

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9195. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 9196. A bill to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. J. Res. 562. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 326. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that certain social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 327. Resolution endorsing the efforts of the South Carolina Jaycees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

72. By Mr. OLSEN: Resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, asking the Montana congressional delegation to request the U.S. Department of Agriculture to review the marketing of Montana wheat and to reacti-

vate the National Loan Rate Study Committee to evaluate changes which would provide equitable loan rates for Montana wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

73. Also, resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, urging that the cars and rolling stock of all carriers serving Montana be immediately returned to the Montana area so said cars can be available to transport to market the products of Montana farms, forest products, and other industries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

74. Also, resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, urging Congress to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. Also, resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, requesting Congress to name the body of water created by the Corps of Engineers dam on the Kootenai River near Libby, Mont., "Kootenai Lake"; to the Committee on Public Works.

76. Also, resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, urging that the Meat Import Act of 1964 be amended so that it will modify the harmful effects of excessive meat imports on domestic cattle prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

77. Also, resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, urging elimination of the aid to families with dependent children freeze in the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

78. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the Consolidation of Federal Assistance Program Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

79. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to the proliferation of Federal power; to the Committee on Government Operations.

80. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the abolition of zones within the national freight classification system and the elimination of the practice of permitting motor carriers in adding arbitrary charges on less-than-truckload traffic to smaller communities in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

81. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to Federal participation in welfare payments to nonresidents within the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 9197. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Matias Rubio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9198. A bill for the relief of Allreza Soltani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9199. A bill for the relief of Madhavbhai Chhitabhai Patel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9200. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Kasimierz Wojnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9201. A bill for the relief of M. Concepcion Agito Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9202. A bill for the relief of Teodoro R. Carangal and his wife, Rita L. Carangal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9203. A bill for the relief of Wilford Leonard Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 9204. A bill for the relief of Overseas Bartens, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9205. A bill for the relief of Kamal Sedky Basily; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9206. A bill for the relief of Markos N. M. Nomikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9207. A bill for the relief of Arturo M. Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 9208. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and enter judgment on the claim of Robert Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 9209. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9210. A bill for the relief of Elena I. Manzanera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 9211. A bill for the relief of Amprobe Instrument Division of Soss Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9212. A bill for the relief of Paolo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9213. A bill for the relief of Simeon Agapito Alejon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION AUTHORITY ESSENTIAL TO GOOD GOVERNMENT

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as cosponsor of the bill now being considered, S. 1058, a proposal to extend for 2 years the authority of the President to reorganize the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

President Nixon has asked Congress for power to manage his own executive

household. This power was first granted by the Congress in 1932 to President Hoover, and has been granted to each succeeding President since that time. I believe our new President should not be denied full authority and responsibility for executive management and to further streamline the Government.

As the House Members know, the Reorganization Act of 1949 gives the President authority to submit plans to Congress to modernize our Government. The act and this proposal, were recommended by the Hoover Commission, appointed to study means of improving Government efficiency.

Under this act, the President is required periodically to examine the func-

tions of all executive agencies to determine what changes are necessary. The plans for the changes are then submitted to Congress.

Reorganization plans submitted to the Congress automatically become effective in 60 days unless vetoed by either the House or the Senate. Since 1949 Congress has vetoed 22 of the 83 reorganization plans submitted.

This system has given the President the latitude to put his own house in order while at the same time retaining for the Congress an effective means to exercise its will on proposed reorganization.

The authority expired on December 31, 1968. The Senate has already acted to

renew the Reorganization Act, and it is up to us to concur in this much-needed objective by approving legislation to extend the authority.

FIRST LT. JAMES A. GARDNER,
U.S. ARMY

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1969, the Greater Dyersburg-Dyer County Chamber of Commerce and the people of Dyer County, Tenn., met to pay honor to Lt. James A. Gardner, who posthumously was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor by President Lyndon B. Johnson. The ceremony was also dedicated to all the servicemen of this country who have given their lives in defense of our freedom.

I had been asked to attend the occasion but was unable to. However, Mr. Bob Espey, the executive manager of the Greater Dyersburg-Dyer County Chamber of Commerce, forwarded me a copy of the citation which President Johnson posthumously awarded to Lieutenant Gardner for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty."

I ask unanimous consent to have this citation printed in the RECORD at this point and would like to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to Lieutenant Gardner and his family and to the families of all those Medal of Honor winners who have lost their lives, as well as the recipients of the medal who received them personally from the President.

The citation follows:

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, posthumously, to First Lieutenant James A. Gardner, United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

On 7 February 1966 Lieutenant Gardner's platoon was advancing to relieve a company of the 1st Battalion (Airborne), 327 Infantry, that had been pinned down for several hours by a numerically superior enemy force in the village of My Canh, Vietnam. The enemy occupied a series of strongly fortified bunker positions which were mutually supporting and expertly concealed. Approaches to the position were well covered by an integrated pattern of fires including automatic weapons, machine guns and mortars. Air strikes and artillery placed on the fortifications had little effect. Lieutenant Gardner's platoon was to relieve the friendly company by encircling and destroying the enemy force. Even as it moved to begin the attack, the platoon was under heavy enemy fire. During the attack, the enemy fire intensified. Leading the assault and disregarding his own safety, Lieutenant Gardner charged through a withering hail of fire across an open rice paddy. On reaching the first bunker he destroyed it with a grenade and without hesitation dashed to the second bunker and eliminated it by tossing a grenade inside. Then, crawling swiftly along the dike

of a rice paddy, he reached the third bunker. Before he could arm a grenade, the enemy gunner leaped forth, firing at him. Lieutenant Gardner instantly returned the fire and killed the enemy gunner at a distance of six feet. Following the seizure of the main enemy position, he reorganized the platoon to continue the attack. Advancing to the new assault position, the platoon was pinned down by an enemy machine gun emplaced in a fortified bunker. Lieutenant Gardner immediately collected seven grenades and charged the enemy position, firing his rifle as he advanced to neutralize the defenders. He dropped a grenade into the bunker and vaulted beyond. As the bunker blew up, he came under fire again. Rolling into a ditch to gain cover, he moved toward the new source of fire. Nearing the position, he leaped from the ditch and advanced with a grenade in one hand and firing his rifle with the other. He was gravely wounded just before he reached the bunker, but with a last valiant effort he staggered forward and destroyed the bunker and its defenders with a grenade. Although he fell dead on the rim of the bunker, his extraordinary actions so inspired the men of his platoon that they resumed the attack and completely routed the enemy. Lieutenant Gardner's conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity, above and beyond the call of duty, were in the highest traditions of the United States Army.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

MAYOR LEO J. ALVELAIS, OF UNION
CITY, CALIF.

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a most significant event will take place on Saturday evening, April 5, 1969, when leading citizens from southern Alameda County, Calif., gather at a dinner honoring Hon. Leo J. Alvelais, mayor of Union City.

As the Congressman representing this benign and fertile area, I am making a special trip to California to be present at this joyous affair. It will be a unique celebration because Mayor Leo Alvelais is a remarkable human being as well as an outstanding community leader.

My friend, Mayor Leo J. Alvelais was born January 31, 1918, in Chihuahua, Mexico. His formal education was in Spanish. With a strong desire to provide better educational opportunities for his children, he left his native country, moved to California in the early 1940's accompanied by his wife Emilia and their three small children, Leo Jr., Louis Raul, and Emilia Esther. Leo and his family located in Oakland in 1943 where he became involved in the war effort, working in various shipyards in the East Bay. Two more children were born after Leo arrived in California; Michael in 1946, and Robert in 1959.

At the time of his arrival in the United States, Leo Alvelais could not speak a word of English. Today he speaks, reads and writes fluent English although never formally schooled in the English language.

The Alvelais family moved to Union City in 1958 and since that time he has been very active in all phases of commu-

nity and civic affairs. Leo was elected to the city council of Union City in April 1966 for a 4-year term. He was selected as Union City mayor in April 1968 and his term ends in April 1969, while his term as a city councilman will end in April 1970. In addition to his busy schedule as a city official, Leo has been involved in many other community activities.

He is currently a member of the board of directors of the Southern Alameda County Economic Opportunity Agency which administers the antipoverty program in the area comprised of Union City, Fremont, Newark, San Leandro, Hayward, Pleasanton, Livermore and certain unincorporated territory of southern Alameda County.

Leo is also past member of the board of directors of the Legal Assistance Center which provides legal counsel to low-income persons who otherwise could not afford such service. In addition, Leo is involved in several other civic organizations, among them as president of the Latin American Club of Union City, treasurer of Centro Socio Mexicano of Union City, public relations officer of the Union City Taxpayer's League, member of the Commission Honorifica Mexicana of Union City, member of the Union City chapter of the Mexican-American Political Association—MAPA—delegate member of the California State Central Committee, past member of Advisory Committee on Mexican Affairs to the State department of employment, and member of the Union City Improvement Association.

During Leo Alvelais' term as mayor several major steps were taken by his office. A model cities application was submitted to the Federal Government which, although not yet approved, is an ambitious and comprehensive step toward planning and implementing solutions for many of the problems facing Union City. Mayor Alvelais has initiated a mayor's "Stamp Out Unemployment Crusade" in Union City which has developed into an intensive employment drive in cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen—NAB—the State department of employment, Economic Opportunity Agency, and others. Union City received national publicity as the first city in the Nation to formally endorse and cooperate in new ways with NAB in their program to place unemployed persons in private industry.

A Mexican plaza project for the Decoto area has long been a prime program for the mayor to provide a recreational and cultural gathering place to enhance the Mexican heritage of Union City. An open space acquisition and development grant for a Mexican plaza was recently filed with the Federal Government and the city has received authorization to proceed with the project.

The improvement of the Alvarado area has also been a chief concern of Leo's and as mayor he reaffirmed to the county board of supervisors the city's desire to receive top priority for flood control and drainage improvements in Alvarado. Appearing before the board

of supervisors, Leo was successful in obtaining a commitment that Alvarado would be considered first for improvements when adequate funds accrue to the flood control district budget.

Another phase of Alvarado improvement began while Leo was mayor and will involve the possible establishment of special assessment districts in Alvarado to provide curb, gutter, sidewalk, street and other improvements as well as the possibility of a neighborhood development program—NDP—which would be a major step, funded primarily by the Federal Government, to redesign, upgrade and significantly improve a major portion of the Alvarado area while still retaining its essential character and appeal.

Mayor Alvelais has also been active in BARTD affairs including support of recent sales tax measure necessary for financing BARTD completion, execution of the Union City BARTD station agreement and development of the central business district which will adjoin the BARTD line and station in Union City.

Vitally concerned with the needs of the people, Mayor Alvelais was instrumental in the city's entry into the section 23 leased housing program whereby Union City became the first city in Alameda County to join with the Alameda County Housing Authority to improve and provide local housing under which privately-owned dwellings will be leased to occupants with low incomes who otherwise could not afford such housing. Leo was also instrumental in spearheading a sound and acceptable repositioning of the governmental portion of the board of directors of the Southern Alameda County Economic Opportunity Agency.

In addition to his extensive activities as a city official, community leader, and member of civic organizations, Mayor Alvelais manages to find time for full-time employment as the head of the printing department of Fruitvale Canning Co. in Oakland. His energy, devotion to the community and interest in local affairs are unlimited. Both his accomplishments as mayor and his involvement in many community groups and organizations are reflections of his high motivation and continuing devotion to his community.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to share with my colleagues in the U.S. Congress these significant facts about a talented and energetic American, Leo J. Alvelais, who, to paraphrase President Kennedy, asks not what his country can do for him, but what he can do for his country.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, OF MARYLAND

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, a dinner honoring our distin-

guished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, was given in Baltimore. Over 650 people, representative of Baltimore's finest citizenry, attended.

The proceeds from the dinner went toward the building of a new religious school.

Rabbi Shusterman made some very fine remarks on this special occasion when he paid tribute to SAM.

It is a distinct honor and privilege to submit to my colleagues in the House, the remarks of Rabbi Shusterman. Needless to say, I agree with the Rabbi's comments 100 percent.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

This banquet, like love, is a many splended thing. If we had decided only to hold our usual donor dinner to raise sufficient funds for the needs of our own brotherhood program we would say "dayaynu—it is enough for us." The cause or the end justifies the means. If this were only a gathering to stimulate further interest in the vital building program of the congregation, again we would conclude "dayaynu." But think of these important causes and add the extra sparkle of friendship for gratitude to and admiration of our fellow-member and congressman Samuel N. Friedel—and we proclaim in the words of the Passover ritual, "How much the more are we to be thankful for this hour and this experience."

I am by no means a newcomer to Baltimore. Here I have spent the past 27½ years of my life. These, by every possible calculation and appraisal, are the best years of life—Yet when I first met Sam Friedel he already was active in public service, having served in the House of Delegates and the City Council. We saw him progress from local to national involvement. We watched him advance in seniority in the Congress and—as the years flew by—to receive the repeated endorsement of his constituency. He has the knack of making friends and keeping them. Success has not spoiled our distinguished honoree. It is impossible for me to describe all the circumstances under which Sam Friedel and I have worked together, have taken counsel with each other. These range all the way from the sad moments of the death of his mother and brother—to Bar Mitzvahs and Confirmations in his family—from his arranging for an invitation to me to deliver the invocation in the House of Representatives—to my repeated requests that he help us obtain a national figure as speaker for one of our gatherings. He never says "no" to any legitimate request and always extends the hand of helpfulness.

Sam is blessed with two amazing qualities. One is the universality of friendship. He is a Democrat who can boast of Republican friends who trust him and a Jew who is blessed with hosts of Christian well-wishers who respect him. To him labels and color are purely incidental and not of the essence of manhood. He also is a doer rather than a talker. Sam's strong point is not oratory but hard work. We never think of him as the maker of mere campaign promises that remain unfulfilled after the election. He asks for the confidence and endorsement of his constituency on his record. It is the record of a consistent liberal whom even the most cautious conservative would not call "wild-eyed." He is a prudent man who understands the lingo of both the pragmatic politician and the egg-head. That is why we, his fellow-members of Har Sinai in the company of so many friends from other synagogues and churches, rejoice in the privilege of honoring him tonight.

At this high moment in our proceedings I will not encroach upon other speakers by thanking you who made this evening possi-

ble or by expounding on the specific brotherhood needs and aspirations of Har Sinai. Needless to say my personal gratitude is beyond expression. Let me add only a word or two about the new building program. Congressman Friedel was kind enough to ask that as much of the proceeds as possible be earmarked for the new educational and administrative wings we are adding to our temple complex. These are sorely needed to make the Har Sinai of tomorrow an institution more worthy of the challenge of the American Jewish future. We will see to it that something significant is named after Sam so that future generations will understand how proud we are that this man lived and served his city, State and Nation in these trying times.

None of us can tell how long life will last, although we pray for Sam and Regina as we do for ourselves—until one hundred and twenty years give or take a few either way. I want to be remembered for many things I have loved and prized and among these is the privilege of having led the congregation from Bolton Street to the suburbs and of finishing the job, of completing the structures, of seeing our dreams fully realized. I want to provide the next generation with even finer opportunities and facilities than my predecessors left for me. Men like Sam Friedel and scores of others have given this ambition, this dream, this aspiration new meaning and are trying to make it come true. Because of people like you I hope soon to be given the sacred privilege of dedicating the buildings we need to complete this task and to say with the prophet Malachi, "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith the Lord of hosts, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord."

Rabbi ABRAHAM SHUSTERMAN.

CRIME IN WASHINGTON UP ALMOST 44 PERCENT

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, new crime statistics for the District of Columbia indicate January 1969 crime increased 43.9 percent over the same month last year.

Specifically, murder showed a 100-percent increase, rape 64.3 percent, robbery 101.4 percent, burglary 44.1 percent. Only aggravated assault showed a decrease, less than 2 percent.

Apparently these statistics, or the raw material from which they were compiled, led to the decision by Chief Layton and Mayor Washington to place an additional 175 policemen on duty during February. I have previously commended that action.

Congressional committee action on the crime crisis appears to be stalled. The chairmen of the House District of Columbia Committee and the House Judiciary Committee have still not moved any of the legislation pending before them. In the Senate, where hearings have been held, it is reported that no further action will be taken until the President sends up his own plan. Most citizens applauded the statements made by the President regarding his plans for the city of Washington to meet the crime crisis, but the specific legislative pro-

posals to carry out those plans have yet to be received on the Hill.

Every month that goes by without action results in new statistical proof of the scope and seriousness of the problem. There can be no excuse for further delay, either on the part of congressional committees or the White House.

THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN: AN APACHE YOUTH'S VIEW

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Miss Brenda Lavendar, a White Mountain Apache, wrote the thoughtful and pertinent article printed below. The valid points she makes are ones that all Americans would do well to heed:

THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN (By Brenda Lavendar)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is being reprinted from the Talon, the student newspaper at Alchey High School in White-river. Miss Lavendar, a Junior, is on the Honor Roll with an "A" average. She is active in School activities and is secretary of the Luther League at the White-river Lutheran Church. Her desire . . . to get a good education and thus be able to help her people.)

Apache—this was once a word which less than a century ago made a white person shiver with fear and brought visions of cunning, strength, and bravery to the mind. Nowadays what would an outsider, or even an insider think of, once he encounters the word, Apache? More than likely, he would think of one drunken—dumb Indian.

Of course we are improving our way of life, progressing and meeting the standards of the rapidly advancing world around us; but there still remains the bad qualities which we possess and almost always, they are the ones by which we are judged.

We are an intelligent group of people, very capable of opening the doors to opportunity, success, and happiness; but the sad thing is that we do not realize these things. A few of us may, but a majority do not. What we need is unity. We may have great leaders among our midst, but every single one of us have to pitch in our two cents in order to make something out of ourselves, not only as individuals but also as a tribe.

More than often, we tend to shake loose the pressure of responsibility. When a situation arises which requires assistance of a person as an individual or as part of a group, he is prone to say, "Let them do what needs to be done. I'm living a good enough life right now. If things get worse I can always depend on welfare and relief, and another thing, I have lots of relatives. They will help me out."

This is the attitude most of us are likely to have. We have no sense of duty. In order to keep up with the world we must learn to do things for ourselves. We must learn to cope with our problems, and try to solve them, rather than tossing them aside hoping the other person will solve it in time.

We Indians in America are often referred to as the forgotten American; but I sometimes wonder, are we really forgotten? Think of the many wonderful opportunities waiting right under our noses, and we don't have to pay a red cent to achieve them. Think of the many programs by which the government and various other organizations, have brought food, clothing and education to our

homeland. If we can't provide such opportunities for ourselves, the least we can do is to make use of them while they are within reach. Who knows? Tomorrow they may be gone.

Are we the forgotten Americans? It is we ourselves who must determine whether we will be a people who will keep up with the pace of the world, or lag behind and gradually become, the forgotten Americans.

BEN NATHANSON CELEBRATES 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF A NEWSPAPER

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a young man, using an automobile for an office, established a small newspaper in suburban Detroit which he called the East Jefferson Shopper.

Last week that man, Ben Nathanson, celebrated the 30th anniversary of the founding of that newspaper.

He did it by marking the completion of a splendid new building to house all his newspapers.

That small, one-man operation of 30 years ago has now grown into a large and complex publishing enterprise. In this new building, located in East Detroit, Nathanson will centralize the operations of Michigan's largest group of weekly suburban community newspapers.

While Ben Nathanson's newspapers have been growing both in size and number, he has not sacrificed quality. They are among the finest community newspapers in the Nation. It is worth noting too that Ben's weekly column has been honored by the Michigan Press Association.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Ben Nathanson for his success of the past 30 years and wish him continued success in his new publishing plant.

I insert the news story "New Facility Designed To Improve Service," and Ben Nathanson's column "Slants on the News, 30 Years of Service," in the RECORD:

NEW FACILITY DESIGNED TO IMPROVE SERVICE

East Side Newspapers will join the Community News in their new central office building, 17401 E. Ten Mile, East Detroit, Saturday, completing an expansion program which began with the opening of the building in January.

Since that time, the New Ten Mile headquarters has housed the editorial and circulation departments of the Macomb County Community News editions. Advertising and business department personnel servicing Community News accounts will make the move along with East Side Newspapers.

The move, announced by president and general manager Ben Nathanson, will be made without any disruption of service. The office will continue to be open for business during the regular hours of 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on week days and 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Saturdays. It is located on Ten Mile at Macomb, between Kelly and Gratiot. The Community News telephone number, 772-3700, will remain the same.

East Side Newspapers, which publishes the East Side Shopper, East Side Booster and East Side Express in Detroit, Harper Woods Community News and Grosse Pointe Press, will retain a branch office at its former

headquarters, 16300 Harper in Detroit. It will continue to be staffed by editorial, circulation and want ad departments.

The new office will make possible the uniting for the first time under one roof the operations of Michigan's largest group of weekly suburban community newspapers. In addition to the five East Side Newspapers, the group publishes Macomb County editions of the Community News in Mount Clemens, East Detroit, Roseville, Fraser, St. Clair Shores, Clinton Township, Warren and Center Line. Total weekly circulation average is 150,000.

In addition, Nathanson publishes the Northwest Detroit, Southfield Record and Oak Park News with headquarters at 17311 W. Seven Mile. These three Northwest Detroit suburban editions with a combined weekly average circulation of 40,000 are composed at the new Ten Mile headquarters.

Since 1965, the Harper office has served as the headquarters for the two-county, 13-edition East Side Newspapers/Community News group while a branch Macomb office was maintained, first at 21850 Gratiot and then at 14614 E. Nine Mile, prior to the January move into the new building.

Now for the first time the group will be housed in a building specifically designed and built for its publishing operations.

In making the announcement, Nathanson emphasized that "the flexibility and updating of our facilities will allow us to keep pace with the growth of our Macomb County suburban editions and the progress of our Detroit and Wayne County editions we have experienced in the past five years."

Nucleus of the group was the East Side Shopper, started by Nathanson in 1939 as the East Jefferson Shopper.

The Macomb County editions of the Community News were taken into the group in 1962 and expanded in 1964. The Northwest editions were purchased in April, 1968.

The modern 12,000 square-foot carpeted facility on Ten Mile includes news room and general office space, executive offices, conference room, lunch room, dark room, circulation library, storage area and utility room in addition to the type-setting and composition departments.

As soon as weather permits, the 77-car parking area will be paved and the area landscaped.

THIRTY YEARS OF PUBLISHING: SLANTS ON THE NEWS

(By Ben Nathanson, president and publisher)

Almost 30 years to the day it is since I ventured into the business of publishing a community newspaper in Detroit. It was March in 1939 when the East Jefferson Shopper (later the East Side Shopper) came into being.

My office for almost two years was my 1937 Chevrolet, and the wonderful Kilcoyne family who lived at 739 Manistique permitted me to use their address as a mailing location. The paper's first business location was at 1039 Eastlawn, then to Jefferson and Coplin, Jefferson at Phillip, Mack at Alter road, and in 1965 we moved to Harper and Three Mile drive which has been the headquarters for our East Side Newspaper/Community News groups ever since.

Branch offices since 1965 (now closed) were operated from Gratiot and 8½ Mile road and Nine Mile road near Hayes. Our newest Northwest Suburban Newspaper group has editorial and business offices at 17311 West Seven Mile road near Southfield. The Northwest Detroit, Oak Park News, Huntington Woods News and Southfield Record are published weekly from that office.

THE LONG SEARCH

Next week the business headquarters of our East Side/Community News groups will be transferred to our new 12,000 square foot

modern building at 17401 East Ten Mile near Gratiot in East Detroit. The digging, assembling and construction has been under way for about a year, and a year prior to digging the first shovel of dirt, I searched (with the help of many real estate experts) to find a land site large enough and geographically suitable so that we could house most of our East Side employees under one roof and efficiently service our subscribers and advertisers from somewhere near the center of our circulation area.

The daily newspaper strike, construction strike, telephone strike, Edison strike—and there must have been some other strikes—all contributed to the delay, a most frustrating experience.

Now, at long last, members of my very patient staff are about to see another dream come true in our growth pattern. A new era of public service and self-fulfillment is about to begin, and I don't mind admitting that the prospects for future growth are even more exciting than they were when I was driving by 1937 Chevy.

A LOYAL TEAM

In those days I was pretty much all alone. Today I am blessed with a fine, loyal team of employees, almost 100 strong, plus almost 1,000 carrier boys who help deliver our nine basic newspapers and 15 editions to almost 200,000 families every week in the tri-county area in and around Detroit and 17 suburbs.

Our present Harper-Three Mile drive building will continue to be utilized (as a branch office) for the convenience of patrons in eastern Wayne County who desire to deliver news items in person or pay bills personally to our classified advertising or circulation departments. Service personnel will be stationed at the Harper branch as a public convenience daily from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and Saturday from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. for an indefinite period.

A double telephone switchboard with 26 incoming lines has been installed at the new headquarters building on Ten Mile road to handle the anticipated increase in phone communications created by the consolidation of the majority of our staff involved with East Side and Community News editions. Free parking areas to accommodate 77 cars adjacent to our new building on our two acres of land has been provided for customers and employees.

UTMOST IN COMFORT

Seven heating and air-conditioning zones have been installed in our new facility which is designed to offer the very best comfort for employees and the public. When it is officially completed in the next few months, our central office building will be carpeted throughout the interior and asphalted everywhere in the 47,000 square feet of parking area. Special outside lighting will brighten the exterior.

Our huge exterior sign was created not only to identify our location, but also to offer passing traffic the correct time via a revolving clock. Beneath the time piece the sign resembles a theatre marquee so that it may be used to publicize special attractions, important community affairs and other observances. We plan to make our sign available to service groups and municipal governments served by our newspapers. Advance reservations will be cleared by our public service department.

Requests for display space also will be honored on a limited time basis to groups who want to utilize our large lobby area inside the new central building. Preference will be given to organizations that do not have their own facility in which to exhibit non-profit projects and programs near and dear to their hearts.

HAPPY COLLECTORS

Two years ago when I started to search for an existing building large enough to house our East Side staff and also centrally located

in terms of our total circulation coverage, I discovered how impractical it was. Therefore, I was obliged to buy land, and fortunately I was able to find a suitable site not too far from Detroit proper, which has been our base of operations for so long. The two acres I found on Ten Mile and Macomb street is the very last two lots available on Ten Mile in East Detroit. The City of Roseville begins, in fact, on the east side of Macomb street. Furthermore, the northern portion of our land (63 feet) is in Roseville. Thus, we are tax payers now in three cities: Detroit, East Detroit and Roseville. There's nothing like making three tax collectors happy instead of only one!

Although the need for centralizing our location in terms of our southern Macomb County and eastern Wayne County interests are concerned has been pressing for some time now, I feel it is very important, too, for our newspapers to be identified and located in Detroit proper which explains our retention of branches at Harper and also at West Seven Mile.

At least the current move, I trust, will provide us with adequate means to serve our various constituencies in the manner to which they are entitled. In the past, our phenomenal growth and lack of foresight into the future created problems which in effect made our facilities too small almost the very day we moved into them. Enough is enough already!

PROTEST THE CLOSING OF THE ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAINING SCHOOL

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I recently placed in the RECORD a number of letters from students and parents whose school, the St. Clair County Training School, is being closed by order of a Federal judge. These students and their parents do not want their school closed, and have made every effort to get this idea across to those who have made this decision. I have received another letter from the student council of the school, and I submit this letter for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

PELL CITY, ALA.,
February 14, 1969.

HON. BILL NICHOLS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: We, the student body at the St. Clair County Training School, are soliciting your assistance in helping to maintain the present status of our school, Grades 1-12. Many of us who had our beginning at the County Training School would like for it to be the school that we could refer to as "our dear Alma Mater." We, the Elementary, Junior and Senior High School students have anticipated being the potential graduates of this school.

Another one of our basic concerns is that we would like to maintain our high school so there might be one predominantly all Negro school in St. Clair County. We feel that we have an outstanding school, for there are many former students who have pursued higher goals in life and have been very successful. Every effort is being done by our qualified principal and staff in providing knowledge and skills that will help us to become useful and productive members of our society.

The school being accredited by the State Department and one of the few schools ac-

credited by the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges is a remarkable accomplishment for us. Taking the High School Department away will destroy these accomplishments that we have diligently toiled to obtain.

We are seeking your help as our Congressman to render your service and efforts in helping us to maintain our school.

Very truly yours,

ALICE GAMBLE,
President of Student Council.

PEGGIE FORMAN,
Secretary.

MARGARETTA TINSLEY,
Student Council Adviser.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's Washington Post "Potomac" magazine carried an excellent feature article by Julius Duschka highlighting the history of the League of Women Voters. His historical résumé commemorates the 50th anniversary of the league in Montgomery County, Md.

In preparing his article, Mr. Duschka was told that he could never understand the league until he had seen one of its unit meetings. This admonition led to what he described as his very conspicuous presence in a family-room full of women, when he attended a recent unit meeting of the Montgomery County, Md., League of Women Voters.

I have shared this reporter's experience, both as a State senator and a Member of Congress, in meeting on numerous occasions with units of the county league. On each of these occasions, I have been presented with comprehensive, well-defined positions taken by the league which demonstrates their thorough research and systematic analysis on matters of public concern. I have likewise been impressed by the personal depth of understanding which these ladies have evidenced in their visits to my congressional office, and the subsequent resolve to act on the basis of their findings. Their research is diligently pursued; their interests are broadly conceived; and their participation is zealously lived.

As the league enters this period of national recognition on its 50th year, I would like to commend to my colleagues a brief history of the League of Women Voters of Montgomery County, Md. It was prepared and provided by the Marie Bennett Memorial Library of the Montgomery league, and it confirms the things I have been saying:

EXPERIMENT IN PEACEFUL AGITATION

Members of the League of Women Voters of Montgomery County, Maryland, have been practicing participatory democracy for half a century. March, 1969 marks the beginning of their fiftieth year. Their record is a graphic reflection of the principle that informed, determined and organized citizens can profoundly influence the performance of their government.

They began in 1920 under the leadership of a handful of veterans from the woman suffrage movement. Their first president was Mrs. Lavinia Hauke Engle. Her father was a Quarter lawyer who had handled several prominent cases involving the rights of women. Shortly after the Civil War he had sponsored the first woman attorney to be admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, Miss Belva Lockwood. Mrs. Engle's daughter, also named Lavinia, was Field Secretary of the National American Woman Suffrage Association until 1920 when she became Executive Secretary of the League of Women Voters of Maryland. Miss Engle is still active in the Montgomery County League. Also among the early leaders was Mrs. Eugene Stevens of Bethesda, who later served as president of the local chapter.

It is helpful to recall the political climate into which the League of Women Voters of Montgomery County was born. In many respects, Montgomery County in 1920 represented Maryland in miniature, even as Maryland has been called the United States in miniature. The county's location between coastal plain and mountains, between north and south, astride Braddock's Road to Cumberland and the west, between the port of Baltimore and areas whose commerce it served, and adjacent to the nation's capital, brought together within the county attitudes and passions from all over the nation. These often enriched and sometimes divided the populace.

Most of the county was rather typical of rural, agricultural America, but the rapidly growing population close to the District of Columbia was overwhelmingly made up of urban-oriented business and professional people and government workers. The county contained active supporters of women's rights and their opponents. There were advocates of Negro rights and their opponents. There was then, as now, an uncommon diversity in the ethnic and religious backgrounds of the population.

In 1919 female suffrage had been one of the more heated issues in the local elections. While party platforms and statewide candidates discussed the issue in terms of state's rights, candidates for local office reflected a strong local southern influence with reference to the numbers of Negro women in the state and declarations of support for suffrage for white women only. Thus the notion of women engaging in politics at this time not only provoked wrath among opponents of female suffrage, but also involved the racial issue. The Maryland League of Women Voters had Negro members from its very beginning, and included them in their luncheon meetings in Baltimore hotels which were otherwise segregated.

In those days, women's activities beyond the home, were limited mainly to the various ladies aid societies and women's clubs, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Daughters of the Confederacy. For the reform minded, there were the Women's Christian Temperance Union, which met quite regularly, and the Anti-Saloon League. Many business interests were uneasy. Not surprisingly, the liquor interests felt, with some justification, that women had had a lot to do with the prohibition movement which convinced them that women were not to be trusted with the vote. Thus a certain audacity and courage was required to begin the work of the League of Women Voters in Montgomery County in 1920.

The Montgomery League, functioning as a component of the Maryland League, contributed to the nationwide effort to teach women how to use the vote and to improve conditions in their community by conducting local citizenship schools, get-out-the-vote drives, and studies of county government. They urged their representatives in Congress and the General Assembly to support legislation in the fields of education, health, legal

status of women, and child welfare, to name a few.

From this tiny beginning was to grow the third largest local League in the country, ranked behind only New York City and Los Angeles. For nearly two decades, however, they continued as a small, informally organized group of less than 100. Some of their leaders during the thirties were: Mrs. Herman Wilson, Mrs. Gilbert Grosvenor, Mrs. V. L. Ellicott (daughter-in-law of Mrs. Charles Ellicott of Baltimore, president of the Maryland League its first eighteen years), Mrs. Walter Perry, Mrs. Mordecai Ezekial, Mrs. Raymond Clapper and Mrs. John C. Livingston. They prodded local officials and examined government functions first hand, sometimes asking embarrassing questions. Their findings were reported back to their members, to the press and to anyone who would listen. Slowly the masculine hostility and suspicion receded as their reputation for careful, objective work took root.

The local group seems to have been somewhat insulated from the more devastating effects of the depression; nevertheless, the late thirties did mark the beginning of a surge of growth and activity. In 1938, the League took its first step in what was to become a ten-year successful campaign to do nothing less than to revolutionize the county's government. That effort is still remembered as a classic episode in the League's history.

The headlines of the times testify to the League's participation in this campaign, but are no measure of the scope of that participation. First, the League endorsed the County Civic Federation's call to the County Commissioners for a professional study of the local government. The League had just completed a two-year study of its own which had convinced its members that major changes were in order. When the Commissioners yielded to this request, the League was one of the groups which urged them to accept the offer of the Brookings Institution to make the study for a nominal charge. Careful review of the Brookings Report in 1941 prompted the League to call for a charter providing for local self-government under a council-manager system with a merit system for county employees.

The League's organizational ability was put to work, sometimes independently, sometimes through the Montgomery County Charter Committee. Members gathered signatures. They manned the Speakers' bureau. They produced fliers and booklets and distributed them. A five "man" Charter Board was elected, consisting of four men and a past president of the League. The whole League was galvanized into action. The opposition was entrenched and formidable. The charter which the Board drafted in 1943 was narrowly defeated in the 1944 election, but a new campaign was begun immediately. The same difficult process was essentially repeated and produced the charter that was adopted in 1948. Another former League president was elected to serve on the first County Council.

The League truly came of age during this long fight. Its membership doubled and then redoubled. Its place in county affairs was now firmly established. The emphasis in its program shifted beyond the confines of more traditional feminine interests in welfare, education and health toward broader questions of public policy such as planning and zoning, constitutional reform, civil rights, and international political and economic relations. It accelerated its metamorphosis from a feminist organization into one which by the early sixties could adopt the slogan "one man, one vote" without a second thought. Its internal organization had been restructured from the national board down to the neighborhood units.

Broad membership participation was built into the structure. Every member had a responsibility to help to choose items for

study, to inform herself and to help to make policy decisions. The organization precluded the reliance on a few experts to study problems and boards of directors to establish policy. The new structure sacrificed the capacity for quick action in order to gain a capacity for more effective action. This practice is sometimes infuriating to groups urging the League to dash off and right which ever wrong is troubling them most at the moment. They find it difficult to understand that the effectiveness which they admire is the result of painstaking concentration on carefully selected items.

The methods of operation developed and refined during the charter fight were applied to a series of other local causes. Since an essential element in these methods includes working with other groups wherever possible, the League certainly can not claim sole credit for all the reforms which it sponsored. However, many League objectives have been realized, including (1) a county library system, (2) a merit system for county employees (with a League member on the first Personnel Board), (3) a county operated junior college, (4) an elected school board, (5) transition to integrated schools without the necessity for local court action, (6) more local control over state established bi-county agencies for planning, parks, water and sanitation, and (7) a strong local open housing ordinance.

Its work has helped to achieve many triumphs in the continuous effort for better land use planning, excellence and efficiency in the public schools, a rapid rail transit system, fair and adequate housing for all citizens, responsive and responsible county government, better park and recreation services, and conservation of water resources. While pushing for these measures on the local level, it has maintained an active participation in national, state and metropolitan area programs on matters pertaining to foreign policy, human and natural resources, fair representation, fiscal reform, state constitution and so on.

"God forgives, man forgets, but a woman remembers forever," quoted one candidate at a League candidates meeting in Montgomery County over twenty-five years ago. So that all citizens, not just women, may know a candidate's position before an election, and not let him forget it afterward, the League has always maintained an extensive voters' service program. Before each election it publishes a Voters' Guide which includes a list of polling places, an objective analysis of each referendum question, and information supplied by the candidates about their background and their stands on key issues. It conducts candidates meetings which regularly offer the public a view of candidates from all parties and factions on a neutral platform. It makes information on registration and voting available through fliers, public media and a telephone service at its office.

Between elections, the League publishes booklets such as its "Know Your County," which has been used as a text by the public schools, "Equality of Opportunity," and "Housing in Montgomery County." It maintains a speakers bureau, sends observers to meetings of public bodies, and conducts "go-see trips" to County Council sessions, the State House, the U.S. Capitol and the United Nations in New York.

A steady stream of League graduates has flowed into party politics and public office. They have taken positions in the Maryland Senate, the House of Delegates, the Circuit Court, the County Council, the Board of Education, the Constitutional Convention, and innumerable other boards, commissions, and committees and operating level positions in government and politics.

Presidents of the League of Women Voters of Montgomery County since 1940 have been the following: Mrs. G. Minier Hostetler, Mrs.

PGad Bryan Morehouse, Mrs. Dean Dinwoodey, Mrs. Durward V. Sandifer, Mrs. Frank R. Garfield, Mrs. Ralph E. Himstead, Mrs. James R. Hemingway, Mrs. James V. Bennett, Mrs. Thomas Lee Smith, Mrs. Elizabeth Rohr, Mrs. Thomas G. Casey, Mrs. William A. Schell, Mrs. Mayhew Derryberry, Mrs. William N. Garrott, and Mrs. Alan Y. Cole.

In a few words, what does it all mean? What is the essence of "the League" in Montgomery County? The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan organization whose purpose is to promote political responsibility through informed and active citizen participation in government. It believes in the democratic principles and individual liberties established in the Constitution of the United States. It takes action on governmental measures and policies in the public interest. It does not support or oppose any political party or candidate. Membership is open to anyone who subscribes to its purpose and policy. Voting members must be women citizens of voting age.

Applications of these principles means that League members are encouraged to become involved in the party of their choice, but that those who hold leadership positions or represent the League before the public may not participate in partisan affairs. It means that within the League, allegiance to democratic principles is almost spiritual in nature. Those with treasured myths about women's organizations should take note. Young radicals revolting against the notion that "the clothes makes the man" should take note. Among League members, the clothes do not make the woman, nor does the accent, nor ancestors, nor income, nor creed, nor academic attainment. There is an incredible disinterest in anything about one except for what she has done in the League—lately. Here is a mechanism whereby unbelievably diverse personalities work harmoniously toward common interests. One might call it a laboratory in participatory politics.

Does forty-nine years of experimentation justify its continued existence? At least twelve hundred women in Montgomery County would answer, "Yes!" They believe that the ever increasing complexity of life in general and government in particular make it ever more vital for individual citizens to have a program which offers systematic analysis and action on matters of broad public policy. This challenge they take as their assignment from society for the next fifty years.

JAMES K. NORTHAM

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to insert the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star, published on March 12, 1969.

This tribute is too eloquent to be expanded. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, Jim Northam was a warm, good friend to my father and me. And, along with the rest of our fellow Hoosiers, we are diminished by his loss.

JAMES K. NORTHAM

James K. Northam served the legal profession, his state and his country with acuity and insight born of study, experience, knowledge and reflection about people and the things they live by. He was scholarly, observant and individualistic, a witty analyst of human events, a keen student of world affairs, a man with a sense of history and style.

His tragic death by fire is a deeply felt loss to his many friends and acquaintances. Our profound sympathy goes to his family.

"LOVE THY NEIGHBOR"

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, during a time of major disaster in the 33d Congressional District of California, when floods virtually wiped out whole communities, it occurred to me that my colleagues might like to see the kind of people-to-people programs that developed out of nowhere. It is this kind of "Love Thy Neighbor" attitude which solves problems quickly and efficiently.

The following is a copy of a bulletin which I took from a bulletin board in a residential area which suffered more than \$1 million in home loss alone during the flood:

MARCH 7, 1969.

To: Dunlap Acres Residents.

From: Joe Mulder, Yucaipa Valley Park and Recreation District, Volunteer Director, 13th Street and Avenue E, Dunlap Command Post, Telephone 797-8882.

Hi NEIGHBOR: I'm happy to have time to stop and jot a few lines for your information on the progress of the clean up and digging in your neighborhood. Progress looks good.

Owners of flood damaged properties which have not been re-appraised should notify the county assessor's office "as quickly as possible" in order to obtain assessment reductions for 1969.

Please check with me before hiring heavy equipment to make sure the price is fair.

Now, I'd like to thank my volunteer staff—Bob Mulder, who has been working side by side with me and the Red Cross volunteers, Barbara De Roo, Joyce Nehlsen, Natalie Sanchez and Inga Wilkes. Barbara, Joyce and Natalie came to us from Redlands and Inga is your own neighbor from 15th Street. I'm sure you know these gals by now. You can recognize them by their Red Cross arm bands.

It would have been impossible to have made the progress that we have without the help of the Marines—many of those boys have served one or more tours of duty in Vietnam. Thank you for your neighborliness to our Marine helpers—1st Plt, B Co, Hq. Btry, 5th F.A. Gr Marine Corps Base, 29 Palms, Calif. 92278. That's the address in case you want to thank them personally. Now that the danger to life and limb is over the Marines must return to military duty.

Rev. T. White of the Free Methodist Church has been so kind as to let the Command Post be headquartered in his office. We do thank him. There are so many people to thank for their time, talent and donations I don't know where to start. We will list our friends on another bulletin.

We do have large amounts of clothing, bedding, household items which your friends have donated to us for your use. Please come and get these things as we need the space for more donations that have already been offered. These items are stored at the Southern Baptist Church on 15th St. and Avenue E, the Free Methodist Church on 13th St. and Ave. E, and also the Yucaipa Valley Welfare on Avenue B west of California Street. There is no charge.

Ruth Tator and Stephanie Stephens, Red Cross Case workers are stationed at the Southern Baptist Church, Ave. E & 15th from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. to help flood victims that are

destitute. We thank Rev. Fike for the use of his church.

Well, it's back to work and thanks to the Yucaipa Valley Presbyterian Church for getting this bulletin out.

MEAT IMPORTS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, meat imports coming into the United States are supposedly controlled by Public Law 88-482, passed by Congress in 1964. This law has been very inadequate. Today meat imports are coming in over, under, through, and around this so-called meat import control law. The so-called yardstick known as the adjusted base quota provides only the minimum of protection on the quantity of fresh or chilled beef that is imported, and none at all on the preserved or canned beef. I am therefore introducing a bill which I believe will be of material assistance as a warranty to our economically oppressed rural citizens by strengthening the act of 1964 and to broaden the species and kinds of meat which can come under import quotas.

My bill maintains the same adjusted base quota of 725,400,000 pounds of meat. But my legislation would include under this 725.4 million pounds, fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of lambs; fresh, chilled or frozen meat of swine; all beef and pork sausages, whether or not in airtight containers; prepared or preserved pork; and lastly, prepared or preserved beef and veal. These items are added to those few which are now included under Public Law 88-482, namely fresh, chilled or frozen meat of cattle, goats, and sheep.

Although the policy of Congress as stated in the law, specified the quantities of beef, veal, and certain mutton products which may be imported, no statutory provision exists to check such imports unless the Secretary of Agriculture estimates, in advance, that the volume is likely to exceed the adjusted base quota by 10 percent. This language has made it possible for an extra 10 percent of foreign meats to come in the United States, above the quota.

My bill would eliminate these additional imports and would forbid importation of the specified meats above the 725.4-million pound total. It would not be necessary for the Secretary to make any estimates before these imports could be checked. By this bill, the quota would be imposed by the law itself, and would not be dependent upon the Secretary's estimate.

This proposal would also require that no more than one-fourth of the products imported each year would be allowed on the market during any one calendar quarter. This would protect against flooding the domestic market during any particular period of time. Finally, my bill provides that offshore purchases of meat by the Defense Department for the use of our troops at home or abroad shall be

charged against the quota applicable to such meat.

Meat imports into the United States had a value of \$763 million in the calendar year of 1968, representing a 15-percent increase over the previous year. A total of 1,128,000,000 pounds of beef and veal were imported in 1968, with a value of \$485 million. In 1967, this figure was 979 million pounds and had a value of \$404 million. Increases were noted in all three categories of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, both in volume and in value.

In the area of pork, \$169 million were imported in 1968 as compared to \$157 million in 1967; fresh lamb doubled from \$4 million to \$8 million; and fresh mutton also increased in value of imports from \$14.1 million to \$15.5 million. The average value per pound of imported beef was 42 cents while canned pork, usually as shoulders or canned hams were imported at 75 cents per pound.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that a total of 613.9 million pounds of meat subject to the narrow limitations of Public Law 88-482 entered the United States in 1965. This figure grew to 823.4 million pounds in 1966, 894.9 million pounds in 1967; and to a whopping 1,001 million pounds last year. All without once having to implement quotas as all of these totals were well within the annual 10 percent guaranteed growth as defined in the present inept law.

I sincerely hope that this Congress will permit hearings on the need for amending the present law so that we may have an opportunity to bring some limited protection to a very vital segment of our society, that of the rural food producer.

MISS ALICE M. ISELY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Miss Alice M. Isely, of Wichita, Kans., who was a highly respected teacher and librarian for many years, passed away last week. She was 103 years old.

About a year ago I visited with Miss Isely in her home. She was interested and concerned in the work of the Congress. She had written to me many times in recent years expressing her views on legislation and other matters affecting our country. Miss Isely was a dedicated American citizen, and I might add, she was proud of her republicanism.

She had served as librarian at Fairmount College in Wichita for 33 years. Born in St. Joseph, Mo., Miss Isely helped organize Sunday school classes for the Congregational Church in Utah and Colorado. After 12 years in that area, she went to New England where she was a teacher, speaker, and assistant to Congregational ministers.

Miss Isely was librarian at Fairmount and the University of Wichita from 1911 to 1935.

The Isely family has contributed much to the history of Kansas. Her brother, Bliss Isely, was the author of Kansas history textbooks, and a sister, Mrs. Lydia Wellman, was the mother of authors Paul and Manley Wade Wellman.

Alice Isely will be missed by all of us who knew her.

HUMANITARIAN WAITRESS

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents and longtime friends, Miss Virgie White, of Kingston, Okla., was recently honored as winner of the 1968 Lake Texoma Association Humanitarian Award for her devotion to the lake and the people who live around it. An interesting article describing Miss White and her work appeared in Oklahoma's Orbit, the Sunday magazine section of the Daily Oklahoman which is published in Oklahoma City, Okla., on March 2, 1969.

The article was written by Mr. Vernon B. Snell and reads as follows:

HUMANITARIAN WAITRESS

(By Vernon B. Snell)

There are more facets to Virgie White's unselfish life than there are catfish in Catfish Bay.

Miss White is the popular Kingston waitress who received a check for \$1,000 recently as the winner of the 1968 Lake Texoma Association's Humanitarian Award for her devotion to the lake and the people who live in Texomaland.

Compliments paid to the sprightly little Lake Texoma Lodge waitress at the awards ceremony and since would fill a book. They already have filled a scrapbook compiled for her by friends, and she has enough letters, cards, telegrams and citations left over to fill another big one.

Carl Albert of McAlester, house majority leader in the U.S. Congress, wrote to the Lake Texoma Association about the award. "You can't be around Virgie but a few minutes without her saying something good about Lake Texoma," he said.

Such letters came from the rich and the poor. They came from Lt. Gov. George Nigh, from former Gov. Raymond Gary, from Gladys Erickson of the Chicago American and from a man named V. G. Olson of Pecan Gap, Texas, who has been taking his family to Lake Texoma since 1945.

Mrs. Boyce Harkey, wife of the lodge manager, introduced Virgie at the awards dinner, held at the swank Tanglewood Hills Country Club on the Texas side of Lake Texoma.

"Many persons have diverse abilities," she said, "but few as many as Virgie White. Who else can wait on 50 persons efficiently, making all of them feel they are receiving her special attention? Write a newspaper column? Be a politician? Converse with persons from all walks of life? Be a lover of nature and animals and still have time to promote the interests of youth?"

"The dedication Virgie has displayed through the years is rare, and what she has done has not been for her betterment financially or otherwise. If she had a million dollars she'd give every dime of it away. Her greatest attribute is self-confidence."

Virgie White is a one-woman humane society. She's always finding a dog by the side of the road, abandoned or injured by a car, and taking him to a Durant veterinarian for repairs. When the dog is able to travel, there's another pet in the White household.

She has four dogs right now, and not long ago she was giving a home to seven, along with six cats.

Virgie White was born four miles south of where Texoma Lodge is today. She isn't about to say when. Her father was Joe White, a farmer who was part Cherokee Indian.

She and her two sisters walked two miles to school at Woodville, a community which was moved to higher ground when Lake Texoma was built. Virgie finished high school there.

"No family was poorer than we were," says Virgie, who remembers that she and her sisters used to go fishing with their father instead of attending parties.

"We didn't have party clothes in those days. We were poor, but we didn't know it." How does she come to know so many people? "I've always wanted to know what made them tick. So I've tried to find out."

One of her pet projects is the Kingston Youth and Civic Club. She gave the club the land on which its building now stands. Actually, the club paid her for the lot, but she turned the money back into the building fund.

Miss White is leader of the Happy Hour Blue Birds, and has been since 1961. She helped organize the Camp Fire Girls and the Little League baseball team at Kingston. "I help with the kids" is the way she describes her baseball activities. Among other things she goes to all practice sessions and helps transport the boys to game in the Madill league.

Virgie is a little dynamo who goes to bed at midnight, gets up at 5 a.m. and is on the go all the time. She has never been seriously ill in her life.

She has no intention of retiring. "I intend to work until the day I die . . . I do."

H.R. 9157—A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF KING COUNTY, WASH.

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, with my colleague, Mr. PELLY, of Washington, a bill—H.R. 9157—for the relief of King County, Wash.

This bill is introduced by request. A copy of the letter requesting the introduction of this bill is included with these remarks:

KING COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,

Seattle, Wash., February 3, 1969.

Re King County's Request for Private Legislation, Federal Aviation Administration Matter.

HON. BROCK ADAMS,

U.S. Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ADAMS: The undersigned request your support in seeking the passage of private legislation, which in effect would relieve King County of its obligation to return to the Federal Aviation Administration \$158,301.83, said sum being principal and interest on a grant-in-aid default.

May we clarify that this is not an indebtedness in the way of an assessment against the

Boeing Company, but rather it is pre-paid rent at a fixed annual rate of \$25,000 on Boeing's leased premises at Boeing Field.

As has been pointed out by the Acting Airport Manager John Tobin, King County is embarking on a vigorous campaign to upgrade the facility to make it a safer and more efficient operation and a source of pride to the community. This \$25,000 will necessarily reduce the Airport Fund accordingly, and could seriously curtail these improvements. These monies are desperately needed, as King County Airport will not receive Federal Air Airport Program (F.A.A.P.) grants in 1969.

Thank you again for your interest. Any efforts made by you on behalf of Kings County are very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
KING COUNTY, WASH.,
JOHN T. O'BRIEN, *Chairman*.
ED MUNRO, *Commissioner*.
JOHN D. SPELLMAN, *Commissioner*.

FIVE FOOD CHAINS IN ATLANTA HALT SALE OF GRAPES

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, five major food chains in Atlanta recently halted sales of California table grapes in response to the national boycott farmworkers are sustaining against growers who stubbornly refuse to sit down at the bargaining table with their union, the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO. Similar response to the boycott in cities across the country is strong evidence that by and large, Americans believe that farmworkers should have the same rights and protections under the law to form unions that workers in most other industries have. The action of the Atlanta food chains is especially significant, for it was reportedly made in the face of a so-called "buy grapes" drive mounted by the John Birch Society and the National Right To Work Committee. In my opinion, that took a special kind of courage, and deserves wide recognition. Accordingly, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story from the AFL-CIO News about it, as follows:

FIVE FOOD CHAINS IN ATLANTA HALT SALE OF GRAPES

ATLANTA.—Five big food store chains in Atlanta have discontinued the sale of California grapes at the urging of local clergymen and a citizens' committee set up to support the boycott campaign of the AFL-CIO Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

The food chains acted in defiance of a "buy grapes" counter-campaign led by the John Birch Society and the National Right to Work Committee.

Leading the grapes boycott drive were the Atlanta Committee to Support the California Farm Workers and the Concerned Clergy, made up of 50 local ministers, priests and rabbis. Their efforts led to halting of grapes sales by the A & P, Big Apple, Colonial, Kroger and Winn-Dixie stores.

Earlier, major chains in Chicago and Detroit announced they would no longer carry California grapes and mayors of Chicago and Philadelphia joined with the chief executives

of other major cities in halting purchase of California grapes by city institutions.

The boycott, launched by the Farm Workers after California table grape growers refused to recognize the right of their workers to union representation, has the backing of the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

ROONEY ASKS MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS TO CURB SALESGIRLS PEDDLING SUBSCRIPTIONS TO VIETNAM VETERANS IN HAWAII

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I return to the subject of magazine subscription sales today to direct a personal appeal to the magazine publishing and subscription sales industries.

I have addressed my colleagues many times in recent weeks to call attention to deceptive and blatantly fraudulent practices which are used by companies engaged in the sale of magazine subscriptions.

Today, I publicly appeal to the integrity of the magazine publishers and the organizations which sell their product to immediately call off the vultures who are seeking out members of our Armed Forces serving in Vietnam as their prey.

A letter written by the mother of an American serviceman in Vietnam has just come to my attention. She explains that her son, upon his arrival in Hawaii on a brief rest and rehabilitation leave from the combat zone, was walking along a street away from the airport when two girls in a car pulled over to the curb and struck up a friendly conversation.

Understandably impressed by their sweet-talk, the young serviceman accepted their invitation to get in the car. Little did he expect that his first contact with American girls after duty in Vietnam would end with his being deceived into signing not one but two contracts for magazines, costing a total of \$258.

These girls, who described themselves as exchange students from California who were earning points to win trips to Europe, secured the contracts on January 17, 1969, for an organization known as Publishers Continental Sales Corp., 2601 East Michigan Boulevard, Michigan City, Ind. 46360.

Mr. Speaker, I have written to the magazine sales company asking that it order its sales personnel to stop victimizing American combat veterans and refund to this serviceman \$169 collected from him. I also have written to the Magazine Publishers Association to ask that the publishers themselves immediately take steps to stop this gutter type of sales activity.

As further evidence of the need for prompt and firm congressional action to clean up magazine sales practices, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD the letter from this serviceman's mother to the editor of "Action! Express,"

public service feature of the Easton, Pa., Express newspaper:

MARCH 10, 1969.

ACTION EDITOR: Here is another gimmick those magazine houses are doing to the fellows in Services.

Recently my Son, who is serving in Vietnam took his R & R to Hawaii; he no sooner got off the airplane and was walking up the street away from the airport when two girls in a car pull along side him and asked him if he was new here. Of course he told them he was, then they told him to hop in the car and they started to tell him that they were Exchange students from Calif. and how they entered into a contest for a tour for their team to Rome, France and Spain. Each magazine they sold was worth so many votes for their team, they never told him the prices on the magazines and for how long the subscriptions were for until after he signed the paper. How rotten and how low can those magazine houses get. I'll pass the address of the magazine house to you. Publisher's Continental Sales Corp. 2601 East Michigan Blvd. Michigan City, Indiana, 46360

We wrote and told our son not to pay those people another red cent, being that he is not yet 21, the paper he sign were no good, because he was under age.

As I sit here and write this to you I can't but help wondering how many other fellows are being taken for a sucker ride by those magazine company.

I'm enclosing two photostat copies of the two bills I received in the mail, get a load of the number of issues they talk him into and the prices.

What should we do for our Son who is over in Viet-Nam? Here is hoping Action Express looks into this stinking mess.

I remain,

Mrs. G.,

R.D. No. 2, Kunkletown, Pa., 18058.

NEED TO CONTROL STEEL IMPORTS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that there is need for legislative action to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron, and steel mill products.

The need is evidenced by the clear danger to our steel industry and its half million steelworkers that exists from the dramatic and continual rise in steel imports.

Whereas the United States formerly was a net exporter of steel products, the situation was reversed in 1967. Indeed, last year our exports of steel products totaled only 2.2 million net tons while our imports had increased to 18 million tons. What is more, our exports mostly were Government financed.

Thus, last year we had a net deficit of nearly 16 million tons, representing about \$1.5 billion. Translated into employment, this deficit represented 140,000 potential jobs in the U.S. steel industry, based upon each million tons representing jobs for about 7,700 persons.

I am in sympathy with the basic free trade policy for our country, but, at the same time, I believe it is essential for our own economy and for our own industry that we keep careful tab in specific areas should exceptions become necessary.

There is clear need for an exception on steel.

Differing from legislation which I have introduced in the past, the bill which I am introducing today has no termination date. Instead, it provides that at the end of 5 years the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a comprehensive report to the Congress on the effect of the limitation on steel imports. At that time the Congress can decide whether any change in the rules is in order.

THE SLUM PREVENTION ACT OF 1969

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Ways and Means Committee urging support for my bill, H.R. 8797, the Slum Prevention Act of 1969. As I told the committee, I believe that this proposal could become a major tool in the battle against slums in our large cities. I ask my colleagues to consider the proposal carefully and to support it when it comes before the House for consideration along with other tax reform proposals. I insert my statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE ABNER J. MIKVA, OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, MARCH 17, 1969

Chairman Mills and other Members of the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, it is my great pleasure to appear before you today to testify in support of H.R. 8797, the Slum Prevention Act of 1969. I have called my bill the Slum Prevention Act because I believe that this proposal could become a major tool in the battle against slums in our large cities. The proposal would cost the taxpayers no money (unless they were slum owners), and might even bring in some revenue to the Treasury—a feature which may make it unique among those that seek to remedy our urban ills. The proposal is to withdraw tax depreciation allowed under existing law from real property which fails to comply with the health and safety provisions of local housing and building codes. A complementary provision would disallow a capital loss write-off for abandonment of property which is in violation of such codes at the time it is abandoned. These two provisions could put the Federal income tax laws on the side of slum prevention instead of on the side of slum promotion.

Mr. Chairman, we do not allow a criminal depreciation on the gun he uses to break the law; to my mind there is no reason to allow depreciation to a slum landlord on his non-complying slum property. The slumlord causes far more social harm than the common thief; but he has the law on his side when he files his income tax return. The owner of urban property which is in violation of local housing and building codes endangers the health and safety of not only the residents of that building, but of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of residents in neighboring buildings. For this reason it does not seem to me we can any longer afford to do without the powerful stimulus which depreciation withdrawal would provide to maintenance of urban property in compliance with local law.

The need for an approach to real estate depreciation allowances such as I propose, Mr. Chairman, can no longer be seriously questioned. In speaking of a special report

to the National Commission on Urban Problems, of which he was chairman, former Senator Paul Douglas noted:

"Tax provisions not only provide little encouragement for repair but actually may tend to discourage improvements by investors. . . . As the Federal income tax is now constituted, the profitable course for real estate investors is to take accelerated depreciation after purchase, avoid repairs, and sell off their properties within a decade before their tax shelter fades. Continuity of ownership and sound maintenance are inhibited by opportunities for fast gains in this cycle of constant trading."

This conclusion is buttressed by the statements of many noted experts in the field of Federal treatment of real estate taxation. As one expert, cited in the report to the Commission on Urban Problems, put it:

"Uncle Sam is a principal cause of the phenomenon known as the slumlord . . . no matter how many violations have been lodged, the slumlord may file his depreciation . . . even in an old-law tenement he may take it on an accelerated basis."

Certainly no one would argue that the Federal tax structure is designed to encourage speculation in slum property, but nevertheless that is its result. We must face up to the fact that the income tax laws are to a large extent responsible for the enormous profitability of speculation in substandard urban real estate. Thus, it is tax benefits which are already available to owners of substandard urban property which make it so highly profitable for them to continue to speculate—and to avoid maintaining their properties in accordance with even the minimum health and safety standards of local law. We must do something to put the tax laws on the side of urban residents and city governments rather than on the side of the slumlords.

This brings me to another important point about my proposal—it creates no special exemptions, gives no tax breaks, contributes to no tax shelter. Former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley Surrey often argued that it was not sound, as a matter of tax policy, to use the Federal income tax laws to accomplish other social or humanitarian goals—however worthy they may be. Such practice, he felt, often resulted in dislocations and inequities in the tax laws which far surpassed in seriousness the original problems sought to be solved. But Mr. Surrey never argued, Mr. Chairman, that the tax laws should create social problems. That is, in fact, what has happened with the depreciation allowances now available on substandard urban property. My bill would not create special tax categories to accomplish slum prevention, but would deny to owners of slum property a tax break which would otherwise be theirs. When the Federal government is bending every resource to solve the problems of decaying cities, I think we can do no less. It is time to write tax laws which help prevent slums rather than help promote them.

