Middle West, live six to seven million people. Along its shores is one of the major fruit-growing areas of the nation with its accompanying spray schedules. In the northern part of the Lake Michigan basin lie extensive publicly owned and industrial forests—spraying here, too. Certainly, over the past two decades, many tons of DDT have been released in the watershed from a wide variety of sources, as far as 100 miles from the lake, right down to the shore itself. Dutch elm disease and mosquito control in cities and parks, farms and orchards, state and national and industrial forests, homes and backyards, spray remnants dumped down the drain—all have contributed. Dieldrin undoubtedly came from a narrower range of sources—and somewhat more recently—from farms and orchards, and home and

backyard use, and even woolen moth-proofing plants.

Runoff from city and farm and forest finds its way down river; or in the atmosphere, dust storms and water vapor add their share of DDT from points west. Regardless of the source of DDT, once it reaches the lake it is going to stay there, and this has been going on for the past 20 years.

The Lake Michigan situation is only an example—a big, easy-to-recognize example of environmental contamination. Large bodies of water store these pesticides. Tiny organisms pick up the chemicals and store them. Larger organisms eat the little fellows who in turn are eaten by larger critters until at the top of the food chain—fish-eating birds store vast quantities of the stuff in their fat. The lowly clam concentrates DDT 70,000 times greater than his water environment.

The effects of this storing-up in animals from the smallest to the largest is not completely known, but the gaps are beginning to fill in. Man, for the first time in his history, has chemicals at his disposal that can completely alter his own food chain. By wiping out certain insects or minute sea creatures he removes one link in the very delicately balanced chain of life on which he depends. The complexities of the whole thing are beyond my ken, but believe me, they are complex, they are subtle, and they are real. Enough is known now about the persistent pesticides DDT, dieldrin, lindane, chlordane, aldrin, endrin, to name a few, to know that they affect the reproductive cycle of certain animal species. We know that DDT was the most probable cause of the loss of close to one million coho salmon fry raised from Lake Michigan nurtured eggs—DDT picked up in Lake Michigan. We know that the pink shrimp, the same that you use for shrimp cocktail, can be killed by four tenths of a part per billion—four tenths of one part per billion—of DDT after two days' exposure. One part per billion is the same as one ounce of chocolate syrup in one thousand tank cars of milk, and that's mighty weak chocolate milk.

It would be nice if we could prove beyond a shadow of a doubt how DDT directly affected man. But these effects are indirect (we think) and subtle. Effects on lower level organisms are better known but even here the story is not completely clear. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence for us to be greatly concerned and to start bringing the unnecessary and widespread use of these persistent chemicals to a halt. Keep in mind, though, that pesticides are only one of the many environmental pollutants that are of real concern to all of us.

The entire pesticide matter flared up brightly last fall when, to curb an outbreak of Japanese beetles in southwestern Michigan near Lake Michigan, the State Department of Agriculture proposed to apply 2.8 tons of dieldrin. The Agriculture Department was totally within their legal authority and they felt that this was in the best interest of the people of Michigan. However, we felt that there were safer ways to get at the problem and we opposed the spray program. Further, the Environmental Defense Fund took the matter to court and at the same time brought action against 56 municipalities who used DDT to control Dutch elm disease.

In a nutshell this action stalled the application of dieldrin until it was too late in the fall and the area was not treated. Then 53 out of the 56 cities stipulated that they would drop plans to use DDT against the elm bark beetle.

Unfortunately this entire affair brought our two state agencies eyeball to eyeball and this is never a good thing. The whole thing was doubly "silly" because both had the best interests of the people at heart. Naturally we felt the broader viewpoint of concern for the entire environment was proper wherein the ag folks were "after the beetle."

To resolve this "confrontation" Governor

Romney appointed a three-man Pesticide Advisory Panel—the Director of the Pesticide Research Center at Michigan State University, an ecologist from the University of Michigan, and an industrial entomologist whose hobby is bird watching.

They advised the Governor that an application of dieldrin and chlordane in the fall of 1968 would be the lesser of two evils (the other being application by private interests). So a several-ton application on 4,800 acres is planned and the Environmental Defense Fund has the Department of Agriculture back in court again and there you are—up to date.

