

86. By Mr. LANDGREBE: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to commending Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, for his outstanding record of achievement in the field of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

87. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to enactment of necessary legislation to appropriate full authorization for financing cooperative fire control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

88. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the citizenship of members of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

89. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Indiana, relative to changing the method of judicial review of convictions under State laws concerning obscenity and pornography; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to extension of navigation on the upper Columbia River; to the Committee on Public Works.

91. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to locating a new national cemetery in Terre Haute, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

92. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to amending the Social Security Act to provide for Federal payment of the cost of welfare benefits paid to persons who do not meet State-imposed residency requirements; 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. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 9488. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9489. A bill for the relief of Ann Marie Parada and Oscar Nelson Parada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9490. A bill for the relief of Dapen Liang, his wife, Alice Tsai-hunk Y. Liang, and their children, Gladstone C. K. Liang, Nancy C. C. Liang, Dora C. F. Liang, Mary C. M. Liang, and John C. P. Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9491. A bill for the relief of Harold George Pereira, his wife, Winifred Caroline Pereira, and their children, Joseph Maurice, Anthony Francis, Beverly Ann Maria, Nathaniel Francis, Joachim Boniface, and Thomas James Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 9492. A bill for the relief of Dr. Helena V. Strandstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9493. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9494. A bill for the relief of Gloria Blackwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9495. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Bowman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 9497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9498. A bill for the relief of Enrique G. Balart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9499. A bill for the relief of Juanita Cecile Sawyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9500. A bill for the relief of Michael Waithe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 9501. A bill for the relief of Miguel Arrastio Esponda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 9502. A bill for the relief of Digna Espartero Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9503. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Susca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 9504. A bill for the relief of William J. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

82. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to a Federal tax-sharing program, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are one of the little-known Slavic peoples whose homeland in the northwest of Russia and east of Poland has been part of the Russian empire for centuries. These sturdy people, never numerous or strong enough to cope with their more powerful foes, had been overwhelmed by the Russians. For many centuries they endured all sorts of hardships under the czarist regime, and when that regime was no more, in 1918 they attained their goal of freedom and independence.

On March 25 of that year, Byelorussian leaders proclaimed their national independence and founded the Byelorussian Republic. They formed their own democratic government, began rebuilding their war-torn country and were doing their best to reconstruct the shattered fabric of their social, economic, and political life. Unhappily, however, they were faced from the beginning by numerous insurmountable difficulties, and the defenses of the country were totally inadequate. Soon the country became an easy prey for the Red Army of Communist Russia. Late in 1918, the Byelorussian people were robbed of their richly deserved, but short-lived, freedom.

Since then, the Byelorussian people have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. But the idea of freedom and independence has never deserted them, and they still cling to the hope that someday they will once again—and this time permanently—attain their national goal. On the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day we all pray that their just cause will prevail against the forces of tyranny, and that they will attain that freedom.

Correspondence recognizing Byelorussian Independence Day follows:

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Jamaica, N.Y., February 18, 1969.

HON. W. T. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. In spite of all the sacrifices, the young state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic which was created in its place is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government and does not represent the will of the Byelorussian people.

This is why March 25th is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the Free World as a symbol of their national aspirations. Americans of Byelorussian descent will also celebrate the twenty-fifth of March this year, which marks the fifty-first anniversary of the struggle of Byelorussian people for freedom and independence.

We deeply appreciate your moral support of the nations enslaved by Russian Commu-

nism, among them the Byelorussian nation. This is why we ask you, as a United States Congressman, to make this year a statement from the House floor in defense of the national and political rights of the Byelorussian people.

Speeches in the halls of Congress give strength and hope to the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and encourage them in their spiritual resistance against Communist slavery.

Respectfully yours,

VLAD KURYLLO,
National President.

UNITED BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN
COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE,
Kew Gardens, N.Y., March 7, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The day of March 25, 1969 will mark the anniversary of great importance for American citizens of Byelorussian origin. On this day Byelorussians everywhere in the countries of the free world will celebrate the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

In Byelorussia, however, this national celebration is not permitted. This year, instead, marks the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian SSR.

The Byelorussian SSR is not a sovereign state. Soviet Russia turned Byelorussia into its own colony by military conquest. At the time of the First World War, the Tsarist Russian Empire was disintegrating. All the non-Russian nations liberated and restored themselves as free, independent and sovereign countries. The Byelorussian constituent body—the First All-Byelorussian Congress— assembled on December 17, 1917 in Miensk, the capital of Byelorussia. It was composed of 1,872 freely elected delegates from all areas

of Byelorussia. Their first task was to take the necessary steps for establishing an independent Byelorussian Republic. Since participating communist delegates were of a small minority, they were unable to change this trend. Therefore, an armed force, dispatched by the Bolshevik-Russian government, overran and dispersed the Congress. Immediately following this action, however, Congress met and chose the Executive Council which, on March 23, 1918, proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The elected Byelorussian government acted vigorously on the diplomatic arena and organized armed forces which fought for national independence.

The Soviet Russian government, in opposition to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, decided to create fictitious statehood for Byelorussian people. In Moscow in November 1918 the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) passed a resolution establishing the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. The candidates for the government of BSSR were selected in Moscow and dispatched to Byelorussia. In connection with the departure of those candidates from Moscow on December 29, 1918 Stalin sent a telegram to Myasnikoff, a Russian ruler in Byelorussia, which read as follows: "The Byelorussian are departing for Smalensk today. They are carrying a manifesto. The Central Committee of the Party and Lenin is asking to have them accepted as younger brothers, who as yet may be without experience, but who are ready to give their lives for the Party and Soviet work".

In the city of Smalensk on December 30, and 31, 1918, the sixth north-western provincial conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) took place. This conference, consisting of Russians and internationalists, named itself after the first meeting of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia. There were participating 162 delegates with voting rights and 25 delegates with consulting right. This meeting sent a greeting to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in Moscow, which also contained this statement: "By proclaiming the establishment of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Byelorussia, the conference confirms its uninterrupted ideological, tactical and organizational connection with the Russian Communist Party, which was created during many years of common activity. The conference further confirms that in the future the communists of Byelorussia will follow the leadership of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and consider it as the higher authority of the Party".

On December 31, 1918 the conference approved "the provisional revolutionary workers' and peasants' government for Byelorussia", which had been previously appointed in Moscow and which consisted of communists only. As a matter of ethnic formality two Byelorussians: Zhylunovich and Charviakou, were added to this government. The leading part of this government, however, was composed of non-Byelorussians. On January 1, 1919 this government announced a manifesto which had been prepared earlier in Moscow. This date and this act are considered the foundation for the Byelorussian SSR.

On February 2, 1919 the first assembly of Soviets of BSSR convened in Miensk. It was composed of 230 delegates, of which number 213 were communists and 17 sympathizers. The representative of the Soviet Russian government, Sverdloff, had announced the decision of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee which recognized the Byelorussian SSR. Answering this recognition, the assembly decided to maintain close federal connection between the BSSR and RSFSR.

On February 3, 1919 this assembly accepted a constitution, a national emblem and a flag for BSSR, modeled after the Russian RSFSR.

Created by Soviet Russian government in this way, the BSSR is camouflaging the actual colonial status of Byelorussia. For the entire 50 years of this Soviet Russian domination, Byelorussians, have been subjected to a systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level.

This rule has been marked by economic exploitation, social oppression, mass terror, political deportations, imprisonments and murders. Denial of religious freedom to all faiths openly continuous. A low standard of living, malnutrition and substandard housing are permanent features of the Soviet rule. The end result is that during this period Byelorussian nation has lost over six million of her population.

At this time Byelorussians in the BSSR do not have any possibility to defend their own national interests. Therefore, we take the liberty to ask you for support of the aims of the Byelorussian nation for liberation from the horrors experienced during these past 50 years of Soviet Russian occupation, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian State.

Very respectfully yours,
MICHAEL BACHAR,
Chairman.

INCREASED "E" BOND RATE SEEN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 of this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 7015, providing for an increase to 5 percent in the interest rate for U.S. savings bonds and now that we have 3 consecutive months in which there were more bonds cashed in than were purchased, I feel that something should be done immediately to increase the incentives for savers to purchase these bonds.

An article by Mr. Joseph R. Slevin appearing in the Washington Post edition of Sunday, March 23, 1969, discusses this matter and I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

INCREASED "E" BOND RATE SEEN: MEAGER
YIELD ANGERS SAVERS
(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Savings bond buyers want a more generous interest rate return and the Administration intends to give it to them.

Dissatisfied investors are sending a stream of bitter complaints to the White House, Congress, and the Treasury Department. They are making it clear that they think the 4 1/4 per cent "E" bond return is stingy and should be increased.

"Being a good citizen, I put my life saving in Government 'E' bonds," an older woman recently wrote Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy. "However, now that I am retired I feel that I have done myself a great injustice by doing so. I do think some consideration should be given to older folks, who invested their savings with the Government. We retired people cannot keep up with the purchasing power with inflation on the rampage."

A retired cripple advised Kennedy the other day that he had sold his savings bonds and put his money in savings and loan associations that pay 5 per cent. Another man complained that inflation has halved the value of his bonds and warned that he will cash them in unless the Treasury increases the rate. "I am at the edge of the cliff, ready to leap," he declared.

President Nixon will ask Congress to authorize a higher rate as soon as the law-

makers complete action on a controversial debt limit bill that passed the House on Wednesday. Administration plans call for urging Congress to repeal the statutory 1/4 per cent ceiling both on savings bonds and on marketable bonds.

The best reason for increasing the savings bond rate is that small savers are not being treated fairly by their Government. The 4 1/4 per cent rate not only is below the 5 per cent return that an investor can get from many thrift institutions but it is even further below the return of more than 6 per cent that the Treasury pays to sell billions of dollars of notes and other securities to professional investors. Most savings bond buyers are financially unsophisticated people. They trust the Government to give them a fair shake and their confidence is being abused.

The savings bond program will start to come apart at the seams if the interest rate is not increased. The Treasury will find it harder to sell new bonds and cash-ins of outstanding bonds will rise rapidly.

Millions of Americans now hold \$52 billion of savings bonds. While sales and redemptions are slightly less satisfactory than they were, officials believe the erosion can be halted if the 4 1/4 per cent rate is increased soon.

The Government has boosted the rate five times since the savings bond program was started in 1941. An "E" bond originally paid 2.9 per cent. The most recent change came last year when the rate was lifted from 4.15 per cent to 4.25 per cent. All savings bond owners get the benefit of a rate increase for it applies to outstanding bonds as well as to new purchases.

Thrift institutions, such as savings and loan associations, look on savings bonds as competitors and can be expected to try to limit the size of the coming increase. Savings bond holders should get at least 5 per cent but that is a higher return than the heads of many thrift institutions would like to see the Government pay.

Nixon and Kennedy may find that they can give savings bond holders a fair return only at the price of a bitter row with the well organized thrift institutions.

INCREASING THE NATIONAL DEBT CEILING

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on H.R. 8508, the President's request for an increase in the permanent and temporary debt ceilings to \$365 billion and \$377 billion respectively.

This bill passed the House by an overwhelming majority—313-93, because the Congress really had no other choice. Not to have approved it would have been denying the Government the funds to pay its obligations. Obligations, incidentally, which had previously been approved by this very body.

I voted for this bill because it would have been irresponsible not to have done so. When this Congress approves programs and expenditures and appropriates funds therefor, if it then refuses to honor these commitments by not voting for the necessary increase in the debt limit, such action cannot be described as other than irresponsible.

Such a situation would be analogous to giving the Government a credit card and

then refusing to pay the bills resulting from the charge account.

I do not mean to imply that I approve of the debt ceiling device. Quite the contrary. I rather resent being forced into a position of voting for a procedure which I think is basically wrong in order to be voting responsibly. But when a nation incurs debts it is obligated to pay them. What we should do instead is to cut down on the debts.

Attempting to control expenditure of public funds by manipulating the debt ceiling is deceptive, fictional, and extremely misleading to the public. The only true and effective means of fiscal control is to control the congressional approval of programs, expenditures and, most importantly, of appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this is the last time Congress will ever be asked to approve this inappropriate means of fiscal control.

ELECTRONIC GADGETRY A BARGAIN—EVEN AT \$1,000 A POUND

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, an article appeared in the Washington Post casting serious reflections on the capability, efficiency, and perhaps even the probity of the American aerospace industry. This article was commented on in the January 29 issue of the authoritative Aerospace Daily which seriously questioned the validity of the Richard A. Stubbing study on which the Washington Post article was based. I inserted the Aerospace Daily article in the RECORD on February 18 noting at that time that I did not intend to become an apologist for the aerospace industry, or indeed for any other segment of our industrial structure, but indicating that I felt that both accuracy and fairplay dictated that any illumination of the true facts with respect to our aerospace industry should be presented as a matter of open record.

In continuance of my original intentions in this respect, I wish to draw the attention of Members of the House and the public to another article on this subject, this one appearing in the March 18, 1969, issue of the Washington Star. It is written by Mr. Orr Kelly who, in referring to the Stubbing report, states that:

A new myth is in the process of being created.

The myth, in its simplest form, is that most of the newest, most complicated gadgetry being turned out by this country's laboratories and factories is a lot of junk.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point Mr. Kelly's article which does much to dispel the myth referred to and, further, explains and describes some of the true achievements of the aerospace industry:

"JUNK" MYTH ON ELECTRONIC GADGETRY

(By Orr Kelly)

A new myth is in the process of being created.

The myth, in its simplest form, is that most of the newest, most complicated gadgetry being turned out by this country's laboratories and factories is a lot of junk.

The myth got its start with publication, earlier this year, of a report on a study done by Richard A. Stubbing, a budget analyst for the Bureau of the Budget—and, according to those who worked with him, one of the best.

While on leave from his government post last year for studies at Princeton University, Stubbing wrote a paper for a class in systems analysis in which he tried to determine how good some new electronic equipment was by comparing the time and work before breaking down—known as the mean time between failures—with the standards set in the original specifications.

He found that, in many cases, it measured up rather poorly to the original goal.

The conclusion drawn by some of those who read the report—or read about it—was that Stubbing had proved that the newer electronic equipment doesn't work very well and that it is getting worse and worse.

But Stubbing's study really proved no such thing because, for the limited purposes of his class report, he used only one measure of reliability and compared it with the original specifications.

Another, perhaps better, measure would be to check how well a piece of equipment compared to what it was designed to replace.

By this measure, there is no doubt that much of the newer electronic gadgetry does far more and operates more reliably than what it has replaced. The dramatic advance in capability and reliability from the early Gemini Space Craft to the Apollo Moon Craft is a clear indication of the kind of improvement that has been made.

(The main question raised by Stubbing is whether the government is getting its money's worth for some of the new equipment it is buying and there are many in the Pentagon who would agree with him that it isn't. But this is a different question from whether the equipment itself is junk.)

The myth has been greatly nourished in recent days by scientists opposed to the Sentinel missile defense system.

Dr. Herbert F. York, former director of defense research and engineering, for example, told a Senate hearing the other day that the system could prove to be a "catastrophic failure" and other scientists have testified that it can't be made to work.

But this neglects the fact that it is something close to a scientific miracle that anti-missile technology has advanced to the point that it is worth a serious debate.

The basic problem is to hit a missile coming in at four miles a second with a defensive missile that can only get up to a speed of about 1 mile a second—hitting a fast bullet with a slow bullet. This seemingly impossible problem was solved nearly seven years ago.

Next was the problem of a radar set so fast and accurate it could sort out a real warhead from a cloud of decoys and debris. With the phased array radar, developed a few years later, that problem began to come under control.

The technology, which is pretty remarkable, does work.

But the debate is over whether this technology can be put together into a system that works, and that is a different problem.

A missile defense system, once deployed, may remain in place for years. And then, perhaps without warning, it must work both instantly and perfectly.

The difficulty is illustrated by comparison with a conventional air defense system. No one has ever developed such a system that even approached 20 percent effectiveness. If the North Vietnamese had come close to that figure for even a short time, they could quickly have broken the back of the American bombing effort. But a missile defense

system that dropped as low as 90 percent effectiveness would indeed, in York's phrase, be a "catastrophic failure."

The myth that most of our modern gadgetry is junk may well be obscuring a much more important truth.

Man progressed over a period of many centuries from simple, highly reliable implementations of limited usefulness like the chipping stones and the club to complex, highly useful devices of limited reliability like the vacuum tube radio. Now, he is beginning to come within sight of the day, when he can build complex, highly useful devices that will also be very close to being perfectly reliable.

The remaining degree of unreliability can be very frustrating, as anyone knows who has found his battery dead on a cold morning.

But it would be unfortunate if the myth that we are busy building junk were allowed to flourish and draw attention away from such real and pressing problems as how to build these new gadgets most economically and, even more important, what to build and how to use it most effectively for the benefit of mankind.

A MODEST PROPOSAL

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion over the question of whether or not we should proceed with the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. The President has requested congressional approval of a "safeguard" system. I support him in this request. As our Commander in Chief, it is the President's constitutional function to insure the national security. He has decided that that security requires the "safeguard."

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial in the RECORD from the March 16, New Haven Register. This editorial was forwarded on to me by former Congressman Ellsworth B. Foote, of the Third Congressional District, 80th Congress. I commend it to your thoughtful consideration:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Mar. 16, 1969]

THE ABM DECISION: NIXON MAKES HIS MOVE WITH SKILL

So it is to be "safeguard" instead of "Sentinel." It is to protect the American deterrent to war and not America's centers of population. And it's to cost \$6 billion or \$7 billion and not \$10 billion as the most conservative estimators guessed.

In announcing his awesomely difficult decision on the anti-ballistic missile program the other day, President Nixon cleared away a lot of underbrush. He revealed convincingly that the art of political compromise is finely developed in the new Administration, and that this art can be employed without violating national security—at least for now—and without limiting the avenues open for the future. We think he should have solid national support in this effort.

The President came neatly down the middle between those who advised him to approach Moscow naked with an olive branch in his hand, and those who urged him to arm to the teeth—without regard for the possibility that the Soviets then would do the same.

By his plan to equip the Minuteman missile sites with ABM systems that presumably will protect them from enemy missile assaults, the President warns both China and Russia that there can be no "first strike" against the United States without sure and devastating retaliation against the aggressor, America is not being left exposed.

Yet "peace" is the Nixon Administration's watchword. The President is taking pains not to provoke hostile response abroad with anything that appears to be an offensive build-up.

There is, of course, immense risk involved. At stake is the conclusion—or, more accurately, the conjecture—that the Kremlin, with a Chinese tiger glowering menacingly on the East and a domestic population yearning for a plumper consumer economy within, is anxious to minimize its expenses and frictions with respect to the West.

It is this combination of circumstances that has built up intense pressure on the White House to accept the view that history is offering a rare "opportunity" for international rapport that should not be lost, for it may not recur for a generation.

Nixon himself noted this possibility in his Inaugural. But he has huge responsibility to discharge as well as circumstances to act upon—circumstances and widely conflicting shreds of advice. Scientists offer political advice, politicians offer scientific advice. Even those who stick to their specialized fields aren't in agreement with each other.

We can't be sure that our ABM will work when its installed in 1973—or that the Russian missiles won't. Even if our Minutemen are protected successfully by our ABM's, will these Minutemen be able to penetrate Russia's defenses and serve as a convincing deterrent?

Again the President has been frank. There is no final answer to the deterrent problem at this time, and there is no sure way to protect America's cities—except by preventing war. All Nixon promises is an annual review of his "modified" ABM program, weighing up-to-date intelligence on the nature of the international threat, the status of arms-control talks if any, and new technological developments—all elements on which to base changes or new decisions as warranted.

Congress now must decide whether this is a reasonable solution, adequate at this time for national security and also for the prospects of securing a tapering-off of the cold war.

There are times, even in a democracy where the individual voter is sovereign, when the public has to let its President choose, and to place its confidence in his judgment. This is such a time—and Congress, we hope, will see it just that way.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO LOCATE A VETERANS HOSPITAL IN SOUTHERN NEW JERSEY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Legislature which was approved by the senate on March 10, 1969, and by the general assembly on March 17.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the resolution and again

urge action on proposals to build a veterans hospital in the southern part of my State. While I represent a district which is along the Hudson River I am well aware that the need of veterans in our State justifies a third veterans hospital to supplement the two overcrowded facilities at East Orange and Lyons.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45; STATE OF NEW JERSEY

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to locate a veterans hospital in southern New Jersey

Whereas there is only one Federal Veterans Hospital located in New Jersey; and

Whereas the general population as well as the disabled veteran population of southern New Jersey has expanded greatly and continues to expand; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to give appropriate consideration of the location of a new veterans hospital in southern New Jersey.

2. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives elected from New Jersey and to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

D. D. DUGGAN: A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT RETIRES

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1969, Donald D. Duggan retired as Deputy Chief Postal Inspector after serving in the Post Office Department for nearly 45 years.

Mr. Duggan, a native of the Seventh District of Iowa, rose from the position of substitute mail clerk to the second highest post in the Postal Inspection Service.

During World War II he served as the U.S. Army's Chief Postal Inspector and was awarded the Legion of Merit citation for his meritorious service contributing to the "improvement of mail service for our troops abroad."

After the war he served as a member of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff and helped to supervise the rehabilitation of the Japanese postal service. For his outstanding contribution, he was awarded the second highest award Japan can bestow, the Second Order of the Sacred Treasure.

D. D. Duggan's record of dedication to his job is well known throughout the entire U.S. Government service. Upon his retirement he returned more than 2,916 hours of unused accumulated sick leave.

I wish to join the citizens of western Iowa in saying how proud we are of this native of Honey Creek, Iowa, who graduated from Missouri Valley High School, and rose to this important post in the service of our Government.

Donald Duggan's dedication and excellent performance will long be missed in the Post Office Department. At this point in the RECORD I insert the following article concerning this outstanding

civil servant, "Missouri Valley High School Alumnus Retires as Deputy Chief Post Office Inspector":

MISSOURI VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL ALUMNUS RETIRES AS DEPUTY CHIEF POST OFFICE INSPECTOR

Donald D. Duggan, the Post Office Department's Deputy Chief Inspector, retires February 28, after nearly 45 years of continuous service in the nation's civilian and military postal systems.

Mr. Duggan was born and reared at Honey Creek, Ia. He is an alumnus of Missouri Valley High School.

Rising through the ranks to the second highest position in the Department's Inspection Service, Duggan began his post office career in 1924 as a substitute mail clerk in Chicago. He entered the department's inspection service in 1934 as an inspector for the Philadelphia post office. He also has served as an inspector in the Washington, D.C., and St. Louis post offices. He was appointed deputy chief inspector by the Postmaster General in 1961.

WAS CHIEF FOR ARMY

During World War II, Duggan served as the U.S. Army's chief postal inspector. He was awarded the Legion of Merit Citation for his recognized contributions to the "improvement of mail service for our troops abroad."

Later, as a member of General Douglas MacArthur's staff, Duggan helped to supervise the post-war rehabilitation of the Japanese postal service. His successful efforts, including the establishment of an inspection system patterned after our own, earned him Japan's second highest decoration, The Second Order of the Sacred Treasure.

As deputy chief postal inspector, Duggan has assisted the chief postal inspector in the implementation of policies designed to insure the safe and prompt delivery of the mails and to guard the public against the use of the postal service for illegal purposes.

HIGH PRAISE

Commenting on Duggan's retirement plans, Chief Inspector Henry Montague expressed his "deep gratitude and high praise for Don Duggan's record of accomplishment."

Duggan, who will return 2,916 hours of unused accumulated sick leave to the Post Office Department when he retires, said he has no special plans after he leaves his post. "First, I am going to catch up on some long overdue rest and relaxation," he said. "I do know one thing, however," Duggan added. "Whatever I do, whenever I send or receive a letter I will think of the Post Office Department and especially my good friends and associates in the Postal Inspection Service."

Duggan resides with his family in Arlington, Va.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this day, March 25, marks the 51st anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The importance of commemorating this event here in Congress should not be underestimated. I am certain that it will serve as an inspiration to the millions of Byelorussian people now subjugated by the Soviet Union.

Recent press accounts of new liberal reforms in Hungary demonstrate that

the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet bloc troops has only temporarily slowed down the progress of democratic reforms within the Soviet bloc.

The rulers of Soviet Russia are finding out that oppression can never eradicate the yearnings for political and social freedoms that motivate mankind.

The reaction of the Czech people to the invasion is itself a demonstration that the love of freedom still flames within their hearts and cannot be put out by force.

Indeed, the courageous sacrifices for liberty that we can recognize in the Byelorussian people and elsewhere in Communist-dominated lands serve as an inspiration and example for all of us.

As we view renewed popular unrest and pressures against autocratic Communist rule, we must reaffirm our own sympathy and support for the Byelorussian people's search for freedom and justice.

Let us extend our prayerful wishes to the people of Byelorussia that they may soon be free of the yoke of Communist slavery within the Soviet Union.

May they once against exercise meaningful political and social determination.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE MACHIASPORT PROJECT

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to place in the RECORD joint resolution 11 of the Vermont General Assembly, a resolution relating to expressing support of the Machiasport project in Maine.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE MACHIASPORT PROJECT

Whereas, Vermonters and their fellow citizens of New England do not have ready access to low cost sources of energy now available to virtually every other area of the country, and

Whereas, our region is sorely dependent on fuel oil, particularly for home heating, and

Whereas, this commodity is generally more expensive in New England than anywhere else in the United States and, in recent winters, its supply has often been threatened by quotas and other factors over which we have no control, and

Whereas, the State of Maine has applied to the Free Trade Zone Board for permission to site an oil refinery in the town of Machiasport for the purpose of producing large quantities of this desperately needed commodity, and

Whereas, the presence of this refinery in our region will assure a lowered price for fuel oil and ready availability of this product, particularly in the winter months, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the members of the Vermont General Assembly express their support for our sister state's application for this refinery and urge our Congressional Delegation to continue its vigorous advocacy of Maine's request that the communities of Machiasport and Portland be declared free ports for the purpose of receiving crude oil and processing it for eventual distribution in our region, and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Vermont Congressional Delegation and to the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Interior in Washington, D.C.

Approved: March 14, 1969.

DEANE C. DAVIS,
Governor.

THOMAS L. HAYES,
President of the Senate.

JOHN S. BURGESS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I personally very strongly support not only the statements of fact but the resolving portion of Joint Resolution 11 of the Vermont General Assembly.

EDUCATION OR CHAOS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William O. Walker, outstanding publisher and Negro leader in Ohio, in an article of March 8, 1969, in the Call and Post, comments on disruption in our schools. As he aptly points out, while depriving many students of an education, the unrest in our schools hits hardest at the Negro, who, more than any one thing, suffers from the lack of a good education.

I associate myself with the views of Mr. Walker and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

EDUCATION OR CHAOS

(By William Walker)

It seems that the gauntlet is down. Our school officials will either have to run it or stand up to the challenge.

The whole question revolves around who will run our public schools: the elected Boards of Education, or dissident students and their advisors—a renegade bunch of subsidized troublemakers.

This is the challenge facing schools in most of the big cities of Ohio, and to a large extent, the nation.

These public schools were created and exist for the sole purpose of furnishing an education, at the taxpayers' expense, for all students as provided by law.

The authority of elected and hired schools officials to provide this education is being challenged. School buildings are being invaded by outsiders. Classes are being interrupted. Teachers are threatened and, as in John Hay High School in Cleveland, every kind of harassment imaginable used to prevent those students who want to study from doing so. The result was utter chaos and the closing of the school.

Despite the fact that trouble has been brewing at John Hay for several months, school officials acted as if they were caught unawares. They were indecisive, vague as to what to do and reluctant to take a firm stand.

This weakness on the part of the school officials encouraged the troublemakers to become more bold and demanding. Some encouragement was given them by a board member who tried to act on his own without first knowing all the facts. This is inexcusable.

John Hay is the starting point. Either the school officials win the battle there, or else they will lose control of all the other schools. At some point, Supt. Paul Briggs must decide that thus far he will retreat and no further.

It must be determined now who runs the schools—the teachers and the officials or a motley group of troublemaking students and their incitors.

In no case where trouble has erupted in a public school, has a majority of the enrolled students participated. This majority has its rights too. It is the lawful obligation of the school officials to protect them and keep the schools opened for them no matter what it cost.

At John Hay, the rebelling students were permitted to bypass the duly-elected and representative Student Council. This was certainly a big mistake. It weakened the whole democratic process of orderly procedure for presenting student grievances to the appropriate school officials. This in itself was an invitation to trouble.

If the Student Council isn't the proper agency for students action and redress, then the schools should set up such an agency and respect its jurisdiction.

All schools, colleges and public schools, should know by now that they face a revolt; a revolt that is organized, directed and financed. Demands are being made that students know cannot be granted. Demands that if granted, would wreck our whole system of education.

It seems that knowing this, our school officials would be better prepared and informed as to what to do.

Since a large number of Negro students are participants and or instigators in these troubles, the Negro community must therefore become involved. No matter what happens, the Negro student and the Negro community have the most to lose.

Black nationalism is all right in its proper place. But when a few self-appointed, selfish individuals arrogate unto themselves the right to dictate as to what majority of Negroes want, then it is time to call a halt.

The one thing the Negro is suffering most from today, is the lack of a good education. Anything that interferes with our improving our posture in this field, must be dealt with promptly and decisively.

We want the opportunity to get an education. The next generation of Negroes must have a good education or else their lot will be with those on relief or the outcast.

We therefore, must support education and fight chaos. With an education, we can have everything. With chaos, the gains we've made will be lost, as well as the future. We then have but one choice—education.

BLOOD AND TREASURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 24, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the income tax deadline on April 15, more Americans who still pay taxes are shuddering to learn that in addition to having had the highest taxes in the history of America, they are having to pay additional sums to finance a runaway bureaucracy. As our colleagues receive the taxpayers' embittered cries from home, I think they will find of interest the report on the World Bank from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly on March 10.

The only logical conclusion could be that instead of making matters better, we are financing them worse.

The Barron's article follows:

BLOOD AND TREASURE: A NOTE ON THE NEW HEAD OF THE WORLD BANK

From the hundreds of press releases which daily cross our desk, two last week struck us

as out of the ordinary. According to one, which arrived on Wednesday from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: "The World Bank has announced the successful placement of a \$192,650,000 issue of U.S. dollar bonds in markets outside the U.S. . . . The bonds were purchased by central banks and other governmental institutions for 57 different countries and by international organizations. The new World Bank bonds, known as "Two Year Bonds of 1969, due March 15, 1971," bear interest at 6%, payable semi-annually." The other, from the International Development Association (a World Bank subsidiary), ran as follows: "Expansion of telecommunications services, one of the most urgent needs in Pakistan, will be assisted by a credit of \$16 million from the International Development Association (I.D.A.). The credit to the Government of Pakistan is for a term of 50 years, including 10 years of grace. The credit will be free of interest but a service charge of 3/4 of 1% will be made to cover I.D.A.'s administrative costs."

In issuing the two statements, World Bank flacks—to whose professional skill we will personally attest—doubtless meant only to inform the public of the institution's latest financial moves. Willy-nilly, however, they succeeded in disclosing a good deal more. For one thing, Pakistan, the government of which, in the wake of recent bloody riots, may change for the worse, hardly rates as a preferred credit risk. Again, "telecommunications services" (which, so the press release indicates, includes "direct dialing facilities between 13 towns in East and 21 towns in West Pakistan"—who said never the twain shall meet?—as well as "the construction of two ground stations to work via the Intelsat 3 satellite" should pay their own way or command a relatively low priority in an underdeveloped land. Finally, the terms of the transactions must strike even the most open-handed observer, to say nothing of a Scrooge, as a less-than-fruitful use of scarce and costly capital.

"If I wanted to be a banker," so Robert S. McNamara, who now guides the destinies of both lending institutions, reportedly once remarked, "I would have joined a mere bank." He's in the right place. Under his management—like that of his predecessor, George D. Woods—the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has grown progressively less businesslike. Key personnel, such as the highly respected former treasurer who had been with the bank since it opened its doors, have resigned or otherwise yielded to officials of scant stature or expertise in money matters. Bank and I.D.A. loans have poured out not only to applicants of doubtful credit standing but also to nations—Yugoslavia and Tanzania, for example—that are hostile to capitalism and all its works. In transactions with more respectable and better-heeled customers, the World Bank, far from seeking to operate at a profit, as investors who hold its obligations have a right to expect, lately has been lending at interest rates which fall even to cover the cost of its own newly borrowed funds. To damage or destroy the usefulness of a giant institution, and to dissipate its resources of money and talent, is no easy task. However, the man who gave us both the Edsel and the TFX may yet bring it off.

If he fails, it won't be for lack of trying. "In the past 90 days," the new president proudly told the board of governors last September, "the World Bank has raised more funds by borrowing than in the whole of any single calendar year in its history." That apparently was just for openers. Mr. McNamara went on to say: "I believe that globally the Bank Group during the next five years should lend twice as much as during the past five." Special emphasis, he added, should go to Latin America and, notably, to Africa, "where

the greatest expansion of our activities should take place. There, over the next five years, with effective collaboration from the African countries, we should increase our rate of investment three-fold." The man has been as good as his word. Since fall, the bank, frequently in combination with its I.D.A. affiliate, has lent sizable sums to Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Tunisia and Zambia, on terms far and away the easiest in the world.