Some proposals have been made to withdraw only accelerated depreciation from urban property. The sponsors of such proposals say that this would slow down the turnover rate—a factor which contributes mightily to slum conditions. But this would still leave the Federal government in the position of subsidizing slum property owners. I maintain that we should withdraw all depreciation allowances from property which does not meet the minimum health and safety requirements of local law. It has been said that such a rule would put a powerful weapon in the hands of local code enforcement authorities. I say this is a weapon they should have had years ago. It might have helped them enforce health and safety provisions of their codes which under present circumstances are frequently completely ignored.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Chairman, that the only significant objections to proposals such as mine are to the administrative difficulties they present. I believe that by careful drafting, the use of legal "presumptions" where owners have been cited for violations within the taxable year, and development by the IRS of standard forms and procedures, all of these objections can be met. If we do not at least attempt to put this policy into effect, we are in the position of saying to urban residents throughout the nation, "Yes, we believe a policy change is necessary, but we just can't draft a bill to put it into effect." I don't believe the public will buy that argument, and I'm not sure that it should. For those on the Committee who are interested in some of the more interesting policy and technical problems which the bill raises, I have included a "technical appendix" to my remarks which discusses some of these problems in more detail.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should emphasize that I am not advancing the Slum Prevention Act as a panacea which will solve all the problems of slum housing and substandard urban property. As Senator Douglas observed: "Slum housing problems are too complex to be resolved solely or primarily by income tax changes." The point is that my proposal can help arrest the growth of the slum cancer. At that moment of truth when a property owner can still opt for property maintenance rather than property milking, he ought to know that the risks of milking include loss of a meaningful tax deduction. The decay of our inner-city areas is the most pressing domestic problem facing this nation. In my opinion we cannot afford not to effect this realignment of Federal tax law. I urge the Committee to include in its reform proposals to the House a provision such as I have advocated here today. It may well be the strongest possible action the Congress could take to show the cities that we do care. At the very least it will put the tax laws where they should be, on the side of slum prevention instead of slum promotion.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX TO STATEMENTS OF HON. ABNER J. MIKVA BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, MARCH 17, 1969

Any attempt to amend the extremely complex Internal Revenue Code inevitably raises important and difficult problems of policy and drafting. The Slum Prevention Act is no exception. As with tax legislation in the past, some of these problems must be left to be worked out by the Internal Revenue Service in its regulations. Some of the most significant problems, however, have been solved by careful drafting and the use of legal "presumptions." This appendix discusses the solutions which were devised to carry out the policy of the Slum Prevention Act of 1969.

The first general rule of the Act is "No deduction shall be allowed [for depreciation] for a taxable year with respect to property which is noncomplying residential property at the close of the taxable year." The Act then proceeds to define "noncomplying residential property" and to describe the extent of the disallowance if property is found to be non-complying.

The second general rule is that "No deduction shall be allowed [for a capital loss] by reason of the abandonment in a taxable year of property which is noncomplying residential property at the end of the taxable year." This rule would prevent recapture as a capital loss write-off of depreciation which was not taken at the time of the abandonment.

Property which had been cited more than 30 days before the close of the taxable year for a violation of health or safety provisions of a local housing or building code would be presumed to be "noncomplying." The taxpayer could rebut this presumption by satisfying the Secretary (1) that the violation did not exist at the time of the citation or had

been corrected before the close of the taxable year, (2) that the building had been demolished since the end of the taxable year, or (3) that the owner was exercising due diligence either to correct the violation or demolish the building.

The depreciation withdrawal provision applies only to residential property, and only to residential property which is at least ten years old. This latter requirement was inserted in order to exempt buildings which contained structural defects at the time they were built. It was felt that it would not be fair to hold a new owner responsible for these to the extent of forfeiting his depreciation deduction, although of course he would be responsible for repairing them under most local building codes. By the time a building is ten years old, most of the original structural defects will have been found and corrected.

The type of code, the violation of which will result in loss of depreciation allowance, is not limited—building codes, housing codes, electrical codes, plumbing codes, etc., are all included. Only those provisions, however, which affect health and safety will count for purposes of the Act. The taxpayer's determination that a violation for which he has been cited is not a "health and safety" violation will, of course, be reviewed by the IRS and will have to be acceptable to it. Ultimately it is foreseeable that local code enforcement authorities will probably begin to specify which provisions of their codes they feel affect health and safety. Thus it might happen that when a property owner receives notice of a violation from a local housing or building code enforcement agency, the notice would contain the statement "This violation affects health and safety within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code." Such a determination by the local enforcement authority should carry great weight with the IRS when auditing the taxpayer's return.

It has been objected that the tax withdrawal proposal puts too big a club in the hands of local code inspectors. To some extent protection against abuse of their authority by inspectors is provided by the fact that the taxpayer may rebut the presumption against him by showing that no violation in fact existed. Another answer to this "crooked inspector" argument is that the tax laws ought not to be drafted on the assumption that local officials are corrupt or inefficient. To the extent that the Act puts into the hands of honest, overworked housing and building inspectors throughout our nation's cities an additional weapon to aid in securing compliance with often-ignored local codes, it probably should have been enacted long ago.

If a property owner lost depreciation on one piece of property, he would not necessarily lose his depreciation on all other property owned in the same city, or even the same block. Other property, even if next door, which has regularly been reported as separate property for the purposes of the depreciation allowance would be considered separate property for the purposes of depreciation withdrawal.

Finally, in order to make the depreciation denial sanction meaningful, the Act would require an adjustment to the property's "basis" as if all the depreciation otherwise allowable on the noncomplying property had been taken. Thus the basis of the noncomplying property would be adjusted just as if all the allowable depreciation had been taken, even though it was not taken because of the property's noncompliance. This safeguard is necessary in order to keep an owner whose property is perennially in noncompliance from gaining the advantage of depreciation by putting his property in compliance immediately before sale, and taking the unused depreciation in the form of a capital loss on sale.

THE AMERICAN LEGION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, the American Legion celebrated its golden anniversary commemorating 50 years of dedicated service to the Nation and its veterans.

I want to extend my heartiest congratulations to this great organization on its 50th birthday.

Last Saturday night, together with scores of my colleagues in the House and Senate, I attended the Legion's birthday party in Washington, D.C. I witnessed another example of the American Legion's unselfish devotion to the memory of their fallen comrades. Reversing the traditional custom of receiving gifts on a birthday, the American Legion presented to the Nation its 50th anniversary gift—a system of permanent lighting at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery. In an impressive ceremony in the ballroom of the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, President Nixon flicked a remote control switch that illuminated the national shrine with the first permanent lighting system in its 50-year history.

Impressive though this ceremony was, it represented but the culmination of 50 years of impressive and dedicated service to the Nation by the American Legion.

Since that historic day of March 15, 1919, when a small group of less than 500 World War I veterans met in Paris, France, in what is now termed "The Paris Caucus," the American Legion has, on three occasions, opened its ranks to a new group of veterans which has served in the Armed Forces of our Nation during time of war or conflict. Today, its membership is made up of more than two and a half million veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and Vietnam.

During this 50-year span, the American Legion has compiled an impressive record of achievement. From the time of its founding, this organization has dedicated itself to the care of the war disabled and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans. The outstanding benefit program enjoyed by the Nation's veterans can be attributed in large measure to the legislative leadership and support of the American Legion over the years. A significant list of legislative milestones offers tangible evidence of the effectiveness of the American Legion's effort over the years. The establishment of the Veterans Bureau in 1921 and its successor, the Veterans' Administration in 1930; the World War Veterans Act of 1924; the first non-service-connected pension program for widows and orphans; the World War II GI bill and similar programs for veterans of more recent conflicts are but a few of the major pieces of legislation in which the American Legion played a leading role.

Not content with the passage of laws to protect veterans, the American Legion, in its formative years, inaugurated a rehabilitation program designed to assist veterans and their dependents in obtaining the benefits to which they were entitled. Today, American Legion service officers at the post and department levels, and the Legion's expert staff at the national level are counseling thousands of veterans and their families concerning their rights and benefits, helping them file and process claims, gain admission to VA hospitals and assisting in many ways in guiding the destinies of the Nation's veteran population. No one contributed as much to the rehabilitation program as my friend and fellow Californian, Bob McCurdy.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the American Legion on 50 years of achievement. I am confident that its future will produce an equally impressive record of success.

BETH SHOLOM CONGREGATION MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to note that the Beth Shalom Congregation of Elkins Park, Pa., will be celebrating its 50th anniversary with a special Sabbath morning service on Saturday, March 22, 1969.

In a time when the actions of small groups generating destructive influences in our Nation are rewarded with headlines and stories in major newspapers, I am proud to cite Beth Shalom Congregation as an outstanding example of a small group that has grown to exercise profound and constructive influences.

On March 22, 1919, 12 men joined together in a testament to their faith and signed a charter for Beth Shalom Congregation. In half a century, Beth Shalom Congregation has grown to a house of worship for more than 1,000 families.

Beth Shalom itself is unique among our thousands of synagogues in this country. The synagogue is the only one ever designed by Frank Lloyd Wright.

Nighttime travelers, passing through this heavily traveled area of Montgomery County, are inspired by the tower of light of this remarkable edifice.

To the congregation this tower represents Mount Sinai, source and base of religious law. Here is the meeting place of divinity and humanity, where is supported the sacred law, symbol of God's descending will.

To others, this tower of faith is a dramatic landmark symbolic of the religious freedom enjoyed by the Jewish people, yes, and by all people in Montgomery County and the United States of America.

I pay special tribute to Rabbi Emeritus Mortimer J. Cohen who led the congregation for 45 years, and to Rabbi

Aaron Landes, and the officers and directors. Their dedicated work has greatly enriched the life of the congregation and has supplied a solid foundation upon which to build for the future.

In a time when our spiritual and moral values are challenged both from within and without this Nation, Beth Shalom's 50th anniversary provides proof of the sustenance of religious values in our life and the capacity for equipping families to cope with the trials of a world with God's compassion and understanding.

May the years to come bring continued success in the efforts of the Beth Shalom Congregation to meet the spiritual needs of man in our complex and demanding age.

**AN EQUITABLE SYSTEM FOR FIXING
AND ADJUSTING THE RATES OF
COMPENSATION OF WAGE BOARD
EMPLOYEES IS NEEDED**

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Prevailing Wage Rate Determination Act of 1969," whose purpose is to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees.

Because the number of wage board employees exceeds 765,000, this bill is of vital concern to one-fourth of all employees of the Federal Government. It directly affects their wages, their own individual rights and obligations as well as the rights and obligations of their union representatives who are bargaining for them and who represent them on the various wage board committees established by this bill.

Basically, my bill is intended to bring order and system out of the chaotic situation which now exists in the Federal Government's procedures for fixing the rates of pay of employees working under the so-called prevailing wage rate system. The information which I have been receiving for some time showed such a great discrepancy between rates of pay for wage board employees performing the identical functions and working in the same community that I found that the presumption of serious inequity and injustice could not be excluded.

This bill would reduce such a possibility of inequity.

While remedying abuses, the bill will preserve, nonetheless, the concept and procedures of the "prevailing wage" system. It thus is not a modification of the wage board system itself but simply a measure to eliminate injustice and inequity by providing new mechanisms to establish basic regulations, to conduct wage surveys, and to adjudicate or arbitrate differences.

The most important single improvement in my bill over the present arrangement is that it will give a statutory foundation to improved procedures for wage board rate determinations. The principal instrumentality provided by

the bill to assure that such a policy is pursued is a newly created "standing committee" within the Civil Service Commission, to be known as the National Wage Policy Committee.

Composed of 11 members, the National Wage Policy Committee will have as its chairman a person who shall be from outside the Federal service and who shall be appointed directly by the President and shall hold no other office in the Federal service during his tenure as chairman.

To assure that the chairman is objective, my bill provides that he will serve exclusively at the pleasure of the President of the United States and that his compensation will be \$75 for each day spent in the work of the Policy Committee.

In addition, the Policy Committee will have five Federal employee union representatives and five management representatives.

The Federal employee union representatives will be appointed as follows:

Two by the President of the AFL-CIO; and one each appointed respectively by the President of the Federal employee union representing the first largest, the second largest, and the third largest number of Federal employees subject to this act.

The five employer representatives shall be appointed to the National Wage Policy Committee as follows:

Two management representatives will be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, at least one of whom shall be appointed on a rotational basis for a period of 2 years from the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force;

One management representative from the Veterans' Administration will be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

One management representative from the Civil Service Commission will be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; and

One management representative will be appointed, on a rotational basis for a period of 2 years, by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission from Federal agencies which are leading employers of employees subject to this act.

In addition to establishing the National Wage Policy Committee, my bill will require each Federal department or independent agency designated by the National Wage Policy Committee to establish an Agency Wage Committee, composed of five members. The role of the Agency Wage Committee will be to assure the implementation within the agency of the wage surveys through the functioning of the local wage survey committees.

A most important feature of my bill is the inclusion under its wage rate system of all employees who are now paid from so-called "nonappropriated funds." These employees will no longer be considered outsiders to the wage board, or prevailing wage rate, system. They will be assured equity and justice in the same manner as if they were receiving their pay from appropriated funds. Certainly, it is improper that an employee should

receive less money for his work simply because his employer or manager draws his checks on a different bank account.

As with all legislation, I realize that this bill may emerge in somewhat different form when it is finally enacted. However, on the basis of my experience, I am sure that the final statute will not be very much different in its essentials than the bill which I introduced today.

**PENTAGON PROCUREMENT: BIL-
LION-DOLLAR GRAB BAG**

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues an important study of defense procurement which has appeared in the Nation magazine for March 17. It is a fine primer on the policies, practices, and profits supporting our massive military-industrial complex.

Written by a former member of my staff, Mr. Richard F. Kaufman, the article's basic premise deserves to be underlined:

The cumulative effect of Congressional reports of waste and mismanagement on defense contracts should be to shift the emphasis of future investigations. Although the difficult job of digging into programs and disclosing abuses in individual cases should continue, the central question today is no longer whether there are exorbitant profits, padded costs, poor performance, general mismanagement of procurement, and a swollen military budget. The central question from now on is, what can be done to change the procurement system so that the military-industrial complex will be brought under a social control.

Under unanimous consent, I am placing the full text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

**PENTAGON PROCUREMENT: BILLION-DOLLAR
GRAB BAG**

(By Richard F. Kaufman)

(NOTE.—Mr. Kaufman is on the staff of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government, chaired by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, which has been investigating profits and costs in defense procurement.)

WASHINGTON.—Two kinds of activities are paid for by military expenditures: the purchase of weapons, hardware and other goods; and the support of personnel, the operation and maintenance of bases, military construction and civil defense. Of last year's \$79 billion Defense Department bill, \$44 billion went for the former. (If military expenditures on programs outside the Pentagon were included, such as military assistance, space, atomic energy, Selective Service and veterans' assistance, the sum would be much higher.)

One of the most disturbing facts about the costs of procurement is that so much money is wasted on excessive profits and excessive costs, and is therefore unnecessary. No one knows how much waste there is, but reliable estimates run into billions a year. In 1964, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, looking into "Pyramiding Profits and Costs in the Missile Procurement Program," concluded that the contractors had taken excessive profits, that contract costs were inflated by high initial estimates, that missiles were being procured under an "archaic system," and that "much of the de-

fewer dollar is being improvidently spent." More recent investigations by other committees and the Government Accounting Office into the procurement of planes, ships, nuclear propulsion equipment, fuel, rifles, small tools, etc., and into the use of government-owned plants and equipment, demonstrate that the costs of procurement are much higher than they ought to be. The Pentagon could make do with considerably less money than it gets.

This conclusion can be reached without challenging the basic assumptions of military policy, and solely on the basis of proven inefficiency, waste and profiteering by contractors, particularly the major contractors, and mismanagement of the program by high officials in the Defense Department. A recent study by an official in the Bureau of the Budget, whose duties are to analyze costs of weapons, reveals that performance of complex electronic systems tends to be poor, that deliveries are late, costs two to three times higher than the original estimates, and profits inversely correlated with poor performance—that is, the most inefficient contractors earn the highest rewards. Last year the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee reported "loose and flagrantly negligent management practices in the Defense procurement program."

The cumulative effect of these and many other reports should be to shift the emphasis of future investigations. Although the difficult job of digging into programs and disclosing abuses in individual cases should continue, the central question today is no longer whether there are exorbitant profits, padded costs, poor performance, general mismanagement of procurement, and a swollen military budget. The central question from now on is, what can be done to change the procurement system so that the military-industrial complex will be brought under social control.

The chaos and waste in present procurement policy was at least implicitly recognized last year by the effort of the House Government Operations Committee to create a commission to study government procurement. The proposal will be revived in the new Congress. Assuming the commission is established, an early tip-off as to its intentions will be its make-up. If it is dominated by defense industry spokesmen, it will probably not differ significantly from the many "business advisory groups," such as the Industrial Advisory Council (formerly the Defense Industrial Advisory Council), which now monitor and influence procurement policy.

One way to economize would be to reform present policies by legislation. Profiteering is the most blatant aberration of faulty procurement. How high should defense profits be? Present policy, if you can call it that, is contained in a body of Defense Department regulations called the Weighted Guidelines. They are supposed to help compute the right profit for any negotiated contract by specifying percentage points for factors like contractor inputs, risk and record of performance. The points are totaled during contract negotiations to arrive at the profit rate. However, like many other procurement regulations, the guidelines have been heavily influenced, as to both wording and interpretation, by the defense industry. They give an appearance of systematic method, but are in fact so flexible that Pentagon officials can use them to arrive at a high profit rate even for contracts involving a minimum of capital investment (the buyer gladly supplies interest-free cash, land, buildings and production equipment) and little, if any, risk. Since the adoption of the Weighted Guidelines in 1964, profit rates have gone up by 25 per cent. Yet strong industry pressure is now being exerted to revise the guidelines upward.

Although most procurement is negotiated, the Pentagon awards some contracts through

competitive bids, and a device for insuring high profits has evolved in this area as well. This is the "buy-in—get well later" formula. A contractor bids for a weapons research and development contract below his (unrevealed) estimated costs, so as to make sure that he will win. Once he is in operation, his costs skyrocket, but the Pentagon finds that it must pay them, to "get him well." In addition to being reimbursed for the tardily revealed higher costs of R and D, the contractor has also laid a foundation on the basis of high costs, openly stated. Once the contractor has completed the preliminary work—which was all that the original contract contemplated—it is usually too late for the government to find another potential producer; it is "locked in" with the original contractor. Incentive contracting was developed under Secretary McNamara to discourage this practice. Studies show, however, that these and various other contractual devices create "reverse incentives," whereby the contractor is motivated artificially to inflate his cost base in order to earn larger profits.

Statutory limits on profit could help. They would differ from the Weighted Guidelines in being less susceptible to favoritism—at present, the larger contractors make the larger profits—and because they could not be changed by administrative decision. Congress would establish reasonable profit ceilings. Banks and railroads are limited in the interest and rates they may charge, and today's high defense profits are inexcusable.

However, profit limitations would be no cure-all. Of last year's \$44 billion for military procurement, profits probably amounted to no more than \$5 billion. And while profits as customarily reported on corporate books may be reduced, the result will not necessarily be to cut the total costs. Contractors can simply enlarge their cost base to increase contract prices and offset any reduction in profit rates. Padding expenses to hide profits is an old bookkeeping technique.

What really needs to be done is to control the gross cost to the government of military procurement. It is for this reason that Adm. H. G. Rickover so strongly advocates uniform accounting standards. One of the critical stages in the procurement process is the initial negotiation. At this point costs and profit rates are agreed upon, and the government is at a serious disadvantage unless it can obtain accurate estimates from the contractor. During the performance of the contract it also needs reliable cost data in order to act on requests for reimbursement, to know whether the costs are running higher than the original estimates, and to discover whether it is being overcharged. Rickover believes that until contractors are required to adhere to uniform standards for reporting costs and profits, the government will not have such information. He reports cases where contractors charged costs to government contracts which should have been charged to nongovernment, commercial work, and the Government Accounting Office has revealed similar situations. Rickover estimates that the imposition of uniform accounting standards alone would reduce procurement costs by more than \$2 billion a year.

The absence of good cost data, aggravated by falsification in many cases, moved Congress in 1962 to enact the Truth in Negotiations Act. Without uniform accounting standards, this Act is largely ineffective, but thus far it hasn't mattered much because the Pentagon has failed to enforce its mild provisions. Briefly, the Act requires contractors to submit certified cost data for all negotiated contracts. However, there is a loophole in the Act, called the waiver provision, which is large enough for any weapons system to fall through. It allows the procurement officer to determine that there is adequate competition for a particular item. When this subjective judgment is made, the

Act is waived and the contractor is not required to submit any cost data, even though in fact the contract has been negotiated. Needless to say, the waiver provision has been liberally applied. Closing this loophole and requiring strict enforcement of the Act would be a relatively simple gesture toward reform.

A second piece of legislation that needs to be rehabilitated is the Defense Production Act. This vestigial remnant of the Korean War controls provides that production for national defense be given preference over other business, but enforcement by the Department of Commerce is accomplished in the most timid fashion. A Commerce official testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee last year that legal action against a contractor to enforce a priority has not been taken since the Korean War, despite the fact that the Pentagon has asked the Commerce Department to issue directives against companies which have rejected assigned priorities. As a first step toward breathing some life into this Act, it ought to be moved out of the Commerce Department.

A third leaky bulwark against the excesses of military contractors is the Renegotiation Act. The speeches of Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez have made the limitations of this Act well known. It is badly riddled with loopholes, sharply limited in scope and jurisdiction, and the Renegotiation Board which enforces it is seriously understaffed. Only the personal intervention of Sen. William Proxmire with the Bureau of the Budget last year prevented further staff cuts. The purpose of the Act is to recapture excessive profits earned on military contracts, but present restrictions on the board keep recoveries well below the real level of profiteering. To bring the board close to its strength in the Korean War period, the "standard commercial article" exemption, by which some of the most profitable types of procurement are exempt from review, would have to be eliminated, and its staff increased from its present level of about 200 to at least the 1953 level of 742.

As for conflict of interest, there are hardly decent standards of regulation to revise. The heavy back-and-forth flow of procurement officials and weapons salesmen between the Pentagon and corporate duty is barely touched upon by laws or regulations. The laws that do exist apply mainly to military personnel, not to civilians, and are so narrowly interpreted that they have almost no effect.

The case of Maj. Gen. Nelson M. Lynde, Jr., retired from the US Army, and employed by Colt Industries, Inc., is instructive. It was investigated in 1967 by the Special Subcommittee on the M-16 Rifle Program, of the House Committee on Armed Services. From 1962 until February, 1964, General Lynde, as senior officer of the Army Weapons Command, was directly involved in the procurement of the M-16 rifle. In 1963 he personally approved the prices negotiated with Colt. Five months after retirement in 1964, he went to work for Colt. Responding to an inquiry from Lynde, the Army Adjutant General had advised that the conflict of interest law did not prohibit this employment, since his job description did not indicate that he would be selling anything to the government. Shortly after arriving at Colt, General Lynde requested of the Army copies of four classified documents, including at least one that concerned the M-16. In addition, according to the subcommittee report, Lynde was on the distribution list for many inter-company memoranda involving the M-16. As the subcommittee stated: "It is actions such as these that cause the American taxpayer to lose faith in the integrity of both military and civilian officials associated with the expenditure of millions of dollars yearly in the procurement of supplies and materiel to meet our military requirements." The subcommittee

tee also noted with displeasure that Colt's profits on the M-16 were as high as 19.6 per cent for 1965, and that an examination of price proposals disclosed a lack of sufficient data to support cost estimates. Conflict of interest laws should be completely rewritten.

A radically different approach to procurement would be to return to the more traditional relationship of government and industry—to disengage the defense industry from government, and encourage greater competition among contractors. Disengagement would mean both less government regulations and less government support. Managerial controls now exercised by government, it is suggested, should be returned to the companies, and much red tape surrounding contracts eliminated. At the same time, subsidies such as interest-free government financing and government-owned plant and equipment should be withdrawn. Since these forms of aid favor the larger contractors, small business would become better able to compete.

Competition could also be encouraged directly by awarding development, production and follow-on contracts separately and competitively. Lock-ins and other monopoly situations could be avoided by parallel awards and second sources. That is, more than one contract could be awarded in the early stages of R and D and of production, before the government had settled on a single contractor for the major production work. And second sources would be kept alive by reserving to the government the right to distribute designs and production techniques developed by one contractor to any of the others during the life of the contract.

The hope is that restoration of competition will force contractors to fall back on their own resources. This, in turn, would reconstitute the self-regulating mechanism of free enterprise which, according to the theory of capitalism, is the best guarantor of innovation, efficiency and lower costs. Government regulation would thus be unnecessary. Unfortunately, while economists like Murray Weidenbaum at Washington University (St. Louis) advocate more capitalism as the solution to the rising costs of procurement, the large military contractors don't want it. Why face the discipline of efficient management and the risks of competition when billions of dollars of business can be generated through the art of government grantmanship?

Political pluralism, rather than economic pluralism, is another cure offered for the abuses of military contracting. H. L. Nieburg views the boundary between the Defense Department and defense contractors as permanently wiped out. Military contracting has created quasi-public utilities within the defense industry. Rather than emphasizing the government's access to information and regulatory controls, Nieburg would enhance what he terms the existing pluralism of institutions and relationships. He would encourage the conflict among government agencies and confrontation between constituencies with opposing stakes in contract programs. New institutional arrangements can act as countervailing forces against the pressures that inflate procurement costs. His suggestions include an Office of Contract Ombudsman, an intergovernmental body to collate national programming and budgeting plans, and creation of a new court, modeled after the Court of Customs, and Patent Appeals to test contract award decisions.

Basic changes of the procurement system itself can also be considered. In view of mounting costs, which many believe is making it impossible to solve our serious domestic problems, reversing, not merely halting, the government's capacity to manufacture for its own needs may become necessary. It would be no radical departure from the

American experience. In the past, the government has produced everything from small arms to ordnance to ships. The great advances in nuclear energy were made in government laboratories.

When Admiral Rickover testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee last year, he suggested that those companies or their divisions whose business is almost exclusively with the government might be treated as public utilities. Such a step would be formal recognition of the fact that some contractors have a monopoly or near monopoly on certain kinds of military equipment. Instead of negotiating profit rates on the basis of total sales or costs, they would be granted a reasonable rate of return on their investment. In exchange, their books would be audited and their performance measured by a public body. This system is used in England, and a recent Rand Corporation study shows that average defense profit rates are generally much larger in the United States than in England. This is especially true of aircraft, aircraft engines and missiles, items on which we have suffered runaway price inflation over the past several years. When Rand compared rates of return on net assets for selected aerospace firms in the two countries, for the years 1956 through 1963, it found average profits for the U.S. firms to be 25.6 per cent, more than twice the level of the English firms.

Perhaps the greatest problem in the field of public affairs today is the reluctance of the average citizen to be critical of military assertions and military policy decisions. The reasons for this have little to do with the complexity of the subject, for military affairs are no more difficult to understand than any other subject. The concept of national security, which somehow is supposed to protect us from and at the same time see us through war, is veiled in secrecy, except on the most ceremonial occasions. Like some sacred cow, it has free run over our land and through our streets. The people are supposed to feed it and worship it, but not to study it.

Meantime, the vast majority of those who are expert in military affairs are either employed by or obligated to the military establishment. Despite a few notable exceptions, there is no tradition of independent military analysis in the academic or professional worlds. For the most part, those who do the analyses are those who benefit from the growth of military spending.

Military spending has proved to be a one-sided controversy, with the experts, professionals and counselors all arguing for expansion. An encouragement of military policy studies, apart from military circles of power and influence, can begin to correct this imbalance. Courses on military affairs, defense production, defense management, procurement, profiteering, the impact of military spending, to name a few, ought to be offered by every university, and not as part of ROTC or in conjunction with Defense Department grants. Departments and graduate schools for military policy studies ought to be established on many campuses, not to produce future military leaders but to train civilian military planners capable of criticizing budgets and policies, and of offering alternatives. Military research and analysis needs to be supported through nonprofit groups funded from nongovernment sources. But wresting the military budget from those who spend it will take an enormous amount of research and analysis, consideration of alternatives and argument, followed by political action. Military experts and industrial lobbyists will continue to work hard to insure that they hog more than their reasonable share—now, after Vietnam and into the foreseeable future.

THE RUSSIAN MERCHANT MARINE: A NEW COLD WAR DIMENSION

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in the February 28 edition of the Weekly Review, there appeared an excellent article on the new Russian merchant marine and the menace which it presents to the ocean trade of the West.

I think my colleagues interested in the promotion of our own obsolete merchant marine will find this article extremely interesting. I, therefore, by unanimous consent, insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Although Russia's world-wide naval buildup is receiving close attention in the West, the Soviet bloc's equally spectacular expansion of its merchant marine is escaping notice. It merits watching, however, not only because Russia has deliberately set out to capture part of the West's ocean trade, but also because many of the Soviet merchant ships are equipped for naval reconnaissance and survey work as well as for various other military tasks.

The activities of the Soviet trawlers have already become notorious, but the truth is more serious than that. With the help of her merchant navy, Russia already has every route on every ocean under permanent surveillance, and in case of an emergency many of the ships are capable of operations which can be a direct threat to western shipping.

ENORMOUS BUILDING CAPACITY

Russia's ship-building capacity is being rapidly increased, and it is supplemented by the production of the satellite countries. At the end of 1968, the Soviet merchant fleet had at its disposal 14,698,000 tons dwt. (U.K. approximately 20,000 tons), of which 1,049,000 tons were sailing under the East German flag, 1,700,000 under the Polish flag, 750,000 tons under the Bulgarian flag, and 467,000 tons under the Rumanian flag.

According to the Soviet Minister for the Merchant Marine, W. Bakejev, plans have been approved to expand this by 1970 to a total of 18,002,000 tons, to be followed by a steady growth to 20,000,000 tons of Russian ships (leaving aside what the satellites will contribute by then) in 1980. The combined total will by then probably exceed 30,000,000 tons.

SATELLITE SHIPS UNDER RUSSIAN ORDERS

It must also be stressed that the ships of the satellite states operate under Russian sailing orders, regardless of what flag they fly. For their own use the satellite countries have to depend largely on chartering western ships.

For example, although Poland's merchant navy comprised 220 ocean-going ships at the end of 1968 with a total deadweight of 1,539,000 tons, she had to spend more than \$100 million on chartering western ships for her export trade, while her own ships were engaged on missions for Russia. In addition she spent \$45 million on freightage for her exports carried in unchartered western ships.

In contrast to this, the last time Russian goods had to be carried in western ships was in 1964. Early in 1965, Bakejev was able to announce in Moscow:

"The USSR has achieved total economic and political independence in her ocean trade."

AUXILIARY NAVAL VESSELS

More than 80 per cent of the merchant fleet sailing under Russian orders consists

of ships less than ten years old, and the main body comprises ships of between 13,000 and 50,000 tons. All the cargo ships are able to maintain speeds of more than 14 knots.

Current construction is concentrated on fully automatic ships of the *Novogorod* and *Tshapajev* classes, which are officially described as multi-purpose vessels.

There is much that is secret about these two classes of ships, but it can be taken for granted that they are equipped to serve as auxiliary naval vessels in case of need.

In addition, a new class of trawler has come into service which is also described as a multi-purpose vessel. But as Russia already has a surplus of trawlers, the new class has not so far been used for actual trawling. The first news of it was given in December, when it was announced that it had been tried successfully off the west coast of South America. What it was doing there is not known.

A SERIOUS ECONOMIC THREAT

Apart from security considerations, the Soviet merchant marine is developing into a serious economic threat to western shipping lines as it has started competing for west European cargoes at rates which must be totally uneconomic for Russia. One of the first bids was to enter the Australia-west Europe route, and by last December Russian ships were undercutting western shipping rates on this route by up to 50 per cent.

It has now entered the west European-Latin American route, offering rates up to 70 per cent below those which any western shipping line can offer.

By any yardstick these Russian ships must be operating at a heavy loss, and it must be assumed that they are doing so in consequence of deliberate Soviet policy.

LOW-RATE TANKER CHARTERS

Another new venture is the construction of a surplus tanker and ore-carrying fleet for the specific purpose of chartering the ships to western firms. It is expected that the charters will be offered at very low rates which will make refusal unattractive.

A bid is also soon to be made to enter the London-Yokohama trade. In this case, the Russian ships will use the Chukchen-East Siberian-Laptev-Kara-Barents seas route, cutting the distance from about 13,000 miles to about 8,000 miles and lopping up to a fortnight off the sailing time. This will offer serious competition.

The purpose of entering the western ocean trade on such an uneconomic basis seems clear. By getting the West to rely at least partly upon Russian shipping, western shipping interests are, of course, damaged, and in the event of an international crisis the sudden withdrawal of the Soviet merchant fleet would create a crippling ocean transport shortage for the West.

In fact, Russia has moved the cold war into a new dimension.

CONGRESSMAN DANIELS URGES ACTION TO AID IRISH IMMIGRATION

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Monday, March 17, we observed the feast of the patron saint of the Irish people, St. Patrick. Down through the years this great day has become a special day for all Americans, those of Irish descent and those who are not.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on this day to observe the many contributions that have been made to this Nation by the sons and daughters of Erin. From Commodore Barry and Gen. John Sullivan, who helped achieve American independence during our struggle to free ourselves from British colonial rule to this very day, Irishmen and their descendants have been the first to spring to the defense of this Nation.

The Irish community has been outstanding in so many fields that it would take days to list the eminent Irishmen who have distinguished themselves in the arts, letters, in the theater, in government, at the bar and bench, and in dozens of other fields of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to inject business into the proceedings today which are generally light in nature. On the other hand, I must state that it is singularly appropriate for us when we discuss the contributions made by emigrants from Ireland to consider a harsh immigration law which has stopped the flow of ambitious Irishmen and Irishwomen to these shores.

This year we have seen the number of immigrants from Eire drop to almost nothing. From July 1, 1968 to December 31, 1968 only 72 preference and nonpreference visas were issued in Dublin to Irish applicants. Compare this, if you will, to the 7,000 visas a year issued between the years 1956-65 to Irish immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, a great many Members are deeply disturbed by this situation and under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) efforts are being made to correct our immigration law. On March 19, the gentleman from New York has obtained a special order. I hope many Members will join with us at that time.

SERVICE UNION JOB TRAINING PLAN EXTENDED

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that most unemployed Americans are anxious to work and earn their own way. Unfortunately, a great many are unprepared for the jobs that are available.

The program for custodial jobs recently launched in Washington by the Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, is typical of the commendable interest that a number of unions throughout the country are now demonstrating in helping jobless workers help themselves.

Under unanimous consent, I now insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article about the SEIU's custodial job training effort, taken from a recent issue of the AFL-CIO News:

SERVICE UNION JOB TRAINING PLAN EXTENDED

A Service Employees program to train jobless workers in Washington for custodial jobs has proved so successful it is being extended for another year.

The program, jointly aided by the Labor Dept. and the Health, Education & Welfare Dept., will receive \$292,986 in new federal funds to train and place 200 workers by April 1970. This will bring to 600 the number of persons receiving training under the program since 1967.

Trainees, nearly all Negroes, learn about cleaning mixtures, minor electrical repairs, rug and furniture shampooing, and a range of other subjects to equip them for employment. They also take remedial courses in reading, current events and simple arithmetic.

Michael J. Nash, director of the project, reported that nearly 90 percent of those who enroll complete the course.

Most of them previously had earned no more than \$1.50 an hour when working. Project graduates, however, have been filling jobs at up to \$2.50 an hour, with some starting at more than \$3 an hour.

WILLIAM C. DAVIS' STATEMENT AT GRAZING FEE HIKE HEARINGS

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, arbitrarily, the previous administration's Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture, administratively increased the grazing fees on public lands. This was done without adequate consultation with those affected. This was done in spite of the fact that the Public Land Review Commission is still working on its report that would consider all the various factors involved.

Mr. William C. Davis, executive secretary of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association recently testified before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is holding hearings on these grazing fee increases.

The statement he submitted was very perceptive and should be considered thoughtfully by all Members of Congress. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DAVIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ARIZONA CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, ARIZ., AT HEARINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, MARCH 4 AND 5, 1969, GRAZING HEARINGS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is William C. Davis. I am Executive Secretary of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association. We have 1,636 members. The latest United States' Census shows 1,654 livestock operations in Arizona. There are 1,560 Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service leases and permits in Arizona, so it is easy to see that public land grazing is a vital part of the Arizona range livestock industry.

Ranchers, financial managers and knowledgeable citizens are gravely concerned over the recently announced increases in public land grazing fees; an increase based on neither law nor economics, but based rather on the fact that the United States has a near-monopoly and can thus dictate its own terms and let the devil take the hindmost.

The term "fair market value" has been coined for the first time in connection with grazing fees on public land. Because it is new in this instance we believe it should be more closely analyzed than it has been to date. In so doing two questions come immediately to mind: (1) What factors should be used to

arrive at an ultimate "fair market value"? and (2) Is it (fair market value) a yardstick that can be accurately applied to grazing fees?

In response to the first question I believe we have to decide what is being sold, and under what conditions. It is forage that is being sold, and the true value of forage depends upon its price in the market. In the case of grazing this means converting the price paid for grass into the price received for beef. Some recent studies in Arizona show that it would take only minor increases in the cost of production to make most ranches unprofitable.

One study¹ shows the cost of running one cow for one year on a typical Arizona ranch is \$82.50 before making any interest payment on land investment. This typical ranch uses a combination of Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service and State lands. Profit or loss depends to a great degree on percentage of calf crop. Parenthetically, I should add that a high percentage of marketable calves is very difficult to attain in the public land areas of Arizona because of the roughness of the country, the comparatively low carrying capacity which means widespread cattle, and a high population of predators. Under last year's level, grazing fees amounted to 5.6 percent of the cost of running a cow. Under the announced increase, at the end of ten years, fees would escalate to about 16 percent of the cost.

A second study² contains a table of Arizona cattle ranch income summaries. Ranches range in size from 34 head to 700 head, located in six different productive type areas of the state for a total of 21 representative Arizona operations. Percent of return to capital and management on these ranches varies from negative on ten ranches to as high as 5.2 percent. The three ranches with the highest return were from the western desert in years when stocker steers were pastured; however, because of a lack of regular precipitation in this area it is possible to run steers only once every four years on the average. A weighted average return would be about 1.7 percent per year in the Western Desert. The average return on investment on just the eleven ranches which had a positive return is 1.36.

A third University of Arizona study³ was conducted for our State Department of Property Valuation for property tax purposes. For this study a "synthetic" ranch of 450 animal units was created and placed in various areas of the state. Ranch size and cost of operation were developed for each location. Net profit from the 25 different models varied from \$7.23 to \$7.61 per animal unit. The state-wide average was \$1.92 per animal unit. In this study they assumed no cash return to owner as one of the costs, but they did make a \$4,800.00 per year allowance for a manager.

From these three studies, and others from around the country it can be seen that the actual market value of forage is very low. Nothing appears in the immediate or near future outlook on costs or prices that would materially increase that true value.

Other factors that were claimed to be used in arriving at a so-called fair market value were the supposed comparability and competitiveness between private and public grazing lands. To be truly competitive the supply and quality of each should be approximately equal. To be comparable the conditions of the lease should be approximately equal. In Arizona neither condition exists. In round figures we have 13 million acres of Bureau of Land Management land and 11 million acres of Forest land, as well as 9 million acres of State land, compared to an estimated 5 million acres of private range land—a ratio of more than 6 to 1. Much of the private land is irretrievably tied to public leases

through commensurability requirements, further reducing the amount available for private leasing. Private land is generally of superior grazing quality, else it wouldn't have been homesteaded or otherwise acquired into private ownership. Conditions for a true supply and demand situation do not exist, unless monopolistically created.

In addition to the lack of a truly competitive situation we must also weigh into any fair market value appraisal the terms and conditions under which the forage is harvested. Just as a reminder I would like to point out some of the conditions of a public land grazing lease as compared with a normal private lease. First, of course, is the matter of multiple-use. In all the talk we have heard about "comparable lands", "realistic fees", "vested interests", etc., we seldom hear the one point that is a major key to the whole situation. That is "multiple-use". These lands are shared with a multitude of other users, both commercial and non-commercial. They are open to the public regardless of how much interference and damage is caused. They are open to everyone for every legal purpose—and often used for illegal ones. Grazing is an important one of the multiple uses, but only one of many. If you had an apartment house occupied by fifteen or twenty tenants would you ask one or two of them to pay the same price as they would if they had exclusive use of the building?

Another substantial difference between public and private leases is the commensurability requirement. A rancher must meet certain qualifications of ownership of base property. Even in Arizona where much of the land is on a year-long grazing rotation plan we still must meet commensurate property standards. Such conditions would seldom apply to a private lease.

The demands for rancher-financed improvements on public land have accelerated with the advent of management plans. Last week I talked with a rancher who has a Forest permit. He was given a plan which called for several improvements on his small allotment, to be financed 100 percent with his own funds because federal matching funds were not available. If he makes the improvements they immediately become the property of the federal government. If he does not conform he faces a very severe cut in preference numbers at best, or loss of his permit at worst.

Improvements today must be constructed in such a way as to enhance "public values". But as a matter of fact normal range management practices over the years have greatly enhanced the actual public values of public land; especially wild life values. Over a period of years stock numbers on public land have decreased. In Arizona, at least, the game population has been generally up—grammatically at times. The game trend is not completely unrelated to livestock management. Improvements for livestock have also benefited game. Stock tanks, salt boxes, and feed bunkers installed by ranchers have also been used by game. Juniper control areas are favored by deer and hunters alike. Game not only uses public land and the rancher-financed improvements thereon, but also freely utilizes any and all of the forage and feed on private land in the area.

Arizona has very little live water. Rancher-developed springs, tanks, pipelines and water catchments have made usable vast areas of the state. Such watering places have been lifesavers for both men and animals in the arid country. Without the management and conservation practiced by ranchers, much of Arizona could very well become a biological desert, of little economic use, and of even less practical use for the public. Yes, public values should certainly receive more than passing credit when determining the level of grazing fees.

Testimony of other witnesses will cover the

validity of including the cost of holding a permit as a legitimate and inseparable cost of doing business. I won't dwell at length on this point, but do wish to completely endorse the position taken by other livestock groups. Any analysis of the cost of operating any business must include the cost of money or the analysis will be incomplete and inaccurate. A cost item identical to the one disregarded by the government is built into the lease paid for private land—and private leases carry much weight in the governmental interpretation of what comprises cost, or fair market value.

The principle reason given for not including the annual interest on the permit value in the fee formula is that "to do so would recognize a proprietary interest in the public land". On this point I would like to raise a question and make an analogy. My question is, if the interest factor were used, what proprietary interest, or "right" would be created that doesn't already exist? A United States Department of Agriculture paper⁴ states "The studies have confirmed that grazing permits have accrued a value that the private sector buys and sells and uses for collateral". So the fact of value is recognized; at issue is what should be the amount of value and who should hold it. Inclusion or deletion of one factor in a formula won't increase or decrease "rights", it just changes monetary value. Use of the interest factor wouldn't change any terms or conditions of a lease; it wouldn't allow a rancher to run more or less cattle; it wouldn't give him any more or fewer "rights" than he now has; it wouldn't give any more nor less access and use of the land to the hunter, fisherman, rockhound or general public. Let me ask the question again, this time in a little different way: By not using the interest factor, what proprietary interest or "right" does the rancher now have that will be taken away?

Now to the analogy I mentioned. In my home city of Phoenix are a large number of radio and T.V. stations. All are able to operate because they have a license or permit from the federal government. They have to abide by certain rules and regulations or the permit will be revoked. Under these rules they have put the permit to use and built operations of considerable value. The value will vary depending upon many things, capital inputs, goodwill, etc., but in any case the value is considerably higher than the fee charged for the license. Bearing in mind that the permit had no value until it was put to use, let's assume that the Federal Communications Commission decided to set an annual fee so it would return a fair market value to the government. After all, they could reason, T.V. Station XYZ, for instance, wouldn't be worth a couple million dollars if they didn't hold a government permit. Therefore, according to this logic, an "equitable" annual fee would be set at a level sufficiently high to capture for the government the market value of XYZ T.V., on the grounds that that value was created by virtue of the fact that the government issued the permit to broadcast! Change a few words to fit the grazing fee situation and you no longer have an analogy, but the actual case in point.

The complete economic impact of the grazing fee increase is difficult to assess. We know it would be extremely severe on the range livestock industry and local communities in the public land states. In Arizona, the out-of-pocket costs to ranchers would be just under \$2 million annually. Using a conservative generator factor of 2, this would mean an additional loss of about \$4 million to the local economy. But this kind of figuring is deceptive, because we can't determine the timetable upon which ranchers will be forced out of business. Some will go out as soon as the fees consume their profit margin. For those with the "average profit" of \$1.92 per head that would happen the second year of the ten year plan. Others will

Footnotes at end of speech.

stay longer, using savings or borrowing on appreciated land values as long as possible. But these courageous souls, too, will be forced out unless market prices improve far beyond any present optimistic forecast. We have heard much lately about people with large outside incomes investing in ranches to take advantage of tax write-offs. Such investors can soon have a hey-day if the grazing fee decision is not modified.

Many references have been made to the financial institutions and their concern in this matter. One lending agency not heard from, to my knowledge is the Farmers' Home Administration. The FHA has both farm ownership and operating loans which are certain to be affected. They also have furnished an unusually high percentage of the financing for many recently organized grazing associations. These associations are formed by a group of people who go together and purchase a comparatively large ranch, or combination of ranches. Usually there is a considerable amount of both federal and private land involved. Since the portion of the purchase price which is financed is very high, the annual payments are also very near the maximum ability of the ranch. And payment schedules were based on grazing fees as anticipated under the old formula. In addition to the very real likelihood that the association members will have to default and lose their investment, we also have to realize the federal government will, by foreclosing the mortgage, take over more of our already scarce private range land. It would be interesting to know how this federal agency, the FHA, views the fee increase. They have obviously been recognizing the permit value as loan collateral.

At the beginning I expressed the belief that an analysis of fair market value should be predicated on two questions, the first of which was: "What factors should be used to arrive at an ultimate fair market value?" So far I have listed several factors I believe should be used in arriving at a fair market value for public forage rather than placing major reliance on going rates for private land. These include:

- Value of forage in the market.
- Low per unit livestock returns.
- Lack of truly competitive conditions.
- Lack of true comparability between public and private land.
- Value of multiple-use.
- Rancher financed management and conservation practices.
- Cost of money as a legitimate cost of doing business.

"Rights" not a part of permit value.
Government interference in business.
Economic impact.
Loans put in jeopardy.
No doubt there are many more that could be listed. True, these are mostly "negative values", but any honest appraisal must include negative as well as positive values if we are looking for real market value, rather than trying to justify an arbitrarily set market price.

My second question was: "Is fair market value a yardstick that can be accurately applied to grazing fees?" The answer is probably "yes" if all values, both positive and negative, are given proper weight, and if the Congress of the United States amends the applicable laws to provide for such a yardstick. Perhaps the use of the fair market value yardstick is too cumbersome and too subject to a variety of interpretations to be dependable over a period of time.

Up to the present time two different systems have been used to set fees. Bureau of Land Management has used 150 percent of the price per pound of cattle. The Forest Service has used a system that recognizes the difference in quality of grazing between areas, and uses market price as an annual adjustment factor. Although the Bureau of Land Management formula is more simple

and does recognize that the price of beef helps determine the value of forage, we feel the Forest Service method is more equitable. It stands to reason that there is an operating cost difference between running one cow on ten acres compared to ten cows on one acre.

This difference should be reflected in any fee schedule for public land grazing.

The Arizona Cattle Growers' Association is not opposed to a reasonable increase in fees; in fact, an increase was anticipated even under the old system. We do object not only to the amount of the new fees, but to the way it was imposed. We urged our people to cooperate in the survey and the statisticians received excellent response. Yet when we tried to obtain some of the raw data it wasn't available. We honestly expected all cost items to be used, but as you know, they were not. For a change of such magnitude the least that could have been done was to hold public hearings in the areas affected. Notwithstanding all those adverse items we have tried to evaluate the plus and minus of the increase. Admitting that we aren't the best qualified party to make a completely objective evaluation, the minus still seems to far outweigh the plus. Here is our evaluation:

PLUS SIDE

1. \$18 million annual increase to federal treasury (assuming no rancher goes out of business), less deduction in Number 2, below.
2. \$4.5 million to local state and county governments (25 percent fund), less administrative costs.
3. Satisfaction for those interests that want to see public land grazing terminated.

NEGATIVE SIDE

1. \$18 million decrease in ranchers' net income, if full AUM use could be maintained.
2. \$36 million negative impact on local communities.
3. Loss of up to \$700 million in collateral base.
4. Outstanding debts on assets that no longer exist.
5. Difficulty in obtaining future mortgages.
6. Decline in rancher financed or cooperative improvements.
7. Need of federal government to bear the burden of Number 6 in some combination of:
 - a. Increased appropriations for resource maintenance.
 - b. Decreases in value of federal land due to deteriorating rangelands and watersheds.
 - c. Decline in level of fees collected due to loss of capacity and use.
8. Need to increase expenditures on wildlife requirements.
9. Need for more urban employment for accelerated flow of agricultural owners and workers, perhaps a "second front" in the War on Poverty.
10. Up to \$375 million loss in ranch assets.

I'm sure other persons could add several more items to each list. However, the negative so badly outweighs the plus that the need for review and change should be obvious. We respectfully urge this Committee to take the steps necessary to bring about such a change.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee we commend you for calling this hearing on this most important matter. We appreciate the opportunity to have our views heard. Thank you.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Ranch Costs" by Al Lane, Extension Livestock Specialist, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, in "Arizona Cattlelog", January 1969.

² "Budgets for Livestock Ranches in Arizona and Other Western States", by Wm. E. Martin, Prof. of Agricultural Economics, University of Arizona.

³ "Ranch Budgets for Tax Study", Dept. of Ag Economics, Univ. of Ariz., Aug. 1965.

* Letter dated January 13, 1969, from Under Secretary of the Interior to Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall.

⁵ "Studies, Alternatives and Recommendations on the Forest Service Grazing Fee Issue", submitted by U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, November 12, 1968.

VOTING IN THE HOUSE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1969, there was released to the public a study made by the staff of the Democratic study group. I believe the study is useful and I commend it to all those concerned about the future of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives and in the Nation:

VOTING IN THE HOUSE

INTRODUCTION

This is a two-part study of voting in the House of Representatives. Part I examines the voting patterns of Democrats associated with the Democratic Study Group as compared with non-DSG Democrats and Republicans. Part II examines the voting performance of Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen.

The study is based primarily on 30 key votes during the 90th Congress. However, votes from the 89th Congress and studies of voting in several other Congresses are also considered. The 30 key 90th Congress votes (See Attachment No. 1) were selected to provide a representative picture of voting patterns based on the following four factors:

(1) *Liberal-Conservative Orientation*: The 30 votes include most of the major liberal-conservative tests of the 90th Congress.

(2) *Administration Support*: The Democratic Administration took a public position on all but four of the 30 issues.

(3) *Support of Democratic Party Principles*: Two-thirds of the 30 votes involved programs and policies advocated in the 1964 Democratic Party platform, and many of the remaining one-third involved traditional Democratic policies.

(4) *Party Unity*: On all but three of the 30 votes a majority of Democrats voted one way while a majority of Republicans voted the opposite way. The average vote saw two out of three Democrats voting one way and four out of five Republicans voting in opposition.

All four of the above factors were involved in at least 20 of the 30 votes, while three of the four factors were involved in virtually all 30 votes. Thus, findings in this study are expressed in terms of support for and opposition to the "national Democratic position" or "Democratic programs and policies."

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

DSG Democrats voted 91% in support of Democratic programs and policies.

Non-DSG Democrats nearly equalled Republicans in opposing Democratic programs—69% to 76%.

Opposition of non-DSG Democrats was responsible for two-thirds of the 17 Democratic defeats on 30 key votes.

Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen alone were responsible for over half the 17 defeats.

One of every three Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen—42 of 114—voted more often against than in support of Democratic programs.

34 Democratic chairmen—including six full committee chairmen—exceeded the Republicans in their opposition to Democratic programs—92% to 76%.

The other 72 Democratic chairmen voted 88% in support of Democratic programs.

The number of Democrats voting more in opposition than support of Democratic programs has been steadily increasing over the past 16 years—from 0 in the 83rd Congress to 53 in the 90th Congress.

PART I. DSG DEMOCRATS, NON-DSG DEMOCRATS, AND REPUBLICANS

Part I examines the voting impact of 145 Democrats associated with the Democratic Study Group compared with 102 non-DSG Democrats and 186 Republicans.

The study shows that DSG Democrats gave an exceptionally high and consistent level of support to Democratic programs and policies while non-DSG Democrats voted more in line with the Republicans in opposition to the Democratic Administration, Democratic Party Platform position, and the majority of their Democratic colleagues in the House.

Overall, DSG Democrats voted 91% in support of the national Democratic position on the 30 votes compared with only 31% for the non-DSG Democrats and 24% for the Republicans.

(Note: Vote percentages are based on the number of members voting on each issue. Voting participation was remarkably even. On the average, 91% of the DSG Democrats, 90% of the non-DSG Democrats, and 93% of the Republicans participated in each vote.)

On vital humanitarian and social issues such as hunger, poverty, education, civil rights and the urban crisis, DSG Democrats voted 96% in support of Democratic programs and policies compared with only 38% for non-DSG Democrats and 36% for Republicans. (A summary of DSG, non-DSG and GOP voting in specific subject areas is included at the end of this section.)

The national Democratic position prevailed on only 13 of the 30 votes studied—and on five of these votes the average margin of victory was only 13 votes. Thus, without the exceptionally high level of DSG support—which ranged from 90% to 100%—votes on such key issues as food stamps, rent supplements, school desegregation, free trade and foreign aid would have been lost.

On the other 17 votes, the national Democratic position was defeated—in most instances because of the voting alliance between non-DSG Democrats and Republicans. On these 17 votes, 76% of the non-DSG Democrats teamed up with 86% of the Republicans in opposition to the majority of Democratic members.

The non-DSG members included a total of 75 Democrats who voted against more often than in support of the national Democratic position on the 30 key votes in this survey.

All but two of these Democrats were conservative to ultra-conservative members from Southern and border states. Their opposition was directly responsible for two-thirds of the 17 Democratic defeats.

Following is a summary by subject area showing the pattern of voting support for national Democratic positions by DSG Democrats, non-DSG Democrats and Republicans (categories correspond to categories in Appendix No. 1 which describe the 30 votes individually):

[In percent]

Poverty and hunger (4 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	98
Non-DSG Democrats.....	39
All Democrats.....	75
Republicans.....	23
Education (2 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	95
Non-DSG Democrats.....	47
All Democrats.....	77
Republicans.....	39

[In percent]

Gun control & crime (3 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	85
Non-DSG Democrats.....	17
All Democrats.....	58
Republicans.....	26
Federal expenditures (4 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	86
Non-DSG Democrats.....	32
All Democrats.....	67
Republicans.....	8
Housing and urban affairs (6 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	96
Non-DSG Democrats.....	44
All Democrats.....	76
Republicans.....	23
Civil rights (3 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	94
Non-DSG Democrats.....	22
All Democrats.....	63
Republicans.....	57
Foreign aid (3 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	91
Non-DSG Democrats.....	27
All Democrats.....	66
Republicans.....	20
Consumer protection (2 votes):	
DSG Democrats.....	91
Non-DSG Democrats.....	16
All Democrats.....	61
Republicans.....	7

MISCELLANEOUS (3 VOTES)

[In percent]

	DSG	Non-DSG	Democratic	GOP
Prevent cutoff of aid to student demonstrators....	69	7	45	25
Reform of House rules.....	97	24	68	14
Public power.....	81	26	59	3

PART II. COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Part II of this study examines the voting behavior of Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen in the House of Representatives.

The role of committee and subcommittee chairmen is of special importance in analyzing House voting patterns. Not only are they recognized as leaders in the House and in their party, they are also the main beneficiaries of Democratic control since members of the Democratic majority, in effect, give them their chairmanships.

In addition, committee chairmen represent 45% of Democratic voting strength in the House, and how a chairman votes often influences the votes of other members—especially those who serve on his committee.

During the 90th Congress there were a total of 114 chairmen heading 21 standing (or full) committees and 141 subcommittees. (Several members chaired more than one subcommittee.)

As noted in Part I, a total of 75 Democrats voted more in opposition than support of Democratic programs and policies on the 30 votes in this study. And as might be expected, many of these Democrats were committee and subcommittee chairmen.

However, the degree and extent of opposition by Democratic committee chairmen appears to be far greater than is generally thought.

For example, analysis of the 30 votes in this survey shows that over half (42) of the Democrats who voted more in opposition than support of Democratic programs were committee and subcommittee chairmen.

As a group, these 42 Democratic chairmen voted an average of only 13% in support of Democratic programs and policies and 87% in opposition. This was almost exactly opposite the record of the other 72 Democratic chairmen who averaged 88% support and only 12% opposition.

The opposition votes of the 42 Democratic

chairmen provided the margin of defeat on nine—or better than half—of the losses sustained by the Democratic majority. (Roll Call Nos. 6, 178, 239, 275, 277, 296, 336, 387, & 417.) On two other losses (Roll Call Nos. 227 & 319) these Democratic chairmen were responsible for 90% of the margin of defeat. Considering the tendency of many members to "vote with" their committee chairmen, these two Democratic defeats could also be attributed to the defection of the 42 "opposition chairmen."

Thus, on many of the most crucial votes of the 90th Congress, one-third of Democratic committee chairmen voted against the Democratic Administration, Democratic Party principles, and the majority of their Democratic colleagues—and were responsible for the defeat of many Democratic programs.

These 42 include eight of the 21 standing committee chairmen (Colmer, Mills, Ichord, Rivers, McMillan, Poage, Mahon, and Teague).

The degree and extent of their alienation from and opposition to Democratic programs, policies and principles can be seen in the fact that 34 of these 42 chairmen exceeded the average Republican in their opposition to the national Democratic position on the 30 votes in this study.

As a group, these 34 chairmen voted only 8% in support of the national Democratic position on the 30 votes surveyed while voting 92% in opposition. The overall Republican record—which two other Democratic chairmen equalled—was 24% support and 76% opposition.

The 34 included six committee chairmen (Colmer, Mills, Ichord, Rivers, McMillan, and Poage) whose average as a group was 12% support and 88% opposition.

Eight of the 34 chairmen (including one full committee chairman, Colmer) voted 100% against national Democratic programs, policies and principles on these 30 key issues. Fourteen others voted more than 90% in opposition. (Attachment No. 2 contains a complete listing of the support and opposition scores of all Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen.)

All but one (Baring of Nevada) of the 42 Democratic chairmen who voted more in opposition than support are from Southern and border states. However, analysis of their voting records would seem to indicate that the extreme opposition of these chairmen is not necessarily due to regional differences over race and civil rights, but involves instead a basic disagreement with Democratic programs, policies and principles in general.

This conclusion is supported by the voting records of the 42 Democratic chairmen on non-civil rights issues in the 89th Congress as well as the 90th. In the 89th Congress, for example, three out of four of the 42 chairmen voted against such basic Democratic programs as Medicare, aid to education, model cities, anti-poverty, rent supplements, distressed area aid for Appalachia, and minimum wage increases.

Analysis of Congressional Quarterly voting studies

To test the validity of these findings, several voting studies conducted by *Congressional Quarterly* were also analyzed.

For example, a recent CQ survey of the voting patterns of the 91st Congress committee (but not subcommittee) chairmen indicates that the six full committee chairmen who exceeded the GOP in opposition to Democratic programs and policies in the 30 key vote survey, had the highest levels of support for the conservative coalition in both the 89th and 90th Congresses.

This survey also shows that, with minor exceptions, these six chairmen (Colmer, Rivers, McMillan, Mills, Ichord and Poage) had the highest levels of opposition to the Democratic President during the two Congresses and the highest levels of opposition to federal action in meeting domestic needs

and problems. (See *CQ Weekly Report*, No. 6, Feb. 7, 1969, p. 226.)

Another CQ study of the 90th Congress shows that 32 of the 34 chairmen who exceeded the Republicans in anti-Democratic votes supported the conservative coalition on 60% or more of the votes studied. Half of these chairmen voted 80% or more in support of the conservative coalition. (These 32 chairmen included five full committee chairmen: Colmer, McMillan, Rivers, Ichord, and Poage.) (*CQ Weekly Report*, No. 44, Nov. 1, 1968.)

Still another CQ survey shows that 25 of the 34 chairmen who had higher individual opposition scores than the GOP voted more in opposition than support on 40 foreign policy issues supported by the Administration during the 90th Congress. (This group included four full committee chairmen: Colmer, Ichord, McMillan and Rivers.) (*CQ Weekly Report*, No. 44, Nov. 1, 1968.)

Most revealing of all, however, are CQ's Party Unity-Party Opposition studies. For example, the 90th Congress survey indicates that 51 Democratic Congressmen voted against-more-than-with the majority of their party while two others voted against-as-often-as-with their Democratic colleagues on 171 votes during the 90th Congress. (*CQ Weekly Report*, No. 43, Oct. 25, 1968.)

All 53 of these members are among the 75 Democrats who voted more in opposition than support of the Democratic position on the 30 key votes.

The 53 voting more in opposition than support in the CQ study also include 30 committee and subcommittee chairmen—all of whom are among the 34 committee and subcommittee chairmen who exceeded the Republicans in their opposition to Democratic programs and policies in the 30 key vote survey. (See Appendix No. 2.)

The 53 include the entire Democratic delegations from North Carolina, South Carolina and Mississippi (18 members); 90% of the Alabama and Virginia delegations (9 members); 60% of the Florida, Georgia, Louisiana and Missouri delegations (19 members); 20% of the Texas delegation (4 members); and one member each from Arkansas, Oklahoma and Nevada.

On the average, these 53 Democrats voted in opposition to the majority of their colleagues on 58% of the 171 votes surveyed by CQ and in agreement with their fellow Democrats only 28% of the time.*

Analysis of previous CQ Party Unity studies shows that the number of members voting against-more-often-than-with the majority of their Democratic colleagues has been steadily increasing over the past 16 years and that the 90th Congress level is a record high.

Following is the record of the last eight Congresses showing the number and percentage of Democrats voting against-more-often-than-with the Democratic majority, and how many of them are committee chairmen:

DEMOCRATS VOTING AGAINST MORE THAN WITH THEIR PARTY

Congress	Number of Members	Percent of all House Democrats	Committee chairmen
83d (1953-54).....	0	0	0
84th (1955-56).....	4	2	2
85th (1957-58).....	12	5	6
86th (1959-60).....	18	6	10
87th (1961-62).....	23	9	12
88th (1963-64).....	29	11	15
89th (1965-66).....	49	16	28
90th (1967-68).....	53	21	30

* Note: "Number of Members" includes both Members and chairmen. Also, figures in column "Percent of all House Democrats" are based on the actual number of Democrats in that particular Congress.

* CQ's individual ratings were based on all 171 votes regardless of whether or not mem-

As the chart on the previous page indicates, committee and subcommittee chairmen have accounted for at least half of the total number of Democratic members who voted against-more-than-with the majority of their party in each Congress.

Comparison of the 30 key vote analysis and these CQ studies produces 30 committee and subcommittee chairmen who might be considered the hard core of opposition within Democratic ranks.