Our position on pesticide use can be simply stated. There has been plenty of distortion by the press and other interests of this position, but you as foresters and conservationists should understand it clearly.

(1) We believe that where proper alternatives are available, the persistent pesticides should *never* be used.

(2) Where alternative safer methods of pest control exist, at least for certain stages of the pest's life cycle, that pest should be attacked at *that* stage with non-persistent chemicals.

(3) Where alternative methods of control do *not* exist, the harm to the total environment from using persistent pesticides should be carefully weighed against the calculated harm of the pest. In other words, we must make darn sure that the cure is not worse than the cold.

(4) When persistent chemicals must be used they should be used under as carefully controlled conditions as possible at the time of the year when the environmental conditions will make their use the least harmful.

Regardless of the outcome of this affair, we are encouraged because we see progress on one *big point—people are beginning to be interested and concerned—the first step toward acceptance and action.*

Go into a Farm and Garden store or department in Michigan and you'll see people reading pesticide labels, albeit a problem for anyone on Geritol—or even Serutan—to read 6-point black type on a green label background.

DDT is no longer recommended for Dutch elm disease control in Michigan.

Many cities no longer use this chemical for that purpose.

DDT is no longer registered by the Department of Agriculture for mosquito control.

People are concerned. At a hearing in the Legislature on a Pesticide Control Bill there were as many in attendance as at a hearing on whether hunters should shoot doe deer—and that is really something. Probably the only thing guaranteed to stir up more interest would be a hearing on whether to permit nudism in Michigan.

This concern about pesticides is only part of a feeling that many people are having for a cleaner environment—people seeking solution to the problems of a technology-ridden world.

Foresters, farmers, and horticulturists have made great strides toward the elimination or greatly restricted use of the persistent pesticides—leaning more and more on the "safer" chemicals and on other control methods. We are happy about this.

But we have a long way to go. The U.S. Forest Service, state agencies, and universities still recommend persistent chemicals *even though there are safer alternatives.*

We'd be somewhat happier if these publications would point out the differences when there is a choice. This ought to be done and done quickly. Out-of-date publications should be discarded or revised.

Chemical companies still recommend DDT and its "family" without reservation. Oh sure, they urge caution. Beware of getting poisoned! But what about environmental poisoning—less dramatic but perhaps just as important to the survival of the race of

man. To read some of those ads, you'd think their products were as safe as the talcum powder mothers use on babies.

We urge a hard look at these deficiencies. We urge action on several points.

We urge agencies to take a look at and shown concern for the entire environment—not just their own restricted "area."

We urge that pesticide tolerances be included more firmly in the inter-state and intra-state water quality standards.

We urge updating and revising pesticide control laws and regulations on applicator licensing, labeling, registration, and applicator training.

We urge a stepped-up educational program to bring the concept of our delicately balanced ecosystem to the people. It's the most important thing in their lives but they don't know it.

We urge a national inventory of the sources of pesticide pollution and a monitoring of these sources.

We urge tight enforcement of present and future pesticide laws and regulations.

We urge accelerated research to document the direct and indirect effects of pesticides, and to develop safer pest control methods.

We urge a regional approach to pesticide problems to accommodate the many problems in different ecosystems.

The recently approved four-state agreement between the conservation departments in Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan to halt the flow of pesticides into Lake Michigan is a model that we hope will stimulate similar action in other regions of the country, and we will urge Governor Romney to broaden its effectiveness by bringing the governors and the agriculture departments of these states into the effort.

We will work to identify and correct environmental contamination in its earliest stages.

We will work to develop and improve an ecological conscience in all of us, and we will work toward the day when government at all levels will be more of a trustee of our natural resources rather than a referee between the many users competing for a resource.

We are not really worried about DDT affecting our virility, we're just tired of being buried in our own filth and ecological ignorance.

CONTINUED OPPRESSION IN RHODESIA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it was reported a few days ago that the Rhodesian Government has stiffened substantially the income and means qualifications for voting. The effect of this and other measures is to help perpetuate the grip of the white minority on the black majority of Rhodesia's citizens, as the following newspaper article explains:

RHODESIA UPGRADES VOTERS' MEANS TEST

SALISBURY, RHODESIA, February 14.—The Rhodesian Government announced today a 20 per cent increase in income and means qualifications under which black and white Rhodesians qualify for the vote.