In consequence, neither the bank's income account—the latest quarterly statement, unlike that of most money-lenders these days, disclosed flat earnings—nor its balance sheet, which shows current liabilities exceeding current assets by one billion dollars, is much to brag about. Liquidity, indeed, is so low that despite a heavy flow of repayments, the bank must make repeated trips to the well. True, as the president noted, the funds to date have been forthcoming. (I.D.A., which draws all its giveaway wherewithal from governments, last week won a fresh vote of confidence from the Nixon Administration and the House Banking and Currency Committee, which cleared a long-delayed \$480 million, authorization). What Mr. McNamara failed to stress, however, are signs of mounting lender resistance. Two bond issues publicly offered in Switzerland since 1967 have been hard to sell. Moreover, in recent financings the bank has appealed not to private sources of credit but to various government agencies—municipally owned German savings banks, for example—the resources of which are limited.

Whether the World Bank, during a global shortage of capital, will be able to pursue its course remains to be seen. It is painfully apparent that by any sensible view of the U.S. national interest—this country, after all, contributed the biggest chunk of capital and remains in effective control—such plans are not worth pursuing. Thus, by lending \$16 million to Zambia, the World Bank supports an increasingly oppressive and racist regime, which, like the rest of East Africa, has robbed thousands of East Indian traders of their means of livelihood. By advancing Nigeria \$6 million "to cover anticipated foreign-exchange requirements . . ." the World Bank doubtless has helped finance a war of extermination against Biafra. The \$30 million earmarked for Tanzania, which has swung about as far left as anyone can go, will help to further Red Chinese designs on the Dark Continent.

Geopolitics aside, free-and-easy credit makes no economic sense. Projects which fail to offer an adequate return on investment at going interest rates probably shouldn't be launched. Borrowers who persist in such perverse ways—and lenders who provide the wherewithal—merely wind up wasting a nation's substance. In the best of times—to judge by the perennial plight of India, which has dissipated literally billions of dollars worth of World Bank, I.D.A. and other forms of foreign aid—grants and low-interest loans (which, in an age of inflation, come to virtually the same thing) are gifts of doubtful value. Today, when the free world stands on the brink of a new, and possibly fatal, financial crisis, they are a folly which no one can afford.

The last to grasp this simple truth will probably be Robert Strange McNamara, whose current views, in the light of those he recently espoused, seem curious indeed. As Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara—at the expense, to be sure, of the national security—placed computerized "cost effectiveness" and other shibboleths of the accountant's trade above all. Contrariwise, in his new post, where such yardsticks might apply, money evidently is no object. Blood and treasure come high. The head of the World Bank already has cost this country far too much.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia.

After the Byelorussian people declared their independence, they were able, for a few brief months, to live according to their ideals and beliefs.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

As thousands of American citizens who are of Byelorussian ancestry know, their families and friends still in Byelorussia have no freedom to express their deeply felt aspirations for self-determination and individual liberty. Today all Americans join with our fellow citizens of Byelorussian ancestry in renewing our own devotion to the principles of freedom and in our deeply felt hope that the day is not far off when the people of Byelorussia as well as people everywhere, can join us in our enjoyment of the blessings of freedom.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the love of freedom is strong in all Americans but it is especially so in those who have experienced, or whose loved ones have experienced, tyranny. Many of my constituents were born in other lands; many more have parents, brothers, children, and friends still residing in these native lands.

I speak today of the oppressed of Lithuania, the small Baltic nation whose independence was restored 51 years ago and then tragically snuffed out almost 30 years ago when it was invaded by the Soviet Union. Now a satellite state behind the Iron Curtain, Lithuania's memory of freedom is distant but not dim.

The Lithuanian American Councils of my district in Wisconsin include some of the most outstanding citizens of our State. These fine groups keep us aware of the value of freedom and the tragedy of its loss.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include, at this point in the RECORD, the resolutions memorializing Lithuanian independence which were adopted recently by the Lithuanian American Councils of Racine and Kenosha, Wis.:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY, FEBRUARY 9, 1969

We, Lithuanian Americans of Kenosha, citizens of and permanent residents in the United States, gathered on February 9, 1969, at Kenosha, Wis. to commemorate the 51st anniversary of the restoration of the Independent State of Lithuania,

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration of Lithuania to a free exercise of the right to self-determination and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; do hereby Resolve

(1) To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to firmly restate and vigorously promote in all diplomatic dealings with the Soviet union, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania;

(2) To assure the Lithuanian people presently suffering under Soviet occupation of our unwavering determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—total freedom and independence;

(3) To support the policy of any United States Government, aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and enduring peace, based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to government.

Dr. VITOLDAS BALCIUNAS, M.D.,

Chairman, Lithuanian American Council, Kenosha Branch.

VLADAS SKIRMUNTAS,

Secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Kenosha Branch.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, RACINE, WIS., BRANCH, FEBRUARY 2, 1969

Whereas, on June 15th, 1940, Soviet Russia forcibly occupied the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas, the people of this country since then are living under severe oppression and colonial rule; and

Whereas, Communism in its relentless drive for world domination is keeping millions of people in bondage and the world in the stage of turmoil; therefore be it

Resolved, that this mass meeting condemn Soviet Russia for its aggression and colonial policies against an enslaved people, especially as it is now in progress in Czechoslovakia; and therefore be it further

Resolved, that this mass meeting urge Soviet Russia start gradual withdrawal of the occupational forces from the enslaved countries and stop discriminating against the minorities within their original territories; and be it further

Resolved, that this mass meeting humbly ask President Richard M. Nixon, members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that they exert necessary efforts to bring the case of Lithuania and all other enslaved countries before the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, that this mass meeting will always support the efforts of any Administration which will seek an honorable and just peace to end the war in Southeast Asia where Communist aggression must be stopped to fulfill the American promise; and be it finally

Resolved, that this mass meeting express gratitude to the Government of the United States for the non-recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into Soviet Russia.

MARTIN KASPARAITIS,

President.

STANLEY P. BUDRYS,

Secretary.

A BILL TO MODIFY AND ABOLISH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to modify the reporting requirement and establish additional income exclusion relating to pensions for veterans and their widows. In addition, this legislation would liberalize the restrictions on benefits to remarried widows of veterans, and simplify procedures for hospitalization of veterans.

One of the most important provisions of this legislation concerns the abolition of the requirement that a veteran file an income questionnaire after the age of 72. This requirement particularly affects veterans of World War I. At this age, it becomes almost impossible for the veteran to, in any way, increase his income. His income at this point in time does in fact, decrease along with added expenditures for medicines for he and his wife.

This legislation is sorely needed to correct the substantial inequities which burden veterans and widows of veterans. Under the existing law, a widow permanently forfeits her right to pension benefits if she remarries. This legislation would provide for the reestablishment of such benefits if the second marriage is terminated by death or valid divorce.

sion should contribute to a better understanding of our national decision-making processes in the field of research and development.

HISTORY OF THE APOLLO: DECISION 1958-61

Through July 1960, Sputnik's flight in 1957 was the spacemark of this generation.² With this act, the Russians undermined worldwide belief in the technical supremacy of the United States. Our confidence in the strength of our international diplomatic-military position was replaced by deep anxiety which made itself felt in our educational system and our national leadership. Pressure was on the Eisenhower Administration to produce in space. Priority was given to the Vanguard program, and the Army and Air Force were authorized to use military rockets for the launching of their satellite systems (2, p. 56). Shortly thereafter, the President appointed the chairman of his Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) as his Special Assistant for Science and Technology.

Probably the first considered statement of space policy was submitted by the PSAC in 1958. Accompanied by a Presidential statement declaring belief in the "peaceful use of space," this document outlined a rough timetable ("early," "later," "still later") for projects such as orbiting solar observatories and unmanned exploration of near planets. Manned lunar exploration was placed well down on the timescale. The aim was to place space exploration in the perspective of a total national scientific effort. The names of those who signed will reappear frequently in any history of science and government: James R. Killian, Lloyd V. Berkner, James H. Doolittle, George B. Kistiakowsky, Edwin H. Land, Jerome B. Wiesner, and Herbert F. York.³

A few months later, Congress passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act. A civilian space agency (NASA) was established with broad powers to pursue these objectives in cooperation with the Defense Department, industry, and the educational community. Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson, chairman of the Senate's Select Committee on Space, was very influential in the formulation and passage of the act.

A number of significant steps to exploration of the moon were taken even before NASA was organized. Mercury was the most popular program. As early as December 1957, an Army rocket technology team headed by Wernher von Braun submitted a "Proposal for a National Integrated Missile and Space Vehicle Development Program." It called for a booster of 1.5 million pounds thrust. This would provide a payload capability of 20,000 to 40,000 pounds for orbital missions.⁴ In August 1958, the Army officially authorized work on the booster which was to become the Saturn project.

In October 1959, the "von Braun team" at Huntsville, Alabama was transferred from the jurisdiction of the Army and became the George C. Marshall Space Center under NASA. This ended 2 years of interservice rivalry between the Air Force and Army for control of this phase of space research. The transfer was made possible by a decision of the Department of Defense that the Saturn project did not offer sufficiently near-term military benefits to justify its cost.

In January 1960, the Eisenhower Administration submitted a \$50 million supplemental request to Congress for a large liquid hydrogen engine for the Saturn program. Although no missions were assigned, it was clear to those who cared enough to follow these developments that the United States was beginning to provide the capability for manned flights beyond Mercury.

In unmanned flights, the United States began to deliver more immediate results, successfully launching meteorological navigational communication and sun exploration satellites. Meanwhile, the Russians continued to demonstrate their lead in booster

APOLLO: HOW THE UNITED STATES DECIDED TO GO TO THE MOON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people Leonard Mandelbaum's excellent article on how the United States adopted the Apollo program, from a recent issue of Science magazine. The background of this historic decision is of interest to all of us.

Mr. Mandelbaum's suggestions with regard to integrating the many programs of science, research, and development funded by the Federal Government are also especially timely.

I am glad to include this article by an outstanding attorney in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

APOLLO: HOW THE UNITED STATES DECIDED TO GO TO THE MOON

(By Leonard Mandelbaum)

The United States program to send a manned expedition to the moon and back has involved more scientists, engineers, and public attention than any other civilian research and development project. Certainly none has matched the \$20- to \$40-billion estimate of Apollo.¹ An examination of the history of the approval of the Apollo deci-

Footnotes at end of article.

thrust by taking pictures of the back of the moon with Lunik III (October 1959).

NASA disclosed a 10-year plan which envisaged a manned permanent space station, orbiting between 300 and 1000 miles from the earth, manned circumlunar flights in 1966-68, and manned lunar landing and return in the early '70's.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics took a more aggressive position.⁵ It adopted, with unnamed dissenters, a staff report which concluded that "NASA's 10-year program in space is a good program as far as it goes but it doesn't go far enough." Among other specific recommendations, the report called for a "manned expedition to the moon this decade." The major cause for concern was the Russian lead in booster propulsion.

THE 1960 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Candidate Kennedy attacked the Republicans for "letting us fall behind" in the space program and vowed that this was another field where he would "get this country moving again." Nixon conceded that we lagged in booster power but attributed the blame to the Truman Administration. He insisted that American achievement was impressive and promised to build upon it, and energetically pursue the NASA 10-year program, including the plan for manned lunar landing by 1971.⁶

The difference in the campaign promises occurred in matters regarding scheduling and the role of the military. While Kennedy urged a speedup, he nonetheless emphasized "elastic" target dates for goals such as the manned space platform, manned lunar landings, and nuclear power in space. But he called for these accomplishments as swiftly as possible. While standing for "preeminence" and "security," Kennedy did not call for military domination, and asserted that "freedom of space must be assured, preferably by mandate of the United Nations." Nixon was more explicit about giving the military the "mission" and the "necessary strength to defend freedom of space."

NASA, alert to the possibilities of change, added to the framework for future missions. Late in July, NASA representatives announced to an Industry Conference that the successor to Project Mercury would be "Apollo," a concept which then meant placing three men in sustained orbital flight and circumlunar flight.

On 17 October 1960, NASA's George Low, then program chief of Manned Space Flight Center, advised his superior, Abe Silverstein, that he had formed a study group to look into the question of manned lunar landing. No funds were needed and Silverstein approved. Later that year, NASA made a presentation on "NASA Long-Range Goals Using Saturn and Larger Vehicles" to the PSAC ad hoc Man-in-Space panel. In December 1960, the PSAC Man-in-Space panel reported an estimate of \$20 to \$40 billion for a manned lunar landing.⁷

EISENHOWER'S LAST BUDGET AND THE WIESNER REPORT

In preparing his final budget, President Eisenhower was apparently more impressed with the more cautious approach of his scientific adviser and the pressures of his Bureau of the Budget than with the arguments for an accelerated space program. The report of the President's Commission on National Goals warned against being "driven by nationalistic competition into extravagant programs which would divert funds and talents from programs of equal or greater importance."⁸ It is also likely that Eisenhower's warning about the "military-industrial" complex was being prepared at this time.

The Budget Bureau called for a "bargain basement" figure for space. Only last minute protest from T. Keith Glennan (the first

NASA administrator) and Hugh Dryden (deputy administrator) prevented a statement in the budget message barring manned space flight beyond Mercury.⁹ The \$1.1 billion dollar figure in the proposed fiscal year 1962 budget was accompanied by the following statement in Eisenhower's budget message: Further test and experimentation will be necessary to establish if there are any valid scientific reasons for extending manned space flight beyond the Mercury program.

Even before the Inauguration, the new Administration was presented with a fundamental critique of space leadership and priorities. After an admittedly hasty review of the national space program, the Wiesner ad hoc committee (including Donald F. Hornig, Land, and two members of the staff of the Senate Space Committee) concluded that:

(1) The Nation's ballistic missile program was lagging.

(2) More effective management and coordination of the space effort was needed and particularly in the top echelons of NASA.

(3) A national booster program was encouraged "particularly for military projects." No distinction between civilian and military requirements was acknowledged.

(4) Mercury should be downgraded since it "exaggerates" one phase of space activity.

(5) Overall space program priorities should be reviewed.

(6) The Space Council should be used for managing the space program.¹⁰

Glennan prepared a briefing for the new Administration, but was not called upon. The inference of ineffectiveness in the Wiesner report contributed widespread doubt as to whether NASA would continue as an independent agency (9, p. 3). The downgrading of Mercury and military emphasis in the Wiesner report fueled this type of speculation.

Between the Inauguration and 30 January 1961, NASA did not have an administrator. The job of finding one was assigned to Vice President Johnson. James Webb, a former colleague of Senator Kerr, was appointed and confirmed by the Senate. Despite the negative comments about space management in the Wiesner report, the two top technical personnel, Dryden and Robert C. Seamans, remained.

THE FIRST KENNEDY REVIEW

President Kennedy called upon NASA to recommend significant changes in the Eisenhower space budget. Administrator Webb proposed an increase of \$308 million, including \$173 million for vehicles and propulsion, \$48 million for Apollo (presumably spacecraft design) and \$25 million for interplanetary exploration. The agenda for the meetings on this subject, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, focused on the "rate" the Administration wished to pursue in closing in "on the USSR's lead in weight lifting ability; and advancing manned exploration of space beyond Mercury."¹¹

There is broad agreement on what transpired at the key meetings of 22 and 23 March. The Bureau of the Budget was prepared to recommend an increase of only \$50 million. At 5:15 p.m., 22 March, the President entered the meeting. Present were David Bell (Bureau of the Budget), Glenn T. Seaborg (Atomic Energy Commission), Johnson, Webb, Dryden, Seamans (associate administrator of NASA), and Edward C. Welsh, who had just been designated executive secretary of the Space Council.

Dryden addressed himself to the advantages of space exploration: science, military "insurance," avoidance of technological obsolescence, and the economic return. Seamans explained that an early version of the Saturn vehicle would make possible Apollo flights in 1964, circumlunar effort in 1967-68, and lunar landing in 1970. Seaborg spoke up for a nuclear role in any accelerated space program. The President expressed disappointment over our second place in big

space programs.¹² Some idea of the President's attitude and of the pace of decision-making in this period was indicated when, half an hour after the meeting, The Bureau of the Budget called Seamans and asked whether the Saturn upper stage cost was estimated at \$67 or \$77 million (9, p. 6).

The final decision was to go ahead on the booster program. Important emphasis was given to the early Saturn stage and nuclear rocketry. This action was consistent with the Wiesner report. An additional \$125 million was requested of Congress. Apollo was deferred for a more comprehensive review.

SPACE SCIENCE BOARD REPORT

One week later, the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences presented the government with a report entitled "Man's Role in the National Space Program." Lloyd Berkner, chairman of the group, communicated his views personally to Webb on 27 February. The Academy was performing a traditional role in providing advice to the government (upon request) on scientific and technological matters. The board adopted its position on this topic at its 10 and 11 February meeting (submitted in writing to the government on 31 March), but the paper was not made public until 7 August 1961, 2 months after President Kennedy announced the Apollo decision and one month after congressional approval.

The report recommended that "scientific exploration of the Moon and planets should be clearly stated as the ultimate objective of the U.S. space program." The board found that it was not then possible to "decide whether man will be able to accompany early expeditions to the Moon and planets." Planning should include provision for manned flight on the basis that his participation "will be essential." This planning should be "consummated only as fast as possible consistent with the development of all relevant information." Crash programs were rejected.¹³

GAGARIN AND THE BAY OF PIGS

But history preempted planning. Gagarin's 108-minute ride (12 April 1961) set off another space crisis, and in responding to newsmen on the same day, the President reiterated his impatience about being "second to Russia in the space field." Two days later, the House Space Committee pressed Seamans on the subject of the schedule of the lunar program. They stressed that 1967 was the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, a logical time for Russian astronauts to plant a red flag on the moon, and expressed impatience over the apparent lack of a sense of urgency in the Administration.¹⁴

One week later, the American-supported Bay of Pigs fiasco took place. In a footnote to his detailed account of the Apollo decision, the NASA historian states that the "Bay of Pigs does not emerge as relevant" (7, footnote 109). This might seem to be an overstatement, considering the fact that Cold War events of such significance as Gagarin's flight and Bay of Pigs are not dealt with in separate compartments. At the least, the Bay of Pigs entered into discussion of the prospective Shepard Mercury flight. According to one source, in a meeting attended by Welsh, McGeorge Bundy, and Wiesner, someone asked, "Could we stand another defeat?" Welsh's response was, "Could we stand a success?" (9, p. 9).

In a memorandum of 20 April, the President directed the Vice President to find out which activity would give the United States a real chance to get ahead, how much it would cost, the competitive possibilities of outer space programs, and whether we were making a maximum effort (2, p. 199). The President reported this activity to the press on the next day.

We have to consider whether there is any program now, regardless of its cost, which offers us hope of being pioneers in a space project. . . . If we can get to the moon before the Russians, we should.

Footnotes at end of article.

Meanwhile, the Vice President was consulting with key advisers. Early meetings included officers of BOB, DOD, NASA, AEC, and PSAC. The first significant recorded meeting was held 22 April. NASA advised the Vice President that the Russians would beat us to a manned circumlunar flight. A manned lunar landing and return required a new generation of boosters, so that chance of success was believed good.¹¹

On 23 April, the Vice President and other government officials briefed Frank Stanton, president of CBS, George R. Brown, president of a large Texas construction firm, and Donald Cook, then executive vice president for the American Electric Power Service Corporation, as a test of "public reaction." Wiesner was reportedly meeting with scientific panels and coordinating with Welsh. Johnson also touched base with Senator Kerr, Congressman Brooks, and the ranking minority members Senator Bridges and Congressman Fulton (2, p. 199).

The businessmen were assertive in their call for a vigorous program. The military people agreed on the technical feasibility. By 3 May, the Vice President felt it was about time for NASA to come forth with a specific recommendation. Until that time, NASA was assuming the role of an adviser on the technical questions, ready to work within the framework of a policy decision.¹² Given the Vice Presidential directive, Seamans, Webb, and Secretary McNamara spent the weekend on 6-7 May working on a program. Just before the weekend started, the reaction to the successful completion of Alan Shepard's flight finally eliminated any doubts there might have been about the direction of America's space program.

The Shepard flight, unlike Gagarin's, was not one of the proximate causes of the Apollo decision. It is quite possible that had it been less successful or less tumultuously received, the decision may have been delayed for more comprehensive review and it may have been presented differently. Welsh felt that the event now served to convince the doubtful few.¹³

During the weekend, DOD and NASA representatives first agreed that "national security or national prestige" in a broad sense was involved, and that we had to do something that appeared to be significant on a worldwide basis. Secretary McNamara wondered if the lunar landing was a big enough jump. He suggested the possibility of manned planetary exploration. It was rejected as the central objective, but the overall supplemental \$750 million appropriation which they recommended included support for a nuclear rocket and a communication satellite program (9, p. 10).

A major cost item stemmed from the parallel development of two large boosters. One, fueled by a solid propellant, was to be developed by the Air Force. The other, liquid-fueled, would be developed by NASA. The \$750 million package also included substantial amounts for a nuclear rocket (Project Rover) and for weather and communication satellite programs. Of this total amount, \$549 million was to be allocated to NASA, and the rest divided among DOD (solid fuel propulsion), AEC (nuclear rocket), and the Weather Bureau.

The report was completed at 2:00 a.m. on Monday and presented to the Vice President later that morning. It was the day of the hero welcome for Shepard in Washington. There are different recollections as to when the President approved the package for submission to Congress as a supplemental request for FY 62. One source reported the next day. In any event, there was no change of any significance (9, p. 10).

In his address to Congress, President Kennedy presented this decision that before the end of the decade, Americans would be landed on the moon and returned. He also covered a

broad range of subjects including Communist activities in the uncommitted nations, defense alliances, civil defense, and disarmament. Later, Kennedy described the Apollo decision as his "most significant."

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

Before Kennedy announced the Apollo decision, the House Science and Astronautics Committee completed its review of the earlier request for the \$1235.3 million supplemental budget allocation. The committee recommended an increase of \$1417.8 million or \$130 million more than the Administration request.¹⁵ Most of the additional funds were earmarked for Apollo (\$42.6 million).

Congressman George Miller (D-Calif.), now chairman, filed a separate report with Congressman Bass (R-N.H.). This minority of two "deplored the manner in which the increased funds were authorized by the Committee. . . ." They concluded that "none of the increases have been adequately or cogently explained in detail or justified by a sufficiently itemized explanation. . . ." Review by the Space Council was suggested as an alternative.

Congressman Fulton (R-Pa.), however, summarized the prevailing view prior to the President's May decision:

My feeling is that you, NASA, are like the ballplayer who is hitting a lot of long flies and doing a pretty good job, but you aren't in the same ballpark with the Russians. You are not in competition—seems to us we are in a race. . . . I feel we are, and I feel it has a tremendous effect on the world (15, p. 828).

When President Kennedy accelerated the lunar program, he was essentially confirming the position of the committee. Accordingly, there was no problem in securing House committee approval of the supplemental appropriation.

Senate hearings were brief. Approximately the same witnesses were heard—NASA and DOD key officials. Both the Senate and House hearings were more noteworthy for who was not there and what was left unexamined. The Space Science Board report was not discussed. The record does not show any representatives of the PSAC or the scientific community, business, or labor communities. Until the Office of Science and Technology was created (in 1962), the Executive Branch was reluctant to allow the chairman of PSAC to testify on the grounds that his relationship to the President was confidential.

The Senate hearings were held 7, 8, and 12 June. No record of any testimony on 12 June is included. There were 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans on the committee at that time. Three Democrats and two Republicans were present the first day. Among the Senators who did not attend were: Russell (second ranking Democrat, and cited on the floor of the Senate as an authority and vigorous proponent), Magnuson, Dodd, and Holland. On the Republican side, the truants were: Bridges (ranking Republican), Wiley, Smith (now ranking Republican), and Case. The committee report indicates that the only pointed interrogation was on the relatively small request (\$50 million) for communications satellites.

On the floor there was a fairly active debate between Senators Allott and Kerr. The former noted the "stress and strain on the President" and wondered if this "precluded serious consideration of the implications." Predictably, his main concern was cost.

Senator Kerr would not risk selling the program short: "I contemplate this program as one which will enable the American people to meet their destiny. . . ." He rejected the propaganda theme and stated that the basic motivations were in addition to the inspiration, the "practical aspects of space including—military spinoff." According to Kerr, the most exciting space spinoff was longevity:

I say to the 183 million Americans of

today—that in my judgment, one of the benefits that will come from the program will be an increased average life span of at least 10 years for each one under 50 years of age today. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 9, page 11628.

CONCLUSIONS

Gagarin's flight, possibly accentuated by the Bay of Pigs, reversed the policy of two administrations. The Apollo decision of 1961 was ignited by an event interpreted as a loss of international prestige. It was a commitment to recapture national honor in space. It was made possible by the preparations of men and organizations whose growth was linked with this gigantic R&D program.

Eisenhower's Administration would not commit itself to an ambitious manned space flight program until Mercury, and possibly other projects, demonstrated feasibility. The Wiesner Committee report to President-elect Kennedy favored a less prominent role for manned space flight. As late as 23 March 1961, the Kennedy review of the Eisenhower space budget resulted in greater funding for boosters, but no commitment to an accelerated manned space flight program. This cautious approach drew support from the NSF report of March 1961, which warned against "crash" priorities and called for an orderly space program.

But all the consideration gave way under the impact of the Russian spectacular of 12 April. Soon after the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy gave instructions, not for a review, but for a method to dramatically outperform the Russians in space as soon as possible.

Congress acted without hearing testimony of compelling military need.¹⁷ The Apollo decision was made without reference to any comprehensive and integrated national policy designed to maximize the use of scientific and technological resources for social objectives. Indeed, the record does not indicate whether the available National Academy of Sciences report was introduced. It was a typical Cold War reaction.

If the views of informed and concerned citizens were solicited, the record does not provide evidence of it; if efforts by the scientific community and other groups to record opposition or reservation were made, they were not afforded much weight. Proposals of comparable magnitude, though of lesser cost, required volumes of committee testimony and days of floor debate and a flood of amendments (Peace Corps, Manpower Training, Appalachia, Reciprocal Trade). A subsequent Congress would give greater attention to rat control and rent supplement measures which did not nearly approach the \$1 billion mark.

There were other grounds to justify the action. One of the more interesting reasons, outlined by Dryden, was the need to advance science and technology through a focus on specific goals. But why Apollo? Crisis usually results in a narrowing of options¹⁸ and the cold war emergency created by the Gagarin flight preempted any opportunity for comprehensive review to choose an optimal program or programs for this purpose.

For example, the national and international need for cheap protein sources and the rich potential of undersea development might have indicated that accelerated oceanographic research would have been a wiser investment of technological resources.

With regard to the economic justification, it is important to recall that the United States was still suffering from an economic slump in 1961. But the unemployed and underemployed were mostly the coal workers and displaced farm workers of Appalachia and elsewhere, and the untrained minority groups of the ghettos—not the engineers and technicians that a research and development program demands. If public works were agreed upon as the primary approach to unemployment, most economists would have

Footnotes at end of article.

preferred activity that provided opportunity for the unskilled and semi-skilled.

This article has not delved very deeply into the scientific arguments for Apollo. To begin with, the advocates never raised it as a critical justification. If they had, then perhaps the report of the National Academy of Sciences, which gave priority to other pace projects and required a more orderly progression for manned space, would have been sufficient to deter the acceleration of Apollo.

A far more important question of principle is involved. Modern science is often inextricably linked with modern technological development. Both call for huge investments of men and money. This necessarily involves questions of priority: Which other proposals for R & D must be refused, and which other social objectives must be deferred? These are primarily political questions to be decided upon by political and administrative representatives with the full and knowledgeable participation of the entire concerned community—natural scientists, social scientists, and citizens' groups.

Too often, it is impossible for concerned citizens to appraise and comment upon an incipient program. This is sometimes attributed to the esoteric knowledge required to understand what is proposed. But tax and trade bills are complicated too. The more serious obstacles to mature consideration are the crisis atmosphere (often artificial), the fragmented machinery (discussed below), and the momentum of technological impulse.

The April 1961 response to the Russians was the spark that set off Apollo—but it probably would have been launched anyway. With the approval of the concept of Saturn, it was plain that the men, desire, and organization were welded together behind the idea of manned space exploration of the moon. These factors add up to a considerable social force that I have termed "technological impulse."

Only an alert and vigorous set of sociopolitical mechanisms, equipped with a well-designed policy, could confine this promotional force to its proper place in a democratic society. The American of the late 19th-century economy was substantially the manifestation of the planning and activity of the great industrial captains. This economy is now permeated by a network of social controls. It is no less vital; many argue that its growth is due in large part to the regulatory system.

Perhaps it was too much to expect both a rationalized science policy and a sophisticated system of R & D decision-making less than 4 years after Sputnik and before any experience with the Russians in limiting the technological terrors of the Cold War. But now it is 12 years since Sputnik. We know more about poverty, and other social problems both here and abroad. There is increased awareness of the potential of technological approaches to social questions of inadequate housing, food production, environmental pollution, and crime prevention and control.¹⁰

Nevertheless, recent decisions such as approval of the supersonic transport program, and the Air Force manned orbiting laboratory provide substantial evidence that without an integrated federal R & D policy and decision-making system, technological impulse, supported by vague claims of international prestige and increased security, will prevail.

Any well-integrated policy would recognize that scientific and engineering manpower, including systems analysis capability, are required for basic social objectives before surplus resources may be allocated to prestigious or otherwise marginal projects. The latter would be entitled to more serious consideration if the most were minimized by international cooperation, minimal duplication, and adequate research experience prior to heavy development outlays.

Such a policy is impossible within the fragmented framework of federal R & D decision-making which has not substantially changed since 1961. Executive and congressional committees and panels are certainly more informed than they were 7 years ago. But both systems are designed for specialization. The PSAC uses panels of experts to judge the validity of increasingly esoteric proposals. Nuclear, space, and military problems are assigned to separate and powerful congressional committees. It is a system ideally suited for the effective lobbyist, whether he represents industry, government agencies, or institutional education.

A generation has passed since the nuclear age was introduced and the space age heralded. Within this period, imposing numbers of articles and books by respected authorities have debunked reform ideas such as instituting a Department of Science. Now that the federal budget for research and development items is being given most critical review, it is time for well-informed people in the social and natural sciences to step forward with meaningful ideas on policy formation and machinery, so that these limited resources will be employed at maximum advantage.

FOOTNOTES

¹ At different stages different estimates were given. Originally, the Administration talked of the \$20- to \$40-billion range. More recently, NASA tried to establish that only a few billion will be used for items designed solely for Apollo. Other outlays, however (launch facilities, booster technology, Gemini, and others), are deemed necessary for an overall space program. Recently T. Wicker (New York Times, 29 Dec. 1968, p. 12E) cited a \$24-billion estimate.

² For a summary of pioneering in this field, see J. Holmes, *America on the Moon: The Enterprise of the Sixties* (Lippencott, Philadelphia, 1962), sec II.

³ President's Science Advisory Committee, *Introduction to Outer Space*, The White House (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 26 Mar. 1958).

⁴ *Saturn Illustrated Chronology* (George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., 10 Aug. 1964), p. 1.

⁵ Democrats enjoyed a 15 to 9 majority of this committee at that time.

⁶ J. Doherty, "Space in the 1960 Campaign," NASA Historical Archives, Washington, D.C. (unpublished).

⁷ E. Emme, "Historical Perspective on Apollo," NASA Historical Note No. 75, Washington, D.C., 24 Oct. 1967, p. 26.

⁸ U.S. President's Commission on National Goals, *Goals for Americans* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960), p. 114.

⁹ My interview with Robert C. Seamans, Jr., NASA Associate Administrator, 27 May 1964 (John F. Kennedy Library, Cambridge, Mass.), p. 1.

¹⁰ Report to the President-elect of the ad hoc Committee on Space, released 12 Jan. 1961, particularly p. 14.

¹¹ My interview with Dryden in Washington, D.C., 23 Mar. 1963.

¹² *Man's Role in the National Space Program* (National Academy of Sciences, Space Sciences Board, Washington, D.C., 31 Mar. 1961).

¹³ *Hearings before the U.S. House Committee on Science and Astronautics*, 87th Congress, 1st Session, regarding H.R. 6874, p. 375.

¹⁴ My interview with Welsh in Washington, D.C., 14 Apr. 1964.

¹⁵ *Report of Committee on Science and Astronautics*, No. 391 to accompany H.R. 6874, 87th Congress, 1st Session (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.), p. 89.

¹⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 9, p. 11626.

¹⁷ While military experts saw some potential benefit from manned space flight capability (for inspection and repair of satellites,

and so forth), most saw no military application for extended space flight to the moon and planets.