With minor variations, these 30 chairmen show up on virtually all indexes considered as voting more in opposition than support of Democratic programs, policies, principles and the majority of their Democratic colleagues. They are also among the 34 Democratic committee chairmen with higher opposition scores than the average Republican.

The 30 include five committee chairmen (Colmer, Poage, Ichord, Rivers and McMillan) and 25 subcommittee chairmen. (See Attachment No. 2. The 30 chairmen are those whose names are preceded by an asterisk, capitalized, and underlined.)

Finally, in assessing the significance of the findings in this study, it should be borne in mind that the disaffecting Democrats were not voting against extreme or radical proposals, but programs and policies which could be supported by Democratic chairmen representing a broad range of philosophical and political attitudes.

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF 30 VOTES USED IN DSG STUDY

Following is a list of the 30 key votes analyzed in this study:

Poverty and hunger (four votes)

(1) House Roll Call 128, June 8, 1967. Amendment to require states to pay 20% of costs of food stamp program. (Rejected: 173-191. Voting against: Dem, 77% DSG, 99%; Non-DSG, 40%. GOP 18%.)

* (2) House Roll Call 387, Nov. 15, 1967. Motion to recommit Economic Opportunity Act Amendments with instructions to cut fiscal 1969 authorization from \$2.1 billion to \$1.6 billion. (Accepted: 221-190. Voting against: Dem, 69%; DSG, 96%; Non-DSG, 29%; GOP 17%.)

(3) House Roll Call, June 26, 1968. Amendment to cut \$100 million of OEO appropriations from the Labor, HEW, and related agencies appropriations bill. (Rejected: 181-220. Voting against: Dem, 68%; DSG, 94%; Non-DSG 26%; GOP, 37%.)

(4) House Roll Call 293, July 30, 1968. Amendment to provide authorization for appropriations as needed for food stamps for fiscal 1969-1972 rather than the proposed ceiling of \$245 million for fiscal 1969. (Accepted: 227-172. Voting for: Dem, 85%; DSG, 100%; Non-DSG, 62%; GOP 19%.)

Housing and urban development (6 votes)

* (5) House Roll Call 178, July 20, 1967. Motion to provide for floor consideration of the Rat Control and Extermination Act. (Rejected: 176-207. Voting for: Dem, 72%; DSG, 97%; Non-DSG, 38%; GOP 12%.)

* Votes preceded by an asterisk represented a defeat for the national Democratic position.

* (6) House Roll Call 336, Oct. 24, 1967. Motion to increase Model Cities funds from \$237 million to \$537 million. (Rejected: 156-241. Voting for: Dem, 63% DSG, 87%; Non-DSG, 25%; GOP 10%.)

(7) House Roll Call 343, Oct. 26, 1967. Motion to insist on \$10 million in fiscal 1968 funds for rent supplements instead of \$40 million requested by the President. (Rejected: 184-198. Voting against: Dem, 76%; DSG, 96%; Non-DSG, 47%; GOP 20%.)

bers voted on each issue. Thus, percentages do not add up to 100% because many members did not vote on all issues.

* Votes preceded by an asterisk represented a defeat for the national Democratic position.

(8) House Roll Call 122, May 8, 1968. Motion to limit fiscal 1969 expenditures for the Department of Housing and Independent agencies to \$15.5 billion—a reduction of \$7.3 million. (Rejected: 173-217. Voting against: Dem, 85%; DSG, 98%; Non-DSG, 71%; GOP, 19%.)

* (9) House Roll Call 239, July 10, 1968. Motion to delete grants to public housing authorities for tenant services and grants for interim assistance for blighted areas. (Adopted: 217-193. Voting against: Dem, 78%; DSG, 97%; Non-DSG, 33%; GOP, 15%.)

(10) House Roll Call 240, July 10, 1968. Final House passage of the HUD Act of 1968. (Passed: 295-114. Voting for: Dem, 79%; DSG, 100%; Non-DSG, 48%; GOP, 63%.)

Education (two votes)

(11) House Roll Call 104, May 24, 1967. Motion to recommit Elementary and Secondary Education Act for further hearings. (Rejected: 180-236. Voting against: Dem, 81%; DSG, 94%; Non-DSG, 59%; GOP, 25%.)

(12) House Roll Call 156, June 27, 1967. Motion to recommit Education Professions Development Act striking the Teacher Corps provisions. (Rejected: 146-257. Voting against: Dem, 72%; DSG, 96%; Non-DSG, 35%; GOP, 52%.)

Civil rights (three votes)

(13) House Roll Call 220, Aug. 16, 1967. Passage of bill providing protection against interference with persons exercising or attempting to exercise their civil rights. (Passed: 327-93. Voting for: Dem, 70%; DSG, 99%; Non-DSG, 30%; GOP, 86%.)

(14) House Roll Call 95, April 10, 1968. Resolution to permit acceptance without challenge of Senate-passed open housing and other amendments to the Civil Rights Bill. (Adopted: 229-195. Voting for: Dem, 63%; DSG, 92%; Non-DSG, 20%; GOP, 42%.)

(15) House Roll Call 368, Oct. 3, 1968. Motion that the House accept Senate provisions weakening two House-passed amendments that would have greatly restricted HEW in its enforcement of school desegregation. (Accepted: 167-156. Voting for: Dem, 56%; DSG, 90%; Non-DSG, 17%; GOP, 44%.)

Gun control and crime (three votes)

* (16) House Roll Call 200, Aug. 8, 1967. Amendment to replace categorical grants to local governments with grants to states for planning and improving law enforcement methods. (Accepted: 256-147. Voting against: Dem, 63%; DSG, 90%; Non-DSG, 24%; GOP, 2%.)

* (17) House Roll Call 275, July 24, 1968. Amendment to exempt shotgun, rifle, and .22 caliber rim-fire ammunition from ammunition sales restrictions. (Accepted: 218-205. Voting against: Dem, 57%; DSG, 83%; Non-DSG, 18%; GOP, 38%.)

* (18) House Roll Call 277, July 24, 1968. Amendment to permit the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice to ship guns through the mail to clubs participating in the civilian marksmanship program. (Accepted: 225-198. Voting against: Dem, 53%; DSG, 81% Non-DSG, 10%; GOP, 39%.)

Foreign aid (three votes)

(19) House Roll Call 374, Nov. 8, 1967. Motion to recommit the foreign aid authorization bill and remove the authority of the President to engage in the sale or purchase of defense equipment or services with nations trading with or shipping to North Vietnam. (Rejected: 196-200. Voting against: Dem, 73%; DSG, 97%; Non-DSG, 35%; GOP, 20%.)

(20) House Roll Call 375, Nov. 8, 1967. Adoption of conference report authorizing \$2.7 billion in fiscal 1968 for foreign economic and military assistance programs. (Adopted: 205-187. Voting for: Dem, 69%; DSG, 94%; Non-DSG, 30%; GOP, 29%.)

* (21) House Roll Call 267, July 18, 1968. Motion to recommit the foreign aid authorization bill with instructions to cut an additional \$165 million, bringing the authorization to \$1.9 billion—nearly \$1 billion below the Administration request. (Adopted: 268-150. Voting against: Dem, 56%; DSG, 82%; Non-DSG, 17%; GOP, 11%.)

Federal expenditures (four votes)

* (22) House Roll Call 296, Oct. 4, 1967. Motion to delete a total of \$20.7 million in appropriations for National Institutes of Health research and for education of the deaf. (Accepted: 226-174. Voting against: Dem, 69%; DSG, 91%; Non-DSG, 34%; GOP, 13%.)

* (23) House Roll Call 319, Oct. 18, 1967. Amendment to continuing appropriations bill ordering the President to reduce government expenditures in fiscal 1968 to \$131.5 billion—\$5 billion below the administrative budget—and to hold federal agencies to their fiscal 1967 spending levels. (Accepted: 238-164. Voting against: Dem, 69%; DSG, 82%; Non-DSG, 31%; GOP, 5%.)

* (24) House Roll Call 159, May 29, 1968. Motion to instruct House conferees on the Tax Surcharge bill to insist on limiting expenditure reductions to \$4 billion rather than \$6 billion. (Rejected: 137-259. Voting for: Dem, 59%; DSG, 81%; Non-DSG, 27%; GOP, 3%.)

* (25) House Roll Call 227, July 3, 1968. Amendment to deny all funds for highway beautification except \$1.25 million for beautification study. (Accepted: 211-145. Voting against: Dem, 69%; DSG, 89%; Non-DSG, 35%; GOP, 9%.)

Consumer protection (two votes)

* (26) House Roll Call 417, Nov. 29, 1967. Motion to instruct House conferees to accept Senate amendments to Wholesome Meat Act which required intra-state meat plant operations to adhere to federal standards, and in some cases, to be inspected by federal officials. (Rejected: 166-207. Voting for: Dem, 66%; DSG, 95%; Non-DSG, 24%; GOP, 11%.)

* (27) House Roll Call 224, July 2, 1968. Motion to lessen the authority of the Sec-

retary of Transportation to set safety standards for gas pipelines. (Accepted: 247-125. Voting against: Dem, 55%; DSG, 87%; Non-DSG, 9%; GOP, 4%.)

Miscellaneous (three votes)

* (28) House Roll Call 6, Jan. 10, 1967. Amendment to delete 21-day rule. (Accepted: 233-185. Voting against: Dem, 68%; DSG, 97%; Non-DSG, 24%; GOP, 14%.)

* (29) House Roll Call 195, June 19, 1968. Amendment to delete \$671,000 in planning funds designated for the Dickey-Lincoln power project in the Public Works-Atomic Energy Commission appropriation for fiscal 1969. (Accepted: 266-132. Voting against: Dem, 59%; DSG, 81%; Non-DSG, 26%; GOP, 3%.)

* (30) House Roll Call 280, July 25, 1968. Amendment to Higher Education Amendments requiring colleges to deny federal funds to students who participate in campus disorders. (Accepted: 260-146. Voting against: Dem, 45%; DSG, 69%; Non-DSG, 7%; GOP, 25%.)

APPENDIX 2

SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION RATINGS OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 90TH CONG.

(†) Dagger—A dagger in front of a chairman's name indicates chairmen who have higher opposition than support scores on both the 30 key vote index and the CQ index. (Equal scores are also included.)

(‡) Double dagger—A double dagger in front of a chairman's name indicates chairmen who have higher opposition than support scores on only 1 of the 2 indexes. (Equal scores are also included.)

(*) Asterisks—An asterisk in front of a chairman's name indicates that his level of opposition to the 30 votes in the 30 key vote index was higher than (or equal to) 75 percent—the overall level of Republican opposition.

(O) Numbers in parentheses—The number in parentheses following each chairman's name indicates the number of committees and/or subcommittees he chaired during the 90th Cong.

State	Chairman	30 key vote index		CQ party unity index	
		Support	Opposition	Support	Opposition
Alabama	* Andrews (1)	0	100	21	66
	* Selden (1)	11	89	29	54
	Jones (3)	53	47	67	18
Arizona	Udall (1)	97	3	81	5
Arkansas	* Gathings (3)	0	100	25	72
	* Mills (1)	15	85	46	43
California	Brown (1)	92	8	49	11
	Holifield (1)	97	3	84	2
	Johnson (1)	87	13	90	6
	Miller (1)	96	4	67	2
	Moss (2)	100	0	75	3
	Sisk (1)	85	15	74	4
Colorado	Aspinall (1)	70	30	58	13
	Rogers (2)	83	17	78	11
Connecticut	Daddario (1)	97	3	79	4
	Monagan (1)	80	20	73	15
Florida	* Bennett (1)	10	90	37	63
	* Haley (2)	0	100	10	86
	* Sikes (1)	18	82	46	42
	Fascell (2)	93	7	80	8
Georgia	* O'Neal (1)	3	97	29	62
	* Davis (1)	21	79	44	42
Illinois	Dawson (2)	100	0	68	1
	Gray (1)	79	21	71	10
	Kluczynski (1)	100	0	74	2
	O'Hara (1)	97	3	81	4
	Price (3)	100	0	93	2
	Pucinski (1)	93	7	74	12
Kentucky	* Natcher (1)	50	50	67	33
	* Stubblefield (1)	47	53	58	30
	Perkins (1)	80	20	89	11
Louisiana	* Hébert (4)	20	80	19	25
	* Passman (1)	10	90	32	51
	* Willis (4)	35	65	22	11
Maryland	Fallon (1)	87	13	64	12
	Friedel (3)	100	0	93	4
	Garmatz (2)	97	3	82	8
Massachusetts	Boland (1)	97	3	82	5
	Macdonald (1)	90	10	61	9
	Philbin (1)	97	3	78	6
Michigan	Diggs (1)	100	0	57	3
	Dingell (1)	79	21	83	9
Minnesota	Bianchi (3)	96	4	81	5
	Karst (1)	93	7	78	8
Mississippi	* Abernethy (2)	0	100	20	70
	* Colmer (1)	0	100	17	71
	* Whitten (1)	7	93	30	61
Missouri	* Ichord (2)	15	85	35	53
	* Jones (3)	6	94	23	39
	* Sullivan (2)	93	7	77	7
Montana	Olsen (1)	89	11	73	6
Nevada	* Baring (2)	4	96	17	65
New Jersey	Daniels (2)	100	0	93	4
	Thompson (1)	100	0	70	1
New York	Carey (1)	100	0	68	6
	Celler (2)	93	7	66	1
	Dulski (1)	90	10	88	6
New York—Continued	Farbstein (1)	100	0	75	4
	Hanley (1)	93	7	85	12
	Kelly (1)	90	10	82	5
	Pike (1)	75	25	67	27
	Resnick (1)	100	0	37	0
	Rooney (1)	100	0	82	2
	Stratton (1)	63	37	48	27
North Carolina	* Fountain (2)	3	97	25	55
	* Henderson (1)	7	93	32	59
	* Lennon (2)	0	100	23	74
	* Taylor (1)	13	87	30	64
	* Whitener (1)	13	87	29	60
Ohio	Ashley (1)	100	0	68	5
	Feighan (1)	93	7	83	4
	Hays (3)	64	36	60	14
	Kirwan (1)	100	0	71	6
Oklahoma	* Jarman (1)	0	100	27	69
	Edmondson (2)	70	30	80	14
	Steed (1)	55	45	66	26
Oregon	Green (1)	82	18	63	16
Pennsylvania	Barrett (1)	97	3	77	3
	Clark (1)	68	32	68	12
	Dent (1)	93	7	68	4
	Flood (1)	86	14	78	7
	Green (1)	100	0	87	2
	Holland (1)	100	0	(1)	(1)
	Moorhead (1)	97	3	79	6
	Morgan (2)	93	7	85	4
	Nix (1)	100	0	84	2
	Vigorito (1)	87	13	83	13
South Carolina	* Ashmore (2)	4	96	14	57
	* Dorn (1)	7	93	34	54
	* McMillan (2)	14	86	29	47
	* Rivers (2)	14	86	37	37
Tennessee	* Everett (1)	30	70	45	30
	Evins (1)	52	48	46	13
Texas	* Burleson (1)	10	90	36	55
	* Dowdy (1)	3	97	23	67
	* Fisher (1)	3	97	22	56
	* Poage (2)	14	86	43	44
	* Pool (1)	4	96	(?)	(?)
	* Teague (3)	24	76	36	30
	* Purcell (1)	31	69	49	27
	* Mahon (2)	43	57	65	33
	Brooks (1)	83	17	85	6
	de la Garza (1)	57	43	61	25
	Palman (3)	83	17	64	9
	Wright (2)	65	35	68	12
Virginia	* Abbt (1)	0	100	12	64
	* Downing (1)	21	79	47	47
	* Hardy (2)	24	76	43	35
Washington	* Foley (1)	77	23	82	12
	Hansen (1)	90	10	78	3
West Virginia	Hechler (1)	97	3	88	12
	Staggers (2)	83	17	65	9
Wisconsin	Reuss (2)	100	0	85	5
	Zablocki (1)	90	10	82	9

1 Representative Holland died during 1968 and was not included in the CQ study.

2 Representative Pool died during 1968 and was not included in the CQ study.

Note: 30 key vote index—The 30 key vote index gives the percentage of votes on which the chairman supported the national Democratic position and the percentage of votes on which he voted in opposition. Votes on which the member was not recorded are not included. CQ index—

The CQ index shows the percentage of 171 party unity rollcalls on which the chairman voted in agreement with the majority of his party and the percentage of which he voted in opposition to the majority. All votes are included, whether or not the member was recorded. Thus, a member's party unity support and opposition scores add up to 100 percent only if he voted yea or nay on all 171 rollcalls.

AIC'S SUPER SATURDAY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, American International College of Springfield, Mass., this season fielded two of the most skilled and spirited sports teams in its history. The college's hockey team last Saturday edged Norwich University 7 to 6 to win the division II title of the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference. That same day AIC's basketball team won the National Collegiate Athletic Association's District I title by defeating Springfield College 91 to 68.

I would like to congratulate AIC's hockey coach, Bill Turner, its basketball coach, Bill Callahan, and their players for the truly remarkable performance they turned out this season.

The hockey team's 1968-69 season is over—the ECAC holds no national competition in hockey—but the basketball team now goes on to the NCAA national tournament in Evansville, Ind. I know my colleagues from New England join me in extending best wishes to the team for a successful tournament.

The Springfield, Mass., Union yesterday published a column outlining AIC's double victory in hockey and basketball last Saturday. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put this article in the RECORD at this point:

AIC'S SUPER SATURDAY

A couple of old war horses who used to run the infield track on American International's baseball battlefield about a quarter-century ago won the daily double for their alma mater Saturday.

Forming what would be known in racing parlance as a "perfecta exacta" were coaches Bill Turner and Bill Callahan.

Turner started AIC's super Saturday by directing his precocious puck-chasers to a 7-6 victory over Norwich in the ECAC Division II finals at the Coliseum.

A few hours later, Callahan took the controls in Butova Gym and he pushed all the right buttons as his cagers crushed Springfield, 91-68, for the NCAA District 1 college division crown.

THOSE SKATERS CAN SCORE

Will there ever be a happier day in AIC athletic history than Saturday, March 8? It's most improbable.

Turner, a full-timer as placement director at AIC, couldn't be more pleased about his team's accomplishment. His boys may have defensive shortcomings, but they certainly know how to score. Lads like Gary Socha, Yves DeRome, Mike Egoroff and Dave Forbes are at their best when the puck is on their sticks.

The object of the game, after all, is to outscore your opponent. Turner's boys are well-schooled in this fundamental.

This is the end of the road for the hockey team, since there is no national competition in the college division. But the basketball team has bigger goals remaining.

Most observers, including the rival coaches, who saw AIC squash Springfield Saturday night are convinced that the Yellow Jackets could do some business in Evansville this time.

The members of the eight-team field supposedly are the best college division teams in the country. AIC's Wednesday afternoon opponent, San Francisco State, was rated highly in national polls.

CXV—426—Part 5

A year ago, the Jackets were somewhat shaken before they even took the floor against Kentucky Wesleyan. Their trip to Evansville was delayed by storm conditions and the kids, most of whom had never been on an airplane before, didn't make the tourney scene until a few hours before game-time.

Adding to AIC's troubles was the injury to Henry Payne. The little playmaker fractured a bone in his hand in the regionals at Worcester and his trip to Indiana was as a spectator.

Despite the adversities, AIC made a respectable showing before bowing to the eventual national champions, 90-78.

CARTER FOOLS 'EM

The present AIC team is better equipped to do the job in Evansville. Bobby Rutherford, Al Bush and Curtis Mitchell are older, stronger and wiser. Greg Hill is one of the smoothest underneath operators Callahan has ever brought along. And Al Carter may not be the strongest big man around, but the 6-11 beanstalk never stops trying. His fine shooting touch has fooled a lot of people.

With speed as his major asset, Callahan has looked to his bench often. Rudy Wolters, Jim White, Cisco Maloney and Tom Doyle have all been big contributors.

After it was all over Saturday in Butova Gym, there was renewed controversy about the pairings. Many viewers felt that AIC and Assumption were the two best teams, and on the strength of what happened, those teams should have been battling for the title rather than meeting in the first round.

Springfield, however, certainly can't be discredited. The Chiefs made the selection committee look good with their spirited showing and conquest of Central Connecticut. Ed Bilik's boys did themselves proud.

And speaking of a golden Saturday for sports, all the success wasn't on the AIC campus. Springfield brought home New England crowns in swimming and wrestling, and a national title in women's gymnastics.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM
IMPORTANT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, congressional procedures, more appropriate to horse and buggy times than to the jet age, have fostered poor legislation, diminished the role of Congress as a co-equal branch of Government, and interfered with the public's right to know.

For such reasons, I urge the prompt enactment of legislation which I am co-sponsoring with many others to modernize legislative branch procedures and operations.

Passage of this legislative reform bill would greatly strengthen the voice of the minority party in writing the laws of the land, improve congressional budget and research functions, and give taxpayers a better idea of what their lawmakers are doing. It would provide better supervision of lobbying activities and tighten up congressional oversight of the activities of the executive branch. On balance, this bill to improve the internal functions of Congress is highly desirable.

Included among improvements the bill would require are:

Creation of new committee rules that

would require the announcement of record votes, permit a majority to compel the filing of a report or bill, prohibit voting by proxies, and require that committee rules be printed at the beginning of each session;

Assurance to the minority party of proper committee staff, the right to file minority views on committee reports, equal time in debating conference reports, and the right to schedule witnesses during committee hearings;

Reform of each standing committee's oversight functions over the regulations, procedures, practices and policies of the Government relating to laws within that committee's jurisdiction; and

Strengthened congressional research and budgetary functions, including an upgraded legislative reference service, greater utilization of the General Accounting Office and procedures for stepping up appropriations processes.

FARMERS NOW OWN THEIR CREDIT
BANKS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, a milestone of national significance was recently reached in the field of agricultural credit. This occasion was properly recorded in the Land O' Lakes News, and I am reproducing this article in my remarks to amplify the importance of this fruition of the congressional and industrial goals at the time that the original law went into effect in 1923. I believe this complete ownership and their repayment to the Federal Government of the money that was loaned to farm credit bank is a strong testimony of the determination and ability of rural people to keep their promises. The article follows:

FARMERS NOW OWN THEIR CREDIT BANKS

December 31, 1968 was a day of real significance for American agriculture, for on this day farmers and ranchers in North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan, through their Production Credit Associations, became the sole owners of the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of St. Paul.

This announcement was made by Andrew Lampen, President of the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of St. Paul. Production Credit Associations have concluded to take advantage of recently enacted laws authorizing them to retire the remaining \$12.5 million of Government capital in the Credit Bank and become complete owners of the equity interests in the Bank.

Through national coordination, 453 PCAs will retire \$126 million of Government capital remaining in the 12 intermediate credit banks.

"When the credit banks were established in 1923, Congress made no provision for the retirement of the Government-owned stock. In 1956 Congress provided a plan for PCAs to acquire capital stock in the banks and gradually retire the Government's investment. Subsequent legislation has speeded up this process," Lampen explained.

The credit banks provide loan funds to PCAs who in turn make loans to farmers and ranchers for operating and capital purposes. The banks obtain their loan funds by selling

securities each month to investors in the nation's financial markets. This often has been called the bridge between Wall Street and the farmer.

"On a national basis farmers borrow nearly \$6 billion a year from their 453 Production Credit Associations," Lampen stated. "Of this, over \$700 million is provided by 52 associations served by the Credit Bank of St. Paul."

Lampen added that this is the last step taken by farmers and ranchers in paying back the capital originally invested by the Government in the three Farm Credit Banks of St. Paul; The Federal Land Bank, the St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives, and now the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank.

"A half century ago few people thought farmers could become their own bankers. This is a truly significant accomplishment. It is a tribute to the help of an understanding Government, service-minded management, the loyal support of 544,000 PCA farmer-members and the faith and determination of the nearly 2500 farmers that serve on the boards of directors of the associations," Lampen concluded.

PHIL HART: SENATE MAN

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the leading political figure in the State of Michigan is our senior Senator, PHILIP A. HART. He is a marvelous human being and a man I am proud to call friend.

Senator PHILIP HART served his apprenticeship in Government in a quiet, effective manner. All who came in contact with him were impressed by his intelligence and decency. It is gratifying that in the foremost legislative arena in the world, these qualities have served him well. The people of our Nation are fortunate that circumstances and PHIL HART's special abilities have come together in such a way that he is now elevated to a position of national leadership.

The flavor of the man is captured in a recent article by the distinguished Washington correspondent of Knight newspapers, Saul Friedman. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the article is set forth below:

ESTABLISHMENT REBEL: MICHIGAN'S SENATOR PHILIP HART—CAN MICHIGAN'S PHIL HART, AMERICAN SENATOR, REMAIN PURE—AND BE POWERFUL TOO?

(By Saul Friedman)

"It was on the dignity of the Senate that Augustus and his successors founded their new empire . . . In the administration of their own powers, they frequently consulted the great national council, and seemed to refer to its decision, the most important concerns of peace and war . . . Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the Senate and the people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom."

—Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." (Emphasis in the original.)

Lyndon B. Johnson, a latter day Augustus, gave Phil Hart his first lesson on how to enjoy being a United States Senator.

The lesson was administered in January, 1959, just after Hart came to the Senate.

Hart still recalls the incident, perhaps because it was the first of the hundreds of little initiation rites for the new boys of the Club.

"It was the evening of the first roll call, which was to be a test of the leader's strength. But I didn't know it," Hart says. "You're always supposed to vote with the leader when he wants to adjourn out of trouble. I wasn't ready to quit, so I voted against the leader's motion to adjourn."

The next day, Johnson wandered over to Hart's little desk in the back of the Senate chamber, towered over him and drawled quietly: "Senator, let me tell you a little story. When Sam Rayburn first came to Congress, the Speaker told him: 'Young man, you vote against the leadership whenever your conscience or the interests of your state require it. But don't do it very often and don't do it on anything important.'"

Hart, a little shaken, told Johnson he understood. But he didn't really get the message, because he drew himself up and added politely: "Don't count on me."

The imperious Democratic leader walked off and we can only surmise that he probably wondered whether the quiet little man from Michigan was going to be another one of those do-good-but-accomplish-little liberals, or learn another Sam Rayburn dictum Johnson was fond of quoting: "You got to go along before you can get along."

There are those in the Senate who never learned. And as majority leader, vice-president, and President, Johnson had little to do with them.

In 1957, for example, William Proxmire, a Democrat, was running in a Wisconsin special election for the Senate seat vacated by the death of Joseph R. McCarthy. Johnson was the most powerful figure in the party, then out of the White House, and he used his influence to funnel funds, some from the oil industry, into Proxmire's campaign. After Proxmire won, Johnson met him at the Washington airport, to give him a hero's welcome, and begin buttering him up.

Within a few weeks, Proxmire tried to start a rebellion against Johnson's leadership, and charged the Texan with being dictatorial, which he was. From that time on Johnson saw to it that Proxmire didn't get a thing in the Senate. He barred Proxmire from committees he wanted, even if it meant asking a senator with more seniority to move from one committee and onto the one Proxmire wanted. And Johnson always called Proxmire "Senator Pismire."

It was natural for Hart to have been a bit defiant. There was no love for Johnson among Michigan's Democrats. It may pain some of them to remember it now, but at the time they believed Johnson stood for all that was archaic and evil in the Democratic Party. But that was long ago, when they were the crusaders for what is now called New Politics.

Hart and the leaders of the party that elected him were devout liberals, and their political idols were G. Mennen Williams, Adlai Stevenson, Paul Douglas, of Illinois, and Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota.

These were the kind of men who had guided Hart's views and his career. So it was to be expected that he should look to such liberals for leadership in the Senate.

But eventually Hart discovered, to his deep dismay, that most of these men, even a giant like Douglas, were frustrated and almost without effect in the Senate. The seniority system, the musty rules and traditions of the Senate got in their way. And the clique led by Johnson and the late Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma, was all-powerful.

What disturbed Hart most, however, was the inability of the liberals to put aside their fervent and often dogmatic idealism, and work with and within the system of the Senate—to change it, to become effective, to win even the smallest victories, and to serve their constituents.

This is what Johnson was talking about in

that little lesson on the Senate floor. And although it took him a long time, he learned it.

A small incident in the fall of 1966 will illustrate how well Hart has learned the folkways and games of the Senate.

Sen. James O. Eastland, a Mississippi Democrat, and an archetype of the porcine, cigar-chomping southern racist, was running for reelection. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee he was also in on the kill of the civil rights bill that year, for which Hart was floor manager.

A leader of Senate civil rights forces, Hart arose in the chamber one day to denounce Eastland as an obstructionist enemy of all civil rights legislation. Hart's language was unusually harsh.

It seemed a courageous thing for Hart to do, for Eastland was his chairman and a very influential member of the Senate. One of Eastland's allies, Sen. Sam J. Ervin, a North Carolina Democrat, arose to reply to Hart and defend his colleague from Mississippi.

But as Ervin began speaking, Eastland sidled up to him and whispered loudly: "Damn it Sam, sit down and shut up. You're ruining the whole thing."

Hart's speech, it turned out, had been written by Eastland's staff. It was to be circulated in Mississippi to help Eastland win against a Republican who charged he was too soft on the Negro issue.

Eastland and Hart still chuckle over the incident. And Ervin, because he was taken in by it, gets a belly laugh out of remembering it.

It also helped give him a fondness for Hart which is reserved for no other liberal northerner.

"There are few men in the Senate with whom I disagree more, or have greater affection for," Ervin said of Hart. "Some folks around here believe that if you entertain views hostile to their own, there must also be a personal hostility. Senator Hart is unfailingly a fine gentleman."

Ten or even five years ago, Hart would have thought such a charade repugnant and dishonest. Most of his old idols would never have taken part in it. And yet it was not dishonest.

He agreed with every word in the speech. Indeed Hart could not have made it on his own without expecting some kind of retribution from Eastland. It is rare for a senator to denounce another, much less his committee chairman. Eastland would probably have been elected without the speech, but as it was, Hart's favor made Eastland slightly beholden.

Two years later, under Hart's guidance, the civil rights bill passed, with a minimum of trouble from Eastland. And with Eastland's help Hart has had little difficulty getting federal judicial appointments in Michigan through his committee.

Just before the end of the 90th Congress, when Lyndon Johnson failed to get confirmation for his appointment of Justice Abe Fortas as Chief Justice, he told Hart he could have the nomination.

But there wasn't enough time left in the session and the idea died. Although the hostility towards Fortas' liberal views was high in the Senate and the Judiciary Committee, if there had been a couple of weeks left before adjournment, Hart's nomination could have been approved.

Eastland quietly told Hart he would not oppose him. And Ervin, a constitutional conservative, said later even he might have supported Hart despite their opposite views on recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

The nomination of Hart never came about, but it would have been ironic. Johnson, who once wondered if Hart would ever become his kind of senator, was ready to elevate him to the Supreme Court, partly out of gratitude for his fight in the Senate on Fortas' behalf. And Hart, who for years was miser-

able in the Senate and dreamed of a Supreme Court nomination, discovered somewhat to his surprise that he didn't want to be on the court after all.

He understood his role in the Senate. He had become a member in good standing of its Establishment, the club within the club. For the first time he was happy at his work, and good at it.

Having discovered this and come to terms with himself and the "great national council" called the Senate, Hart is now reaching towards the height of his powers.

His Judiciary subcommittee on anti-trust and monopoly is one of the most important in the Senate, and Hart has become a spokesman for those who challenge corporate windmills. In separate stories in one magazine, Hart was quoted three times in a single issue as the Senate authority on the practices of big business.

Before Hart became chairman of his subcommittee, it was run by the late Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, a flamboyant and gutsy fighter who was more suited to playing Don Quixote. He took on drug companies and crime syndicates in hand-to-hand combat that propelled him to prominence and a place on the 1956 Democratic ticket.

After Kefauver's death, his staff was so disappointed with Hart's gentle, judicial style, many called him "chicken Hart" and "faint Hart." Yet beneath Kefauver's bombast, there had not been much significant legislation. And Hart, like Kefauver, was confronted with a conservative majority on his subcommittee, which limited any liberal, trust-busting action.

Nevertheless, Hart was pushed forward with an impressive list of hearings which exposed seamy practices in big business. In the past couple of years the medical profession has begun to restrict the practice of physician-owned drug companies, because of an investigation by Hart. In an adroit maneuver, Hart took his truth-in-packaging bill out of the clutches of his hostile committee, and sent it to the more liberal Commerce Committee. It was approved and became law.

Two years ago the Louisville Courier Journal said in an editorial that Hart is "filling a void left by the death of Sen. Estes Kefauver and the defeat of Sen. Paul Douglas. He is emerging as a spokesman for the great, amorphous mass of consumers in this country, poking around in shadowy corners of the domestic scene for the enlightenment of the public. . . . He is a valuable man to have in the Senate."

In the next two years, partly because he must stand for reelection in 1970, Hart is stepping up the activity of his committee, venturing into areas where few have gone and survived politically.

Hart has already begun and will continue to look into the auto insurance and auto repair industries. He will also investigate the high cost of hospital care, the stranglehold that credit bureaus often have on consumers, the favoritism granted big corporations in defense procurement, monopolies in the newspaper and broadcasting industries, and the manner in which international oil cartels manipulate government, the market, and oil prices.

Hart is also a member of the Commerce Committee, and depending on the wishes of the chairman, Sen. Warren Magnuson, he may get to run a subcommittee which will have jurisdiction over air transportation. Magnuson offered Hart the consumer subcommittee, but he turned it down because it would merely duplicate what he is now doing.

In the Senate at large, Hart is the acknowledged expert and the prime mover of civil rights legislation. And more important he has become a force behind what Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, has called "the winds of change" that are now wafting through the Senate. When Kennedy sought

counsel on whether to run for the Assistant Democratic Leader's post, he called Hart first, and he took his advice.

Hart was among the early opponents of the anti-ballistic missile system. And he was one of the early advocates of massive action to relieve hunger and malnutrition in the nation. In both these efforts, and others, Kennedy has joined Hart.

In the relationship of the two men, Hart has displayed no personal ambition, except to reform his party and the Senate the better to deal with the issues of the day. And towards this end he has supported and encouraged Kennedy. Thus, as Kennedy's star rises, so will Hart's.

This too has a potential for irony. Hart has almost always played a supporting role in his political lifetime, and even now he would refuse a formal Senate leadership post unless it was thrust upon him. Yet the ways of life, death and politics have put Hart in a position of leadership, however informal, and great influence. And he has survived or surpassed those he once followed and worshipped.

Stevenson and Kefauver are dead. Douglas and Humphrey are over the hill. And Soapy Williams, the man to whom Hart owes all he has, will soon be looking for a new future.

To be quite accurate, Hart's first political debt is to his wife, because she is rich. Mrs. Jane Hart, whose volatile temperament is a perfect foil for her husband's calm, is the daughter of the late Walter Briggs, a Detroit industrialist. Phil Hart says candidly that he could not have indulged himself in a political career if his wife's money was not available to keep up their homes, send their eight children to school, and pay some office and campaign expenses.

Born on Dec. 10, 1912, in Bryn Mawr, Pa., Hart was the son of a moderately well-to-do banker. He went to Georgetown University, in Washington, and while there roomed with Walter Briggs, Jr., and through him went to the University of Michigan law school and met his future wife when she was still a scrawny, tomboyish teenager.

By 1943, Hart had finished law school and had become a captain in the army. And in the women's page of a Detroit newspaper it was recorded that "Society reporters have been keeping a sharp eye on the romance of Phil and Jane ever since October, 1940 when Janey appeared at a banquet in honor of the Detroit Tigers (which her father owned) escorted by her young lawyer friend."

On June 10 of that year they were married. Among the guests were former Ohio Gov. James A. Cox, the Democratic presidential nominee in 1920, and A. Mitchell Palmer, who won spurious fame as attorney general after World War I, when he ordered the nation's first "Red hunt."

On D-Day, a year after the marriage, Hart was seriously wounded by a mortar shell on Utah Beach at Normandy. He went on to fight in the Battle of the Bulge, and came home with a Purple Heart, a couple of Bronze stars, and the French Croix de Guerre.

Hart, along with many veterans, returned to Michigan when a new political era was dawning.

He had long been interested in politics. His father, a friend of Woodrow Wilson, and the Democratic chairman of his county, had taken him to the 1924 party convention. But he had no idea he would run for office. A quiet, rather reflective and introverted man, Hart never believed he was suited to politics.

Politicians often like to say they were destined for office, and like any red-blooded American boy, set their minds to it while studying Plutarch by the light of a log fire. The truth is that politicians, like most men, simply find themselves surrounded by circumstance and become its victim or its beneficiary, depending on their luck, their support, their opponent, and their ability to make the most of opportunity.

In the late 1940s in Michigan, the industrial and political power of Detroit had matured. The United Auto Workers, having joined in the war effort was over its violent formative period, and had become generally respectable. The strapping new, and liberal guard of the labor movement, the idealism of many a returning veteran, the changing face of Michigan, and the vision of a few, young men were the ingredients for change in the Democratic Party.

Soapy Williams became the standard bearer, and Phil Hart, one of his University of Michigan classmates, became his sword carrier. The Harts were about the only Democrats in Bloomfield Hills.

But the irrepressible Janey remembers those days with starry-eyed nostalgia as they fought losing, uphill battles against the entrenched Oakland County Republicans. Phil Hart only remembers that they lost.

"I have never yenned for the time when we were going to lose by a half million votes," he says. "Back in those days it wasn't as exciting as it is now. I suppose it was fun then, not having any responsibility, having the ability to scream."

Besides battling Republicans, the young Turks among the Democrats also fought the American Federation of Labor and Teamster Control of the party, and the influence of communists in the labor movement and liberalism.

After Williams became governor, he appointed Hart Corporation and Securities Commissioner, and in that job he prepared to run for Secretary of State. He was trounced and Williams gave him work as director of the state Office of Price Stabilization. Unhappy in that job, Hart, during the last part of the Truman Administration, became U.S. District Attorney.

As part of his duties he prosecuted several Michigan communists under the Smith Act, and has regretted it ever since. When the liberals in Michigan and elsewhere, went on their own anti-communist hunt in the labor movement and other organizations, they unwittingly fed the fires of the McCarthyist monster they came to detest. Since those days, Hart has supported Supreme Court decisions knocking down those laws which he used against Communists in Michigan.

The Michigan battle against the AFL and the Teamsters came to a climax in 1954 when Hart, then legal advisor to Williams, announced he would run for lieutenant governor. Backed by the United Auto Workers, Hart ran in the primary against George Fitzgerald, attorney for the Teamsters and a former Democratic National Committeeman. It was a vicious campaign in which the Teamsters on occasion tried the use of a little muscle against Hart's supporters. But Hart won easily and went on to defeat his Republican opponent.

From then on, the political reporters referred to Hart as Williams' "heir-apparent." When Williams got tired of being governor, it was said, he would go on to bigger things and leave the statehouse to loyal ol' Phil.

Jane Hart, who never got on with Soapy's tempestuous wife, Nancy, chafed at seeing her husband wait at Williams' pleasure. But patient Phil said of Williams: "He and he alone set me on the road. He built the party. I'll wait."

Not only did he wait. He advised Williams to run for the Senate and from there make a bid to get on the national ticket in 1960 or later. But Williams was convinced that his national future would be brighter from a governor's office. He was thinking of the governors then powerful and prominent in party politics—Stevenson, for one. Someone showed Williams an analysis which concluded there was a better chance for national office as a senator than governor. But Williams thought otherwise and made the biggest mistake of his career. He chose to run again for governor

and the way was clear for Hart to run for the Senate.

Hart easily defeated the incumbent, Charles Potter, and in running ahead of Soapy by 170,000 votes began leaving his old teacher behind. And like many a man who is big in his own state, as Hart headed for Washington he left naivete and political virginity behind.

On a night soon after his arrival in Washington, the Senate freshmen of the class of '58 gathered with their wives for dinner at the home of one of their number, Vance Hartke, of Indiana. He was a small town mayor who had come to the senate looking like an overly ambitious button-hook salesman.

During the evening Hartke expansively picked up the telephone and ordered the operator to get Lyndon Johnson at the LBJ Ranch.

"I've gathered the new boys here, Mr. Leader," he said, "because I thought you might want to say a few things to them."

Jane Hart recalls the incident: "One by one, like little boys, they trooped to the phone to say 'Yes, Mr. Leader, No, Mr. Leader, Of course, Mr. Leader.' It was disgusting. I kept hoping that Phil wouldn't go to the phone. But he did. And I chewed him out all the way home."

"All I can say in my defense," said Hart, "is that I was the last to go to the phone."

"I'm sure now it would have made no difference if I hadn't gone to the phone. But politicians are human, and people don't understand this. They are subject to the same pressures as anyone else, even more. But politicians too worry about their job, their bosses, their paycheck. So they go to the phone—to be safe."

Despite Hartke's fawning over Lyndon Johnson, and perhaps because of it, he has never been admitted into the inner circles of the Senate. Nor have many senators who are conscientious, make headlines, and get reelected.

"I don't know that there is any more of a club in the senate than in a local bar association," Hart said. "Some men, by virtue of their ability, their judgment, their trustworthiness, their personality, and the work they do draw more water than others. Some men simply have power because of the positions they hold."

"When a new man comes to the Senate it's like a new boy moving in on the block. He is tested in subtle ways to see what he has, to see if he'll lend a hand when he wants something."

Hartke became a hero to liberals when he broke with President Johnson over the Vietnam War. But fellow senators, including the liberals, knew that Hartke challenged the President out of personal pique and his inability to get Johnson's help in the Senate. Therefore Hartke's opposition to the Vietnam War carried little weight with his colleagues, and his manners offend them.

Similarly, Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy, one of Hart's closest friends in the Senate, could not impress his colleagues when he made his challenge against Johnson. Although he had come to the Senate under the sponsorship of its most influential leaders, during most of McCarthy's tenure he did little work and he wasn't there when embattled liberals needed another voice and another vote.

Although both are liberals, Hartke and McCarthy are at the opposite extremes of Senate style. One, Hartke, was too tight, too openly ambitious; the other, McCarthy, too laconic and indifferent.

It is true that neither had formal position in the Senate and therefore no power to admit them into the club. But this year Russell Long, of Louisiana, chairman of the Power Finance Committee, was defeated as assistant Democratic Leader and thus drummed out of the club. And Sen. Robert Byrd, of West Virginia, an ambitious little

man who is majority secretary, seems destined always to carry the bats for the players.

"The way you vote or whether or not you are invincible at home doesn't have a lot to do with where you stand in the club," Hart said. "All I can say is that how much power and influence you wield around here depends on the judgments others make of you for intangible reasons."

For equally intangible reasons, those who are in the club seem to know it. And they operate with an easy self-assurance and a tacit understanding of all the unwritten rules of their league of gentlemen.

You can look down from the galleries to the rich maroon and white carpeted Senate chamber and pick out the club members by the way they saunter easily onto the floor, well-tanned, well-tailored, chatting casually with fellow senators. There are others, with papers and assistants and nervous impatience.

The members of the club frequently cross party lines in their relationships with each other, giving and taking on legislation, favors, tickets to inaugural balls, or the choice of office suites. At the beginning of each session of Congress the leaders will hold committee assignments in abeyance until after the rules and organizational fights, so that the choice of assignments can be used to keep a stubborn Senator in line.

Some members of the club will not allow themselves to be used to help defeat a colleague of the opposite party. Sen. Jacob Javits, of New York, is a Republican but he refused to campaign in Pennsylvania against Democrat Joseph Clark (who was defeated anyway). And two years before Hart helped Eastland out, Michigan Republicans invited Republican Thurston Morton, then Senator from Kentucky, to speak to their state convention. He learned, after accepting the invitation, that he was to help whip up enthusiasm to defeat Hart.

Morton tried to withdraw but couldn't. So he cleared his speech with Hart. He told the Republicans, in effect, that if they wanted to defeat Hart they would have to find a candidate of great integrity, honesty, experience, and ability. Hart had no difficulty getting reelected.

The conviviality of the club, the horse-trading, the seeming hypocritical politeness in debate, produce what is called an area of "enlightened self-interest." And on that bit of ground law is made.

But the pace of progress is painfully slow, and it sometimes seems like retrogression. And so there are critics of the Senate who say, with the support of convincing evidence, that it has become moribund.

Eugene McCarthy, who led a formidable assault on the creeping pragmatism of the political process, believes that it may be irrelevant and unable to cope with the revolutionary crises of the times. That is one reason for his indifference and for his decision to leave the Senate next year.

Hart has spent many hours debating with friends like McCarthy and Sen. Edmund Muskie, of Maine, and himself the worthiness of the Senate process and its snail's pace accomplishments. To wit: Hart may get a favor or two from Eastland, but the people of Mississippi still have him for a Senator.

"My great question is over whether we get taken in by confusing the time and effort and abuse in getting something done, and what gets done. We equate all the work we do with what is accomplished and what is accomplished seems small."

"You can surrender and say the hell with it. But I can't. Therefore you must convince yourself that that's the way history is made—with small accomplishments and much confusion. This is the way society functions, and so does the Senate. But it sure is a drag and depressing sometimes."

When he is not depressed, Hart can recall the voting rights and fair housing bills he helped shepherd into law.

"When I'm eighty years old, a lot of towns are going to be different because of those bills," says Hart.

And the Senate, he believes, is changing rapidly and reforming because of the early battles of men like Douglas, Kefauver, and Humphrey.

"No longer does a liberal have to be an idealistic, visionary, speech-a-day fighter who has to hope that long after he's gone he will have had some effect," Hart said. "Each decade needs a different kind of man, and today we are beginning to get those things men like Douglas wanted."

Thus Hart displays the reason for his calm patience: His implicit faith in the system, the process, the institution.

The United States Senate is only the second such experiment in all of history. The first was the Senate of Rome, organized 700 years before the birth of Christ.

It reached its greatest power during the time of the Roman Republic. But eventually it became bogged in a mire of its own making, dominated by tradition and cliques, preoccupied with games, unable to grapple with really basic issues, then at last supine beneath the Caesars' imperial ambitions.

The American Senate is of course different and more modern than its Roman ancestors. It may still use spittoons, straight pens, snuffboxes, and blotting sand. But the Senators don't wear togas anymore.

ACTION IN THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we who are concerned about the problems of the high cost of home building, and, in this connection, the high cost of lumber and plywood, recognize that these problems have many facets.

Clarence W. Richen, vice president of Crown Zellerbach Corp. for Northwest timber operations, is a very forward looking, experienced, and conscientious leader in the wood products business in the Northwest. He recently wrote me concerning the long-range needs of the forest survey, and also of that outstanding installation, the Forestry Science's Laboratory at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg.

In connection with the latter operation, he has pointed out that plans for the development of phase II of this laboratory were completed by mid-year 1967. Nothing further has been done because Congress has failed to appropriate the money for this valuable tool in our continuous battle to insure that lumber and plywood supply is not outrun by demand. The funds for this phase are desperately needed, and should be appropriated this year.

We can make loud noises, deplore the situation, make speeches, and in many other ways show our concern for the high price of lumber and plywood, but here is one action which we can take, one which in the long run will be much more

effective than critical statements or sympathetic understandings.

For the benefit of my colleagues who are genuinely interested in real, solid steps, looking toward providing adequate supplies of forest products, I herewith submit Mr. Richen's letter:

CROWN ZELLERBACH CORP.,
Portland, Ore., March 7, 1969.

HON. WENDELL WYATT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WYATT: Here in the Northwest the past year's startling upsurge in the price of timber has stimulated many forest owners—public and private, both large and small to seek opportunities for investing more of their funds in intensive timber growing. But before such venture capital can be attracted to tree farming in the large amounts required, forest owners must have far more specific information on the combination of techniques that will yield the best returns under their particular set of conditions.

All of this adds up to a very large series of tasks that forestry research simply has not come to grips with in a realistic way. Forestry researchers have been highly productive in developing the scientific basis for the technology we use today, in view of the fact that they are operating with a fraction of the funding and facilities required to make the progress so badly needed. But they must step up their output.

I know you are familiar with the 10-year National Plan for Forestry Research presented to the Congress a few years ago. I was on the National Forestry Advisory Committee at the time. This is a coordinated plan based on a careful analysis of the most important forestry problems in each region. It was prepared jointly by scientists and research administrators in the U.S. Forestry Service working with counterparts in the forestry research organizations of the Associate State Universities and Colleges. This plan has great merit—first, it coordinates efforts, and second, it has been just recently prepared. Unfortunately it is only about one-half activated.

For these reasons I was interested in reviewing provisions for research included in the budget recommendations for the U.S. Forest Service sent to the Congress earlier this year. For the entire United States, the budget for next fiscal year recommends a 3 percent increase in Forest Service research. Meanwhile the cost of doing research has increased a considerably greater amount as has also the need for the results of research.

I note several small but important increases are recommended for projects headquartered in the Pacific Northwest—Forest Survey at Portland, Oregon, Douglas-fir Silviculture in Olympia, Washington, Forest Fire Research at Seattle, and Wildlife Habitat at La Grande, Oregon. I am asking your support of these items.

I ask your particular consideration of several research programs, headquartered in Oregon, that merit and need your help now.

The Forest Survey is an essential in any timbered region. This project, conducted by the U.S. Forest Service, is the only source of information on timber resources that covers all owners, both public and private, and shows the relationships between current timber volumes, growth, cut, timber mortality, and opportunities for expanding, or threats of a shrinking timber supply in or tributary to such geographic units as counties and states, as well as regions and the entire nation. It would be virtually impossible to plan and operate efficiently a continuing, complex timber industry today without the basic information and essential analyses supplied by the Forest Survey. The budget

proposes an increase of \$25,000 for the survey project based in Portland, Oregon, that serves the entire states of Washington, Oregon, California and Hawaii. Actually, an increase of \$100,000 in this work is needed to produce the detail of information promptly enough to serve the needs of the rapidly developing timber industry and the communities dependent upon it.

Dedication of the new Range and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory at La Grande, Oregon last October filled an important gap in the forestry research facilities for the Pacific Northwest. The research headquartered there is working out the scientific basis for coordinating management of big-game ranges with timber production, grazing of cattle and sheep and watershed management on the 60 million acres of forest and related range lands in eastern Oregon and Washington. The deer and elk alone in this area furnish more than 2 million man-days of recreation hunting annually. I am pleased to learn that the budget for Fiscal Year 1970 proposes an increase of \$89,000 to strengthen the La Grande project and for operating the new laboratory at a more efficient level. Wildlife habitat research got a late start in the Northwest, and this strengthening is much needed. I would also urge the Forest Service to extend wildlife and fish habitat research to the important watershed and timbered lands west of the Cascade Mountains in Oregon and Washington as soon as possible.

I am particularly concerned at this time about one installation in the National Plan for Forest Research—the U.S. Forest Service Forestry Sciences Laboratory at Corvallis, Oregon. As I remember, you have visited this laboratory. Research at this laboratory is developing improved methods of controlling forest insects and diseases, which alone extract a toll of 7 billion board feet of timber annually from northwestern forests. Another project there is working out the essentials of watershed to minimize damaging siltation, flooding and landslides, while improving the quality and timing of water available for domestic, recreational and industrial use. Still others are working to increase future timber supplies by developing genetically superior trees; improving methods for regenerating, culturing and harvesting forest crops and determining the impacts of chemicals used in land management on the forest environment.

Staff members of my own Company and numerous others are cooperating actively in this work, seeking to speed progress in the development of further research results that all of us need so critically. But progress is retarded because the facilities at the Corvallis Laboratory are grossly inadequate and behind the schedule of development projected in the National Plan. As you know, the Congress provided funds to develop plans for Phase II of this laboratory in 1966—almost three years ago. The detailed plans were completed by mid-1967, but they have not been used because no funds have been appropriated for construction. I understand \$2.7 million would be needed if funds were provided to start construction in 1969.

In view of our increasingly serious timber supply situation, and the communities, jobs and industry dependent thereon, I would urge that the Congress provide now for completing the Corvallis Laboratory and for operating the research projects headquartered there at full strength as soon as can now be arranged.

Many thanks to you for your thorough and knowledgeable consideration of the forestry problems and opportunities so important to our national and regional progress.

Cordially,

C. W. RICHEN,
Vice President,
Northwest Timber Operations.

REDUCED RATE AIRLINE FARES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 8284, a bill which authorizes air transportation at reduced rates for youths between the ages of 12 and 22, all persons who are over 65 years of age and military personnel who are traveling at their own expense in uniform of those services while on official leave, furlough, or pass.

This legislation has become necessary because of a case that is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. Trailways Bus Co. brought the action, A CAB examiner hearing the case ruled on January 21 that special youth fares were unjustly discriminatory and should be canceled. American Airlines petitioned the decision and the ruling is now being reviewed by the CAB. If affirmed this decision will terminate present youth fares. Under the challenged youth fare system, which was established in 1966, children aged 12 through 21 are able to travel anywhere in the United States by plane on a standby basis, at a 50-percent reduction of fares except at peak traffic times and seasons. Other special rates are allowed for family reductions for husbands and wives or children traveling together.

Youth fare traffic increased from 2,100,100 passengers in 1966 to 5,760,000 in 1968. College students and vacationing families were the chief users of these special rates.

H.R. 8284 would remove the doubt that has been created by the CAB case and make it clear that the airlines may grant reduced rate transportation on a space available basis to military personnel, young people, and senior citizens. Such a provision now applies to ministers of religion. The three groups that this bill would extend coverage to have certain characteristics in common which make such coverage appropriate and desirable. They are all at reduced levels of wage earning capacity; they are all likely to be at rather extended distances from their families; and they are all likely to be traveling at their own expense—as opposed to businessmen who can deduct their travel expenses at income tax time. These three groups would be traveling on a standby basis and therefore not interrupting normal air traffic nor in any way inconveniencing full fare passengers.

Specialized treatment of certain groups is not unheard of.

I am especially concerned about extending this coverage to our senior citizens. We are all aware of the special needs of youth and military personnel. Yet many find it far too easy to forget about our senior citizens and our very special obligations to them. An older person who, having worked for 30 to 50 years, retires to enjoy more leisure time often finds that, living on a fixed and considerably reduced income does not leave much room in their budget for

air travel. Yet these are the very people who have the time and the greatest need to visit their children and grandchildren who are often located in distant States.

VIRGINIA SIANO
HUMANITARIAN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize that drug addiction is one of the most insidious scourges of our time, competing as it does with the minds and bodies of our young people. It is a serious challenge which must be met not only by marshaling the efforts of the appropriate government agencies, but by enlisting the help of all of our citizens.

It is gratifying to know that in the Pelham Bay area of my district in the Bronx, there is a woman who, in her dedication to service to those who have become drug dependent, might well be an exemplar for this private help.

Mrs. Virginia Siano, of 1921 Hobart Avenue in the Bronx, has for years been a prime mover in the drive to educate drug addicts into an awareness of the need for new direction in their lives. A wife, a mother, and a grandmother, Mrs. Siano has worked tirelessly, on a volunteer basis, not only to reorient drug victims, but to raise funds for their physical rehabilitation.

This Sunday, March 23, at the Chateau Pelham in the Bronx, Mrs. Siano will sponsor her seventh annual fundraising dinner for the benefit of Synan, an organization devoted to bringing professional help to drug addicted youths. Over the years, she has raised many thousands of dollars for this worthy purpose, her only reward being the satisfaction that comes from seeing defeated human beings return to the full status of dignified and productive members of the community.

Mrs. Siano is endowed with a special gift of compassion, a real sense of duty to her fellow man, and an indomitable spirit of self-sacrifice. Through kindness and understanding, she has opened the door to life for so many, a door that for all practical purposes was forever locked. Her participation and commitment have been total, her success remarkable.

Typical of the indication of respect and affection in which Mrs. Siano is held is a comment from a former drug dependent youth whom she helped. He said, in the full gratitude of his heart:

I sincerely hope that the good Lord or whoever it is who produces women like Mrs. Siano allows her many more good years on this earth, as there are all too few of her kind.

What a wonderful tribute for any human being.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are other Virginia Sianos in this world, rare as they may be, and in expressing our credit to her today, we recognize all those who helped find the way for others who have lost theirs.

LOU RAWLS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, in these times of turmoil both at home and throughout the world, I would like to take a few moments to call attention to someone who personifies the qualities in life which are too often lacking in our society today. I refer to a gentleman by the name of Lou Rawls. His is a name that is known and respected wherever the soulful music of America's heartland is played. His continued success lies not only in his talents as a performer, but also in his philosophy, and the consideration shown to those around him. Despite a hectic schedule which includes recording, night club, concert, television, and motion picture appearances, Lou Rawls always takes time to visit two high schools each month, at home or on the road, to encourage young Americans of all races and creeds to stay in school. Perhaps because of his own experience, Lou's primary interest is in the area of education. His pet slogan is, "It's easier to teach without hate rather than teach not to hate." He has appeared over the country with one message, "Stay in school."

Lou feels very strongly about the value of education and particularly about the absence of more factual material on black accomplishments and contributions to this country. Toward this end, he has started a project to introduce into the school curriculum factual material designed to bring about better understanding between all ethnic groups; it is his belief that better understanding will follow better awareness. Lou was born on the Southside of Chicago, Ill., deep within the ghetto binding black Americans. Lou's childhood was a struggle for survival within the ghetto, but at the early age of seven he began singing with the local church choir. After graduating from Dunbar High School, he joined the Pilgrim Travelers, a well-known male gospel group. He interrupted his singing to volunteer for the U.S. Army and spent 2 years with the 82d Airborne Division. After finishing his tour of duty, he began singing at local clubs in the Midwest area. In 1959, Lou moved to Los Angeles and began working in local clubs. However, it was not until 1967 that things really broke for Rawls and he was acclaimed by Billboard magazine as the No. 1 jazz vocalist; No. 2 rhythm and blues singer for albums; No. 4 best male vocalist for albums; and No. 86 for singles, which made him the winner of Billboard's Top Artist Award in the musical category.

In the highly competitive entertainment world, where stars rise and fall with remarkable speed, Lou Rawls continues to grow as a star of the first magnitude year after year. Today Lou Rawls is actually three people—businessman, entertainer, a devoted husband to his wife, Mrs. Lana Rawls and their two children, and most important of all an untiring

soldier in behalf of furthering education for all mankind. It is indeed gratifying to pay tribute to this outstanding gentleman.

THE FIRST BREACH IN THE WALL

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry in this Nation has been accused of dragging its feet on unionization and civil rights. Over the years, major legal struggles have developed over its resistance to 20th century attitudes regarding union activities and fair employment practices.

Gradually a case was being built up against this industry on several of these counts. Most of this momentum has gone by the boards as a result of Mr. Packard's decision to award major textile contracts for the Pentagon to three of the worst offenders.

Many Negro youngsters serving in the Armed Forces might take issue with his decision. Their uniform cloth will now be made by companies who have been accused of unfair employment practices and discriminatory promotion policies toward categories of workers.

Mr. Packard and the Defense Department have poked that first little hole in the wall. We are taking that first discouraging step backward, as those who have fought advances in human rights silently congratulate one another.

The Washington Post has been conducting a campaign aimed at delineating the dimensions of this sad progression of events. A recent editorial in that paper aptly capsulizes the present situation. I insert it here for the enlightenment of this body.

THE PENTAGON DISPENSES SOUTHERN COMFORT

One of the more mystifying episodes of the past several weeks has concerned a verbal agreement reached between the Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard, and the representatives of three Southern textile firms—J. P. Stevens, Burlington Mills and Dan River Mills. The employment policies of all three firms had been under investigation and review by the Pentagon and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance for over a year owing to well substantiated charges that they were racially discriminatory; and all three firms had been so unyielding to Government efforts to bring them anywhere near compliance with the guidelines for Federal contractors that neither the Pentagon's own investigators nor the OFCC would recommend that contracts with them be approved.

Early in February, however, Mr. Packard awarded the three offending firms \$9.4 million in Federal contracts, asserting that he had received assurances that they would put "affirmative action plans" into practice. Ordinarily, and by provision of an Executive Order, such assurances would have been put in writing. However, no one but Mr. Packard and the textile firms' representatives seems to know of what these assurances or "plans" consist. They were not committed to paper or shared with officials at the OFCC or elsewhere in the Department of Labor who were involved in the cases and who have a clear responsibility for their outcome. Indeed, more than a month after the contracts have

been awarded and despite the OFCC's effort to find out more about them, the most that could be learned was that the firms had assured Mr. Packard that they would try to meet the Government's standards.

There are a couple of things that ought to be said by way of providing some background and perspective on all this. One is that Mr. Packard's own reputation in this field appears to be good, as is that of the firms for which he was responsible in private life. The other is that contract cut-off or denial has been anything but standard operating procedure in these tangled matters—the custom has been to threaten it or to delay the award until the Government's racial requirements were met. But when you have said this, you have pretty well exhausted what assurance or extenuation is to be found in Mr. Packard's odd act.

The dangers inherent in what he has done are more readily apparent. The Southern textile cases had been building for a long time. They were ripening for a big decision and had acquired the status of test cases, being widely watched in the South and elsewhere for evidence of Washington's seriousness on the question of contract compliance. Now whatever meaning they had in that regard has been spent. Moreover, weak as the Government apparatus for assuring compliance had been, there is little question that it has been drastically further weakened by the exclusion of the OFCC—presumably the maker and judge of compliance policy—from the deliberations between Mr. Packard and the spokesmen for the mills.

Finally, there is the matter of example and direction. In the South, and especially in the areas of greatest recalcitrance, Federal guidelines and official statements about them are read with excruciating, comma-picking care, there is a kind of stock market effect at work, whereby the most minute evidence of loss of resolve in Washington is registered at once in declining cooperation on the part of those companies or school districts or local governments still holding out. Reportedly, right on the heels of Mr. Packard's decision, inquiries did start coming in—from other Government agencies as well as from private concerns—as to whether this did not mean new and relaxed procedures were now in effect.

By May 1, the Southern textile firms in question will be obliged to issue a quarterly report on their progress in meeting Government requirements. Customarily, the Pentagon would issue instructions as to what it wished answered in that report. This routine procedure offers an opportunity to retrieve the situation somewhat; a public and specific list of what the Federal Government expects to hear about in that report would have the effect, retroactively to be sure, of establishing the compliance terms the mills are expected to meet. Nor would it be a bad idea to issue such a public declaration before the end of March, since additional contracts are scheduled for award by then and some are expected to go to the same three firms. The Administration, via the Pentagon and the Labor Department, should be trying to strengthen the compliance program, not weaken it. They will have the most cause for regret if they open a Pandora's box of resistance and regression.