The increase in requirements for new voters followed the report of a special commission earlier today that the buying power of Rhodesian currency—the Rhodesian pound—declined since July, 1957, by 21.6 per cent.

Earlier today, Prime Minister Ian D. Smith gained massive support from an important

section of his Rhodesian Front party for a new constitution.

Almost 200 delegates from the sprawling Mashonaland division approved the proposals at a meeting here. There was only one dissenting vote.

Mr. Smith said Wednesday that the party had decided to scrap two-stage constitutional proposals in which an initial multi-racial parliament would have been replaced after five years by political separation of the races.

The new constitutional proposals are believed to provide for a Senate, a multiracial national parliament—which would be dominated, like the present one, by whites—and three provincial assemblies. Over-all control of the country would remain firmly in the grip of whites.

SAVE THE MONTAUK POINT LIGHTHOUSE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in the long overview of history ours is a relatively young nation. Yet we have certain national landmarks that we value for their role in American history.

The Montauk Point, Long Island, lighthouse built in 1795 at the personal direction of President George Washington is truly an American landmark and worthy of preservation as an integral part of our history.

I have received a letter from a constituent, Mr. Andrew John Vissicchio, Jr., of Glen Head, N.Y., on the subject of the Montauk Point lighthouse and a copy of an article that appeared in the Long Island Daily Review regarding the lighthouse. Because of the significance of this subject to the history of our country, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include Mr. Vissicchio's letter and the aforementioned newspaper article in the RECORD at this point:

GLEN HEAD, N.Y.,
February 17, 1969.

To the Honorable and Distinguished Members of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I call your attention to a matter of national heritage the subject is a lighthouse which has served her nation since 1795 when President George Washington personally approved her construction.

This lighthouse located on the eastern tip of Long Island, N.Y., Montauk Point, has pointed the way for millions. Standing watch in the night to guard her countrymen from peril. Faithfully, without complaint, she has shepherded traveler and sailor to the safety of their harbor.

Now her life is threatened, as the hill on which she rests is being eroded by tide, and to our shame, neglect.

We have helped to save the temples of Egypt, we write the heritage of the future in the epic of outer space—are the only things worth saving the grand and the pompous? Is the grand old lady of Montauk Point to be buried in the sea because her countrymen are thankless of her service and neglectful of their heritage?

Most respectfully,

ANDREW JOHN VISSICCHIO, Jr.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Daily Review,
Feb. 12, 1969]

SUBJECTS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO LONG ISLAND:
MONTAUK LIGHT

In 1795, the then still fledgling nation of the United States, entered into its first contract for public construction of a lighthouse facility, with one Mr. John McComb, Jr. Mr. McComb was the low bidder, of \$22,000, for the construction of a lighthouse at Montauk Point, on Long Island. The contract was approved personally by President George Washington and signed by Mr. Tench Cox, Secretary of the Treasury.

In the nearly one hundred and seventy-five years since then, Montauk Light has had a continuous history of service to thousands of mariners who have made the Port of New York their destination. Of added significance to its service as a primary navigational facility, however, is Montauk's historical importance.

As the first lighthouse authorized for construction by the world's most renowned democracy, Montauk Light has come to symbolize the very growth of this nation. To hundreds of thousands of foreigners who sought to escape tyranny for the promise of all that a life in America holds, the lighthouse has been matched only by the Statue of Liberty as a beacon of freedom for the downtrodden.

Today, nearly two centuries of historical significance is in danger of being erased by the inevitable tides of man and nature. The Montauk facility itself is marked for eventual replacement by automated equipment to be placed atop a steel tower. The lighthouse building is destined for certain destruction via tidal erosion and neglect, unless an aroused citizenry demands specific action by government officials to preserve it.

MR. P. R. "PEM" CURRY

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. P. R. "Pem" Curry, the manager of the Western Electric system plant at Nashville, Tenn., recently retired after many years of devoted service and concrete contributions to that plant, its employees, and to our community of Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn.