¹⁸ R. C. Snyder, in *Approaches to the Study of Politics*, R. Young, Ed. (Northwestern Univ. Press, Evanston, Ill., 1958).

¹⁹ A. Weinberg, "Scientific choice, basic science and applied missions" in *Basic Research and National Goals, 1967, A Report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives by the National Academy of Sciences* (Washington, D.C., March 1965), p. 279.

CUTTING CRIME

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the Indianapolis News on March 7, 1969 concerning reducing juvenile crime in White County, Ind. It shows that greater firmness and imaginativeness on the part of our courts and judges can significantly reduce criminal offenses, particularly among the young. If this approach has been successful in reducing crime in White County, Ind., why not initiate similar methods in other areas of the country?

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 7, 1969]

CUTTING CRIME

White County has a three-man team which has reduced juvenile crime by 80 per cent in a single year.

Youngsters who get in trouble there face Judge Maurice J. Zerface. Under his "get tough" policy, juvenile offenders often find themselves confronting a jail term as well. Zerface and Monticello City Court Judge Edwin W. Malmquist agree that "once a youngster has lived inside a jail cell, he never wants to go back." Neither judge has had a youth appear a second time since the policy was initiated in July 1967.

Judge Zerface says parents are responsible for the conduct of their offspring and orders them to appear in court when their youngsters get in trouble. He makes the parents assume the burden of disciplining their children by holding them in contempt if they do not. "When we place the onus on the parents," he says, "we find they're usually tickled to death to find they can control their children after all."

The third member of the team is Charles E. Smithburn county probation officer, who aligns himself with the general views of the two judges. Smithburn works with the schools and various civic organizations to head off potential youthful crime, but he also believes offenders should be adequately punished.

In the common-sense opinion of the two judges, a person capable of stealing a car is no longer a juvenile and should be tried in adult courts. This is in sharp contrast to the attitude of Marion County juvenile court which seldom waives jurisdiction on youthful cases, regardless of the severity of the offense. Judge Harold N. Fields says he used the waiver in 80 cases in 1968 out of a total of over 3,000 cases.

The soft approach hasn't worked. Juvenile crime in Indianapolis increased from 6,573 in 1967 to 7,080 in 1968—a 7.7 per cent hike. In 1967 youthful crime rose 17 percent over the previous year.

Judge Zerface takes the view that the first

job of any court is to protect the public from the offenders and that rehabilitation is an outgrowth of proper punishment. Zerface believes that the names of juvenile delinquents should be published because the public has a right to know who the lawbreakers are.

The difference in results in the two counties is graphic. While White County has reduced its juvenile offenses, Marion County experiences a steady rise in youthful crime. It would seem that a dose of common sense also might work in juvenile crime prevention in Marion County.

GOOD PEOPLE ARE CONCERNED

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the good people of Florida I have the honor to represent are deeply concerned over the substantial trend of the Congress to delegate to the executive department more and more powers properly belonging to the Congress.

I share this deep concern and it was for that reason I voted in opposition to S. 1058.

This legislation, acted upon by this body on March 18, is yet another step in eroding the people's power constitutionally expected to be exercised by the branch of Government closest to the people, namely, the Congress. S. 1058 extends until April 1, 1971, the time within which the President might reorganize the executive branch of Government. While I keenly favor substantial revamping and reorganizing of our multitude of Federal agencies with the consequent economies, I do not perceive it proper for the executive branch to reorganize short of active congressional approval.

In simple terms, the reorganization authority allows the President to substantially redesign the U.S. Government and unless the Congress rejects the plan within 60 days after the President has submitted it to the Congress, it will take effect without legislative action.

Thus, it is possible that the President could juggle the Government of more than 200 million people to his own will, and, with the help of only a few, jam the legislative process so as to make impossible any public debate on the proposal until past the 60-day deadline.

In this approach, there is great danger to our representative form of government. Once such reorganization becomes law by inaction, it will be difficult to undo it with congressional action.

In summary, it is good and proper for the President to recommend, but the decisions of policy belong to the Congress.

I shall continue to fight for governmental reorganization. It is needed. But I shall fight with equal vigor for the public's right to have their representatives constitutionally charged to do so make the final determination.

Thus, I voted in opposition to the extension of Executive power.

For similar reasons, I voted in opposition to S. 2171, the bill which, if passed, would have placed in the hands of a commission the power to set national

observances and holidays. To some, this bill was insignificant. To some, the matter of presidential proclamations declaring national holidays and observances is of no import.

But, to the people of the Fourth District of Florida, it is a matter of import. To my constituents, every item of business which commits this Nation to any course of action, be it governmental reorganization or national holidays, is a matter to be decided by the elected representatives of the people.

I am committed to a course of action which will halt this pattern of law-making.

I shall continue to press for government by the people and I will oppose government by commission and agency.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the drive for freedom and self-government is one which is instilled in the minds of people who have been oppressed, but who find hope in the examples of other free nations that human dignity will ultimately prevail over slavery. So it is with Byelorussia, first born as a concept manifested by distinctive cultural bonds.

The outbreak of World War I gave the Byelorussian people and other non-Russians the opportunity to exert their national independence, and under German occupation, Byelorussian national cultural revival was given impetus by the order of German Field Marshal von Hindenburg to establish the Byelorussian language as the official language in the nation's public life. In October 1917, subsequent to the Russian March revolution, 1917, the Great Byelorussian Rada, representing all Byelorussian organizations and parties, declared itself the national representative of the Byelorussian people. Then by resolution of the first All-Byelorussian Congress in December 1917, the right of nations to self-determination was enthusiastically endorsed and the groundwork was laid for the establishment of a democratic government to be designated as the Byelorussian National Republic.

Although the Bolshevik revolution had intervened in November 1917, causing the Byelorussians to become the first victims of Communist aggression, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk on February 19, 1918, between the Germans and Bolsheviks once again placed Byelorussia under German occupation. With the suppressive interference in Byelorussia's national and political life thus abated, the initial declaration of independence came about on March 9, 1918, pursuant to the actions of the first All-Byelorussian Congress more than a year earlier, and on March 25, the official proclamation of all independence was declared:

A year ago, the peoples of Belorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most

of our cities and towns. Today, we, the Rada of the Belorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Belorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The people of Belorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Belorussia with other states.

With the advent of the armistice in November 1918, the dissolution of the German armed forces was the beginning of the demise of Byelorussia as an independent nation. Submission at the hands of the Soviet power was swift, and still another nation, which tasted freedom but briefly, was snuffed out.

Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 51st anniversary of Byelorussia's independence. While the physical boundaries of this once-free nation were erased, the spirit and faith of her people still live, and in this fact alone lies the seeds of revival of national independence.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of independence for the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, but it will not be celebrated in the streets of that republic as one would see the Fourth of July in this country. Behind this lack of festivity in Byelorussia lies 50 years of occupation by the Communist forces of the Soviet Union.

We in a free nation often take for granted the liberties that were an inheritance from our forefathers. Byelorussians had only 1 year to taste freedom. After a history of being carved up among other nations and ruled by outside forces, independence was a welcome treasure to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. These people fought hard to maintain their long-sought freedom, but the overwhelming number of the enemy forced them once again into a state of conquered people.

In a recent letter to me, Michael Bachar, chairman of the United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee, described what conditions have been like for the Byelorussians under this latest occupation. He wrote:

This rule has been marked by economic exploitation, social oppression, mass terror, political deportations, imprisonments and murders. Denial of religious freedom to all faiths (is) openly continuous. A low standard of living, malnutrition and substandard housing are permanent features of this Soviet rule. The end result is that during this period (the) Byelorussian nation has lost over six million of her population.

Such conditions should not be tolerated anywhere in this world by any free and independent nation. Therefore, I would like today to join those among our citizens who are of Byelorussian descent in calling for the liberation of their native land from the arm of the Soviet Union. Let us hope that once again we may see

the will of the Byelorussian people guiding the destiny of their nation. May I assure my Byelorussian friends that their efforts in this regard will continue to have my enthusiastic support.

THE COUNTERFEIT BALLOT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in this age when it is so important that the people of the United States be well informed as to the workings of their Government, the news media has played a commendable role in education. I should like particularly to enter into the RECORD a series of nine well written and authoritative articles published by the McClatchy newspapers: the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee, all of California. These nine articles explain and outline the problems of the electoral process which are facing the 91st Congress and the Nation. Martin Smith and Leo Rennert have written superb articles informing the people of the history and dangers of and the alternatives to the present electoral system.

Martin Smith is a gifted and powerful writer who has the talent of reporting the facts while editorializing at the same time. This combination provides an intellectual work which is an education as well as a pleasure to read. In the "Counterfeit Ballot," Mr. Smith has reported the advantages and inequities in the electoral college system along with proposed changes. With these articles, the people are able to formulate their own conclusions and take enlightened positions.

I have received numerous letters from my constituents which voice their opinions and views on this subject. I am not surprised at how well informed they are in this area after reading the works of Martin Smith. There is no doubt in my mind that the "Counterfeit Ballot" and Martin Smith are responsible for many of these reactions. We are owing to the McClatchy newspapers and Mr. Smith for their service to the American people. It seems right that we should now place the "Counterfeit Ballot" series into the RECORD as recognition and thanks for this well-done service.

The articles follow:

[From McClatchy newspaper, Jan. 20, 1969]
THE YEAR 1787 BROUGHT LONG, HOT SUMMER
OF UNREST, STRIFE
(By Martin Smith)

Philadelphia and the rest of the United States had a long hot summer to endure in 1787.

There was grave social unrest and governmental instability throughout the new nation.

Still fresh in Americans' minds was Shay's Rebellion which, fed by discontent among small farmers and debtors, broke out the year before and required troops to restore law and order.

The government established under the Articles of Confederation could not bind together the 11-year-old nation.

From late May until mid-September, delegates to the Constitutional Convention in

Philadelphia wrestled with the problem of establishing a new framework for American government.

WORKING AGAINST TIME

They were working against time. Anarchy threatened the new nation. What was giving them the most difficulty was the question of how the nation's presidents should be chosen.

Pennsylvania delegate James Wilson noted: "This subject has greatly divided the house and will also divide the people . . . It is in truth the most difficult on which we have to decide."

Wilson favored a direct popular vote for president. Among the delegates on his side were some of the most prominent individuals who participated in the convention, including Gouverneur Morris and James Madison.

Madison, whose role at the convention was so important that he became known as "the father of the Constitution," admitted that conducting a nationwide popular vote would not be easy. Even so, it seemed to him to be the best way of selecting a president.

"The president is to act for the people, not the states," he said.

A RADICAL IDEA

But this was a radical thought in 1787.

As Neal R. Peirce, whose book "The People's President" describes the events, says: "Only a few delegates to the Constitutional Convention felt that American democracy had matured sufficiently for the choice of the president to be entrusted directly to the people. On the two occasions that the convention voted on direct vote, the proposal was resoundingly defeated."

Elbridge Gerry called the idea "radically vicious" and warned: "The people are uninformed and would be misled by a few designing men."

The proposal for a direct popular vote was one of the major ideas advanced at the convention for a method of choosing presidents. Another was to have Congress choose the president.

The deadlock continued through the summer until a compromise finally was reached in September.

MADISON LOOKS BACK

Thirty-six years later, Madison looked back on the convention and indicated that the compromise had been thrown together in some haste by weary men:

"The difficulty of finding an unexceptionable process for appointing the executive organ of a government such as that of the United States was deeply felt by the convention; and as the final arrangement took place in the latter stages of the session, it was not exempt from a degree of the hurrying influence produced by fatigue and impatience in all such bodies."

The compromise left it to the individual states how presidential electors would be selected. In the nation's early elections, electors assigned to the states simply were named, in most cases by the state legislatures.

ONE BIG CATCH

The compromise of 1787 gave the final say in the choice of a president to the House of Representatives if no candidate won a majority of the presidential electors. But there was a catch—a big one.

As a sop to the small states, each state's delegation of congressmen in the House would be given only one vote so that the large states would have no more powerful voice in naming a president than the small ones.

The compromise permitted the Constitutional Convention to complete its job and sell its product to the individual states. The crisis of the summer of 1787 had been met, but the compromise reached on how presidents would be elected would mean great troubles in the future of the young republic.

The troubles arrived in just a few years.

[From the McClatchy newspapers,
Jan. 19, 1969]

ACTING PRESIDENT WAS CHANCE UNDER ARCHAIC VOTING SYSTEM

(By Martin Smith)

It all sounded so strange that election night. The voting trend was indecisive, and the choice of the president might be left to the House of Representatives under the archaic constitutional procedures established nearly two centuries ago.

A deadlock in the House appeared to be a real possibility. The television pundits were talking of the chance an acting president might be necessary to take over the reins of government if the House could not reach a decision by Jan. 20.

An acting president? It sounded as if they were talking about a Central American banana republic, not about the United States. But they were.

VOTERS DECIDED

It did not turn out that way, of course. Hubert H. Humphrey ran more strongly than expected, but George Wallace ran weaker and Richard M. Nixon won a majority of the Electoral College votes.

Once more, in the view of those who for decades have been warning that the nation's presidential election system is in need of basic revisions, the United States had teetered briefly on the brink of disastrous governmental instability, then veered back safely for another four years.

It is a drama occurring in one form or another every four years because—and this needs repeating—American voters do not elect their presidents. The voters only choose members of the Electoral College, who, in turn, choose the presidents and vice presidents.

TROUBLE ARISES

It is a system which only worked, more or less, the way it was supposed to in the first two elections in which it was employed. The third time around, in 1796, the system began to cause trouble.

Individual electors are expected to vote for the candidate on whose slate they ran, but they do not have to do so. Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of North Carolina proved that again last month.

He was one of the 538 individuals—members of the Electoral College—who decided who should be the president of the United States for the term starting tomorrow. Bailey is a John Bircher, which is his privilege, and although he supposedly was elected by North Carolinians to vote for Richard M. Nixon for president, he instead cast his vote in the Electoral College for George Wallace. As events turned out, that was Bailey's privilege, too.

SECOND, THIRD CHOICE

The system, coupled with an undemocratic, boss-controlled method of selecting party candidates, makes possible the election of a president who actually may be the second—or third—choice of most American voters.

United States Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, called this year's election another "brush with catastrophe."

The potential horrors of the present system long have been known. Sometimes the horrors have come to pass.

Three times in the 19th century—in 1824, in 1876 and in 1888—a candidate has captured fewer popular votes than an opponent but still has gone on to become president.

CLOSE CALLS

So far this has not occurred in the present century, but there have been three close calls—in 1948, in 1960 and again last year.

If, regardless of how many popular votes a candidate might have, neither he nor any opponent has an Electoral College majority, the choice of a president is left up to the House of Representatives, where the politicking for support would be intense.

A deadlock in the House always would be a possibility. Congressmen, when called on to elect a president, do not vote as individuals. Instead, each state is accorded one vote—no matter what its population is.

ONE VERSUS 38

Nevada's single congressman would decide how his state's one vote for president would be cast, while California's 38 congressmen would decide whom their state's one vote would support.

In the opinion of many political scientists and also many hardheaded practical politicians, the worst possibility is that a cloud would hang over the head of some future president who won the office under what were regarded as dubious circumstances.

Stanford University political science Prof. Ray Wolfinger has warned that, under these circumstances, considerable numbers of the population "might feel freer to disobey the law."

OMINOUS TALK

It is ominous talk. But it is based upon real dangers.

An acting president? A president regarded by most Americans as a usurper?

It could happen because of the Electoral College.

U.S. ELECTORAL SYSTEM HAS ALWAYS CREATED PROBLEMS

(By Martin Smith)

After just two presidential elections the new nation's Electoral College system for selecting presidents broke down and required patchwork repairs.

George Washington managed to get elected president in 1788 and was re-elected in 1792, along with his vice president, John Adams, without trouble with the election machinery.

After that, however, the system failed to work the way it was intended.

Adams, a Federalist, won the presidency in 1796. But his running mate, Thomas Pinckney, failed to be elected vice president. Thomas Jefferson, the presidential candidate of the Republicans, later to be renamed the Democratic party, became the vice president because of the way in which Electoral College votes were counted.

MORE SERIOUS BREAKDOWN

The breakdown in the system became much more serious four years later. Jefferson ran again for president. His Republican party running mate was Aaron Burr, the candidate for vice president.

But under the confusing system of counting votes, Jefferson and Burr were tied in the Electoral College balloting for president.

It was just as if the Electoral College recently had been unable to choose between Richard M. Nixon or Spiro T. Agnew for president.

In 1801 the House of Representatives had to make the choice between Jefferson and Burr. It elected Jefferson as president and Burr as vice president, but not until after a week of turmoil and 36 ballots.

PATCHWORK REPAIR

The system obviously had to be changed, and Congress passed and the states ratified the 12th amendment to the Constitution. It was patchwork repair. The Electoral College was retained, but the tricky double ballot system by which a candidate for vice president could wind up as a contender for president, even opposing his own running mate, was eliminated.

The changes became law in 1804 and still govern today's presidential elections, although they have resulted in other constitutional crises in the ensuing 164 years and appear to be an increasing danger to the American political system.

In 1824 the election again was thrown into the House of Representatives after the four-

way race ended without any single candidate capturing a majority of electoral votes. What happened then is what many observers fear might happen today. The man finally selected as president trailed one of the other candidates in the number of popular votes cast.

ADAMS TAKES OFFICE

As a result, John Quincy Adams took office under a cloud. Enough Americans thought political manipulators had cheated Andrew Jackson out of the presidency to render the Adams administration incapable of exercising effective leadership.

Candidates who trailed in the popular vote again were elected president in 1876 and 1888. Democrat Samuel Tilden won 4,287,670 popular votes in 1876, while Republican Rutherford B. Hayes had only 4,035,924 votes. But, aided by highly dubious election procedures, he won the presidency with a majority in the Electoral College.

Democratic President Grover Cleveland sought re-election in 1888 and received 5,540,365 popular votes. His Republican rival, Benjamin Harrison, trailed in the popular vote count with 5,445,269. Harrison, however, became president, winning 233 electoral votes to only 168 for Cleveland.

There have been three close calls during the 20th century.

TRUMAN VERSUS DEWEY

In 1948, Democrat Harry S. Truman won more than 24 million popular votes, while Republican Thomas Dewey was given fewer than 22 million. But if Dewey had won as little as 12,487 more votes in California, Illinois and Ohio, he would have won the presidency with an Electoral College majority.

In 1960 Democrat John F. Kennedy received 34,220,984 votes and Republican Richard M. Nixon 34,108,157. It would have required a shift of only 11,414 votes in Illinois, Missouri, New Mexico, Hawaii and Nevada to have made Nixon president eight years before his time although he would have trailed Kennedy in the popular vote.

Last year Nixon enjoyed a popular vote margin of 500,000 over Democrat Hubert H. Humphrey. But if a few thousand strategic votes had shifted in a few key states, Nixon would have failed to gain an Electoral College majority, and the election would have been thrown into the House of Representatives.

Such a result was the goal, of course, of George Wallace, the third party candidate for president. Election chaos would give the third party leaders their best chance to manipulate the selection of a president to their liking.

[From the McClatchy newspapers]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM FALTERED IN THIRD ELECTION

(By Martin Smith)

The founding fathers offered an attractive rationale for the Electoral College system of selecting presidents.

Although the system simply was the result of a political compromise, the framers of the Constitution argued it offered a positive good. The system, as they saw it, would permit the very best men in the nation to sit down every four years and calmly, without rancor and partisan considerations, decide who would make the best president.

This vision quickly proved to be a mirage. The founding fathers themselves promoted the development of political partisanship. The presidential electors were regarded as faceless individuals. They were unnecessary and sometimes troublesome middlemen in the process by which presidents were selected.

UNEXPECTED VOTE

In 1796 one of the Pennsylvania electors voted for Thomas Jefferson for president when everyone thought he had been committed to vote for John Adams. An angry Federalist politician wrote:

"What, do I chuse Samuel Miles to determine for me whether John Adams or Thomas Jefferson shall be president? No! I chuse him to act, not to think."

Other individual electors occasionally have broken their faith by thinking.

The most recent was Dr. Lloyd W. Bailey of Rocky Mount, N.C., who, although he was elected as part of Richard M. Nixon's slate of electors, chose instead to cast his vote for George Wallace for president.

One elector broke loose from Harry S. Truman's Tennessee slate of electors in 1948. Adlai Stevenson lost one of his Alabama electors in 1956.

AMBITIOUS SCHEME

The most ambitious renegade was an Oklahoman who had been elected in 1960 to cast his Electoral College ballot for Nixon. Instead, the elector promoted an unsuccessful project to persuade other electors to desert Nixon and John F. Kennedy and support instead, a strong conservative for the presidency.

His scheme simply was a variation of attempts by Southern conservatives since World War II to force the election into the House of Representatives where Alabama's voice would count every bit as much as New York's.

Strom Thurmond ran for president in 1948 in the hope the election would go to the house where a major party candidate then might have to bow to dictates from Dixie on race questions.

Thurmond failed, as did George Wallace who ran last year with more or less the same idea.

But Wallace's movement remains as a threat to the two-party system which most political scientists think has been a mainstay of political stability in an increasingly troubled nation.

Soon after Wallace announced his presidential candidacy last year, a Democratic congressman called for modifications of the Electoral College system to provide for a runoff election if no one candidate received a majority of the electors.

But it was a Republican, U.S. Rep. Clark MacGregor of Minnesota who called for abolishing the Electoral College and replacing it with a popular vote.

"The Wallace candidacy is a cynical attempt to capitalize upon the vagaries of our presidential election system to get a stranglehold on national policy," warned MacGregor.

"The American people would not wish us to stand by idly while a minority presidential candidate attempts to blackmail either major party candidate into such an unholy alliance."

WALLACE ASSESSMENT

Robert H. Finch, the incoming Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who was until recently California's lieutenant governor, assessed the Wallace candidacy in 1972 and observed that the former Alabama governor has "a pretty good piece of political machinery going for himself."

Finch acknowledges the process by which the United States Constitution is amended is an exceedingly slow-moving one, but he sees the Wallace threat as providing "a greater catalyst for change now than ever before."

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 23, 1969]

CAMPAGNING NIXON MOVED CLOSER TO POPULAR VOTE IDEA

(By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. James O. Eastland, the conservative Mississippi Democrat who, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, will have a lot to say about any changes in the system of electing presidents, has predicted the system will be revised—if the new president wants revision.

"If the next president pushes electoral reform, we'll get it," said Eastland. "If he doesn't, I don't assume so."

The new president is Richard M. Nixon who indicated during the campaign he favors changes in the system. He said once he was not proposing abolition of the Electoral College, but he also said he thinks the man with the most popular votes should become president.

NO DETAILS OFFERED

Nixon has not offered any detailed recommendations for revising the system but in his most extensive statement on the issue, he said on Sept. 3 in Cleveland, Ohio:

"I am not suggesting we go so far as the direct election of the president. But I do believe that in a particular state the fact that one man may win the state by a few thousand votes and then get all the electoral votes of that state—I think that, in effect, disfranchises a lot of other people who may have voted on the other side. I would rather have proportional representation in the Electoral College."

MOVES CLOSER

But later in the campaign, Nixon seemed to be moving closer to the idea of deciding the presidential election by popular vote.

On Oct. 15: "I think that if the man who wins the popular vote is denied the presidency, the man who gets the presidency would have very great difficulty in governing."

On Oct. 21: "Whoever wins the popular vote should be the next president of the United States."

On Oct. 30, while challenging Democratic rival Hubert Humphrey to accept the decision of the popular vote: "I say again, the candidate who gets the most votes should be the next president. I stand ready to accept the decision of the electorate."

FINCH PREDICTIONS

Former California Lt. Gov. Robert H. Finch, a close friend and adviser of Nixon's and chosen by the President to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, predicted in a Sacramento interview that Nixon will offer specific proposals for changing the presidential election system.

Finch said he does not know yet what forms these proposals will take. Speaking just for himself, however, Finch said he likes the idea of retaining the Electoral College but having most of the electors chosen by individual congressional districts. This would result in the electoral votes of most states being split among leading candidates.

Finch said this proposal "has great appeal to me because it would tend to develop a viable two-party system in the South. There would be an enormous incentive to try to develop strong congressional candidates in those Southern states."

FOUR PLANS

The congressional district plan is only one of four basic proposals expected to go before Congress at the 1969 session for changing the method by which American presidents are selected.

The other three basic plans:

Retaining the Electoral College but simply apportioning each state's electoral votes on a percentage basis to reflect the popular vote in the state. The present winner-take-all system would be eliminated.

Retaining the Electoral College system and also its winner-take-all provision so that a state's entire slate of electors still would go to the winner of the popular vote, but eliminating the office of elector. An automatic state unit electoral vote system would be substituted for the individual electors.

Simply abolishing the Electoral College and deciding the presidential elections by a nationwide popular vote.

This last proposal has been given new support as the result of a special study by an

American Bar Association commission which strongly recommended that a popular vote decide presidential elections.

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 24, 1969]

INDIANA SENATOR SEES ONLY ONE WAY: JUNK ELECTORAL COLLEGE (By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, has been calling for reforms in the Electoral College system since he first was elected to the Senate in 1962.

But for a long time he opposed any plan to eliminate the college entirely and substitute in its place a direct popular vote for president.

Bayh changed his mind in 1967.

He called for going all the way and eliminating the Electoral College entirely in favor of a popular vote.

NEW ENGINE NEEDED

"Mere procedural changes in the present system would be like shifting around the parts of a creaky and dangerous automobile engine, making it no less creaky and no less dangerous," he warned.

"What we may need is a new engine, because we are in a new age."

What caused Bayh to shift his view in a report issued by a special American Bar Association commission which after a detailed study concluded:

"The Electoral College method of electing a president of the United States is archaic, undemocratic, complex, ambiguous, indirect and dangerous. . . .

"While there may be no perfect method of electing a president, we believe that direct nationwide popular method is the best of all possible methods."

The commission, headed by Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwestern Legal Foundation and dean emeritus of the Southern Methodist University Law School in Dallas, offered detailed recommendations on how presidential elections might be decided by popular vote.

It recommended that a party's presidential and vice presidential candidates continue to run as a team. The presidential candidate and his running mate who captured the most popular votes would win—provided they had at least 40 per cent of the popular vote.

If no ticket won 40 per cent of the popular vote, then a runoff election would be held between the two tickets with the highest number of votes.

DATE SETTING PROCEDURE

Congress would have the power to set the dates for regular and runoff elections, but individual state legislatures would have the power to provide for places and manner of the elections. Congress, however, would retain reserve powers to overrule the state legislatures.

Persons qualified under state law to vote for members of Congress would vote in presidential elections except that a state would be empowered to make even fewer restrictive requirements for presidential voters.

Congress also would be given a reserve power to provide for uniform age and residence requirements.

Among those on the 15-member commission were leading legal scholars and attorneys, including Paul Freund, a constitutional law professor at Harvard Law School; four former ABA presidents; two state governors, and Herman Phleger, a San Francisco attorney and former adviser to the U.S. State Department.

They returned an eight-count indictment against the Electoral College system, charging it:

"Allows a person to become president with fewer popular votes than his major opponent.

"Grants all of a state's electoral votes to the winner of the most popular votes in the

state, thereby cancelling all minority votes cast in the state.

"Makes it possible for presidential electors to vote against the national candidates of the party.

"Awards all of a state's electoral votes to the popular winner in the state, regardless of the turnout in the state.

"Assigns to each state at least three electoral votes regardless of its size.

"Falls to take into account population changes in a state between censuses.

"Employs an unrepresentative system of voting for president in the House of Representatives.

"Allows for the possibility of a president and vice president from differing political parties."

THE 12TH AMENDMENT CITED

The 12th amendment to the Constitution in 1804 was intended to eliminate this last possibility but the amendment did not shut the door completely on such a turn of events.

For example, if the 1968 presidential election had been thrown into the House of Representatives Republican Richard M. Nixon might well have been the ultimate choice. But the choice of the vice president would have been left to the United States Senate. Many observers think it likely that the Senators would have chosen one of their colleagues, U.S. Sen. Edmund Muskie, the Democratic vice presidential nominee, for vice president instead of Spiro T. Agnew, the Republican nominee.

The ABA report has been made at a possible turning point in history—when the defects in the present system for electing presidents are becoming increasingly apparent to the public.

[From the McClatchy newspapers, Jan. 25, 1969]

SENATOR SMITH PROPOSES END OF CONVENTIONS, ELECTORS (By Martin Smith)

U.S. Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, the independent Republican from Maine who now is the only woman serving in the upper house, proposes the most far-reaching changes in the system by which the United States elects its presidents and vice presidents.

Not only would she eliminate the Electoral College, replacing it with a direct popular vote, but also she would eliminate the conventional system of selecting nominees.

Her plan is simply to hold national direct primaries. They would be held in early August. If no one candidate in a party received a majority of the vote cast within his party's primary, a runoff primary would be held four weeks later.

FIVE PERCENT TO QUALIFY

For a party to qualify for the national ballot, it would have to have membership of more than 5 per cent of the total registered voters in the nation. A candidate would have his name placed on the primary ballot if he had nominating petitions signed by 1 per cent of the total vote in the preceding presidential general election. This would have amounted to about 700,000 signatures in 1968.

Mrs. Smith favors direct primaries in the selection of presidential nominees for the same reasons she favors direct elections in choosing presidents.

"What is good enough for electing presidents should be good enough for nominating party candidates for president," she has testified. "It is the only logical end of putting the power in the hands of the people—for they should be able to choose among all possible candidates and not just in the final round at the general election."

She has some support among her colleagues. U.S. Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., has asked:

"Is it not a far better thing to choose our presidential nominees in a national primary,

where the candidates and their ideas are on display and are contending openly, than it is to choose them in the narrow, emotional, cynical, rumor-filled, bandwagon-rolling, shouting, no-one-listening climate of a party convention?"

Some who argue in favor of direct election of presidents argue, however, against direct national primaries. Aaron B. Wildavsky, chairman of the political science department at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, is one.

MAKE VOTES COUNT

He warns that experience with state primaries shows that when one party remains in office a long time, which is not unusual, interested voters tend to join the dominant party to make their votes count more in the primary elections.

Those who remain in the out-of-power party are the diehards who nominate candidates who please them "but who could not win the election because they are unrepresentative of the majority," says Wildavsky.

"A national primary is also likely to lead to the appearance of extremist candidates and demagogues, who, unrestrained by allegiance to any permanent party organization, have little to lose by stirring up mass hatreds or making absurd promises."

UNFAVORABLE LOOK

Neal R. Pierce, author of "The People's President," a book calling for direct presidential elections, is another who looks with disfavor on proposals to abandon the convention system and institute direct primaries.

He agrees with the contention that conventions provide the opportunity for various factions within a party to reach compromises on platforms and nominees and to have party leaders keep in mind the necessity of appealing to a broad base of independent voters.

Pierce adds:

"Also, there are years when none of the candidates who have advanced themselves and run in the various state primaries have been able to build a really broad base of national support. Under such circumstances, the convention can 'draft' a candidate like (Republican) Charles Evans Hughes in 1916 . . . or (Democratic) Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson . . . in 1952"

[From the McClatchy newspapers,
Jan. 26, 1969]

POLITICAL PARTIES PRESS TO BRING ELECTORAL REFORMS

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—One of the first lessons a neophyte learns on Capitol Hill is that it takes support from a potent, well-organized constituency somewhere in the country to insure success for any legislative drive.

Medicare would have been impossible without the rising strength of the old folks' lobby. Farm subsidies will go on as long as King Cotton reigns in the south and the west. And the military-industrial complex can be relied on to keep defense spending at record levels.

So in any discussion about prospects of Electoral College reform, the crucial question becomes: Where is the equivalent special interest group to prod the 91st Congress to approve basic changes in the nation's method of electing its presidents?

The answer this year—and it is at the heart of the suddenly much brighter outlook for some kind of constitutional change—is simply that the Republican and Democratic parties have become the chief active lobbyists for reform.

Their motivation—despite a lot of rhetoric about an "aroused public"—springs largely from selfish considerations.

Republican and Democratic leaders are rushing action on a constitutional amendment because nothing less than the preservation of the two-party system is at stake.

They still bear the traumatic scars of the threat posed last fall by George Wallace. They know this specter easily can come back to haunt them in 1972 if the Constitution is not changed in the meantime.

If there is one thing worse than losing a presidential contest, it is ending up with a standoff and having to bargain with Wallace for the key to the White House.

There is no question that the present system is ideally suited for a third-party candidate intent on bringing the two major parties to heel.

Wallace knew he could not win. But he was counting on an inconclusive result in the Electoral College which would have permitted him to use his electors to make a deal with one or the other of the leading contenders.

CAME CLOSE

He came close. Had California gone to Hubert Humphrey, for example, Richard Nixon would have failed to get the required absolute majority of 270 electoral votes.

Wallace then could have instructed his electors to supply that necessary majority in return for assurances on U.S. Supreme Court appointments, a veto over certain cabinet selections, a pledge to go easy on desegregation or any other number of concessions.