ROGER L. STEVENS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week Roger L. Stevens departed from his

position as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. All who are concerned with the arts owe a special debt of gratitude to Mr. Stevens for his leadership during his 3 years as Chairman.

Because he was the first Chairman, Mr. Stevens had a unique opportunity to chart the future course of the Endowment's support for the arts. The tremendous enthusiasm for the Endowment from the artistic community is eloquent tribute to Mr. Stevens' effective and creative leadership.

In an age of science and sophisticated technology, he recognized the importance of providing man with the opportunity to enjoy and appreciate the beautiful. Thus, the National Endowment for the Arts took giant steps in increasing the opportunities, for all Americans—in the cities, smaller communities, and the rural areas—to enjoy the arts.

I have been particularly impressed by the Endowment's emphasis on education in the arts. The Endowment has, in the past 3 years, initiated numerous programs to lift the quality of instruction in the arts. Grants to teaching artists have enabled poets, painters, sculptors, and composers to take a leave of absence from teaching to do creative work on their own. On returning to their teaching, they can offer their classes increased inspiration and enthusiasm for their subject. Tours by performing arts groups, assisted by grants from the Arts Endowment, have enabled countless young Americans to experience firsthand, plays, musical presentations, and art exhibits.

Mr. Speaker, I could mention many other instances of exciting projects supported by the National Endowment for the Arts. These examples would further support the conclusion that the Endowment, inspired and led by Roger Stevens, has made a significant beginning in carrying out the task which Congress has assigned to it. The contribution of Mr. Stevens to this auspicious beginning cannot be overstated.

Although Mr. Stevens will no longer serve in a Federal post, it is encouraging to know that he will continue his active interest in the arts through a new private foundation which will attempt to generate increased support for the arts from the private sector of our economy. I am sure that all of my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Stevens gratitude for his contribution to the entire Nation and good luck in his future enterprises.

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER PUBLIC AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the National Public Affairs Conference cosponsored by the American Institute of Architects and the Consulting Engineers

Council of the United States, meets this Wednesday and Thursday here in Washington. This meeting of architects and engineers, two key elements in the redevelopment of our cities and the planning and reconstruction of such community facilities as mass transportation systems, sewage treatment plants, and water and sewer facilities, is unique in two ways: it demonstrates the new cooperative spirit between two traditionally rival groups—architects and engineers—and it points up the increasing interest and participation of both professional organizations in the operation of government.

Architects and engineers have for years regarded each other as professional rivals. This week's AIA-CEC conference illustrates the newly progressive relationship of U.S. architects and engineers whose traditional professional jealousy has been replaced by what is jointly proclaimed as "the design team concept." Working together, architects and engineers contribute collectively and equally to the creative process. The winner in this team endeavor is the Government and other clients who are the recipients of A/E cooperative services.

The Architect/Engineer Public Affairs Conference points up a second subtle change now occurring in architecture and engineering. For many years the legislative and political arenas have enjoyed only occasional participation by the design professions. Few architects or engineers have seen fit to seek office, engage in political campaigns, or present a concerted voice to State legislatures or to the U.S. Congress. However, this is no longer true. Today, more than 500 men and women, representing A/E firms responsible for planning many of this Nation's most magnificent public works projects, such as the Chesapeake Bay bridge-tunnel, Shea baseball-football stadium, the San Francisco Bay area rapid transit system, the Air Force Academy, and many, many others, are gathered here in Washington to improve their knowledge of the legislative and executive operation of their Government.

Officers and committee chairmen are present from the 50 States. Their interest in public affairs includes self-education and, more, the determination to act—to meet those of us who represent them in the Congress and to discuss with us programs aimed at solving problems of housing, pollution, and transportation.

The American Institute of Architects and the Consulting Engineers Council of the United States deserve a warm commendation for their efforts in establishing productive cooperation between their two endeavors and for bringing these respected professions out of the world of computers and drafting boards and to this city. They bring us their advice and counsel; they come to share with us their ideas on solving our Nation's technical-sociological problems.

With these thoughts in mind, I wish to invite my colleagues to join in welcoming the members of the architectural and engineering professions to the Nation's Capitol and to wish them well in their Public Affairs Conference deliberations.

OTTINGER OPPOSES DEBT LIMIT HIKE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is again being asked to increase the permanent ceiling on the national debt—this time to \$365 billion—and to increase the temporary debt ceiling to \$377 billion through June 30, 1970.

This is the third time in 16 years Congress has been asked to raise the national debt limit. The Eisenhower administration twice requested a higher debt ceiling and the Johnson administration made one such request. Each request was accompanied by pious assurances that it would be the last time. Each increase in the debt ceiling served only to increase the inflationary pressures and the burden on the American taxpayers. One would think we had learned our lesson by now.

How can this administration and this Congress justify again raising the national debt limit. Can there be any doubt about the need for fiscal reform, instead of merely adding on to the unfair burdens created by topsy-turvy priorities in Government spending and a tax structure which has a loophole for every special interest?

Interest payments on the national debt now come to \$16 billion, \$12 billion more than we spend for education. In a very real way, we are mortgaging our future.

Since becoming a Member of this House, I have repeatedly expressed my concern over what I consider unsound fiscal policies. It is a tragic paradox that at a time of unprecedented national prosperity marked by a record gross national product and soaring corporate profits, low- and middle-income Americans are caught in a squeeze between higher taxes and higher prices. They are not participating to the extent they should in our overall economic growth and the fiscal policies of this Government are directly to blame.

I am particularly concerned about the plight of the retiree and others living on a fixed income, for they are most cruelly afflicted by fiscal mismanagement at the Federal and State levels.

For 4 years now, I have been calling for comprehensive tax reform and a total assessment of our national spending priorities. I have introduced specific legislation to accomplish these goals and am pleased that at least a first step has been taken by the initiation of tax reform hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means.

It appears that these hearings may take the remainder of the year and that no tax reform legislation will come up for action before 1970, at the earliest. But this is no excuse to delay reevaluating budget priorities—determining which programs and policies are in the national interest in light of economic conditions—and taking immediate steps to eliminate those found unnecessary and defer those found nonessential at this time.

The new administration inherited a proposed budget from its predecessor, but it need not adopt that proposal as its own. There is plenty of fat to trim: Farm subsidies, public works, the supersonic transport, highway construction are all ripe for either deferral or reduction, to say nothing of the Sentinel missile system. Let us not overlook the supposedly sacrosanct defense budget, from which about \$10 billion in wasteful spending could be cut, according to an investigation conducted by Congressional Quarterly last year.

A vote to raise the debt limit can serve only to encourage this administration and this Congress to continue the discredited fiscal and monetary policies which brought our economy to the point of inflationary crisis. That is why I will vote against increasing the debt limit: to convince the administration that it must take a long, hard look at its budget and establish realistic priorities.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to salute and congratulate the American Legion on the 50th anniversary of its founding. As a member of Laurence Roberts Post No. 21, in Wilmington, Del., and as a friend of a distinguished Delawarean who is a founding father of the American Legion, National Executive Committeeman Thomas W. Miller, I have long been familiar with the outstanding work of the American Legion on behalf of our Nation and its citizens.

The American Legion is fundamentally a patriotic organization, dedicated and devoted to advancing the ideals of America—justice, freedom, democracy, and loyalty—and to exalting, under the motto "For God and Country," the sacredness of human personality and the inestimable gift of American citizenship. Founded in Paris on March 15, 1919, by 1,000 representatives of the American Expeditionary Force, the American Legion currently has more than 2.6 million members—veterans of four wars: World Wars I and II, Korean and Vietnam conflicts—in some 16,000 posts in the United States and abroad. Bound together in comradeship and service, Legionnaires—"Veterans as Citizens"—actively devote their efforts to four major programs: Americanism, child welfare, rehabilitation, and national security. In addition to working for handicapped veterans, their widows and orphans, an emphasis is placed on citizenship development of youth, with over 5 million participating each year, in such programs as Boys State, Legion baseball, and a national oratorical contest.

The work of the American Legion during its first 50 years is a source of inspiration to all Americans and we are all more comforted in the knowledge that

we may look forward to many more years of Legion service to community, State, and Nation.

SOVIET NAVAL BUILDUP IN THE MEDITERRANEAN—PART 1

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, March 17, there appears an extensive article by Jerry Greene of the New York Daily News reviewing the state of the overall military preparedness of the United States. In the article Chairman MENDEL RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee observed that examinations of the readiness of the Atlantic and Mediterranean Fleets proved to be shocking.

By way of a timely and provocative contrast, the Chicago Tribune began a four-part series on the buildup of the Russian naval fleet in the Mediterranean Sea written by Michael McGuire of the Chicago Tribune Press Service. It stated in part:

For many months, the Russians have had a well-trained fleet in this sea consisting of modern and highly efficient surface ships and submarines, some of which are capable of launching nuclear-tipped missiles.

Although we are assured that the American 6th Fleet or NATO naval forces could destroy the smaller Russian surface fleet quickly with Soviet submarines presenting more of a problem, the Soviet naval presence brings home to us quite forcefully the urgent necessity of keeping our Naval forces in combat readiness.

While some citizens may lament that defense expenditures are exorbitant, one cannot apply an ordinary economic rule-of-thumb when confronting the Soviet military juggernaut. Our Mediterranean Fleet provides both military protection and psychological reassurance to our allies whose assistance is necessary if the free nations are to preserve their liberties in the face of Communist worldwide designs.

I request that the article, "American 6th Fleet Keeps Eye on Russ Mediterranean Subs," by Michael McGuire and appearing in the Chicago Tribune of March 16, 1969, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

AMERICAN 6TH FLEET KEEPS EYE ON RUSS MEDITERRANEAN SUBS
(By Michael McGuire)

(NOTE.—This is the first in a series of four articles on the buildup of the Russian naval fleet in the Mediterranean sea. The articles tell how the Soviet presence is viewed by United States navy's famed 6th fleet and by senior naval officers assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty organization's southern Europe command headquarters in Naples, Italy.)

NAPLES, ITALY, March 15.—Underestimating Russia's decision to strengthen its naval presence in the Mediterranean sea would lead to grave consequences for the United

States and her European allies, American naval authorities here say.

For many months, the Russians have had a well-trained fleet in this sea consisting of modern and highly efficient surface ships and submarines, some of which are capable of launching nuclear-tipped missiles. The Soviet flotilla has been fulfilling a dual purpose mission of showing its nation's flag and keeping an eye on the United States' powerful 6th fleet and the navies of our North Atlantic Treaty organization allies.

Sixth fleet commanders and top-level American naval authorities attached to the NATO southern Europe command headquarters contend the Soviet leaders are putting the Red fleet to work primarily as a political and psychological influence on the nations ringing the Mediterranean.

RUSSIAN SUBS ARE THREAT

Military analysts assert that the 6th fleet or NATO naval forces could destroy the smaller Russian surface fleet quickly, but might have problems dealing with the Russian submarines.

Many of the senior naval officers assigned to the 6th fleet and NATO said they fear that if American naval power is withdrawn from the Mediterranean, or if its strength is cut, the defensive backbone would be ripped from the southern flank of NATO's European defense structure. Such a move would leave the allied European nations highly vulnerable "and easy pickings for the Russians," they say.

Some of the senior American naval officers interviewed expressed concern over the American public's general "lack of knowledge" concerning the "important and essential" role played by the United States naval forces in the Mediterranean. They say they fear some Americans are under the "mis-taken" impression that our European allies could stand alone against communism.

FEARS TAXPAYER PRESSURE

"I'm afraid that good, solid midwesterner—whose opinion is so important in forming our international policy—may start feeling our presence here is just another funnel thru which his tax dollars flow into a pool or waste," said one senior naval officer. "He may convince Congress that things have changed and the old need to defend Europe has diminished; that the time has come to tighten the budget belt and pull away."

Tho it would be a serious error to underestimate Russian presence some American naval leaders here said it would be an equal error to overestimate the present danger. The entry of one or two additional ships thru the Turkish Dardanelles or past Gibraltar [the only two entrances to the Mediterranean since the Suez canal was blocked] does not represent an immediate and direct military threat to the 6th fleet and NATO navies.

"I think the Soviet leaders' intention in considerably strengthening their Mediterranean fleet is above all psychological and political in nature," said Vice Adm. David C. Richardson, 6th fleet commander. He was interviewed by The Tribune aboard his flagship, the U.S.S. Little Rock, anchored in the harbor at Gaeta, Italy.

CAN ACHIEVE SUCCESS

"There is no doubt that if they succeed in convincing certain countries that they have now succeeded in eliminating any chance of the United States coming to their aid in case of danger, they will have achieved a success of considerable importance," Richardson said.

Of the 35 Soviet military ships in the Mediterranean, American naval authorities are primarily concerned with the nine or so Russian submarines, at least two of which are nuclear powered.

The Russians constantly move their sub-

marines and attempt to prove to themselves and to the Americans that, if war breaks out, they can strike the main units of the 6th fleet, and primarily the fleet's two attack aircraft carriers, and thereby destroy American striking power from the outset.

U.S. SURVEILLANCE LIMITED

The American aim is to keep constant track of the Soviet subs, altho a general shortage of anti-submarine warfare equipment currently limits surveillance of the Russian subs.

Sometimes, however, the Americans follow the submarines' movements, or suddenly swoop down on them when least expected. In this way the 6th fleet keeps its own defense plans at high level, and shows the Soviet military leaders the futility of their efforts.

"I don't think it (the Russian submarine presence in the Mediterranean) is a cause for alarm, but it is a cause for concern," said Adm. Horatio Rivero, commander of the NATO forces in southern Europe, which are assigned the defense of Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

NOT IGNORING FLEET

"I do not mean that we are in any way ignoring the Russian surface fleet, but the surface fleet can more easily be located and kept under surveillance than the submarines," said Rivero, 58, who played a key role in United States naval planning during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

Some American naval officers said it is impossible for the Americans and the NATO nations to maintain a thorough knowledge at all times of the whereabouts and activities of the Russian submarines. However, one officer said current surveillance facilities made available to American and NATO forces in the Mediterranean allow at least a 60 per cent capability of finding the Russian underwater craft when a concentrated effort is made. The 1,145,000 square miles of Mediterranean water stretch across the 2,000 miles between Gibraltar and Lebanon.

The navy men said that if the submarines came out of hiding to move into attack positions, they easily could be located and destroyed.

ROCKS PROVIDE COVER

Vessels of any kind easily can be spotted passing through the Dardanelles, but the rock-strewn waters around Gibraltar provide ideal cover for submarines to slip in and out through the strait at a depth of a few hundred yards.

Since Greece, Turkey, and Italy are peninsular nations, they would have to depend on receiving more than 90 per cent of their wartime supplies by sea, said a naval officer. Hence, high strategic value is placed on access to the Mediterranean by those nations, the United States, and Russia.

"If you didn't have any submarines to worry about in the Mediterranean, then the lines of communication [sea lanes] and shipping convoys [under threat of attack in war] would not require the kind of warship escort we now must provide," said Rivero in an interview in his Naples NATO headquarters.

APPROXIMATELY 50 SHIPS IN FLEET

Meeting the Russian naval threat is the 6th fleet force which normally consists of approximately 50 ships, 25,000 men, and 200 aircraft. The fleet consists of three main task forces.

The first of these is the attack carrier striking force, which consists of two aircraft carriers, two cruisers, and destroyers equipped with surface-to-air missiles, rocket-launched anti-submarine weapons, and drone anti-submarine helicopters.

Second is the amphibious task force, which consists of a squadron of amphibious attack transports, cargo ships, minesweepers, and a variety of amphibious assault craft. This force also includes a combat-ready battalion landing team of some 1,600 United States

marines, reinforced with additional armor and artillery.

FLEET HAS FLOATING BASE

Third is the service force, which forms a floating base that enables the fleet to stay at sea for indefinite periods of time. This consists of auxiliary ships, including tankers, repair shops, and supply-provision ships. This force is a mobile grocery store, repair shop, hardware store, and fuel station.

The 6th fleet receives additional support from land-based aircraft used for scouting and anti-submarine operations, and also includes approximately four submarines used chiefly to provide training services to surface units. Adm. Richardson also exercises operational control over the fleet of Polaris ballistic missile submarines in the Mediterranean.

The presence of Russia warships in the Mediterranean dates back to the days following the close of World War II, when the 16 ships in the 6th fleet forces observed Russian submarine following them about.

INCREASED AFTER WAR

During the 1960s, the Russian warship fleet rose slowly and leaped sharply following the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

The number of Russian ships operating in the Mediterranean varies according to activities of the 6th fleet and NATO sea forces and the state of political affairs. When the 6th fleet or NATO forces hold exercises, the number of Russian ships increases.

American naval officers here said the Soviets observe these NATO exercises closely. They said the Russians also increase their knowledge of seamanship by observing the methods used by American fighting ships to refuel and take on supplies while under way at high speeds.

REACH HIGH IN AUGUST

Following the Czechoslovakian crisis last August, the number of Russian ships rose to a high of about 60, including submarines. Over the fall and winter, the number decreased to about 30, and then slowly began rising to the present Red fleet strength.

Normally, one-half the Russian fleet consists of combat ships, the rest being a collection of logistic support ships and auxiliary ships.

Despite their confidence that the NATO forces could meet the Russian naval presence successfully in combat, naval authorities assert that a severe blow would be dealt to the overall NATO defense posture if the 6th fleet were withdrawn from the Mediterranean.

HOPES WON'T HAPPEN

"I hope that this will never come about, because the 6th fleet is not only our best important element of our naval power here, it also has a great importance to the defense of the countries in the area," said Rivero.

"It would reduce my capability very substantially, because the 6th fleet in addition to its role in a major war is really a mobile tactical air force," he said.

"This air force can be applied in any particular part of the region where it is needed most. In addition to that, it can provide mobile air support for our merchant shipping which may be attacked by air if the Soviets succeed in establishing their presence in the southern part of the Mediterranean."

MAY BE NO SUBSTITUTE

"So the 6th fleet is a very versatile instrument, and without it, I would have to have some substitution. In some respects, there is no substitute because you are operating in areas quite a distance from land, and it is very difficult to provide the air power to maintain control of the air," Rivero said.

Rivero said the 6th fleet also plays an important role in the political and psychological game. It is a visible evidence of the interest the United States has in the countries in the Mediterranean.

RADIO STATION WWDC APOLOGIZES TO CONGRESSMAN OLIN E. TEAGUE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include copies of two radio editorials from radio station WWDC which I believe to be self-explanatory:

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS AND CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager William S. Sanders was on February 12, 1969. We welcome comments.

Rarely have we seen such blatant and flagrant abuse of congressional power as has been used by Texas Representative Olin Teague. Congressman Teague has openly and shamefully helped to blackmail the Maryland State Senate into reversing a vote.

The vote, as originally taken, would have required out-of-state congressmen to pay Maryland state income taxes. Suddenly, the issue was recalled for a new Senate vote, and during angry debate, Congressman Teague was quoted as planning to attempt to halt some three to four million dollars in federal aid to Maryland education if the measure was not reversed. The debate was heated, at times vicious. But the outcome was a reversal and out-of-state congressmen are now exempt from paying state income tax in Maryland. The reversal vote was thirty to ten, with many Senators saying that they were switching for one reason . . . fear of Congressional retaliation.

We feel that Congressman Teague is clearly in conflict of interest. He is currently fighting a Montgomery County lawsuit charging that he failed to pay two hundred dollars in County income taxes.

On this basis, WWDC calls for a Congressional probe into the ethics of Congressmen who have contributed to the obvious coercion of the Maryland State Senate against the best interests of the residents of the Free State.

Thank you for your interest.

APOLOGY TO CONGRESSMAN OLIN TEAGUE

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on March 6, 1969. We welcome comments.

On February 12th, WWDC broadcast an editorial concerning what we thought was a flagrant abuse of Congressional power by Texas Representative OLIN TEAGUE in his effort to continue the exemption of U.S. Congressmen from Maryland county taxes. We have received further information and we think this information deserves airing.

First of all, the issue of whether Congressman Teague should pay Montgomery County income tax revolves around a principle and is not a personal matter. In fact, the Congressman has offered to donate to charity or a PTA of the choice of Montgomery's County officials, the amount of the tax—about \$200. The Congressman pointed out to us too, that when his children attended Montgomery County Schools, he was asked to sign a statement each year that permitted Montgomery County to receive money from the Federal Government as an impacted area. The Congressman further argues, logically we must admit, that if he can perhaps be called a "non-resident" for that purpose, and a "resident" for the purpose of buying auto tags, and an "inhabitant" of his home state for purposes of being a member of Congress, then the entire matter should be straightened out by the court.

WWDC, now feels that the Congressman's

case is perhaps a compelling one. At least, it has a great deal of merit and should be seriously considered by our listeners. Congressman Teague's ethics, we are now furthermore convinced, cannot be questioned. Our apologies, therefore, to the Congressman for any implications concerning his conduct, and. . . Thank you for your interest.

URBAN EXPERTS EXAMINE URBAN-RURAL AMERICA

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, of deep concern to all of us is the prospect of continued congestion in the Nation's large metropolitan areas and of unchecked economic decline in rural America. A report dealing with this matter in its many facets was published last fall by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission is a 26-member bipartisan body established by Federal law to maintain continuing review of the relations among Federal, State, and local governments as they seek to discharge their responsibilities to the American people. The members of the Commission are Governors, mayors, county officials, State legislators and Representatives of both Houses of Congress, the Federal executive branch, and the general public. The representatives of this body on the Commission are the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN).

In its report entitled "Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth" the Commission asserts that the current random shifts in population and economic development are producing a growing imbalance between people and opportunities. The Commission declares that a projection of its findings on urban and rural economic growth trends promises that:

A continued build-up in large urban centers and erosion in smaller rural areas will make public and private services more costly in both areas;

Increasing congestion may intensify social and psychological pressures on urban dwellers;

Present migration and population growth patterns, coupled with trends in industrial location, will generate an increasing geographic mismatch of jobs and jobseekers; and

Finally, continuation of the present course of urban growth in suburban areas foreshadows even more "sprawl"—accompanied by a disorderly and wasteful use of land.

The Commission recommends that the National and State Governments formulate policies to help regulate future growth in rural and urban areas and it makes specific proposals—some of them highly controversial—to restore equilibrium between the rapidly growing concentrated metropolitan belts and the rest of the countryside.

The Commission's report and its recommendations are receiving widespread attention. An article in the March 1969

issue of Public Management, the monthly magazine of the International City Managers' Association, contains a brief summary of the Commission's report and perceptive comments, pro and con, by three knowledgeable observers, Prof. Joseph F. Zimmerman, State University of New York at Albany; Mr. D. G. Weiford, secretary, Wisconsin State Department of Local Affairs and Development; and Mr. Charles T. Lanigan, director, New York State Office of Planning Coordination.

The article follows:

THREE URBAN EXPERTS EXAMINE URBAN-RURAL AMERICA

Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C. 20575. 1968. 186 pp. Single copies free on request to ACIR. Additional copies at \$1.25 from Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Major findings: Metropolitan areas . . . have experienced the nation's largest (population) growth. This has been due to the dramatic population increases in noncentral city jurisdictions. . . . The greatest proportionate increase occurred in "metropolitan remainders"—suburban areas outside incorporated places of 10,000 or more.

Urban areas of up to one million experiencing the highest growth rate generally were located in a geographic crescent running from Virginia through the Old South and the Southwest to the Pacific Coast.

Eighty per cent of the net migration into metropolitan areas was attributable to only nine such areas: Los Angeles-Orange County; New York-Northeastern New Jersey; San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose; Washington, D.C.; Philadelphia; Houston; Miami-Fort Lauderdale; San Bernardino-Riverside; and Dallas.

Improved economic opportunities prompt migration but mainly among the better educated and skilled. Blue collar workers, less skilled, many Negroes, and the aged for personal and various noneconomic reasons tend to resist the attraction of job opportunities elsewhere. The result: migration from depressed areas tends to deplete the most productive sector of its work force.

Urban-rural comparisons of population growth, educational and health facilities, housing, and income levels suggest major disparities for every index, with rural America consistently in the disadvantaged position.

Within metropolitan areas another set of disparities emerges with central cities confronting much greater public finance—public service problems than suburbs and metropolitan remainders.

. . . economic growth of municipalities was most frequently related directly to rates of increase in the total population and inversely to rates of increase in the nonwhite proportion.

Increasing concentration of people in large urban centers will make public and private consumption more costly as a result of diseconomies of scale.

While the evidence is not conclusive, it may well be that increased size and congestion will also take a net social and psychological toll in urban living conditions.

The advantages of suburban and metropolitan remainders in attracting new industry will continue to widen the gap between the economies of central cities and their surrounding neighbors, deepening the problems of many central cities. A most serious aspect of these problems will be the growing inability of the central cities to provide jobs for their residents.

Continued migration of the Negro population to central cities will add fuel to already incendiary conditions in central city ghettos.

At the same time, the nation's smaller

urban places outside of metropolitan areas will be increasingly bypassed by the economic mainstream and will also find it difficult to offer enough jobs for all their residents.

RECOMMENDATION: IMPLEMENTING STATE POLICIES DEALING WITH URBAN GROWTH

The Commission believes that state governments have a role to play in influencing orderly urban growth. The following should be considered as useful approaches to the implementation of state policy regarding urban growth.

State assistance in making credit more readily available for business and industrial location in certain areas by establishing state and regional industrial credit agencies;

Placement of state and local procurement contracts and construction projects to foster urban growth in certain areas;

Assistance and guidance for urban growth through the establishment of state and state-chartered local land development agencies and state property tax deferral for new community development;

State regulation of development along highways and at interchanges where no effective local control exists;

Giving local governments the powers necessary to deal with urban growth by providing urban counties with appropriate governmental authority and organization, by encouraging county consolidation, and by granting municipalities authority to annex territory for new community development under certain conditions;

Authorizing localities to adopt new and strengthened land use and development ordinances and regulations such as official map, planned unit development, and unmapped or floating zone ordinances and dedication or cash payment-in-lieu requirements for parks and school sites.

RECOMMENDATION: A NATIONAL POLICY DEALING WITH PATTERNS OF URBAN GROWTH

To help assure the full and wise application of all governmental resources consonant with the economic and social health of both rural and urban areas and of the nation as a whole, the Commission recommends the development of a national policy incorporating social, economic, and other considerations to guide specific decisions at the national level which affect the patterns of urban growth.

The Commission recommends that the President and the Congress assign executive responsibility for this task to an appropriate executive agency. The Commission also recommends that the Congress provide within its standing committee structure a means to assure continuing systematic review and study of the progress toward such a national policy.

The Commission further recommends that the executive and legislative branches, in the formulation of the national policy, consult with and take into account the views of state and local governments.

Joseph F. Zimmerman, Professor of Political Science, State University of New York at Albany:

"Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth" thoroughly documents patterns of economic growth and urbanization and the problems currently faced by central cities, suburbia, and rural areas. Few will quarrel with the report's findings, but many of its recommendations illustrate that writing an acceptable diagnosis is easier than writing an acceptable prescription.

"This brief appraisal, of necessity, must be selective and will focus upon the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations' call for a national urban growth policy involving major federal-state manipulation of growth trends. The case made for an urban growth policy is a convincing one, but several 'possible components' of the policy suggested as 'useful approaches' are in need of careful rethinking.

"The ACIR states that it wishes to influence 'the movement of population and eco-

nomic growth . . . so as to achieve generally a greater degree of population decentralization throughout the country.' Such a policy has been followed by a number of countries with little success.

"The Soviet Union has attempted to curb the growth of Moscow since 1931, yet the city has experienced the same rate of population growth as the New York City area. The Irish government has been unable to prevent the depopulation of rural areas and the continued rapid population increase in the Dublin area. And the British government's post war attempt to divert population and jobs to new towns and other parts of the country was unsuccessful in curbing population growth in the London area which had a rate of increase twice as large as the remainder of the country.

"ACIR correctly points out that governments currently are interfering with market forces, but such interference is not sufficient justification for massive interference—via tax incentives, below market rate loans, direct payments, and construction and procurement contracts—with the complex forces which determine patterns of growth. A policy of artificial promotion of growth in certain areas and limitation of growth in other areas can have adverse consequences for the United States. In fairness to the ACIR, it must be pointed out that the report summarizes the principal arguments against its suggested 'useful approaches.'

"A strong case is made for the use of various kinds of subsidies to induce industry to locate in areas which are declining economically or are not growing rapidly enough. Inherent in such a policy is the danger that it may develop into a 'pork barrel' approach similar to rivers and harbors projects.

"If subsidies have to be utilized to induce firms to locate where they otherwise would not locate, it is probable that subsidies would be needed to keep the firms operating in economically disadvantaged locations.

"In the long-run, economically depressed rural areas and labor surplus city neighborhoods would profit most from programs designed to make the areas more attractive to industry; programs that would provide excellent transportation facilities and utilities, suitable sites, and skilled labor. An inefficient transportation system, for example, raises the cost of production and places a region at a competitive disadvantage *vis-à-vis* other regions. By contrast, an efficient transportation system promotes the competitive position of a region's firms and acts as a magnet for new industry. The report unfortunately makes but few references to the transportation system, a dynamic force that heavily influences the rate and pattern of development of areas.

"Since World War II, the hard-core unemployment problem in central cities has among its root causes two opposing movements—the influx of a substantial number of unskilled persons to large cities and the exodus of many industrial firms from cities to suburbs. The problem has been further accentuated by automation which has reduced the demand for certain types of labor.

"The fact that there are 500,000 hard-core unemployed in central cities is paradoxical in that jobs commonly are available in suburbia. This situation has led several observers, including the ACIR, to recommend that industry be discouraged to construct new factories in the ghettos, to take advantage of available labor, and cool the explosive nature of the unemployment problem.

"Realistically, profit-motivated industry cannot be expected to construct new factories in ghetto areas unless provided with major incentives. Suitable sites in these areas are scarce and attempts to assemble sites are fraught with danger.

"Obviously, it makes more economic sense in the short-run to transport employable persons from the ghettos to jobs in suburbia. This is more easily accomplished and can be done in a short period of time com-

pared with the time that would be involved in inducing industry to construct new factories in central cities.

"Urban problems are compounded by inconsistent federal programs which are, in part, a response to competing interest groups. The interstate highway program, for example, favors the private automobile and encourages metropolitan sprawl, and appears to conflict with the mass transportation program. And the insurance of home mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration has promoted sprawl, weakened central cities, and made acute the transportation problems of metropolitan areas. Action should be taken, as urged by the ACIR, to coordinate the various federal programs which affect economic growth.

"In conclusion, the ACIR would be on safer ground if its recommendations were more modest and were restricted primarily to: (1) the elimination of inconsistent federal programs which work at cross-purposes with each other, (2) improvement of comprehensive planning to accommodate further urbanization, (3) promotion of policies designed to make economically depressed areas more attractive to industry without the use of subsidies, and (4) development of an inexpensive transportation system to move unemployed workers in central cities to and from jobs in suburbia."

RECOMMENDATION: REDIRECTION OF MULTI-STATE ECONOMIC PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

To facilitate the development and implementation of a national policy dealing with urban growth, the Commission recommends that the President and Congress reassess the policies and structures of the existing and proposed multi-state economic planning and development agencies as they affect the geographic distribution of economic and population growth. The Commission further recommends that such agencies be charged with taking national policies into account in the formulation of their regional programs and with developing regional components for the formulation of national policies and programs dealing with urban growth.

D. G. Welford, Secretary, Department of Local Affairs and Development, State of Wisconsin:

"While reading the pages of *Policies for Future Growth* the thought stubbornly persisted that the situation is simply out of control. The message is plain and stark. In the face of a very real urban growth crisis it asserts that we are strangling ourselves with numerous uncoordinated public and private efforts which are doubly ineffective because few people have grasped either the immensity or severity of the problem.

"Yet the quality of life itself is in serious danger. Giant population clusters have already become unmanageable and future growth projections are little short of ominous. Jacksonian democracy is unsuited to meet the crisis and its application merely worsens conditions. Laissez-faire development practices, for example, once a substantial source of national power, have become a killer. Looking ahead even to a single generation the report implicitly concludes that the nation is on a collision course with a dark destiny.

"The proffered solution, like the problem, is a paradox. To provide decent housing, jobs, workable transportation, relief from onerous taxation, a healthy environment, and all of the other factors which are part of the American Dream, power inevitably must be shifted upward to the federal and to some extent to state government. In no other way can impending disaster be replaced with relative order. Failure to embark on wholly new dimensions of leadership and control by higher units of government is the equivalent of national chaos. This is the message of the report as I interpret it.

"In a precise textbook manner the story is unfolded. Disparity prevails everywhere. It

prevails in the fiscal and social plight of the central cities. It prevails in the inability of lone units of local government to solve a host of worsening problems and a corollary disinclination of communities in the same metropolitan area to work together in meaningful ways. It prevails in the decline of rural income levels and needed governmental services. It prevails in those forces which unwittingly created the ghetto and work to maintain its existence. And if things are bad now, what will it be like in some 20 to 30 years when 'estimates indicate a national population increase of 73 per cent . . . practically all of it urban'?

"In a democratic society, government usually reacts to crisis. Seldom can meaningful plans and expenditures be made for problems which loom somewhere in the future. As I read the report I remember thinking that its message was surely true but that, popularly speaking, it remains largely unrecognized. The typical man on the street does not yet see it as a problem of crisis proportions, and for that matter neither do most members of the state legislatures. This same lack of perspective is shared by many public officials including some municipal administrators. Indeed, the somewhat wicked thought occurred to me that there are quite a few city managers throughout the country who make a very good living representing communities which probably shouldn't even exist as separately organized entities.

"When seen in this light one cannot help but wonder at the desire—to say nothing of the ability—of governments voluntarily to undertake such adventuresome and uncharted missions as advocated in the report.

"Nevertheless the report stands on its own merits. It carefully details the nature of the problem and the inevitable consequences of inaction. It concludes that we must begin with the enunciation of national policy to redirect the forces of urban growth, including action programs to encourage the dispersal of population. It concludes, too, that a whole battery of bold new policies must be carried out by state action if success is to be achieved.

"Because of my position in state government I was inevitably drawn to those sections of the report dealing with 'the appropriate roles' of state and local governments. The recommendations for state action will undoubtedly attract critical fire. An article in the December, 1968, issue of *Nation's Cities* is a case in point. It bore the provocative title, 'What Role for States in Our Federal System?', but concluded that it was at best a minor one and urged Congress to resist arguments for more participation by state governments in the administration of new federal programs for urban America. A majority of the big city mayors support this negative view.

"The ACIR report, however, strikes a note of balance. Important elements of proposed national policy can be implemented only at the state level because inevitably 'the focus . . . shifts to the states.' A stern warning is issued if this responsibility is ignored as it admittedly has been so frequently in the past: ' . . . inaction by the states may lead to such a degree of national dominance that the position of state government in the American federal system may be further eroded. The states need to act, rather than merely to react . . .'

"So the challenge is put forth: The states, working within the framework of national urban growth policies, must adopt and implement comprehensive urban growth policies of their own. There must be a strong state planning process as well as the designation of multi-county planning and development districts. Local government, particularly the county, must be strengthened, and areawide planning and functional agencies authorized. The further proliferation of separate governments in urban areas must be halted. State departments of local or com-

munity affairs should be established to provide technical assistance to local governments. Imaginative and positive land-use and development controls must be provided. Bold new concepts for encouraging population dispersal should be adopted and set in motion, including a strong leadership role in stimulating and guiding new community development.

"The question of course is whether the states will be able to muster the capacity to play such a key and positive role in coping with the complex problems of urban growth. To date the record has not been good and little evidence exists to indicate that a dramatic change is in the offing. The reapportionment of state legislatures over the country thus far seems to have done no more than exchange a predominantly rural view for an equally parochial suburban one.

"A few states have made notable strides toward achieving some of the action programs recommended in the report but in light of the enormity of the problem these efforts can only be regarded as embryonic. I therefore regretfully conclude that we have no alternative but to look to the federal government for strong leadership including incentives to goad the states into action. Otherwise it may be predicted that most of the states will continue to do little more than to act indecisively, or as the report puts it, to react rather than to exert bold leadership.

"The overriding value of *Policies for Future Growth* is that it indisputably makes its case and then draws a well-conceived and well-balanced action blueprint requiring for success the effective participation of all levels of government and the private sector. Its value to governmental leaders will be great."

RECOMMENDATION: STATE POLICY DEALING WITH URBAN GROWTH

To assure full and wise application of state governmental resources consonant with the economic and social health of both rural and urban areas in the state, the Commission recommends the development of state policy incorporating social, economic, and other considerations to guide specific decisions at the state level which affect the patterns of urban growth.

The implementing legislation should provide for (1) coordination by an appropriate state agency of state, multi-county, metropolitan, and local planning, and relating such planning to regional and national considerations; (2) conformity of programs and projects of state agencies to the state urbanization plan; and (3) formal review by an appropriate state agency for conformance with the state plan of metropolitan area and multi-county plans and of those local comprehensive plans, implementing ordinances, and projects having an impact outside the jurisdiction's borders.

The Commission further recommends that multi-county planning agencies be assigned responsibility to review applications for federal or state physical development project grants in nonmetropolitan as well as metropolitan areas.

The Commission also recommends that the state legislatures provide within their standing committee structure a means to assure continuing, systematic review and study of the progress toward a state policy dealing with urban growth.

Finally, the Commission recommends that the states give consideration both to the national policy and to the views of local governments in the formulation of state plans and policies dealing with urban growth.

RECOMMENDATION: POSSIBLE COMPONENTS OF A NATIONAL POLICY DEALING WITH URBAN GROWTH

The Commission is of the opinion that national governmental policy has a role to play in influencing the location of people and industry and the resulting patterns of urban growth. Some of these ways are of

proven capability; others are untried. The following should be considered as useful approaches to the implementation of a national policy regarding urban growth:

Federal financial incentives, such as tax, loan, or direct payment arrangements for business and industrial locations in certain areas;

Placement of federal procurement contracts and construction projects to foster urban growth in certain areas;

Federal policies and programs to influence the mobility of people, to neutralize factors producing continued excessive population concentrations, and to encourage alternative location choices; such policies and programs might include, among others, resettlement allowances, augmented on-the-job training allowances, interarea job placement and information on a computerized basis, and the elimination or reduction in the "migrational pull" of interstate variations in public assistance eligibility and benefit standards;

Strengthening the existing voluntary federal-state programs of family planning information for low-income persons;

Federal involvement and assistance under certain conditions (such as assurances of an adequate range of housing) for large-scale urban and new community development.

Charles T. Lanigan, Director, State of New York Office of Planning Coordination:

"In this recently published report, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations presents a thoughtful inquiry into urban settlement and growth in the United States today. Nationwide population movement and trends, industrial growth location factors, shifts in personal income, and growing imbalances between governmental service delivery and social service needs are reviewed and analyzed.

"In light of this background, existing governmental policies affecting economic growth and urban settlement are discussed, and their noncoherence is especially noted. Growth patterns, including particularly the building of new communities and the impediments to their realization, are examined. Conclusions are drawn and suggested policies are put forth for consideration by federal, state, and local governments. Most significant of all, the need for a national policy to guide the location and the character of future urbanization is stated in clear, ringing terms.

"A national urban-rural development policy, in the words of ACIR's Assistant Director David B. Walker, requires a 'consideration of the dynamics of the economic process and its effect on urban-rural America; the need for job training, a national resettlement policy and uniformity in welfare programs; and evaluation of the existing and future role of state and local government.'

"Given a national policy, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller said recently, each state in cooperation with local government should set goals for urban and rural areas and develop a comprehensive plan to achieve these goals. States also should make a careful assessment of projects and programs in relation to urban and rural growth and should amend or supplement these policies and actions to promote a rational pattern of settlement.

"As a director of a state planning agency I am particularly interested in ACIR's suggestions for better coordinated, more effective state policies to bring about a desired balance in urban-rural growth.

"First, states ACIR, there should be a statewide planning process sufficiently advanced to create a state growth and development policy. Physical, economic, and social considerations must be taken into account; the structure, form, and direction of growth determined; state agency policies and programs understood and adjusted in terms of their effect on settlement patterns; guidance for local, metropolitan, and regional plan-

ning and development programs provided; and the interplay between local efforts and national regional policies enhanced.

"In New York State's publication, *Change/Challenge/Response*, released in 1964 and a successor document presently in preparation, we have set forth an urbanization policy in the form of a state development strategy. The purpose of this endeavor is first to project the kind and location of urban settlement that will improve the economic growth of the whole state and second to suggest the component functional and regional substrategies needed to effect this pattern of urbanization.

"We are convinced that numerous balances are required: in urbanization and open land retention; in physical, economic, and social factors; in transportation networks and public facility provision; etc.

"Our next steps will be to test this development strategy against regional development policies being prepared by the various regional planning agencies and against the plans and programs of state functional departments. The planning significance of New York's PPB system lies in the continuing interweave of state functional plans with overall statewide urbanization policy.

"To implement a state policy for urban-rural growth ACIR suggests that states consider the enactment of a number of programs and other legislative mechanisms. Among them: creating state and regional industrial credit facilities; authorizing locational preference in awarding public contracts; providing for the chartering of state and local land development agencies; authorizing property tax deferral for new community development; strengthening county government; permitting noncontiguous municipal annexations; and authorizing local governments to adopt more flexible and more effective land use and development controls.

"The extensive material in this report stimulates a lot of thinking about urban and rural development and indicates a number of areas for further exploration.

"We need, for example, to develop new measures of urban density, to better understand the effects and side effects of population intensity levels on the well-being of urban dwellers, and to provide for compensatory features and facilities.

"We need to evaluate the implications of a state urbanization policy that selects certain areas for either major growth or whole new community development in preference to others. How are such decisions justified? How are the questions of individual property and local government autonomy in relation to the general urbanization needs and the more inclusive authority of state government resolved?

"There is much work ahead for us to understand how new communities can be brought into being so as to contain a representative mix of metropolitan population and to offer families of all incomes and situations a real choice in where they shall live. The problem of land acquisition and financing must be dealt with; housing construction costs must be lowered on a large scale basis; and resettlement policies in the way of educational programs, job training opportunities, and encouragement must be instituted.

"We need to build governmental mechanisms—the state and local governments in joint effort—that will permit the creation of governmental units for new communities with sufficient capabilities to meet the needs of their ultimate population. In less formalized new community government situations we need to set the stage for the accommodation of local zoning ordinance and building code specifics with the overall proposals of land development corporations.

"The implementation of a statewide development plan for the settlement of the whole state requires the understanding and support of its citizens, who are citizens of localized urban and rural areas as well. From our various viewpoints we need most of all

to understand the nature and dimensions of urban and rural problems, their interrelationships, corrective policies for each area, and their interrelationships. In publishing this report, ACIR has taken a major step to create this understanding."

HOSTILE SHORES MUST STILL BE TAKEN

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview published in the *Armed Forces Management* magazine, Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Leonard H. Chapman presented some perceptive thoughts on the future role of our fighting marines. I am certain that his comments will be of interest to our colleagues and for their benefit I submit the following article for inclusion in the RECORD:

HOSTILE SHORES MUST STILL BE TAKEN—THE MARINE CORPS' AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT ROLE HAS NOT DIMINISHED

(By Craig Powell, editor)

The next two years may be the most crucial in this one hundred years believes United States Marine Corps Commandant General Leonard H. Chapman. "The world is living in troubled and decisive times," he says. "The years 1969 and 1970 can well be the determinative years for the United States in the Twentieth Century. Thus, the decisions made in this time frame may well be the factors that will chart the course of U.S. national security affairs for many years to come."

The Marine Corps' 24th Commandant continued, "It is for this reason that we are doing the very best we can devise to insure that the United States Marines will always be able to carry out its part in the defense of the country."

It is an unfortunate fact of life that in any composite picture certain elements or portions of the composite can become blurred or out of focus. This is perhaps true of the composite profile of the Marine Corps, today. Not so much so to the initiated. But rather to those who view segments out of context with the whole.

HAS TIME OVERTAKEN?

Over the past two decades the accelerating pace of world affairs has been such that military forces, concepts, and tactics have been in a constant state of flux and evolution. It is not necessarily unusual then, that to a peripheral viewer it might distastefully appear that time has overtaken the requirement for a Marine Corps. The last such viewer of importance was President Harry S. Truman, who had to beat a hasty retreat.

Historically, Marines' duties have been amphibious in nature; providing landing forces, both sea and air. Their task, assault and secure the beachhead. Outwardly, during the Korean war and now in the conflict in Southeast Asia the Corps' operations have been tasked with fighting in a protracted situation, a type of conflict usually related to Army operations.

These factors, plus the Army's advanced techniques in helicopter operations have caused some to pose the question: "Is there a need for the Marine Corps in the future, or can its role now be filled by elements of the other services?"

To answer the questions and to clarify such misconceptions, AFM talked with Commandant Chapman who recently returned from a trip to Southeast Asia and asked him

to address the subject as well as indicate the future of the Corps in the post-Vietnam world.

In no-nonsense Marine fashion, Chapman attacked the subject with a direct frontal assault. "First," he said, "it is true that in Vietnam today, we are on what can be termed a strategic defensive. This was the case at Khe Sanh and now in holding positions at the DMZ (Demilitarized Zone). However, let me point out that, the Marines are charged not only with maintaining landing forces but also with carrying out such other operations as may be directed by the President of the United States. The latter is what we are doing in Vietnam. And it is the restricted nature of that war, by national policy, that brings about the current situation."

The General went on to explain that at the same time strategic defensive positions are being maintained, the Marines are tactically on the offensive and have been since their commitment in March of 1965.

MARINES ON THE MOVE

In the I Corps area this is truer today than ever before. Across South Vietnam, Marine battalions are constantly on the move. Both day and night, in the jungles, in the mountains, and in the low-lands they are searching out the enemy. Airlifted by helicopter and utilizing supporting air and naval arms, this mobile concept is well in keeping with most typical Marine operations.

The main force units of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese regulars have been defeated and have mostly retreated to the sanctuary of Laos and North Vietnam. The weather is currently good, and the Marines have adequate forces to get away from fixed position to engage the enemy in ambushes, patrol confrontations, and cordon operations. He is even being hunted out within the Viet Cong infrastructure.

The Marine chief told AFM, "Our forces are highly mobile, hard hitting units. We are patrolling constantly and extensively, seeking the enemy; and when he is located, we have the mobility, firepower, and flexibility to be able to build on that contact and inflict high casualties upon him."

Further expanding, he pointed out that activities in Vietnam employ many of the features of the landing or amphibious type operations. "Our actions have often been spread out over a long beach line with Naval gun support and supply support. In like manner the air-support has been typical of that employed in a traditional Marine assault role just as helicopter support has been the same as in beachhead attacks."

Illustrating the point further, Chapman stated that in Vietnam there have so far been some 62 battalion-size Special Landing Force amphibious operations. The most recent, *Bold Mariner*, a part of Operation Russell Beach, involved two Marine battalions and an Army brigade (approximately 8000 men). "All of these," he continued, "have encompassed the techniques and tactics standard in traditional Marine operations."

CLAIMS VALIDATED

"The Corps should be a force in readiness and I think we have clearly demonstrated that our claims to that effect have not been merely advertisement." In fact the Marines in Southeast Asia have never missed a deadline and have always landed on schedule fully combat ready. This has been true since the 9th Marine Expeditionary Brigade went ashore in March 1965 through the ultimate buildup to the current strength of two and one third Divisions and the equivalent two Air Wings. Even the 27th Marine Regimental Landing Team, which deployed to Vietnam during last year's TET offensive, moved out in 48 hours.

Maintains the top Marine, the Corps' charter mandates that it provide the capability to move anywhere in the world on a moment's notice. That includes the organiza-

tion, the training, equipment, and logistics to enable it to do so. Chapman feels that the Marines can do so. Obviously, then, to assume that there has not been a role for the Corps in Vietnam is fatuous. To assume that there will be any diminution of that role in the post-Vietnam world would be more so.

PREDICTIONS ARE DIFFICULT

Trying to predict what contingencies may be over the horizon in that post-war arena necessitates a certain amount of "crystal balling." Still, a pragmatic appraisal of the future and the roles and missions of U.S. military forces that may be necessary is, perhaps, a little more exact science. Particularly when based on past history and a well of military experience.

Surveillants of the U.S. defense scene have noted a growing trend toward retrenchment; the advocacy of "rapid response" and "instant deployment." Under this strategy U.S. forces would be retained within the Continental United States, at the ready, with sufficient airlift and sealift necessary for "rapid response." Here again, the uninitiated might conclude that this discipline in itself equates to a lessening importance of the "landing force" role. Quite the contrary is true.

These same surveillants of the defense scene will, if they are doing their home work well, note that the U.S. has given up many of its advanced bases around the world subsequent to World War II and Korea. The nation is already down to only a portion of those hard-fought-for bases. Even today negotiations are imminent for the return of additional bases such as those in the Philippine Islands.

States Chapman, "It is obvious that we must increasingly rely on going back across the oceans; quite likely to land on a hostile shore against a determined enemy. And if that time comes there will be only one way to go ashore and the Marine/Navy team must execute those operations. In this light, the future holds not a lessening, but a growing requirement for amphibious or Marine type landing forces."

If then, the role of the Marine Corps in the future has not diminished, what changes in organization, equipment and tactical doctrine are in the offing to cope with the ship-to-shore-assault mission? Not a great deal believes the General. He envisions there will be an evolution. Today's organizational structure and training techniques will alter some as better methods of doing things are found. Too there will be some changes in tactics with the advent of new equipment and weapon systems.

"We are following all new weapon systems development to see how they may fit our needs," Chapman commented. "We would very much like to have a V/STOL or VTOL aircraft. There are many advantages for us in this type of plane."

Expanding, the Marine chief explained that there is always the necessity to get Marine air ashore as quickly as possible. Currently there is a reliance on a fixed base such as the SATS (Short Airfield for Tactical Support). The SATS is really a carrier deck ashore. It is a light, easily emplaceable, durable airfield matting with light catapult and arresting equipment. It also includes an Instrument Landing System (ILS) and Ground Control Approach (GCA). It does the job and is reliable. "We had one on hand in Vietnam and at Chu Lai it was expeditiously emplaced with the first aircraft landing and taking off on a combat mission on the 26th day," Chapman said. However, there are drawbacks to this system. It requires flat terrain and there is a commensurate concentration of aircraft and facilities which greatly increases its vulnerability to attack. "Thus," remarked Chapman, "the VTOL aircraft is attractive in that it can be dispersed, solving the concentration/vulnerability problem. They can also be operated off of small vessels."

The General also indicated that the Corps is looking approvingly at the British Hawker-Siddeley *Harrier* which is now going in to the Royal Air Force active inventory. "It is the first V/STOL to have true operational capabilities and good ones. Frankly, we are most interested and are trying to get some as a start. I would like to believe that the Marines are the logical ones to receive the first of this type of aircraft. It seems to fit well to our role."

It is Chapman's opinion that there is no need to put a V/STOL or VTOL behind every bush. However, he thinks that the Marines should start in a small way to gain operational experience in this type of equipment. "We need to learn how to handle and fly this type of aircraft," he said. "We should determine the best methods of attack, formation flying and tactics in general. Actually our immediate requirement is for an operational test and evaluation program leading toward an eventual capability of three or four squadrons. But I think we should start soon and the *Harrier* certainly has merit and I am hopeful that we are successful in acquiring it."

In light of the increasing airmobile capabilities in the Army, AFM asked the Commandant about the helicopter in future Marine plans. The General was most directly candid, "Nothing could be more solid in our planning than our concept of 'vertical envelopment.' We have over the years been extending and elaborating on it. Now it is at full scale and the helicopter is almost as common as the jeep."

Reemphasizing the point, he told AFM that through the late 1940s the Corps went through laborious efforts involving the use of the then limited capability helicopters and landing teams to develop tactics, techniques and doctrine for their successful use. In 1950 when the Korean conflict started the Marines had the first operational helicopter squadron in combat. A parallel Navy program provided the flight decks for the follow on squadrons and this has grown to the full-fledged capability of today.

By way of example, Chapman cited 50,000 to 55,000 Marine helicopter sorties per month in Vietnam moving some 75,000 troops each week. "While a number of rotary wing aircraft have been lost in Vietnam, they are not as vulnerable as some people think. This is apparent when losses are compared to the magnitude of operations."

"The important lesson we have learned in Vietnam, in this area, is the need for more light helicopters. The large transport helicopters CH-46 and CH-53 are doing an excellent job. However, we need more gunships and utility type helicopters like the *Huey*."

AFM asked if the Marines had any interest in the Lockheed AH-56A *Cheyenne* (Advanced Aerial Fire Support System). "I don't think we would want it at this time," he answered, "but we are watching it. We prefer a mix of jets, Cobras (*Huey* gunship) and naval gunfire support. It better fits our requirements at this time."

In relation to advanced systems, the Commandant was also queried as to what relationship the new hovercraft, the C-5A *Galaxy*, and the programed Fast Deployment Logistics Ships (FDL), might have on future Marine operations.

"The hovercraft," he said, "has some attractive features. It enables one to move rapidly over certain types of terrain. At the same time it is an extremely complex piece of machinery and requires a considerable amount of power. Like other developments, we're keeping a close eye on it, though at this time we have no plans to acquire this type of vehicle for our inventory."

"As to the C-5A and the FDLs, this perhaps needs a little explanation. Future contingencies may require the capability to move across oceans and accomplish landing operations under fire. This, of course, is the re-

sponsibility of the Navy/Marine team. However, the supertransports and the Fast Deployment Ships do not actually figure into this type of action. They are more applicable when there is a need to move whole armies in what can best be described as an 'administrative landing.' However, there is a valid requirement for both types of operations and they are complementary to each other. Certainly, the C-5A and the FDLs will be an asset in the rapid development of large numbers of troops, but they are not really germane to the Marine role."

In wrapping up the discussion, Chapman noted that the Corps' immediate preoccupation is the continued support of the III Marine Amphibious Force in Vietnam. "Our secondary, yet equally important task," he continued, "is to keep our other Fleet Marine Forces in readiness. Within those we have three Marine Expeditionary Forces (MEF); one in the Eastern United States composed of the 2nd Marine Division and 2nd Marine Air Wing; one in the West, the 5th Marine Division and the 3rd Marine Air Wing; and one in reserve, the 4th Marine Division and 4th Marine Air Wing. The III MAF is in superb condition and uncommitted MEFs are in good shape to take on any commitment that may be made."

To Chapman the many facets of the composite are all clear. He leaves no doubt of his conviction that there is a very explicit role for the Corps in both today's military forces and in the nation's defense posture of the future.

Over the past 193 years the Corps has been prepared for, hardened and tempered in the crucible of war. In time the conflict in Vietnam will have passed and the men of the Corps will move out. But the role for the Marines as delineated in the "Key West Agreement" will remain. The planners must consider that sooner or later there will be a need to take a hostile shore. When that time comes the job will be done by the Navy/Marine team.

The Corps may in time vary its tactics and its equipment. But essentially, it will retain its role and its identity. Or as the 17th Commandant once said, "The only secret weapon developed by the Marine Corps is the Marine."

ELECTORAL ABDICATION

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times printed an excellent editorial today criticizing the administration for its hesitancy to support the direct popular election of the President. I agree that we cannot ignore the steadily growing public opinion favoring this method, out of misplaced fear that such reform may not be ratified in the State legislatures.

The editorial follows:

ELECTORAL ABDICATION

In major political battles, as in major military ones, neutrality can often be an oblique way of taking sides. To refuse to come to the aid of a good proposition when its fate is in doubt to undermine its success. This is exactly what the Nixon Administration has done with regard to Electoral College reform.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee, has reiterated what President Nixon had said earlier: The Administration favors direct, popular election of Presidents and Vice Presidents, but it will not urge Congressional approval of this reform because it does not think the plan could win ratification among the states. Instead, the Administration has

offered its own reform proposal, a wholly inadequate substitute that spins a host of new complications of its own.

The reason for this posture is difficult to understand. Is the Administration too timid to make a fight for what it considers right? Or does it really oppose thoroughgoing electoral reform?

The view that the best possible reform is unattainable is a view contradicted by every available poll. A sampling of sentiment among state legislators showed overwhelming support for direct popular election of Presidents and Vice Presidents. As for the voters themselves, polls show as many as 80 per cent favoring direct election.

Perhaps still another poll of state legislators would give the Administration the courage of its convictions, if its convictions really support direct election. Senator Birch Bayh, long an advocate of electoral reform, plans to conduct such a poll.

But responsible political leadership should not depend on a wet finger windward or the results of the latest poll. By its own testimony the Administration favors direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents. It ought to fight for this most basic of electoral reforms.

UTAH LEGISLATURE URGES LESS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Utah recently passed House Joint Resolution 12 entitled, "A joint resolution memorializing Congress to cease and desist the proliferation of Federal power." The resolution, I think, is representative of an ever-increasing attitude among citizens throughout the country, citizens who have a genuine and certainly not unwarranted concern for the preservation of a proper balance between National and State government operations. We in the Congress would do well to take to heart the message of this resolution, and dedicate more of our efforts to the strengthening of State and local governments, and less of them to adding to the powers and responsibilities of the already over-large Federal Government. The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 12

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to cease and desist the proliferation of Federal Power

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas, the Congress of the United States continues to expand the proliferation of federal control over our cities, counties and states, and

Whereas, this proliferation of national government is contrary to the thinking of our founding fathers, contrary to the fundamental tenets of federalism, and

Whereas, if such proliferation does not cease, our federal system, which once manifested a delicate balance between federal and state powers, will become a giant state engulfing monster; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 38th Legislature of the State of Utah, both houses concurring therein, That Congress be memorialized and respectfully requested to cease and desist from further encroachment on state and local powers reserved to the states under the Constitution of the United States; Be it

Resolved further, That Congress immediately consider systematic withdrawal of many of the non-productive and expensive federal agencies which result in unnecessary taxation imposed upon citizens of this and other states, and allow states to appraise their own social and economic needs and levy and collect taxes to provide for these indigenous problems; Be it

Resolved further, That the Secretary of State of Utah be, and he is hereby directed, to send copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to United States Representative Wilbur D. Mills, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in Congress.

HAVEN J. BARLOW,
President of the Senate.

LONIE N. PACE,
Speaker of the House.

Received from the Governor, and filed in the office of the Secretary of State this 13th day of March, 1969.

CLYDE L. MILLER,
Secretary of State.

BOSS WHO DOESN'T WANT ADVICE KEEPING EXPERTS BUSY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, lack of communication can often create seemingly insurmountable problems which reduce themselves to minimal proportions when lines of communication are opened up.

I call the attention of my colleagues and place in the RECORD a recent article from the Pittsburgh Press, which describes an interesting experiment on the subject, conducted at the U.S. Department of Commerce Field Office:

BOSS WHO DOESN'T WANT ADVICE KEEPING
EXPERTS BUSY: PUTTING OUT OFFICE FIRES
TAKING MORE TIME THAN EVER

(By William Allan)

More than 50 red-blooded American business types spent some 75 minutes trying to fashion toy towers out of paper, paper clips, soda straws and the like at the U.S. Department of Commerce Field Office here the other day.

They're not candidates for padded cells. They were taking part in a very interesting experiment in communications.

A team of five specialists from Arthur D. Little, the Cambridge, Mass., management consulting firm, set up the experiment because it constituted a challenge with unfamiliar materials.

"Technical knowhow, therefore, was of very little use," explains Arnold J. Judson, the chemical engineer member of the Little team.

He adds that communications constitute a very real problem in most firms. Research scientists don't talk to marketing people, production managers clam up when the finance section is represented and the president complains that no one understands what he's trying to do.

The fact that so many Pittsburgh business people showed up for an all-day conference on the subject is some proof that communications are a concern—although none of them probably would own up to the above description.

The fact there were in attendance some presidents of rather large corporations, plus some vice presidents of gigantic firms, indicates the concern is at the top.

Lewis E. Conman, director of the Commerce Field Office here, says the session was set up on request and that this was the first time the Little team worked with such a heterogeneous group.

He adds that industries report to him that the amount of management time wasted "putting out fires" is reaching staggering proportions.

Interestingly, Kenneth J. Beck, whose specialty is social problem solving, reports there oft times are more communications blocks in small firms because people are closer and have built up more walls than those in conglomerates.

Mr. Judson is specific to emphasize that there is no "formula" to solve the communication's problems of any firm and that when a team of experts attacks a problem in a firm, it expects to tangle with it for at least several months—and sometimes several years.

Typical problems include the boss who doesn't want any advice, the marketing department which stifles everything from the research people and the research people who look down their noses at the marketing people as "idiots."

Despite all you hear against "rule by committee," the Arthur D. Little people like it.

"Risks are involved and taking risks is easier for a team, because the risk is spread," explains Mr. Judson, "while the team also concentrates all the resources you have available."

Sometimes the resources come from without.

He told of a firm which came up with a terrific new food product which everyone thought was great, but which had a shelf life of only six weeks. While everyone in the firm was arguing among themselves, it was suggested that the distributor be involved (communications) and he volunteered the answer by speeding up his end of the deal.

Quite often communications are so poor the obvious is overlooked.

NEW DANGER IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the noted author and newspaperman, Anthony Harrigan, has written a very astute and highly analytical article for the March 10 issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report which dramatically points out the alarming shift of the balance of power in the Mediterranean toward the Soviet Union.

Because of the tense and vexing problem posed by the various conflicts in the Mediterranean area, I consider Mr. Harrigan's article especially timely, and I include it as a part of my remarks, as follows:

NEW DANGER IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

(By Anthony Harrigan)

The ugly riots that greeted President Nixon on his arrival in Rome last month are but one indication of deepening trouble throughout the Mediterranean world. In Italy, the Italian Communist Party (Partito Comunista Italiano—PCI) is gaining strength through cooperation with the socialists. The Christian Democratic Party, which saved Italy from communism, is split into seven warring factions. The political climate in Italy is reflected in the recent announcement by Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni, a so-

cialist in the coalition government, that Italy had decided to recognize Peking. Recognition of Hanoi may be forthcoming shortly.

PRESSURES ON ITALY

The threat to Italy as a free nation is not only internal. If Yugoslavia should be invaded by Soviet troops, as Czechoslovakia was invaded, Russian forces would be poised on Italy's northeastern frontier. With a Russian military presence on her land frontier, and with a Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean, Italy would be placed in a nutcracker. It also should be realized that the Soviet fleet soon may spend more time in the Adriatic Sea—between Italy and Yugoslavia—as part of a pressure operation against those two South European countries. Nor can the Italians, any more than the Greeks, ignore the ominous military build-up in little Albania across the Adriatic. Earlier this winter, Albania announced a 40 per cent increase in defense expenditures. The money, derived from Communist China, will go for the construction of naval facilities and other military installations. In aiding Albania in this manner, the Chinese Communists have in mind establishing a military foothold in the Mediterranean. They understand the military and political potential in what Sir Winston Churchill called "the soft underbelly of Europe."