An article by Mr. Nat Caldwell in the Nashville Tennessean entitled "Pem Curry Steps Down as 'Boss'" and an editorial in the same publication, "A Popular Boss Takes His Leave" outline the energy, ability, warm nature and pleasant wit of Pem Curry, a man all Nashvillians respect and many, who know him, love.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Caldwell's article and the Tennessean editorial pays deserved tribute to Pem Curry and I insert them in the RECORD at this point, adding only that it has been my great pleasure and high privilege to have known Mr. Curry and work with him in community activities. He is a gentleman and a builder in our community, and our community is a better place in which to live, work, and raise a family because of Mr. P. R. "Pem" Curry.

The article and editorial follow:

PEM CURRY STEPS DOWN AS WESTERN
ELECTRIC "BOSS"

(By Nat Caldwell)

Most men about to be turned out to pasture after 49 years in what a leading novelist has called "the corporate squeeze" come through as fairly tragic figures.

But nobody in Nashville or anywhere over the far flung Western Electric system, who knows him, is going to feel sorry for P. R. (Pem) Curry, 65, for stepping down next week.

City Councilman Mansfield Douglas, who has worked under the manager of Nashville's big Western Electric plant since 1955, first as janitor and recently as a personnel man, grinned admiringly as he spoke of the impending retirement.

He watched Curry as "the boss" trotted down the long factory floor.

"Retiring," Douglas almost snorted. "Just watch him . . . prancing like a youngster. You know what? People around here these days are wondering who's going to have the fun of working for or with Mr. Curry next. This kind of man can die. All of us will. But he doesn't just retire. He keeps going at something else . . ."

Following Curry around the plant as he hobnobs with the people who work for him—his old or new friends, a few obviously physically handicapped—one in wheel chair—not exactly the usual Duke's mixture of a plant this size, (there are many extra black faces)—one gets the idea Douglas is correct.

"We'll miss him around here," the councilman continued. "And, as you walk around with him today, you might see a tear in the corner of somebody's eye . . . They know why a reporter is out here . . . But they will be careful of this . . . because he swings around so fast and looks back at you. They wouldn't want to be caught with even one tear . . ."

Take the union. The Western Electric Division of The Communications Workers of America could have gone to Miami or Palm Springs or Phoenix for its annual mid-winter executives' conference. But they came to Nashville instead, to be around "just before Curry shoved off," a local CWA leader said:

He was their guest at one affair and they were his guests at a luncheon. The good natured wise cracks exchanged were many.

Frank Novotny, CWA director for 35 Western Electric plants, confirmed the reason for holding the conference in Nashville three weeks ago. He said:

"This guy was reasonable. He could see both sides of the fence . . . Also he's been out and done most of the rough jobs himself . . . He knows . . . You can't say the same for all those younger company smoothies.

"Why this guy had to quit school in the seventh grade. Then he went back, after passing a GED test, to college nights in Atlanta . . . He would have gotten his degree, too . . . if he hadn't quit early in World War II to set up a communications system for the Air Force on Guadalcanal."

Nashville civic leaders remember how a short, heavy set, and ready-witted man has contributed in easing broader community headaches.

E. J. Shea, former executive vice president of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, now regional executive for ASCAP, recalled:

"Remember when a Negro couldn't buy a hamburger in most restaurants in Nashville and there was rioting about it. Pem Curry was the sparkplug of the very small group of civic leaders who bluffed some, reasoned more, and mainly just kept plugging to clear this matter up.

"And nobody even dreamed of giving him a red carpet or a blue ribbon for what he did."

Shea told of Curry's well known battle for the UT Extension Center's expansion. "He begged old office furniture for equipment, built lockers out of packing materials, scrounged used lab equipment, then this, then that. Finally, we had an accredited night college," Shea continued.

"Stubborn, persistent, the man was. He kept on, dingdonging governors, wore down Andy Holt, bullied us at the Chamber—but good naturedly—and Nashville kept getting a better night school and today's assurances of a four year university branch."

Western Electric employees at the plant picked up the story:

"Imagine that you were busy installing a new switchboard in a little tiny Bell exchange in the East Kentucky coal fields 350 miles from Nashville and, suddenly, the big boss was looking over your shoulder.