So it is not surprising that after such a close call, Democrats and Republicans are falling all over themselves in Congress to throw all kinds of Electoral College reform measures into the hopper.

House Speaker John W. McCormack has called for prompt action. Minority Leader Gerald Ford similarly terms the problem urgent and wants committees on both sides of Capitol Hill to get on with the job.

REFORM VIRTUALLY ASSURED

In the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, who is rarely given to haste, thinks the nation already has waited too long. And Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, a master at sniffing political winds, predicts Electoral College reform is virtually assured this year.

If further evidence of unprecedented congressional interest is needed, one has only to look at the quick start of committee hearings.

The Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, headed by Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., has started taking testimony. In the House, Chairman Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., of the Judiciary Committee has scheduled extensive hearings.

All this activity, however, tends to mask major problems which lie ahead.

If—as now appears quite likely—Congress acts to protect the two-party system against "poachers" in presidential contests, there are several ways of accomplishing this without necessarily switching to direct, popular elections.

Or put another way, the survival of the two-party system is not contingent on "one man, one vote."

To remove the Wallace threat in 1972, it would be sufficient to adopt a constitutional amendment which would eliminate presidential electors—but not the Electoral College system of counting votes. If no candidate obtained a respectable plurality, say 40 per cent of the electoral total, a runoff election could be provided to keep the contest from being thrown into the House of Representatives.

BOGGS PROPOSAL

House Majority Whip Hale Boggs of Louisiana has introduced just such a proposal. It will bear close watching because it has attracted considerable interest and support. It could well be the forerunner of a compromise solution.

As far as the reformers are concerned, the Boggs plan has the advantage of eliminating the problem of "faithless electors" who change their mind after election day in total disregard of popular will.

It also would bar any further serious bid by Wallace since electors no longer would be

around to be traded for political concessions. A Republican or a Democrat would have to win—either by capturing at least 40 per cent of the electoral vote or by winning in a runoff.

By retaining the electoral vote count, however, the Boggs plan would perpetuate problems and inequities created by the present system of adding state-by-state totals.

First, each state still would have as many electoral votes as it has representatives and senators in Congress. And all electoral votes of a state would continue to go to the winner in that state.

This would mean a candidate—though ahead in popular votes nationwide—still might lose if his opponent led in electoral votes.

Bayh, who favors an all-out switch to direct popular elections, believes such a situation would be intolerable.

"Grave dangers could divide this nation at a critical hour if the president-elect lacked a popular mandate," he remarked. "In these perilous times, we simply cannot afford the luxury of an electoral system that fails to guarantee the election of the popular choice."

Bayh has 40 Senate cosponsors for his direct-election proposal. But it takes a two-thirds vote in both houses and ratification by the legislatures of three fourths of the states to accomplish any change.

SOUTHERN OPPOSITION

Under these rules, opposition by southern and small states to all-out reform could become a formidable factor.

Southerners want some semblance of the Electoral College retained to preserve the notions of "federalism" and "states' rights" as key elements in the political fabric of the nation.

Small states also have grown attached to the extra influence they derive from the two-vote bonus under the present system.

For example, Nevada has only one representative. But it gets three electoral votes in recognition of its two senators. The two extra votes have the net effect of tripling the state's impact in the Electoral College. For Nevada, they represent a 200 per cent increase above its entitlement on a strict population basis.

In California's case, the extra two votes represent a comparatively insignificant addition—from 38 to 40 electoral votes, or an increase of only about 5 per cent above its entitlement under a fair population apportionment.

Since it takes only 13 states—and they all can be small ones—to block a constitutional amendment, it is quite apparent that the drive to abolish the Electoral College and substitute direct elections remains an uphill fight.

Celler, who has served in the House longer than any other present member, significantly is pushing both types of reform.

"The direct-vote approach is theoretically the most sound," he said in an interview. "But that which is wisest is not always most acceptable."

"I think we will have to adopt something short of a direct vote."

Celler predicts small states would "rebel" if Congress attempted to gain ratification of an amendment to wipe out the Electoral College altogether.

"I can understand their point," he said. "After all, we are a federal union, a union of states."

MORE OPTIMISTIC

Bayh is more optimistic. He still thinks the direct-election plan has a chance.

Small states, he argues, labor under a "misconception" when they worry about losing their two-vote bonus in the Electoral College.

What they overlook, he points out, is that the big states also would give up an important advantage—their present make-or-break role in deciding presidential contests.

Because all electoral votes of a state now go to the winner in that state, he notes, presidential candidates increasingly are basing their strategy on capturing the big states—California, New York, Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas.

Under a direct-election system, Bayh believes candidates would look for votes where they have the best chance of getting them—in big as well as small states—since every person's vote would count in the final total.

Thus, he reasons, what the small states would lose by giving up their two-vote bonus in the Electoral College would be offset by reducing the big punch a handful of voters now can wield in swinging one or more big states behind a particular candidate.

The argument apparently is working with some small-state representatives. Among the co-sponsors of Bayh's measure for direct elections are Sens. Alan Bible, D-Nev., Mike Gravel, D-Alaska and Daniel Inouye, D-Hawaii.

The American Bar Association and several other prestigious groups throughout the country also are supporting it.

Still, there is wide agreement that the concept of "one man, one vote" as a controlling yardstick for presidential elections so far has not developed anything resembling the devoted and dedicated constituency feverishly working on the bipartisan—but less sweeping—objective of keeping third-party intruders away from the approaches to the White House.

[From the McClatchy newspapers,
Jan. 27, 1969]

**ELECTORAL COLLEGE DRAWS GOVERNORS'
DISSATISFACTION**
(By Martin Smith)

The Electoral College has existed for more than 180 years, although Americans have been dissatisfied with it for much of that time.

Few persons think it will be easy to replace it with a direct popular vote in the selection of presidents and vice presidents. But public unhappiness with the antiquated Electoral College is greater than ever, and many political leaders agree now is the time to eliminate it.

In 1948 and again in 1960 national polls indicated the public, by a 2-1 margin, wanted the Electoral College eliminated. The percentage of those opposed to it has climbed dramatically. Last November a Harris Survey showed that an overwhelming 79 per cent of those polled favored direct election of presidents and vice presidents. Only 11 per cent opposed elimination of the Electoral College.

Dissatisfaction with the system is widespread and increasing, but there is dissent, too.

While some Southern white conservatives are reluctant to eliminate the Electoral College completely, preferring instead to tinker with and retain the present system, an important minority group also shows a cautious, if different, attitude on the issue.

Clarence Mitchell, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has told a U.S. Senate subcommittee his organization flatly opposes any move to divide a state's electors according to popular vote percentages within that state. This is one of the reform-but-retain proposals being heard in the debate over the Electoral College.

MINORITY FACTORS

Minority groups see an advantage for themselves in the winner-take-all system by which a candidate captures a state's entire slate of electors by winning that state's popular vote, no matter by how small a margin. Nominees now regard major groups of minority voters as possibly the deciding factors in swinging some states. Minorities justify this possible advantage as necessary to offset the bloc of Southern white segregationist states.

Mitchell, however, also has told U.S. Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Indiana, the American Bar Association proposal to eliminate the Electoral College completely in favor of a direct popular vote is an excellent one.

But Mitchell added the NAACP would support the recommendations for a direct popular vote "only if there are absolute and foolproof safeguards against discrimination in registering and voting."

If there can be guarantees that minority groups will not be prevented from participating in a direct popular vote for president, the NAACP will support the ABA recommendations. But if the present system is to be retained, the proposal to divide a state's electors will only make existing inequities even worse, in the NAACP view.

REWRITING IS SLOW

Rewriting the Constitution is a slow-moving process. The usual way is for an amendment to be approved by a two-thirds vote of each house of Congress, and then be ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the 50 states.

The McClatchy newspapers sent inquiries to governors of all 50 states, seeking their views on the present system of electing presidents and vice presidents. Not all replied. Some of those who did said they had not reached a decision yet on proposed changes. Some thought the Electoral College might be retained if basically overhauled.

But not one of the governors said he likes the system the way it is. There were significant voices from both major parties calling for its outright abolition in favor of direct popular votes.

One of the most outspoken was Pennsylvania Republican Gov. Raymond P. Shafer. He noted that one of his state's delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention, James Wilson, thought even then that American presidents should be chosen by direct election.

"It is time that we add our strength to the lone voice of that great Pennsylvania," said Shafer. "I will recommend that our General Assembly, when it next convenes, lead the nation in a call to Congress for a constitutional amendment to abolish the Electoral College."

REPLIES FROM OTHERS

Other governors who replied or otherwise expressed themselves in favor of outright abolition of the Electoral College included Democrats Warren E. Hearnes of Missouri and William L. Guy of North Dakota and Republicans Richard B. Ogilvie of Illinois, John A. Love of Colorado, Russell W. Peterson of Delaware and Tom McCall of Oregon.

One who replied when he still was a governor of Maryland but since has assumed another office is Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

"There is no question in my mind that basic reform of this outdated process is necessary," said Agnew. "Maryland is one of the few states with a statute binding electors to cast their votes for the winner of the state's presidential election but even the constitutionality of this law is dubious."

UNRUH TAKES STAND

The strongest voice in California in favor of eliminating the Electoral College is Assemblyman Jess Unruh. He is asking the state legislature to urge Congress to begin the process by which the Constitution can be amended to provide for a direct popular vote for president and vice president.

"Today it is clear, as it has been for more than a century, that the Electoral College envisioned by the framers (of the Constitution) bears no relation to their intent, if indeed it ever did," Unruh has commented.

ELECTORATE IS COMPETENT

"... No modern politician who values his profession dares to argue that the American

electorate is incompetent to elect the president of the United States. If this is so, all rational argument against popular presidential elections disappears. The Electoral College is a useless and occasionally dangerous appendage to our body politic. It must be removed."

No matter how low the Electoral College ranks in the public esteem, the surgery proposed by Unruh and other prominent Democratic and Republican leaders will not be easy to accomplish.

Nearly everyone agrees that some surgery is necessary. So far, there is insufficient agreement as to its extent, and this could renew the Electoral College's lease on life.

DISASTER COULD OCCUR

Then, the disaster that most observes fear may occur: The Electoral College once again could award the presidency to a man who was the only runner-up in the popular vote.

The Counterfeit Ballot could result in the selection of a Brand X president.

**BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY**

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the 51st anniversary of declaration of Byelorussian national sovereignty.

During the 20th century, the Byelorussians have endured much. They have suffered the oppression of the Russians and the injustices of German occupation during World War I. And yet, in the face of these awesome adversities, the Byelorussian people have steadfastly clung to the hope that once again they might enjoy the freedom they briefly tasted.

The making of the Byelorussian State, culminating in the declaration of independence on March 25, 1918, was the consequence of a national reawakening that occurred during the 19th and early 20th centuries. It began as a cultural revival and gradually was transformed into a political movement.

This cultural revival found its origin in a growing interest in ethnology and the Byelorussian language. It was from this that a unique conception of Byelorussian nationality developed. The formation of a Byelorussian national political party spurred on the development of national political objectives.

With the outbreak of World War I, the Byelorussians took advantage of Russia's weakened condition by declaring their independence.

The German Army continued its march eastward and Byelorussia succumbed to the German occupation. While the Germans imposed certain restrictions on them, the Byelorussians were allowed to continue their political and cultural development.

Sensing that the Byelorussian national identity posed a threat to the new regime in Russia, the Bolsheviks determined to crush this new state. The Byelorussian national state fell as one of the first victims of brutal Communist aggression.

It is with a sense of great respect and

admiration that I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to a courageous people who struggled long and hard to protect their national identity and culture. Let these freedom fighters and their descendants be an inspiration to all mankind. On the observance of Byelorussian Independence Day, let us seek to restore the faith and hope of a brave people that one day they will again be free.

VA GUARANTEED HOME-LOAN FINANCING—INCREASING INCOME OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE FUND

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home-loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund.

We have extended the home-loan program to veterans with service after January 31, 1955, and this has created eligibility for about 6 million veterans. In addition, there are substantial numbers of veterans from the Korean conflict still eligible for home loans.

Last year the Veterans' Administration concurred with action of the Secretary of the Housing and Urban Development Department in raising interest rates on Veterans' Administration guaranteed and direct loans to 7½ percent. At the time this action was taken, I had hoped that increased funds for veterans' home loans would become available, and that the excessive discounts being charged by lenders would disappear. The situation did improve briefly, but since the first of the year it has become progressively worse and now with the most recent action of the administration to raise the prime lending rate, discounts have risen sharply again and mortgage financing is not readily available even at the high interest rate of 7½ percent.

It is apparent that, if the home-loan benefit is to be of any value to veterans, additional sources of mortgage financing must be found. During the past few years, while veterans have been in service, building costs, including interest charges, have risen sharply. During the 2 or 3 years that a veteran may have served, housing costs have advanced as much as 25 percent. The young veterans returning from service cannot compete with wealthy corporations which enjoy a special investment tax credit, and as a result mortgage financing is not available; and if obtained, requires an unconscionable discount.

The national service life insurance trust fund is in excess of \$8 billion. In my bill, I propose that \$5 billion be made available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the purchase of guaranteed and direct loans made to veterans. Under this plan, the lender-mortgagee will continue to originate loans, but may sell these loans to the Veterans' Admin-

istration. One percent is charged by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to defray administrative costs. All principal and interest over and above this charge, or 6½ percent, will be returned to the national service life insurance trust fund. At present the fund is invested in the public debt and is yielding less than 4 percent return. Under this plan, funds will be made available for veterans' loans and the return to the national service life insurance trust fund will be increased.

The veterans' home-loan program has been one of the Nation's most successful housing programs for the past 20 years. More than \$72 billion has been loaned to approximately 7 million veterans. Loss rates have been lower than in conventional lending programs. This plan of using the national service life insurance trust fund is preferable to direct loans, but if this plan does not provide equity of opportunity for the returning war veterans, we will be fully justified in resorting to direct loans to insure that the veteran will have a fair opportunity to compete for mortgage financing.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9476

A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1828. Investment of funds of the national service life insurance fund in first mortgage loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter

"(a) When issuing a commitment to guarantee a proposed home mortgage loan under section 1810 of this chapter, the Administrator is authorized and is hereby directed to issue, if such is requested by the lender-mortgagee, a nonassignable commitment to purchase the completed loan from such lender-mortgagee. For each such commitment the lender-mortgagee shall pay a non-refundable fee of not in excess of one-half percent of the amount of the commitment. Such commitment shall provide for the purchase of the loan from the lender-mortgagee for the price specified in the commitment (which price shall be specified as a percentage of par) if the lender-mortgagee certifies to the Administrator, not earlier than sixty days subsequent to the disbursement of the loan proceeds but not later than twelve months from the date of the Administrator's issuance of the loan guaranty evidence, that:

"(1) It has not been successful in effecting a sale of the loan to a private investor at a price equal to or in excess of that specified in the Administrator's commitment;

"(2) It has not charged or collected from and will not charge or collect from the seller or builder of the property, or from any third person or entity, directly or indirectly, any discount (points) in excess of the difference between the face amount of the loan and the price specified in the Administrator's purchase commitment plus the origination fee charged by the lender-mortgagee and the commitment fee specified in this subsection (a); and

"(3) The loan is not in default.

"The purchase price specified in any purchase commitment issued under this subsection shall not be less than the average price for which 180 day purchase commitments were auctioned by the Federal National Mortgage Association at the last Association auction preceding the issuance of the Ad-

ministrator's purchase commitment, but in no instance shall the Administrator agree to pay more than par (unpaid principal balance plus accrued interest) nor less than 96 percent of par for any loan purchased under this subsection. Insofar as practicable the Administrator shall utilize the purchase authorization in this subsection in those localities where the discount levels are determined by him to be substantially in excess of the discounts entailed in the Federal National Mortgage Association average auction prices for its 180 day purchase commitments.

"(b) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the National Service Life Insurance Investment Fund (hereinafter called the Investment Fund). The Investment Fund shall be available to the Administrator for all operations under this section, including the payment of expenses and losses, except administrative expenses. From time to time, the Administrator shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount of funds necessary to purchase loans as the consequence of commitments issued or to be issued, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and to purchase direct loans, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and the Secretary shall, as authorized by section 720(c) of this title, transfer such funds from the Insurance Fund to the Investment Fund, except that the aggregate of transfers pursuant to this subsection shall not, in the period between the enactment of this section and June 30, 1974, exceed \$5,000,000,000.

"(c) The Administrator shall utilize the funds transferred to the Investment Fund as provided in subsection (b) of this section to purchase loans pursuant to commitments issued as provided by subsection (a) of this section. In addition, the Administrator may utilize available funds of such Investment Fund to purchase (at par plus accrued interest) direct loan assets of the Direct Loan Revolving Fund and the entire proceeds of any such sale of direct loan assets shall be deposited in the Direct Loan Revolving Fund and be available thereafter for the purposes of that Fund. The Insurance Fund shall be paid interest on all funds transferred to the Investment Fund at the same rate as the average interest rate on loans purchased by the Administrator less one percent but in no event less than the average return on the other invested portion of the National Service Life Insurance Fund. All monies received by the Administrator in the repayment of such loans shall be deposited in the Investment Fund and shall also be available, until June 30, 1975, for the purchase of loans pursuant to commitments issued as provided in subsection (a) of this section, and for the purchase of direct loans as provided for in the second sentence of this subsection, except that if the Administrator at any time determines that the balance in the Investment Fund is in excess of anticipated needs for the purchase of loans, he may so notify the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then transfer such excess to the Insurance Fund. All collections of interest on loans purchased and all non-refundable commitment fees received pursuant to the authority in subsection (a) of this section shall be deposited in the Investment Fund by the Administrator, who shall, after determining the amount to be retained in the Investment Fund as a reserve for expenses and losses, periodically notify the Secretary as to the amount of such interest collections available for transfer to the Insurance Fund and the Secretary thereupon shall effect such transfers. Such transfers shall constitute the payment of interest to the Insurance Fund. After June 30, 1974, all monies received in the repayment of loans purchased pursuant to [subsection (a) of] this section and all interest collections on such loans, except for such sums which the Administrator determines to be necessary for retention in the

Investment Fund as a reserve for losses, shall be deposited in the Insurance Fund. Interest collections so deposited shall constitute the payment of interest to the Insurance Fund.

"(d) In the event of a deficiency in the Investment Fund reserves for expenses and losses, the Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Investment Fund from available funds of the Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund or the Direct Loan Revolving Fund such sum or sums as may be necessary to defray such deficiency. For the purposes of this subsection the Administrator shall accord priority to the utilization of available funds of the Direct Loan Revolving Fund to the elimination of such deficiency notwithstanding the obligations of that Fund in respect to advances theretofore made by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 1823 of this chapter.

"(e) The Administrator may sell, and shall offer for sale, any loan purchased under the authority of this section at a price determined by the Administrator, but not less than the price paid by the Administrator to purchase the loan (i.e., the percentage of the unpaid balance of the loan), plus accrued interest. The Administrator may, in respect to loans [originated under section 1810 and subsequently purchased by him, guarantee any loan] thus sold, guarantee any such loans subject to the same conditions, terms and limitations as would be applicable were the loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter.

"(f) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section, the Administrator, when authorized by appropriation acts so to do, may set aside first mortgage loan assets of the Investment Fund as the basis for the sale of participation certificates pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of the Participation Sales Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-429), and until June 30, 1974, the proceeds of any sale of such participation certificates shall be deposited in the Investment Fund and be available for the purposes of that Fund. After June 30, 1974, the proceeds of any sales of such participation certificates shall be deposited in the Insurance Fund.

"(g) In the administration and management of the Investment Fund the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, invest the funds thereof in loans which will represent a broad spectrum of the veteran home-buying population in respect to age, income, and location of the properties which will constitute the loan securities. In order to facilitate a more adequate supply of mortgage financing for veterans in the lower and middle income brackets the Administrator shall purchase only loans not in excess of \$30,000 which are secured by single family dwellings only. The Administrator is authorized to adopt such standards, policies, and procedures and to promulgate such regulations as he considers necessary or appropriate for carrying out his functions and responsibilities under this section. In carrying out such functions and responsibilities the Administrator may contract with private entities for the servicing of any loans purchased by him for the Investment Fund provided that the servicing fee payable pursuant to any such contract shall not exceed the Administrator's estimate of the cost of the direct servicing of such loans by agency employees."

(b) The analysis of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1828. Investment of funds of the National Service Life Insurance Fund in first mortgage loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 1811(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) he is unable to obtain from a private lender in such housing credit shortage area,

at a discount charge for the purchase of existing housing to the home sellers or builders not in excess of the discount involved in the latest average auction price of the Federal National Mortgage Association's 90-day purchase commitments, and for the purchase of a newly constructed or to be constructed home, at a discount charge to the home sellers or builders not in excess of the discount involved in the latest average auction price of the Federal National Mortgage Association's purchase commitments for the period of twelve to eighteen months."

SEC. 3. Section 720 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer from such fund to the Investment Fund established under section 1828 of this title such amounts as the Administrator may from time to time request pursuant to such section, and shall transfer from the Investment Fund to the National Service Life Insurance Fund, upon notification by the Administrator, such amounts as the Administrator determines are available for such transfer pursuant to the provisions of such section."

THE TROUBLED MIDDLE EAST

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a very lucid and compelling article on the troubled Middle East. The article appeared in the *Lawndale Press* in Hawthorne, Calif., on February 27, 1969, and was written by Myron Roberts. Mr. Roberts is a professor of literature, an assistant editor of *Los Angeles* magazine, and the author of the column, "Observations," in the *Lawndale Press*.

The article follows:

OBSERVATIONS

(By Myron Roberts)

Coming as it does on the heels of our unhappy involvement in Viet Nam, the continuing crisis between the Arabs and Israel is being greeted by the great majority of Americans with studied indifference and by the American government with supercaution. America does not want and cannot afford involvement in another war at a time when domestic problems threaten the very fabric of our society. And yet it should be pointed out that significant differences exist between Israel and South Viet Nam and these differences must be kept in mind in determining this country's course.

First of all no one is asking us to send hundreds of thousands of troops to Israel to fight a war which the Israelis are unwilling or unable to fight themselves. On the contrary Israel has demonstrated its ability to defend itself; what they do seek from the United States is that we use our influence and if necessary our power to prevent Russia from attacking Israel on behalf of its Arab allies. And that we agree to sell to Israel, and I repeat sell, not give, to Israel the weapons she needs to match the weapons which Russia is providing free to the Arabs.

In short Israel is asking nothing that the U.S. would not do, as a matter of course, for any friendly government, from Mexico to Tito's Yugoslavia, which finds itself threatened. The strategy of the Arabs at this point seems clear, they hope through a series of guerrilla acts of terrorism to provoke a crisis

which will seem to lead the world to the brink of a confrontation between America and Russia with all that this implies.

The Arabs apparently believe that in such a showdown the U.S. would in effect wash its hands of the affair, leaving the Israelis no choice but to submit.

But what is it that the Arabs demand of Israel? Only that this tiny nation commit suicide, since the Arabs have never budged an inch from their belief that Israel has no right to exist. In other words the Arab position is, Israel, kill yourself decently or we will do it for you—with the help of our gallant Russian and French friends. What is it that Israel asks of the Arabs? Only that she be accorded the right to exist that her ships and planes be permitted to travel through the sea and across the sky in the normal manner. That her ports remain free from blockade and her industries free of embargo. That she be permitted to buy and sell in the marketplaces of the world. The Arabs doubtless have their grievances, all of which are subject to negotiation and compromise agreement. But what is not negotiable is an insistence by one party that the other party cease to exist. That is genocide.

I have no doubt that Israel will find a suitable answer to the current wave of terrorist attacks. And when Israel hits back, I dare say she will do so, not by trying to murder innocent people, as the Arabs have done, but by damaging Arab property. Arab excesses whether they take the form of public hangings or shooting up aircraft in neutral countries may provoke worldwide consternation, but they will not be greeted with the cries of outrage and horror that would follow if the shoe were on the other foot. This is the familiar double standard by which all rational and democratic states are judged as compared to their totalitarian neighbors. For the North Koreans, for example, to have acted the part of barbarians and savages with respect to captured men of the U.S.S. Pueblo provokes no worldwide indignation. But if the U.S. had treated North Korean prisoners in a similar manner, the anti-U.S. demonstrations would have been instantaneous and global.

I have been one of those who have fervently believed in the cause and the ideals of the United Nations. But it must be admitted that with respect to the Arab-Israel conflict, the U.N. has never seemed more blind, more inept and more biased against the principles of its own charter. Remember the last war between Israel and the Arabs states was precipitated by the decision of U Thant to withdraw U.N. troops which were supposedly preventing Nasser's magnificent Arab legions from sweeping Israel into the sea. More recently the U.N. muttered a polite, "naughty, naughty" when Arab commandoes tried to kill passengers aboard an Israel airliner. But when Israel responded by destroying Lebanese property taking pains to see that no one was killed or even injured, the U.N. went into a fit of righteous indignation. The blatant unfairness of this has not been lost on the world.

In the long run, of course, Israel cannot survive indefinitely as an island of 20th century enlightenment in a sea of Arab darkness. Somehow the Arab peoples must be helped to a better life so that they will be less willing to feed their empty stomachs with anti-Israel propaganda. The real irony of Israel and its miracle of the desert should be the hope and inspiration of the Arab world. For what Israel has managed to do the Arabs can do—provided only that they give up dreams of military glory and concentrate on building a decent life for themselves and their children. That is the real interest of the Arab peoples and to persuade the rulers of the Arab world of this fact should be the object of both U.N. and U.S. policy. It is also the interest of the Russian people and the American, none of which have anything to gain by continuing the power

struggle in the Middle East. Until the Russians and the French and the United Nations come to recognize this fact, the U.S. must persevere in its policy of insisting that Israel shall not be sacrificed on the altar of expediency.

FHA EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM
NEEDS IMMEDIATE FUNDING

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most distressing situation facing many of the farmers of my district. After three almost disastrous crop years, many of the farmers in my district now face virtually a "do-or-die" situation. But without even having an opportunity to take their chances on the natural elements this year, the futures of many of these farmers are about to be foreclosed because of a lack of emergency loan funds by the Department of Agriculture.

According to the latest information I have available to me, there are almost 500 farmers in my district alone who have made application for FHA emergency loan funds and who have been approved, but who have been turned down now because of a lack of funds. Let me emphasize that the rules have not been bent concerning these people. They applied for funds, they were fully qualified to receive the loans, and they were led to believe that the loans would be forthcoming.

On the basis that the loans would be forthcoming, most of these farmers have already begun preparing their land for the 1969 crops, they have begun to buy seed and other necessities—on credit, of course—and they have even carried a number of employees on their personal word that pay would be forthcoming to them. For these farmers, their total lives and investment are dependent on receiving the FHA emergency loan funds.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these people are not asking for a gift or a grant. They are merely asking for loans that will be repaid to the Government. And I would contend that this is a fiscally sound investment to protect the livelihoods of these farmers. Most of them have devoted their entire lives to farming. They lack the training or the skills to move easily into other vocational fields. Therefore, if they lose their farms, their equipment and their homes through our inability to provide the necessary and needed FHA loans, these farmers face unemployment, underemployment or the prospect of becoming another anonymous face in our already overcrowded urban ghettos.

This is an emergency situation that deserves emergency action. I have already sent telegrams to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget urging them to find the necessary funds to fulfill these commitments to our farmers. In the case of my district, this amounts to about \$2 million.

At this point, I include the texts of telegrams that I have sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO THE HONORABLE CLIFFORD HARDIN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

HON. CLIFFORD HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to bring to your attention as forcefully as possible a situation in Eastern Arkansas, as well as my whole state, that borders on disaster for many of our citizens. According to the best estimates that I have been able to assemble, almost 500 farmers in my district, and more than 650 in Arkansas as a whole, are now being turned down for FHA Loans because of lack of funds. Just yesterday, another of our farmers said he would lose his land and his equipment if he cannot get FHA help. He had been informed that his application was being denied for lack of funds. "I know the Farmers are almost forgotten objects," he told me. "This would be a small thing in comparison to other things we are spending on."

As you know, the applications that are now being turned down do not involve persons who are not qualified for the loans. The Loan Applications have already been carefully screened. The people affected are farmers who have had applications in for several weeks and who have already begun preparing their 1969 crops, acting under the assumption that the loan would be forthcoming. Since we have allowed them to go into March beginning the preparation of their crops and getting further in debt, I sincerely and strongly believe that we have an obligation to help these people. These farmers are not asking for a gift. They just want a loan that will be repaid to the Federal Government. They need your help in order that they can help themselves.

Let me point out that the problem has far-reaching circumstances, closely tied to the critical problems we are facing in our cities. These farmers now facing extinction have devoted their whole lives to the farms. All of their investment is tied up in their farms, and they lack adequate training in any other areas. In other words, they face either unproductive and underemployed work, they face addition to the too-crowded welfare rolls, or they face becoming another anonymous face in our urban ghettos. None of these alternatives is nearly as efficient or effective as the relatively low cost of keeping them on the farms.

It is imperative that we get additional funds to cover the FHA Emergency Loan Applications that have been received and are qualified. It was with this in mind that I voted Wednesday to increase the national debt ceiling, in order that we could possibly find the necessary funds somewhere to help these farmers who face ruin.

According to the unofficial statistics I have been able to accumulate, there are 488 applicants in my district with requests totaling \$2,047,048 who have been denied funds. This is one-third of those in my district who applied for the FHA emergency loans. In Arkansas as a whole, there are 657 applicants who requested \$2,786,861, who were turned down for a lack of funds.

I would like to request an appointment to meet with you at the earliest possible date to discuss this emergency. I stand willing to help in any way possible in getting the necessary money to fund these most deserving applications. I look forward to hearing from you.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

BILL ALEXANDER,
Congressman from Arkansas, First District.

COPY OF TELEGRAM SENT TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT P. MAYO, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

HON. ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYO: I would like to urge as strongly as possible that the Bureau of the Budget approve an additional two million dollars for Farmers Home Administration emergency loans. These funds are needed without delay. According to the latest information I have available, this would take care of about 500 farmers in my district who made application for FHA emergency loans and who were approved, but who have now been turned down for lack of funds. These farmers, who have just been through three tremendously bad crop years, had been led to believe that since their loans were approved, the funds would be forthcoming. Consequently, they have already invested in their 1969 crops, beginning to prepare the lands and purchasing seed and other necessary items—on credit, of course. Most of these farmers in my district stand to lose their land, their equipment, their homes—in short, their total investment—if FHA funds are not approved to cover their loan requests. The alternative for most of these farmers is unemployment, underemployment, or addition to the growing problems in our urban ghettos.

I realize that our financial condition is not good, but I would like to point out a few pertinent points. First, the FHA funds are a loan, not a gift. These funds will be repaid, so there is very little investment made by the Federal Government. Second, the investment we might have to make in these farmers could turn out to be much greater if FHA funds are not forthcoming and these people become part of our massive urban problems. Third, I voted to increase the debt ceiling just so we could have access to funds to meet pressing and necessary needs such as this.

Again, let me urge in the strongest possible terms that the Bureau of the Budget approve the funds requested by the Department of Agriculture to fund the FHA loan programs.

BILL ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress.

SAVE THE DUNES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Times of March 16, 1969, brought to mind again the heroic fight waged by my neighbor and constituent, former Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, to preserve for all Americans one of nature's greatest wonders—the Indiana Dunes.

The editorial also reminds us, however, that although that battle was won, the war is not yet over. Those who wish to protect our Nation's natural wonders from gross commercial exploitation or from total destruction must maintain their vigilance. Luckily for those of us who wish to see the dunes preserved in their natural state, there exists a hardy group of conservationists known as the Save the Dunes Council. I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to com-

mend that group and to encourage it to continue its valiant work to save the dunes.

The New York Times editorial reminds us, finally, that there are some intriguing questions about the status of the Indiana Dunes which at this point remain unanswered. In the first place, what is the nature and what are the terms of the agreement to be reached between the National Park Service and the Chicago, South Shore & South Bend Railroad? I have made attempts to get an answer to this question, and so far have had limited success. Second, why were no additional funds for land acquisition during fiscal 1970 requested by the Park Service? Those of us who wish to see the dunes park project move forward as quickly as possible have been sadly disappointed by the Service's refusal to ask Congress for funds, which have already been authorized, to acquire additional land in the dunes area.

This situation has brought to mind, Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite comments by that fount of political wisdom, Mr. Dooley:

Th' crusade is over an' vice is rampant again. . . . Th' good man, th' crusader, on'y wurruks at th' crusade wanst in five years, an' on'y whin he has time to spare fr'm his other jooties. 'Tis a pastime fr' him. But th' defenise iv vice is a business with th' other la-ad an' he nalls away at it, week days an' Sundays, holy days an' fish days, mornin', noon an' night.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the crusade for the dunes is not yet over; and let us remember that it is a full-time job.