Meanwhile in Italy, the campaign against the NATO alliance is stepped up. Foreign Minister Nenni says that his country will support it only with reservations, meaning that the socialists in the coalition want to isolate Greece which is ruled by a military government.

Italy's continuing drift to the left causes some observers to believe that the time will come when Italy may have a government similar to the one now in power in Greece. The thinking is that Christian Democrats, because of their divisions, may be unable, at some point, to arrest a communist-socialist takeover of the government. If that happens, the Italian military may feel they have an obligation to the country and its traditions to intervene, at least temporarily, until communist pressure has eased. It would be a tragedy for the free world as much as for the Italian people if Italy, the ancestral home of the Western world order, were, after two decades of struggle, to succumb to communist domination. The U.S. public, certainly, should be aware of the dynamics involved in the Italian military situation and how these dynamics may possibly affect U.S. commitments to the defense of NATO's southern flank.

THE TEST CASE IN GREECE

A test case already has arisen in Greece. The military junta governs in Greece because of a leftward drift of the former parliamentary government of that country—of its leaders, not the Greek people. Again, the Greek military decided they had a responsibility to the Greek nation not to allow the national interests to be severely damaged by the misguided "neutrality" that was strong in the government before the coup. The Greek junta has been wise, however, to stress that the country continues to be a monarchy.

Observers in Athens believe that King Constantine will be permitted to return from exile before very long, though his real power will be reduced and he will be limited to ceremonial duties similar to those of the British monarch. For the United States, the emergence of the Greek military government has posed some vexing questions. The U.S. unquestionably prefers that parliamentary rule be restored as soon as possible. But the U.S. has properly refrained from trying to impose an American-type political solution on the Greeks. What is of central importance to the United States is that Greece not be handed over to the communists. As in the case of Italy, it would have been tragic if the last parliamentary government of Greece had discarded the country's links with NATO and thereby taken the first step in bowing

to the Soviet Union's new might in the Mediterranean.

As a practical matter, the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean must have access to the territorial waters and air space of Greece. The Sixth Fleet, in order to carry out its deterrent duties and keep the peace, must be free to thread the maze of Greek islands in the Aegean and the Sea of Crete. U.S. planes must have permission to overfly these islands. The airfield on Crete, with its 9,000-foot runway, provides the planes of the Sixth Fleet with an important safety factor. In addition, the Crete field makes possible vital reconnaissance flights over the Eastern Mediterranean. The security of many NATO countries thus depends on continued use of Greek territories and installations.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH SPAIN

At the western end of the Mediterranean, concern is growing over Spain, which is not a member of NATO but which is vital to the alliance. Under a bilateral U.S.-Spanish treaty, currently in process of renegotiation, the United States bases Polaris submarines at Rota in the southern part of the country. The major air base at Torrejon, outside of Madrid, would be enormously important to the United States if a limited war broke out in the Mediterranean, requiring reinforcement of U.S. forces in the region. In the future, reconnaissance over the entire western Mediterranean and the increasingly dangerous northwestern zone of Africa will depend upon widened access to Spain's air facilities.

Observers of the Spanish scene are watching not simply the progress of the treaty negotiations, governing the four existing bases, but the situation inside Spain. General Franco, who has ruled the country since the 1930's, is now an old man whose health is reported to be worsening. The "state of exception" in force in Spain is widely interrupted as a prelude to an announcement governing the political succession in the country which officially is a monarchy. In the event of General Franco's death or incapacity, surviving communist and anarchist elements, which have been invoked in strikes and student protests in the last two years, might renew the terrible civil war that devastated Spain.

In view of this danger, it is believed that the Spanish armed forces would be the decisive element at a moment of political change—the first in more than 30 years. Informed students of the Spanish scene note the existence of Spain's crack armored division, the "Guadarrama No. 11," outside of Madrid. This division, commanded by General Tomas Garcia Rebull, recently executed seize and hold exercises in the capital city.

The NATO countries have a deep interest in the next generation of political leadership in Spain and in Spanish military and foreign policies of the 1970's. The existence of a powerful Algerian army and air force, outfitted with superior Soviet equipment and trained by Red Army advisers, is not only a grave threat to Spain but to the NATO countries. History-minded Europeans have not forgotten that Western civilization faced its greatest threat in the early medieval period when the Moors swarmed out of North Africa and seized Spain. In the 20th century, the Soviets—far removed from the Spanish scene—came close to turning Spain into their first satellite.

The Algerian threat might be manifested first against Spanish Sahara, a large, empty but highly strategic territory in Africa. If the Soviet Union were able to become politically and militarily entrenched elsewhere in West Africa, Spanish Sahara suddenly could assume tremendous importance to the United States as a site for airfields.

A SOVIET "MARE NOSTRUM"?

The long-range objective of the Soviet Union is to turn the Mediterranean into a closed sea, or a "sea of peace" as Soviet prop-

agandists describe it. If Spain could be politically controlled, or successfully intimidated by Soviet-equipped forces in Algeria, Moscow would have an excellent chance of literally closing the Mediterranean to the passage of U.S. warships. In the Gulf of Finland, which lacks a narrow passage such as exists at Gibraltar, the Soviets already have enforced their closed sea doctrine.

As one looks around the Mediterranean, it is relatively simple to discern the Soviet grand strategy for this historic basin. The political and military squeeze is being applied by Moscow at all the key points.

First of all, a Soviet squadron has been successfully inserted into what has been virtually an American lake since the formation of the Sixth Fleet in the late 1940's. This Soviet fleet now operates from one end of the Med to the other, and is welcome in the major Arab ports. Large administrative and repair facilities are located at Alexandria in Egypt. The Arab states, with the exception of Morocco, Tunisia and Libya, have been drawn into the Soviet orbit. The Soviet naval force also has engaged in some interesting political maneuvers, such as the anchoring of a Soviet warship off Sicily during a recent election—a show-the-Red flag mission that paid off for Sicilian communists. Leftist demonstrations in Istanbul have resulted in the cancellation of a U.S. Sixth Fleet visit to another Turkish port, and Turkey generally has shown increased fear of offending the Soviets. Internal pressures have been increased in Italy and Spain. In short, the Soviet strategy for the Mediterranean is working well. Whereas this was a secure area for the West not long ago, it is now a region that's "up for grabs."

The need now is for U.S. and NATO countermeasures against the Soviet Union and its client states along the southern littoral of the Mediterranean. From the strictly naval standpoint, it is essential that the U.S. Sixth Fleet be strengthened to provide adequate protection to friendly states that may be politically menaced or that may be subjected to attacks by Arab states under cover of Soviet rocket cruisers. The U.S. and the NATO alliance also must be alert to the danger that the Soviets may try to win the tiny island-country of Malta to their side and transform it into a communist air and naval base.

Ideally, Spain should be made a full-fledged member of NATO. This, more than any other action, would indicate to the Soviet Union the seriousness of the Atlantic countries in determining to check Russian aggression in the Mediterranean. If this course is not politically feasible at this time, the next more important action would be a considerable expansion of the U.S.-Spanish base agreements to provide for wider air coverage of the Western Mediterranean and, thereby, to acknowledge the threat from Africa that is a threat to the entire NATO alliance.

Because of shrewd political and military maneuvers, the balance of power in the Mediterranean has been shifting towards the Soviet Union. To restore the balance of power to the Western side, and to deny the Soviets further opportunities to extend their influence, the U.S. will have to augment its forces in the Mediterranean and give convincing expressions of solidarity with anti-communist forces in the NATO nations of southern Europe.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1969

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick's Day is a joyful time for the

Irish and for those of us who are privileged to join them in celebration of this wonderful occasion. For it commemorates the conversion of that mystic and beautiful island to the Catholic faith, as well as the introduction of Ireland to the mainstream of Western European civilization.

St. Patrick's Day is observed in the United States with great festivity. Irish Americans throughout the country devote March 17 to commemorating their ties to the homeland, while demonstrating their own particular vital quality of Americanism. Parades, the wearing of the green, merrymaking and celebrating—these are the essential ingredients of St. Patrick's Day throughout the land.

But, on a deeper level, St. Patrick's Day should remind every Irish American—and all Americans as well—of the singular contributions which the Irish people have made to that Western society of which their patron saint so long ago made them a part. Statesmen and poets, scholars and patriots—all have contributed in colorful fashion to the pageant of Irish history. Edmund Burke was born in Dublin; Oliver Goldsmith reminded the world of Irish suffering. Later, William Butler Yeats and Charles Parnell, in the struggle for Irish independence, contributed the Irish virtues of imagination and determination to Ireland's successful fight for freedom and self-expression.

These men and others, and indeed all Irishmen, are remembered on St. Patrick's Day. For the world would be poorer—as would the fabric of American life—without Ireland, the greenest of the Western isles.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, national health insurance—that is, comprehensive health and medical care for every American—has been a dream of many in this Congress for many years. Now, according to AFL-CIO Social Security Director Bert Seidman, there are clear signs that such a proposal has a much improved chance of adoption. In a Labor News Conference interview on the Mutual Broadcasting System, Mr. Seidman outlined what such a national health insurance plan should include. I think that many of our colleagues would find his views on this subject helpful, and, under unanimous consent, I place a transcript of the program, as well as an AFL-CIO press statement commentary thereon, in the RECORD, as follows:

Growing public and congressional support for national health insurance make the proposal more politically feasible this year than in recent years, the AFL-CIO's social insurance expert reported today in a Mutual Radio Network interview.

"People are becoming very much concerned about unmet health needs in this country," declared Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Social Security. He said that generally favorable experience of the Medicare program has demonstrated the ef-

fectiveness of meeting those needs "on a comprehensive basis."

The union spokesman cited a recent national Harris poll showing that 57 percent of those responding favored "a system of Medicare for everyone."

That is "essentially what national health insurance is," Seidman explained, and such strong support is particularly significant, since this has not been a "burning issue in Congress in recent years." The AFL-CIO produced public service program was broadcast Tuesday at 7:35 p.m. (EST).

Seidman stressed that a national health insurance program would make comprehensive health and medical care, including prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation, available to all Americans, but would not prevent anyone from receiving care and treatment outside the system, if they so choose. He turned aside the suggestion that such a system would be a "poor care program."

"We would try to put in the incentives to make it a program of excellent medical care . . . for the entire population, as is now the case in many other countries," he asserted.

He said that there is wide misunderstanding about the amount of health insurance that people now have and what it covers. Although a "considerable portion of the population, perhaps as high as 70 or 80 percent, has coverage for hospitalization," only a much smaller proportion has covered for medical services other than surgical, he noted.

"In 1967, private health insurance in this country covered only about 22 percent of personal health care expenditures," he declared.

Reporters questioning Seidman were Judith Randal, medical editor of the Washington Evening Star, and Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Guest: Bert Seidman, Director, Social Security Department, AFL-CIO.

Reporters: Judith Randal, medical editor of the Washington Evening Star; Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Social Security.

The AFL-CIO has long sought the best medical care for all Americans that the wonders of modern medicine make possible. In an article published in the January issue of the American Federationist, the AFL-CIO's official monthly magazine, Mr. Seidman declared that the time has come for labor and other progressive groups to unite in a determined drive for medically advanced and economically sound national health insurance. Here to question Mr. Seidman about that proposal are Judith Randal, medical editor of the Washington Evening Star, and Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Miss Randal, I believe you have the first question?

RANDAL. Mr. Seidman, what exactly do you and the AFL-CIO mean by a national health insurance system?

SEIDMAN. Miss Randal, we consider national health insurance to be a system whereby people pay in advance, through a governmental insurance system like Social Security, for the costs of their health care.

We think that this ought to be divided three ways, with the employee paying one-third, the employer one-third and the government one-third. And, incidentally, this

is a system that many foreign countries have had for a long time.

RANDAL. You would vision this as voluntary or compulsory?

SEIDMAN. We think that in order for such a system to be effective, it should be a compulsory national health insurance system, just as Social Security and our other forms of social insurance are compulsory. In this way, all people would contribute. But, at the same time, all people would have the benefits of the system.

BRAZDA. Where do the existing health insurance companies—Blue Cross, Blue Shield and the many commercial companies—come in? Do you legislate them out of existence?

SEIDMAN. I wouldn't legislate them out of existence. It is at least possible that they might be able to provide some kind of complementary insurance, as they have for older people under the Medicare program. But I would think that most people would have most of their health care covered under the national health insurance system.

BRAZDA. This has been tried before—at least proposed before—has it not—the idea of national health insurance?

SEIDMAN. Yes, there have been bills in Congress for many years for national health insurance. During the Truman Administration, particularly, there were bills which were supported by the then AFL and the CIO, for setting up a national health insurance system. At that time, this effort was not altogether successful, but, instead, a conscious decision was made to try to get this kind of protection for the group that needed it the most—that is, the elderly. And, that is what we got under Medicare.

RANDAL. Do you envision that Medicare will become amalgamated with this? What would happen to Medicare?

SEIDMAN. I would expect that Medicare would become a part of the national health insurance system. As a matter of fact, you might say that national health insurance, in a certain sense, is Medicare for everyone.

It isn't just the elderly who have unmet health needs, and, it isn't just the elderly who have difficulty meeting the costs of their health care. There are many other people with the same problems. This is what national health insurance would do—it would cover everybody.

RANDAL. Now, since the advent of Medicare, we have had a very rapidly rising cost picture, where health care is concerned. Do you envision that you would have a "charge-what-the-traffic-will-bear" situation, as we now have with Medicare in open-end fee arrangement? What would be done to control this?

SEIDMAN. I would hope that if we set up a national health insurance system in this country, or, even under the present Medicare system, that we would begin to introduce controls on costs and incentives for efficiency and coordination that, up until now, we haven't had.

One reason we haven't had it is that the tail has been wagging the dog. In other words, people get the kind of medical care that they are able to pay for and sometimes this isn't the best medical care or the most efficient medical care. If all their health care needs could be met financially, then we could begin to put the system on a more rational basis.

BRAZDA. Under your idea, is everyone going to get the same sort of medical care—rich, poor, middle-income alike?

SEIDMAN. Under national health insurance, Mr. Brazda, everybody would have the same opportunities for health care.

When you say the same kind of health care, of course, that would be determined by their needs. A person who has a more acute illness will get a different type of health care than the person who is not quite so ill, or, depending upon the type of illness and so on.

But, everybody would have the same kind of across-the-board health care, ranging all

the way from prevention, through diagnosis, and treatment, and rehabilitation, and so on. Now, if people wanted to get their health care outside the system, they would have every right to do so. It wouldn't require all doctors to have their entire practice within the national health insurance system.

That, also, has been the experience of other countries, by the way, that have national health insurance.

BRAZDA. If you have a national, compulsory health care-health insurance program, why would anyone go outside it? What could they get by going outside the system?

SEIDMAN. The only answer that I can give you, Mr. Brazda, is that it may be a status symbol. You know, people who just want to go to the Park Avenue doctor and pay him more, so as to be able to say that they are paying more for their medical care than their neighbors are.

I can't think of any other reason, because, I think, people would be able to get good medical care under national health insurance.

RANDAL. This idea, of course, has been discussed for many years. What makes you think that it is now "an idea whose time has come?" Why is it politically feasible now, when it might not have been, say, a generation ago?

SEIDMAN. One reason, Miss Randal, is that we have now tried it. And, while the AFL-CIO has some criticisms of the Medicare system, we do know that the elderly are getting much better care under Medicare than they have ever had before.

A second reason for this is that people are becoming very much concerned about unmet health needs in this country. Not just those of the poor, but the unmet health needs of a lot of other people, as well. People are looking for some way of dealing with this on a comprehensive basis. As a matter of fact, a poll taken not too long ago by the Louis Harris organization showed that when asked whether they thought there should be a system of Medicare for everyone—which is essentially what national health insurance is—that 57% of those who had an opinion favored this.

I think that's quite surprising, in view of the fact that, as you say, Miss Randal, this has not been a burning political issue in the Congress in recent years.

BRAZDA. You are talking, then about a "poor care" program, aren't you—medical care payment program for the poor? This is really what you are proposing in proposing a national health insurance program, isn't it?

SEIDMAN. Not at all, Mr. Brazda—this is not a "poor care" program—quite the contrary.

We would try to put the incentives to make it a program of excellent medical care—and not just a program for the poor, either. It would be a program that would cover the entire population, as is now the case in many other countries.

BRAZDA. I have a good health insurance program through my employment and I expect that you do—most regularly-employed people now have health insurance of one sort or another. Are you going to do something better for these people, or are you going to simply supplement health insurance to make sure that everyone has it?

SEIDMAN. Well, in the first place, I think that there is often a very incorrect idea of the amount of health insurance that people do have and the coverage.

A considerable proportion of the population, perhaps as high as 70 or 80 percent, has coverage for hospitalization, but, the proportion of people covered for medical services other than surgical, is much smaller.

The fact is, and this may surprise some people, that in 1967, private health insurance in this country covered only about 22 percent of personal health care expenditures.

The government, through various programs, including Medicare, accounted for about a third. But 44 percent of all personal health care expenditures came out of the pockets of the people who were sick.

So, we don't have the kind of broad health care coverage under the present hodgepodge of systems that we have. That's why we are for a national, across-the-board health insurance system.

RANDAL. Mr. Seidman, one of the things that opponents of compulsory health insurance system frequently cite is that we are woefully short of health manpower and facilities. What do you think could be done about this in the face of the institution of such an insurance program?

SEIDMAN. I think one of the things that could be done is to improve the efficiency of the system.

We do have efficient health care for people who are in what's called prepaid group practice plans. These plans are not operated on the traditional solo practitioner basis—you know, the single family doctor system or the fee-for-service system. Instead, they are groups of doctors providing the whole range of medical services. People are in this system on what's called a capitation basis. That is, a person pays so much to the group that he belongs to, to cover all his medical services.

It has been found that this kind of approach to medical care provides a much more efficient system.

Fewer people go to the hospital, and hospital care is the most expensive kind of care. There is also a very great shortage of personnel for in-hospital care.

You even need fewer doctors under the group practice system, because there is a considerable emphasis on prevention that we don't have in our ordinary medical care.

These are the kinds of things that we think can be done under national health insurance.

BRAZDA. Speaking of doctors, Mr. Seidman—organized medicine, at least—which represents a good part of the doctors of this country fought Medicare with every resource at its command. How is organized medicine going to accept an idea of a national health insurance program with government backing?

SEIDMAN. Frankly, Mr. Brazda, I don't think that the American Medical Association is going to join with the AFL-CIO in fighting for national health insurance.

They weren't with us in the fight for Medicare, but we won that one. At the time, the doctors said they would never participate in the Medicare program, and so on. Yet, almost all doctors are participating in the Medicare program.

We think the same thing would happen under national health insurance. We don't expect the American Medical Association to support this. But, we do expect many progressive doctors who don't see eye to eye with the AMA to support us. And, we do expect that if the Congress, as we hope it will, enacts national health insurance, the doctors will participate in it.

RANDAL. Speaking of prepaid group practice, Mr. Seidman, this is illegal in many states. What kind of incentives do you think could be offered to get state legislatures to move on this—state legislatures, which tend, perhaps more than the national legislature, to be influenced by the AMA?

SEIDMAN. Well, I'm not a constitutional lawyer, Miss Randal, but I think that this can be done in one of two ways.

The hard way, of course, is to do it state-by-state. This is being done. That is, the repeal of laws which restrict or prohibit the development of prepaid group practice in a particular state.

The other way of doing it is to establish some kind of national standards which would, in effect, repeal these laws.

In any case, I think that we should do everything possible, both under our present arrangements and if we get national health

insurance, to encourage the development of group practice. This is the efficient way of making medical care available to more people.

BRAZDA. Do you actually have a plan? Do you have a national health insurance plan—clauses, and phrases, and sub-clause, and so forth.

SEIDMAN. If you mean, have we actually drawn up the bill that we will introduce in this session of Congress, the answer is, we have the general specifications for such a bill, but we haven't actually written any legislative language.

We would do that, of course, in cooperation with the Congressional sponsor of the legislation.

BRAZDA. Do you plan to do that in this session?

SEIDMAN. We do hope that legislation for national health insurance will be introduced in this session of Congress, along the lines of what I suggested at the beginning of the program. This is, tri-partite financing by employers, employees and the government. We think, incidentally, that workers would be paying less for better medical care under such an arrangement than they are paying now for inferior medical care.

BRAZDA. Well, this is not the most liberal Congress we have had in some time, even though it is Democratically controlled. How do you assess the chances this year and next year, in the 91st Congress, for such an expensive program?

SEIDMAN. Well, in the first place, I don't quite know what you mean by an expensive program. I think that what we have now is expensive. It is costly, inefficient medical care.

National health insurance, in the long run, would be much less expensive for the American people.

Of course, I can't predict what the Congress will do. I think that there is greater interest in national health insurance—some kind of system which would comprehensively cover the health needs of the American people—greater interest than there has been in a long time. This has been expressed by leading members of both political parties, and I think that there is a good chance for it.

At the same time, I think that we should also do everything possible to extend the present programs, until we can achieve national health insurance.

RANDAL. Mr. Seidman, you said earlier that the AFL-CIO has some criticisms of Medicare. I wonder, first of all, what they might be, and secondly, are you going to seek legislative remedies or are you going to let this drop, in the hope that you can get a national health insurance program launched?

SEIDMAN. Our main criticism of the Medicare program is that there are not sufficient cost controls or enough encouragement for the development of quality in the program. We do favor doing what can be done under existing law. We think that more can be done to control physicians' fees and hospital charges. If necessary, we favor legislation to do this.

Bills have already been introduced which would have the effect of moderating physicians' charges under Medicare.

RANDAL. Do you think they have much chance of passage in this session of Congress?

SEIDMAN. Whether those particular bills have a chance of passage or not, Miss Randal, I don't know.

But I do not think that many people feel that the increases that have occurred in medical expenses and medical costs are simply out of line. For example, there is a publication called Medical Economics, which goes to all doctors, and so far as I can tell, it is financed by the advertising of drugs and so on. That publication, which is not anti-physician or anti-AMA, said that for most doctors, expenses had risen only slightly or not at all, since the advent of Medicare, since there has also been an uptrend of pro-

ductivity. Frequent or large fee increases during the past two or three years are hard to justify, except, of course, in cases where they were overdue.

They make it clear that the 14 percent increase of fees over the last two years and the 20 percent rise of doctors' net incomes—income after expenses—are simply not justified.

As far as hospital expenses are concerned, as you know, everybody has been talking about the increase in hospital workers' wages. We feel that increase was long overdue, but actually, the non-salary hospital expenses have been going up faster than wage and salary expenses.

Non-salary expenses have gone up 27 percent in two years, as compared with only 18 percent for wage and salary expenses. Now this is the sort of thing that we think needs control, to keep these expenses in line.

If it is going to take legislation, then this is what we need.

BRAZDA. Your tri-partite plan—financing plan—envisions the federal government, under Social Security, paying a third, the employer paying a third and the employee paying a third. What about those unemployed widows and so forth, where there is no employer-employee relationship? Who pays that two-thirds?

SEIDMAN. Well, I would expect that under those circumstances, we would have the same situation we have under Medicare. The government would, as they say, buy into the program for people who are not employed, and can't afford to make the payments, and have no employer to make it for them.

BRAZDA. The federal government then would be paying the entire insurance for these people?

SEIDMAN. For people who are unable to meet the costs and are not employed—yes, that would be the case. But this is true under the Medicaid program now, as well.

BRAZDA. What about people who are employed, but who are temporarily unemployed? Would it be part of their unemployment insurance that their health insurance would be fully continued until they became employed again?

SEIDMAN. I think you would have some kind of arrangement whereby their health insurance would be continued under those circumstances. And, we do have this under private arrangements at the present time. I would see no difficulty in doing this.

But, the important thing is that national health insurance would cover all of the people with a full range of medical care. That's why the AFL-CIO feels that national health insurance is the way to deal with the health problems of the American people.

HARDEN. Thank you, Miss Randal, and thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Social Security. Representing the press were Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health, and Judith Randal, medical editor of the Washington Evening Star. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

A FAIR PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would increase the per diem allowance of Federal employees from the present figures of \$16,

\$30, and \$10 to a new set of figures of \$25, \$35, and \$15.

The fact is that this country is subject to severe inflationary pressure. All of our costs are rising, including the cost of hotels and necessities that every traveler needs. We are now asking Federal employees to finance Government business out of their own pockets since per diem does not cover their travel expenses when they represent the Federal Government away from their own homes.

Simple justice requires that we act and act soon, this week or next, on per diem allowances that are now a joke. These allowances must be changed so that they pay for the necessary expenses of traveling Government employees.

HOWARD BERTSCH

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, too often these days the departure of a great and dedicated public servant goes unnoticed and unheralded. Such a departure occurred when Howard Bertsch resigned after 8 distinguished years as administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

We in Oregon have long been proud of Howard Bertsch. Here is a man who devoted his entire adult life to the cause of small farmers and rural people—nearly 30 years.

He started his long career with the Federal Government with the old Resettlement Administration soon after graduating from Oregon State.

Working as he did in personal contact with the distressed and dispossessed farmers during the depression he developed a deep concern and a broad understanding of their problems and their needs. This experience also gave him new insight into the unshakable integrity, great will and ability of rural people to overcome adversity if only given the opportunity. These attitudes were to characterize his approach to his work and decisionmaking for the rest of his Government career.

He moved up steadily through the ranks of farm security and then the Farmers Home Administration. In 1949 he was put in charge of the agency's national farm ownership loans division.

In 1954 he went to Iran to serve as financial advisor to the development bank and the agricultural bank of Iran. For his work there, he was awarded "the Order of the Crown" by the Iranian Government.

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy called him back to the United States and appointed him as his Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration. Mr. Bertsch built a dedicated staff and a team that shared his concern for farm families, the rural poor and a desire to improve the rural communities. For his work that first year as Administrator he was awarded the highest honor the Department of Agriculture can bestow on any employee—the Distinguished Service Award.

Thus, there began in 1961 with the appointment of Mr. Bertsch a period of dramatic growth in services to rural people and a multiple increase in the agency's responsibilities.

The administration and Congress, concerned with rebuilding all of rural America to stem the flow of people to our cities, gave the agency a greatly expanded rural housing program, a series of rural community-building loan programs and credit tools to alleviate rural poverty.

In 8 years the credit assistance to farm families and rural communities—who were unable to obtain credit elsewhere—increased fivefold, from \$300 million in 1960 to nearly \$1.5 billion in 1968. In his final year as Administrator, Farmers Home Administration assistance was benefiting some 4.5 million rural people as compared to 900,000 in his first year on the job.

When he left office last month, the Farmers Home Administration was providing loan assistance to provide the equivalent of 50,000 new homes in rural areas to low and moderate income families. In his 8 years, the agency helped more than 3,000 rural communities to install water or sewer systems.

Mr. Bertsch had the satisfaction, as did the Nation, to see the impact of these programs on rural America. There is clear evidence that the exodus of rural people to our cities is slowing down and in some areas, rural population is increasing as business and enterprise are attracted to these communities who now have basic facilities and new homes.

The thrust and the momentum that Mr. Bertsch generated behind these programs to rebuild the countryside and improve the living environment of rural people will continue. This is the legacy this great and dedicated public servant has left to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I could not let the departure of this devoted and able man who gave a lifetime of service to rural people pass unnoticed and without a word of praise and appreciation for his contribution. Others of my colleagues who knew him and worked with him over these 8 years will, I am sure, join me in saying "well done and thank you, Mr. Bertsch."

CHEAP SHOE IMPORTS—ACTION NEEDED NOW

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire, and indeed the whole of New England, is largely dependent upon the textile and footwear industry, the major employer of the area. The manufacture of footwear plays a vital role in our economy.

Recent statistics show that the importation of foreign shoes continues to threaten and may soon outdistance our own manufacture. Imports in 1968 came to almost 30 percent of our domestic production and if these imports continue to grow at the present rate, by 1975 we

could easily have a situation where foreign manufacturers will produce over 50 percent of the footwear used in the United States. Some estimates go as high as 90 percent.

The following chart shows vividly the inroads being made in this important source of livelihood for the people of New Hampshire and other States:

SHOE IMPORTS—OTHER THAN RUBBER

Year	Pairs (in thousands)	Percent increase over previous year	Value (in thousands)	Percent increase over previous year
1963.....	62,820	14.1	\$89,545	11.6
1964.....	75,372	20.0	103,674	15.8
1965.....	87,632	16.3	118,478	14.3
1966.....	96,135	10.7	153,569	29.6
1967.....	129,134	34.3	217,593	41.7
1968.....	175,438	35.9	328,543	51.0

Mr. Speaker, how long can an industry endure this gradual erosion? Since 1958 we have been told repeatedly that the trend against the country's export position was only temporary. More than 10 years later can it still be considered "temporary"? Something must be done and it must be done now.

In this connection, I urge action on a bill which I have cosponsored—H.R. 7696—to promote equitable competition in this field. I urge thoughtful and careful consideration of this legislation and support when it comes up for a vote.

A PEOPLE-ORIENTED FARM PROGRAM

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill—H.R. 9009—which I consider to be a comprehensive program to strengthen marketplace income for farmers, reduce the influence of Government in the management decisions of farmers, and provide financial assistance to farmers who need skills training and other forms of assistance in order to develop off-farm income.

The emphasis of my bill is Government action to assist farmers in their adjustment as people to changing technology, in contrast to present farm programs which deal almost exclusively with Government action to adjust commodity supplies.

The principal provisions of the bill are:

First. The 5-year program begins January 1, 1971, and runs through December 31, 1975. It would amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. The program provides for a 5-year transitional period during which acreage controls, base acreages, marketing quotas, processing taxes, and direct payments for wheat, feed grains, and cotton would be phased out.

Second. Limit the total funds that may be spent on all direct payments for wheat, feed grains, and cotton under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to 80 percent of the amount spent on 1969 crops in 1971, 60 percent in 1972, 40 percent in 1973, and 20 percent in 1974.

Third. Reduce the cost of wheat certificates to processors to 80 percent of the

1969 level in 1971, 60 percent in 1972, 40 percent in 1973, and 20 percent in 1974.

Fourth. Effective with 1975 crops, discontinue all acreage allotments, base acreages, marketing quotas, processing taxes, and direct payments—annual land diversion, compensatory, and certificate—for wheat, feed grains, and cotton.

Fifth. Continue the cropland adjustment provisions of the act of 1965 with amendments: First, to require that programs be operated on a competitive bid basis with emphasis on whole farms; and, second, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to retire at least 10 million acres per year in 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975.

The Secretary would announce in advance the maximum acreage to be contracted for each year. If accepted bids do not exhaust this acreage, higher bidders could be offered the opportunity to negotiate contracts at the accepted bid level.

Provide that loan rates for wheat, feed grains, cotton, and soybeans, shall be set at not more than 85 percent of the previous 3-year average price, beginning with the 1971 crop year.

Prohibit the sale of CCC stocks at less than 150 percent of the current loan rate plus carrying charges, except when sales are offset by equivalent purchases in the open market.

In addition to and conditional on the adoption of the second, third, fourth, and fifth items: Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to offer a special transitional program in 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975, which would be open to any farmer who has had average gross annual sales of farm products of not more than \$5,000 and off-farm income of not more than \$2,000 per year for husband and wife for the immediately preceding 3 years. Such farmers would be eligible to receive one or more of the following:

First. Compensation for acreage allotments and base acreages surrendered to the Secretary for permanent cancellation. This would apply to all commodities having acreage allotments or acreages. Such compensation would be in addition to land retirement payments under the cropland adjustment program and would also be available to eligible farmers who wish to surrender their acreage allotments or base acreages without participating in the cropland adjustment program.

Second. Retraining grants of not to exceed \$1,000.

Third. Adjustment assistance of not to exceed \$2,500 per year for 2 years.

Fourth. Loans under existing credit programs further to facilitate the transition of eligible farmers to more gainful employment.

SNOOK WINS AGAIN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Snook, Tex., is not just a little town with a pretty name—it is a legend. Snook, for the third time, is the home of the Texas

class B championship basketball team. They won this title before in 1965 and again in 1966. They won it again this year at the Texas Interscholastic League Basketball tournament in Austin. They are due our heartiest congratulations.

I would venture to say that, in its league, Snook has won as many championships as any other town in Texas. I do not see how they keep on winning, but I am glad they do. It proves the boys have determination and strive hard to maintain their reputation. It proves also, that they are well coached. Jimmy Horn has taken his team to the finals five times in his successful career at Snook. He can take short boys and make them giants. The Snook Blue Jays gave up a height advantage of 1½ inches per man, but they have patented the delay game combined with a full court press.

The next time the nominees are considered for the Basketball Hall of Fame, Jimmy Horn should be in the running. I am honored to represent the people of Snook, and to point out to my colleagues that there really is such a place as Snook, and that it is a vibrant and successful little community in Burleson County.

DEVELOPING COLLEGES MAKE SENSE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the early days of the Peace Corps I was privileged to meet and work with Derek S. Singer, a dynamic and capable person who came to the corps from an outstanding career overseas with CARE and the International Cooperation Administration. He very ably served as Acting Director of Latin American Programs and as Chief of Programs for the East Coast of South America in Peace Corps—Washington and overseas as Peace Corps Director in Bolivia, Indonesia, and Tunisia.

Currently the director of the faculty development project of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Mr. Singer recently presented an incisive and challenging paper on the role of higher education in the world's developing nations and the important and meaningful contributions which can be made by 2-year colleges. The issues he has raised and the proposals made deserve our full and careful consideration.

I commend this paper to the attention of our colleagues and am pleased to insert it, herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD:

DEVELOPING COLLEGES MAKE SENSE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

(By Derek S. Singer)

I am convinced that the time has now come for many American junior community colleges to make plans to increase their involvement in international programs, particularly in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. A greater commitment of time, energy and resources would pay big dividends both for the less-developed

nations with which they can work as well as for many colleges.

Before joining the Association one year ago, I lived and worked abroad for 13 years, primarily in the less-developed countries. My assignments gave me the privilege of serving in posts as diverse as Bolivia, Colombia and Costa Rica; in Formosa (Taiwan), Japan and Indonesia; and in Tunisia and the Congo. In each case, I worked in jobs relating to economic, cultural and social development, usually in programs designed to accelerate the educational and manpower development processes of the "host country."

Positions which I held while assisting in the accomplishment of these goals included being a director of two CARE relief programs, a training officer for four AID (State Department) missions, and a Peace Corps director in three countries. In my judgment, all but one or two of the countries to which I was assigned needed and could support a modest national community junior college system, to supplement their predominantly European-oriented "white-collar" universities. In fact, at least two of them (Japan and Taiwan) already possess a national network of two-year post-secondary schools. Many other "developing countries" have also expressed recent interest to the Association in exploring for themselves the great potential of America's two-year college experience, and adapting its application to their own urgent, practical needs to provide trained manpower in development programs of national urgency.

Two such countries have already been mentioned. Some others which I know are seriously contemplating or actually experimenting with the flexible, pragmatic opportunities offered by community junior colleges include India, Ceylon, Chile, Brazil and Kenya. Several European countries also have pilot two-year colleges, particularly in specialized fields. Examples include hotel management (Germany), fashion technology (France), and distributive education (England). Such schools have often been developed with the cooperation of U.S. "sister" institutions. In addition, there are actually American-style AAJC member colleges in Switzerland, the Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico. In all probability, more of these programs are underway or being planned in still other countries, with particular stress on the technical and vocational fields in which trained manpower is in most acute demand, to match the pace of accelerating national development programs.

Today, volunteer assistance groups such as the Peace Corps, Papal Volunteers, and the Friends Service Committee, all provide paraprofessional personnel overseas on an interim basis. Working abroad with manpower supply groups such as these has indicated very clearly to me that the kind of young workers which they send often hold jobs which require the same kind of training and skills as are generally acquired by the graduates of many U.S. two-year colleges.

My own list of the "two-year college skills" most needed, and in shortest supply in the developing world, would include:

Automobile mechanics, diesel mechanics, farm machinery management, machinery and equipment maintenance and repair, secretarial and business, data-processing, engineering technology, medical laboratory technology, physics and chemistry laboratory technicians, X-ray technology, fire science, recreation and physical education, elementary education, community service.

Considering the relatively modest level of technology and industrialization in most of the developing countries, many of the more specialized programs at U.S. two-year colleges are not suitable for Asia, Africa, and Latin America. However, the situation is one which changes and rapidly evolves: new skills not required today may be urgently needed tomorrow. The establishment of a modest, flexible but growth oriented comprehensive community junior college system in many

of the newer countries overseas could well complement and facilitate the rapid modernization and growth which they so earnestly seek. Such a solid training infrastructure could prove invaluable to planners and programmers in many developing areas.

Beyond skills alone, introducing the "comprehensive" aspect of America's public community colleges could lend still another important dimension of the foreign two-year college movement. Enlightened leaders in many developing countries have come to realize that true "nation building" and country development programs must proceed hand-in-hand. The potential of community services, of adult education, and of the recreational, social and developmental "outreach" programs of U.S. community colleges can provide a unique and positive extra, to supplement the scholarly, research-oriented colleges and universities so typically found in many new nations. Even as they bravely strive to develop, grow and progress on many fronts at once, most of these states must also fight the ignorance, indifference, and inertia of a large proportion of their national population. To combat poverty, disease, and hunger effectively, such countries are discovering that they must first overcome the dead hand of the past. They must rid themselves of many inherited influences from a colonial history which gave them some benefits, but which most often discouraged initiative, cooperation, and our popular American spirit of working together as equals to tackle and solve common problems.

Although the community college approach could never solve all these problems, I believe that, wherever adopted, it could represent an important catalyst for civic pride and cooperation in many developing countries, where such national "rallying points" are in particularly short supply. Last year, Daly C. LaVergne, the director of AID's Office of International Training put the matter this way at AAJC's national convention in Boston.

The type of post-secondary educational institution most generally needed in the developing countries probably more nearly resembles the American junior and community college than the four-year college. In addition to the similarity of objectives (producing educated people who can immediately be absorbed by the critical skilled manpower needs of the wider community), the U.S. junior college and the developing country colleges face similar problems.

With all these advantages and benefits possible, why have there been so few opportunities for our community junior colleges to foster the growth of counterpart colleges abroad? Why have so few AAJC members been called upon to perform overseas, in contrast to the hundreds of American four-year colleges and universities which have enjoyed governmental contracts and foundation support for many years with technical assistance projects abroad?

Answers to these questions are neither simple nor easy to come by. Some of the reasons are historical. In its present form, the comprehensive community junior college has simply not been around as long as many of the better developed, many-sided university programs whose experience is now being tapped for the benefit of developing countries. Also, as mentioned earlier, an outdated, colonial-type attitude toward higher education has long been predominant in the majority of so-called new states. Thus national educational goals and attitudes favorable toward such practices as open-door admissions, extensive and continuing student personnel services, and a commitment to community outreach programs in general have been the exception, not the rule. It is only in very recent years that such historical biases as these have begun to change. Finally, perhaps, the U.S. two-year college movement and important sections of the developing world are ready to meet together on equal terms.

Another, more serious roadblock still remains. A number of AAJC member institu-

tions have formally signified an interest and willingness to expand their world studies programs, to welcome foreign students on their campuses, and to work toward an overseas faculty exchange program. Some would also send modest-sized education advisory teams to the less-developed countries. A number of these junior and community colleges constitute the membership of the Association's Committee on International Education, which currently represents 8 member colleges (and others interested in overseas work). In addition to these schools, representatives from at least a dozen other two-year colleges have also indicated to AAJC an abiding interest in seeking help and advice to develop some kind of program with an overseas counterpart school or college. And yet, with rare exceptions, the problem of "image" and "academic standing" has blocked most efforts to reach a "take-off" point with such programs. In government-sponsored projects particularly, invidious and unfavorable comparisons with the supposedly superior faculty, campus resources, and reputations of the "4/Us"—the four-year colleges and universities—have effectively prevented serious consideration of the community or junior colleges for AID or other government-sponsored education projects in the developing world.

Some noticeable recent evidence of this negative attitude can be found in an extensive AID report entitled *University Resources for International Development*. This study was prepared in 1968 for the Agency for International Development by the prestigious Academy for Educational Development in New York, and authored by Chester M. Alter, former Chancellor of the University of Denver.

It should be noted first that Dr. Alter's purpose was to compare and evaluate for AID the overseas performance record or "score" of several major categories of institutions of American higher education in carrying out AID contract programs abroad. There were nine classifications discussed, all subsumed under the general rubric of "universities." Only six two-year colleges were selected for the survey sample, although three or four times that number were sampled in most of the other categories examined. Not one member of the Academy's twenty-man study team, nor of its ten-man advisory committee, was drawn from a junior or community college. The great majority were presidents, deans, directors and senior faculty members from four-year colleges and universities. A further analysis of the study group and its committee reveals that at least six members were either then or formerly employed by colleges and universities which currently or recently held AID-financed contracts abroad. Needless to say, the community junior colleges had no such connections on Dr. Alter's study group.

Turning to the study itself, its approach and methods seem quite straightforward. Basically, *University Resources for International Development* tries to analyze several "criteria for excellence," as described in another report prepared by John W. Gardner in 1964 entitled *AID and the Universities*. In this study, Mr. Gardner also used the word "universities" in the generic sense, and listed eight separate areas in which he advised AID to establish and monitor high performance standards by its overseas contractors. These criteria included:

Institutional resources, caliber of faculty, interdisciplinary programs, research resources, administrative capability, overseas experience, quality of personnel, institutional commitment.

Considering both the historical limitations on community junior college involvement overseas (above), and the backgrounds of most of the survey members responsible for the study, its conclusions should probably surprise only the naive or the incorrigibly optimistic.

By and large, the impression gained from Dr. Alter's conclusions neatly illustrate the old adage of damning with faint praise. Here and there his report to AID does say a few kind words about the contributions which two-year colleges might make to a few particular development projects abroad. However, typically and almost inevitably a big "but" accompanies nearly every such reference. Some modification, restriction or proviso virtually emasculates whatever slight praise the author may give to the two-year college. To illustrate, a few quotations follow from *University Resources*, together with my brief commentary on each:

Quotation 1: A high degree of interdisciplinary sophistication probably would not be found in the typical junior college. Naturally, there are individual exceptions . . . (but) for the purpose of marshaling enough over-all strength to warrant a total institutional contract, many junior colleges would be found lacking.

Comment: To view the bias in this section of the Alter Report ("Caliber of Faculty"), one only need take note of the large "straw man" which the authors jerry-rig here, only to topple over with the greatest of ease. Logically neither AID nor the developing countries it serves should be interested in generalizations about the "typical" junior college, nor whether "many" such colleges may or may not be lacking in over-all institutional strength. While such generalizations are dubious and unsupported in themselves, there is something even more important. Assertions of this type are irrelevant and quite useless to foreign policy-makers who must carefully assess whether a specific community or junior college is both competent and willing to help AID implement significant portions of its educational assistance programs in some of the less-developed countries.

Quotation 2: The usual expectations of the typical junior college would lead to the conclusion that this criterion (personnel quality) probably or even usually, would not be met adequately.

Comment: In general, the comments made about the first example pertain. In addition, the superficial, unsupported generalizations of the report are particularly evident here. Whose "usual expectations of the typical junior college," one could ask Dr. Alter, and by which standards of "personnel quality" does the staff and faculty of the junior community college fall to measure up? Define your terms, professor!

Quotation 3: (In discussing foreign programs) a typical comment from junior college administrators is: "Yes, we are interested, . . . but frankly we are so new, are growing so fast and we have so many things to do here that we just have not had time to develop overseas work." Such expressions are not at all exceptional and are without doubt logical and legitimate.

Comment: Once more, can words such as "typical" and "not exceptional" truthfully be applied, considering that the (supposed) attitudes of administrators at only six two-year colleges are cited? Even more dubious and suspect is the condescension implicit in the concluding comments in this, the report's final section, entitled "Institutional Commitment". One reads in the report, "As of the fall of 1966 there was only one junior college on AID's list of university contractors." Forty universities, colleges and consortia were surveyed in the Alter report alone which held AID contracts at that time for training, research or technical assistance abroad. It seems reasonable to conclude that such "institutional commitment" becomes much easier to discern when a school has already enjoyed the generous support of one or more government contracts!

Many more examples could be cited. All in all, I believe that the conclusions drawn and the inferences left by this AID report are frequently distorted, sometimes biased, and often consist of such unsupported allegations

and meaningless generalizations as those that are quoted.

It is necessary to combat such distorted images of America's two-year colleges wherever that may be found. However, it is more important still to stress the positive, constructive potential of modern junior and community colleges for making creative and worthwhile contributions to the education and manpower development of the newer countries overseas. Everyone's time is wasted in contentious value judgments about which kind of institution has the "best" faculty, which has a greater institutional commitment, or which has a "superior administrative capability" to work effectively abroad.

In any case, the criteria devised by John Gardner for AID to measure the effectiveness of its overseas education contractors seem more applicable to help assess a different kind of performance. Quite possibly, a different kind of standard should be applied to the special contribution which the two-year colleges might make to foreign education assistance work. Writing in the *Junior College Journal* of May, 1958, Mr. Gardner made clear his conviction that excellence indeed could mean one thing for one group of schools, quite another for a different one. He wrote:

As things now stand the word excellence is all too often reserved for the dozen or so institutions which stand at the very zenith of our higher education in terms of faculty distinction, selectivity of students, and difficulty of curriculum. In these terms, it is simply impossible to speak of a junior college as excellent. Yet sensible men can easily conceive of excellence in a junior college.

The traditionalists might say "Of course! Let Princeton create a junior college and one would have an institution of unquestionable excellence!" That is correct, but it leads us down precisely the wrong path. If Princeton Junior College were excellent in the sense that Princeton University is excellent, it would not be excellent in the most important way that a junior college can and may be excellent. It would simply be a truncated version of Princeton. A comparably meaningless result might be achieved if General Motors tried to add to its line of low-priced cars by marketing the front end of a Cadillac!

Thinking back on my own years of service in the developing countries, I am certain that John Gardner's analogy was a perceptive and accurate one. Whether through government projects, by cooperation with foundation programs, alone or in consortia with universities, through exchanges with the small but growing group of "counterpart colleges" abroad, or in other ways, I am convinced that the particular excellence of our institutions can be focused with increasing effectiveness and growing results on programs of international studies, institutional service, and faculty enrichment. After all, the style, the motivation, and the goals of "democracy's colleges"—a uniquely American contribution to the world's educational growth and progress—do seem to fit the needs and aspirations of so many of today's developing countries. For many such nations, the community junior college may truly be a good idea whose time has come. One "old hand" at working to introduce the movement to such countries is Mr. William R. Kunsela, President of the State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College at Delhi. A few months ago, in a report to the AAJC Committee on International Education, Mr. Kunsela put the matter this way:

The fact that only a few of our institutions have had experience in developing countries should not be a deterrent, nor should it be interpreted as lacking interest.

The community college will be given the opportunity to apply its expertise on the international scene only at such time as the developing nations are encouraged to become familiar with and experiment with the community college as a solution to middle-

level manpower needs, and to this manner of expanding educational opportunity.

The Association intends to do its best to provide such encouragement, to awaken an international interest in the two-year college, and to stimulate the kind of frank and informed questions and dialogue which can lay the ground work for expanding the movement wherever and whenever representatives from the new countries are ready to "talk shop". Perhaps Uncle Sam may also want to take another look one day soon at the exciting resources which America's two-year colleges could contribute to America's assistance programs abroad.

COMPLICATIONS OF DESEGREGATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very frank, thoughtful column reflecting an objective grassroots commentary on complications of desegregation written by columnist Leonard Carriere was carried in the Thursday, March 13, Blue Island Sun-Standard.

The communities served by the Sun-Standard are encountering the typical complications of school integration problems. Mr. Carriere, an outstanding civic leader in his community, discusses the subject in a penetrating, thoughtful, and calm fashion:

COMPLICATIONS OF DESEGREGATION

(By Leonard Carriere)

Desegregation cases can get rather ridiculous when a mathematical formula is at the heart of the matter. Why otherwise intelligent people lose all sense of proportion when it comes to this area of thought I do not know. There must be something hypnotic in the magic numbers.

The U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to hear a case originating in the deep south from a school district that has a 60 per cent white and 40 per cent Negro student population. The problem does not arise over the mix of the students but rather over integrating the teaching staff. When the matter was heard in the Federal District Court having jurisdiction, there was a finding and an order that the teaching staff was to be integrated at 60 per cent white and 40 per cent Negro, or on a 3 to 2 basis. Without more, it is clear that the result was directly correlated to the racial proportion that prevailed in the district.

It did not rest there. The matter was taken up on appeal where it was reversed. Now the U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to look into the matter. What they will decide remains to be seen. It has some extremely interesting possibilities.

I cannot help but think in conjunction with these matters of the pledge of allegiance that the school children recite. In it, you will recall, there is a reference to "one nation, indivisible . . . with liberty and justice for all . . ." Now I ask, how indivisible is this nation that the Constitution seemingly requires a division based on racial proportions? How much justice is there when the prize goes not to the most capable but rather in accordance with someone's idea of a proper division? Where is the equality of opportunity, on either side, when it is necessary to make an allocation based simply on the fortuitous circumstances of the racial composition of a community? What has happened to the time-honored American doctrine that each of us stands on our merits irrespective

of race, religion, national origin or political affiliation?

Like the French poet Villon, one might also ask, "But where are the snows of yesteryear?" Gone my friends to the place from whence they came! However, let us get back to our 3 to 2 school district.

Assume that this particular district requires a teaching staff of 100. Following the formula, it becomes necessary to hire 60 white teachers and 40 Negro teachers. If, from the number of applicants, it develops that you have hired the 100 most capable teachers on a 60-40 basis, everything is fine. Yet, this would at best be a strange and rare coincidence. Suppose you have 150 applicants, out of which there are 80 exceptionally well-qualified and capable white teachers but only 20 equally well-qualified and capable Negro teachers. You cannot hire the other 20 white teachers as common sense would dictate. There is the formula. The same is equally true where you have the reverse, or 80 exceptionally well-qualified Negro teachers but only 20 of their white counterparts. To keep the balance you would need to hire 40 second-rate white teachers when you have available to you 40 better teachers that you must turn away.

Somehow it just doesn't make good sense to go about fulfilling one of our most fundamental obligations in this fashion. The children deserve better, unless one were to reward the pledge of allegiance to read as follows—"... to a nation infinitely divisible, as expediency may from time to time require—or as the population may from time to time change—with liberty and justice in accordance with the percentage I may from time to time bear to the whole—"

It isn't only the Danes whose nostrils are offended.

TUSCALOOSA

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pride that I call the attention of this House to the particular significance of the year 1969 in our great State of Alabama. This year we celebrate the 150th anniversary of our State and my hometown—Tuscaloosa.

The name Tuscaloosa, has been given to a city, a county, and a river in Alabama. In the language of the Choctaw Indians, "Tuska" and "lusa" signifies "warrior" and "black." Tuscaloosa was the name of a giant Indian chieftan whose village and tribe suffered a cruel fate at the hands of DeSoto in 1540. The United States later allowed the Creek Indians to establish their Black Warrior town in the year 1809, but in 1813 it was burned to the ground following an Indian revolt. Following this defeat of the Creek Nation by Andrew Jackson, white settlers began to enter the area where explorers only had been before, and the first settler in the vicinity was Thomas York in 1816.

The town was incorporated on December 13, 1819, which was 1 day prior to the State of Alabama's entering the Union. Beginning in 1826 and for over 20 years, Tuscaloosa was the State capital of Alabama. That period witnessed the opening of the University of Alabama and the building of the capitol and more than 35 of Tuscaloosa's elaborate antebellum homes. Also, many industries such as foundries, cotton mills, and canneries

began to locate along the banks of the Black Warrior River. From this early beginning, we have grown into a thriving community of over 75,000 people.

The University of Alabama was founded in our city in 1831 with an original student enrollment of 96 young men. The Tuscaloosa Female College and the Alabama Central Female College were later combined with our university which has grown to today's enrollment of over 20,000 students.

Historically, Tuscaloosa has been a center of educational opportunity, industrial development, economic progress, and wonderful living. We are proud of its heritage, enjoying the dynamic present and looking forward to a fantastic future.

Tuscaloosa celebrates its 150th birthday, April 19 through April 26, 1969. The citizens of our community, both young and old, as well as the many welcomed visitors who come, will share a wonderful fun-filled week of festivities, entertainment, historical pagentry and good old southern hospitality.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent of this House, I spread upon the RECORD a schedule of events for our 150th anniversary celebration in the city of Tuscaloosa, together with the names of our citizens who are participating in the planning and organization of the celebration:

SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMITTEE

General chairman: Tom Shurett.

Executive committee: Harlan Meredith, Charles Snyder, John Pradat.

Committee chairmen: C. J. "Cuz" Hartley, Mrs. William O'Conner, Lewis Manderson, Tom Moore, Bill Walker, Hillard Fletcher, Van Brown.

Committee members: Tom Hester, Joe Colquitt, James Kincaid, Lane Hubbard, Teddy Neilson, Mrs. Rainey Collins, Mrs. Byron Morris, Dayton Hale, Wayne Norwood, Cary Findlay, Mrs. Jimmy Hinton, Lou Couto, Mrs. David Partlow, Mrs. Harry Pritchett, Jerry Belk, John Ross, James Doster, Jimmy Walker, Don Barnes.

Kelly Tucker, Mrs. Sam Phelps, Travis Partain, Gary Fitts, Lyman Mason, Russ Chapell, James Cowden, Jim Wilder, Bill McGuire, Don Mize, Mrs. Thad Matkin, John Cade, Norman Bassett, Marvin Harper, Rufus Bealle, Otis Walters.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Saturday, April 19—Homecoming Day

The opening of all sustaining events, including Sesquicentennial Headquarters, Hospitality Center, exhibits and displays, historic sites, registration of dignitaries and former residents begins.

Opening Ceremonies at a central location by Sesquicentennial Officials.

Major Sesquicentennial Parade.

Annual Pilgrimage of the Tuscaloosa Preservation Society.

Post-parade reception and luncheon by the Mayor.

Sesquicentennial Anniversary Cotillion, a grand and dignified Celebration event climaxing opening day.

Sunday, April 20—Religious Emphasis Day

Monday and Tuesday, April 21 and 22—

University of Alabama Days

Annual festive days planned by the University with this year's events and activities programmed to the Tuscaloosa Sesquicentennial Celebration.

Wednesday, April 23—Business, Industry, Labor and Government Day

Special luncheon with the Greater Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce as host honor-

ing Tuscaloosa's outstanding leadership in the above areas.

Open Homes Tour: Antebellum and more modern homes of Tuscaloosa which many are desirous of seeing are opened to the public.

Tours of industrial facilities planned.

Premiere performance of the historical spectacular, "The Black Warrior Saga" with a cast of over 500 utilizing the entire arena floor of the Memorial Coliseum portraying in drama, comedy and music the thrilling highlights of Tuscaloosa's 150th commemoration.

Coronation ceremony for Tuscaloosa Sesquicentennial Queen and her Royal Court of Honor.

Thursday, April 24—Ladies Day

"White Collar Girls" breakfast, featuring an old fashioned style show of what the working girls of yesteryear wore.

Ladies Club luncheon honoring outstanding club women leaders of civic projects. The speaker will be the Honorable Patricia Hitt, Assistant Secretary, Community and Field Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Friday, April 25—Salute to Youth Day

Saturday, April 26—Sesquicentennial Men's Day

Burial of the Sesquicentennial Time Capsule, containing many Sesquicentennial souvenirs, letters to future government leaders, pictorial material of Tuscaloosa today.

THE USELESS SAFEGUARD

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to go ahead with the ABM system was unwise. I have stated the reasons for my own objections on many occasions in the past. Of all the criticism of President Nixon's decision, the following New York Times' editorial stands out in its brief but lucid exposition of the inadequacy of the President's present position on the ABM:

THE USELESS SAFEGUARD

President Nixon has put the best possible packaging on a bad decision. It would have taken bold executive leadership to reverse the policy on the Sentinel antiballistic missile system which Mr. Nixon inherited from the Johnson Administration; to overrule Secretary of Defense Laird and the Pentagon planners, and to confront the military-minded Congressmen on Capitol Hill who automatically equate more weapons with more security.

Instead, the President offers the nation a delusive compromise. He has moved the proposed ABM sites away from the cities to make them less visible to justifiably angry taxpayers. He promises a saving of \$1 billion in next year's budget, but the ephemeral nature of that saving is made plain by his own estimate that over the next several years the ABM system will cost \$6 to \$7 billion, or more than Sentinel would have in the Johnson version. Moreover, all experience with the spending habits of the Pentagon suggests that this project will wind up costing much more than any initial projection.

The President has placed his emphasis on protecting the nation's Minuteman missiles, which is technically feasible to some extent, as against the original impossible goal of providing realistic defense for the cities against a massive Soviet attack. But he has also retained the anti-Chinese orientation of Sentinel, claiming that the ABM system

would defend the country against the Communist Chinese for the next ten years. It adds up to an unconvincing package.

To shift part of the ABM system into the role of protecting the American nuclear deterrent accents the most plausible—and least destabilizing—case for this project. But it is still a hollow case. The increased measure of protection is decidedly marginal. It is simply not a sensible way for this country to invest several billion dollars in this tense period of domestic crisis. The nation's awesome nuclear striking power affords all the protection that is needed. It is not necessary to add this Maginot Line in the sky when there are so many alternative uses for the money here at home.

As for the threat of the Chinese Communists, they have not shown themselves over the past twenty years to be more reckless than the Russians. What basis is there for believing that Peking will launch an attack on American cities with comparatively unsophisticated missiles and thereby foolishly risk a devastating American nuclear retaliation?

The best that can be said for this decision is that by moving the ABM sites away from the cities, the President has removed at least for the present the danger that Sentinel would actually be the beginning of a "thick" defensive system. The building of such a system would not only be fantastically expensive but might also make the Russian leaders genuinely fearful about United States intentions. But President Nixon could have disposed of this entire issue more effectively if he had called upon the Soviet Government to begin arms control talks now and announced that he would withhold a decision on the ABM system until he saw how those talks were progressing.

It is now up to the Senate to defend the national interest. The ABM system is a project as wasteful as the Pyramids and not much more useful. It is not necessary for a majority of the Senate to remain in bondage to the Pentagon pyramid-builders in order to show that they care about the defense of this country.

WOUNDS FATAL TO LINCOLN GI

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Army Sp4c Lee D. Thomas, a brave young man from Lincoln, was recently killed serving his country in Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

WOUNDS FATAL TO LINCOLN GI: SP4C LEE THOMAS KILLED IN VIETNAM

The combat death of a young Lincoln serviceman in Vietnam has been reported by the Department of Defense.

Army Spec. 4 Lee D. Thomas, 18, was killed Friday, according to a telegram received by his parents, Ronald and Cella Loop of 178C Port Vue Road.

The telegram said Spec. Thomas died as a result of wounds suffered when the military vehicle in which he was riding was ambushed. Spec. Thomas entered the Army in July, 1967, and was assigned to Vietnam in October of last year. He had attended South Allegheny High School.

Funeral arrangements will be announced by the Jack L. Teichert Funeral Home, Duquesne, following return of the serviceman's body from Vietnam. Military services will be conducted.

NEWS CONFERENCE BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DAVID PACKARD

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. David Packard, has been supervising the Defense Department's review of the ballistic missile issues. On March 14, 1969, shortly after the conclusion of the conference at which President Nixon announced his decision on the ABM system of substantially modified design, Mr. Packard at the Pentagon presented an excellent briefing in which the system was described in more detail.

In order that all Members may have a readily available, more complete description of the system as presented by Mr. Packard, I include the text of his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

NEWS CONFERENCE BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DAVID PACKARD

Mr. PACKARD. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to have the opportunity to come before you today and give you the results of some of the things that we have been working very hard on, as you might expect, for the past few weeks.

Mr. Laird, Dr. Foster, the Service Secretaries, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and I have examined thoroughly the ballistic missile defense issues. We have examined the needs for such a defense, the objectives of the program, the technical feasibility and the various alternatives available. After this extensive review, we forwarded our conclusion and recommendations to the President. These views can be summarized as follows:

1. We have not recommended deployment of a defense of major cities against a massive attack, the kind the Soviets could launch, because it would not materially increase our security. We must deter such attacks with our retaliatory forces.

2. Protection against ballistic missiles can and should be made available to our land-based nuclear-war deterrent forces. Such added protection will help insure the survival of the American deterrent forces in the face of the still growing Soviet threat. We recommended that an ABM system be configured so that extra protection and warning will be given to missiles, bombers, and the national control center as the threat develops.

3. The people of our country can be protected effectively from a small missile attack, the kind the Chinese Communists will probably be able to launch sometime in the 1970s. We judge such a defense to be a prudent and practicable measure and recommended that it be deployed as the threat develops.

4. Locating sites away from major cities should make clear to the Soviet Union that the American defense is designed to preserve our deterrent—not to change the strategic balance. We recommended that the sites for ABM radars and missiles be determined by the needs of the defense and that they be moved away from cities to the extent practical.

5. A careful review of existing ballistic missile defense components convinces us that the program is sound and feasible technically. We so informed the President.

6. A phased installation of a ballistic missile defense will provide the option to meet the threats as they materialize. We recommended a specific deployment plan to meet this objective.

7. Such a deployment plan would provide

for early shake-down of integrated operational components and offer the most economical deployment.

8. A decision to deploy such a defense and the pacing of the deployment is fully consistent with our national objective of meaningful agreements with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic offensive and defensive systems.

9. A rigorous research and development effort is needed to seek better ways to defend against enemy missiles. We recommended that these efforts be continued.

The Department of Defense sent the President its analysis of four basic possible resolutions of the ballistic missile defense issue. These options were:

1. A heavy defense designed to protect major cities against a massive attack.

2. The existing Sentinel.

3. Modifications of Sentinel that would improve planned protection of our deterrent forces as the threat materializes, protect our population against a small attack, and demonstrate clearly that we are not attempting a heavy defense of major cities.

4. Cancellation of Sentinel, continuing just research and development but with no real option to deploy a defense in the next two or three years, regardless of the threat that may develop.

The President, as you know, rejected a heavy city defense, rejected the option of no defense and approved the phased protection of our land-based forces and the light, overall protection of population. This deployment will permit a shift of radar and missile sites away from major cities.