"That's the way he was . . . out on the road driving 350 miles . . . just to see for himself . . . not to spy on anybody . . . but just what I said . . . out to see for himself."

And what does the retiree have to say?

"I've got a big house on Old Hickory Lake. I've got a cabin cruiser and a lot of the inland waterway to see. . . My house has one of the biggest workshops you ever saw. I've got the equipment to work in metal, wood, anything. . . I still could go back and get my engineering degree. . . There's always plenty for a man to do. . ."

The strong face, which looks ruddy in one light and grayish in a different light, is highly mobile. So are the shoulders, arms and legs behind the big desk that has imprisoned him not more than an hour or two a day since Western Electric opened its Nashville plant in 1955.

Today 1,700 men and women call him "the boss." The biggest group works at the main plant here. The rest are split up in small crews repairing and installing equipment for Bell over the three states.

"I was a building superintendent for Western Electric at Atlanta, when I decided to try college. Something like a glorified janitor but good pay. The war came on. I got to thinking. I was too young for World War I and I'd be too old for World War II . . . That decision landed me at Guadalcanal where early telephone poles were set in holes that had started as foxholes a few days before."

Before the end of the war, he bossed Air Force communications equipment for most of the South Pacific with 3,500 men and 200 officers taking orders from the major. Replacement parts were scarce and the "scrounging" Curry did to keep his lines alive was notorious at a time and in an area where commanding officers valued a successful scrounger as highly as the Congressional Medal winner.

Better jobs with Western Electric followed the war. But Curry was fortyish and the rule exception that sent him to Nashville for the new plant job provided an opening for an unusual figure in Bell system management. Mansfield Douglas had to sue him to get out of his janitor's job and move up. Curry learned about the suit when superiors in New York read over the phone to him a tiny Nashville item in a long list of federal job discrimination court suits in the New York Times.

Curry burned only briefly. "I found Mansfield to be a hard worker and a broad gauge man. He didn't have to sue again," he says. "He got to be a maintenance mechanic and did a good job. I had an opening in the office, ticket auditor in accounting, then purchasing, and lately personnel. Mansfield now does most of the interviewing, white and Negro for new employees in Alabama."

Thirty-two additional Negroes have been hired by Western Electric's Nashville plant since April, 1968.

And there are plenty of hard core whites, including the wheel chair case.

"Never heard one complaint," Curry added, quite unnecessarily, if before you talked to him you have poked around the plant a bit and attended a union mid-winter conference.

That's why Douglas' final words "That guy'll be doing something big, very quickly" is an unnecessary reassurance about this guy who'll sit behind the big desk for the last time on Feb. 28.

A POPULAR BOSS TAKES HIS LEAVE

Mr. P. R. (Pem) Curry, manager of the Western Electric Co. plant here, is retiring next week after 49 years with the company.

Mr. Curry has had a varied and exciting career in the communications field, including the job of setting up a communications system for the Air Force on Guadalcanal during World War II.

But he will be best remembered in this area for his talent in employe relations, and in human relations generally.

Although a management official, he was extremely popular with the union members who worked under his supervision. The Western Electric division of the Communications Workers of America held its mid-winter executive's conference here recently to be with Mr. Curry before his retirement. "This guy was reasonable," said one union official. "He could see both sides of the fence."

Mr. Curry also saw to it that equal employment practices were followed at his plant. He played a major role in opening up Nashville restaurants to Negro customers several years ago. And being a former night school student himself, he fought for the expansion of the University of Tennessee night school here.

Mr. Curry has been a quiet force for progress in this community. He is to be congratulated upon the end of a productive career, but it doesn't seem likely that his retirement will diminish his interest in community affairs.

YOUTH HAS ITS SAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a series of articles written by high school students is featured in the Park Forest Reporter. Miss Peggy Burnett, a senior at Rich Central High School, is the author of a very challenging and effective article in the Wednesday, February 12, edition of the Reporter.

Miss Burnett who plans to attend college and pursue a career in the field of teaching is the editorial editor of the Torch, the Rich Central High School newspaper and is president of the school literary club.