The editorial referred to is attached:
[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1969]
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 beachgrasses 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's 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 MEN WHO MET THE OIL SLICK CHALLENGE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the March 1969, issue of Drilling magazine carried an editorial which contains a message I think should have wide distribution. The editorial follows:

THE WART ON OUR NOSE

There have been accusations and recriminations in the wake of the Santa Barbara blowout. Probably, there will be more during the weeks and months ahead. But few will come, we devoutly hope and believe, from within the petroleum industry. For who in the business can say with assurance, "It could never have happened to me"?

It happened off Santa Barbara as the whole world watched. The world saw the boiling waters in the shadow of Platform A, the inexorable spread of the oil slick, the contamination of white boat hulls, slime on the beaches and the agony of the birds.

Did it also see, we wonder, the magnificence of men in the face of disaster? Could it see the taut faces of those hundreds of men in the vicinity of Platform A, on the clean-up crews, at the bird care center? Could it identify the executives, the scientists, the field men and the clerks? Did it know that those fleeting figures on the TV screens were flesh and blood people—not corporations, not job classifications, but people pitting all they had against the awesome power of a blowout?

We doubt that the world at large has any conception of what it took in money, courage, intelligence and human endurance to contain the Santa Barbara blowout. From personal experience or close association, most of us in the industry have a pretty good idea of what it took. And we're proud of the people who, seeing what had to be done, simply did it.

Because they did it, the gray whale swims today through the Santa Barbara channel and seals cavort about Platform A as a thou-

sand men complete the clean-up of the beaches and oil company marine biologists monitor the health of the creatures of the sea.

A solid 3500-foot column of cement now seals forever the well that goes into the record books as a wart on the industry's nose. It's a wart, that is, to the world at large. To those of us in the industry, it is also an unseen monument to the magnificence of our people.

Wells are planned and drilled by ordinary men who put on their pants one leg at a time and sometimes fail to zip the fly. They aren't automatons, they aren't perfect, they're people. Because they're people, they sometimes do things which—could they have a second chance—they'd do differently. When they make a mistake, they do all in their power to put it right.

We can't say, of personal knowledge, why there was a blowout in the Santa Barbara channel. We know only that there was a blowout and that some very fine men gave everything they had to minimize the havoc and bring the well under control.

We can't ask the world to forget the blowout, discount the damage, or hold the industry blameless. We ask only that the world also remember the little gray blobs that flickered briefly on its TV screens—the unknown and unsung men who faced a blowout and did their damndest to put it right. They're a credit to the human race.

NIXON ABM POLICY SOUND, REASONABLE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress debates the pros and cons of the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., of March 16, 1969, and fluently expresses the reaction of that publication to the President's recommendations for the modification of the ABM system:

NIXON ABM POLICY SOUND, REASONABLE

President Nixon's decision to go ahead with a modified anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system is a sound and reasonable approach to a complex and emotional issue in which this nation's security is at stake.

The President's decision to deploy a limited ABM system designed to protect American mainland military bases serves notice on both the Chinese Communists and Russia that this nation will remain fully prepared for retaliatory action in event of any attack on the United States.

American leaders absolutely cannot permit a lapse into the pre-World War II isolation blindness which left this nation totally unprepared to defend itself while Nazi Germany and Japan forged giant war machines and ridiculed our unwillingness to face up to that threat.

It would be joyous and comforting if we could be assured that Russia and China, both nuclear bomb powers, have only peaceful intentions toward the United States. There is virtually nothing at this point, however, to show that either nation is cutting back missile striking forces.

Nor has either Communist power shown any interest in reasonable bargaining on arms controls. The recent history of both nations demonstrates adequately that they rely on the steel fist as their major bargaining weapon.

History books record clearly that every country that has attempted to bargain with either of the Communist powers from a position of military weakness, has met with disaster.

We believe President Nixon has taken a logical course on the ABM issue which should neither set off a new round in an arms race nor discourage hopes for future negotiations on arms controls.

At the same time, the President has cut back on the more costly program proposed by former President Lyndon Johnson and eased some urban fears by moving the missile sites away from major cities.

In particular, President Nixon has served notice to the leaders of the Soviet Union that the ABM system will be a defensive one but that the American ability to fight back will not be weakened.

He has also indicated that the ABM system will be subject to review each year, depending upon what the Russians have done with their programs in the meantime. The President repeated that he is willing to talk with Kremlin leaders about arms controls. This could be extended to China if the leaders at Peking ever decide to come out from behind their curtain of secrecy and negotiate.

One thing is certain. No nation in this age of turmoil can relax its defensive capabilities and simply rely on the good will of other powers to assure peace.

We would also hope that those who yell for massive cutbacks in defensive programs will consider that the year 1969 is not 1939.

When the storm of war broke on western Europe in 1939, the Nazis, who had been preparing for a decade, rolled easily over their neighbors who somehow had talked themselves into believing such a thing could never happen.

No more tragic examples in modern history need be cited than Holland, Belgium and France in 1940 and the sleeping posture of the United States on Dec. 7, 1941.

Thirty years ago, the United States was fortunate enough to get a breather during which time it recovered and built a military machine to win the war.

In an age of ballistic missiles which can span continents and oceans, there will be no time to start preparing after the first act of aggression.

IMPROPER STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of Pennsylvania, William C. Sennett, has given appropriate reply to an improper statement by the National League of Cities concerning the use of Federal funds by Pennsylvania under the Federal Streets Act. The attorney general's statement follows:

IMPROPER STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

Attorney General William C. Sennett took issue today with statements made in Washington Wednesday by the National League of Cities regarding the Federal Safe Streets Act.

"The League's statements indicate a lack of familiarity with the Federal Act," Sennett said.

The League had charged that millions of dollars in federal crime-fighting funds are being wasted on rural areas and the creation of a new level of bureaucracy.

The Attorney General said that the charges are without foundation, especially as far as

Pennsylvania's participation is concerned. Sennett is chairman of the Pennsylvania Crime Commission which was designated by Governor Raymond P. Shafer to implement the Safe Streets Act in Pennsylvania.

Here is Sennett's statement in rebuttal to the allegations made by the National League of Cities:

"The record must be set straight immediately, especially concerning Pennsylvania's plan under the Federal Crime Control Act.

"The assertion that in Pennsylvania funds are being diverted away from cities and into criminal investigation and regional planning councils is totally without foundation.

"To date, of the \$240,524 in Federal aid received and dispersed for riot prevention, 75 percent, or nearly \$190,000, went to 30 cities, boroughs and townships throughout Pennsylvania. As for money for regional planning, the Federal Act, itself, absolutely requires planning money to be spent . . . only for planning.

"Approximately \$360,000 has been earmarked by the Act and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for use in Pennsylvania for local government law enforcement. To date, no money has, in fact, been spent for regional planning.

"Second, not one dime of the Federal planning money under the Act is to be spent, or is being spent, in Pennsylvania for criminal investigations of any kind.

"The Federal Act mandates two phases of development: first, the planning phase; second, the action phase. Provisions in the Federal Act require a partnership in state and local planning to improve the criminal justice systems in the state. At the present time, we are just entering the planning phase.

"The assertion that mayors are not being represented is also untrue. Pennsylvania Crime Commission staff members have met several times with local government officials and will continue to meet with them in order to develop how many elected local government officials should be on each regional planning council. I absolutely guarantee that local government officials throughout Pennsylvania will have full proportionate representation, not only on the regional planning councils, but also on the Crime Commission Advisory Council.

"Governor Shafer, through the Pennsylvania Department of Justice and the Pennsylvania Crime Commission, is honestly and openly attempting to create an effective State-and-local partnership to prevent and control crime throughout Pennsylvania.

"Street crime, professional crime and organized crime will all be dealt with in a balanced State-and-local program. This program—a counterattack on all crime in Pennsylvania—will be the product of both State and local planning.

"I urge all responsible local government officials and all citizens throughout Pennsylvania to rally together to separate fact from fiction so that we can get these Federal programs moving. We can use these Federal programs to strengthen our criminal justice system."

SALUTE TO NAB'S MOST DISTINGUISHED MEMBER

HON. GARRY BROWN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week the National Association of Broadcasters presented its 1969 Distinguished Service Award at the opening general assembly of its 47th annual convention here in Washington. There is

probably no greater distinction than for a man to be honored by his peers who have deemed him an individual worthy of recognition.

This award is the broadcasting industry's highest honor. Previous recipients include: David Sarnoff, William S. Paley, Herbert Hoover, Dr. Frank Stanton, Edward R. Murrow, Bob Hope, Sol Taishoff, Chet Huntley and David Brinkley, and Lowell Thomas.

Yesterday, March 24, a new name was added—that of John E. Fetzer of Kalamazoo, Mich., a man highly qualified and deserving to take his place in this renowned company.

The broadcasting industry knows John Fetzer as one of the industry's great pioneers, innovators, and leaders.

The sports world knows John Fetzer as owner of the world champion Detroit Tigers. The residents of the Third District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent, know John Fetzer as a man who has contributed, and continues to contribute in countless ways, to his community and his country. He is a man of many dimensions—a leader in the business world, the academic world, chairman and member of numerous civic committees, councils, and boards.

This recognition of his meritorious service as a broadcaster and outstanding citizen is the crowning achievement of over a half century of service in the development and growth of a dynamic industry.

As Members of that august body which makes a bit of history every day, it is with great pride and deep respect that we salute this man who contributes to the first draft of history every day.

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS ATTRACT ENGINEERS

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the professional engineer is often thought of as a man buried over his drawing board, blind to the problems of society all around him. Until recently, in too many instances, this has been true. Now, however, we can begin to see encouraging signs of a change in outlook, an awakening by engineers to their social responsibilities. The National Society of Professional Engineers is playing a key role in this most important development.

With the deliberate intent of stimulating engineers to greater community involvement, the NSPE has selected six of its 500 chapters to launch pilot projects focusing on problems of their own choice. The Hartford County Chapter of the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers is, I am proud to say, one of the six.

Their activity, I think, is one of unusual interest that could well serve as a pattern for adoption in many other cities. In brief, they have undertaken, in cooperation with mechanical engineering students at the University of Hart-

ford, to provide the children of Hartford with a unique "teaching playground." Donating their skills and time, they are working toward a target date of June 1 for completion of this playground at a site selected by the Women's League Day-Care Center.

Not only will this playground meet a need which exists in so many of our cities for more places of wholesome recreation, it will serve the additional important purpose of allowing the playground directors to set up learning situations involving mechanical principles. Who knows, perhaps this playground will inspire some youngsters to enter the study of engineering, and help meet our Nation's needs in this field.

To provide more detail on this program, I insert in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in the Hartford Times:

**PILOT PROJECT HERE: COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
ATTRACT ENGINEERS**

(By Robert W. Bounds, P.E., president, Hartford chapter, the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers, Inc.)

The Hartford County Chapter of the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers has been selected by the National Society of Professional Engineers as one of six chapters throughout the country for their Community Involvement Pilot Project program.

The intent of the program is to involve professional engineers in community affairs. Other chapters selected are located in: Philadelphia; Miami; Madison, Wis.; Carson City, Nev., and Newark, N.J.

As envisioned, each of these chapters were to choose some local problem or situation on which they would focus their attention and talents. The knowledge of professional engineers must be utilized to aid in solving the problems that face society.

This attitude is being emphasized during Engineers Week, Feb. 16-22, with the national theme—"Engineering—Partner in Rebuilding Urban America."

The Hartford Chapter has set up a special committee to handle the Pilot Project which is headed by Professor Conrad Hemond Jr., P.E. of East Granby, Conn.

Last year the committee met regularly and studied a list of local situations which were selected due to their technical or pseudo-technical nature.

In October, 1968, the committee decided to concentrate the attention of the Chapter on a University of Hartford student design project called, "A Teaching Playground." The chapter efforts in the Pilot Project program will be to see through to completion, this spring, the construction of this unique instructional playground to be located in the north portion of Hartford.

The playground scheme is the result of several theses prepared by senior students of the University of Hartford, Mechanical Engineering Department.

The theses describe numerous playground contrivances which are designed to instruct children about physical principles and natural laws while they play. The theses were prepared by: Robert Gilbert of Middletown; Thomas Berg of Gales Ferry, Leo Frechette of West Hartford; Edward Markowski of Suffield; Theodore McCormack of East Hartford; Arch Roberts of Moosup; and Robert Cote of West Hartford.

The subject of the theses studies was the result of suggestions to the university concerning the need for play equipment which could illustrate fundamental physical principals. The suggestions were made by Mr. William Van der Does, director at the Women's League Day Care Center which is located in north Hartford.

Cooperation and support in connection with the playground project has been very encouraging. Representatives of various neighborhood groups have attended committee meetings. Mayor Uccello has been informed of the undertaking and indicated her approval.

The Park Department and the Department of Licenses and Inspections of the City of Hartford know of the plans and have made suggestions for their implementation. Various local engineering firms are cooperating on construction problems.

The local chapter of Associated General Contractors Inc., has indicated interest in discussing the construction phase of the project. The tentative completion date is May 15, 1969.

Other organizations have expressed interest in the playground installation. The Connecticut Valley Hospital has requested information for the construction of a playground for a group of 20 disturbed children.

The NSPE Community Involvement Pilot Project will not terminate when the six selected chapters have completed their particular projects. As planned, each chapter will prepare a report for NSPE consisting of a complete history, analysis and summary of the project.

These reports will be compiled into a handbook on Community Involvement which will be distributed to the over 400 NSPE chapters in the country.

These handbooks, it is hoped, will provide the chapters with a precise outline of six case histories which can be used as guides for the same types of programs in many other communities.

We in the Hartford Chapter realize that the engineering profession is guilty of remaining aloof to many of the ills of society. We hope the undertaking of this project, as limited as it is in scope, may be the turning point and the engineering profession will in fact become genuinely involved.

THE ABM DECISION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, based on the information which I have reviewed to date, I am inclined to oppose the appropriation of \$7 billion for the construction of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system that has been proposed by President Nixon. First, I believe these funds would be better spent in increasing assistance for elementary and secondary schools, for higher education loans and improved facilities, to fight crime, abate pollution, halt urban decay, and feed hungry Americans. Secondly, I do not believe this system is needed to protect us against any attack which the Communist Chinese could mount in the next 6 to 8 years. Third, I am not convinced that the Safeguard system will really improve the creditability of our deterrent vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Lastly, I believe the decision to deploy this system will escalate the arms race at a time when it appears we can make some real progress toward curtailing this spiral.

As a Congressman, I know it is my duty to lead my constituents and not follow the opinion of a bare 51 percent. However, I do feel that each and every

citizen has a substantial interest in whether the Safeguard system is deployed. This morning I read that some 63 percent of those surveyed recently support the President's action. While I personally am opposed to the system at this time, I feel that this issue is far too important to be decided on my own personal preferences. Therefore, I plan to survey my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania on this matter shortly before I make my final decision. I also plan to continue to seek out as many experts on both sides of my question as I can find. I urge all my colleagues to do the same. If our constituents overwhelmingly believe that the Safeguard system will improve the national security, certainly we cannot ignore their views when this matter is considered by the House.

**THE 148TH ANNIVERSARY OF
GREEK INDEPENDENCE**

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 148 years ago, the brave people of Greece rose to wage a struggle for independence against the Ottoman Empire and their valiant efforts produced for them a Greece resurrected as an independent nation. The dedication of the people of Greece to their independence should properly be commemorated on the anniversary of their uprising against the Ottoman Turks.

The people of Greece today steadfastly maintain their independence and are being served by a government they overwhelmingly endorsed in a referendum last fall. In turn, the Greek Government is dedicated to improving the living standards to its own people and it continues to provide steadfast support to the NATO Alliance. It can be said without fear of contradiction that no nation surpasses Greece in its cooperation with NATO.

Historically, the people of the United States and Greece have maintained a truly great friendship. The Greeks remember the support that American citizens gave to them in their battles for independence. This historic association is augmented by the close association that Americans of Greek origin maintain with the land of their forebearers.

Therefore, cooperation between Greece and the United States is consistent with the close historic association of the two nations.

As we note the growing pressure being exerted in the Middle East by the Soviet Union and recognize that Communist belligerence on many fronts, we should remember that Greece is bordered by three Communist-ruled countries. Therefore, people of Greece stand in the forefront of the free world struggle against Red tyranny just as they have persevered against oppressors of their nationalism in other historic eras.

Mr. Speaker, we commemorate this occasion and take the opportunity to express friendship, respect, and continued interest in the historic alliance between the people of Greece and of the United States and their respective governments.

THE TAKEN-FOR-GRANTED AIR CONTROLLERS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Department of Transportation Appropriations, I am always mindful of the millions of air travelers who rely on the alertness, skill, and fitness of the air controller who quite literally holds their lives in his hands.

As a private pilot, I am well aware of the magnificent job our air controllers are doing, often under the most adverse conditions. Yet it comes as a surprise to me that the general public, even those who make frequent use of commercial airlines, is so uninformed and unaware of the tremendous importance of the air controller, to their safe flights.

The following article from *Business & Commercial Aviation* magazine does not exaggerate the righteous discontent of our taken-for-granted air controllers and the conditions under which they currently are working:

THE ANGRY MEN OF ATC

(By James Holahan)

To most pilots, the air traffic controller is a detached voice, reassuring, authoritative, helpful, essential—the voice that makes our massive inertia-laden air traffic control system play as intended.

There are times we goof a bit and we can detect a tinge of sarcasm in the voice of air traffic control. Like when we stray a couple of miles off the center of the airway. There may be a time when we goof royally and we hope that beyond that voice is a forgiving heart and no violation will be filed. And there are times when we can detect a note of sincere friendliness—particularly at night when things aren't so busy and we are about the only plane up there in that great big sky. We exchange simple amenities as we are handed over to the next sector. We'd really like to say more but the rigid code of radio discipline forbids it. "Thanks a lot for the help." "How do you like your job?" "Married?" "Got any kids?" "How did you get into this crazy business anyway."

Though we seldom stop to realize it, at times there is a certain amount of humanism mixed in with the modulations that travel from the guys in the cockpit to the guys behind the scope and mikes. Hot cathodes or P-N junctions can't detect it, nor would it show up on an oscilloscope, but it's there.

But what do we know about the source of that voice on the other end of the radio wave? What type of guy is he? What's his background? What does he have to know to do his job?

Few of us, even if the questions had occurred, have ever bothered to find the answers. This guy is part of the system. A faceless entity. Despite the traces of humanism that the electronics couldn't filter out, we took him for granted. That is we used to, until one day last summer. He stood up

tall and said "Damn, I'm tired of glueing this creaky old system together with psyche, sweat and blood—now I'm going to play this game exactly according to the words written in the rule book."

He did. And traffic slowed down from Los Angeles to New York just as if someone had filled the Olympic pool with Karo syrup during the 200-meter butterfly. Suddenly this air traffic controller stepped into the spotlight. He had a face, and it was scowling.

He was telling us and the public at large that he had been neglected for too long. He felt he was overworked, underpaid, underappreciated and misunderstood. Besides, he told anyone who would listen, he had lousy equipment to work with. If air traffic kept burgeoning and he didn't get more help in the form of more men and women, reliable equipment, the summer of 1968 was going to last all year—every year.

The public and the pilots got to know the man of air traffic control—quickly. The public became aware that pilots did not fly airplanes all alone. Pilots knew this but they sometimes forgot, and this sudden self-identification jogged their memories.

Well then, who is the air traffic controller? Why is he angry?

To begin with there's 9341 of him—that is, non-supervisory-level men behind mikes and/or radar. He works in control towers, IFR rooms (which are at major airports) and air traffic control centers.

If he works in the center, his average age is 37. If he works in a control tower or IFR room, his average age is 34. Ninety percent of all controllers are between 28 and 40.

Very likely he came from the military, where he learned air traffic control or was a pilot, navigator or flying radar officer.

He's a civil service employee but doesn't like it because he's lumped in with a lot of job types requiring less skill, and the Byzantine civil service regs are forced to cover all with little differentiation. If he's a journeyman controller on the scopes, he's a GS-12 (civil service rating) and could make from \$12,174 to \$15,828 for a 40-hr. work-week year depending upon which one of the ten salary levels he is at within that grade. With extra pay for nightwork, Sundays and holidays, he might make about \$1700 more per year. If he worked a six-day week or ten hours per day for five, his yearly salary could top \$20,000.

Now if our journeyman radar controller is in one of those locations handling more than a million traffic movements annually, his grade jumps a step to GS-13 which encompasses a \$14,409 to \$18,729 per year spread. With night, etc., extras and overtime he could hit in the \$25,000 neighborhood.

Not a bad neighborhood to be in, would say many a business pilot who has been mooching around in a twin-tailed Beech for a stipend much below twenty grand without the niceties of 26 paid vacation days and the retirement benefits afforded by Uncle Sam.

The controller starts between \$5000 and \$7000 per year. He attains journeyman status (GS-10 to 12 if in a control tower, GS-12, 13 if on radar in a center or IFR room—in about 3½ to 5 years. It takes him several years to go from the first pay step in a grade to the top (tenth).

While many controllers are content, particularly if they are in light-to-medium traffic locations, a good deal of them are not. Most of the dissatisfied ones are in the major terminals in the N.Y., Chicago, Washington golden triangle section of the country where the traffic is the heaviest. Their dissatisfaction seems to stem from their steady diet of long, unrelieved hours "at the boards," shift work, mounting workloads without a commensurate expansion of the work force, obsolete equipment, necessity to train men on the job, dissatisfaction with remuneration and, in some cases, difficulty

with supervisors and lack of communications through the labyrinthian FAA chain of command. The voice of the air traffic controller which is listened to and obeyed over the airways and airports of the land is, they say, muffled and largely ignored on intra-FAA channels.

To strengthen and amplify that voice, many of them have joined the new Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association, PATCO, formed in the New York area in February, 1968. The organization was the idea of two GS-12 controllers in the New York Center, Mike Rock and John Maher, ages 31 and 35 respectively. Rock is the association's full-time chairman and Maher its national coordinator. They conceived the plan for the group in the fall of 1967. Both had been chapter presidents of the National Government Employees Association, NAGE, which is a union of all types of government employees. They were entirely dissatisfied with what NAGE was doing for air traffic controllers and decided another organization—composed only of active controllers—was needed.

Originally, the thought was to have such an organization for New York only. The two founders searched for a "name" lawyer to help them and ultimately contacted noted criminal lawyer F. Lee Bailey after reading about his flying activities. Bailey not only gave them valuable preliminary advice but he also went so far as to put his Learjet at their disposal, loaned them money and took, at no remuneration, the post of executive director. They decided to make it a national association.

With the drive supplied by Rock, Maher and a nucleus of some 200 controllers in the N.Y. Center and JFK, supplemented by the push of Lee Bailey, PATCO grew to its present strength of some 6250 non-supervisory active controllers who are dues-paying (\$150 per year) members. "We're still getting in twenty to thirty new members a week," says Mike Rock who adds "We're the only association that speaks for the rank and file controller. Supervisors are permitted to join but only as associate members and these do not have a vote."

According to Rock, NAGE numbers only 2475 controllers and the only other controller group (The Air Traffic Controllers Association, ATCA) has 2350 members on its rolls. (A check with ATCA finds that the association claims over 4000 members, many of whom are supervisory people and a few hundred are military controllers. It says the 2350 figure cited by PATCO is the number of members who pay dues by the FAA dues checkoff plan.)

Rock and Maher told B/CA that air traffic control is decidedly a young man's game. "A controller in a busy center or terminal reaches his prime in his early thirties and starts going downhill fast when he passes 40. In his mid-fifties he's burned out as a controller in a high density location," says Maher. He claims that there are many "burned out" controllers now behind busy scopes and they may take 20 seconds to do what they used to do in five. He says that the shortcomings of these men are covered up by some of the younger controllers and that during critical periods supervisors relieve the over-the-hill types from the scopes and put them on less demanding positions. PATCO strongly favors early retirement for controllers and a six-month recheck (right now there are no rechecks unless a man is found deficient by a supervisor). PATCO, however, doesn't seek mandatory retirement; it feels that when a man starts losing his speed and confidence (another thing he loses in the forties, Rock and Maher maintain) he should be switched to a light-to-medium traffic location.

Rock relates that it is not unusual during peak periods in the New York area to have men at the boards continuously for eight to ten hours without a break. Lunch, he says,

even has to be eaten at the position. Some men will have only soup and coffee since chewing food will not be conducive to intelligible communications.

"Sure," admit a number of FAA supervisors who were formerly controllers, "we put in stretches as long as twelve hours in control positions (now the maximum is ten) too. But this was not a steady thing. We had plenty of days when the workload was light. It isn't a regular thing today, either."

"They're forgetting that airlines file IFR now regardless of the weather," the working controllers will counter. "The man behind the scope sees targets. They are the same in fair or foul weather and in New York, Chicago, Washington, Los Angeles, they're always crowded in peak hours."

However, with a little probing, you will find that bad weather days are the worst because everyone flying has to be on an IFR plan and the pipelines are saturated, so there are more airplanes that must be handled in a given period.

There was a freeze put on training new controllers in 1963. Only recently has FAA, thanks to the heat generated by controller groups that was felt by Congress, was there a thaw, Congress has now provided funds for the training of 2400 new controllers and the FAA has re-opened its controller school at its Oklahoma City Center.

During the freeze, air traffic just about doubled; controllers had to handle almost twice the traffic with the same work force.

"We did it by cutting lots of corners," says Rock, "and staying on this ragged edge of minimums." He seems to imply that controllers stuck out their necks to expedite traffic by such practices as using less than the mandatory three-mile separation demanded "by the book" [i.e. FAA ATC regs] when within 40 miles of a terminal, by clearing planes to land before a plane on the runway has actually turned off, by handling too many airplanes at one time.

Shortly after PATCO was formed came the now historic "safety program" which many claim, but cannot prove, was a euphemism for an intentional slowdown to put PATCO in the public eye and lend strength to its demands. As told by PATCO, "Our policy is simply this: Follow FAA regs to the letter; give every airplane the separation its pilot has the right to expect, and stop cutting corners."

Whether, as some say, minimum separations were stretched beyond that needed for safety and other delays were deliberately introduced into the system, or the controllers just stopped sticking their necks out and making up for the lack of manpower, equipment, airfield capacity, etc., no one but the men at the boards may ever know for sure, but during May to September, 1968, air traffic operated in low gear. Delays in New York were felt in Los Angeles. Some flights suffered delays of two and three hours. Others were diverted to fields a couple of hundred miles away. Passengers lost time, airlines lost millions of dollars.

FAA officially never admitted that it found any rule infractions during the "safety program," though it sent inspection teams to critical locations. In a few instances controllers were removed from their positions by supervisors for allowing too much separation, and in one case, one was reported for not maintaining sufficient separation. In no case was punitive action taken.

In November, 1968, the Acting Administrator sent a telegram to all regional directors in the field which was a masterpiece of indecision. It started out by referring to recent newspaper articles saying that PATCO was advocating a slowdown. After emphasizing FAA would not tolerate a slowdown or compromise of safety, it quoted PATCO's executive director Herman Meyer (Bailey relinquished this job and remained as legal counsel) as saying just what he would be

expected to say, i.e., "We would not condone our members engaging in a deliberate slowdown," etc. Thomas concluded with how inquiries from the public should be answered.

If indeed there was a slowdown, the controllers had boxed FAA into a trap where it could never admit publicly that it knew (as many claim) corners were being cut and infractions to the letters of the rules had been going on for some time to make the system play. To do so would have opened it up to all sorts of libel suits and some heads in the executive suites of 800 Independence Avenue might have rolled. It would have taken a much stronger and better—politically—entrenched man to deal sternly with the situation. Dave Thomas, a career FAA man and only acting administrator didn't have the strength and, apparently wasn't inclined to take forceful action—assuming such was warranted. It was his Bay of Pigs and he suffered through until the normal traffic drop in winter.

During the rise of PATCO, ATCA began to become more vociferous. Formed in 1956 and long regarded as a very ethical and professional association more concerned with making better and more knowledgeable controllers than higher remunerated ones, ATCA lost members in droves to PATCO. The latter accused ATCA of being management dominated (many of its members are supervisors; how many, it claims it doesn't know) and of always having as its executive director a retired chief from FAA's air traffic service. It said this association was too much a part of management to fight for the journeymen controllers. While strongly denied by ATCA, many people in FAA headquarters confidentially agreed that this is true.

But ATCA is out to change this belief. A year ago it hired the public relations firm of Ruder & Finn (the same one recently hired by the State of Israel to bolster its image in the U.S.) to publicize that it is a viable spokesman for the controller. It recently has made battle with FAA on the matter of overtime pay. Top graded controllers only recently were awarded time-and-a-half for overtime. However, in many locations funds ran out and men could be paid only in compensatory time on a one-for-one basis—one hour off for each hour worked overtime. ATCA is out to insure that in all instances there will be sufficient funds to pay overtime and in no case substitute comp time.

B/CA talked to Jerry Biron, newly appointed head of the manpower section of FAA's air traffic service. Biron admits that during prolonged periods of bad weather controllers are overworked but, he says, "the only way to eliminate this is to staff for peak periods. This would result in overstaffing most of the time. With the present scarcity of controllers, we don't see how this would be feasible, or even possible."

Biron blames the situation on everyone's underestimation of the growth of aviation. "Admittedly we don't have as many controllers as we need, nor do we have enough airports," Biron told B/CA. He thinks flow control will help, although he points out we always have had flow control. "Now we're refining it, trying to predict delays so that those that occur, occur to people while on the ground."

The ATS manpower chief thinks one reason for frustration of some controllers is that there are not many management slots open to them. Also, he points out, top salaried GS-12 and -13 controllers would have to take a cut in pay to step into management and few want to do that.

Biron disagrees that controllers are burned out at 40. "Look at the lunar astronauts," he argues. "Borman is 41. These men are performing far more demanding tasks than any air traffic controller."

B/CA discussed the situation with a number of airline and corporate pilots. The general feeling is one of sympathy and am-

pathy with the controllers. However, many feel that PATCO has instigated them, convinced them that they should be unhappy. Many think it ridiculous, even demeaning to include such entertainment-world figures as Arthur Godfrey, Arnie Palmer, Johnny Carson, and Susan Oliver among PATCO's trustees.

To this replies Mike Rock, "Who would come five miles to hear Mike Rock or Joe Schmo? Big names attract people. Controllers are individuals. They're not easily persuaded to go listen to other controllers."

Few outsiders, however, deny that F. Lee Bailey's liaison with PATCO is fortuitous for its growth. Says NBAA's ATC coordinator John Woods, "Bailey's so brilliant that he frightens everyone. He's spectacular. He keeps pushing and doing things."

Said one corporate pilot, "The guy has already moved mountains. He's done things that never could have been done without such a strong personality."

Others are suspicious. They wonder about the role of this man who saved the Boston Strangler from death row, who freed Sam Sheppard and who, because of pre-trial actions, was barred from representing another accused murderer in New Jersey. Some respect him, fear him and believe (even hope) he'll fall on his face.

However, there's no doubt that Bailey is strong, spectacular and gifted with almost relentless drive. Articulate and one of the most eloquent speakers in general aviation since Jebb Halaby left for the Pan Am presidency, Bailey has Halaby's gift for impressing his listeners more for his form than substance. A short (about five-foot-six), well-built man with a modish touch of slightly long sideburns and a seeming preference for deep-colored shirts, ex-Marine pilot Bailey is slightly slow to smile and supposed to have an I.Q. of 170. The almost permanent furrows in his forehead and greying hair make him look older than his 35 years.

You don't have to talk to him long to realize that he is immersed in every phase of PATCO and, though a pilot and not a controller, he impresses with his understanding of air traffic control and controller problems. Frank and a realist, he will tell you that there are a lot of controllers who are content and apparently have no gripes, that the most angry spots are New York and Chicago, that some supervisors tend to push the controllers around, that the courts has established that a controller must exercise judgment in excess of the written regulations, that ATCA is not the type of organization that could represent controllers since "it just doesn't want to rock the boat," that his Learjet is great but "costs like Hell."

Bailey has his hopes set on a bill drawn up by Senators Hartke, McIntyre and others, that was introduced this month in Congress. The bill would take the controller out of civil service and form a separate career field established by federal law with certain requirements, training, progression, voluntary early retirement, and normal salaries between \$17,000 and \$25,000. Eventually, he would like to close the salary gap between airline pilot and controller.

Bailey also talks of unifying all the heterogeneous groups of civil aviation. Despite all the well-known obstacles and conflicting goals of many factions with the G.A. fold, Bailey, either out of naivete or Napoleonic confidence, thinks it can be done. Although he did not say it, it would be difficult to imagine him thinking of himself in a secondary role to say Tipton, Hartranft, Ruby or Ward in such a unification. He has already developed an excellent rapport with the Airline Pilots Association and currently is working out joint safe separation standards with that group. He is looking for similar rapport with AOPA and NBAA.

While he is fighting for recognition and betterment of the lot of his controllers and

probing into general aviation, one wonders how he is able to keep up with his practice of criminal law which evidently pays the bills for his activities, including a Learjet (and pilot), flight school outside of Boston and, recently, part interest in the Brantly helicopter redesign and remanufacturing. One might ask "What is he looking for in aviation?" He probably couldn't afford to take a

government post, nor could the industry pay him for fulltime services.