Our budget-revision request to the Congress will reflect those Presidential decisions. Budget details will be announced when they have been submitted to the Congress. In general, I can say that the President's decision will permit us to reduce ballistic missile defense obligation in this fiscal year and the next by a total of \$1 billion. Total investment costs of the fully deployed missile defense will be somewhat more than the Sentinel.

The net effect of the new decision is to establish a Modified Sentinel program which will enhance our ability to deter a massive attack and provide a capability to defend against a small attack. Thus, for an acceptable cost, we add significantly to the credibility of our deterrent posture and to the security of the American people.

The concepts involved in protection against missile attack are complex. They have raised many difficult questions during recent public discussion of the Sentinel system. In order to contribute to an informal discussion, I want to describe the Modified Sentinel, particularly its deployment sequence, and finally answer further questions that you might have.

In presenting a description of the system, I am very well aware that many of you have studied this issue over the last few weeks and know a good many of the details, but I would like to go through the whole system very quickly with you so that we have an understanding about the terms. Then we can get into any issues that are still troubling you in the question period.

Question. When did the system acquire that name, Mr. Packard?

Mr. PACKARD. We would appreciate it if you would hold off questions until we are through and everybody gets a shot at him.

Mr. PACKARD. I think it's helpful to talk about the concept of an area defense and the concept of a localized defense. The two work together in the system, but I think it's helpful in looking at it in these two different concepts.

In the area defense concept we have a Perimeter Acquisition Radar, which we call PAR, which has a long range; its range is limited by the horizon and it can see out far enough so that as an enemy target comes

in, the PAR can pick up the target, acquire the threat; information is fed from the PAR back to a computer system located in the area, and the track of the incoming missile is predicted, and the possible point of impact, the probable point of impact, I should say, is provided by the PAR.

As the missile approaches more nearly the range of the Spartan missile, it is picked up by the missile site radar which then acquires the target, and also provides the guidance information for the Spartan to produce the intercept at a point high above the atmosphere and at a considerable distance away from the site of the radars, the missiles and the target.

I want to point out particularly that in the area defense configuration of the system, the operation of the system, the Spartan impacts the incoming weapon at a very high altitude.

There has been some talk about possible effects from the fact that this impact is with a nuclear warhead. I want to assure you that there are no significant effects on either people or property because this intercept is made at a very high altitude, above the atmosphere of the earth.

The terminal defense concept involves a capability which if for any reason, the area defense capability does not acquire the warhead, the warhead then is still within the range of the MSR radar, it comes down into the atmosphere and a very fast missile called the Sprint is sent, again guided by the missile site radar to a point of impact below the atmosphere.

I would like to go through the basic components of the system. Again I expect you have heard a good deal about these, but I wanted to go through them again for you.

The Perimeter Acquisition Radar, the PAR. It is a very large building. It is large because it needs a very large radar phase to provide the long range capability, the accuracy, and to be able to provide the information for the system to do the jobs that the system has to do.

It has a detection range of greater than 1,000 miles. It is in a building that is some 200 feet square and 130 feet high. It has an antenna diameter of 112 feet. Just as a matter of interest, this radar uses what we call a phased array principle. In order to provide the capability for this system, it has to be able not only to detect the enemy warhead out quite some distance, it has to be able to detect a number of them, if necessary, because we have to be prepared for a number of missiles coming in at the same time.

The radar provides for an electronically swept beam so that this beam can be swept across the sky very rapidly and a great deal of information can be acquired from this.

The concept you are familiar with is a bid disc that's moved around mechanically and would not be suitable at all for this sort of a system.

The PAR is in this development status. The components have been tested. Because it is a large installation it has been decided that the first radar would be assembled and tested at an operational site. I am confident that the technology involved in the PAR is well known and sufficiently reliable so that this proposed procedure is entirely appropriate.

The missile site radar is designed with the same general technical principles, the phased array principle, and has to do very much the same kind of a job that PAR does, except that it has a shorter range and provides to again pick up the position of the missile and also to guide the local Sprints and Spartans to the intercept point.

This has a detection range of several hundred miles. It is not quite as large as the PAR—120 feet by 120 feet. A good deal of it is placed below ground because it is desirable that it be hardened because it is located in the area where there might be targets.

The prototype unit of the missile site radar has been installed at the Kwajalein test area, and is undergoing tests out there to check out and work out its operational capability.

One of the things I might point out, you can see the picture indicates that the missile site radar has faces on two sides, it actually has faces on all four sides, and one of the changes we made in the system, which will come out later, is to add some additional faces to these radars.

The Spartan missile is the long range missile which is used with the area defense concept. As you can see, it is a rather large missile. It has a thermonuclear warhead. There have been flight tests in progress. Actually, successful flights have been accomplished in intercept. Additional work will be necessary for the warhead development. On this point, the question has been raised whether we are going to have to test these warheads in the atmosphere. The answer is we do not intend to do so. We can handle this with the present underground testing program.

The Sprint, as I said, is a very fast missile. It has to get off the ground and get up and intercept the incoming warhead when it is within the atmosphere. This is really a very tremendously impressive development. There have been successful flight tests and I have no doubt at all about the capability of this component of the system.

The area defense concept is provided by the Perimeter Acquisition Radar to intercept the warhead a long way out, the missile site radar to acquire it when it is within range, and to guide the Spartan or Sprint to the intercept point.

This shows you about the coverage that you get with the Spartan so-called area defense capability and this is a simulated location to give you some idea as to the approximate coverage you would get in the area defense concept with one missile installation. This doesn't represent a particular installation in our program.

In studying this problem, I've had the opportunity to go rather carefully through the technical capabilities of these components that I have described to you. There is one other component that is very important in the system and that is a large computer. Because the information from these two radars is fed into the computer, a good deal of calculations have to be made and the information sent back to the radar and the missile to provide guidance for the intercept.

The computer capability is extensive and is one of the things that provides a very impressive capability for the entire system. I have looked into that and looked into the things that the computer is expected to do. I am confident that we will be able to tie the system together effectively with the computer capability that is well within present technology, and I see no difficulty in being assured that this can and will be done.

In addition to looking at the capability of the system, to try and decide in our own minds whether this proposed system would indeed do the job that was suggested for it, or such other jobs as might be appropriate, we also felt it was desirable to go back and see if there have, in fact, been changes in the threat between the time the system deployment was proposed back in 1967 and the present time.

You will recall that when the present Sentinel deployment was proposed, it was said that the Chinese ICBM threat was imminent. It was thought that their ICBM capability might be approaching the test stage. It was also thought at that time that the Soviet ICBM effort was leveling off, or was expected to be leveled off.

It was also thought that we would have adequate warning for our bombers to get off in case they needed to be used. There have been some changes in the information we have and the way we see the threat be-

tween then and now. I would like to go through those with you on a specific basis.

The Chinese ICBM is still delayed, but we think it is still expected. They have, in fact, as you know, gone ahead with their thermo-nuclear warhead development. They have actually tested thermo-nuclear warheads of rather impressive size.

We know also that they have done more work in expanding their missile test facilities, so there is still a good deal of concern and, I think, agreement that the Chinese ICBM threat which was predicted in 1967 is still likely to come about sometime soon, and we still, therefore, believe that this should be taken into consideration in such deployment as we might propose.

One of the things that impressed me very much in the studies that I have made is that we have a good deal of evidence, I think quite hard evidence, that the Soviet ICBM deployment and development is continuing. It was this that caused us to take another hard look as to what we should do with this ABM capability.

We also know that the Soviets have been moving ahead with a rather active program in producing Polaris-type submarines. They are now in production. They are not yet deployed as far as we know. But this gives the Soviets the possibility of launching missiles from locations close to our shores, and we are very much concerned about this threat of reducing the ability of our bombing force to get off in case we need it.

I think there was some talk about the fractional orbit bombardment system at the time the previous decision was made. There has been some further work on that and it looks as though the Soviets may be planning to use this for some purpose.

Before I talk about the specific recommendations that we made, I would like to take a minute or two and give you a little outline as to the differences between the job of protecting our cities against a nuclear attack and the job of protecting our deterrent forces.

In the terms that you use in this business, cities are what you call soft weapons, they are easily destroyed, easily destroyed and we get into the very important concept that you can use smaller weapons, a large number of smaller weapons is in fact just as effective against cities as a smaller number of large weapons.

Further, that it really does not take very many nuclear warheads to give an acceptable destruction to the cities. On the other hand, when you are trying to defend a single position, particularly a hard point, such as the Minuteman in a silo, this can be done more effectively with a larger weapon, and it requires more accuracy.

In a city defense, you don't really have to worry too much about your missile accuracy, but if the enemy develops or has large warheads which can be delivered very accurately, this poses a very serious threat against the Minuteman even in hardened silos, and the differences between the problem of trying to protect a city and trying to protect hardened Minuteman silos and other hardened positions is a significant factor in coming to the decisions and the recommendations we have made.

So we recommended, really, four different alternate deployments of the ABM capability. They are, of course, different gradations between these, but I think this gives a fairly effective range which enables a decision to be made.

We considered a thick anti-Soviet defense of our cities. We looked into this very carefully. As I have indicated to you, we rejected the thick anti-Soviet defense as not being a desirable thing to do at this time. We reviewed the original Sentinel, looked at its characteristics and considered the desirability of recommending simply that the President continue with the present Sentinel program.

We considered some modifications to the Sentinel program, which I will describe in more detail to you in a moment, and we also considered the possibility that we should not have an ABM defense, or in that general range might simply fall back to a research and development program.

I am sure you heard the President's speech this morning and know the decision that he has made as a result of our recommendations. I think, then, it might be well for me to go through and give you a little more detail about the system that we have proposed to him and that he has recommended to proceed with.

This is the modified Sentinel program which we have recommended and which the President has decided to proceed with. I will point out first that this rejects the thick system. This rejects the concept that we try to defend our cities against a heavy Soviet attack.

We looked at the possibility, needless to say, if it were possible to completely defend our cities from a ballistic missile attack, a nuclear attack of any kind, it would be a very desirable thing for us to do, and if we felt that this could be done with present technology we would have certainly recommended this to the President, and I rather anticipate he would have considered it very carefully. But we do not believe this is the right way to go and I think the President outlined the reasons quite well this morning, as we outlined them to him.

The second and important factor in the modified Sentinel program that we have recommended is that this plan gives the President the opportunity to deploy the system as the threat develops.

Third, and, of course, essential in the consideration, is that the system we are recommending is designed to provide for increased protection of our deterrent forces. This, of course, is a very important factor. We have shifted the emphasis from the defense of our cities to the defense of our deterrent forces.

The system that we are recommending does provide, continues to provide, the area defense of our population against a light or an irrational attack, or against accidental launches.

The system that we are deploying provides about the same measure of area defense capability as the Sentinel system provided, but it did not provide a base on which you can build a thick system.

We have recommended that the national command authority be included in the protection. Here, of course, we are talking about providing this capability close to a city because the most important center of our national command authority is in the city of Washington, and if we are to provide adequate protection for the national command authority, it would be necessary to put the full system in the area of Washington.

The President is not recommending that as an initial step. This preserves the option for the President to curtail or re-orient the system if arms control agreements are reached.

Our recommendation included a recommendation to strengthen our R&D effort, or looking toward a providing for such improvements in the system that might be feasible, even though we propose to start some installations as quickly as we can.

The final deployment will not be achieved even on the first of the two systems we are recommending until several years later and we believe it is prudent to continue a strong research and development effort.

Because the deployment is going to be measured against the threat, this gives us an opportunity to incorporate such improvements as may be able to be achieved from this R&D effort as the deployment moves ahead.

And, of course, this recommendation we are making moves the sites away from major cities. Again I want to emphasize that at least in my studies and in the conclusions that I have come to in studying this matter, this is

very important because this provides us with no base in the system we are recommending for the thick deployment for any base for going ahead with the thick system.

Now let me go through and give you a little more information as to specifically what we are recommending to do in the immediate future.

We are going to include in the FY 1969 budget revisions and the FY 1970 budget provision, obligational authority to start construction and procurement to be able to install sites in two Minuteman wings.

These will be up in the northern areas of the country and this program is planned to include two complete systems, including Perimeter Acquisition Radars, the missile site radars, the Sprints and Spartans.

One of the reasons we are doing this is because this is a complex system and we believe it is very important to move ahead and be able to have one completely operational site ready to work on the test and shakedown as early as possible.

In looking at this I have concluded that in a system like this you are not likely to have all of the problems worked out in the laboratory or in experimental work, and I therefore think it is very important that we proceed to have an actual operational site so we can put the radars and computers together and have the whole thing so that we can shake out the problems of adjustment, test and so forth, that are certain to be necessary in a complex system of this kind.

We are recommending also that we proceed with surveys, with site selection, and actually we are going to recommend that we go ahead and acquire all of the sites necessary for the deployment that may evolve if we follow this development and the President decides to go ahead.

We are recommending that because we hope to provide for the President, in recommending this option, the ability to move ahead more rapidly if he decides that is desirable. And in order to do that we have looked at two factors which we think might be significant in pacing the deployment, if he does decide to go ahead more rapidly.

One of them is this matter I have already mentioned, of getting a complete operational site so we can get on with the shakedown that is going to be necessary.

Second is to go ahead with the selection of the sites so that we can have all of the site available and not have delays that might be incurred in the site selection.

We are going to plan, as I've already indicated, to continue all necessary RDT&E. I might say when I talk about RDT&E there have been some suggestions that maybe we haven't looked at some of the other kinds of ABM systems that some of the Services are recommending. I assure you we have and we do indeed have some other development money to continue exploration of other kinds of ways of doing this job. But we conclude that this is the way to go ahead at this time.

The program we are recommending is going to include in the Fiscal Year '69 budget revision; and the Fiscal Year '70 budget revision which will enable us to move ahead on the installation at these two Minuteman sites and to acquire the sites necessary for the rest of the system.

The construction toward the deployment of other parts of the system or the whole system will be determined by considerations that may be made at a later date by the President.

These considerations will be determined by how the arms talks come along and how the threat develops. For example, if arms talks are not successful, and there is a continued increase in the USSR threat, we can move ahead with more protection for more of our Minutemen; we can go ahead and deploy on other sites, or we can go ahead with any combination of these as might be thought appropriate at the time.

If the developing Chinese threat actually develops, then we will have to consider the possibility of going ahead to provide the area protection, and we will have the sites available and we can move ahead on that program. (Chart 12)

This shows a map giving the location of both the sites which we are proposing to begin with right away and what we see now as the deployment of the full system at such time as it may be appropriate to deploy the entire system.

Let me point out some of the changes that we have made from the Sentinel program as I go through the map. In the first place, we are locating these installations at or near Minuteman bases, and we will provide for the opportunity to do that at other Minuteman bases in addition to these two if we decide to go ahead.

We are recommending that the other sites be located so that they will be in the general area of our bomber bases or other facilities which we think are important.

They will not be located adjacent to cities unless we find some area where we can't get close enough to bomber bases without being close to some city. I don't think that is a very serious problem.

One of the things that has changed as I indicated is that the submarine launched missile threat from the Soviets is now in our view a serious one. This had made it necessary for us to add perimeter acquisition radar in the Southern California area and in the Florida area. It has also made it necessary for us to provide additional faces on these perimeter acquisition radar so that they can look out over the ocean areas where submarine deployments might be located; the same way on the East coast. We have, therefore, provided a more comprehensive look around the country with the perimeter acquisition radar.

We continue to maintain a strong picket line, you might say, of the sites across the northern boundary of the country. This is important because the threats from the land based forces of both the Soviet Union and the Chinese tend to come generally from this direction.

We have, as I have already told you, added complete look-around capability at all of the missile site radars. In the Sentinel deployment it was not considered necessary to provide for this threat coming from other directions, so we have added that capability.

These sites in almost all cases will have both perimeter acquisition radar, missile site radar, and both Sprints and Spartans. You can see the blue circle indicates the locations where we will have the perimeter acquisition radar, the five across the top of the country and the two down here (indicating) to provide this protection for submarine launched missiles. All of the sites will have missile site radar and they will also all have both kinds of missiles.

The Washington, D.C. location, as I have already indicated, is we think the important one, in terms of the command control capability.

So now, Ray, if I could have that next to the last chart again. Well let me just take one more minute and reemphasize again what we plan to do in the initial step. We plan to ask for construction money and money to proceed with the production of the components for the installation of two complete systems at the Malstrom Air Force Base and the Grand Forks Air Force Base.

These are Minuteman missile site locations. We plan to ask for funds to purchase sites at all of the points you see here on the map. Again, we think that is important so that if we do find the threat develops and it is necessary to proceed more rapidly, that will save us some time in ability to move ahead.

So, if I could go back and just summarize for you, the system that we are proposing, what we proposed in this plan to the President was the modified Sentinel, you might

call it. It's important, I think, to emphasize that it's based on the concept which rejects the idea that we can protect our cities from a heavy Soviet attack and provides for a deployment on which it is not possible to build such a deployment. Yet, it gives us the capability of measuring the deployment as the threat develops.

It is concentrated largely on the protection of our deterrent forces, our land based deterrent forces. It provides for the defense of our population against the light or irrational attack from third country launches. It provides for protection of the national command authority. It provides protection from this submarine launched missile threat that we have described.

We plan in this program to strengthen our R and D effort. We believe this is the least that should be done at this time in order to provide the capability that this country needs to make sure that our nation will be safe.

Before I answer questions, we would like to show this very short film for you. Then I will be glad to come back and answer whatever questions you have.

This is the Kwajalein area here. Do we have a soundtrack with this or shall I be the soundtrack?

Mr. FRYKLAND. Norm?

Question. Is this a PAR?

Mr. PACKARD. That is an MSR. I have not seen this. This is a test at Kwajalein where we are actually firing some missiles guided by MSR.

Question. Is that a Spartan?

Mr. PACKARD. That is a Spartan. There have been a number of successful intercepts with the Spartan. Not of course with a nuclear warhead on them.

That is a Sprint there.

That Sprint is really a tremendously impressive development.

Question. This is a slow motion film, isn't it?

Mr. PACKARD. Yes. It goes a lot faster than that.

Question. You had only one firing of the Spartan? Were there two firings of the Spartan?

Mr. PACKARD. There were two firings of the Spartan in that picture. There have been more than that. All right, we will have some questions now.

Question. Can the Spartan and the PAR handle the sophisticated decoy problems? If not, why are they necessary for missile base protection?

Mr. PACKARD. We have looked into that question rather carefully and the answer is that we believe that they can handle the penetration aid problem very well. I can't assure you that we can handle all possible aspects of it, but I am confident we can handle the penetration aid problem and I think our technology is good on that.

Question. That is in the face of the Presidential Science Advisor's recommendation or conclusion?

Mr. PACKARD. I have looked into this thing very carefully and I think in spite of the fact that there are some of our scientist friends around who think it can't—I have been working with scientists for a long time and I find they are not always in agreement with each other.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you explain why the cost of your system is nearly a billion and a half more than the previous system yet it has possibly a half dozen complexes fewer?

Mr. PACKARD. In order to do the job that we believe needs to be done we found it necessary to provide additional capability in the system. I have already told you we have to put more faces on the PAR radar. We have to put in additional PAR and that is a fairly extensive installation. We've gone back and put in the missile site radar, the capability of looking all around. We have added

some more Sprints in the plan, not a great many more. Also by providing the flexibility, we got a little cost when you put flexibility into a system. But in general we are providing additional capability for the money and we think it is the right way to go.

Question. What will this new budget figure be? I thought the President indicated that it would be half of a total figure now, but that this was \$1.8 which would reduce it to almost a billion dollars.

Mr. PACKARD. The plan that we are proposing is a little complicated because it combines both the FY '69 budget and the FY '70 budget.

The reduction that will result from changes in both of these budget authorizations will be about \$1 billion less than was in the previously proposed program.

Question. It is 1.8 plus another billion. That is what?

Mr. PACKARD. The round figures are there was a 1.9 in the '69 budget, 1.8 in the '70 budget, and these will be reduced. I don't remember the exact figure. We will get some reduction in '69 budget and some additional reduction in the '70 budget. So the two combines will be about a billion dollars less.

Question. Mr. Packard, would you tell us something about the so-called protection of the national command center or Washington, D.C.?

Mr. PACKARD. We think this is an important element in the program because the decision making process at the time any crisis might come about could be crucial. I think this simply says I certainly don't subscribe to a system that we can program a computer and put all the information in it and have it make the decisions. We have to preserve the ability for somebody to make the decision on these matters and we think the protection of the command capability is important. I can't assure you of the timing on this but we think this is a very important element in any system.

Question. Mr. Secretary, is the southern New England site the Sentinel site in Andover and Reading that you already own?

Mr. PACKARD. I don't know. I can't tell you exactly where those sites are. We are going to go out and reconsider all of the sites in terms of the new concept.

Question. Mr. Packard, I would like to follow up that one question. Don't you think you are going to get a political kick-back since Washington, D.C. is the only city in the country that is being protected?

Mr. PACKARD. I guess you can anticipate that as well as I.

Question. Mr. Secretary, can you break down the \$6 to \$7 as between production, construction and R and D?

Mr. PACKARD. I don't know that I have a complete breakdown on that. I think the best thing to do, if you would like to have that, we can get it for you.

Question. Can you tell us how many Spartan missiles and how many Sprint missiles in total would be in this?

Mr. PACKARD. Yes, I think so.

Mr. FRYKLAND. No, you can't.

Mr. PACKARD. No, I can't. That is classified.

Question. Can you tell us how many will be at each site?

Mr. PACKARD. No, we can't tell you that.

Question. Can you tell us when it was decided not to put the city of Washington into the initial program along with the two missile sites? When was it decided not to go ahead with that in the initial—

Mr. PACKARD. Let me go back and tell you why we decided to do what we decided to do.

In looking at this whole system, I was anxious that we move ahead with a complete system so we could put these components together, put them together with a computer and, as I have already indicated, do the check-out.

We didn't think it was appropriate to do that at Washington. We thought it would

be desirable to do that at the Minuteman site where we could undertake some testing and do the things necessary to get the system checked out. So we selected these two initial sites really on that basis and I am convinced that by doing that, it is going to help our time scale so that if we do want to go ahead, this will help us do so.

Question. Are you going to go ahead with Washington no matter how the arms talks go?

Mr. PACKARD. That is a decision the President will have to make.

Question. Mr. Secretary, how much time is there for making a command decision on launching an anti-ballistic missile once an attack has been determined? Does this have to be done by a computer or is it actually done by authorities in Washington?

Mr. PACKARD. Well, this is not done by a computer. I can't describe to you the details of how the decision is made, but a decision has to be made. In fact, the system is designed so that it won't keep going unless somebody keeps telling it to go.

Question. How much time is involved?

Mr. PACKARD. Johnny? Twenty minutes?

Mr. FOSTER. It depends on the nature of the attack. For attacks from the Soviet Union it could be as long as 20 minutes. For attacks off of our coast, it would be only a few minutes.

Question. Mr. Packard, looking at 1973, if we drew foot prints on this current chart as they did on the Johnson proposal, would there really be very much difference between their extension into the 1973 period and your extension into it?

Mr. PACKARD. Do you mean if you look at the footprints of the area defense?

Question. That is right.

Mr. PACKARD. No.

Question. Is the only difference the priority to which we are now assigning the first two sites?

Mr. PACKARD. No. There is a very significant difference, I have already mentioned and that is, we have decided we cannot protect our cities and we do not provide a base for building up a thick system. The area defense will be very similar and provide complete coverage.

Question. Will it provide the same sort of area defense which was envisioned by Mr. McNamara in September 1967?

Mr. PACKARD. But only the area defense.

Question. Mr. Secretary, does that mean there will be as much life saving capability in this one against China as there was in the other one? Do the figures still hold?

Mr. PACKARD. I think the life saving capability will be comparable. You will recall that in the previous system, it was anticipated that in a given attack there might be 10 million lives lost without the system and maybe one million or none with the system. I must say I find it a little hard to consider these numbers very accurate. They are a little speculative. But the same area defense capability will be provided in this system. I think our capability is similar.

Question. I was wondering why you keep emphasizing that there is no city protection. Are you simply trying to tell us that this is not going to be expanded later to a thick system? Is that what you are trying to say to us?

Mr. PACKARD. Well, I am trying to tell you, I think, that with the present day technology, it is not possible to provide a complete defense of our cities. I think the President described it rather well this morning. If you want to completely protect the cities or to protect your cities in any useful way, you have to provide a high level of protection. You can't—preventing 50 percent of the missiles coming into your cities is absolutely useless, because they can completely destroy them.

Question. Was that not implicit in the original Sentinel?

Mr. PACKARD. It may have been. I can't go back and determine the reasoning in the original Sentinel.

Question. Mr. Secretary, we are all aware that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are on record with Plan A and Plan B. Plan A was to protect 25 cities and Plan B was to protect 50 cities. So, doesn't your decision today represent a reversal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. PACKARD. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, as I indicated, concur in the recommendations to the President.

Question. Mr. Secretary, would you expand on the Presidential role in this? Does he actually push the button or isn't there enough time for him to act?

Mr. PACKARD. I think that's a matter that I am not privileged to talk about.

Question. Could you say that he will have a final say what goes into the computers or is there a way that he can approve of taking this action or launching them?

Mr. PACKARD. The President has to make the final decision as to when a nuclear attack is necessary, of any kind.

Question. Mr. Packard, to what extent is there any delay in the initial operating capability here as opposed to the Sentinel plan that you considered when you went into the review?

Mr. PACKARD. There will be some delay. If you look at the schedule that was in the original Sentinel plan when it was proposed a year ago you will find some figures of the estimated date of deployment.

Question. Could you mention those so that we will be able to compare?

Mr. PACKARD. It was 1963—We can get the figure for you if you wish. As a result of the decision that has gone along on the last few months, the fact of the hold up on sites and so forth, there has, in fact, been some delay put into the original Sentinel plan, so that if we went ahead with the original Sentinel plan today it would be delayed somewhat beyond, pushed somewhat beyond the dates that were predicted at the time it was authorized.

If we compare what we could do with the Sentinel today, with this present plan, we are somewhat in the neighborhood of one year further out, 9 months further out, and again I hesitate to be specific on this because after looking at it I concluded that one of the key factors is to get a system together and get all the shakedown done. I think that in fact will have some bearing on when it is actually deployed.

Question. Mr. Packard, it still is not clear whether or not you are foreclosing a thick system or not. You suggested in one place you were, but in the others you are going to acquire other sites and add sites to protect population if necessary. Does that not lead you to a thick system situation?

Mr. PACKARD. No, No, because in order to have a thick system you have to include Sprints close enough to the cities so that they can protect the cities.

We are not including that capability.

Question. Mr. Secretary, since we have oriented the system against Russia now as well as Red China in the original conception, I am at a disadvantage because I don't have hearings with me, but I believe that Dr. Foster has testified previously to Congress that for a little more money the Russian offense can always beat whatever amount of money we put in the defense and it is a losing battle, that the offense can always, by adding penetration aids, overpower the defense.

I would like to hear from Dr. Foster or you.

Mr. PACKARD. No, I believe I would prefer to answer that question. I've looked at that very carefully. The situation is that if you are trying to protect your cities, the Soviets can do this with a large number of small warheads, as I have already indicated. It does not take a very large warhead to inflict unacceptable damage on a soft target, like a city. Therefore, if you are deploying this in

a way in which you protect your cities against a Soviet attack, if you get 90 percent of the missiles coming in, ten times more and you are right back where you were.

Question. I am talking about penetration aids outside the atmosphere where you don't have the atmosphere to discriminate them. You have to discriminate with your radar between 1000 decoys.

Mr. PACKARD. In any case, the arguments are that if you tried to deploy a system of this technology to protect against attacks on your cities, it is very difficult to do that.

But if you use this capability to protect your land based missiles, you do a very good job if you save only half of your missiles.

That is really the answer.

Question. Sir, could you tell us, please, taking into consideration what you have just said, could you please give us your hypothesis on what would be the number of lives saved, if any, in the Washington area which would be in the national command control?

Mr. PACKARD. Well I think I would rather not make estimates on that.

Question. Mr. Packard, how was the idea of the superhardening—

Question. We can't hear the question.

Mr. PACKARD. I will repeat it. The question is why wouldn't superhardening protect your Minuteman just as well as an active system?

I think it might be useful for me to go through the situation on that. You can harden your sites against a certain size warhead and indeed if the accuracy of the Soviet warheads is a small fraction of a mile, but they are very heavy warheads, if they get no closer, say, than a half mile, I can't give you these figures exactly, you have some protection.

But if they can find ways to further increase their accuracy, there is no extent of hardening that is possible to protect our missile sites. So the simple proposition is that if the Soviets were able to produce very accurate missiles, hardened sites would not provide protection. In that case, the active defense might turn out to be the only protection you had and that is one of the reasons why we think there is an important ingredient. There are all sorts of alternatives, but this provides added protection for our Minuteman capabilities.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in his discussion this morning the President said that the FY '70 defense budget submitted by President Johnson would be cut by \$2.5 billion. What are the other areas besides ICBM?

Mr. PACKARD. I can't comment on the defense budget. It hasn't even gone through the Bureau of the Budget yet, and we have some other things. It is probably a little too early to predict exactly what the Budget's going to be.

Question. On the Sentinel thing, on your map of the modified Sentinel, you say in the corner that all sites have Sprint and Spartan coverage. How can you achieve this for the Florida-Georgia area, especially in the case of Sprints from sites in North Dakota?

Mr. PACKARD. You don't use your Sprints up in North Dakota to protect Georgia. You use the Sprints in Georgia to protect areas in Georgia.

Question. But it says all sites have Sprint and Spartan coverage?

Question. And you also said you have to get money to purchase the sites?

Mr. PACKARD. At every site we locate Sprint and Spartan missiles. Therefore, those Sprint and Spartan missiles protect the sites and the areas around them, the bomber bases or missile sites, or whatever they are. So every site has both Sprints and Spartans located on it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, do you think the Johnson Administration made a serious mistake placing the major emphasis on the people-saving capability of the Sentinel system rather than putting prime focus on the defense of military bases like you have?

Mr. PACKARD. I would not want to make a judgment on the Johnson Administration. As I pointed out, there have been changes in the threat. I think they did not feel at the time that the Soviets were going ahead with the deployment of their large warhead missiles. We know they are now. So there are some changes in the threat between the time the Johnson decision was made and the time we are making this recommendation. I think the recommendation we are making is appropriate in consideration of the threats we now see.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said that it is not possible under the current state of the art to defend the cities. Is the research and development program of the Pentagon now going ahead to see if it is possible in the future to develop a system that could defend the cities?

Mr. PACKARD. Well, the research and development program of the Pentagon includes a very wide range of things, including research and development of other ways to protect the country against the threat of nuclear war.

We are hoping that possibly you can find such a capability, but I don't see that as being possible today in the present technology.

Question. In other words, it is not altogether impossible that ultimately we will have a thick system if you can find a way to do it?

Mr. PACKARD. When you are talking about scientific things, I hesitate to say anything is impossible. The next time you look at it, somebody has come up with a way of doing it. It is a very difficult job to be done because you have got to provide very good protection, if you want to protect your cities.

Question. Mr. Secretary, when could you get all these 12 into operation, if necessary?

Mr. PACKARD. The total deployment here will be a little bit after the mid '70's.

Question. Sir, on the blackout problem which has been raised by Dr. Bethe and others, what confidence do you have in the ability of the system to deal with an electronic blackout caused by nuclear explosions?

Mr. PACKARD. Needless to say I have looked at that problem. The explosion of a nuclear warhead high above the atmosphere generates a concentrated ionization that can interfere with the ability of radars for a short period of time. I have looked at that carefully, and I believe that for the use of the system to protect our Minuteman bases, with the deployment we have, we will be able to deal effectively with that blackout problem.

Question. Mr. Secretary, looking at this and the map that we used to have of the Sentinel system, I just can't imagine how your footprints are going to cover the whole country for area protection against the Chinese. Can you make circles with your finger or something?

Mr. PACKARD. There is a small protection down in the southwest part of the country where the overlap is going to be very, very light. You also have to remember that in drawing those circles you are talking about an 80 percent probability of kill or 50 percent. By having fewer sites the protection is a little bit lighter but it covers the whole country.

Question. Mr. Secretary, this morning in the President's statement, he said, in discussing the options open to him, that he had ruled out the course of increasing the number of sea and land based missiles and bombers.

Is the thinking in the Administration that there will be a freeze on bombers and missiles, sea and land based, similar to the freeze in the last Administration? And did the Joint Chiefs of Staff go along with the idea of limiting it at this time?

Mr. PACKARD. Again it is difficult for me to project what the last Administration's position and thinking was on it. But we have a

very adequate deterrent capability right now. We have a good, strong land based missile force. We have a very capable Polaris system. We have a very capable manned bomber system. I think if we could have assurance that the Soviets would agree to something along the present level, this would provide a very stable situation. This program we have is designed not to enlarge the system but to protect the system.

Question. Where is the security gap then, sir?

Mr. PACKARD. I don't know. I haven't talked about that.

Question. Mr. Secretary, could I ask you a question? Is it safe to say that if Sentinel is ever actually used, you'd also want to clear the Minuteman? Therefore, when Sentinel was actually fired, the Minuteman would be cleared of the silos and we would take offensive action at the same time?

Mr. PACKARD. That is a decision that would have to be made depending on the circumstances. I think it is safe to say that in a nuclear situation you have to have control of both your offensive and defensive weapons. One of the things that is helpful to have the first installations at these Minuteman sites is so that we can work out those command control relationships that are going to be important.

Question. Is this to say, Mr. Secretary, that we are prepared to accept a small-scale nuclear strike without retaliation?

Mr. PACKARD. I can't answer that. That is not my decision.

The Press. Thank you.

BUCK JONES' COURAGE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the 60-year-old father of 11 who miraculously survived a mine cave-in at Lark, Utah, just a few miles from Salt Lake City. After spending 8 days surrounded by rock, some 300 feet below the surface of the earth and 20,000 feet into the tunnel, William Vernon Jones was rescued. The Christian Science Monitor on March 13, 1969, editorialized on the indomitable human spirit exemplified by this Utah coal miner. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

BUCK JONES' COURAGE

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the rescue of William V. (Buck) Jones after 8 days trapped in a Utah mine was his strong spirit throughout the ordeal. For the first 3½ days he could communicate with no one. He was caught in a closet-sized space by a 25-foot thick slide at the end of a tunnel 4½ miles from the mine entrance.

"I'd never got out if the Lord hadn't had his arms around me," he explained when brought to the surface by his fellow miners.

His words echoed those of the Psalmist who also found real comfort and security in an awareness of God's nearness: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

There is always a widespread emotional involvement during the long days and hours of an uncertain rescue attempt. Many who

followed the reports of the rescue mission were buoyed by the miner's calm and courage.

Utah Gov. Calvin Rampton put it best when he said, "It makes you proud of the resiliency of the human spirit."

Mr. Speaker, after spending a week in a Salt Lake City hospital, I am happy to report that Mr. Jones is back on his feet and reports that he wants to get back to work in the mines.

GENERAL CLARKE ADDRESSES ARKANSAS BASIN MEETING

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the privilege of attending the annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association in Tulsa, where the principal speaker was Maj. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, deputy chief of the U.S. Army Engineers.

General's Clarke's speech on that occasion was a thoughtful, penetrating analysis of this Nation's efforts, achievements, and needs in the field of water resource development. I would like to have it appear in the RECORD, and I feel sure all the Members of this body will be as impressed as I am with the size of the job we have to do in this field and the vast benefits we will realize when the job is done.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. FREDERICK J. CLARKE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY, BEFORE THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MARCH 14, 1969

It is good to have so warm a welcome back to your Valley. Although this is only my second visit with you, I have followed the progress of the Arkansas Basin project with close attention, and I assure you of my continued strong and constructive interest in the fulfillment of its great promise during the coming years. Considering the showing made so far, and projections for the future—and the sustained drive you are putting behind it—I feel sure that the project is going to be one of the outstanding success stories in the history of water resources development in this country.

The coming years of our national growth are sure to present challenges many haven't fully realized. The impact of population growth and resulting urban pressures and social problems are now beginning to be felt. Solutions have not yet materialized. These challenges have special relevance in the field of water resources conservation and management because the availability of adequate good water and related benefits will be fundamental to the acceptable accommodation of the 400 million Americans expected to be on our census rolls fifty years hence—twice the population of the United States today. Such tremendous increase in numbers could have disastrous consequences unless we think and plan wisely now along every line and in every part of our country to provide all the social benefits which can be derived from our water resources. This is essential if we are to meet the needs of all our citizens of tomorrow.

Almost three-quarters of our people live in large cities today, and every year millions more are pouring into them seeking jobs and advantages they cannot find elsewhere. Too often they cannot find what they seek in the city, and their frustration is one of the major causes of social unrest and up-

heaval. It is also becoming increasingly difficult in fast-growing metropolitan complexes to furnish many essential services, notably of concern to us to supply sufficient good water to meet basic requirements.

Substantial acceleration of water resources development on a regional basis is a must in most parts of our country if rapidly rising urban water demands are to be satisfied. But even more important in the long run, far-sighted development programs can help to slow—perhaps, in time, even to reverse—the population drift toward the megalopolis we conceive today. Through such programs, meshed with the many others being undertaken at various levels of government to achieve social betterment, increased opportunities can be created for a fully satisfying life outside of present urban areas.

New vigor can be breathed into smaller towns and villages, and new self-sustaining communities can be created, affording young people a real chance to apply their initiative, energy, and enthusiasm to the building of successful careers in challenging but less crowded surroundings.

The Arkansas Basin project furnishes a fine example of what I'm talking about. It is already giving powerful impetus to the economic advancement of the Valley. When your new waterway becomes a going concern throughout its entire length—when the full range of benefits becomes available, the project will have a continually accelerating effect on the development of the entire basin. This new area of golden opportunity fostered by the expansion of basic and collateral industry, and by the growth of communities and the commercial enterprise necessary to support them, will provide social benefits far beyond the more narrowly defined benefit/cost ratios on which we justify projects today.

Senator Mundt stated recently in the Senate that: "Our failure to include among the benefits derived from projects many of the actual and potential benefits to be obtained from such improvements has tended to magnify our problems and to cause the rejection or delay of many projects of vast importance to America's future."

There is much apprehension that in many cases urgently needed development may be blocked, or at best severely restricted, by the new and considerably higher discount rate recently established by the Water Resources Council for the computation of benefits and costs. Continued use of the present criteria will make it more difficult to justify all the new development which will be necessary in the years ahead. But the retarding effect of the higher discount rate could be offset to a large degree by a broader approach to the identification and evaluation of the total benefits which water resources development provide.

I doubt that anyone could really believe that the benefit estimates used in the justification of any project truly reflect the actual value of its contribution to the national good. Up to now, projects have been justified largely on the basis of primary benefits creditable to the national account—generally such "hard" items as the savings that will be effected in transportation costs, the market value of power which will be produced, and the amount of structural flood damages which will be prevented.

What are considered secondary benefits—additional and real contributions to national development—have generally been ignored in the calculation. Nevertheless, these additional benefits sometimes in the long run make far more valuable contributions to national development and other objectives than the primary benefits.

Consider our waterways in this context. The primary commercial transportation and related benefits of a waterway are merely the seed from which tremendous economic values grow and multiply year after year.

Just since 1952, the advantages waterways provide have attracted to their banks well over \$133 billion worth of new industrial plant. Already you have announced plans for \$400 million of new plants along the Arkansas. Part of the soaring payrolls, rising bank balances, broadening tax bases, and other results of such economic expansion surely should be given appropriate consideration in benefit/cost analysis as additional credits both to expanded national growth and regional development. Similarly, not only the market value of power but its effect in the building and strengthening of a regional economy should enter directly into b/c calculations. The real benefits of flood control are by no means limited to the prevention of calculable structural and similar damage, which is the practical basis for evaluation. For example, projects also prevent very serious economic losses such as those resulting from pay and production stoppages. But, above all, of course, they help to prevent great loss of life and tremendous human suffering, benefits which are not susceptible of measurement by any formula so far devised, but which ought to be taken into full and effective consideration. I might also point out that long experience has proved forecasts of the dollar value of flood damage prevention even under the primary benefit criteria are often far too conservative.

In many instances, as you know, the entire cost of a flood control project has been "recovered," so to speak, by its prevention of losses on a single occasion. Overall, our flood control program has prevented damages of more than \$3.30 for every dollar invested in it.

The social benefits I referred to earlier—the contribution of water resources development to the relief of urban pressures through the dispersion of population and creation of new environments for a satisfying life outside the great cities—these certainly should have meaningful reflection in the justification of future projects wherever appropriate. So should contribution to the inspirational values associated with the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Only a part of the tremendous recreational potential of our projects can be included in the benefit/cost ratio under present authorities. All of it should be. Likewise, the value of the contributions of development to the enhancement of water quality should be adequately represented.

In the case of tangible secondary benefits such as industrial and related expansion, it is not too difficult to make tolerable forecasts. However, the evaluation of intangibles—the saving of life and the prevention of human suffering, the social benefits of population dispersal, the conservation of natural values, the enhancement of water quality—present a real challenge to the imagination and the vision of everybody concerned, for as yet we possess no yardsticks by which such benefits can be measured. But I am sure that if informed and capable people in all areas who are vitally interested in an ongoing program of water resources development, such as the members of this influential and farsighted Association, put forth their best efforts, we can come up with some workable answers.

Some more flexible device, one more responsive to growing and changing needs than the benefit/cost ratio as we know it today, is required to arrive at the true value of a project in the light of our overall national objectives.

The Arkansas Basin Project for many reasons is the best laboratory we have ever had for the clinical observation of a major project through all stages of its development and on through the years of the fulfillment of its purpose. We are going to learn many lessons from its performance which will be of immeasurable future value to our whole country in determining where we are going in

the field of water resources development, and how we are going to get there. I don't need to urge you to do all you can to assure the fullest success of this project. However, I do ask that you insure a broad appreciation of the full range of social benefits which water resource development provides. It will help in meeting the challenge of the future.

Thank you.

A CASE AGAINST THE UNO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an ever-increasing number of people feel it is time for a walkout on that instrument of global subversion—the UNO. Korea, Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Tibet, Germany, Palestine, the Congo, Katanga, and a myriad of other reasons demand it.

A most interesting analytical comment on the U.N. appeared in the South Africa Observer for December 1968. I include this comment of Mr. S. E. D. Brown following my remarks:

INSTRUMENT OF GLOBAL SUBVERSION: TIME FOR SOUTH AFRICA TO WALK OUT OF UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations' vote on November 19 approving the text of the proposed international convention on war crimes and crimes against humanity—which blandly included the policy of apartheid in its category of crimes—was another example of the debased standards reached by this criminal and communist-orientated organisation.

This again raises the question: Does it serve any purpose for South Africa to continue its membership of this much-vaunted organisation of "international peace and security"?

Supporters of continued membership argue that it is in South Africa's interest to remain a member, because it affords our delegations the opportunity to reply to the attacks made on us. However, since the first session of the General Assembly in 1946 South Africa has been continually attacked, insulted and reviled. These attacks have been replied to and our policies have been explained, but our enemies have never taken any notice of our explanations.

In any case, during the past five sessions, the Black members have staged regular walkouts when the South African delegate has taken the rostrum.

FINANCIAL BURDEN

There is also the financial burden on South Africa. Over the past 22 years, this cost has amounted to approximately R14-million. Participation in the Korean War cost South Africa another R6-million, apart from the loss of life it entailed.

In view of these facts, in view of the actions of the organisation against Rhodesia and Portugal, and in view of its sustained hostility and threats against South Africa, it is our considered opinion that it serves no purpose whatever for South Africa to remain a member of this organisation.

REVOLUTIONARY GOALS

The tragic truth to be faced is that the United Nations today functions with an entire lack of system, rule and principle in giving its rulings; and its disregard of its own Charter to suit its subversive, revolutionary ends has become standard practice.

It is now wallowing in double-dealing, double-standards and blatant hypocrisy so

deep, that the time has now come for South Africa and every other self-respecting nation—white, black, yellow or brown—to turn the searchlight on the organisation and on its origins, goals, and revolutionary activities.

CHRISTIANITY NOT MENTIONED

The United Nations was engendered by the American people and the West in an honest and fervent desire for universal peace. It was proclaimed from most pulpits as more or less of a going concern, and almost as a panacea for the reign of Godliness and Christian living.

Yet God and Christianity are not even mentioned in its Constitution!

This omission was not accidental. It was planned that way, to suit the atheists of Moscow and the traitors and enemies of Western civilisation.

GROSS DECEPTION

When the U.N. Charter was first presented to the nations of the world, great stress was laid upon Article 2, Sub-paragraph 7, which states:

"Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter."

But this has proved to be a gross deception, as South Africa and other small countries have learned to their cost.

This fundamental provision in the Charter has been completely, constantly and deliberately ignored over the past 22 years; and every organisation commission, and covenant flowing out of the United Nations Charter has been for the sole purpose of intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations.

The U.N. Charter of 1968 is not the same Charter that was drafted in San Francisco in 1945, and it will continue to be amended, step by step, to conform finally with the hidden purposes and goals of the world planners and subverters.

COLLECTIVIST ONE-WORLD STATE

Regardless of its widely advertised objective of maintaining "international peace and security" by preventing wars, the goal of the U.N. is a one-world collectivist state.

But before this can be achieved it is necessary for people's minds to be conditioned to accept the new order which Julian Huxley described as "a single world culture, with its own philosophy and background of ideas, and with its own broad purposes."

In bringing about this new order it is necessary to destroy racial integrity and national sovereignties, and to advocate and promote widespread miscegenation. And in this, Unesco closely follows the Communist line.

This is the task assigned to Unesco, many of whose major recommendations will produce the very world order towards which every top Communist has been working since the days of Karl Marx.

BREAKING DOWN SOVEREIGNTY

This position was made clear at the first meeting of the U.S. Commission for Unesco on September 23, 1946, when William Benton stated: "We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty . . . It is in this process Unesco can be—and indeed must be—the pioneer . . ."

This idea is carried a good deal further in Chapter VIII of "The Synthesis of the Communist Textbook on Psychopolitics" which states: "If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation we have won that country. Therefore there must be continual propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teenager in particular."

In short, the function of Unesco is to condition the world to accept the total, planned world-society envisaged by the Fabians, Lenin, Trotsky and scores of other revolutionaries—a society in which the traditions, integrity, and sovereignties of all peoples will have been destroyed—together with the Western world as we know it.

And it is, therefore, nothing short of incredible that the good peoples of the Western world cannot see through the duplicity and criminal intrigue that permeates the U.N. Organisation and its special agency, Unesco.

PRINCIPAL ARCHITECTS

The "Chicago Tribune" gave a revealing clue to one of the principal architects of the United Nations. It wrote on July 11, 1945:

"Our government sent six men and a woman as delegates to the recent conference at San Francisco, but when members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate want to find out what is in the treaty they don't ask the delegates. The questions are directed to Mr. Leo Pasvolzky, a Russian-born official in the State Department, who is the man who knows more about the document than anybody else."

"Mr. Stettinius headed the delegation, presided at a good many of the public sessions, and at all back-room conferences. The hearings in Washington started, appropriately enough, with a lengthy statement read by Mr. Stettinius, but apparently written by Mr. Pasvolzky. When the time came to ask questions Mr. Stettinius gracefully yielded the center of the stage to the same Mr. Pasvolzky, who knows all the answers."

"This is more than a little odd. Mr. Pasvolzky's expertism is said to result from the fact that he wrote the original draft of the treaty, but that was quite a long time ago and his work meanwhile has undergone considerable modification. Nobody has yet explained why the department entrusted the drafting of this document to a foreign-born functionary, whose training has been in economics rather than diplomacy. It is even more curious that the natives among our delegates, two of whom are members of the Senate committee, did not assert for themselves the right of interpretation."

"The diffidence—if that is the word for it—of Mr. Connally and Mr. Vandenberg, to say nothing of Mr. Stettinius and the rest, has given the country the impression that it is really Mr. Pasvolzky's treaty, not theirs; that he understands it and they don't; that men with a good deal of experience in foreign affairs who were themselves participants in the negotiations have only an incomplete grasp of the content and purpose of this intricate and difficult document. They were at San Francisco, it appears, to assist him rather than he to assist them."

"At any rate, as matters stand, it appears that this country is being asked to approve a treaty which only one man, and he foreign-born, fully understands."

Another principal architect of the United Nations was Alger Hiss—a man later unmasked as an undercover member of the active Soviet espionage ring in Washington.

Early in 1944 Alger Hiss made preliminary plans for setting up the U.N. Later he was appointed Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs in the U.S. State Department, with the specific task of handling all American relations with the U.N.

In September 1944 he was made Secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, where he had a shaping hand in drawing the first blueprints for the U.N. And in 1945 he reached the heights when he was made Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. There he presided during the drafting of the United Nations Charter.

In 1950, however, after serving Communist Russia well for many years as an agent, he was convicted of perjury in connection with

his espionage activities and sentenced to five years in the Lewisburg Federal Penitentiary.

GROMYKO, TOO

The presence of such Americans, and their unrevealed helpers, in top policy-making circles in San Francisco throws a revealing light on Soviet Russia's role in building the kind of U.N. that would best serve her subversive purposes.

And so it should come as no surprise to learn that another architect of the U.N. was none other than Mr. Gromyko who, during a press conference at the U.N. in August 1958, in answer to a leading question bearing on the U.N. Charter, boldly declared: *"Believe me, I sit here as one who helped to draft the U.N. Charter and I had a distinct part in drafting this part of the Charter with my own hands."*

And so, behind the idealistic phrases of the U.N. and its facade of "world peace", "human rights", "brotherhood" and "tolerance", we find that it is the enemies of peace and the perverters of human rights who have plotted an organization conveniently designed to steal our liberties and to destroy our nations.

MOST IMPORTANT POST

One of the most important positions within the entire organization—if not the most important—is that of the Under-Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs. This is a little-publicised office and even less is known about the man who holds the job.

This officer has three main areas of responsibility. They are: (1) Control of all military and police functions of U.N. peace-keeping forces; (2) Supervision of all disarmament moves on the part of member nations; and (3) Control of all atomic energy ultimately entrusted to the U.N. for peaceful and other purposes.

In view of the fact that these functions may one day constitute the ultimate power of life and death over every human being on the face of the earth, there would appear to be some minor justification for us to be more than passively curious over who will wield this power.

Since the United Nations was created in 1945, there have been eight men appointed to the position. Eight out of eight appointed were Communists. The men were: Arkady Sobolev, U.S.S.R.; Konstantin Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.; Ilya Tchernychev, U.S.S.R.; Dragoslav Protich, U.S.S.R.; Anatoly F. Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.; Georgi Petrovich Arkadev, U.S.S.R.; Eugeny Dmitrievich Kiselev, U.S.S.R.; and Vladimir Pavlovich Suslov, U.S.S.R., who holds the office at present.

By secret agreement between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., this important post will always be filled by a Communist!

CHRISTIAN APOLOGISTS

Many Christian apologists of the U.N. are ever ready to point to the positive Health, Welfare and Educational work of the U.N., and to all its campaigns against the drug traffic and the world-wide help given to refugees, and so on.

But do we require a dictatorial world instrument of government—which will clamp control on all citizens from the cradle to the grave and which will turn the world into one vast Collective—in order to carry on these humanitarian endeavours?

The U.N. cause is being promoted in America by one of the most aggressive and heavily financed power blocks that has ever shaken a club over the American people, the Western world and the Eastern world.

In this bloc is a cluster of professional public relations specialists who devote their full time to highly skillful U.N. publicity and lobbying work.

The same mentalities that put a new toothpaste on the market, the same men who advertise liver pills and scream into our

minds the dictatorial orders that we must buy certain beers, certain cigarettes and certain patent medicines—this same clique of aggressive promoters who ram their merchandising schemes down the throats of an unsuspecting and uninformed public are propagandising the world that the U.N. is the "conscience of mankind" and that it can give the world a just and stable peace".

Winning this propaganda campaign is now a turnkey job, handled by professional promoters and advertising men with little regard for issues, principles or traditions. These builders of public opinion today are the same people who control films, newspapers and television, and who are, with few exceptions, all on the side of this internationalist, Communist conspiracy—the United Nations.

BLIND TO REALITIES

Many U.N. supporters and advocates of world government are not Communists. Many of them dislike Communism. Yet they seem blind to the certainty that the integrated world for which they are agitating would be no other than a Collectivist world. They seem endowed with a cut-out mechanism which prevents their visualising the kind of hell to which they seek to lead us.

They do not seem to realize—indeed, they seem to ignore the fact—that the U.N. Charter may be accurately described as a formulation of the Soviet totalitarian system, habituated to Western ways of thinking and modes of procedure—or to use the words of Prof. S. D. Madariaga, the internationally well-known Spanish Liberal, who has described the U.N. Charter as "... in the main a translation of the Russian system into an international idiom and its adaptation to an international community ... Uno bore upon its brow from the very beginning the mark of Moscow."

Nor do these one-worlders seem to realise that they are helping to hand over the world to ruthless new masters, namely, to the Lords of Finance and Usury and to the Lords of Communism, both now firmly entrenched as the hierarchy of the U.N.

THREAT TO ALL HUMANITY

The great threat to free humanity is Communism in all its "liberal" and international disguises. It has infiltrated into all positions of public trust and responsibility throughout the Western world, the press, the schools and universities. With its Communist egalitarian basis it is set to destroy all concepts of race and nation.

There can, therefore, be no compromise with Communism. Yet, through the U.N., the Communists have so exploited the knaves and the fools among American and Western statesmen that they are making successful a complete act of treason against our traditions and the civilisation passed on to us in trust by our forebears.

We of the Western world desire peace. But we do not desire the peace of the slave. We know there is no freedom without sovereignty; that when peace comes to the world, as it will some day, it will come from the hearts of men and not from the forums of ambitious politicians. Security councils have never created security, and no organisation of nations ever remained united.

Ten thousand charters cannot alter these facts, and indeed, they suggest the answer. If we value our honour and our freedom, the U.N. as at present constituted must be destroyed.

MUST BE DESTROYED

The U.N. must be destroyed because of its origins. It was conceived and brought forth in an atmosphere of secrecy, deception and treason; and nurtured in an environment of hatred, corruption and greed.

It must be destroyed because it functions with an entire lack of system, rule and principle in giving its rulings. Its disregard of its Charter to suit its subversive revolutionary ends has become commonplace—and

it perpetuates itself with double dealing, double standards, and blatant hypocrisy.

It must be destroyed because of its dishonourable record in Hungary, Tibet, Goa, Palestine, the Congo, Czechoslovakia and most other parts of the world. Its evil face—its real face—was clearly visible for all to see in its naked aggression in Katanga—and which is today leering at South Africa and Rhodesia.

It has rendered itself incapable of establishing peace—except the peace of the collectivist slave. And the sooner it is destroyed the better will be the prospects for real order, justice and peace in the world.

The first real step to world peace will only be taken when responsible nations walk out of the U.N.

That, clearly, is now South Africa's path of duty. Just as it is the duty of every self-respecting nation on earth.

EXCELLENT STATEMENT OF DR. CHRISTIAAN BARNARD

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of Congress and the American people to the excellent statement given by Dr. Christiaan Barnard, the world-famous heart surgeon, before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate very much your kindness in giving me this opportunity to address you.

Perhaps there are some here today who wonder why a heart surgeon would want to participate in bioscience research in the space program of the United States.

Let me hasten to explain that I regard the scientific exploitation of the circumstances offered by space flight as having great significance for the life sciences.

Technical capabilities—in any field—depend to a large extent on an understanding of basic mechanisms. Our techniques can go only as far as our knowledge and the limits of our imaginations will allow. For scientists, as for congressmen and others dedicated to seeking solutions to complex social problems, imagination and a willingness to rise to challenge are critical characteristics.

Today the study of biology in the space environment is one of man's greatest scientific challenges. We know that all living organisms were conceived and have carried out their entire existence within the narrow confines of a shallow layer in, on, or just below the earth's surface. Countless life cycles have ensued within the narrow boundaries of temperature, atmosphere, day-night cycle, and gravitational fields that exist on this surface. All of these are governed by an exquisitely organized system of control vested in the genetic apparatus of the cell. I shall divert briefly to consider the working of these mechanisms. The primary genetic material is a chemical substance known as deoxyribonucleic acid. Like all nucleic acids DNA consists of a long chain of sub-units called nucleotides. Each nucleotide in turn is made up of a molecule of phosphoric acid, a pentose sugar (deoxyribose) and a heterocyclic base.

There are 4 different nucleotides in DNA: They differ only in respect of their bases. The latter may be a purine—adenine or guanine; or a pyrimidine—cytosine or thymine.

In DNA, the nucleotides are linked up so

that the backbone of the molecule consists of alternating sugar and phosphate groups. One of the purine or pyrimidine bases is attached, like a side chain, to each sugar group.

Each molecule of DNA is made up of two such polynucleotide chains. The two chains are wound round each other in the form of a helix, and they are linked to each other transversely by hydrogen bonds between pairs of bases.

A purine base is always linked with a pyrimidine. Thus adenine is always linked with thymine (A-T or T-A), while guanine is always linked with cytosine (G-C or C-G).

The DNA molecule can be likened to a spiral staircase, in which the bannisters consist of long sequences of sugar and phosphate groups while the base-pairs constitute the steps. This structure was worked out by Crick, Watson and Wilkins in 1953.

REPLICABILITY

During cell division, the two strands of the DNA molecule uncoil and separate at the hydrogen bonds, leaving the bases free. Each free base attracts its complementary nucleotide from the surroundings. The new nucleotide falls into place by linking transversely to its base partner by means of the hydrogen bond, and longitudinally to the other newly-attracted nucleotides through its phosphate group. In this way, the double helix of the DNA molecule is reconstituted.

EXPRESSIVITY

The vital genetic information which is stored in the DNA must be carefully protected. To achieve this, the DNA is kept secluded in the nucleus and a system of messengers is provided to carry the genetic information to the ribosomes of the cytoplasm where the work of protein synthesis is carried out.

The messengers are molecules of a related nucleic acid—ribonucleic acid (RNA). This "messenger RNA" (mRNA) differs from DNA in consisting of just a single polynucleotide chain with the base uracil instead of thymine and with the sugar ribose instead of deoxyribose. The DNA provides the "master pattern" for the synthesis of mRNA molecules in which the sequence of bases is complementary to that in the parent DNA. Like DNA, mRNA is insoluble and has a very high molecular weight.

The amino acids are brought to the messenger RNA at the ribosomes by another kind of RNA called "transfer RNA". Transfer RNA (tRNA) is a relatively small, soluble molecule consisting of a chain of about 70 nucleotide units. The short chain is bent double and twisted into a double helix. There is a specific tRNA for each of the 20 different kinds of amino acid. In addition, the structure of each tRNA molecule is adapted to link with specific sites along the messenger RNA. Thus, the tRNA molecules act as "adaptors" which "plug in" at the correct places along the messenger RNA molecule and ensure that their amino acid passengers are lined up in the correct order.

Having been lined up properly, the amino acids now break their link with their tRNA carrier and link up instead with their neighbouring amino acids to form polypeptide chains in accordance with the DNA instructions.

The polypeptides produced from the mRNA template make up the enzymes. The enzymes are responsible for all the physico-chemical reactions necessary to convert the inert, raw materials of the environment into the cells, the tissues and the organs of the living body. Thus all the vital metabolic processes of the cell are controlled by the nuclear DNA, through a series of RNA intermediaries.

For centuries, biological scientists have studied the interaction of living organisms with the environment on earth, and this

study continues. Now, we have been presented with a new set of circumstances under which to measure and study vital processes—the space environment.

The question may be asked, why man—particularly medical man—should be concerned with space when so many problems remain to be solved here on earth?

Basically, the answer is the same as that which led man earlier to explore unknown lands and uncharted seas. It is the inherent motivation for the quest of knowledge of the species; the compulsion to respond to the challenge.

While the origin of organized science is difficult to determine the curiosity of man is undoubtedly an inherent feature of his social evolution. This curiosity has produced a vast storehouse of biological and other knowledge to which scientists in this country and the world over continue to contribute. It would clearly be impractical to consider repeating in space all the experiments, in all the organisms, under all the conditions which have been studied on earth. Nor would such an approach be scientifically sound.

Because of the great expense of space experiments and the large commitments of resources and manpower, some system of assigning priorities to the problems which require answers is mandatory. The field is narrowed considerably by our present and foreseeable technological limitations. A large number of desirable avenues of exploration are unattainable.

Further guidance is supplied by the results of studies performed on earth using partial simulations of the space environment. In addition, biologists, by virtue of their experience and knowledge of experimental techniques can select with reasonable accuracy experiments with a high chance of yielding important results.

Finally, scientists have some preliminary data from the manned space program. The principal objectives of this program, however, have been to determine if man can survive and function in space for periods of time. They have not been designed primarily to answer relevant basic questions. This is borne out by what we have learned from the manned space program. Man can survive and function. He can command and maneuver the spacecraft, meet emergencies and even take over when there is a minor system failure. But despite the thousands of man-hours in space which have been accumulated, we have gathered very little systematic information about the biological effects of the space environment.

Medical scientists have learned that space flight may lead to impairment of the ability to maintain the upright position, a decrease in exercise tolerance, some loss of calcium from the skeleton, and changes in the body fluid compartments. (Incidentally, all these changes were predictable from earth studies of inactivity.) But as far as the vast amount of knowledge yet to be learned is concerned, we have barely scratched the surface.

We know nothing about some fundamental aspects of the biological effects of space flight.

We have little information on its effects on cell differentiation, growth, and metabolism—factors which are of critical importance to space survival for the longer missions contemplated for the future.

For example, a practical aspect of this fundamental question revolves around how an injury sustained by an astronaut would heal. Furthermore, cellular effects of the space environment may have important implications for a wide variety of diseases on earth.

A biosciences program, as I understand it, is a program conceived to seek knowledge the most rewarding way—by application of the scientific method. Experiments have been flown and others are about to be flown which have been carefully selected to extend

man's knowledge of Biological phenomena. These experiments are based on years of investigation on earth and are designed to answer some fundamental questions regarding growth, development, and function of a wide variety of living organisms—plants and animals—in space. In this context, I would like to discuss some experiments which I have proposed in collaboration with Dr. N. C. Birkhead of the General Electric Company. I believe that if these experiments are carried out they will answer some fundamental questions bearing on cellular function as related to man's interaction with his environment. To illustrate this approach, I would like to describe briefly some proposed experiments and comment on their rationale.