The editorial follows:

YOUTH HAS ITS SAY

(By Peggy Burnett)

There is not a single literate person living in the United States today who does not realize that the country is floundering in the midst of a serious domestic problem. This problem is the result of a dichotomy in the organization of America's governmental system. The dichotomy occurred because the writers of the Constitution tried to promote

organized individuality as a form of government. That is to say, they recognized obvious necessity of having an orderly, stable government while at the same time providing each individual with the right to dissent, thereby disrupting that order. The conflict creating the serious domestic problem is therefore a question of values: In a democracy, which is more important, individual rights, with its accompanying prerogative of dissent, or government stability? To anyone understanding the basic principles of democratic rule, the answer should be obvious. Government stability must be held in higher esteem than the right of dissent.

It would be ridiculous to say that the right of dissent has no place in a democracy; that very right is what makes democracy democratic and America free. The founders of the country made dissent legally and morally right so that citizens who disagreed with the government could change conditions without destroying the system. Democracy is thus the only form of government that has the capacity for peaceful internal change. If a minority can persuade the majority that the government should be changed, and if the minority has provided a workable and satisfactory solution to the country's problems, then the government can be peacefully altered by the democratic means of majority consent.

This basic principle, however, is being ignored by many of today's dissenters, student demonstrators in particular. According to one member of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), "Our job is to ask questions, not to provide answers." In other words, these dissenters are taking for themselves the right to destroy without assuming the responsibility of rebuilding. Furthermore, since their pseudo-intellectualism assures them that they are right, they feel no compunction whatsoever about using any means necessary to attain power. More often than not, these means are outside the law. When flaunting the law becomes an acceptable way of change, the stability of the country will be so greatly undermined that democracy will cease to exist.

The purpose of granting Americans the right to disagree was to make it possible for the government to evolve according to the needs of the times. This right was granted with the understanding that Americans wished to continue living under the democratic system, and would therefore refrain from dissenting in such a way as to harm that system. Unless this right is exercised within the bounds of democracy, unless the rights of the majority are considered as important as those of the minority, unless freedom and equality are the ultimate goals of any dissenters, democracy will not survive. The world will lose the best form of government that it has ever spawned.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1969

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and 18 of our colleagues, the Selective Service Act of 1969. The bill is identical to the one introduced by Senator KENNEDY yesterday.

The principal change in the present draft law contained in our bill is that which provides for random selection of draftees from a "prime selection" group consisting of first, 19-year-olds not deferred or exempt; second, former deferrees aged 19-35; and third, registrants 20-26 not deferred or exempt. This plan revises the present order of priority by requiring that the youngest registrants, the 19-year-olds, be drafted first. A registrant would remain in the prime selection group for 12 months and would be withdrawn from the group if not selected within that time. In other words, his exposure is limited to 1 year and he can then plan his future if he is not called. The registrant would be given a choice between entering the prime selection group upon graduation from high school or waiting until he had completed his education. A student could thus postpone his exposure to the draft, but this postponement would not become an exemption, as frequently happens under the present system.

Other important provisions of the bill include:

Elimination of occupational deferments except where ordered by the President;

Granting of conscientious objector status to atheists and agnostics, so long as they are genuine pacifists, as well as to those whose objection is based on conventional religious training and belief;

Adoption of national standards and criteria in the administration of the draft law, and their uniform application nationwide;

Prohibition of use of the draft as a punishment for protest activities, by limiting draft delinquency to acts relating to a registrant's own individual status;

Extension of major new protection to persons subject to the draft, through a requirement that the Selective Service Director inform each registrant of his rights as to deferment and exemption; the establishment within the Justice Department of appellate procedures for claimants denied conscientious objector status; and assurance that draft registrants can appear in draft board proceedings affecting them and be represented by counsel; and

Prohibition of discrimination of any kind in the makeup of any Selective Service panels which determine the draft status of registrants.

Senator KENNEDY has called the present Selective Service law "an out-dated patchwork." In my judgment, the bill we are introducing today will eliminate the inequities in the current system, shorten the period of uncertainty for those who are subject to the draft, and assure registrants proper representation in draft board proceedings. These are changes which I have repeatedly advocated and which should have been made, either through legislation or by executive order, several years ago. I hope that the Congress will act at an early date.