The somewhat enigmatic Lee Bailey notwithstanding, the important thing is that the collective voice of thousands of air traffic controllers has spoken. It speaks harshly and carries a big stick. While we all might not agree with all that it is saying, none of us can help listening.

who sought to destroy him. And in the first portion of the Gospel reading, St. Matthew recounts Jesus' rebuff to those who looked for an on-the-spot miracle as proof of His authority.

He promised the one sign upon which hinge all Christian faith and hope, the sign of Jonah-His resurrection from the dead.

For, as St. Paul teaches, . . . "If Christ has not been raised then our preaching is useless and your believing is useless; . . ." (1 Cor. 15:14) "But," writes Paul, "Christ has in fact been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of all who have fallen asleep." (Ibid., 20) "just as all men die in Adam, so all men will be brought to life in Christ. . . ." (Ibid., 22).

The foundation stone of all Christian faith and hope, the ultimate proof of our own resurrection in Christ, the reason for our hope!

Last year my brother bishops of the United States issued a collective pastoral letter on the mystery of the Church, on her nature and function in the light of certain problems of the hour.

It was my edification, my benefit, to adopt as my own such words with which that pastoral was introduced to our Church in America:

"As the years of the Council progressed, we became more aware of the magnitude of the agony and the loftiness of the aspirations which identify this mighty century.

"We experienced anew our need to carry the cross of the human condition, to trust more deeply in the never-failing presence of the Spirit, to affirm hope even when many would counsel despair, and to wait, in all our distress, the fulfillment of Christ's Easter promise. . . .

"We pray that God, our Father, who keeps alive in us a sense of inadequacy, may give us the courage to bring to fruition the work of the Council which begins and ends with confidence in one another and with faith in Him."

Do not such words echo, among the problems of our days, the humble faith and hope of today's liturgy and of the psalmist's prayer in time of danger?

In the community of the Church, St. Paul teaches us that not only are we members to form one body and even as parts of it to belong to each other, but also—marvel of mysteries—that we form one body in union with Christ (Romans, 12:5). We are more than ourselves. Together we are Christ's body. (1 Cor. 12:27)

The Church is Christ's body, and we are its living parts. (Eph., 5:30) That Christ in His members, the Church, suffer crucifixion—now from without, now from within—is ordained as the course of salvation. But it is never crucifixion without the certain faith and the firm hope of resurrection in Him.

It is in this faith and in this hope that I come to you, the community which is the Church, the Diocese of Saginaw. The local church, a diocese as is this of Saginaw, is fashioned after the model of the universal Church, as we are taught by Vatican Council II.

The universal Church comes from, and is in, the local churches. Without the local church, there is no universal, no catholic church. (Constitution on the Church, 23) Yet no local church can isolate itself from the world-wide mission of Christ and His Church, whose limits are none.

The college of bishops with the Holy Father are the gifts of the Spirit to the universal Church for her unity in faith, in hope and in love. By ordination in episcopal orders and by mission of His Holiness, I am now given to you, the people of God in Saginaw Diocese as your bishop.

I do not, of course, mean that, in a colloquial sense, I am God's gift to Saginaw. Rather am I given to you as yours to use and to be used for your ministry for your service.

ANNUAL INCOME OF JOURNEMEN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS IN CENTERS AND IFR ROOMS ON RADARSCOPES

	Civil service grade ¹			
	GS-12		GS-13	
	Bottom of grade	Top of grade	Bottom of grade	Top of grade
Normal 40 hr. week	\$12,174	\$15,828	\$14,409	\$18,729
With premiums for nights, Sundays and holidays ²	13,502	17,557	15,981	20,774
6-day (48 hr.) week with premiums	17,150	22,304	20,303	25,711

¹ Journeymen controllers are GS-13's in 13 designated busiest locations.

² Air Traffic Service estimates that a man would reasonably work 40 Sundays and 8 holidays in a year and that 40 percent of his work would be at night. (Reason is that controller's workweek begins on different day each week and he rotates among 1st, 2d, and 3d shifts.)

CHARLES D. ROCHE

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Charles D. Roche, adviser on congressional relations to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has recently returned to the ranks of private enterprise. Chuck, a newsman and editor from Boston, joined the staff of the late President Kennedy in time for the 1960 campaign. Following the election that year he came to Washington as a vice president of the Democratic National Committee and soon after joined the White House staff. While serving as congressional relations adviser, Chuck played a vital part in some of the most important and progressive legislation this Nation has ever seen. His competence and guidance were always welcome just as his loyalty and integrity were always appreciated. Chuck Roche was a good friend to many of us and while we will miss him we wish him, his lovely wife and children the best of luck in the days to come.

to the diocese and its people, and to the faith and hope which are so necessary in these difficult times. Congressman HARVEY and I commend Bishop Reh's remarks to the attention of our colleagues as worthy of their most serious consideration as they face the problems of our Nation here in the Congress:

I AM GIVEN TO USE AND BE USED FOR YOUR MINISTRY

(Text of Bishop Francis F. Reh's homily at his Mass of Installation as third Bishop of Saginaw)

Through the Liturgy of this Ember Wednesday in Lent, my esteemed and beloved fellow-bishops and priests, state and city officials, religious, fellow-ministers of religion, and laity, through the Liturgy of this Ember Wednesday, the Christian community throughout the world professes its faith and expresses its hope in a particular way.

In the Entrance Hymn we raise to the Lord a trusting prayer of hope, founded on faith, as the author of Psalm 24 (25) did raise his prayer when in danger.

"To you I lift up my soul, O Lord. My God, in you I trust; let me not be put to shame, let not my enemies exult over me." (Psalm 24 (25) : 1-2)

In our times of problems and tribulations, of perplexities and troubles, of uncertainties and distress, of insecurity and also danger, this liturgy begins in the same spirit of faith and hope of the psalmist,

"Look toward me and have pity on me, for I am alone and afflicted. Relieve the troubles of my heart, and bring me out of my distress." (Psalm 24 (25) : 16-17)

"Redeem Israel, O God, from all its distress." (Psalm 24 (25) : 22)

Then in the readings the Church sets before us examples of these virtues of faith and hope and also of the providence of God.

The first reading (Exodus 24: 12-18) relates that after trials in Egypt and during the hazardous journey in the desert, Israel's faith and hope in Yahweh—a faith and a hope weak indeed, but bolstered by Moses—are rewarded.

The covenant is ratified on Sinai. The House of Jacob, the sons of Israel, are given the sublime destiny of becoming God's own people, a kingdom of priests, a consecrated nation. (Exodus, 19: 5-6)

The first Book of Kings (19:3-8) provides us with our second reading. It is an obvious example of God's providence as reason for faith and hope. At the point of despair for his life, Elijah is fed and strengthened by an angel of the Lord.

He escapes the hand of the wicked Jezabel,

I AM GIVEN TO USE AND BE USED FOR YOUR MINISTRY

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the 10th Congressional District of Michigan is proud to welcome a distinguished leader of the Catholic Church, Bishop Francis F. Reh, to govern the Diocese of Saginaw of which it is a part. Congressman JAMES HARVEY of Michigan's Eighth Congressional District, which also includes a substantial portion of the diocese, joins me in this welcome and in wishing the new bishop of Saginaw every success in his ministry.

At his installation, Bishop Reh witnessed to the dedication which he brings

I am given to you as your shepherd and leader, but as shepherd who must be willing to give his life for his sheep, as leader who will not ask his followers to go where he will not go himself.

I am given to you, may I say, by the Spirit, so that in the Spirit I may be the sign and the assembly point of your unity in faith and hope and love in Christ.

Credam Firmius!—that I may believe more strongly! It is the motto of my coat of arms. This may seem to some to be outdated heraldry, more regal than sacerdotal for a bishop.

I would find it of little interest to argue the case, for or against. But for me those words have been more prayer than motto. They are part of a prayer of Pope Clement XI.

"Lord, I believe; may I believe more strongly!

"Lord, I hope; may I hope more confidently!

"Lord, I love; may I love more ardently!"

It is my prayer today as I come in joy to have you as my lot, my portion, my life in Christ! It is my prayer in the spirit of this Lenten Ember Liturgy, of the faith and hope of Moses and the children of Israel, of trust in the Providence who renewed the covenant and saved Elijah, of faith and hope in the sign of Jonah.

It is my prayer in the spirit of my brother bishops of the American Hierarchy, of their expressed faith and trust in the never-failing presence of the Spirit and in the fulfillment of Christ's Easter promise.

Will it not also be our prayer, your prayer and my prayer in Christ, and so the prayer of the Church of Saginaw?

Since that great Council Vatican II, the spirit of evil has been busy with his minions. He saw and feared and hated that Council's thrust to renewal of Christian witness to the world. And so he has sown his weeds of confusion to overshadow clarity, his cockle of division and suspicion to dwarf unity and understanding; his evil seed of anger to stunt true zeal; his thorns of doubt and skepticism to stifle faith and hope.

If there can be degrees of ease or of difficulty in believing, it seems more easy to believe in the devil today. One can almost see his tactics, sense his presence, detect his stench.

These are times of trial for our country and for the world of men. Fear, insecurity, distrust and violence are more bed-fellows than strangers to us.

It will be the strength of our faith and the solidity of our hope which, in such times, will give true service to God and to our Church, to our country and to all our fellow-children of God in Saginaw, in America and throughout the world.

This witness of strong faith and solid hope will be our service of love to mankind in its present time of trial.

A long time ago we were exhorted by St. Paul never to surrender our precious heritage of faith and hope. In drawing to a close his first letter to the Church he had established at Corinth, he wrote at length on the fact of Christ's Resurrection, witnessed by the apostles, as the foundation of our faith and the decisive proof of our future resurrection in Him.

Paul was writing, it is true, with the particular problems and troubles of his Corinthians in mind. But can we say that the inspired words of Holy Scripture were intended by the Holy Spirit for but one time or one people? And so, cannot the conclusion of the fifteenth chapter of Paul's letter serve us also today as both a beautiful and powerful exhortation to faith, hope and perseverance?

"Never give in, then, my dear brothers, never admit defeat; keep on working at the Lord's work always, knowing that, in the Lord, you cannot be laboring in vain." (1 Cor. 15:58)

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, one of the successful and prominent lumbermen in my home State of Oregon is Mr. Grover B. Kelsay, of Jasper, Oreg.

Mr. Kelsay has had a truly remarkable Horatio Alger career. He knows why we have such high lumber and plywood prices, and he knows what the solution is and is not afraid to announce it. He recently wrote a letter to President Nixon, and has consented to having a copy of it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am certain it will be of great interest to my friends in Congress who are concerned about the high price of lumber and plywood:

HILLS CREEK LUMBER Co.,
Jasper, Oreg., March 4, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For many years, I have had a dim view of politicians! One of my oft-repeated statements is "what this country needs are more statesmen . . . and less politicians!"

I have been a most ardent supporter of you for many years. I was appalled when you were defeated in the 1960 election, and have been dismayed by the two presidents' administrations in the interim period.

Despite the sniping and the carping of your critics, I have felt you have achieved your office with the best training and most qualifications for the presidency than any man of this century. So—you would have to say I'm an admirer of yours, and I feel our nation is in the most capable hands available at this very moment.

Your acceptance speech for the nomination to the presidency was outstanding in many respects, but particularly impressed me with your "dreams" for this nation, and brought home to me the realization we all are brothers under the skin; that we all have dreams and aspirations, and that we all can achieve most of those desires if we want them strongly enough.

During your years of public life, you have impressed me with your apparent sincerity of purpose; that you do so want to do the right things for this nation; and I do believe in you, so foolish as it may seem, I'm writing to you, personally, on the thought that you are the common denominator we seek in our nation; that you are a man of the people; that you will, indeed, read my letter, even though it has not come through "channels" . . .

You see, Mr. President, I have tried many times in the past few years to go through political channels with plans of importance for my industry and region . . . and great reams of gobbledegook and no results has been my reward. I can't reach someone with the power of decisions.

I'm a lumberman—a success story not dissimilar to your "dream". My old boss and later partner ran a kid baseball team on which I played when 15 years old, took a liking to me, steered me through college, and hired me when I was graduated. I came to work for him as his bookkeeper in May, 1938; and here I am almost 31 years later, same company, same office . . . except now I'm a partner and general manager of the firm! My old boss has long since retired, though he lives nearby and is one of my dearest friends,

and I have his job . . . all worked out and my ownership paid for out of earnings at this company.

All I needed was the opportunity; and that was given me by a man who believed in me; as I believe in you.

So—to the crux of this letter—I'm a lumberman, and a pretty good one, at least by reputation and accomplishment.

I know what this government should do in our timbered region, and I know that it will be done eventually; but I'm afraid your administration will be too long in finding out to avoid many pit-falls and countless billions of dollars wasted needlessly. The timing of this necessary decision is NOW!

Grandiose statement, you say? Well no, sir, it's absolutely true. The government owns 70% of the timber and timber growing regions in our western states, and has managed them decently up to recent years.

Now, however, great advances have been made in forest genetics—better seeds, better, faster growing trees, fertilization techniques, and many other things that will improve and enhance the tree growing productivity of the region.

Our federal forests are managed—and properly—on a sustained yield basis, but improvements of the past decade dictate a sharply upward curve in the potential allowable annual cut or harvest of our forest resource, and our agencies are not yet with it. The timing is now!

You, sir, cannot be unaware of the sharp prices upward this past year in plywood and lumber. Homebuilders are being shot down in their plans, for prices have skyrocketed on materials they use. The National Ass'n of Home Builders are perturbed, and indeed incensed.

Your administration has within it the power to right this situation, without expense to our taxpayers, and those odds I like.

Ed Cliff is head of our national forest service. He made a major speech two months ago in which he clearly stated the allowable cut on the national forests could be increased by up to 66% annually, if he had the necessary money appropriations through Congress to do the work necessary in the field.

"Ah ha!", you say, "money it takes". No, Mr. President, for every dollar it will take to expand the cut, 2, 3, or 4 dollars will almost immediately return to the national treasury, and those odds I like!

Certainly, if we can budget 500 million more dollars a year, with positive assurance that it will return 1 billion or more each year, there is some way to do it quickly. I'd dearly love to be in Congress with such a voting opportunity. If you will put your influence behind such a concept, I'm sure success will follow.

Plywood prices are up 140% this past year; lumber prices are up 60% or so; and the home buyer and other users of our products are the ultimate victims. Many markets historic to wood will be lost forever to steel, concrete, plastics, etc.

It has been carefully estimated by home builders that, for every 10% increase in lumber and plywood prices, 1% is added to the price of a home. If this figure be accepted and I believe it to be accurate, then as of today as against prices prevailing one year ago, homes will cost 10% more because of lumber-plywood price increases just in this last year alone.

Projecting further, 1,600,000 homes @ \$22,000.00 each today as against \$20,000.00 each one year ago . . . represents \$3,200,000,000.00 the home buyer must pungle up extra in one year to pay for double the price of plywood and lumber in his home.

Frankly, Mr. President, the price last year was too low—the price this year is too high—surely we can manage our economy to whatever extent be necessary to avoid 100% price increase in one year.

The only possible, practical, substantial step that can be taken now to reduce the chaos in our industry, I do most sincerely believe, is the one I have suggested. Please, Mr. President, will you give your most earnest supporting consideration to follow through on my suggestion? To outline at once some bill for the consideration of the Congress to appropriate the extra funds so necessary to implement the full potentially allowable cut of our National Forests per Ed Cliff's up to 66% overage of that cut now officially in existence today. That would be statesmanship of the highest order . . .

Thanking you for your patience to have read this letter to its conclusion; and hoping you are, indeed, a man of and for the people, as I believe you to be, I am

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. KELSAY,
Partner, Hills Creek Lumber Co.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, until World War II, Byelorussians were among the less known of the many peoples living under the yoke of Soviet communism. We had heard of the Ukrainians, of the Baltic peoples, of peoples in the Caucasus, and even of those in distant Asiatic areas, but one seldom heard of the Byelorussians, and this despite the fact that as an ethnic group they are more numerous than any of the groups named above. As a matter of fact, the 10 million Byelorussians constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union. These people with their long history had lived in the area southeast of the Baltic countries, between Poland and Moscow, through the Middle Ages. Early in modern times their country was annexed to Russia and so it remained until, briefly, they regained their freedom in 1918.

Throughout their subjection to Russia's czars, Byelorussians managed to retain their national traits and traditions, and succeeded in keeping alive their national sentiments. After the czarist regime was overthrown late in 1917, it was a natural thing for the Byelorussians to proclaim their independence. They did so on March 25, 1918. They set up their own government and—for a tragically short time—were masters of their own destiny. Within less than a year, the Red Army overran the country, and independent Byelorussians ceased to exist.

Since then, for more than 50 years, these people have suffered under Communist domination. They have found it impossible to reconcile themselves to the Communist regime imposed upon them. Neither they in their hearts, nor in any sense, the Byelorussians living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. On the 51st anniversary observance of Byelorussians Independence Day let us hope that they will attain their freedom once more and live in peace in their homeland.

A QUICK LOOK AT THE WORLD AS
IF THROUGH IRISH EYES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, our new colleague from Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON, not only put on a green tie and made a St. Patrick's Day speech, as we all did, but took a quick look at the world as if through Irish eyes. Although he does not claim to have Irish blood, the former Ambassador and Chief of Protocol has a gift of wit that is very Irish indeed. His remarks provide a devastating commentary on some all too prevalent American attitudes.

It is with a sense of privilege that I insert herewith a St. Patrick's Day address delivered at St. Louis University by Congressman JAMES W. SYMINGTON: ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES W. SYMINGTON DELIVERED AT ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, MARCH 17, 1969

What does it mean to be Irish? Since we are all Irish today we have the right, even the duty, to ask. And we have a choice. To be Irish means to be passionate or thoughtful, fierce or gentle, sober or . . . refreshed. Yet, never anything but proud—with unbridled imaginations and undaunted dreams. The Irish believe, among other things, in life after birth.

Over the rest of the world "things are in the saddle and ride mankind." This was never so in Ireland. The Irish soul has slipped the halter of history for 2000 years. It is the leprechaun that can't be caught; the lilting laughter that moves with the mist and moonlight quietly over the land, soothing the hurt places and softening the soil for renewal.

Wear the green she tells us. The great thing about green is it goes with brown and black as well as white.

The great thing about Ireland is its emerald message to the world that all things can grow green again, if we would let them; that men's minds can sprout green thoughts, nations green hopes, and the world the green promise of peace.

It has been a bare two months since a new American administration took office, and a new President voiced in his inaugural address the determination to "open doors," and "keep no nation large or small in angry isolation." What large nation—in addition to our own—I thought, is "kept" in angry isolation. And what small one? If any of you read the words differently, tell me so. But important words they were—little green shoots putting forth from the frosty soil of a frozen foreign policy, testing the January winds of public opinion. Will they bud? Will the groundhog be affrighted by his shadow? Let's give him a tot of Irish whiskey and see, or maybe some cabbage.

We need the perspective to see beyond our shadow or through it.

Irish perspective is a wonderful thing. I had an Irish friend who had stayed up late carousing. "Your eyes are very red this morning," I told him. "You should see them from my side," he replied.

They sum up things.

"Marriage," said George Bernard Shaw, "is popular because it combines the maximum of temptation with the maximum of opportunity."

They are understanding.

"A fanatic," said Dooley, "is a man that does what he thinks the Lord would do if He knew the facts of the case."

What are the facts of the Irish case that distinguish it from ours?

"We have a certain freedom you haven't got," said Eamon de Valera to America five years ago. "A big power," he said, "is not free from suspicion like a small power." We do labor, do we not, under suspicious others have of us and we have of other? It's not a burden to dance under.

Yeats has told us—

"If there's no hatred in a mind
Assault and battery of the wind
Can never tear the linnet from the leaf."

Abroad, our linnet trust in the ultimate purposes of men rests on the leaves of their daily deeds; we forget their linnets rest on ours. The same is true, of course, at home. If Yeats could see our cities, he might think again—

"But I being poor have only my dreams;
I have spread my dreams under your feet;
Tread softly because you tread on my dreams."

However, being Irish for the day, in a world of nations, I thought I would confine my inquiries to my Irish foreign policy. I didn't want to bother the Irish Ambassador who would probably be gathering shamrocks to deliver to our President, if I remember correctly. So I called our State Department where I formerly worked. It's a big Department. Not everyone in it could be expected to know the Irish foreign policy. That is why we have the Irish Desk which thinks of little else but Ireland, Irish problems, and Irish viewpoints. I rang the number and a secretary answered.

"To whom do you wish to speak," she said. "To the Desk Officer," said I. "What is it you wish to know," she said. "Ireland's foreign policy," said I. "Oh," said she, "that gentleman has just stepped out." "Fine," said I, marveling at the specialties these men have, "but I'll speak with any one of his assistants." One came on. "Hello," he said. "Hello," I said, "does Ireland have diplomatic relations with either China, or with the USSR or the bloc countries, or Cuba?" "Gosh," he said, "I don't know . . . hey, Charlie, does Ireland recognize Russia, or China, or East Europe countries?" "I'm holding the line. It's your money, by the way. Charlie gets on. "Let's see," he thinks, ". . . hey, Ernie . . ." By then the boss specialist had returned, and knew not, or at least not quite. They would call back. As the quarter hours ticked by, I knew their difficulty. Must they call the Irish Embassy and reveal a woeful lack of prior consultations on matters of "mutual interest?" The only other recourse, besides a call to the UN, hopeless on St. Patrick's Day, would be a call to Ireland. They called the Irish Embassy, and so did I. We learned, the Irish Desk and I, that the Irish recognize de jure the USSR, all East Europe countries, and Cuba. They trade with the Soviet bloc. They recognize one State of China, but two autonomous de facto governments, one on the mainland, the other on Formosa. Their sensitivity to their American cousins does not prohibit them from keeping the door open to what might be called a two-China policy, guaranteeing support for the continuance of a sovereign Formosa, but acknowledging Peking as the seat of the "State" of China.

The subtle Irish distinction between State and Nation leaves open the opportunity to consider that the Chinese people as a Nation may some day opt to come together in peace. The policy is like Irish lace—intricate but flexibly strong. Ours is as simple and durable as Kleenex.

What about the Irish policy? Is it born of fear? Who would say the land of Robert Emmet, and which gave us John Kennedy and his brothers, deals from fear? Was it courage then? If so, are we Americans less courageous than we Irish? Is it wise? That's the ques-

tion, but one we can only begin to answer if we know what the policy is we are asking about. We suffer at times, not so much from the arrogance of power as the vagueness of bigness. And it is over the vague land that the demagogue roams at will. G. B. Shaw once said, "A 100% American is 99% an idiot." As Irishmen today, we can laugh. As Americans tomorrow, we might ponder the point. We might wonder, too, whether Irish logic would permit her to appease any threatening power by forewearing increased contacts with that power's enemies. Even Russia doesn't do that, as Taiwan will attest.

But here in the land of the free there are those who argue we should cudgel our friends to conform their trade and diplomatic policies to our own. Well, let's start with little ones. They "conform" more easily, don't they? Will my bullyboy friends tell Ireland it's all over between us until they view the world as we do, and act accordingly? Registration will be kept open all day. Passports will be produced in 24 hours; a primer on Gaelic and a slice of cold beefsteak for your eye after you make your demands.

For Ireland is the land not only of broken hearts, but of broken heads. No, I don't think the Irish can be persuaded by threats. There's a good glass of stout for every friendly stranger, and a shillelagh for the other kind.

It's up to you here in the coming months and years to decide whether we should be Irish for a day only or whether more of what we say, and think, and love, and pursue should not be Irish forever, and Ireland—our Shamrock of Gibraltar in the defense of sanity seen through the mist.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a footnote to Congressman SYMINGTON's delightful and pungent St. Patrick's Day speech:

During my 3 years at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, it was my profound pleasure to work frequently with members of the Irish delegation. Free from the rigid ideological attitudes of great powers and devoted to the goal of world peace through law and international organization, the Irish delegation consistently played one of the sanest and most useful roles of any delegation. In the person of the Honorable Frederick Boland, the Irish provided a President of the General Assembly who was wise, humorous, respected and beloved by all.

DALLAS MORNING NEWS SUPPORTS COLLINS BILL

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, all Congressmen are extremely interested in providing the best legislation for our country and, of course, each Member takes particular interest in legislation he feels vital.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and as one dedicated to insuring quality education for every American, I am pleased that the Dallas Morning News supports H.R. 8371 and submit their editorial of March 20.

When we consider how very much our future depends on the educational breakthroughs we can enhance today,

education is not merely expensive—it is priceless.

The Dallas Morning News story follows:

LEARNING DEDUCTIONS

Rep. Jim Collins proposes to let parents handle their children's college expenses, up to \$1,000 a year, as a deduction on federal income tax returns. There are many other proposed deductions now before Congress with a lot less precedent going for them.

The rationale for this deduction would be much like that for job-related training. It is supposed to enhance, somebody's earning power so that, farther down the line, Internal Revenue will get the deduction back and more.

Government at the state and federal levels seems sold on the wisdom of investing in students' quests for higher learning. State and federal loans and grants have mushroomed.

The Collins proposal could make college a little less burdensome on family finances. The deduction would mean an actual difference in income taxes of only \$100 or so for most families but for the family struggling to get Jane or Junior through the halls of ivy, \$100 is an item.

While Congress is at it, special deductions for students working their way through school might also be fertile ground for exploration. There is no better indicator of need and dedication than a student's willingness to work for higher learning.

If Congress takes the administration's cue on tax credits for businesses that go in for employment-related training, deductions for college expenses will merit equal consideration.

The better the education, the more the earning power and the higher the tax contributions. Tax law recognizes this, so proposals like Collins' hinge on degree rather than principle, which already is on their side.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia is the vast land extending from the eastern borders of Poland to the western approaches of Moscow. It is a cold and frigid land, and its inhabitants are rugged rural workers. These people, numbering some 10 million in all, have been living in that land from time immemorial. There they led a simple life and were content with their lot, until several centuries ago their homeland was overrun by the Muscovites. They were then brought under the rule of autocratic Russian czars, much against their will. They were neither free nor happy. The czarist regime did its worst to obliterate all traits of nationalism and national feeling among them. But the Byelorussians persisted in their opposition. They struggled against that regime with all the means and might they possessed, and successfully maintained their national identity. And, in 1918, when the czarist government was gone, they had the chance to regain their freedom.

Byelorussian leaders seized upon this opportunity and on March 25 of that year proclaimed their independence, then establishing the Byelorussian Republic. For

nearly a year they fought their foes for the preservation of their freedom. But their powerful foes proved formidable, and nothing could save the helpless Byelorussian Republic from the invading Red army. Soon the country was overrun and made part of the Soviet Union.

Today these hard-working Byelorussians are struggling against their totalitarian oppressors. They have not given up their hope for freedom and national independence. They feel that if, under present circumstances, they cannot count upon their friends and sympathizers abroad for direct and effective aid, they have at least some claim upon their sympathies. Today, on the observance of the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day I offer my own, and the fervent hope that one day before long these people can attain the freedom and independence they deserve.

THE MANSFIELD WEATHER STATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to note that the Department of Commerce and specifically the Environmental Science Services Administration has reviewed and reversed the decision to close the Mansfield weather station.

This facility was one of 13 which ESSA planned to close by June 30, 1969. It employs only three persons—certainly a small number—but it provides vital and greatly appreciated service to the Mansfield-Ashland, Ohio, area. Since the employees were to be transferred, the savings involved were relatively small, about \$10,000. However, the people of the area, businessmen, farmers, private and commercial pilots, responded in unprecedented numbers to protest this false economy move. Working as a team, we were able to convince the Federal Government to reverse this decision.

Located at Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport, this office fills a monitoring and information gap in the heart of Ohio since it is between the major stations in Cleveland and Columbus. It is located at the highest altitude of any station in Ohio and provides local information to residents faced not infrequently with odd weather conditions which do not apply and are not as important to the major facilities.

In an attempt to reverse the decision to eliminate the facilities, and following an exchange of letters and phone calls, a meeting was arranged with administration officials responsible for the action. Although sound arguments for continuing the operation were presented, it did not appear, at first, that they made much impact. As a letter to me from ESSA had stated: "We realize the valuable service the office provides, but—" Much to the credit of the Department and especially ESSA, they did acknowl-

edge the merit of these arguments by reversing their decision and announcing that the Mansfield Weather Bureau Office would remain in operation.

The letters, phone calls, telegrams, and personal statements I received indicated that the people of the area were genuinely concerned about losing this facility. They realized the valuable service the unit provides to the area; they probably realize it better than the parent agency.

From this station information on local weather conditions is distributed not only in Ashland and Richland Counties, but in surrounding areas including Knox, Wayne, Morrow and Crawford Counties. Officials of local radio stations noted that no less than six radio stations regularly broadcast weather reports to more than 150,000 listeners.

As a growing industrial area which is relying more and more on air travel, these reports are becoming increasingly vital.

As a major agricultural area of the State the information's value to the farmer is obvious, as it is to builders and contractors.

Also obvious is the need for a local facility and the information developed by it for use by both private and commercial pilots, a need which is increasing as the municipal airport is upgraded.

The expansion of recreational facilities in the area—ranging from boating, fishing and other water sports in the summer to extensive skiing in the winter—are also aided by accurate local weather reports.

It was more than evident to those locally involved that the weather station was of substantial service to the Metropolitan Mansfield and Ashland communities, and that these people believed the facility's services more than justified its small cost.

Another interesting fact developed during attempts to save the station. We are all familiar with the jokes and humorous barbs directed at the weatherman and his percentage of accurate forecasts. No doubt these are not altogether funny to the meteorologist. They will be pleased to learn, however, that when the chips are down the people sincerely appreciate their work and are willing to fight to keep them on the job locally. Many of the letters I received expressed this appreciation and also commented on the highly accurate forecasts and the professional and dependable service rendered.

The impersonal nature of big government at times stresses the wrong things and fails to fully appreciate problems and alternatives available. I believe this was the case with the Mansfield Weather Bureau, but it is a credit to the Department of Commerce and the ESSA that they could and did reverse their decision before it was too late.

Without the expressions of concern by the people in this area your legislators certainly could not have presented as strong a case. I was very pleased to present the views of my constituents and work for the results we accomplished together.

HALEAKALA NATIONAL PARK IN DANGER OF LOSING ITS MEAGER FACILITIES

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, each year visitors in ever-increasing numbers are viewing the many scenic wonders of our 50th State. Because natural beauty is not confined to Oahu, the principal island of the 50th State, many visitors travel to the so-called "Neighbor Islands." It is on these neighbor islands that many visitors find the Hawaii of their dreams. Especially popular on the island of Maui, both with visitors and residents alike, is the extinct volcanic crater known in legend as "The House of the Sun," or "Haleakala."

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned, along with State and county officials and citizens of Maui, because the facilities presently available to visitors to Haleakala National Park are not adequate. Specifically, the park has no visitor center for the display of educational materials, and improvements are required to make the roads and trails in the park safe. There is also no park water system, and no park communications system or restaurant facilities.

Even though Haleakala National Park today lacks the facilities which are considered necessities and not mere conveniences, an admission fee has recently been levied for the mere privilege of looking into the crater. I have written to National Park officials informing them of these desperately-needed improvements. I have also written to the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, this past week bringing to his attention a resolution adopted by the members of the Hawaii State Senate requesting the Department of the Interior to reconsider a decision to stop supplying firewood for stoves in the crater cabins at Haleakala National Park.

The National Park Service has announced that beginning April 1, 1969, it will no longer supply firewood for the cabins on the crater floor, and shortly thereafter it will remove all the stoves from the cabins. More than 1,796 campers, hikers, and other visitors utilized these meager facilities last year. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the National Park System will make Haleakala inaccessible to those who like to experience the thrill from a trip to the floor of the crater. It would leave much of this natural splendor, after the first of next month, to only the wealthy who could afford to rent pack animals to carry firewood and other camping gear into the crater.

Today, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the resolution requesting the Department of the Interior to reconsider its decision to cease the supply of firewood and stoves for the basin crater cabins at Haleakala National Park, which was adopted by the Hawaii State Senate on March 19, 1969:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, TO RECONSIDER THE DECISION TO CEASE THE SUPPLYING OF FIREWOOD AND STOVES FOR THE CRATER CABINS AT HALEAKALA PARK

Whereas, the National Park Service announced that, beginning April 1, 1969, it will no longer supply firewood for the cabins on the crater floor of Haleakala National Park, and plans to remove, shortly thereafter, all stoves from the cabins; and

Whereas, the objective of the National Park Service by law is to "... promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks ... to provide for the enjoyment of the same ..."; and

Whereas, 1769 campers, hikers, and other persons utilized these facilities of our national park last year; and

Whereas, many of these persons are members of youth groups, and can neither physically carry the firewood and stoves to the cabins on the crater floor, nor materially afford such necessities; and

Whereas, Haleakala's natural beauty is for all persons to enjoy, including this large number of people who utilize the firewood and stove facilities; and

Whereas, the present decision of the National Park Service will deprive those who can get the most out of a trip through the crater from its full enjoyment and will leave much of this only to the wealthy who can afford pack animals, etc.; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969, that the National Park Service is respectfully urged and requested to reconsider the pending plan to stop the supplying of firewood and stoves for the crater cabins at Haleakala National Park and instead to maintain these facilities for the people of Hawaii and our visitors from overseas; and

Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior, Director of the National Park Service, Senator Hiram L. Fong, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, Representative Patsy T. Mink, Governor Burns and the Conservation Council.

We hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969.

DAVID C. MCCLUNG,
President of the Senate.
SEICHI HIRAI,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE 51st ANNIVERSARY OF BYELO-RUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the gallant Byelorussian people who in 1918 experienced briefly freedom as we know it in our own country. With a progressive constitution the Byelorussian National Republic declared its freedom and independence after centuries of czarist oppression. The freedom so greatly enjoyed by the Byelorussians was short-lived and soon the country was overrun by the Red army. With occupation came annexation by

Soviet Russia and for the past five decades the Byelorussians have lived under tyranny. Even living under oppression these freedom-loving people still hold alive the hope that someday they will once again know true independence.

On this day, Byelorussians in every part of the world wish to remind us all that freedom is priceless. In the United States we tend to take freedom for granted but it is one of the most cherished gifts that anyone can have. It does not come easily and involves much sacrifice. The people of Byelorussia who are not free make that sacrifice every day and continue to be a living example to us all.

It is the hope of all Byelorussians that the date of March 25, will again be a day of real celebration in their own land rather than a day of remembrance in other countries. Let us all who live in freedom hope that that day will be in the not too distant future.

A DEPLORABLE FAILURE OF PLANNING JUDGMENT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area have suffered for years from a lack of implementation of our regional transportation plans. As my colleagues know, Congress felt so keenly about these failures that they provided legislative direction to complete the District of Columbia freeway system in the 1968 Federal Aid Highway Act.

However, the response of the local District of Columbia City Council and the National Capital Planning Commission to this was to adopt a highway plan which not only failed to meet the requirements of the legislation, but which failed to meet the requirements of established transportation planning procedures. There was no consultation on the adopted highway plan with the planners of adjacent Maryland and Virginia jurisdictions. This failure has now been noted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in a letter to the Washington Area Council of Governments asking that this situation be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of March 23, 1969:

NONREGIONAL PLANNING

One of a number of bad things about the District's severely curtailed freeway plan is the fact that it was pieced together and approved by the City Council and the National Capital Planning Commission without the slightest consultation with the transportation planners of suburban Maryland and Virginia.

This was, by any standard, a deplorable failure of planning judgment. For the District is not an island, nor can its transportation

needs be viewed realistically apart from those of the metropolitan area as a whole.

Beyond that, moreover, as the Department of Housing and Urban Development has now made clear, it violates a concept of regional planning which has become a basic requisite for participation in a broad variety of federal aid programs in urban areas. And the agency has warned that the failure must be corrected.

The assertions by HUD, which had not previously entered the District's highway fight, came in response to complaints against the District plan from a unit of the area's Council of Governments, which is supposed to have a voice in establishing this region's transportation policy. As a first step, HUD has asked the Council of Governments' board for some positive suggestions for getting back on the regional track. The council, of course, should comply.

The trouble is, however, that there is really nothing at all that the Council of Governments can do to change the situation unless the city government agrees. And the dilemma in that respect remains just as it has been for months: There is no indication that the District government will budge unless it is required to do so by Congress and by the administration.

HUD has added one more compelling reason for resolving this absurd stalemate through the negotiation of a highway plan which truly relates to the needs of the entire region. We hope that its entrance to the controversy advances that result.

RAY LIVESAY: CRUSADER FOR THE DAYTIMER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, anything that I would add to the article written by Broadcasting magazine on February 10 about Ray Livesay would be redundant. I have known Ray Livesay for more years than I would like to admit and all of the good things written about him in this article I can testify to being no exaggeration. He has been one of the prime leaders in early broadcasting and has achieved success in the industry not just through hard work, but because of his sincere and dedicated interest in promoting good broadcasting. It is with pride in a friend and constituent that I call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

RAY LIVESAY: CRUSADER FOR THE DAYTIMER

(NOTE.—James Ray Livesay—president, 25% owner, WTWO (TV) Terre Haute, Ind.; chief owner, WLBH-AM-FM Mattoon, Ill., and sole owner, WHOW Clinton, Ill.; b. Oct. 1, 1916, Grand Tower, Ill., where he graduated from high school in 1934; owner, radio-set sales and service store, Villa Grove, Ill., 1935; salesman, WDW Tuscola, Ill. (now in Decatur, Ill.), 1936-44; radio-electronics instructor, U.S. Navy, 1944-46; founded WLBH 1946, WLBH-FM 1949 and acquired WHOW 1950; headed merger resulting in WTWO 1965; director-at-large for small-market radio stations, National Association of Broadcasters; board chairman, Daytime Broadcasters Association; past president, Illinois Broadcasters Association; long active in Rotary, Elks, Masons and Central Community Church of Mattoon; m. Leffel Elmore of Hartsville, Tenn., Dec. 10, 1937; children—married daughter Shirley and son Jim, 21;

hobbies—big-game hunting, golf and flying his own plane.)

There are many stories of poor boy makes good in broadcasting.

That of J. R. Livesay, however, is somewhat unusual. It is the story of the grass-roots broadcaster who crusaded diligently for years for what long seemed a lost cause—uniform time for daytime AM radio stations—and who eventually won, at least as far as sign-on time is concerned, thereby benefiting three-fourths of the more than 2,000 daytime outlets in the U.S. but neither one of his own two daytimers.

Ray Livesay has won in other ways, however. For one, he is no longer poor.

For another, his station interests, ranging from part ownership of WTWO (TV) Terre Haute, Ind., to chief ownership of WLBH-AM-FM Mattoon, Ill., to full ownership of WHOW Clinton, Ill., are a source of pride of worthwhile public contribution, considering the social and economic achievements these stations have scored in their respective communities.

Not last nor least is the recognition and friendship of his fellow broadcasters, evident when Mr. Livesay files his Beech Bonanza to some industry gathering and renewed each time he is elected to be director-at-large of the National Association of Broadcasters by the small-market radio-station operators throughout the 50 states. When he ends his present NAB term next year, Mr. Livesay will have served a total of eight years on the association's board.

Among the founders of the Daytime Broadcasters Association at a meeting in St. Louis in 1955, Mr. Livesay has been at the head of the group since that time and presently is board chairman. He has testified often on the issues of the DBA before congressional committees and worked for the cause constantly at the FCC. As an industry adviser to the FCC and the State Department, he helped support the official delegation in its recent negotiations with Mexico to win a new broadcast treaty that awaits the ratification of the senators of the U.S. and Mexico.

Although the full details of the treaty have not yet been disclosed, one gain will be the uniform 6 a.m. local sign-on time for about 270 U.S. daytime stations now on the seven Mexican clear channels. The treaty's chances of ratification are good, Mr. Livesay feels, especially since it is understood the Clear Channel Broadcasters Association "reluctantly" will not oppose the treaty because of national interest.

The Mexican treaty provision puts the cap on the earlier major gains won by the persistence of Mr. Livesay and the DBA before Congress and the FCC. These culminated last August when the commission on its own motion provided a uniform 6 a.m. local sign-on time for some 1,400 daytime stations. The case had been under consideration since 1961 and the ruling last summer was a refinement of the 1967 uniform time ruling after further negotiations with Canada on mutual interference standards and related issues.

"You cannot lace the public interest in an engineering straitjacket," was the theme Mr. Livesay repeated to all who would listen in his crusade. He argued the public will put up with some interference just to get its own local service and felt the FCC should serve people, not engineering curves.

Neither Mr. Livesay's WLBH or WHOW benefit from the changes because they are on U.S. class I-B clear channels. But he fought the DBA battle simply because he thought it was right.

"Principle to me has always meant more than dollars." Mr. Livesay says. However, he advises his son, also interested in broadcasting: "Don't become a crusader like your dad. You'll spin your wheels all your life and waste a lot of time."

Mr. Livesay also admits: "If I'd known it was going to be such a long fight back there

In 1955, I don't think I would have had the courage to start. It was one of those situations where you cross each bridge when you come to it and don't give up."

It is the way he doesn't give up on vital issues in his editorials on WLBH and WHOW, a policy begun in 1950 just months after the FCC rescinded its Mayflower decision banning editorials. WLBH is credited with sparkplugging a new junior college in the area, for example, and now is spearheading a drive for a new hospital.

WLBH has a heavy talk format plus middle-road music while WHOW has been country-and-western since its start. WLBH-FM, started in 1949, went to separate programming and sales in 1963 with an easy-music format. The Livesay team called half of all telephones in Mattoon homes as part of its market research in reaching the separation decision. They found wide FM awareness and acceptance.

"I very firmly believe in the future of FM radio," he says, predicting the small class A outlet will spread over the towns of the country and bring such wide use of the medium that in maybe another decade "our FM facilities will be worth more than our AM." He notes with automation "mom and pop" outlets will be feasible in towns of but 2,000 population.

Mr. Livesay skipped college because he could not find a good radio course at the time. "All they were teaching was warmed-over newspaper journalism," he recalls. During World War II he was a Navy radio instructor. He holds an FCC first class license.

Like others of his generation born on the farm and who grew up winding radio coils on Mother's Oats boxes, Mr. Livesay has broadcasting in his blood. He recalls selling main-street merchants on WJZ Tuscola, Ill. (now in Decatur, Ill.) in the late 1930's as his best education and the source of his enthusiasm for radio-TV in the free-enterprise tradition.

Typically Livesay: "Competition makes us all more healthy—if we are able to survive."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK ON NAMING THE 200 BEV PARTICLE ACCELERATOR AT WESTON, ILL., THE "ENRICO FERMI NUCLEAR ACCELERATOR"

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring Dr. Enrico Fermi by adding my name in sponsorship to H.R. 391, a bill to name the 200 billion electron volt particle accelerator to be built at Weston, Ill., the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator."

It is fitting that we honor this courageous and tireless pioneer in the field of particle physics, whose theory on the chain reaction of slow neutrons in uranium and whose now-famous experiment in the squash court of the University of Chicago propelled this country into the nuclear age.

In thus honoring Enrico Fermi, we should remember that he came to this country seeking freedom from the oppression of Mussolini's police state. We must remember also that on his genius, and the genius of other European men of science who chose America as their home, rests our national security and our whole way of life.

As we reap the benefits of Enrico Fermi's contributions to this country, let us always be reminded of this great man of physics, and of the image and atmosphere of freedom and opportunity which brought him to this country.

CONGRESSMAN EARL CABELL POINTS OUT NASA CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the news release dated March 13, 1969, from the office of the Honorable EARL CABELL, Fifth District of Texas.

I believe Mr. CABELL's remarks dramatically point out that all of the money which has been expended on our space program has not been "blown to the moon" as many disbelievers of the programs have stated.

The release follows:

PRESS RELEASE OF REPRESENTATIVE EARL CABELL

As we applaud those involved in the flight of Apollo 9 for another space mission successfully completed, it is a good time to pay tribute to the dramatic revolution achieved by our space program in this nation's educational system, and to the hope it brings for solutions to more down-to-earth problems.

In the decade between 1958 and 1967, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration allocated some \$572 million to almost 1,400 projects in our universities and colleges. Some of the grants covered assistance to students or to faculty members, others helped build new space science laboratory facilities, and still more financed research projects of an independent nature.

The effects of this financial assistance extend far beyond the college level, resulting in broad improvements down to primary grades where youngsters stimulated by television are showing a new awareness of and a taste for all phases of science and technology.

It is also interesting to note that during this space decade, while our population has grown by only 16 per cent, we now have 30 per cent more pupils in our elementary and secondary schools, and 120 per cent more in college.

The inception of space age education found no specific course of study into which space knowledge might be assigned and, in the rush for learning, many older sciences were impelled into new studies, diverse sciences merged into a broader community of interest, and often physical sciences found themselves side-by-side with the social sciences in joint endeavors.

There is not enough space in this brief essay to explore all the changes that have been wrought since the flight of the first Russian Sputnik, but our educators and our students know that the schools of today are nothing like those we attended as children.

Now we can see an end to this NASA-induced research. Already economies have cut pre-doctoral grants for 1968 to 75 as compared with 3,132 just four years ago, and under the Sustaining University Program, (SUP), there is no money earmarked for construction of facilities for Fiscal 1969.

However, though our educators are disappointed, they value the climate which NASA research projects have fostered.

Deprived of new projects that could reach beyond the Moon, they visualize a new and more down-to-earth approach, an application of the same principles of mental exploration as applied to subjects closer home in the fields of pollution, of poverty, and of social science.

The end result may well be that those who complained man could reach the Moon but could not live with his neighbor on earth may find that the mind-stretching search for knowledge that space exploration required may be just what is needed to find the answers to the problems that plague us here on earth.

ORGANIZED CRIME FATTENS ON STOLEN SECURITIES

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in Albany, N.Y., earlier this week, Manhattan Assistant District Attorney Murray Gross told the Joint Legislative Committee on Crime that underworld wolves have infiltrated among the bears and bulls of Wall Street. Wall Street officials also urged legislation to require fingerprinting of all personnel in securities markets to curb thefts pegged at \$50 million a year. I have introduced such needed legislation in the face of growing evidence that organized crime has invaded the securities industry. The need for such legislation is urgent. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Patrick Young, of the National Observer, a hard-digging reporter from a hard-hitting newspaper, as proof of that urgency:

THE UNDER-THE-COUNTER MARKET: ORGANIZED CRIME FATTENS ON STOLEN SECURITIES

(By Patrick Young)

NEW YORK CITY.—The word is out along Wall Street and down Broad, through the narrow confines of Exchange Place and on the crowded sidewalks of Trinity Place. The bookies and loan sharks have passed it on to the clerks and secretaries who labor in the back offices of the brokerage houses here in the nation's financial center.

The message: Organized crime wants securities for its under-the-counter market in stolen stocks and bonds.

Organized crime's interest in Wall Street isn't a new phenomenon. "We have found evidence of their involvement there for at least eight years," says Frank Rogers, an assistant to District Attorney Frank Hogan. What is recent is the sharp increase in thefts of negotiable securities from brokerage houses here and elsewhere.

A precise figure is impossible to obtain. But Robert W. Haack, president of the New York Stock Exchange, estimates the loss of "lost or stolen" certificates at more than \$83,000,000 since 1966.

FOUR TIMES THE 1966 LOSS

In a letter to the House Commerce and Finance subcommittee Mr. Haack said lost or stolen securities reported by New York and American stock-exchange members totaled \$37,000,000 in 1967, more than four times the \$9,100,000 reported in 1966. Figures are not available yet for 1968, but Mr. Haack said indications are that they will total about \$37,000,000 again.

The thefts, whether organized or not, have wrought problems and changes in the securities industry. Among them:

Insurance. Both the New York and American exchanges require their member firms be fully bonded. Thus a theft costs the investing public nothing. But now some brokerage houses are finding it difficult to obtain bonds. Industry spokesmen say a number of insurance companies are refusing to write bonds or are tightening their requirements and hiking the cost.

"This type of insurance is getting less attractive to insurance companies because losses are mounting," reports James Ordling, secretary of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, a trade group for members of the New York Stock Exchange. "The point hasn't been reached where anyone has been unable to get insurance, but conceivably it could happen."

Insurance industry officials were bothered by Mr. Haack's estimate of recent losses. "That scared us when we saw it," says a staff member of the Surety Association of America. "He has later information than we have."

Security. "The main brokerage houses are becoming acutely aware of the situation," says an investigator here. "They're tightening up considerably." Several firms have hired former police detectives and FBI men to direct their security efforts.

Francis I. du Pont & Co., for example, has installed closed-circuit television and added extra guards. Employees working in the securities area must sign in, receive special badges to wear, shed their outer jackets, and don a company blazer before starting work. Other companies have instituted similar precautions.

The stock exchanges organized an industry committee last January. The group is to determine how many securities are actually stolen and how. Then it will devise methods to counter the back-office thefts. "The only answer to the insurance problem is that the securities industry make its back offices a lot more secure," says Mr. Ordling.

Legislation. The securities industry employs about 152,000 people in various capacities. Rep. John Murphy, New York Democrat, has introduced a bill that would allow the FBI to check the fingerprints of brokerage-house and stock-exchange employees. Insurance companies and national banks now are allowed this check against dishonest employees, but not the securities industry. A similar bill is pending in the New York Legislature to amend a state law that prohibits fingerprinting as a condition of employment, except for state, local-government, and hospital jobs.

THE PUBLIC-CONFIDENCE ISSUE

Securities industry spokesmen are leery of mentioning organized crime, a wariness that stems from concern that public confidence might suffer if a link between the mob and the industry is found. Said Mr. Haack of the thefts, "This could be viewed as evidence of organized crime, but cannot be presumed as conclusive."

Few investigators here, however, have doubts about organized crime's involvement in the thefts. "They've always been the only effective source of dispersment because of their far-flung contacts," says Mr. Rogers. "You'll find stocks stolen here on Monday being offered in Detroit, Miami, Chicago, or Philadelphia on Wednesday."

But serious as the problem is, the thefts represent a tiny fraction of the \$145 billion in securities traded on the New York Stock Exchange last year. "I don't think any one should run a headline saying organized crime is taking over the stock market, or even threatening its normal operations," cautions Ralph Salerno, an organized-crime consultant for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. "But they are behind the recent problem of thefts."

The root of the problem is the surge of securities trading that has engulfed the stock

exchanges and over-the-counter market in the last several years. Paper work has piled up and many brokerage-house books are confused. Securities are stacked on desks, on chairs, on tables, and on floors. Many back offices, says a partner in a small firm, are "amazingly sloppy. Many of the big firms and some of the small ones can't keep track of their securities." In this sort of confusion, a theft may go unnoticed for weeks or even months.

To fight the blizzard of back-office paper, brokerage houses have hired additional employees, some 25,000 last year. Added to this is the rapid turnover in low-paying jobs. Firms simply don't know the background of their employees.

Take Richard Locicero, nephew of an important mob member. He worked for three Wall Street firms within one month. On his third job, as a messenger, he reported to police that he was robbed of \$386,000 in securities. Locicero, two uncles, and three other men were later accused of the theft. On April 5, 1967, two days after Locicero appeared before a grand jury, he was murdered, stabbed more than 100 times.

Conversations with state and Federal investigators and crime authorities here and in Albany, Boston, and Washington, D.C., provide an outline of how securities are stolen and disposed of. Rule 1, says a Federal attorney: "They have got to have a man on the inside where these things are handled."

Organized criminals use two methods of obtaining stocks and bonds. First, their loan sharks and bookies encourage, some times with physical force, debtors who can't meet payments to lift securities. "They've got loan sharks hovering over Wall Street like vultures," says a state investigator. The word also is passed that a market exists. This appeals to light-fingered clerks who aren't above picking up some fast money.

CRIMINALS LIKE BLUE-CHIPS TOO

Sometimes, an inside man will be ordered to lift a particular stock or bond. Blue chips are favored by organized crime as they are by many investors. Sometimes the theft is a simple grab at anything. In 1962, someone stole more than \$200,000 worth of securities from a file drawer at Loeb, Rhoades & Co. All the securities started with "F." Detectives recovered the stock and arrested a close associate of a suspected mob leader when the man tried to sell the securities to an undercover agent.

An inside man may hit again and again. One brokerage house has reported three securities thefts since Jan. 1, totaling about \$300,000. "They're sure it's one employe, but they don't know absolutely who," says an official of the brokerage firm's insurance company.

A co-ordinated effort among New York, Massachusetts, and Canadian officials to gather information on organized crime has produced evidence that stolen securities are funneled back and forth between New York City and Boston, with many going to Toronto. "Intelligence reports are that organized crime is finding this an extremely lucrative field and they are becoming more involved," says Dennis Crowley, Jr., chief of Massachusetts Attorney General Robert H. Quinn's organized-crime section.

This two-nation investigation shows how little detail is really known about organized crime's stock disposal. The number of people involved and the exact methods used remain unknown at this time. But some insights are being gained.

WHAT THE ORIGINAL THEFT GETS

Most of the stolen stocks and bonds pass through three levels. The original thief receives about 3 per cent of the securities' value, though this may be considerably less in a large theft. The buyer or an associate moves the securities on to a third level,

usually out of the state or country, and receives roughly 5 cents on the \$1. The third level arranges for the securities use or disposal, receiving 10 per cent and up.

The disposal of stolen securities demonstrates the diverse contacts and methods of organized crime. First, the securities may be sold on the open market through legitimate brokerage houses. Fake identities and papers are arranged and an account is opened in a city far from the theft. A few legitimate trades may be made and then the stolen securities are offered for sale. Once the seller gets his cash, he disappears.

Sometimes a broker may be bribed. Organized mobsters got temporary control of several small over-the-counter trading firms in 1962. When the stock market took a mighty dip that year, they supplied loan-shark money to the firms to keep them solvent. Later, they called in the debts in cash and favors, using the firms to sell stolen securities.

Securities may also be sold or "rented" to businessmen. A Los Angeles man told Congressman Murphy last week that he was offered \$1,000,000 in securities for \$50,000. "He said they told him, 'We'll name the bank you can go to,'" Mr. Murphy says.

District Attorney Hogan's office arrested a Manhattan manufacturer named Bernard Kessel two weeks ago in a case that involved the use of \$1,250,000 in stolen securities as collateral on a bank loan. The complaint said Kessel paid \$70,000 to "rent" the stolen securities. Mr. Hogan's investigators say they haven't determined who got the rental fee.

Businessmen in debt to organized crime bookies or loan sharks may be forced to obtain loans and turn the money over to mob members. Sometimes this money goes out on the street for loan sharking, at rates of 20 per cent a week and more. The loan is paid off and renewed, giving the mob a source of funds for usury operations.

Stolen securities used as collateral are usually uncovered only when the loan payments are defaulted, as happened with Bernard Kessel. Few banks check securities put up as collateral to see if they are stolen. "A bank relies on the integrity of its borrower," explains an official of the American Bankers Association.

The theft of 5,000 shares of IBM stock from Hayden, Stone Inc., in New York City in 1966 illustrates how widely organized crime operates. Montreal police recovered 600 shares in October of that year with the arrest of two men who tried to sell the certificates to a bank. In November, Toronto police arrested a Boston man and his wife when they attempted to sell 100 shares of the stolen stock.

STOCK SHOWS UP IN PENNSYLVANIA

In February 1967, FBI agents, working on a tip from the Securities and Exchange Commission, recovered 2,600 shares of the IBM stock. The stock had been used as collateral to obtain a loan from a Pennsylvania insurance company. Two hundred more shares were recovered in Los Angeles last May, again after being used as collateral.

Fifteen hundred shares remain missing. Where are they? "Probably serving as collateral for some other loans," says one investigator.

Attempts to directly link high organized-crime leaders to stolen securities usually fail. The mob long ago established a system of "buffers," where orders come down from the top through a series of levels. Intelligence reports indicate that a high organized-crime leader in New England directs much of the traffic in stolen securities between Boston and New York and Toronto.

But law-enforcement people despair of ever proving this. "He uses other people," says one investigator. "He never talks about it on the telephone. He never touches the stuff. He just directs."

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY, MASSAPEQUA CHAPTER, THE ORDER OF THE SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a special tribute and my personal congratulations to the Massapequa chapter of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, celebrating its fifth anniversary in a noble and prestigious fraternal organization, and aspiring to bring to the American way of life the best of an ancient and honorable cultural heritage.

The Order of the Sons of Italy in America had its genesis in New York in 1905 and now, some 64 years later, has satisfactorily fulfilled the vision and ultimate ambition of its principal architects—the formation of what is today one on the biggest and most effective fraternal organizations in the Nation. It has proven that the forces of culture, knowledge, and brotherly love can, indeed, be organized so as to contribute materially to the building of a better people, a better nation, and a better world.

The Massapequa chapter, one of the newest affiliates of the highly respected order, is the largest in the United States. This in itself is a signal accomplishment, taking into consideration its 5 short years of existence. It has, by its deeds, not just words, clearly demonstrated the great good to society which can be derived from an organization working in unity and utilizing the best attributes of its heritage. The strongest testimonial to the success of this effort is the steady expansion of the chapter and its parent organization.

Its membership incorporates all segments of society. It is composed, in part, of those in government, as the Italian-American is fully aware of his civic and patriotic responsibility, a representative number currently serving in the U.S. Congress.

It is composed of individuals from the arts, an area in which the Italian-American is truly gifted, the great works of the talented Fresco artist, Constantino Brumidi, enhancing our beautiful and impressive Capitol Building in Washington.

It is composed of members of the clergy, outstanding citizens from the professional fields, and embraces individuals from every walk of life—men of wisdom and integrity, people who have worked, loved, fought, and died to build a tradition of liberty, justice, and freedom in our beloved country.

The judge or high official is brother to the laborer, because the relations of the members toward each other are governed by the three principles of the order—liberty, equality, and brotherly love.

The United States has been appropriately identified as "a nation of immigrants," and the Italian-American, always in the vanguard to improve and

perfect our great American heritage will, in his pursuit of excellence, also preserve his Italian heritage.

The purposes of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, as stated in the preamble of its constitution, merit commendation and support.

The preamble follows:

We, the members of the Order Sons of Italy in America, a fraternal organization, being a part of the United States of America, which we serve at all times with undivided devotion, and to whose progress we dedicate ourselves; united in the belief in God; conscious of being a representative element of an old civilization which has contributed to the enlightenment of the human spirit, and which through our activities, institutions and customs may enrich and broaden the pattern of the American way of life; realizing that through an intelligent and constant exercise of civic duties and rights, and obedience to the Constitution of the United States, we uphold and strengthen this Republic, in order to make known our objectives and insure their attainment through the harmonious functioning of all parts of our organization, the said Order Sons of Italy in America do hereby ordain and establish the following as our constitution:

ARTICLE I. PURPOSES

The Purposes of the Order are:

- (a) To enroll in its membership all persons of Italian birth or descent, regardless of religious faith or political affiliation, who believe in the fundamental concept that society is based upon principles of law and order, and who adhere to a form of government founded upon the belief in God and based upon the Constitution of the United States of America which government rests upon the proposition that all men are created equal and functions through the consent of the government.
- (b) To promote civic education among its members.
- (c) To uphold the concept of Americanism.
- (d) To encourage the dissemination of Italian culture in the United States.
- (e) To keep alive the spiritual attachment to the traditions of the land of our ancestors.
- (f) To promote the moral, intellectual and material well being of our membership.
- (g) To defend and uphold the prestige of the people of Italian birth or descent in America.
- (h) To encourage the active participation of our membership in the political, social and civic life of our communities.

(i) To organize and establish benevolent and social welfare institutions for the protection and assistance of our members, their dependents, and the needy in general, with such material aid as we are able to give.

(j) To initiate and organize movements for patriotic and humanitarian purposes, and to join in meritorious movements for such purposes which have been initiated by other organizations or groups.

I applaud the cause and determination of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America and offer my full support in its objectives.

THE COLLINS AMENDMENT

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, after a thorough study of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—

ESEA—I have decided that we need to clarify the whole issue of schoolbussing. Accordingly, my view has been printed as a portion of the Report of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, H.R. 514. I submit it to you now:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF JAMES M. COLLINS

I believe that an amendment to this act is needed to clarify the whole issue of schoolbussing, which is completely confused by amendments adopted in prior years which have little, if any, meaning. I think it is time that we all face the fact that schoolbussing to achieve "desegregation," "integration," "racial balance," "enrichment," or whatever term is applied in differing circumstances, has become a bitter local issue in virtually all sections of the Nation. It is an issue that ought to be settled locally without reference to the Federal programs funded under the acts amended by H.R. 514. Those programs have other purposes.

Throughout our committee hearings—and I attended them for a majority of the 22 days of hearings—it was constantly emphasized that the funds for ESEA are inadequate to do the job, particularly those allocated for disadvantaged pupils. I agree with that assessment from what I know of educational needs in my own area. Disadvantaged students desperately need additional, better qualified teachers; they desperately need better classroom space, fewer pupils per classroom, and better equipment and materials for instruction. To the extent that any of these funds are used for transportation, the disadvantaged pupil is being deprived of the essentials of education for a seat on the bus.

Accordingly, we should not permit the diversion of Federal funds to peripheral items like transportation. If local school officials feel that they must transport pupils for the purposes of any of these programs, then they should do so with local and State funds. Since nobody has suggested that the Federal funds pay the total costs of education, or even more than a small fraction of the costs, they should be reserved for essential expenditures.

The other point to be made—and a sound reason for adopting such an amendment—is that such a course would remove the Federal programs from the risk of becoming embroiled in extremely bitter local controversies, and to that extent would strengthen the programs and improve their acceptability in every section of the country.

I therefore reserve the right to offer such an amendment at the appropriate time.

JAMES M. COLLINS.

BYELORUSSIAN PEOPLE OBSERVE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On this date 51 years ago, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born.

In spite of all of its sacrifices, the young state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was created in its place, is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government and does not

represent the will of the Byelorussian people.

This is the reason why March 25 is celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations.

Americans of Byelorussian descent join in this celebration with the fervent hope that freedom eventually will be restored for their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Byelorussia have been deprived of the right of self-determination by the Soviet Union, yet they have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit this spirit and determination to be in vain.

INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has made clear the intent of his administration to preserve the integrity of our university system. His forthright stand opposing morally arrogant individuals who would destroy the university is coupled with an understanding of the basic principles of higher education: that universities and colleges are places in which men are judged by achievement and merit, and that violence or the threat of violence should never be permitted to influence actions, ideas, or judgments in the academic community.

The intent of the administration to enforce congressional prohibitions against grants and loans to students who would destroy a university is appropriate; but no more so than the calm and reasoned understanding of the need for change on our campuses and the responsibility of the universities to implement legitimate reforms.

There are hopeful signs on a number of campuses that faculty and students are reaffirming basic principles of academic freedom, defending the universities from dangers posed by advocates of violence. Fred Hechinger has written an excellent article describing these developments.

I include the Hechinger article from the New York Times of Sunday, March 23, and the statements of President Nixon and Secretary Finch at this point as part of a continuing effort to bring to the attention of my colleagues materials relating to campus disturbances: [From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1969]

EDUCATION

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"Though I am but a freshman, I hope I have enough voice to make you listen; assuredly I have anger enough." So wrote a Columbia College student in a letter to The Spectator, the school's undergraduate daily.

The student's anger was not aimed at an autocratic, repressive university administration; rather, it was aimed at what he regarded as the university's failure to prevent or punish the disruptive actions of the stu-

dents for a Democratic Society. The student charged that "a climate of timorous inaction on the one side and such emboldened anarchy on the other" have made the campus "unfit for living, let alone study."

The letter is, of course, couched in the rhetoric of youthful exaggeration that matches the style of the New-Left radicals. But it is symptomatic of a new trend that seemed to be growing last week—a trend in which liberal and moderate students and faculty members are demanding an end to violence and disruption.

This trend is different from the backlash by right-wing groups, conservative alumni and reactionary legislators who stand ready to subdue campuses with punitive laws and fiscal sanctions. It is different, too, from such "get tough" court actions as the 15-day jail sentences meted out last week to 21 students at the State University at Stony Brook for an all-night sit-in in the library. Such conservative counteraction was to be expected.

Indeed, President Nixon's long-awaited message yesterday confirmed the growing feeling that, rather than unleash the punitive powers of the Federal Government, the politically wiser and certainly educationally preferable course is to put the major burden on the universities to put their house in order and deal with the rebellion in their own way. It is unlikely that, in view of much popular anger at student excesses, the White House would have been so conciliatory if there were not a growing sense that moderation within the campuses may be gaining the upper hand.

The Chronicle of Higher Education, a publication supported by the Carnegie Corporation, reports that since mid-February and the beginning of March protest actions of varying intensity took place on at least 54 campuses; it also noted the rising tide of opposition and cited growing liberal concern that the reaction to radical activism is beginning to smother attempts at educational reforms.

Both at Harvard and at Columbia, influential senior faculty members have recently denounced disruptive protests. The Columbia manifesto was signed by more than 100 professors, among them the institution's most distinguished names. Warning that "attempts to disrupt or prevent the holding of classes are a matter of urgent concern," they demanded that the committee on discipline (a newly established body composed of faculty, students and administration) take effective action to protect the freedom to teach and learn.

At Brandeis University, after several incidents of arson, President Morris B. Abram warned that unless universities "find the way to protect the rights of the lawful against the lawless," they will become garrison communities and "cease to be places of freedom and learning." He added that any member of the campus found to have been involved in acts of sabotage will be expelled and prosecuted in criminal court.

At Cornell—where three students were violently assaulted in an apparent confrontation between blacks and whites and the university's president, Dr. James Perkins, was pushed off the podium by a student—the undergraduate newspaper is beginning to ask for effective enforcement of safety on campus.