It has been known for some time that gravity has an effect on the development of living organisms. This information deals primarily with the effects of increased gravity as produced by the use of the centrifuge. One would expect therefore that the opposite—that is zero gravity—would also have important effects on living organisms. Preliminary studies carried out in the three-day Biosatellite mission indicated that low gravity does affect cellular differentiation and growth. Because of the fundamental importance of this type of information to all living things, a series of experiments to relate these sub-cellular and cellular effects to DNA-mediated processes have great relevance to man's survival in any environment.

Firstly, we have evidence from the experiments with drosophila that the weightless environment will induce genetic changes. These indicate that the genetic apparatus as contained in DNA in the cell nucleus may be influenced adversely by removal from the earth's gravitational field. We should therefore attempt to estimate whether this influence can be extrapolated to more organized systems with more relevance to man. This we will attempt to do by studying the integrity of DNA synthesis in viruses, with single DNA molecules, and progressing to more complex systems such as human cells grown in tissue culture, and finally intact small animals.

Although these methods are not as sensitive as the complete animal and his genetic characteristics, they ought nevertheless, to give helpful quantitative data.

Secondly, it is of importance to know that man in space will react to environmental stimuli that call for the intervention of an intact genetic apparatus in an appropriate manner. If, for example, man were exposed to viral infection or to other stimuli while in a weightless environment, would he be able to respond in the proper way?

In order to examine these questions, we have proposed the following experimental program:

First, we shall attempt to ascertain what, if any, alterations in DNA synthesis are brought about by space flight.

Second, we shall relate these changes to a variety of stimuli that call for a reaction based upon an intact genetic apparatus.

Third, the functioning of the more complex mechanisms responsible for rejection of foreign tissue will be examined by noting the effects of weightlessness on the reaction to transplanted tissues.

The experiments we propose for the first and second phases will use the following basic design.

Radioactive precursors of DNA will be administered to the system at specified times before and after application of an appropriate stimulus. On recovery of the capsule the radioactivity of the DNA isolated from the system will give an accurate indication of DNA synthesis in space and the ability of the system to respond to the applied stimulus. Comparison with simultaneous earth controls will indicate whether the conditions of space flight have had an adverse effect.

Experiment No. 1: To investigate how gravity effects the reproduction of viruses.

This will be done by measuring DNA synthesis in the virus using radio isotopes labeling. Herpes virus or adenovirus will be studied as they function in a tissue culture. They are both pathogenic for man.

Experiment No. 2: To determine the effect of gravity on the ability of human lymphocytes growing in tissue culture to synthesize DNA and to respond to an antigenic stimulus while in the weightless state. DNA synthesis in lymphocytes is measured by a multilabeling radio isotope technique. The response of lymphocytes to an antigenic stimulus is one of the basic immunological responses.

Experiment No. 3: This experiment is similar to the previous one, except that it would be conducted using a whole animal. In addition, DNA synthesis in the various organs can be studied and the alteration of this by antigenic stimulation measured. If malignant (ascites tumor) cells are injected then the response of malignant cell-host reaction to gravity will be examined. As before, a multilabeling radio isotope technique is used.

Experiment No. 4: To determine the rate of DNA synthesis in orbit in a rapidly regenerating organ, the liver. The liver is caused to regenerate rapidly by the surgical removal of about two-thirds of its substance prior to the assessment. Again, a multilabeling radio isotope technique is utilized to determine DNA synthesis.

Experiment No. 5: To study the effects of gravity on the host-graft cellular interaction. This will be done by transplanting one rat kidney into a unilaterally nephrectomized rat and observing the cellular response grossly and microscopically. A number of such animals will be studied so that chronological sequence of events can be determined while its transplanted kidney is undergoing rejection.

Experiment No. 6: To study the effect of weightlessness on the circulation as maintained by a denervated heart. Any transplanted heart is also denervated, that is separated from direct nervous control and regulation. The response of the electrocardiogram, blood pressure, and blood flow will be determined at Ig. and in orbit; at rest and during exercise in order to determine the part played by the nervous system in these responses.

In summary, my hypothesis is this: Gravity has been shown to play a part in maintaining the genetic character of living cells. This genetic character is determined by coded information carried on long chains of deoxyribonucleic acid (or DNA) in the nucleus of cells. The immune response that is the key to safer replacement of diseased organs involves discrimination against living material bearing differing coded information.

If cells in weightlessness lose some of their discrimination in regard to their own character, it is possible that they will discriminate less sharply against cells from another organism. If so, can we then find ways to disturb the integrating influence of gravity on earth.

There is, of course, no certainty that a particular set of experiments will produce the answers we seek. However, it seems to me an urgent matter to build on the provocative findings of NASA's Biosatellite II program. And, in fact, with only limited modification, the spacecraft intended for the Biosatellite 21-day mission, could be used as the space laboratory for the experiments I have described.

There are no questions of greater importance in the life sciences than those bearing on the guidance system that governs all life processes. The American space program has produced some intriguing and virtually important new insights in this area. Yet they are merely clues to the solutions we seek and the answers we need.

As a scientist and as a physician, I ask that you assist us in our pursuits by assigning this program the high priority merited by its potential value to all mankind.

TWO GREAT PHILADELPHIANS AND A GREAT PEOPLE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to offer my salute to two great Philadelphians and a great people.

The first gentleman, James Crumlish, this week has received an honorary life membership in the National District Attorney's Association for his outstanding service.

There is indeed no one more deserving. Jim Crumlish served with distinction as district attorney of Philadelphia from 1961 to 1965.

In 1964-65, he was vice president of the national association which now honors him. His reputation as a public servant devoted to keeping the streets of Philadelphia free of crime is well known by his colleagues throughout the land.

This is indeed a worthy honor for a worthy gentleman.

The second gentleman I salute is the great police commissioner of my city, Frank L. Rizzo.

This Friday, Commissioner Rizzo will receive an official city citation from Mayor James H. J. Tate in recognition of again making Philadelphia the safest major city in the Nation during 1968.

The citation reads:

Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo and the men and women of the Philadelphia Police Department, for the sixth straight year, have attained the lowest major crime rate of the ten largest cities in the Nation. This outstanding achievement attests to the magnificent leadership of Commissioner Rizzo and the dedicated performance of all the members of the Police Department.

In addition to maintaining the lowest crime rate in 1968, the Police Department distinguished itself through its professional handling of potentially explosive situations throughout the year, and utilized the most modern equipment and techniques to provide safety and security to the lives and property of all citizens.

Commissioner Rizzo and the Philadelphia Police Department are hereby officially commended in recognition of their dedication and devotion to public service and for the many personal sacrifices they have made on behalf of all Philadelphians.

I would like to add my second to that citation. I would also like to add my thanks and the thanks of my constituents for Frank Rizzo's extraordinary performance in perhaps the most difficult and sensitive area of big-city, public management today.

Big-city crime has become somewhat like the weather. We all talk about it, but frequently we find ourselves unable to do anything about it.

Mr. Rizzo is the exception. By his presence and performance he has made the

Nation's fourth largest city its safest largest city and that is praiseworthy work indeed.

Finally, I would like to applaud all my Irish friends in Philadelphia, who once again staged a great parade in honor of St. Patrick. The parade marshal was our city's distinguished jurist, Judge Vincent J. Carroll and at his side marched our city's favorite son of Erin, Mayor James H. J. Tate.

Some other Philadelphians who deserve special mention for making observance of that special day always Kelly green and inspiring are the Very Reverend Monsignor James T. Dolan, pastor of the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul; Michael J. Cavanaugh, president of the Commodore Barry Society; Sheriff William M. Lennox, president, and H. Benedict Ripkee, secretary of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick; and Robert Clarke and Patrick J. Carr, editor and publisher respectively of the Irish American Herald.

My Irish friends, both in and out of public life, have long been a source of wonderment and delight to me. The reservoir of their charm and wit seems deeper than the Irish Sea. Perhaps this fable about the leprechaun is instructive.

Irish legend, or fact, has it that if you should be walking along a wooded path some moonlight night in spring and hear the faint tap-tapping of a tiny hammer, you might be lucky enough to catch a glimpse of an Irish leprechaun, the elfin shoemaker, whose roguish tricks are the delight of Irish storytelling.

It is told that the leprechaun has a pot of gold hidden somewhere, and he must give up his treasure to the one who catches him. But catching a leprechaun is a task as difficult as we Democrats sometimes find catching Republican votes.

The leprechaun is sly and any Irishman will tell you if you look away for an instant, the little fellow will escape into the forest.

Once a man compelled a leprechaun, I am told, into taking him to the very bush where the gold was buried. The man tied a red handkerchief to the bush in order to recognize the spot again and ran home for a shovel.

He was gone only 3 minutes, but when he returned to dig, there was a red handkerchief on every bush in the forest.

After that, the only appropriate exclamation is Erin go bragh.

JACKSONVILLE COIN CLUB
ENDORSES H.R. 4312

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I introduced a bill, H.R. 4312, "to permit American citizens to hold gold when there is no requirement that gold reserves be held among currency not circulated and for other purposes."

As example of the widespread support H.R. 4312 is receiving, I include in the RECORD a letter I received from the Jacksonville Coin Club, Jacksonville, Fla. The letter follows:

JACKSONVILLE COIN CLUB,

Jacksonville, Fla., March 9, 1969.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Passed unanimously, in regular business session, endorsement of your House Bill H.R. 4312.

ALLEN K. OVERALL,
Secretary.

CONGLOMERATE MERGERS—A GROWING CAUSE FOR ALARM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the intrusion of big business into the mass communication field should be of major concern to all Americans.

Hundreds of daily newspapers have folded, and many others have been taken over by big business in unholy mergers.

This same trend has been evident in some areas of the broadcast field as big business creeps in.

An interesting appraisal of this matter appeared in the June 1968, issue of the Atlantic, written by Nicholas Johnson, a Commissioner with the Federal Communications Commission.

I include this article following my remarks:

THE MEDIA BARONS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST: AN FCC COMMISSIONER'S WARNING

(By Nicholas Johnson)

Before I came to the Federal Communications Commission my concerns about the ownership of broadcasting and publishing in America were about like those of any other generally educated person.

Most television programming from the three networks struck me as bland at best. I had taken courses dealing with propaganda and "thought control," bemoaned (while being entertained by) Time magazine's "slanted" reporting, understood that Hearst had something to do with the Spanish-American War, and was impressed with President Eisenhower's concern about "the military-industrial complex." The changing ownership of the old-line book publishers and the disappearance of some of our major newspapers made me vaguely uneasy. I was philosophically wedded to the fundamental importance of "the marketplace of ideas" in a free society.

But I didn't take much time to be reflective about the current significance of such matters. It all seemed beyond my ability to influence in any meaningful way. Then, in July, 1966, I became a member of the FCC. Here my interest in the marketplace of ideas could no longer remain a casual article of personal faith. The commitment was an implicit part of the oath I took on assuming the office of commissioner, and, I quickly learned, an everyday responsibility.

Threats to the free exchange of information and opinion in this country can come from various sources, many of them outside the power of the FCC to affect. Publishers and reporters are not alike in their ability, education, tolerance of diversity, and sense of responsibility. The hidden or overt pressures of advertisers have long been with us.

But one aspect of the problem is clearly within the purview of the FCC—the impact of ownership upon the content of the mass media. It is also a part of the responsibility of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. It has been the subject of recent congressional hearings. There are a number of significant trends in the ownership of the media worth examining—local and regional monopolies, growing concentration of control of the most profitable and powerful television stations in the major markets, broadcasting-publishing combines, and so forth. But let's begin with a look at the significance of media ownership by "conglomerate corporations"—holding companies that own, in addition to publishing and broadcasting enterprises, other major industrial corporations.

During my first month at the FCC I studied the cases and attended the meetings, but purposefully did not participate in voting on any items. One of the agenda items at the July 20 commissioners' meeting proposed two draft letters addressed to the presidents of International Telephone and Telegraph and the American Broadcasting Company, ITT and ABC, Messrs. Harold Geneen and Leonard Goldenson. We were asking them to supply "a statement specifying in further detail the manner in which the financial resources of ITT will enable ABC to improve its program services and thereby better to serve the public interest." This friendly inquiry was my first introduction to the proposed ITT-ABC merger, and the Commissioner majority's attitudes about it. It was to be a case that would occupy much of my attention over the next few months.

There wasn't much discussion of the letters that morning, but I read carefully the separate statements filed with the letter by my two responsible and experienced colleagues, Commissioners Robert T. Bartley and Kenneth A. Cox.

Commissioner Bartley, a former broadcaster, wrote a long and thoughtful statement. He warned of "the probable far-reaching political, social and economic consequences for the public interest of the increasing control of broadcast facilities and broadcast service by large conglomerate corporations such as the applicants." Commissioner Cox, former lawyer, law professor, counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee, and chief of the FCC's Broadcast Bureau, characterized the proposed merger as "perhaps the most important in the agency's history." He said the issues were "so significant and far-reaching that we should proceed immediately to designate the matter for hearing."

Their concerns were well grounded in broadcasting's history, and in the national debate preceding the 1934 Communications Act we were appointed to enforce. Precisely what Congress intended the FCC to do was not specified at the time or since. But no one has ever doubted Congress' great concern lest the ownership of broadcasting properties be permitted to fall into a few hands or to assume monopoly proportions.

The 1934 Act was preceded by the 1927 Radio Act and a series of Industry Radio Conferences in the early 1920s. The conferences were called by then Secretary of Commerce Herbert C. Hoover.

Hoover expressed concern lest control over broadcasting "come under the arbitrary power of any person or group of persons." During the congressional debates on the 1927 Act a leading congressman, noting that "publicity is the most powerful weapon that can be wielded in a republic," warned of the domination of broadcasting by "a single selfish group." Should that happen, he said, "then woe be to those who dare to differ with them." The requirement that licenses not be transferred without Commission approval was intended, according to a sponsoring senator, "to prevent the concentration of broad-

cast facilities by a few." Thirty years later, in 1956, Senate Commerce Committee Chairman Warren G. Magnuson was still warning the Commission that it "should be on guard against the intrusion of big business and absentee ownership."

These concerns of Congress and my colleagues were to take on fuller meaning as the ITT-ABC case unfolded, a case which eventually turned into an FCC *cause célèbre*. It also demonstrated the enormity of the responsibility vested in this relatively small and little-known Commission, by virtue of its power to grant or withhold membership in the broadcast industry. On a personal level, the case shook into me the realization, for the first time in my life, of the dreadful significance of the ownership structure of the mass media in America.

THE ITT-ABC MERGER CASE

ITT is a sprawling international conglomerate of 433 separate boards of directors that derives about 60 percent of its income from its significant holdings in at least forty foreign countries. It is the ninth largest industrial corporation in the world in size of work force. In addition to its sale of electronic equipment to foreign governments, and operation of foreign countries' telephone systems, roughly half of its domestic income comes from U.S. Government defense and space contracts. But it is also in the business of consumer finance, life insurance, investment funds, small loan companies, car rentals (ITT Avis, Inc.), and book publishing.

This description of ITT's anatomy is taken (as is much of this ITT-ABC discussion) from opinions written by myself and Commissioners Bartley and Cox. We objected, vigorously, to the four-man majority's decision to approve the merger. So did some senators and congressmen, the Department of Justice, the Commission's own staff, a number of independent individuals and witnesses, and a belated but eventually insistent chorus of newspaper and magazine editorialists.

What did we find so ominous about the take-over of this radio and television network by a highly successful conglomerate organization?

In 1966, ABC owned 399 theaters in 34 states, 5 VHF television stations, 6 AM and 6 FM stations (all in the top 10 broadcasting markets), and, of course, one of the 3 major television networks and one of the 4 major radio networks in the world. Its 137 primary television network affiliates could reach 93 percent of the then 50 million television homes in the United States, and its radio network affiliates could reach 97 percent of the then 55 million homes with radio receivers. ABC had interests in, and affiliations with, stations in 25 other nations, known as the "Worldvision Group." These, together with ABC Films, made the parent corporation perhaps the world's largest distributor of filmed shows for theaters and television stations throughout this country and abroad. ABC was heavily involved in the record production and distribution business, and other subsidiaries published three farm papers.

The merger would have placed this accumulation of mass media, and one of the largest purveyors of news and opinion in America, under the control of one of the largest conglomerate corporations in the world. What's wrong with that? Potentially a number of things. For now, consider simply that the integrity of the news judgment of ABC might be affected by the economic interests of ITT—that ITT might simply view ABC's programming as a part of ITT's public relations, advertising, or political activities. This seemed to us a real threat in 1966, notwithstanding the character of the management of both companies, and their protestations that no possibility of abuse existed. By 1967 the potential threat had become reality.

ITT'S EMPIRE

ITT's continuing concern with political and economic developments in foreign countries as a result of its far-flung economic interests was fully documented in the hearing. It showed, as one might expect, ITT's recurrent concern with internal affairs in most major countries of the world, including rate problems, tax problems, and problems with nationalization and reimbursement, to say nothing of ordinary commercial dealing. Its involvement with the United States government, in addition to defense contracts, included the Agency for International Development's insurance of 5.8 percent of all ITT assets.

Testimony was offered on the fascinating story of intrigue surrounding "Operation Deep Freeze" (an underwater cable). It turned out that ITT officials, using high-level government contracts in England and Canada, had brought off a bit of profitable international diplomacy unknown to the United States State Department or the FCC, possibly in violation of law. Further inquiry revealed that officers and directors of ITT's subsidiaries included two members of the British House of Lords, one in the French National Assembly, a former premier of Belgium, and several ministers of foreign governments and officials of government-owned companies.

As it seemed to Commissioners Bartley and Cox and to me when we dissented from the Commission's approval of the merger in June, 1967, a company whose daily activities require it to manipulate governments at the highest levels would face unending temptation to manipulate ABC news. Any public official, or officer of a large corporation, is necessarily clearly concerned with the appearance of some news stories, the absence of others, and the tone and character of all affecting his personal interests. That's what public relations firms and press secretaries are all about. We concluded, "We simply cannot find that the public interest of the American citizenry is served by turning over a major network to an international enterprise whose fortunes are tied to its political relations with the foreign officials whose actions it will be called upon to interpret to the world."

Even the highest degree of subjective integrity on the part of chief ITT officials could not ensure integrity in ABC's operations. To do an honest and impartial job of reporting the news is difficult enough for the most independent and conscientious of newsmen. And ABC newsmen could not help knowing that ITT had sensitive business relations in various foreign countries and at the highest levels of our government, and that reporting on any number of industries and economic developments would touch the interests of ITT. The mere awareness of these interests would make it impossible for those news officials, no matter how conscientious, to report news and develop documentaries objectively, in the way that they would do if ABC remained unaffiliated with ITT. They would advance within the news organization, or be fired, or become officers of ABC—perhaps even of ITT—or not, and no newsmen would be able to erase from his mind the idea that his chances of doing so might be affected by his treatment of issues on which ITT is sensitive.

Only last year CBS was reportedly involved, almost Hearst-like, in a nightmarish planned armed invasion of Haiti. It was an exclusive, and would have made a very dramatic start-to-finish documentary but for the inglorious end: U.S. Customs wouldn't let them leave the United States. Imagine ITT, with its extensive interests in the Caribbean, engaged in such undertakings.

The likelihood of at least some compromising of ABC's integrity seemed inherent in the structure of the proposed new organization. What were the probabilities that these poten-

tials for abuse would be exercised? We were soon to see the answer in the bizarre proceedings right before our eyes.

During the April, 1967, hearings, while this very issue was being debated, the *Wall Street Journal* broke the story that ITT was going to extraordinary lengths to obtain favorable press coverage of this hearing. Eventually three reporters were summoned before the examiner to relate for the official record the incidents that were described in the *Journal's* exposé.

An AP and a UPI reporter testified to several phone calls to their homes by ITT public relations men, variously asking them to change their stories and make inquiries for ITT with regard to stories by other reporters, and to use their influence as members of the press to obtain for ITT confidential information from the Department of Justice regarding its intentions. Even more serious were several encounters between ITT officials and a New York Times reporter.

On one of these occasions ITT's senior vice president in charge of public relations went to the reporter's office. After criticizing her dispatches to the *Times* about the case in a tone which she described as "accusatory and certainly nasty," he asked whether she had been following the price of ABC and ITT stock. When she indicated that she had not, he asked if she didn't feel she had a "responsibility to the shareholders who might lose money as a result of what" she wrote. She replied, "My responsibility is to find out the truth and print it."

He then asked if she was aware that I (as an FCC Commissioner) was working with a prominent senator on legislation that would forbid any newspaper from owning any broadcast property. (The New York Times owns station WQXR in New York.) In point of fact, the senator and I had never met, let alone collaborated, as was subsequently made clear in public statements. But the ITT senior vice president according to the *Times* reporter felt that this false information was something she "ought to pass on to [her] ... publisher before [she wrote] ... anything further" about the case. The obvious implication of this remark she felt was that since the *Times* owns a radio station, it would want to consider its economic interests in deciding what to publish about broadcasting in its newspaper.

To me, this conduct, in which at least three ITT officials, including a senior vice president, were involved, was a deeply unsettling experience. It demonstrated an abrasive self-righteousness in dealing with the press, insensitivity to its independence and integrity, a willingness to spread false stories in furtherance of self-interest, contempt for government officials as well as the press, and an assumption that even as prestigious a news medium as the New York Times would, as a matter of course, want to present the news so as to serve best its own economic interests (as well as the economic interests of other large business corporations).

But for the brazen activities of ITT in this very proceeding, it would never have occurred to the three of us who dissented to suggest that the most probable threat to the integrity of ABC news could come from overt actions or written policy statements. After the hearing it was obvious that that was clearly possible. But even then we believe that the most substantial threat came from a far more subtle, almost unconscious, process: that the questionable story idea, or news coverage, would never even be proposed—whether for reasons of fear, insecurity, cynicism, realism, or unconscious avoidance.

CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL OVER THE MEDIA

Since the ITT-ABC case left the Commission I have not ceased to be troubled by the issues it raised—in many ways more serious and certainly more prevalent) for wholly domestic corporations. Eventually the merger

was aborted by ITT on New Year's Day of this year, while the Justice Department's appeal of the Commission's action was pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals. However, I ponder what the consequences might have been if ITT's apparent cynicism toward journalistic integrity had actually been able to harness the enormous social and propaganda power of a national television network to the service of a politically sensitive corporate conglomerate. More important, I have become concerned about the extent to which such forces already play upon important media of mass communication. Perhaps such attitudes are masked by more finesse than that displayed in the ITT-ABC case. Perhaps they are even embedded in the kind of sincere good intentions which caused former Defense Secretary (and former General Motors president) Charles Wilson to equate the interests of his company with those of the country.

I do not believe that most owners and managers of the mass media in the United States lack a sense of responsibility or lack tolerance for a diversity of views. I do not believe there is a small group of men who gather for breakfast every morning and decide what they will make the American people believe that day. Emotion often outruns the evidence of those who argue a conspiracy theory of propagandists' manipulation of the masses.

On the other hand, one reason evidence is so hard to come by is that the media tend to give less publicity to their own abuses than, say, to those of politicians. The media operate as a check upon other institutional power centers in our country. There is, however, no check upon the media. Just as it is a mistake to overstate the existence and potential for abuse, so, in my judgment, is it a mistake to ignore the evidence that does exist.

In 1959, for example, it was reported that officials of the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic had paid \$750,000 to officers of the Mutual Radio Network to gain favorable propaganda disguised as news. (Ownership of the Mutual Radio Network changed hands once again last year without any review whatsoever by the FCC of old or new owners. The FCC does not regulate networks, only stations, and Mutual owns none.) RCA was once charged with using an NBC station to serve unfairly its broader corporate interests, including the coverage of RCA activities as "news," when others did not. There was speculation that after RCA acquired Random House, considerable pressure was put on the book publishing house's president, Bennett Cerf, to cease his Sunday evening service as a panelist on CBS's *What's My Line?* The Commission has occasionally found that individual stations have violated the "fairness doctrine" in advocating causes serving the station's economic self-interest, such as pay television.

Virtually every issue of the *Columbia Journalism Review* reports instances of such abuses by the print media. It has described a railroad-owned newspaper that refused to report railroad wrecks, a newspaper in debt to the Teamsters Union which gave exceedingly favorable coverage to Jimmy Hoffa, the repeated influence of the DuPont interests in the editorial functions of the Wilmington papers which it owned, and Anacosta Copper's use of its company-owned newspapers to support political candidates favorable to the company.

Edward P. Morgan left ABC last year to become the commentator on the Ford Foundation-funded Public Broadcasting Laboratory. He has always been straightforward, and he used his final news broadcast to be reflective about broadcasting itself. "Let's face it," he said. "We in this trade use this power more frequently to fix a traffic ticket or get a ticket to a ballgame than to keep the doors of an open society

open and swinging . . . The freest and most profitable press in the world, every major facet of it, not only ducks but pulls its punches to save a supermarket of commercialism or shield an ugly prejudice and is putting the life of the republic in jeopardy thereby."

Economic self-interest does influence the content of the media, and as the media tend to fall into the control of corporate conglomerates, the areas of information and opinion affecting those economic interests become dangerously wide-ranging. What is happening to the ownership of American media today? What dangers does it pose? Taking a look at the structure of the media in the United States, I am not put at ease by what I see.

Most American communities have far less "dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources" (to quote a famous description by the Supreme Court of the basic aim of the First Amendment) than is available nationally. Of the 1500 cities with daily newspapers, 96 percent are served by single-owner monopolies. Outside the top 50 to 200 markets there is a substantial dropping off in the number of competing radio and television signals. The FCC prohibits a single owner from controlling two AM radio, or two television, stations with overlapping signals. But it has only recently expressed any concern over common ownership of an AM radio station and an FM radio station and a television station in the same market. Indeed, such ownership is the rule rather than the exception and probably exists in your community. Most stations are today acquired by purchase. And the FCC has, in part because of congressional pressure, rarely disapproved a purchase of a station by a newspaper.

There are few statewide or regional "monopolies"—although some situations come close. But in a majority of our states—the least populous—there are few enough newspapers and television stations to begin with, and they are usually under the control of a small group. And most politicians find today, as Congress warned in 1926, "woe be to those who dare to differ with them." Most of our politics is still state and local in scope. And increasingly, in many states and local communities, congressmen and state and local officials are compelled to regard that handful of media owners (many of whom are out-of-state), rather than the electorate itself, as their effective constituency. Moreover, many mass media owners have a significant impact in more than one state. One case that came before the FCC, for example, involved an owner with AM-FM-TV combinations in Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada, along with four newspapers in that state, seven newspapers in Oklahoma, and two stations and two newspapers in Arkansas. Another involved ownership of ten stations in North Carolina and adjoining southern Virginia. You may never have heard of these owners, but I imagine the elected officials of their states return their phone calls promptly.

NATIONAL POWER

The principal national sources of news are the wire services, AP and UPI, and the broadcast networks. Each of the wire services serves on the order of 1200 newspapers and 3000 radio and television stations. Most local newspapers and radio stations offer little more than wire service copy as far as national and international news is concerned. To that extent one can take little heart for "diversity" from the oft-proffered statistics on proliferating radio stations (now over 6000) and the remaining daily newspapers (1700). The networks, though themselves heavily reliant upon the wire services to find out what's worth filming, are another potent force.

The weekly newsmagazine field is dominated by *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News*. (The first two also control substantial broad-

cast, newspaper, and book or publishing outlets. *Time* is also in movies (MGM) and is hungry for three or four newspapers.) Thus, even though there are thousands of general and specialized periodicals and program sources with significant national or regional impact, and certainly no "monopoly" exists, it is still possible for a single individual or corporation to have vast national influence.

What we sometimes fail to realize, moreover, is the political significance of the fact that we have become a nation of cities. Nearly half of the American people live in the six largest states: California, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Ohio. Those states, in turn, are substantially influenced (if not politically dominated) by their major population-industrial-financial-media centers, such as Los Angeles, New York City, Chicago, and Philadelphia—the nation's four largest metropolitan areas. Thus, to have a major newspaper or television station influence in one of these cities is to have significant national power. And the number of interests with influence in more than one of these markets is startling.

Most of the top fifty television markets (which serve approximately 75 percent of the nation's television homes) have three competing commercial VHF television stations. There are about 150 such VHF commercial stations in these markets. Less than 10 percent are today owned by entities that do not own other media interests. In 30 of the 50 markets at least one of the stations is owned by a major newspaper published in that market—a total of one third of these 150 stations. (In Dallas-Fort Worth each of the network affiliates is owned by a local newspaper, and the fourth, an unaffiliated station, is owned by Oklahoma newspapers.) Moreover, half of the newspaper-owned stations are controlled by seven groups—groups that also publish magazines as popular and diverse as *Time*, *Newsweek*, *Look*, *Parade*, *Harper's*, *TV Guide*, *Family Circle*, *Vogue*, *Good Housekeeping*, and *Popular Mechanics*. Twelve parties own more than one third of all the major-market stations.

In addition to the vast national impact of their affiliates the three television networks each own VHF stations in all of the top three top markets—New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago—and each has two more in other cities in the top ten. RKO and Metromedia each own stations in both New York City and Los Angeles. Metromedia also owns stations in Washington, D.C., and California's other major city, San Francisco—as well as Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, Kansas City, and Oakland. RKO also owns stations in Boston, San Francisco, Washington, Memphis, Hartford, and Windsor, Ontario—as well as the regional Yankee Network. Westinghouse owns stations in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Boston, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Fort Wayne. These are but a few examples of today's media barons.

There are many implications of their power. Groups of stations are able to bargain with networks, advertisers, and talent in ways that put lesser stations at substantial economic disadvantage. Group ownership means, by definition, that few stations in major markets will be locally owned. (The FCC recently approved the transfer of the last available station in San Francisco to the absentee ownership of Metromedia. The only commercial station locally owned today is controlled by the *San Francisco Chronicle*.) But the basic point is simply that the national political power involved in ownership of a group of major VHF television stations in, say, New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C., is greater than a democracy should unthinkably repose in one man or corporation.

CONGLOMERATE CORPORATIONS

For a variety of reasons, an increasing number of communications media are turn-

ing up on the organization charts of conglomerate companies. And the incredible profits generated by broadcast stations in the major markets (television broadcasters average a 90 to 100 percent return on tangible investment annually) have given FCC licensees, particularly owners of multiple television stations like the networks, Metro-media, Storer Broadcasting, and others, the extra capital with which to buy the New York Yankees (CBS), Random House (RCA), or Northeast Airlines (Storer). Established or up-and-coming conglomerates regard communications acquisitions as prestigious, profitable, and often a useful or even a necessary complement to present operations and projected exploitation of technological change.

The national problem of conglomerate ownership of communications media was well illustrated by the ITT-ABC case. But the conglomerate problem need not involve something as large as ITT-ABC or RCA-NBC. Among the national group owners of television stations are General Tire (RKO), Avco, Westinghouse, Rust Craft, Chris Craft, Kaiser, and Kerr-McGee. The problem of local conglomerates was forcefully posed for the FCC in another case earlier this year. Howard Hughes, through Hughes Tool Company, wanted to acquire one of Las Vegas' three major television stations. He had recently acquired \$125 million worth of Las Vegas real estate, including hotels, gambling casinos, and an airport. These investments supplemented 27,000 acres previously acquired. The Commission majority blithely approved the television acquisition without a hearing, overlooking FCC precedents which suggested that a closer examination was in order. In each of these instances the potential threat is similar to that in the ITT-ABC case—that personal economic interests may dominate or bias otherwise independent media.

CONCENTRATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

The problem posed by conglomerate acquisitions of communications outlets is given a special but very important twist by the pendency of sweeping technological changes which have already begun to unsettle the structure of the industry.

President Johnson has appointed a distinguished task force to evaluate our national communications policy and chart a course for realization of these technological promises in a manner consistent with the public interest. But private interests have already begun to implement their own plans on how to deal with the revolution in communications technology.

General Sarnoff of RCA has hailed the appearance of "the knowledge industry"—corporate casserole dishes blending radio and television stations, networks, and programming; films movie houses and record companies; newspaper magazine and book publishing; advertising agencies; sports or other entertainment companies; and teaching machines and other profitable appurtenances of the \$50 billion "education biz."

And everybody's in "cable television"—networks, book publishers, newspapers. Cable television is a system for building the best TV antenna in town and then wiring it into everybody's television set—for a fee. It improves signal quality and number of channels, and has proved popular. But the new technology is such that it has broadcasters and newspaper publishers worried. For the same cable that can bring off-the-air television into the home can also bring programming from the cable operator's studio, or an "electronic newspaper" printed in the home by a facsimile process. Books can be delivered (between libraries, or to the home) over "television" by using the station's signal during an invisible pause. So everybody's hedging their bets—including the telephone company. Indeed, about all the vested interests can agree upon is that none of them want us to have direct, satellite-to-home ra-

dio and television. But at this point it is not at all clear who will have his hand on the switch that controls what comes to the American people over their "telephone wire" a few years hence.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

It would be foolish to expect any extensive restructuring of the media in the United States, even if it were considered desirable. Technological change can bring change in structure, but it is as likely to be change to even greater concentration as to wider diversity. In the short run at least, economics seems to render essentially intractable such problems as local monopolies in daily newspapers, or the small number of outlets for national news through wire services, news-magazines, and the television networks. Indeed, to a certain extent the very high technical quality of the performance rendered by these news-gathering organizations is aided by their concentration of resources into large units and the financial cushions of oligopoly profits.

Nevertheless, it seems clear to me that the risks of concentration are grave.

Chairman Philip Hart of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee remarked by way of introduction to his antitrust subcommittee's recent hearings about the newspaper industry, "The products of newspapers, opinion and information, are essential to the kind of society that we undertake to make successful here." If we are serious about the kind of society we have undertaken, it is clear to me that we simply must not tolerate concentration of media ownership—except where concentration creates actual countervailing social benefits. These benefits cannot be merely speculative. They must be identifiable, demonstrable, and genuinely weighty enough to offset the dangers inherent in concentration.

This guideline is a simple prescription. The problem is to design and build machinery to fill it. And to keep the machinery from rusting and rotting. And to replace it when it becomes obsolete.

America does have available governmental machinery which is capable of scotching undue accumulations of power over the mass media, at least in theory and to some extent. The Department of Justice has authority under the antitrust laws to break up combinations which "restrain trade" or which "tend to lessen competition." These laws apply to the media as they do to any other industry.

But the antitrust laws simply do not get to where the problems are. They grant authority to block concentration only when it threatens economic competition in a particular economic market. Generally, in the case of the media, the relevant market is the market for advertising. Unfortunately, relatively vigorous advertising competition can be maintained in situations where competition in the marketplace of ideas is severely threatened. In such cases, the Justice Department has little inclination to act.

Look at the Chicago *Tribune's* recent purchase of that city's most popular and most successful FM radio station. The *Tribune* already controlled two Chicago newspapers, one (clear channel) AM radio station, and the city's only independent VHF television station. It controls numerous broadcast, CATV, and newspaper interests outside Chicago (in terms of circulation, the nation's largest newspaper chain). But, after an investigation, the Antitrust Division let this combination go through. The new FM may be a needless addition to the *Tribune's* already impressive battery of influential media; it could well produce an unsound level of concentration in the production and supply of what Chicagoans see, read, and hear about affairs in their community, in the nation, and in the world. But it did not threaten the level of competition for advertising money in any identifiable advertising

market. So, it was felt, the acquisition was not the business of the Justice Department.

Only the FCC is directly empowered to keep media ownership patterns compatible with a democracy's need for diversified sources of opinion and information.

In earlier times, the Commission took this responsibility very seriously. In 1941, the FCC ordered NBC to divest itself of one of its two radio networks (which then became ABC), barring any single network from affiliating with more than one outlet in a given city. (The Commission has recently waived this prohibition for, ironically, ABC's four new national radio networks.) In 1941 the Commission also established its power to set absolute limits on the total number of broadcast licenses any individual may hold, and to limit the number of stations any individual can operate in a particular service area.

The American people are indebted to the much maligned FCC for establishing these rules. Imagine, for example, what the structure of political power in this country might look like if two or three companies owned substantially all of the broadcast media in our major cities.

But since the New Deal generation left the command posts of the FCC, this agency has lost much of its zeal for combating concentration. Atrophy has reached so advanced a state that the public has of late witnessed the bizarre spectacle of the Justice Department, with its relatively narrow mandate, intervening in FCC proceedings, such as ITT-ABC, to create court cases with names like *The United States vs. The FCC*.

This history is an unhappy one on the whole. It forces one to question whether government can ever realistically be expected to sustain a vigilant posture over an industry which controls the very access of government officials themselves to the electorate.

I fear that we have already reached the point in this country where the media, our greatest check on other accumulations of power, may themselves be beyond the reach of any other institution: the Congress, the President, or the Federal Communications Commission, not to mention governors, mayors, state legislators, and city councilmen. Congressional hearings are begun and then quietly dropped. Whenever the FCC stirs fitfully as if in wakefulness, the broadcasting industry scurries up the Hill for a congressional bludgeon. And the fact that roughly 60 percent of all campaign expenses go to radio and television time gives but a glimmer of the power of broadcasting in the lives of senators and congressmen.

However, the picture at this moment has its more hopeful aspect. There does seem to be an exceptional flurry of official concern. Even the FCC has its proposed rulemaking outstanding. The Department of Justice, having broken into the communications field via its dramatic intervention before the FCC in the ITT-ABC merger case, has also been pressing a campaign to force the dissolution of joint operating agreements between separately owned newspapers in individual cities, and opposed a recent application for broadcasting properties by newspaper interests in Beaumont, Texas. It has been scrutinizing cross-media combinations linking broadcasting, newspaper, and cable television outlets. On Capitol Hill, Senator Phil Hart's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and Chairman Harley Staggers' House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have both summoned the Federal Communications Commission to appear before them in recent months, to acquaint the Commission with the committee's concern about FCC-approved increases in broadcast holdings by single individuals and companies, and about cross-ownership of newspapers, CATV systems, and broadcast stations. Representatives John Dingell, John Moss, and Richard Ottinger have introduced legisla-

tion which would proscribe network ownership of any nonbroadcast interests. And as I previously mentioned, President Johnson has appointed a task force to undertake a comprehensive review of national communications policy.

Twenty years ago Robert M. Hutchins, then chancellor of the University of Chicago, was named chairman of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." It produced a thoughtful report, full of recommendations largely applicable today—including "the establishment of a new and independent [non-governmental] agency to appraise and report annually upon the performance of the press," and urged "that the members of the press engage in vigorous mutual criticism." Its proposals are once again being dusted off and reread.

What is needed now, more than anything else, is to keep this flurry of interest alive, and to channel it toward constructive reforms. What this means, in practical fact, is that concern for media concentration must find an institutional home.

The Department of Justice has already illustrated the value of participation by an external institution in FCC decision-making. The developing concept of a special consumers' representative offers a potentially broader base for similar action.

But the proper place to lodge continuing responsibility for promoting diversity in the mass media is neither the FCC nor the Justice Department nor a congressional committee. The initiative must come from private sources. But there are more adequately staffed and funded private organizations which could play a more effective role in policy formation than a single individual. Even the FCC, where the public interest gets entirely too little representation from private sources, has felt the impact of the United Church of Christ, with its interest in the influence of broadcasting on race relations and in the programming responsibility of licenses.

Ideally, however, the resources for a sustained attack on concentration might be centered in a single institution, equipped to look after this cause. The law schools and their law reviews, as an institution, have performed well in this way for the courts, but have virtually abdicated responsibility for the agencies.

Such an organization could devote itself to research as well as representation. For at present any public body like the FCC, which has to make determinations about acceptable levels of media concentration, has to do so largely on the basis of hunch. In addition, private interest in problems of concentration would encourage the Justice Department to sustain its present vigilance in this area. It could stimulate renewed vigilance on the part of the FCC, through participation in Commission proceedings. And it could consider whether new legislation might be appropriate to reach the problem of newspaper-magazine-book publishing combinations.

If changes are to be made (or now dormant standards are to be enforced) the most pressing political question is whether to apply the standards prospectively only, or to require divestiture. It is highly unlikely, to say the least, that legislation requiring massive divestiture of multiple station ownership, or newspaper ownership of stations, would ever pass through Congress. Given the number of station sales every year, however, even prospective standards could have some impact over ten years or so.

In general, I would urge the minimal standard that no accumulation of media should be permitted without a specific and convincing showing of a continuing countervailing social benefit. For no one has a higher calling in an increasingly complex free society bent on self-government than he who informs and moves the people. Personal

prejudice, ignorance, social pressure, and advertiser pressure are in large measure inevitable. But a nation that has, in Learned Hand's phrase, "staked its all" upon the rational dialogue of an informed electorate simply cannot take any unnecessary risk of polluting the stream of information and opinion that sustains it. At the very least, the burden of proving the social utility of doing otherwise should be upon him who seeks the power and profit which will result.

Whatever may be the outcome, the wave of renewed interest in the impact of ownership on the role of the media in our society is healthy. All will gain from intelligent inquiry by Congress, the Executive, the regulatory commissions—and especially the academic community, the American people generally, and the media themselves. For, as the Supreme Court has noted, nothing is more important in a free society than "the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources." And if we are unwilling to discuss this issue fully today we may find ourselves discussing none that matter very much tomorrow.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Cleveland Library Board and a strong supporter of the Cleveland library system, I wish to call attention to the Congress of the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Cleveland Public Library.

I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to the staff of the library on their devotion and service to our library system. If these past hundred years are any indication, the next hundred years of service to our community by the Cleveland Public Library will be very exciting.

Mr. Hedley Donovan, the editor-in-chief of *Time*, Inc., delivered the principal address at the centennial dinner of the Cleveland Public Library on February 18, 1969, at the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland before an audience of over 1,800 persons. The speech Mr. Donovan delivered presents an excellent review of world events. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. The speech is as follows:

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTENNIAL DINNER, FEBRUARY 19, 1969

(By Hedley Donovan)

I am very much complimented to have a part in this Centennial celebration.

In my business, on somewhat similar occasions, say a magazine is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary, one is never quite certain whether to say Many Happy Returns. When we send out letters soliciting subscriptions to our magazines and books—some of you may have received such a letter once or even twice—the number of orders, in relation to the total mailing, is called the Return, and the higher that percentage the happier we are. On the other hand, when it comes to newsstand sales, Returns are unsold copies; some of you, by passing a newsstand and thoughtlessly failing to buy one or more of the *Time* Inc. publications, may have contributed to a kind of Return we do not enjoy.

In the library business, however, I take it Returns are a completely good thing, always welcome, sometimes even stimulated by kindly reminder. So I can indeed wish this library Many Happy Returns, and I offer warmest congratulations to the staff, the trustees, the city officials and all the Cleveland citizens who have built this notable institution.

I was once briefly a Library Trustee myself, in a Long Island suburb. It was the first Board of Trustees of any kind that I had belonged to. Before joining, I had pictured the board meetings as cozy evenings where a few cultivated men and women sat around and talked about books. My fellow trustees were cultivated all right, and you know of course what we did talk about—money.

I believe I was asked here, however, not as a failed trustee, but because of a quite special bond between *Time* Incorporated and the City of Cleveland. This city was the headquarters of our company for two crucial years of its early life. It was the mid-1920's, that brash little sheet *Time* was just barely beginning to catch hold, and its young editors found all kinds of encouragement here in Cleveland, from readers who told them first hand they were doing a good job, from several advertisers, from a bank and a printer who were willing to bet the magazine might last. The encouragement went so far, in one case, that a very pretty Cleveland girl agreed to marry the young circulation manager of *Time*, Roy Larsen; Mr. Larsen is now chairman of our Executive Committee, and his very pretty wife Margot still thinks rather well of *Time*.

Henry Luke, after the Cleveland years of *Time*, always talked of this city as a second home town. I am sure that is one reason *Time* was proud to come here shortly after the war, and serve as co-sponsor, with the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, for a three-day public forum on U.S. foreign policy. In the years since those sessions in 1947, Cleveland and *Time* have both talked a good deal about U.S. foreign policy. I propose that this should also be our subject for the next few minutes.

There have been some changes in the roll-call of our biggest foreign policy problems:

How to de-escalate Viet Nam—22 years ago de-escalate was not even a word in our vocabulary, and neither was Viet Nam;

How to defuse the Middle East—22 years ago the Middle East was French and British responsibility, mainly British, and Israel was a name in the Bible;

How to negotiate a renewal of our defense treaty with Japan, which expires next year, and to smooth the way for that, should we give them back Okinawa?—which 22 years ago might not have been a very popular idea with various Americans who had just been to a good deal of trouble to take Okinawa;

How to revitalize NATO, or has it served its time?—and how to treat with the only World War II leader still in command, that great and maddening man Charles de Gaulle;

And speaking of the General, must we overhaul the whole international monetary mechanism?

And what can we do for the pitiful children of Biafra?

And how do we negotiate some nuclear arms limitation, or should we, with the Soviet Union—which about halfway through this 22 year period acquired the capability of killing half of us, more or less, on half an hour's notice—that was an option previous Americans never had to concede to a foreign government, although, to be sure, we can still kill Russians even more definitively, or as Winston Churchill once said, we can "make the rubble bounce."

And so on. You know the whole long list.

We look out on this world of 1969 as a deeply confused country. It is easy to say that

it is the cruel question of Viet Nam that has got us so mixed up. Our public life has been dominated by Viet Nam ever since we began the bombing of the North four years ago this month, and then sent Marine combat units ashore at Danang in March '65. It is the longest war in American history, not the biggest but probably the most complicated, and surely the most divisive. Now, very slowly and very ambiguously, this strange war seems to be running down. No wonder we ache and grope.

But I believe the causes of our confusion go much deeper than Viet Nam. Indeed the Viet Nam experience—vivid as it has been, important as it has been—has in a sense masked a more fundamental change in the underpinnings of American foreign policy. That change, very simply, is the loss of a working consensus, for the first time in the lives of any of us in this room, as to what we think America means in the world and to the world.

Look back for a moment at two aspects of American history. One we know mainly from reading about it in books, the other we ourselves have lived.

For generations, as many volumes in your library confirm, we Americans believed we were God's elect. John Adams wrote that it was the design of Providence to use America for the "illumination" and "emancipation" of all mankind. Thomas Jefferson proposed that the Seal of the United States should show the children of Israel led by a pillar of light. The notion of America as the chosen people was one of his favorite themes; this very urbane man could say: "God led our forefathers as Israel of old." He called us "the world's best hope," and we hear echoes of that when Abraham Lincoln, amidst the anguish of the Civil War, called us "the last best hope of earth." And all the way to the 1890's, that great historian George Bancroft, trained at Harvard, Heidelberg and Göttingen, believed to the end of his long life (as another historian has written of him) that American history was really "the story of the wonder-working of the hand of God in the American forest." It is hard to imagine any Harvard Ph. D., or Yale or Stanford either, looking at it just that way today.

Yet well into the 20th century, the belief persisted. The debate over our entry into World War I, 1914 to 1917, can be read as a clash between men who believed it was enough for America simply to stand here in its goodness, as example and beacon, and more militant men who believed America must carry its truths across the oceans.

Somewhere after the first World War, we lost that serene confidence that God's hand was especially upon us; the war itself came to seem a mistake and a failure, something America had never felt about its other wars; it was generally a time of rising sophistication and cynicism; the traditional religious beliefs were weakening; the memories of the frontier were fast receding; increasingly large blocs of the American population lacked any ancestral share in the classic chapters of American history; for Americans who did still have faith in the God of their fathers it was hard to believe that the spreading of the urban industrial landscape could enjoy quite the same divine favor as the crossing of the Continental Divide.

And if anything of the old idea of the Chosen People had survived the 1920's, the Great Depression of the 1930's surely did not help it.

Now for a large, literate democratic society once to have held so strongly such a righteous and spacious view of itself, and then in a few years to lose it, should be a profoundly unsettling experience.

But we never really had the experience. For at just this moment Americans were confronted with Adolf Hitler.

Starting in the late 1930's, more and more of the most thoughtful people in America,

in government, in the churches, in business and banking, in the universities, were increasingly preoccupied with the threat of totalitarianism in Europe and Asia. The very people who might have been most concerned with the loss of the old sense of the American mission, and most concerned to find a new one, were spared that search. The Nazis and the Japanese militarists did not require us to think about the uses of liberty, or about deep meanings of America. They required us to defend ourselves, and that was meaning enough.

If the defeat of the Axis Powers had led to a stable peace, the once-postponed search for the modern American mission might have started soon after the war. But Stalin, almost overnight, took the place of Tojo and Hitler. The Cold War was on. Once more we believed ourselves to be holding a worldwide line against tyranny. Once more we were relieved of asking ourselves what else is America all about. We fought a tough, costly war in Korea.

The Cold War eased some in 1953, after Stalin's death and after the Korean truce, and then it eased some more around 1963. The autumn before, the Soviets had started installing missiles in Cuba, the most blatant thrust they ever made outside their own sphere of influence, and John Kennedy very coolly stared them down and eased them out. By the summer of 1963, President Kennedy was making his highly conciliatory American University speech and laying the groundwork for the nuclear test ban treaty.

But once again, just as one set of foreign dangers seemed to be receding, still another crisis, perceived as a major danger to ourselves and our allies, came to dominate our thinking about foreign policy. This of course was Viet Nam.

Let us be a little optimistic and say that Viet Nam is somehow resolved by the end of this year. That will mean that we have gone through a thirty-five-year crisis—from the rearing of Nazi Germany, starting in 1935, through World War II, through Korea and the Cold War, through Viet Nam. It means that all Americans in their forties, fifties and sixties, most of the leadership generation, have spent most or all of their adult lives with a view of an embattled, endangered America.

What if, almost all of a sudden, there were no acute external danger?

Some of the young dissenters on our campuses might be unmoored if there were no Viet Nam, but so might many of their elders, and perhaps more seriously. You know some of the public-spirited lawyers and bankers of downtown Manhattan who have served both Democratic and Republican administrations through many of these days of danger; they have their counterparts in Cleveland and other cities; and then there are the industrialists, diplomats, military men, labor leaders, Congressmen, university and foundation officials—the Establishment if you like; even editors are sometimes mentioned. Mature and responsible men with a lifetime crisis-oriented view of American foreign policy might be suddenly disoriented.

Now there are skeptics who say it will never be allowed to happen. Old-fashioned Marxists, new-fashioned New Leftists, would argue that it was no coincidence that the Cold War came along just as World War II ended, or that Viet Nam came along just when the Cold War was letting up a bit. According to this view, if the American people are now sick of Viet Nam, something else will be cooked up, maybe the Middle East, because the American "military-industrial complex" needs its war orders, the universities need their Pentagon research contracts, the Colonels need their chance to make General, and so on. This is a kind of devil theory of American history, even more naive, and less attractive, than the God theory I spoke of earlier.

I am optimistic enough to think we may soon lack an external crisis, and we will then face a kind of internal crisis of the American spirit. Who is America; what are we all about?

There seems to be fairly widespread agreement on a few things that we are not. During last year's Presidential campaign, one sentiment regularly uttered by all candidates was: "We cannot be the world's policeman." Nixon said it, Humphrey said it, Rockefeller, McCarthy, everybody said it. I don't think I heard anybody advocate that we *should* be the world's policeman, and there were times when it seemed not too attractive even to be a policeman for New York or Chicago.

Senator McCarthy also cautioned us against trying to be the world's judge or the world's confessor. Senator Fulbright has warned us against "the arrogance of power." Objection noted.

Many people say "No More Viet Nams." In fact it is hard, even if you wanted to, to think up another situation very much like Viet Nam. But there are plenty of other voices, McGeorge Bundy for instance, warning us not to over-react to Viet Nam, not to retreat into isolationism, or neo-isolationism. Yet in the kind of world we live in today, isolationism in the sense of the 1920's or 1930's is utterly impossible; it becomes a meaningless thing to warn against. Fortress America, Fortress Cleveland—there are no such things anymore, and everybody knows it.

Indeed much of the old vocabulary for arguing about our role in the world has become obsolete. Balance of power, power vacuum, co-existence, confrontation—I'm afraid journalists no less than politicians keep using these tired old tags as a substitute for studying things as they really are. It is very hard work, of course, to figure out how things really are.

Cold War may not be a very useful expression anymore; nor is containment. I doubt if it clarifies our thinking to keep talking of "The Free World," embracing as it does so many kinds of societies and degrees of freedom, down to zero; nor does it help to call it "The Anti-Communist World," for not all of it is all that anti; we simply mean the non-communist world, and when we say that 118 countries belong to it, we haven't really said a great deal.

"The Communist World" is certainly not an entity either; there are now three big branches—Russian, Chinese, East European; and some sub-species—Yugoslav, Cuban, Viet Cong. We miss our old clear-cut enemies. Ho Chi Minh is not Hitler. I sat across a table from Kossygin one morning last winter and listened to a couple of hours of attacks on America, but it was all very calm and bureaucratic, like an argument with somebody from the Gas Company. The only mushroom clouds Americans remember are in photographs of our own explosions.

Then there are the tidy-minded people who try to lump together all the underdeveloped countries as "The Third World." I once heard some Indian journalists interviewing a group of Brazilian businessmen. I've had trouble ever since with the Third World concept.

The real world is fantastically diverse, and getting more so. We should rejoice in that and stop trying to fit it all into a few old and outdated boxes.

But this, of course, is part of our difficulty in defining America, for what we think *we* are is necessarily something we perceive in comparison with other nations. Once we defined ourselves essentially by contrast with the European monarchies, then as champion of democracy against the mid-twentieth century totalitarianisms. It gets harder to define America against all of today's rich variety of national societies, the many kinds of governments and political philosophies that abound in this world of 1969.

Nor is there any firm point of reference

within our own domestic political dialogue. I do not know of anything that could be called a Republican view, or a Democratic view, of the American position in the world as of 1969. Surely one of the greatest accomplishments open to President Nixon would be to shape a modern concept, post Thomas Jefferson, post Hitler and Stalin, post Viet Nam, of America's place and purpose in the world.

To arrive at such a concept, there are, I think, four or five basic questions on which the President and the country must come to some agreed view:

1. *Do we have a moral obligation to share our wealth with other peoples?* I vote that we do. Our foreign aid programs are always being advocated as "enlightened self-interest." Congress and the public are told that the real purpose is to stop communism, etc. I think we can also afford to help other peoples simply because it's right.

2. *Do we ask that America be emulated?* Do we consider America still some kind of model? My own vote would be that our political system and our economic system are two of the greatest works of modern man. Let us continue to think of them that way, let us make them work even better. They will continue to exert great influence in many parts of the world, and we need never try to ram them down anybody's throat. We are not, however, an all-purpose example. We can hardly ask to be regarded as a model in the matter of racial justice. Almost equally shameful, in my view, is the abuse of our environment and our shoddy aesthetic standards. These uglinesses of the American spirit and landscape hurt us all over the world, and deservedly so.

3. *Are we still willing to fight?* When, where, for whom and what? You and I can list some places and governments we would not want America to fight for; I'm not sure we want President Nixon or Secretary Rogers to read off their list out loud. Are there still causes for which we should be ready to burn up most of the Northern Hemisphere? I think the nuclear deterrent does still deter; the assumption that there are situations in which we would use these weapons is still some assurance we will not have to use them. But this condition may not last much longer. We may be passing into a period where the technology is so volatile, and the missile and anti-missile production response and counter-response so relentless, that the weapons themselves are becoming, as the experts in this frightful subject put it, "destabilizing." So should we take a chance on some arms limitation agreement with the Russians, or should we take our chances with the arms? I myself vote for a try at the agreement. This delicate and dangerous decision is upon the Nixon Administration right now.

4. *As we move about the world, and act in the world, do we think of ourselves as the United States Government or as individual Americans?* My own belief is that we appear before the world far too often and too obtrusively as the U.S. Government. This is a paradox because here at home, we believe—or most of us do—that the American government is something much less than the American people, indeed that the chief aim of government is to help create conditions in which we as individuals can achieve our highest possibilities. The overseas expenditures, embassies, alliances of the U.S. Government seem to me less promising, for the long run, than the overseas activities of individual American students, doctors, businessmen, engineers, painters, basketball players. And our official policies should of course give full encouragement to the private foreign citizen for trade, travel, study in America. You have a lot of experience with this here in Cleveland. So when we ask what does America mean in the world, surely a part of the answer is that the Cleveland Orchestra is going to give concerts in Japan next year; and a Cleveland man named Jesse

Owens has taught sprinting to youngsters in India; and Case Western Reserve has trained thousands of foreign teachers, doctors, engineers; and Republic Steel is digging iron ore in Liberia; and TRW is building the vehicles for the world's first commercial satellite network.

5. And finally, if we have become too tactful to call ourselves the last best hope on earth, and a little uncertain, in any case, whether we really are, and if we are no longer on 24-hour Red Alert in a permanent world crisis, *can we still find some way to invest America with a touch of the heroic?* Old-fashioned patriotism has been in a long decline; the very idea of country has been eroding, and not just because of Viet Nam. America as a way of thinking about things does not have the same force with our children that it had with us and our fathers. When I was growing up two or three states west of here, in Minnesota, I could hear the Great Northern whistles at night, the trains bound for immensely romantic American places—like Montana; I especially longed to see the Rocky Mountains. The other day I heard of a Connecticut school where the whole sixth grade is going to spend Easter vacation in Rome; not a fancy private country day school and not a Catholic parochial school either, just ordinary twelve-year-olds in a suburban public school. Now we all like the idea of our children moving with so much ease and freedom in this richly interesting world that spreads all around them, and as I was saying a moment ago, the individual American learning, working, traveling all over the world is surely a big part of what we want America to mean in the world. Yet we must recognize that this growing cosmopolitanism clashes with many of our older ideas of country. And patriotism, in spite of all the follies committed in its name, has been a powerful organizing principle in human affairs, certainly so in this country; it has gotten a lot of work done, and added an extra dimension, even a nobility, to many lives. I do not know that "mankind" or "humanity" are yet capable of evoking comparable efforts or loyalties or personal satisfactions. So the question remains: can we find contemporary and civilized ways to love America? I pray we can.

You will have noticed that I came here tonight with more questions than answers. I would plead, Mr. Chairman, that this is the spirit in which one approaches a library, and perhaps by extension, one can come with very large questions to the centennial of a very great library. For a great library keeps for us the highest values of the past, and holds for us at least a part of the knowledge that can unlock the doors of the future.

I thank you again for allowing me to join in this centennial. I wish for your city and its great cultural institutions a full share in working out for our time the meaning of the American community, among ourselves and amidst the nations.

STUDENT RIOTERS SHOULD LOSE U.S. AID

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. My Speaker, I am delighted to see the Nixon administration taking a firm approach in regard to the deliberate few who act to willfully disrupt campuses. This action is long overdue. Unfortunately the previous administration, although armed with a legislative enabling act by Congress, failed to

do anything to end the nonsense taking place in the name of free speech at many of our colleges and universities beyond apologizing for "student misbehavior."

There can be no excuse for continuing to allow the hard-core anarchists to bring America's educational institutions to the brink of closure. This policy must end and I applaud executive action to implement the Cramer and Wyman amendments of the 90th Congress.

This leadership from the Nixon administration will materially help in dealing with campus disruptions. It also epitomizes the new direction of American domestic policy that the voters said they wanted on election day 1968.

SOVIET FISHING FLEET?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a Soviet navy of some 100 boats continues to poach the fishing grounds off our eastern coast from Long Island to Virginia.

The small mesh design of the fishing nets clearly indicate that the Soviet fishing fleet is exploiting the sea by taking every living creature in its path.

In fact, Soviet Life for March of 1969, a propaganda magazine published by the Soviet Embassy in Washington, claims that 7,100,000 tons of fish will be caught this year.

One thing is obvious, the Russians do not believe in conservation or any theory of perpetuation of natural resources.

Yet is the aim of this fishing expedition exclusively to exploit the world's richest fisheries or does it have additional objectives, such as compiling useful data for its ever-enlarging navy for future operations?

Mr. Speaker, a freedom rally was recently held in Atlantic City to protest the Soviet fishing fleet, led by Dr. Carl McIntire, of Cape May, N.J.

I insert a copy of the freedom rally advertisement from the Atlantic City Press of February 20 in the RECORD:

ATTEND THE FREEDOM RALLY SATURDAY, COLUMBUS PLAZA—ATLANTIC AND MISSOURI AVENUES—4 P.M.

(NOTE.—Soviet Life, March, 1969, published by the Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., as a slick propaganda feature, devoted six pages to fishing the Atlantic. It claims that 7,100,000 tons of fish will be caught this year, and that over the past ten years "new refrigerated trawlers capable of making autonomous voyages of several months' duration were added to the fishing fleet. Today we have scores of thousands of vessels of various types. We hold second place in the world for overall number and first place in the number of large refrigerated trawlers that process their entire catch abroad.")

(This is what they are doing off the Atlantic Coast of the USA at the present moment.)

Saturday, February 22, at 4 p.m., protest Soviet fishing fleet. See net of Soviet fleet at Columbus Plaza, Atlantic and Missouri. Hear speaker: Dr. Carl McIntire.

The Soviet fishing fleet has been working off our eastern coast from Long Island to Virginia accompanied by two large refrigerator, mother ships. A treaty signed by the

State Department permits entrance within the twelve-mile limit for service operations in at least two places and the treaty obligates the United States in relation to this Soviet activity along our shores. Terms of the treaty commit the Russians to certain limitations upon fish and poundage on which there is no possible way to ascertain their adherence. The testimony, however, of local fishermen is that the Soviets move with such design that our boats must get out of their way, and fragments of nets caught by our boats reveal the small mesh with which they drag the sea gathering up not merely herring, which the United States Government approves of their taking, but everything in their path. So thorough is their consumption of their take that the seagulls seldom visit them. The design of this fishing expedition is far more than fish, but contributes to the over-all world-wide Communist designs against the free world.

The following quotations are taken from an official publication of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 90th Congress, December 1968. "The Changing Strategic Balance, USSR-USA." The accompanying charts are photographically reproduced from this document. This study, prepared at the request of Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (D., S.C.), included such leaders as Admiral H. D. Felt, USN, Ret., chairman, Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. James D. Atkinson, Dr. Robert Morris, and some 18 others.

"For the first time in its history, the Soviet Union is developing an offensive maritime strategy and is seeking supremacy at sea.

"The naval forces now being created by the Soviet Union and the uses of sea power now being made by the U.S.S.R. are part of the overall Communist design of total victory in the struggle against the United States and other free world nations. Even as the Soviets have developed massive ground and air forces and have armed themselves for warfare in space, they are striving to dominate the oceans.

"That played a significant role. In the Vietnam conflict, for example, 98 per cent of the war material transported to Vietnam has moved by ship under the protection of the U.S. Navy.

"The principal American aims in maintaining strong naval forces are: 1) protection of the territory and independence of the United States; 2) deterrence of World War III; 3) protection of the territory and independence of allied and friendly nations; 4) preservation of the vital overseas interests of the United States; and 5) maintenance of normal oceanic trade so that the United States and other peaceful states may receive and ship raw materials and finished goods.

"To accomplish these aims, the United States has maintained the largest navy in the world with powerful offensive and defensive capabilities in its surface, sub-surface and aerial forces.

"Because of the global commitments of the United States, the United States Navy has to be prepared for a great variety of naval contingencies, including amphibious operations, riverine warfare, anti-submarine warfare, protection of vital sea lanes, heavy air strikes against inland targets and strategic ballistic missile attacks against pre-assigned targets. Admiral Moorer has said in this connection that 'our weapon systems must be ready and reliable "scaled firepower" to guarantee the success of our strategies and tactics in every situation.'

"Marshal M. V. Zakharov, Soviet Chief of Staff, said in a press conference February 16, 1968: 'The time when Russia could be kept out of the world's oceans has gone forever. The imperialists can no longer have them to themselves. We shall sail all the world's seas; no force on earth can prevent us.'

"Shortly before his death in early 1967, Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, the Soviet Minister of Defense, placed sea power on a par

with the U.S.S.R.'s missile command when he declared that in Soviet planning, 'First priority is being given to the strategic missile forces and atomic missile-launching submarines—forces which are the principal means of deterring the aggressor and decisively defeating him in war.'

"In the absence of a general war situation, Soviet naval forces have politico-military missions to perform, plus support of 'wars of liberation' and various interventionist operations. In general war, the Soviet warships undoubtedly would strike at free world sea-based power, at merchant shipping, and at bases, ports and coastal industrial centers in many parts of the world.

"In determining the full dimensions of the U.S.S.R.'s oceanic objectives, it is not enough to consider the construction and deployment of warships.

"Behind the new Soviet sea power is an awareness that Communist domination of the globe can only be achieved by supremacy at all major points on the spectrum of conflict. The leadership of the U.S.S.R. is determined to obtain superiority over the United States and its allies under all combat conditions.

"The Soviets have acquired an oceanic vision. They know that the sea is the major artery giving life to the free world.

"Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, has said of Soviet Naval forces:

"By any measuring stick, they (the Soviets) are today the second largest sea power in the world. In a mere 10 years, the Soviet Union with dedication of purpose, large outlays of funds, and with priorities equivalent to or even surpassing their space program, has transferred itself from a maritime nonentity to a major seapower."

"In a recent statement, Admiral Gorshkov said:

"Now we have an oceanic fleet that can challenge the enemy in the open seas of the world. Our navy must be able to destroy enemy targets on land. Inland targets are often more important than marine targets. For this purpose, the guided-missile equipped submarines and surface ships and rocket-equipped aircraft of naval aviation must be on constant alert in different parts of the globe."

"At the same time that the Soviets are sailing into new waters and providing naval weapons to associated states, they are trying rough stuff in ship-handling in an effort to intimidate U.S. fleet commanders to pull-back their vessels. From the Mediterranean to the Sea of Japan, the Russians have engaged in obstructive maneuvers. They have cut into formations and steered on collision courses.

"This Soviet maritime version of its old tactics of aerial 'buzzing' has to be understood as part of the U.S.S.R.'s overall maritime strategy. The Soviets not only are building a giant merchant marine and creating a powerful navy, but they also want to induce in the mind of the West the idea that the U.S.S.R. is the boldest power on the high seas.

"The most successful example to date of 'psy' war at sea is North Korea's hijacking of the electronic intelligence-gathering ship PUEBLO in January, 1968. The units of North Korea's 'pinprick' navy, in effect acting as proxies of the Soviet Union, seized the lightly armed American vessel and thereby inflicted humiliation on the United States.

"The Soviet Union, with 27,000 miles of coastline, has elaborated the theory of closed seas and historic bays to deny the right of innocent passage of free world warships—in violation of the 1958 Geneva Convention of the Territorial Sea.

"It is true, of course, that no one ever owns an ocean; and only the Soviets, for all practical purposes, have closed a portion of a sea, as in the case of the Gulf of Finland.

"The Soviets have engaged in a crash pro-

gram designed to give them supremacy in all areas of maritime power.

"The Soviets have a great advantage in the fact that all their ships at sea, nuclear submarines or ordinary fishing trawlers, are required to contribute to the country's overall oceanographic effort and operate under a centralized control. The aim of this effort extends from exploiting the richest fisheries of the world to gathering data useful for future naval operations."

Listen to Dr. McIntire on Station WLDB, 1490 kc. Atlantic City, 7:30 a.m.—12:30 Noon—4:05 p.m. Daily.

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMANS) and I introduced the Higher Education Bill of Rights and the Medical Education Bill of Rights. These two measures are based largely on the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and seek to make it possible for all qualified high school graduates to go to college regardless of financial means.

The press, members of the academic community, and leaders in business and public service have responded with considerable enthusiasm to these proposals. We would like to share with the Members the support and sense of urgency that these concerned citizens have expressed to us.

Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president of Princeton University, made several particularly thoughtful comments:

No less do I salute you for your concern for both middle class students and those from lower income families. Clearly, aid for the disadvantaged must be greatly increased, and with the Kerr Commission, I would give that highest priority. At the same time, it seems to me important to recognize the constraints that now also affect the middle income family with several children to see through college.

Needless to say, in connection with aid to students, I also applaud your Bill's provisions for cost-of-education supplements to institutions. These seem to me essential if we are to insure and enhance the standards of colleges and universities.

My purpose, however, has not been to comment on each part of your proposals, but rather simply to express strong endorsement of the total package, and appreciation to you for having put it before the Congress.

The president of Purdue University in Indiana, Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, commented that—

Legislation which embodies some of the recommendations of the Kerr Commission report . . . is a tremendous contribution to the enormously important problem of how to support the development of post-high school educational efforts in this country that are unquestionably required on a vast scale.

Similarly, Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard University and a member of the Carnegie Commission, stated:

Since I warmly endorsed the Carnegie Commission's report, I am naturally heartily in support of the proposed legislation, and I trust it will meet with a favorable response

from your colleagues. There are few matters more important to the nation's future than finding effective ways to finance the higher education of our young people, and I attach the highest importance to the adoption of these bills.

In addition, John H. Fischer, president of the Teachers College, Columbia University, has written:

Your approach to the national problems of higher education is comprehensive and perceptive. The enactment of your program would substantially strengthen both our institutions and the opportunities of individual students.

Support also comes from the smaller private colleges, as is clear from the letter received from Wallace R. Klinger, acting president of Hartwick College in Oneonta, N.Y.:

This is certainly a forward looking and progressive piece of legislation. There is no question but what the independent liberal arts colleges desperately need financial support from the federal government both directly and indirectly. Otherwise it will become necessary to increase tuition costs, to the point where only the privileged few will be able to afford the excellent education which such institutions provide.

The Very Rev. Charles J. Lavery, president of St. John Fisher College in Rochester, N.Y., expressed much the same sentiment:

I can support very clearly the views expressed by you and only hope that efforts will be made wherein the private sector of private education may not only stay alive but perform its most necessary role these days.

The president of Kirkland College in Clinton, N.Y., Samuel F. Babbitt, writes:

You are to be congratulated on this legislation. It continues in the implementation of commitments which this country has made over the past few years. Indeed, it simply represents an extension of principles which were adopted before this country even had a Congress to call its own. The success of this legislation will be the success of all areas of higher education.

Sister M. Xaveria, director of student financial aid at Marygrove College in Detroit states:

Permit me to congratulate you for the fine step you have taken in introducing your Higher Education Bill of Rights. It is certainly a constructive step badly needed and will do a great amount of good.

A member of the Carnegie Commission, Clifton W. Phalen, chairman of the executive committee of Marine Midland Banks, Inc., writes that he is "delighted that you have introduced such legislation and I am very much in accord with your objectives." Similarly, a member of the committee that prepared the Rivlin Report in the Department of HEW, William D. Carey of Arthur D. Little, Inc., stated that—

You have performed a distinct public service in introducing bills to strengthen higher education. I feel certain that your action will stimulate useful debate and lead to constructive changes in our public policies.

Considerable support has also been expressed by medical education personnel. Typical of the reactions to the Medical Education Bill of Rights is that of Dr. LeRoy A. Pesch, dean of the school of medicine of the State University of New York at Buffalo:

This critically important legislation has my wholehearted and enthusiastic support. Certainly our present crisis in health care can be resolved only through a combination of far-sighted legislative proposals coupled with responsible action by the medical and educational communities. Please let me know if there is anything I can do personally to aid in the support of this legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of March 14 contained an editorial endorsing our bills which I would like to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, along with a number of representative letters that Mr. BRADEMAs and I have received.

Many of the educators and public officials we have corresponded with have made constructive suggestions for the improvement of this legislation. Our purpose in introducing these measures was to stimulate discussion and dialog between the university and governmental communities. It is our understanding that the bills are also under study in the executive branch. We very much hope that all those dedicated to the improvement of higher education in America will have the opportunity to make these views count and to appear as witnesses before the appropriate congressional committees. Mr. Speaker, we urge that hearings be scheduled by the Education and Labor Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the earliest possible opportunity.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1969]

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

The Higher Education Bill of Rights, proposed late last year by a Carnegie Commission headed by Dr. Clark Kerr, has been translated into a detailed and workable proposal for Congressional action. Bipartisan sponsorship of the plan by Representatives Ogden Reid, Republican of New York, and John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, underlines the widespread agreement among forward-looking legislators that the Federal Government must move decisively to remove the economic barriers that still keep great numbers of able young men and women from going to college.

Like the Kerr report the proposal merges aid to needy students with subsidy to the colleges which admit them, thus increasing the student's freedom to select his campus while putting a premium on institutional self-improvement to attract capable, subsidized students.

The cost of the proposed legislation is unquestionably great. It would start in 1971 with more than twice the present Federal outlay for higher education. But these appropriations would include start-up grants for 500 new public community colleges and fifty new four-year campuses in urban areas—clearly a priority response to the critical needs of the cities.

Equally important is a companion bill to expand the severely strained facilities of the nation's medical education apparatus and to provide grants for medical students from low-income families. The combination of a chronic backlog of unmet medical services and new demands resulting from Medicare makes speedy action on these proposals particularly urgent.

In an effort to avoid controversy, the higher education bill merely asks for continued study of the Kerr proposal for a self-sustaining national student loan bank. Such study should not, however, become an excuse for excessive delay in testing this device to increase even further the student's

freedom of choice and his ability to finance his education at institutions of high prestige. He would pledge repayment in accordance with future income.

Although President Nixon has ruled out hope for massive immediate aid to higher education, short-term budgetary limitations must not stand in the way of clearing the decks for action on these important proposals. The cost of continuing roadblocks to full educational opportunities is as high to the national welfare as it is to individual lives and careers.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,

Princeton, N. J., February 14, 1969.

HON. OGDEN REID,
House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REID: I have read the "Higher Education Bill of Rights" with considerable interest, and want to express my appreciation of this proposed legislation.

You have earned the thanks of the academic community and deserve those of the country at large for so clearly bringing to the attention of the Congress the concept that the improvement of higher education should be a principal national goal.

I particularly applaud the adoption of the general lines of the Kerr and Rivlin reports. [No less do I salute you for your concern for both middle class students and those from lower income families. Clearly, aid for the disadvantaged must be greatly increased, and with the Kerr Commission, I would give that highest priority. At the same time, it seems to me important to recognize the constraints that now also affect the middle income family with several children to see through college.]

Needless to say, in connection with aid to students, I also applaud your Bill's provisions for cost-of-education supplements to institutions. These seem to me essential if we are to insure and enhance the standards of colleges and universities.

My purpose, however, has not been to comment on each part of your proposals, but rather simply to express strong endorsement of the total package, and appreciation to you for having put it before the Congress.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,

Cambridge, Mass., February 21, 1969.

HON. OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REID: You were thoughtful indeed to send me copies of the bills which you and Mr. Brademas are introducing, hopefully to put into effect the major recommendations of the Carnegie Commission. Since I warmly endorse the Carnegie Commission's report, I am naturally heartily in support of the proposed legislation, and I trust it will meet with a favorable response from your colleagues. There are few matters more important to the nation's future than finding effective ways to finance the higher education of our young people, and I attach the highest importance to the adoption of these bills.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN M. PUSEY.

TEACHERS COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,

New York, N.Y., February 19, 1969.

HON. OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REID: Thank you for sending me the copy of the "Higher Education Bill of Rights of 1969", which you and Representative Brademas have introduced. Your approach to the national problems of higher education is comprehensive and perceptive. The enactment of your program would substantially strengthen both our institutions and the opportunities of individual students.

I shall want to support in every possible way efforts to assure passage of your program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. FISCHER.

HARTWICK COLLEGE,

Oneonta, N.Y., February 19, 1969.

HON. OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of February 11 with enclosures of the Bill you have introduced into Congress, the press release, and your floor statement.

This is certainly a forward looking and progressive piece of legislation. There is no question but what the independent liberal arts colleges desperately need financial support from the federal government both directly and indirectly. Otherwise it will become necessary to increase tuition costs, to the point where only the privileged few will be able to afford the excellent education which such institutions provide. I heartily endorse Sections 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 455, 456, 457, 409, and 441.

I trust that this legislation will receive favorable action from both houses of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE R. KLINGER,
Acting President.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,

Lafayette, Ind., February 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR JOHN: I was delighted to receive on my desk today from your office a copy of the release describing the "Higher Education Bill of Rights" which you have introduced in company with Ogden Reid (R.-N.Y.).

Once again you take the leadership in Congress in providing the necessary support by our Federal Government for all parts of our American educational enterprise.

I was truly pleased that you and Reid were the first to introduce legislation which embodies some of the recommendations of the Kerr Commission report, which, in my judgment, is a tremendous contribution to the enormously important problem of how to support the development of post-high school educational efforts in this country that are unquestionably required on a vast scale.

Please keep me informed about the progress of the bill. I'll be glad to do anything I can to help with our mutual friends in the Indiana delegation, as well as with their backers back home in Indiana.

Keep up your great work. I look forward to seeing you when our paths next cross.

Yours cordially,

FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

New Haven, Conn., February 13, 1969.

CONGRESSMAN OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REID: I want to congratulate you and Representative Brademas for the superb job you have done in introducing your Bill on Higher Education. It is a very challenging Bill, and I am sure it will bring forth the support of many in the field of higher education when you hold your hearings. If I can be of any help at that time, please let me know. . . .

I should like to talk to you sometime about the best ways in which the academic community can help you muster support for the Bill.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PERRY MILLER,
Dean.

MARINE MIDLAND BANKS, INC.,

New York, N.Y., March 14, 1969.

CONGRESSMAN OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REID: Thank you very much for sending me copies of the legislation implementing the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission.

I am delighted that you and Congressman John Brademas have introduced such legislation and am very much in accord with your objectives. In addition, let me congratulate you on the very fine editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times relative to your efforts. All best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. PHALEN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,

Chapel Hill, February 19, 1969.

CONGRESSMAN OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REID: Thank you very much for your thoughtful letter of February 14 and the enclosed news release relating to the legislation which you and Congressman Brademas have introduced.

I am confident that your action will produce widespread and meaningful discussion of the necessity for increased federal assistance to higher education.

As one member of the Carnegie Commission, let me express my appreciation for what you have done.

Cordially,

WILLIAM FRIDAY.

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE,

Tarrytown, N.Y., February 18, 1969.

HON. OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REID: On behalf of Marymount College I wish to congratulate you and Congressman Brademas on the "Higher Education Bill of Rights of 1969."

I have read the bill as well as your remarks upon its introduction on February sixth and I thoroughly agree that the improvement of higher education deserves high priority on the national agenda. The legislation you have introduced is comprehensive and drastically needed at the present time if we are to preserve a diversified system of higher education and provide equal access to the education of their choice for all Americans.

It is in the interest of all of those seeking post high school education that the substance of your proposal be accepted and written into law after what you have described as "thoughtful dialogue between the university and governmental communities."

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

SISTER M. BRENDAN, R.S.H.M.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,

February 28, 1969.

HON. OGDEN R. REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REID: We have reviewed your proposed legislation, the "Higher Education Bill of Rights of 1969" and the "Medical Education Bill of Rights 1969." We appreciate your concern and awareness of the need for expanded governmental support of medical and higher education.

The provision for additional scholarships for medical students who need financial assistance will enable many students to receive much needed aid. As you have so aptly stated, many of our middle-income families with several children, large medical expenses or other accumulated debts cannot afford to send their children through college.

Providing additional funds for institutional grants to schools of medicine will assist

such schools in achieving and maintaining a high standard of academic excellence.

If this country is going to meet the present demand for physicians, and is to make meaningful plans for the future, adequate construction funds must be provided. New facilities are needed to accommodate the increased enrollment of students and the necessary growth in the biomedical and behavioral sciences.

The increase in the number of graduate fellowships under NDEA, the extension of the period during which a student may receive a fellowship, and the increase in the amount per fellowship student should result in more teachers for institutions of higher education.

We fully support your legislation and your efforts to make realistic provision for the educational future of our country.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH K. HILL,
President.

HAMILTON COLLEGE,

Clinton, N.Y., February 24, 1969.

HON. OGDEN R. REID,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REID: I have read with care the text of the "Higher Education Bill of Rights of 1969" which you and Congressman John Brademas introduced on February 6, 1969. The Carnegie report summarizes very well many of the most crucial needs of higher education, and I am greatly encouraged that your bill would implement the central recommendation of that report. I hope very much that the Congress will enact the proposed legislation.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. CHANDLER.

BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE,

Bloomfield, N.J., March 3, 1969.

HON. OGDEN REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REID: Thank you for your meaningful response and for the enclosure of the copy of your remarks on the floor of the House concerning the extensive legislative proposal regarding higher education. Such material as this serves as incentive and inspiration to those of us on the "home front."

I assure you of my deepest appreciation in knowing that there are leaders such as you so concerned with such important matters.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID O. ROBERTS,
Dean of Students.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,

New York, N.Y., February 21, 1969.

HON. OGDEN REID,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR OGDEN: I have read with great interest the news release on the higher education bill which you and Representative Brademas have introduced in the House. Needless to say, I approve heartily of your own aspiration reflected in the bill so usefully. If I can be helpful in any way in securing the passage of this legislation, you know that I would be pleased to do so. The constantly spiraling cost of higher education, combined with the added enrollment which we hope will continue to represent increasing democratization of opportunity in education, make mandatory a consideration of higher education as a priority demanding national view and national effort.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

ANDREW W. CORDIER,
Acting President.

OF MEN AND DUNES

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's edition of the New York Times carried an editorial endorsement for legislation to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

As my colleagues know, this is a matter in which I am deeply interested. I have become increasingly concerned that the threats to the Sleeping Bear Dunes area may overwhelm its great public values before Congress acts to establish the national lakeshore.

I am mindful of the sense of urgency in this project, conveyed to the subcommittee on national parks and recreation by National Park Service Director George Hartzog at hearings on my bill last July.

We are now awaiting the Nixon administration's views on the lakeshore legislation. It is my hope that we may have a prompt and favorable report from the Department of the Interior on the Sleeping Bear Dunes bill—H.R. 4287—and my further hope that the Congress will move quickly to enact this legislation. As the Times editorial says, action by Congress this year is imperative if Sleeping Bear is to be saved.

Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial "Of Men and Dunes" from the New York Times for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

OF MEN AND DUNES

Natural sand dunes, the unending masterwork of wind and water, are among nature's more fascinating and useful creations. To the human eye, their clean lines and fantastic and changing shapes are a delight. To shore

birds and migratory birds, they nurture and protect life itself. Birds nest in the beach-grasses and depend for food on the salt ponds and fresh-water pools behind the dunes. To the sea and the lakes, dunes are nature's own barrier to the devastation effects of violent storms.

But something there is in many men that does not love a dune. The only wild, clear call that they hear at the edge of the sea is the screech of profit and the bulldozer's mournful crunch. The land speculator and the summer cottage builder, the highway contractor and the jetport planner, all these see only a beach to be leveled and subdivided into lots and paved with blacktop and sold for dollars.

In recent years, the struggle to save surviving sections of the nation's seashores and lakeshores has made progress. From Cape Cod and Fire Island to Texas' Padre Island and California's Point Reyes, some dunes have been saved by Federal law. But more remains to be done, and old battles have sometimes to be won a second and a third time.

The dunes created by Lake Michigan provided two such battlegrounds. The Indiana Dunes, just east of Chicago at the southern end of the lake, were rescued after a long fight between conservationists led by former Senator Paul H. Douglas and steel companies which wanted to build a deep water port. But the Chicago, South Shore and South Bend Railroad is now pressing the National Park Service for permission to construct a marshalling yard within the boundaries of the lakeshore.

Before this railroad issue is even settled, there is already talk in Indiana that a new jetport may be built immediately south of the national lakeshore. If the so-called Chesterton site is selected, jets would spew oil and fumes as well as roaring noise over the dunes.

Far to the north at the western edge of the State of Michigan, the lake has created the beautiful Sleeping Bear Dunes, so named because their profile from a distance resembles a great bear curled in sleep. Ten years ago the National Park Service identified these dunes as one of the dozen shoreline areas in the nation most worth saving. Michigan's Senators introduced a bill to protect them as

a national lakeshore in 1959. The years have passed but the bill has not.

Intensive private development now menaces the viability of Sleeping Bear as a national lakeshore. Meanwhile, the cost to the Government of acquiring the land has risen by one-third. The bill has been reintroduced in both houses of Congress, but hearings have been delayed until the Nixon Administration makes its position known. It is imperative that legislative action be completed this year. Congress waits, but the grasping hands of the land speculators are busy. Soon the Sleeping Bear may not be sleeping but dead.

THE 118 PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Office of Education, a bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has just issued a list of 118 education programs which it administers. The total cost of these programs for fiscal 1969 will be approximately \$4,301,083,505.

The bureau's list is entitled "Where the Money Is—American Education's Annual Guide to Office of Education Programs." It would have been a good idea to have added: "Where the Money Comes From," but I am sure that my constituents, who are struggling with their Federal income tax returns, already know. Many of them will agree with me that it is not good business to send \$1.50 or more from Illinois to Washington, D.C., in order to get \$1 back.

I have rearranged the programs by price tags, with the most expensive ones first. My listing follows:

[Figures in parentheses indicate estimated amounts or money carried over from prior years, rather than fiscal 1969 appropriations, as in all other programs]

Program	Purpose	Who may apply	Program level
Program for disadvantaged children.....	To meet special educational needs of educationally deprived children.....	Local school districts.....	\$1, 078, 000, 000
School maintenance and operation.....	Aid school districts on which Federal activities or major disasters have placed a financial burden.....	do.....	505, 900, 000
Vocational programs.....	Maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs; develop programs in new occupations.....	Public schools.....	255, 377, 455
Teacher training (vocational).....	Improve qualifications of teachers, supervisors, and directors of vocational education programs.....	Local school districts.....	(1)
Vocational teacher training grants.....	Improve qualifications of vocational education teachers.....	Teachers of vocational education subjects.....	(1)
Student loans.....	Provide for low-interest loans to college students.....	College students.....	190, 000, 000
Supplementary centers.....	Support supplementary educational centers and services.....	Local education agencies.....	164, 876, 000
Undergraduate and graduate facilities.....	Loans to construct or improve higher education facilities.....	Public and private nonprofit institutions, cooperative centers, boards of higher education.....	150, 000, 000
College work-study.....	Provide part-time employment for postsecondary students.....	Colleges, universities, area vocational schools, proprietary schools.....	146, 050, 000
Educational opportunity grants.....	Assist students of exceptional financial need to go to college.....	Institutions of higher education.....	133, 786, 000
Undergraduate facilities.....	Construct or improve undergraduate academic facilities.....	Colleges and universities.....	133, 000, 000
Occupational training and retraining.....	Provide training programs to equip persons for work in needed employment fields.....	Local school authorities; public, private nonprofit.....	128, 000, 000
Do.....	Train unemployed and underemployed persons in all sections of the Nation.....	Persons referred by State employment services.....	(2)
Community colleges, technical institutes.....	Construct or improve academic facilities.....	Public community colleges and technical institutes.....	83, 000, 000
Strengthening instruction in critical subjects in public schools.....	Strengthen instruction in 10 critically important subjects.....	Local school districts.....	75, 740, 000
Public schools, construction.....	Aid school districts in providing minimum school facilities in federally impacted and disaster areas.....	do.....	74, 050, 000
Graduate fellowships.....	Increase the number of well-qualified college teachers.....	Prospective college teachers working toward doctoral degrees.....	70, 000, 000
Interest benefits for higher education loans.....	Provide interest benefits for student loans through commercial lenders.....	Students in eligible institutions of higher and vocational education.....	61, 235, 000
School library resources and instructional materials.....	Support provision of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials.....	Local education agencies.....	50, 000, 000
Educational personnel training programs.....	Improve qualifications of elementary and secondary education personnel.....	Colleges and universities, State and local education agencies.....	45, 000, 000
Training programs.....	Train and retrain educational personnel and teacher aids to strengthen personnel development from preschool through postsecondary vocational school.....	Prospective and experienced education personnel.....	45, 000, 000
Program for special education of migratory children.....	To improve the education of children of migratory agricultural workers.....	Local school districts.....	45, 000, 000
Educational personnel training programs.....	Train and retrain educational personnel and teacher aids to strengthen personnel development from preschool through postsecondary vocational school.....	Prospective and experienced education personnel.....	45, 000, 000

See footnotes at end of table.

[Figures in parentheses indicate estimated amounts or money carried over from prior years, rather than fiscal 1969 appropriations, as in all other programs]

Program	Purpose	Who may apply	Program level
Adult basic education.....	Provide literacy programs for adults.....	State education agencies.....	\$45,000,000
Adult basic education teacher training grants.....	Improve qualifications of teachers of adult basic education courses.....	Teachers and teacher trainers of adult basic education courses.....	(⁹)
Education personnel fellowships.....	Improve the quality of education of experienced and prospective elementary and secondary personnel.....	Institutions of higher education offering graduate programs for elementary and secondary education personnel.....	35,000,000
Public library services.....	Extend and improve public library services.....	State library administrative agencies.....	35,000,000
Education personnel fellowships.....	Improve the quality of education of experienced and prospective elementary and secondary personnel.....	Prospective and experienced educational personnel.....	35,000,000
Teacher training (handicapped).....	Prepare and inform teachers and others who work in education of handicapped.....	State education agencies, colleges and universities.....	30,250,000
Follow Through.....	Extend gains of deprived children who participated in Headstart or similar preschool experiences.....	Local educational agencies nominated by State agencies in accordance with Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity criteria.....	30,000,000
Strengthening developing institutions.....	Provide partial support for cooperative arrangements between developing and established institutions.....	Accredited colleges and universities in existence at least 5 years.....	30,000,000
National teaching fellowships.....	Augment the teaching resources of developing institutions.....	Developing institutions nominating prospective fellows from established institutions.....	(⁹)
Do.....	do.....	Highly qualified graduate students or junior faculty members from established institutions.....	(⁹)
Strengthening State education agencies.....	Improve leadership resources of State education agencies.....	State education agencies and combinations thereof.....	29,750,000
Programs for the handicapped in State-supported schools.....	Programs for children in State operated or supported schools for the handicapped.....	State education agencies.....	29,700,000
Facilities for educational research.....	Construct and equip national and regional research facilities.....	Educational laboratories and research development centers.....	(29,581,000)
Programs for the handicapped.....	Strengthen educational and related services for handicapped children.....	State education agencies.....	29,250,000
Program for children in local and State operated institutions for the neglected and delinquent.....	Improve the education of delinquent and neglected children in institutions.....	State parent agencies, local school districts.....	27,000,000
Graduate facilities.....	Construct or improve graduate academic facilities.....	Public and private academic institutions, graduate center boards.....	25,577,000
College library resources.....	Strengthen library resources of colleges and universities.....	Institutions of higher education and combinations thereof.....	25,000,000
Public libraries.....	Aid construction of public libraries.....	State library administrative agencies.....	24,099,000
Education laboratories.....	Provide for development and testing of educational innovations until ready for use in classroom.....	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations.....	23,600,000
Teacher Corps.....	Strengthen educational opportunity for disadvantaged children; encourage colleges and universities in teacher preparation programs by attracting and training teacher-interns. ³	State and local education agencies, colleges, and universities.....	20,900,000
Do.....	Strengthen education of disadvantaged children, encourage colleges and universities in teacher preparation programs by attracting and training teacher-interns. ⁴	do.....	20,900,000
Guidance, counseling, and testing in public schools.....	Assist in establishing and maintaining guidance, counseling, and testing programs.....	Public elementary and secondary schools, junior colleges, technical institutes.....	17,000,000
Educational research (research, surveys, and evaluations).....	Support research on the improvement of education at all levels and in all subject areas.....	Colleges, universities, State education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals.....	15,167,000
State plan to attract and qualify classroom personnel to meet critical shortages.....	Provide State grants to help local communities attract and qualify persons to meet immediate critical shortages of classroom personnel. ⁵	State education agencies.....	15,000,000
Do.....	do.....	do.....	15,000,000
Endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.....	Support instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts in the land-grant colleges.....	The 69 land-grant colleges.....	14,550,000
Acquisition of undergraduate equipment.....	Improve instruction in selected subject areas.....	Colleges and universities.....	14,500,000
Vocational facilities.....	Construct vocational education facilities in Appalachian region.....	State education agencies in Appalachian region.....	(14,000,000)
Vocational schools.....	Construct or improve area vocational education school facilities.....	Public secondary and postsecondary schools providing education in 5 or more fields.....	(⁷)
Handicapped research and demonstration.....	Promote research and demonstration on education of the handicapped.....	State education agencies, local school districts, nonprofit private organizations, public groups.....	12,800,000
National Defense Education Act language and area centers.....	Support language and area centers at U.S. institutions of higher education.....	Colleges, universities, consortiums of institutions of higher education.....	12,700,000
Foreign language fellowships (excludes English, French, German, Italian, peninsular Spanish).....	Assist in the training of teachers and other specialists in modern foreign languages and area studies.....	Colleges and universities; NDEA language and area centers or institutions with intensive summer programs of language study; Cubans who became refugees after Jan. 1, 1959; public school systems; professional organizations; individuals.....	(⁸)
Modern foreign language graduate fellowships for intensive summer language study and/or academic year.....	Enable U.S. institutions to assist graduate students training to be teachers or other specialists in language-area studies.....	Colleges and universities with language-area studies programs or summer programs of intensive study.....	(⁹)
Modern foreign language undergraduate stipends (summer only).....	Enable institutions to assist undergraduates' intensive study of a non-Western language (summer only).....	NDEA language and area centers of institutions with intensive summer programs of language study.....	(⁹)
Faculty development grants for academic year and summer in foreign language and area studies.....	Strengthen and improve teaching of non-Western languages and related area studies.....	Colleges and universities.....	(⁹)
Faculty development grants for summer seminars in language and area studies.....	Enable U.S. institutions to develop new programs of foreign language and related area studies.....	do.....	(⁹)
Vocational research.....	Support research, training, and pilot programs for special vocational needs.....	State and local education agencies, colleges and universities, nonprofit organizations.....	11,550,000
Special centers for research and development.....	Conduct research on the major problems of education.....	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations.....	10,800,000
Strengthening community service programs.....	Strengthen higher education capabilities in helping communities solve their problems.....	Colleges and universities.....	9,500,000
Program for Indian children.....	To provide additional educational assistance to Indian children in federally operated schools.....	Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.....	9,000,000
Educational research (demonstrations and development).....	Support development and demonstration of educational materials, processes, and organizational arrangements at all levels.....	Colleges, universities, State education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals.....	8,500,000
Librarian training.....	Increase opportunities for training in librarianship.....	Colleges and universities.....	8,250,000
Librarian fellowships and traineeships.....	Increase opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship.....	Fellows and others undergoing training in librarianship and related fields.....	(⁹)
Bilingual education.....	Develop and operate new programs to aid children aged 3 to 18 who have limited English-speaking ability and come from another language environment.....	Local education agencies or institutions of higher education applying jointly with local education agencies.....	7,500,000
Institutes, short-term training programs, and special projects.....	Train teachers, administrators, and specialists serving or preparing to serve in higher education.....	Colleges and universities.....	6,900,000
Fellowships for higher education personnel.....	Training persons to serve as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in higher education.....	Institutions of higher education with graduate programs.....	6,900,000
Researcher training grants.....	Improve qualifications of educational researchers.....	Present and prospective researchers in education.....	6,750,000
Researcher training.....	Develop and strengthen programs for training educational researchers.....	State education agencies, institutions, and organizations.....	(¹⁰)
Teacher institutes.....	Improve ability of school personnel to deal with problems incident to school desegregation.....	Colleges and universities.....	5,931,000
Dropout prevention.....	Develop and demonstrate educational practices which show promise of reducing the number of children not completing school.....	Local school districts in low-income areas and with high percentages of dropouts.....	5,000,000
Media services and captioned film loan program.....	Provide cultural and educational services to the handicapped through films and other media.....	Groups of handicapped persons, nonhandicapped groups for training.....	4,750,000
Media services and captioned films; loan program; training grants.....	Improve quality of instruction available to deaf persons.....	Persons who will use captioned film equipment.....	(¹¹)

See footnotes at end of table.

[Figures in parentheses indicate estimated amounts or money carried over from prior years, rather than fiscal 1969 appropriations, as in all other programs]

Program	Purpose	Who may apply	Program level
Higher educational guarantee reserve funds.....	Provide adequate loan reserves for higher and vocational educational student loans.	State or nonprofit private guarantee agencies.....	(\$4,700,000)
Educational media research and demonstration.....	Support research on educational uses of television, radio, motion pictures, and other media.	Colleges, universities, State education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals.	4,200,000
Educational television.....	Aid in acquisition and installation of transmitting and production equipment for educational television broadcasting.	Nonprofit agencies, public colleges, State television agencies, education agencies.	4,000,000
Facilities comprehensive planning.....	Help States plan higher education construction programs.	State commissions that administer program.....	4,000,000
Talent search.....	Assist in identifying and encouraging promising students to complete high school and enter college.	Institutes of higher education, State and local education agencies, public and nonprofit organizations.	4,000,000
Educational opportunity grants.....	Assist students of exceptional financial need to go to college.	College students of exceptional financial need.....	(12)
Cuban student loans.....	Provide a loan fund to aid Cuban refugee students.	Colleges and universities.....	(3,900,000)
College work-study.....	Provide part-time employment for postsecondary students.	Postsecondary students.....	(13)
Desegregation assistance.....	Aid school boards in hiring advisers and training employees on problems incident to school desegregation.	School boards and other agencies responsible for public school operation.	3,319,000
Desegregation training grants.....	Improve ability of school personnel to deal with desegregation problems.	Teachers and other personnel of public schools.....	(14)
Education Resources Information Center (dissemination of research).	Provide for dissemination of research findings to the educational community.	Colleges, universities, State education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals.	3,100,000
Overseas opportunities for language training and area studies.	Promote development of international studies through grants to institutions for support of overseas projects by groups and individuals engaged in language and area studies or research.	Colleges, universities, consortiums, local and State education agencies, nonprofit education organizations, institutions with graduate programs in language, area, or international studies.	3,000,000
Testing in nonpublic schools.....	Provide for aptitude-achievement testing of private school students.	Testing agencies.....	(15)
Consultant services of foreign curriculum specialists.....	Support visits by foreign consultants to improve and develop resources for foreign language and area studies.	Colleges, universities, consortiums, local and State education agencies, nonprofit education organizations.	(15)
Faculty research/study abroad.....	Enable U.S. institutions to support overseas research and study by individual faculty members or social studies supervisors; to improve curriculum or teacher competence in foreign language and area studies.	Graduate and undergraduate institutions, secondary school systems, nonprofit educational organizations.	(15)
Foreign studies extension (summer seminars abroad for teachers and students or curriculum development teams)	Improve institutional programs in language-area studies by supporting group projects abroad.	Colleges and universities, State education agencies, nonprofit educational organizations	(15)
Faculty research/study abroad.....	Strengthen administration in State education agencies.	State education agencies and combinations thereof.....	(15)
Fellowships for Ph. D. dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages and area subjects (excludes English, French, German, Italian, peninsular Spanish)	Enable U.S. institutions to sponsor study abroad by advanced graduate students with a teaching goal.	Colleges and universities with graduate programs in language, area, or international studies	(15)
Faculty research/study.....	Improve leadership resources of State education agencies.	State education agencies and combinations thereof.....	(15)
Foreign studies extension.....	Improve institutional programs in language-area studies by supporting group projects abroad.	Colleges and universities, State education agencies, nonprofit educational organizations.	(15)
Graduate fellowships for Ph. D. dissertation research overseas in modern foreign languages and area studies.	Strengthen education of disadvantaged children, encourage colleges and universities in teacher preparation programs by attracting and training teacher-interns.	State and local education agencies, colleges and universities.	(15)
State administration of Higher Education Facilities Act program.	Helps States administer programs under HEFA—Title I and Higher Education Act—Title VI-A.	State commissions that administer program.....	3,000,000
Civil defense education.....	Provide information on civil defense procedures to the public.	Chief State school officers or State agencies.....	3,000,000
Library research and demonstration.....	Support research and demonstrations on libraries and library personnel training.	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations.....	3,000,000
Foreign language and area research.....	Support research on improved instruction in modern foreign languages and materials development and area studies.	Colleges and universities, public school systems, professional organizations, individuals.	2,275,000
Interlibrary cooperation.....	Planning for establishment of cooperative networks of libraries.	State library administrative agencies.....	281,000
State institutional library services.....	Planning for improved institutional library services.	do.....	2,094,000
Student loans—matching funds.....	Loans to colleges, universities, and vocational schools that cannot meet program's matching obligations.	Accredited educational institutions (including business schools and technical institutes).	2,000,000
Cuban student loans.....	Aid needy Cuban refugee college students to finance their education.	Cubans who became refugees after Jan. 1, 1959.....	(16)
State administration.....	Strengthen administration in State education agencies.	State education agencies.....	2,000,000
Media research (handicapped).....	Promote better media services to handicapped persons.	Groups of handicapped persons, nonhandicapped groups for training.	1,800,000
Technical assistance, training grants.....	Provide specialist training to foreign educators and strengthen education and economy in developing nations.	Foreign nationals from countries with which the United States has bilateral technical assistance agreements.	1,500,000
Library services to physically handicapped.....	Planning for improved library services to physically handicapped.	State library administrative agencies.....	1,334,000
Strengthening instruction in nonpublic schools.....	Loans to private schools to improve instruction in critical subjects.	Nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools.....	1,000,000
Preschool programs for handicapped children.....	Develop model preschool and early education programs for handicapped children.	Public agencies and private nonprofit agencies.....	1,000,000
Deaf-blind centers.....	To develop centers for children and parents.	State education agencies, universities, medical centers, public or nonprofit agencies.	1,000,000
Foreign teacher development.....	Provide opportunity for foreign educators to observe U.S. methods, curriculum, organization (elementary and secondary).	Foreign educators (administrators, teacher trainers, education ministry officials).	900,000
Regional resource centers for improvement of education of handicapped children.	Develop centers for educational diagnosis of handicapped children.	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies, or combination within particular regions.	500,000
Physical education and recreation for the handicapped.....	Training professionals of physical education and recreation personnel for the handicapped.	Public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education.	300,000
Do.....	To do research in areas of physical education and recreation for handicapped children.	State or local education agencies, public or nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations.	300,000
Information and recruitment grants.....	Improve recruiting of educational personnel and dissemination of information on educational opportunities for handicapped.	Public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, private agencies.	250,000
Leadership and vocational training grants.....	Provide opportunities for Ryukyuan to observe and study in United States to improve education, economy.	Ryukyuan nationals selected by their government.....	170,000
Fulbright-Hays teacher exchange.....	Promote international understanding by exchange of teachers between United States and foreign nations.	Elementary and secondary teachers, college instructors, and assistant professors.	16,050
Total.....			4,301,083,505

¹ Included under "Vocational programs."² Included under "Occupational training and retraining, supra."³ Included under "Adult basic education."⁴ Included under "Strengthening developing institutions."⁵ For programs, instruction, and administration.⁶ For teacher and other professional training and student assistance.⁷ Included under "Vocational facilities."⁸ Included under "National Defense Education Act language and area centers."⁹ Included under "Librarian training."¹⁰ Included under "Researcher training grants."¹¹ Included under "Media services and captioned film loan program."¹² Included under "Talent search."¹³ Included under "Cuban student loans."¹⁴ Included under "Desegregation assistance."¹⁵ Included under "Overseas opportunities for language training and area studies."¹⁶ Included under "Student loans—matching funds."

INFLUENTIAL UNTOUCHABLES—
WHY?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, people are continuing to doubt and ask why appeasers talk and dissenters protest and untouchables influence policy, all the while, American boys are dying by the hundreds each week in Vietnam.

Have American hearts been broken and American blood shed for politicians who are playing games or for the reason they have been told—to prevent the spread of communism? Pity the poor American boy who has given his life in vain and his family who will always miss him.

Why we have not been more successful at the peacetable and why—if we are not making progress—do we not reinstitute retaliatory measures against the escalated Communist moves in South Vietnam.

Perhaps some of the questions may be answered in the March 21 edition of the *Herald of Freedom*, printed by Mr. Frank Capell, Zarephath, N.J., which I place at this point in my remarks:

INFLUENTIAL UNTOUCHABLES

Pity the poor South Vietnamese—with friends like the Americans they don't need enemies. Henry Cabot Lodge, who presided over the liquidation of the Diem regime, is now "negotiating" in Paris and his place as Ambassador to South Vietnam has been taken by Ellsworth Bunker. These are the names in the news but behind the scenes, quietly taking care of the tedious details, are the usual "untouchables" whose names the American public seldom, if ever, hears. They are State Department security risks in the key areas of Saigon, Washington and Paris and their influence on the course of the war in Vietnam and the peace negotiations in Paris should not be underestimated.

Although a new man is taking over William Bundy's job as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Bundy held that position from March 16, 1964 and our disastrous no-win policy in Vietnam has been the result. In fact he is credited with being the "stage manager" of the fall of the Diem regime. Bundy is the son-in-law of Dean Acheson and, like Acheson, was a good friend of Alger Hiss, whose brother Donald (an identified Communist) still works for Acheson's law firm of Covington and Burling in Washington, D.C. William Bundy was chairman of the Alger Hiss defense fund raising.

Assisting the U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam has been a former assistant of Mr. Bundy. Samuel David Berger is listed as Deputy Ambassador in Saigon as of September 1968. He had previously been Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs under Bundy. Berger belongs in the ranks of our "Untouchables" whose questionable activities and association seem only to result in more promotions.

Samuel David Berger was born in Gloversville, N.Y. on December 6, 1911, the son of Harry I. Berger and the former Bess Cohen. He received a Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1933. He continued his studies at the University of Wisconsin from 1935 to 1938 and at the London School of Economics 1938-9, during which time he was a fellow of the Social Science Research Council. He also did some work during this period of time. From 1933 to 1934 he was a labor

economist of the Civic Committee on Unemployment in Rochester, N.Y. He was a director of the Chicago Labor College from 1934 to 1935 and an instructor in Labor History at the Summer School for Workers in Industry at the University of Wisconsin from 1935 to 1938.

After attending the London School of Economics, Berger became head of the Research and Statistics Division of the National Refugee Service (1939-40) and then a labor economist in the Office of Production Management (1940-41). From 1941 to 1942 he was with the Federal Security Administration and from 1942 to 1944 was labor advisor to the Lend Lease Mission to Great Britain. Berger served in the Army as a Captain from 1944 to 1945 and from 1945 to 1950 he was First Secretary of the U.S. Embassy in London. From 1950 to 1951 he was on detail to the White House from the State Department and was an assistant to W. Averell Harriman who was a special adviser to the president at the time.

From 1951 to 1953 Berger was Special Assistant to the Director for Security. He then went to Tokyo, Japan as Counselor of the American Embassy, remaining there until 1954 when he became Counselor of the American Embassy in Wellington, New Zealand. From 1958 to 1961 he was Counselor in Athens, Greece, and then was named U.S. Ambassador to South Korea (1961 to 1964). He served as Deputy Commandant of Foreign Affairs for the National War College beginning in 1964 and then on July 6, 1965 returned to the State Department as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs under William P. Bundy.

Intelligence services have reported that Berger, while attending the University of Wisconsin, was known to maintain a close association with individuals who were identified Communists and with others who were outspoken Communist sympathizers. While at the University of Wisconsin he was given a fellowship by the Social Science Research Council for the purpose of doing graduate study at the London School of Economics, a Fabian Socialist-oriented college, and was reportedly a protégé of Communist Harold Laski. Part of the fellowship program was a study of the socialist British Trade Union movement. The Social Science Research Council came in for severe criticism by the Reece Committee Investigating Tax Exempt Foundations. Among the recipients of their grants have been Ralph J. Bunche, John Kenneth Galbraith, Owen Lattimore, Philo Nash, Walt W. Rostow, Paul Sweezy.

While stationed at the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo as Counselor during 1953-4, Berger was reported as maintaining strong pro-Communist attitude. Confidential sources reported that over a period of years Berger has maintained close contact with a number of individuals with varying degrees of Communist connections—from Communist sympathizers to individuals under investigation for espionage.

Another important State Department untouchable shown by the State Department Biographic Register for July 1968 as being in Saigon is Thomas W. Ayers. He is listed as Assistant Chief of the Planning Division in Saigon as of January 29, 1967. Ayers was born September 10, 1922 in China of American parents, and received his early education there. He was a newspaper reporter in 1942 when he joined the U.S. Navy, serving overseas until 1945. He went to China as an observer for the UNRRA in 1946; was a newspaper correspondent in Nanking 1946-7, bureau manager 1947-8, world service editor in Manila 1948-49. He went back to college and obtained his MA at Harvard in 1951 and his Ph. D. in 1960. He was a lecturer in Chinese at the University of Michigan 1954-55 and entered government service as an intelligence research analyst, Department of State, De-

cember 19, 1955. He went with the U.S. Information Agency, July 30, 1961 and became a press news feature writer. February 17, 1964 he went to Hong Kong as information officer and January 29, 1967 went to Saigon as Asst. Chief of the Planning Division.

While in China Ayers was known to have had strong pro-Communist sympathies. He was a close contact and associate of Sylvia Campbell Powell who, together with her husband John, published the *China Monthly Review*. This publication was so anti-American that it was used by the Chinese Communists in brainwashing captured American prisoners during the Korean War. Ayers was also a close associate and contact of Richard M. Service and Edwin O. Reischauer, both of whom were serious security risks.

Ayers was one of the individuals that the late Scott McLeod reported as a security risk as far back as 1956. In spite of his pro-Chinese Communist sympathies, Ayers has been permitted to take an important position in South Vietnam where we are supposedly fighting the Communists of North Vietnam who have the support of the Chinese and Russian Communists.

Two area development officers listed in the Sept. 1968 Foreign Service list of the Dept. of State as connected with Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS) in Saigon are Philip W. Manhard and Louis Wiesner, both of whom have had backgrounds which have not mitigated against them in government service. Like Berger, Wiesner was a fellow of the Social Science Research Council.

Louis Arnold Wiesner was born in Port Huron, Mich. on April 14, 1916. He obtained his BA degree from Michigan State College in 1937, his MA from Harvard in 1938. From 1939 to 1942 he was an assistant and teaching fellow at Harvard; from 1942 to 1943 he was employed by the Council on Foreign Relations as a research secretary. He entered government service as a research analyst for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in 1943 and switched over to the State Department in August 1944 as a clerk in Berlin, Germany. In Nov. 1944 he was made foreign service auxiliary officer and assigned to the office of the U.S. political adviser on German Affairs at Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Germany. In October 1949 he returned to Washington and was assigned to the Bureau of German Affairs in the Office of German Political Affairs. In November 1954 he went to Ankara, Turkey as economic officer and in July 1959 was assigned as international relations officer in Washington, D.C. In February 1961 he went to Ottawa, Canada, as labor attaché and in July 1967 was detached to the Agency for International Development (AID). Wiesner was married to Elizabeth Phenix in 1950.

Confidential intelligence sources have reported that Louis Arnold Wiesner was a regular reader of the Communist publications, the *Daily Worker* and *New Masses*, as well as the *Young Worker*. He was reported by confidential sources to have attended a number of Communist Party meetings and, while at college, was affiliated with the American Student Union which has been cited as Communist and subversive. He was known as an active supporter of the Young Communist League and, while in college, attempted to establish a Young Communist League chapter. During an interview, he admitted having joined the Socialist Party and further admitted that he had applied for membership in the Communist Party, USA, but claimed he had never been officially notified of his acceptance. Wiesner was reported as having been closely associated with a number of Communists over a period of years.

Philip Wallace Manhard was born in Massachusetts on November 13, 1921. He was graduated from the University of Southern California with a BA degree in 1943, served

with the U.S. Navy from 1943 to 1944 and the U.S. Marines from 1944 to 1946. He worked overseas with a business machine firm and later with an oil company in China. He came into the State Department as a vice-consul on February 12, 1948 and served at various posts in China, Korea and Japan. He is believed to be an employee of the CIA in a special detail. He was assigned to the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs in November 1964 and to the Saigon area development office in September 1967.

In 1947 intelligence services reported that Manhard was a close friend and contact of an individual named Ignacy Witczak who was known to the intelligence services as being a Soviet agent. He was reported on several occasions as having expressed views severely critical of the security section of the State Department in connection with the cases of John P. Davies and John C. Vincent. His pro-Chinese Communist views were such that they were repeatedly made the subject of intelligence reports.

Top man in Saigon of the thousands of government employees and hundreds of thousands of servicemen now in Vietnam is Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. He was Ambassador to Argentina in 1951, Italy in 1952-53 and India 1956-61. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and has been a trustee of the Vermont Council on World Affairs, Honorary President of the Foreign Policy Association and a trustee of "Experiment in International Living." He is a trustee of the (Marxist) New School for Social Research and was on the Board of Directors of the American-Russian Institute. This organization was also known as the American-Russian Institute for Cultural Relations with the Soviet Union and was cited as follows in the official Guide to Subversive Organizations:

"1. Cited as Communist (Attorney General Tom Clark, letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949.)

"2. Cited as "Communist-controlled" organization which was intimately linked with the Institute of Pacific Relations. (Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Report 2050 on the Institute of Pacific Relations, July 2, 1952, pp. 73, 95, 145 and 146.)

"3. Cited as specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda. (Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Handbook for Americans, S. Doc. 117, April 23, 1956, p. 91.)"

Back in headquarters in Washington we have had William Bundy as top man for Far Eastern Affairs since 1964. We have also had Sam Fishback and Evelyn Colbert. Mr. Fishback is employed in the State Department Bureau of Intelligence and Research in their Office of Research and Analysis for East Asia and the Pacific and has been working in Room 7418 in the Office of the Director. Confidential intelligence sources have reported that Sam Fishback, while in college, associated with Communists and Communist sympathizers. He was reported as having attended meetings of the American League against War and Fascism, cited as Communist and subversive. He also attended meetings and was active in the American Student Union, another organization which has been designated as Communist and subversive. Fishback was a dues-paying member of the Washington, D.C. branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which played such an important part in aiding the Communist takeover of China and which is listed as "a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives," in the official Guide to Subversive Organizations.

Fishback was reported as having had to undergo extensive psychiatric treatment involving sexual disturbances. He was a close associate of Morris U. Schappes, now editor of the Communist publication, Jewish Currents.

The State Department Bureau of Intelligence and Research obtains confidential information on the various areas of the world and policy is made on the basis of their advice and reports. Also working in connection with the same area of the world as Fishback is Mrs. Evelyn S. Colbert, who is Chief of the South East Asia Division. Mrs. Colbert was formerly a research analyst in the OSS and was also an accounting coordinator of International Intelligence Surveys. She was employed in the Intelligence Research Office of the Department of State and was coordinator of the International Intelligence Survey, Division of Research for the Far East, Department of State. Mrs. Colbert is one of the individuals who came into the State Department from other agencies in 1945, at the time tremendous numbers of security risks entered the Department of State. She has been reported as being a Communist sympathizer and a close friend and associate of individuals identified as pro-Soviets. Her husband was closely associated with Philip C. Jessup, and together they numbered among their friends individuals who were either Communist or strongly pro-Communist.

Then over in Paris we have the North Vietnamese, the National Liberation Front, the South Vietnamese and the Americans holding "peace talks." No open progress is being made but Henry Cabot Lodge, head of the American delegation, has indicated that we can hope for more progress and results from unofficial meetings than we can from the official ones. Able to mingle among the officials present will be two American government employees stationed regularly in Paris. They are Clifford Gross of the Paris visa office and James West, Information Officer on the International Staff of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in Paris on assignment from the U.S. State Department.

Clifford H. Gross was born in New York on December 16, 1924 and received his BA degree in 1948 from the City College of New York (CCNY). He obtained his MA and Russian Institute certificate in 1951 from Columbia University. He had taught Russian and worked for the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Internal Revenue before becoming an intelligence research analyst for the Department of State in March 1952. He has been stationed in Frankfurt, Vienna and Budapest and speaks Bulgarian, French, German, Hungarian and Russian.

Intelligence agencies reported that Clifford Gross was active in pro-Communist activities while in college. He was reported as active in the Henry Wallace for President Campaign under the auspices of the American Labor Party in a group called Students for Wallace. The Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee cited the American Labor Party as follows: "Communist dissimulation extends into the field of political parties forming political front organizations such as the * * * American Labor Party. The Communists are thus enabled to present their candidates for elective office under other than a straight Communist label."

Security investigations disclose that Clifford Gross had carried on correspondence with the Communist Party USA and with the Soviet Embassy. He was on the mailing list and a recipient of the USSR information bulletin, a propaganda magazine issued by the Soviet Embassy. Gross was known to maintain close association with Communists and Communist sympathizers over a long period of time, according to intelligence sources. He had been reported to the Secretary of State as a serious security risk but this only resulted in additional promotions.

One of the most interesting things about James West of the U.S. State Department is his wife, Mary McCarthy, who has recently been a visitor in Communist North Vietnam. According to his biography in the State De-

partment Biographic Register, West was born Nov. 3, 1914 and graduated from Bowdoin College in 1936. He is next found as being in the U.S. Air Force (Major) from 1941 to 1947. Long lapses of time unaccounted for in biographies of State Department personnel are usually an indication that the individual is something more than meets the eye, often a CIA operative. West started his government career as assistant director of the Foreign Operations Administration in Paris and was transferred to the U.S. Information Agency in 1954. He received Polish language training and returned to the State Department as a political officer in Warsaw, Poland in June of 1959. He was in the Warsaw Embassy during the "Spy and Sex Scandals" which involved the stealing of U.S. codes, the compromising of personnel of the U.S. Embassy by female Communist intelligence agents—even the security officer and the Ambassador himself. Reports disclosed that U.S. Ambassador, Jacob Beam, maintained a mistress who was a long time Soviet intelligence agent and is now the alleged wife of the Polish Ambassador to the United States.

On April 15, 1961 James West was married to Mary McCarthy, author of many best-selling books. Their marriage took place in Paris shortly after Miss McCarthy's divorce from her previous (and third) husband in February 1961. West was still assigned to Warsaw but was transferred to Paris in April 1962 and the couple live in a cooperative apartment in the Montparnasse section of Paris. Current Biography, February 1969 carries a very comprehensive biography of Miss McCarthy from which we learn of her firm stand against the U.S. position in Vietnam. Much controversy has been stirred up by the publication of a series of essays by Miss McCarthy in two books, "Vietnam" (Harcourt 1967) and "Hanoi" (Harcourt 1968). Her biography stated:

"Strongly opposed to United States action in Vietnam, she frankly admitted that she went to South Vietnam in early 1966 'looking for material damaging to American interests' and had no trouble finding it. She later visited Hanoi, shortly before the United States restricted its bombing of North Vietnam."

Mary McCarthy was born in Seattle, Washington on June 21, 1912, the daughter of Roy Winfield McCarthy and the former Miss Therese Preston. She was the oldest of four children and the only girl. One of her brothers is Kevin McCarthy, the actor. Her paternal grandparents were former farm settlers of Irish descent who had made a fortune in the grain elevator business. Her maternal grandfather was Harold Preston, a prominent Seattle lawyer, and her grandmother "Gussie" was, according to Current Biography, "a lively Jewish beauty from San Francisco." At the age of eleven Mary went to live with this couple (her parents having died in the flu epidemic of 1918) and was given an expensive education. Shortly after joining this household she lost her Catholic faith, retaining from it only a love of Latin.

Her marriages were to Harold Johnsgard, an actor (one week after her graduation from Vassar in 1933); Edmund Wilson, the well known writer and critic (February 1938); Bowden Broadwater, a writer and teacher, following her divorce from Wilson in 1946; and West following her divorce from Broadwater in 1961. Current Biography describes her associations and political philosophy:

"Through her professional associations Miss McCarthy came to know many prominent left-wing intellectuals in New York. She did not, however, take an active part in the radical movement, although she much admired Leon Trotsky." She has been quoted as stating: "I still believe in what I believed in then—I still believe in a kind of libertarian socialism, a decentralized socialism."

But I don't see any possibility of achieving it." We don't either, as socialism and decentralization are direct opposites. Socialism cannot be "achieved," it must be "imposed," requiring complete centralization. As the wife of a U.S. diplomat Miss McCarthy is in

a position to spread her anti-American views in important places.

While appeasers talk and "dissenters" protest and untouchables influence policy, American boys are dying by the hundreds each week in Vietnam. Have American hearts

been broken and American blood shed for politicians who are playing games or for the reason they have been told—to prevent the spread of Communism? Pity the poor American boy who has given his life in vain and his family who will always miss him.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 19, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father John F. O'Donoghue, secretary to His Eminence Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, vice chancellor of the Archdiocese of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, You have created man in Your own image and likeness. You have endowed him with an intellect, whose object is truth and with a free will, whose object is good. You, who are the source of all law and authority, look down with favor on these lawgivers who represent Your people in civil society. Make them aware of their responsibilities to You and to all whom they serve. Do not allow human weakness to cause them to stray from seeking the good and the true in all their deliberations.

On those occasions, when their duty to You and to their constituents may appear as an austere and exacting master, and when they may be tempted to mitigate its stern commands by interpreting them in a manner better suited to their own desires, give them the generosity to obey its orders and to shoulder it without hesitation.

Make them aware that their love of duty is but one form of their love for You, and it is the best, since duty is the expression of Your will in our regard and we cannot better love You than by submitting ourselves entirely to Your holy will.

We ask You, Almighty God, to bless them and to give them the courage and the fortitude which the right exercise of their office requires so that they may better serve You and the people whom You have entrusted to their care. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERU SEIZES TWO MORE FISHING BOATS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must report the seizure by Peru this morning of two more U.S. fishing boats, the *San Juan* and the *Cape Ann*.

At last report, the vessels were being escorted to the Peruvian port of Talara. They were intercepted at a point 23 miles off the Peru coast—or 11 miles outside the generally recognized limit for territorial fishing rights.

It was barely a month ago—last February 14—that a Peruvian warship fired extensively on the same *San Juan*, causing major damages. In part, as a result

of the public outrage over that unprovoked attack, Peru agreed to accept a special emissary of President Nixon for talks on this and other problems straining relations between the two countries.

The emissary, John Irwin, is in Peru today.

In view of his presence, at the invitation of the Peruvian Government, this morning's seizure can only be viewed as an act of complete cynicism by his Peruvian hosts.

Either that, or else President Velasco has simply lost all pretense of control over his own armed forces.

I have joined today with my colleagues, Congressman BOB WILSON and Senators ALAN CRANSTON and GEORGE MURPHY, in appealing to the President for "appropriate action" to halt these outrages.

Last month, I called on the President to assign military guards to U.S. fishing boats bound for the hostile waters off Central and South America.

I reasoned that the presence of such guards would serve as a powerful deterrent to would-be attackers. For they would then have to recognize that any action against our fishermen would also be an act of aggression against the United States itself. I believe the case for assigning such protection to our embattled fishing fleet is stronger than ever today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would this not be a good time for President Nixon to recall the emissary that he has sent to Peru?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. If I may answer the gentleman, I think it is always right to go on talking, but I think there are times when one has to act as well as talk.

PERU CONTINUES GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY BY SEIZING TWO AMERICAN VESSELS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I inform my colleagues that Peru this morning seized two more U.S. fishing boats and their crews. One of the vessels grabbed by a Peruvian gunboat, 23 miles northwest of the Point Sal today, was the *San Juan*, the same vessel which sustained \$50,000 damage February 14 from an armed attack on the high seas by Peru.

The regret I expressed is twofold. One that no progress apparently is being made with Peru and, second, that this provocation should occur while Presidential Emissary John Irwin is in Peru

attempting to reach a solution to the problem.

I fear the Peruvian conduct in this matter today indicates a lack of sincerity on their part to achieve negotiations aiming at ending these unlawful seizures.

I find this military action against Americans on the high seas this morning, at a time when our honest efforts at solution are being sought, an insult to our Emissary, to the American President, and to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, our State Department so far has not been able to achieve success with the Peruvians, and our American fishermen should not be expected to live constantly with these threats to their lives. I will be most anxious to receive a report from Mr. Irwin relative to today's armed seizure on his return to the United States.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LENT MONEY TO MAFIA-CONTROLLED COMPANY

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to the incredible fact that the Small Business Administration, under the Johnson administration, had been lending hundreds of thousands of dollars of the public's money to a company controlled by the Mafia.

The company is the ANR Leasing Corp., of New York City, which is controlled by Cosa Nostra member John Masiello, Sr., a well-known loan shark and, I am told, a convicted smuggler as well.

Another member of that firm is Thomas A. McKeever, who has a Federal and State criminal record as long as your arm.

A third official of the company is John Masiello, Jr., who also possesses a criminal record.

On yesterday, I requested Attorney General John Mitchell to initiate an immediate and full investigation of this company and the SBA's part in its financing.

Today, I wish to call attention to the fact that ANR Leasing Corp. has been doing business with yet another agency of the Federal Government.

They are in the business of leasing vehicles to the Post Office Department.

I regret to say that I have, so far, been unable to obtain the specifics of this lease arrangement from Post Office Department officials despite repeated calls from my office for it.

I can only say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I find it sickening and almost unbelievable that the U.S. Government is leasing mail delivery vehicles from a firm controlled by the Mafia.