Harris Wofford, Jr., the liberal president of the New York State University College at Old Westbury and former Peace Corps aide to President Kennedy, in commenting on the Cornell incident, said: "When necessary we must be prepared to enforce the rule of reason by university action, by court injunction, and even by criminal prosecution of those who turn to force. That is unfortunate but not frightening. . . . We should know—as we hope the destructive minority will learn—that the old law of an eye-for-an-eye-for-an-eye leaves everybody blind."

At Michigan State University, more than 10,000 students signed petitions condemning "intimidation, violence, and disruption."

A growing opposition by liberals and moderates could create a totally new balance of power; for it is that liberal and moderate sector—undoubtedly the majority at most major institutions—that alone can render the radical left influential by joining it in the fight for specific, liberal issues, such as the opposition to the Vietnam war, equality for the races, and so on.

Ironically, it was David B. Truman, the former vice president of Columbia University, who expressed his fear—months before last year's student uprising there—that the radical students' tactics would eventually pit students against students. He considered such a confrontation a much more serious threat to the future of higher education than the skirmishes between students and administration.

That this danger persists at Columbia was underscored last week by an extraordinary, full-page editorial in the Daily Spectator, headlined "The University Politicized." (One editorial board member registered his dissent.)

The editorial took what appears to be the current hard line of student radicalism that Columbia is a hostile force exactly because it is a liberal institution.

"Liberalism, which once appeared to satisfy this nation's needs and desires, is now bankrupt," the editorial said. It concluded that since "the liberal politics of the university have cast it in the role of supporting a sick society, we must commit ourselves to transforming the politics of the university by resorting to whatever means prove necessary."

If this represents the radical view (as seems to be the case on many troubled campuses), then it appears virtually inevitable that the battle between students and students will soon enter a critical new phase, paralleled by a similar battle between the radical faculty (especially the younger, non-tenured ranks) and the majority of liberals.

This introduces an entirely new factor in the universities' internal line-up. It had clearly been the intent of the New Left, by selecting issues on which the university administrations were vulnerable—such as war-related research and inadequate response to the needs of the racial minorities—to radicalize the liberals.

But it now appears that the radicals miscalculated the liberals' commitment to non-violence, rational dialogue and legality. While to radicals these elements are expendable luxuries, they are indispensable to the liberal philosophy.

When it appeared that violent or disruptive tactics were not (as originally claimed) merely the reluctant, last-resort response to police busts but part of the movement's ideology itself, the liberals began to plan their own strategies to stop the radicals. In other words, the radicals may indeed have managed to radicalize the liberal campus majority, but as a force *against* rather than for violent revolution.

NIXON TEXT: INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM IS IN DANGER

This week the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has sent a letter to the presidents of the institutions of higher education in the nation calling attention to the provisions enacted by law by the 90th Congress which provide for the withdrawal of various forms of federal support to students found guilty of violation of criminal statutes in connection with campus disorders.

He did this in the exercise of his responsibility as the Cabinet officer chiefly charged with the routine enforcement of federal laws pertaining to education, however, the state of our campuses have for some time been anything but routine.

I should like to take this occasion to make some more general comments which I hope may be of some assistance in moderating the present turmoil.

REGULATIONS MODERATE

First, a measure of perspective is in order with regard to the action of the previous Congress. The new regulations are moderate, and they are justified. It is one of the oldest of the practices of universities and colleges that privileges of various kinds are withdrawn from students judged to have violated the rules and regulations of their institution. Congress has done no more than to withdraw federal assistance from those students judged, not by university regulations, but by courts of law, to have violated criminal statutes.

Almost by definition, given the present tactics of disruption, anyone so convicted may fairly be assumed to have been assaulting the process of free inquiry which are the very life of learning. Any society that will not protect itself against such assault exhibits precious little respect for intellect, compared to which the issue of public order is very near to de minimis.

For there is a second issue, of far greater concern to me, and, as I believe, to the Congress, to the American people generally, and the faculties and students of American colleges and universities especially. That is the preservation of the integrity, the independence, and the creativity of our institutions of higher learning.

VIOLENCE NORMAL

Freedom—intellectual freedom—is in danger in America. The nature and content of that danger is as clear as any one thing could be. Violence—physical violence, physical intimidation—is seemingly on its way to becoming an accepted, or at all events a normal and not to be avoided element in the clash of opinion within university confines.

Increasingly it is clear that this violence is directed to a clearly perceived and altogether too conceivable objective: Not only to politicize the student bodies of our educational institutions, but to politicize the institutions as well. Anyone with the least understanding of the history of freedom will know that this has invariably meant not only political disaster to those nations that have submitted to such forces of obfuscation and repression, but cultural calamity as well. It is not too strong a statement to declare that this is the way civilizations begin to die.

The process is altogether too familiar to those who would survey the wreckage of history. Assault and counter assault, one extreme leading to the opposite extreme; the voices of reason and calm discredited. As Yeats foresaw: "Things fall apart; the center cannot hold . . ." none of us has the right to suppose it cannot happen here.

The first thing to do at such moments is to reassert first principles. The federal government cannot, should not—must not—enforce such principles. That is fundamentally the task and the responsibility of the university community. But any may state what these principles are, for they are as widely understood as they are cherished.

First, that universities and colleges are places of excellence in which men are judged by achievement and merit in defined areas. The independence and competence of the faculty, the commitment, and equally the competence of the student body, are matters not to be compromised.

The singular fact of American society—the fact which very likely distinguishes us most markedly from any other nation on earth, is that in the untroubled pursuit of an application of this principle we have created the largest, most democratic, most open system of higher learning in history. None need fear the continued application of those principles; but all must dread their erosion.

The second principle—and I would argue, the only other—is that violence or the threat of violence may never be permitted to influence the actions or judgements of the university community. Once it does the community, almost by definition, ceases to be a university.

PRIMARY INSTRUMENT

It is for this reason that from time immemorial expulsion has been the primary instrument of university discipline. Those who would not abide the rules of the community of learning have simply been required to leave it, for any other form of coercion would cause that community to change its fundamental nature.

The difficulty of this moment, as of most times when fundamental principles are challenged, is that many of those posing the challenges, and even more of those supporting them, are responding to very basic problems. To reassert, in the fact of student protest, the first principles of academic freedom, while ignoring the issues that are foremost in the minds of those students, is less than inglorious: it is slothful, and dishonest, an affront to those principles and in the end futile.

MANY WRONGS

Students today point to many wrongs which must be made right:

We have seen a deprofessionalization of the educational experience. Our institutions must reshape themselves lest this turns to total alienation.

Student unrest does not exist in a vacuum but reflects a deep and growing social unrest affecting much of our world today. Self-righteous indignation by society will solve none of this. We must resolve the internal contradictions of our communities.

There must be university reform including new experimentation in curricula such as ethnic studies, student involvement in the decision making process and a new emphasis in faculty teaching.

I have directed the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to launch new initiatives toward easing tensions in our educational community.

This administration will always be receptive to suggestions for constructive reform. But the forces of separation and non-reason must be replaced by vigorous, persuasive and lawful efforts for constructive change.

SECRETARY FINCH'S LETTER

Here is the text of the letter Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch sent to the presidents of universities, colleges, junior colleges and community colleges:

"It is my responsibility as the official chiefly charged with enforcement of federal laws pertaining to education, to bring to your attention the recently enacted federal laws relating to violations by students of criminal statutes.

"The provisions enacted are included under Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (p.l. 90-575) and Section 411 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act, 1969 (p.l. 90-557). For your information, I am enclosing copies of these provisions as enclosures to this letter.

"In view of the continued public debate over student unrest and the legitimate bounds of dissent, I ask that you bring to the attention of your students the applicable provisions of these laws and advise them of the procedures you intend to follow in complying with them.

"CONGRESS HAS SPOKEN

"It is important for all concerned to understand that Congress has spoken on this issue and that the law must be enforced. I hope at the same time that you will take the opportunity to review university policy and

regulations with regard to student participation in campus affairs in order to guarantee that in maintaining order on the campus the right of legitimate and responsible dissent is fully protected.

"I would suggest that these provisions be fully discussed by all parties at your institution—trustees, administrators, faculty members, students, and where possible, parents.

"I hope that a thorough understanding of these provisions would enable you to better determine the ways and means by which your institution will deal with this legislation.

"I am well aware that the implementation of the enforcement procedures established by Congress will require a reasonable amount of time, and that we are involved in areas fraught with tension and emotion.

"Under the legislation, the burden of administration falls upon the institutions. We in HEW will do our best to work with you in this difficult area."

THE FOUNDATIONS BRING A BONANZA TO CANTON AREA

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the questionable operations of a few of the very large tax-free foundations has been the subject of considerable comment in Congress, press, and radio of late. I am indebted to the Canton, Ohio, Repository for an excellent article that helps to set the record straight by reporting the outstanding accomplishments of foundations in our locality.

This article may serve as a caution signal to those who wish to take restrictive action against all foundations because of the activities of a few.

The Timken Foundation, the Hoover Foundation, and the Stark County Foundation have contributed tremendously to the well-being of Stark County, Ohio, as the Repository article points out. I am certain this story can be repeated in other localities where public-spirited citizens have used the foundation system to improve their communities.

The article follows:

THE FOUNDATIONS BRING A BONANZA TO CANTON AREA

(NOTE.—Congress is taking a look at the activities of the nation's 20,000 charitable foundations. It has found what look like some "bad apples" in the barrel. Not so in the Canton community, reporter William V. Merriman finds in this study of the foundations which have contributed millions to Canton area community projects.)

(By William V. Merriman)

A west window in The Timken Foundation's offices, eight floors up in the Cleve-Tusc Building, frames the setting:

In the foreground, an American flag whipping in the wind over Timken Vocational High School in downtown Canton.

Behind it, a mile or so to the northwest, the sun reflecting from a 10-story wing under construction at Timken Mercy Hospital.

It's an appropriate view, looking through that window. Timken Foundation money put some of it there—the \$2.2 million high school, a job-training showplace since 1939, and the 13-year-old hospital, built on Tim-

ken Estate land and much of it with foundation funds.

Then there's Central Plaza, for which the foundation gave \$432,000. Malone College, to which Timken has given \$1 million. The \$10 million Cultural Center for the Arts now rising on the old Harter Estate between 9th and 12th sts. NW.

The contributions—\$24 million since the late H. H. Timken Sr. and his sisters, Amelia C. Bridges and Cora Timken Burnett, established the foundation in 1934—also include:

Aultman Hospital (\$3.7 million), Canton Art Institute (\$223,000), Canton Public Library Association (\$271,000), Canton Jewish Community Center (\$100,000), Canton Park Department (\$110,000).

Establishment of Canton Housing Commission (\$100,000), Riverside Park in northeast Canton (\$193,000), Jackson Park swimming pool (\$127,000), Mount Union College (\$846,000), National Professional Football Hall of Fame (\$50,000), Stark Wilderness Center (\$67,500), Joint Walsh-Malone College Campaign (\$250,000).

Is this the type of charitable trust under attack on Capitol Hill for abusing its tax-free status?

Richard C. Baker, treasurer of Timken Foundation, doesn't believe so.

Nor do officials of Stark County's two other major foundations—the Hoover Foundation and Stark County Foundation.

They concede a few of the nation's 20,000 foundations might be "rotten apples"—those which contribute to a study of the "origin and significance of the decorative types of medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina" or educational purposes like paying college tuition of the founder's children or to "gay living and partying of twin sisters" the founder befriended.

"There's no question a foundation in competition with other private business or one set up as a tax dodge should be taxed," says W. D. Hunter, executive secretary of Stark County Foundation.

Mr. Baker agrees, but warns: "Let's not use a shotgun to shoot down a few bad foundations."

He sees this approach developing in Washington, with proposals to tax foundations' income a straight 20 per cent, require them to disburse all income annually, disclose all activities and own no more than 3 per cent of a corporation.

Would Stark County's major foundations be affected by these rules, among tax reforms being considered by the U.S. House Ways and Means Committee?

Very much, if some of the limitations are adopted, say local foundation officials.

Disclosing activities would cause no problems for their foundations, they agree. This is done right now.

But they object to a tax on foundation income and a requirement that all income be given away each year.

A tax merely would dilute the ability of the foundations to continue helping the Stark County community, they are convinced.

Expenditure of all income each year, they predict, would lead to donating money just for the sake of donating money. It would prevent them from holding funds for major projects—like the cultural center.

Foundations are like individuals and corporations under the federal income tax laws. If they donate to charitable or nonprofit enterprises for community benefit, their donations are tax-deductible.

Since foundations presumably contribute all their income for such purposes, they pay no income taxes.

What is causing Congress to take a new look at foundations are such activities as providing a baked potato at every meal for Bryn Mawr College girls, or an annual "Christmas meal" of a bushel of oats for hungry Kansas City horses, or supporting a

Negro voter registration drive in Cleveland that helped elect Carl Stokes as mayor.

Some Washington eyebrows went up when the Ford Foundation, one of the nation's most respected giants in the field, issued \$131,000 worth of study-travel grants to eight former aides of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

The big ones in the Canton community, however, have been donating all their money to projects whose purposes seem to fall well within the guidelines set up by Congress in the first place—guidelines aimed at encouraging generosity for the good of a community.

"We know a few foundations are involved in questionable activities but ours and most others are following the letter of the law and are contributing to worthwhile, nonprofit organizations," said J. S. Hoover, secretary and assistant chairman of The Hoover Co.

Timken Foundation, with assets of \$39 million, is Stark County's largest.

Hoover Foundation, established in 1945, has assets of \$13.7 million.

Stark County Foundation, set up in 1963 with half of the initial \$4.5 million provided from a trust created by Edward A. Langenbach, late Canton industrialist, and the other half from the Timken Foundation, has assets of \$5 million.

Other charitable trusts topping \$1 million here are Timken International Foundation (\$4.2 million) and Timken Roller Bearing Co. Charitable Trust (\$4 million).

In all, 38 Stark County charitable trusts are listed by the most recent U.S. Internal Revenue Service records.

Their assets: \$69 million.

Average annual income, as reported to IRS since 1964: \$6.8 million.

Tax paid on the income: Zero.

Donations made by the foundations in latest annual reports: \$2 million.

Among Hoover Foundation donations in the past two years were \$262,000 to educational activities and institutions, \$220,000 to Aultman and Timken Mercy hospitals, \$419,000 for the new North Canton Community Building YMCA, \$75,000 to North Canton Library, \$340,000 for land for a North Canton City Hall, \$100,000 to the United Fund, \$10,000 for a lake at Stark Wilderness Center and \$12,000 for conservation programs.

Stark County Foundation gifts have included \$250,000 to the Aultman-Timken Mercy hospitals' building fund, \$50,000 to Malone College, \$30,000 to Stark Wilderness Center, \$25,000 to Walsh College, \$24,000 to Stark County Department of Education for a hearing van, \$10,000 each to the Massillon City Hospital building fund and Massillon Museum, \$6,000 to Massillon Boys Club, \$17,000 to Canton Park Commission, \$17,400 to Planned Parenthood of Stark County and \$6,000 to Stark County Historical Society.

It is contributing \$200,000 to the joint Walsh-Malone fund drive.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Byelorussian origin will mark on March 25 the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of that Republic, swallowed up all too soon by the Bolshevik-Russian Government. A Soviet Socialist Republic was created in its stead, to camouflage the efforts which the people had made to seek freedom and independence.

The history of these peoples in an area today occupied by about eight million people in some 81,000 square miles is proof of the steadfast desire for liberty which burns brightly despite the rigid controls both of czarist Russia and now the Communists.

The marking of the anniversary of short-lived democratic statehood serves to recall the growth of that country in the days prior to World War I, building and generating Byelorussian interest in their national culture, setting the clear aim which Americans must support, of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, free from the tyranny imposed upon them.

VICA'S "REPORT TO THE NATION"

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America are a fine example of how the energies of youth can be channeled for the betterment of our society. Consequently, it gives me great pleasure to insert into the RECORD VICA's "Report to the Nation" which was prepared by Mr. Ronald Wright, VICA Region II vice president. I would urge my colleagues to read this report to learn of the great work being performed by many of our youths. The report follows:

REPORT TO THE NATION

(By Ronald Wright)

VICA—the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America—is about to begin its fifth year as the National organization for youth in industrial education. Our founding date is less than three months away—it was in May 1965 that VICA was founded by youth eager to work together and build an organization of opportunity.

Today, we can look back over four exciting years—years of work and planning and, yes, fun. We can look back at the successful National Conferences and past Officers Conferences where so much dreaming and planning took place. We can look back and remember the high hopes of those youth who first proudly began VICA and we can say, without hesitation, I think, that they can still be proud—as VICA moves ahead.

VICA is about to begin its fifth year as the National Organization for youth in industrial education. We can look around us today and be glad for the warm friends who are here sharing today with us. You represent education . . . business and industry . . . labor . . . government. The past three years would not have been possible without you as friends, as supporters and . . . sometimes . . . as helpful critics.

It has become a tradition for us—the state and national officers of VICA—to invite our friends here in order that we can keep you informed and up-to-date on what we are doing. Because we know that you share our interest in the advancement of industrial youth and that you do care about the future of VICA.

The past year has been a busy one. Our membership has grown to over 75,000. Four new state associations—Delaware, Florida, Vermont and Utah—were presented with their charter at our last national meeting. Two other states—Alabama and Kentucky—have joined and will be officially chartered

this June. This brings us to a total of 37 state associations. We're happy to report that students from Massachusetts have taken advantage of the opportunity for direct affiliation with National VICA.

Perhaps most important is the fact that over 1,000 of our members this year are post-secondary students in area vocational schools, junior and community colleges. Their admission to what was originally an all-high school organization was approved earlier this year and the post-secondary division will be officially chartered in June at the Fifth National Leadership Conference. We expect it to really *take off* after that!

VICA has gathered support from many new organizations, through our Foundation this year. New to the growing ranks of contributors were Brodhead-Garrett Company; Clairol, Incorporated; the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the National Restaurant Association. Others of our earlier supporters are here and we extend warm thanks to all of you.

A great deal of planning and dreaming and work has gone into our conception of a National Leadership Center for Industrial Youth Development, which VICA hopes to construct in the future in the Washington area. It is our hope to better serve industrial youth with facilities for leadership sessions, and to provide an educational center for research and development of leadership training materials, publications and techniques, and to provide housing for the National staff and services. The National Advisory Council on Trade and Industrial Education has endorsed the Center proposal and will offer support in its development.

We have made what we know to be a firm friend this year in the National Association of Manufacturers. The NAM has wholeheartedly endorsed VICA. NAM Education Committee Chairman Roland Bixler has stated that the committee would cooperate with VICA in attaining its goals and "every effort should be made by the business community to support education for those who wish to pursue industrial education."

Another project very close to our hearts is the desire to share the opportunity of VICA with the youth of the inner-city areas who need vocational direction and motivation . . . just as we do. Initial thought and planning began during this past year on establishing a demonstration project in the heart of one of our nation's large metropolitan areas. The possibilities of VICA are boundless in this area and we hope that those interested and involved will share the chance to make the possibilities realities.

Yes . . . VICA is about to begin its fifth year as the National organization for youth in industrial education. It is good to look back and to share pleasurable memories of what has gone before but, even more, VICA likes to look ahead. With hard work and dedication, it will be a good future. Will you share the future with us?

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S TOP LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER RETIRES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to a most dedicated public servant. Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague is retiring as the Post Office Department's top law enforcement officer. During his years with the Department, Mr. Montague dili-

gently tackled the problems of postal law violations. We all know how the number of crimes committed has risen dramatically over the past decade. Postal crimes are no exception. The task of the Chief Postal Inspector has indeed been formidable. Mr. Montague has performed it exceedingly well.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Montague at the House Appropriations Committee and in my continuous contacts with the Post Office Department. He has always been most helpful and cooperative.

I would like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Evening Star on March 11, 1969. It is a fitting comment to a fine individual and a dedicated servant.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 11, 1969]

TOP BATTLER OF POSTAL CRIME RETIRING, LEAVES SKILLED CORPS

Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague, who has fought record postal crime with record arrests and convictions of postal law violators, is retiring as the Post Office Department's top law enforcement officer.

Although his retirement actually became effective February 28, he is staying on the job to assist in the transition of the law enforcement responsibility to the new administration.

The 57-year-old chief took office at the start of the Kennedy administration. During his years in the top spot, he has seen post office burglaries and holdups reach an all-time high, mail fraud drain a conservatively estimated \$500 million a year from the public, organized crime got deeply involved in credit card frauds and merchandise swindles, and apartment letter boxes being rifled by the tens of thousands—usually to get at checks arriving on a predictable schedule.

To cope with a postal crime rise which clearly reflects the spiraling nationwide crime rate, Montague developed a corps of specialists and adapted automatic data processing to show him where his specialists were needed most.

QUICK TAB ON OPEN CASES

In mail fraud, for example, his data processing equipment gave him a print-out at month's end showing how many cases were open in each area of mail fraud—how many new medical frauds, chain referral schemes, land frauds, debt consolidation, home improvement rackets, and other schemes affecting young married couples and fixed-income older people. As each new scheme surfaced, Montague deployed the specialists to meet it.

He increased the number of men assigned to mail fraud because he was particularly aware of the social effects of gimmick selling and pie-in-the-sky schemes on ghetto residents. He represented the Post Office Department on the President's Consumer Commission.

To deal with steadily climbing armed robberies of post offices and postal trucks, Montague provided better firearms, more radio equipment and the first radio cars in the Postal Inspection Service. Currently, post office holdups are running at the highest rate in U.S. history.

Postal inspectors now have base radio stations in most big cities, which direct the radio cars not only in postal robberies and burglaries but also in dealing with one of the commonest of postal crimes—letter box thefts in big cities.

FAST ACTION REQUIRED

To get the thieves, inspectors have to move fast and they're on the street ready to move in response to radio calls. Postal inspectors'

investigations of mail box thefts resulted in 6,104 arrests last year.

Montague has emphasized more training all along the lines—more firearms training, more training in specialized areas, even university-administered correspondence courses.

The training paid off with the arrest of 14,339 individuals on postal violations last year, an all-time high. The 11,474 convictions last year also were a record.

A veteran of 32 years with the Post Office Department, more than 26 of them as a postal inspector, Montague last December was awarded the highest career honor the Post Office Department can give—the Distinguished Service Award.

Postmaster General Winton M. Blount yesterday hailed Montague as representing the "finest product of the postal career service tradition of advancement of dedicated careerists through the ranks."

FRANK M. CRUGER, OF INDIANAPOLIS, WRITES "POINTERS ON PREPARING AN EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK" FOR SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the smartest moves ever made by Federal Government agencies and departments was to tap the vast reservoir of knowledge, skill, and experience found among private businessmen. This is especially so when the department or agency is charged with helping others set up, operate, and maintain their own businesses.

Mr. Frank M. Cruger, of Indianapolis, is chairman of the National Affairs Committee, National Industrial Distributors Association, of Philadelphia, and president of the Indiana Manufacturers Supply Co. He was asked by the Small Business Administration to use his own skills and talents to write, for SBA use and distribution, a document in their management aids series for small manufacturers.

Mr. Cruger's product, entitled "Pointers on Preparing an Employee Handbook," has now been published by SBA as Management Aid No. 197. To date, more than 50,000 copies have been requested, which certainly proves its worth and value to the small business community.

It is a pleasure to insert the text of the handbook in tribute to Mr. Cruger and all his fellow businessmen who so generously give of their time and talents, so they may be shared with others who are just beginning. This is in the finest American tradition and something the value of which cannot be calculated.

The above-mentioned follows:

POINTERS ON PREPARING AN EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK

(By Frank M. Cruger)

SUMMARY

Time was when employee handbooks were considered a frill which only large companies could afford. But no longer. Owner-managers of many small businesses now use handbooks to give employees information on policies, wages, and employee benefits.

This *Aid* points out that a successful handbook should include what employees need to know as well as what the owner-manager wants them to know. Suggestions are given on subjects to include, on presentation, and on format.

Nothing takes the place of face-to-face conversation with employees, both old and new. But the owner-manager often finds that he does less and less of it as a growing business increases the demands on his time.

Although an employee handbook will not replace personal contacts, it can help an owner-manager in getting vital information to employees. You should think about issuing one if you want your employees, old and new, to understand:

What you expect of them and what they can expect of you.

What your policies on wages, working conditions, and benefits are.

How much time, thought, and money go into making their jobs secure.

What your company's service to customers is.

What place your company has in the community and the industry.

What makes a job in your company good and permanent employment.

CONTENTS OF A HANDBOOK

An employee handbook can cover many subjects. See the sample table of contents of this *Aid*. A new employee's interest is apt to center around three sections of the handbook—sections number 5, 6, and 7. He wants to know what information he needs to get along on the job, what his benefits are, and what, if any, services the company offers him.

EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK: SAMPLE TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1—Welcome Message.
- 2—History of the Company.
- 3—This Is Our Business.
- 4—You and Your Future.
- 5—What You Will Need To Know.
 - Working Hours
 - Reporting To Work
 - "Time Clock"
 - Rest Periods
 - Absence From Work
 - Reporting Absences
 - Employment Record
 - Pay Period
 - Shift Premiums
 - Safety and Accidents Prevention
 - Use of Telephones
 - How To Air Complaints
- 6—These Are Your Benefits.
 - Vacations
 - Holidays
 - Group Insurance
 - Hospitalization & Surgical Benefits
 - Free Parking
 - Training Program
 - Christmas Bonus
 - Savings Plan
 - Profit-Sharing Plan
 - Suggestion Awards
 - Jury Duty
 - Military Leave
 - U.S. Old Age Benefits
 - Unemployment Compensation
 - Service Awards
- 7—These Special Services Are For You.
 - Credit Union
 - Education Plans
 - Medical Dispensary
 - Employee Purchases
 - Company Cafeteria
 - Monthly Magazine
 - Annual Outing
 - Bowling League
 - Baseball Team
- 8—Index or Table of Contents.

Spelling out this information in a handbook gives the new employee a reference source. Even if your initial interview with him is long, few individuals can absorb many details about several subjects at one sitting.

Moreover, when an owner-manager talks at great length, some new employees may write him off as "an old windbag."

WHAT EMPLOYEES NEED TO KNOW. To fit in with old employees, a new man needs to know the working hours, lunch and other breaks, time clock regulations, and reporting of absence.

He also needs to know about his wages and payday. In discussing wages and other figures that may change from time to time, it is a good idea to keep figures to a minimum. If your handbook makes a general statement, for example, about wages, you can issue a mimeographed sheet on the detailed figures. In this way, you can keep your handbook from becoming out-of-date when you grant the next wage increase.

Your employee handbook also should tell the new employee whom to see when he has questions or problems connected with his work.

BENEFITS AND SERVICES. The newcomer is interested in the benefits and services your company offers. This discussion in your handbook should be factual so that employees can refer to it when they have questions.

Even though many people don't care what a thing costs someone else, it does not hurt to remind employees of the cost of their benefits—such as vacations and health and life insurance. Making them aware that benefits and services are part of your overhead may help them to realize the need for their cooperation in your cost reduction campaigns.

One company ends its section on special services by saying: "These facts mean that we can afford to maintain these plans only as long as the company operates successfully. That depends on the cooperation and efforts of every one here. We hope you make possible this extra security for you and your family. That's the way things work at (name of company): The better the job each of us does, the brighter the future will be."

Examples of services which you will want to mention are the opportunity to buy company products at a discount, the first-aid station, the low-cost cafeteria lunch, and sports activities.

SKETCHING "THE BIG PICTURE"

A welcome message and sections on the history of the company, and "our business," and the employee's future provide an opportunity for the owner-manager to sketch "the big picture" for new employees. Sincerity and simplicity are the keys to presenting these sections. The temptation to editorialize or "preach a sermon" should be avoided because some employees are apt to regard "the big picture" as propaganda.

WELCOME MESSAGE. The welcome message should convey a feeling of friendly interest to the new employee. There are as many ways of expressing a welcome as there are presidents of small companies. Here are two examples.

"I am pleased that you have decided to join us at—(company name). I hope our association will be a long and beneficial one. Our company has a history of more than 20 years of service to our customers. It has grown because of the efforts of each employee. Our future looks bright. But it will present challenges. I am counting on your help in meeting those challenges.

"We know that in return for your support the company is obligated to make your employment as satisfying as possible. Our wage policies and benefit programs are designed to make the company a good place to work. We also emphasize intelligent human relations in our day-to-day contacts.

"You will find out that our company tries to be a good citizen in this community. I hope that you will, if you are not already doing so, participate in worthwhile civic projects.

"Please call on any of us to help you become established in your new job. And again, thank you for joining us."

The second example emphasizes the importance of the employee's job as follows:

"This company is in the service business. Efficient service depends on each employee doing his or her job correctly and promptly. Each job in this company is important. If it wasn't, it would be eliminated quickly.

"I urge you never to lose sight of the importance of your job to the overall effectiveness of our company. Whether customers continue to give us their business depends on the manner in which you and your fellow employees do your work."

It is a good idea to include the owner-manager's picture in the welcoming message. The message should end with a facsimile signature rather than his printed name.

HISTORY. Whether you include a section on the history of your company depends on its age and the significance of past events. When past events are impressive, information about them can help to instill pride in the company and its importance to the community, customers, and employees.

Emphasize the growth of the company through past service to customers and the role employees played in that progress. Tie the past to the present by pointing out that satisfied customers are the company's only assurance of continued sales and jobs.

This section should be brief. It should not be a biographical sketch of the founders and their successors. It can follow the "Welcome" section or it can be the last page of the book. There, it re-emphasizes the sense of participation for the new employee.

THIS IS "OUR BUSINESS." Some owner-managers assume that employees are familiar with the company's products, services, and sales. Often the fact is that employees are ignorant of, or misinformed about, such pertinent facts. This section provides the opportunity to correct this condition. It should be brief and give employees the facts they need to feel that it is "our" business rather "your" business. If the owner-manager does not convince employees that they play an important role in the company's success, who will?

YOU AND YOUR FUTURE. In this section, the owner-manager talks to the employee's pocketbook. His future pocketbook, you might say.

The discussion should cover policies and procedures on wage reviews and promotion. It should spell out who is responsible for making performance and wage reviews and when they are scheduled.

If you have a profit sharing plan for employees, explain it in this section. Emphasize the features that make it worthwhile to remain with your company.

Also if you have a payroll savings plan for buying U.S. Savings Bonds and/or a stock participation plan, tell employees about them. Urge them to use the plan to help make their future secure.

Information about service awards might also be included.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT PROFIT

After "the big picture" has been discussed, it is a good idea to remind employees of the basis of their security with the company. They should be aware that a business must make a profit in order to grow and provide jobs and employee benefits.

Your handbook might say, for example: "And Just A Few Words About Profit.

"Your job and mine are dependent on the success of this company. It takes money to make jobs and it takes profits to keep the company growing. If we are to expand, a profitable history will enable us to obtain necessary funds. You wouldn't invest your money in a losing company.

"To afford the benefits you've just read about we must make a profit. Our future depends on doing our jobs to the best of our

ability. Our efficiency will produce the necessary profits to assure our continued expansion and our maintaining our position to the field.

"You and I have seen many businesses lose sight of the need for profit and go broke. Let's all work together for our successful future."

THE WRITING

An employee handbook should speak to the point. Employees are not interested in unnecessary details. Nor are they taken in by long phrases that say little or nothing.

The writing should also be consistent. Here, the approach determines the style. Will it be a formal approach? An informal one? A "folksy" one?

Not every owner-manager can write clearly or has assistants who can. Local writers—such as newspaper reporters—or high school teachers of English or journalism may be available on a fee basis. They might edit the owner-manager's draft to improve its readability. Or they might write the handbook, using facts which he supplies.

THE FORMAT

The booklet should be attractive. The objective is to invite the reader's attention and hold it throughout. Effective use of color and layout helps to make the booklet inviting and easy-to-read.

The type face plays an important part in the overall effectiveness, as well as design of the cover and layout of pages. Instead of small pen and ink cartoon drawings, the illustrations may be small photographs interspersed with the text. Graphs can be used to illustrate company growth.

The booklet should be small enough to be carried in a pocket but not so small as to be easily misplaced. Typical handbooks range from 5½" x 8½" to 6" x 9".

EXTRA MILEAGE

Although the primary purpose of a handbook is to inform and orient employees, the owner-manager can get extra mileage from it.

A foreman can, and should, use it as a tool for making a new employee "feel at home." For example, at the end of the new man's first week, his foreman can give him a chance to ask questions about the handbook. Sometimes this informal interview gives the foreman the opportunity to clear up information which the new man may have misinterpreted or misinformation which he may have picked up from old employees.

The handbook can also be used as a public relations tool. But keep in mind that image building begins at home. When employees have a good image of your company, they will spread the word. Such word-of-mouth advertising provides a solid basis for building good community relations.

Print enough copies so your employees can have extra to show to friends and relatives. Copies can also be given to leaders of civic and business organizations which work for community growth.

LIVING WITH YOUR HANDBOOK

Once an owner-manager issues a handbook, he has to live with it. Employees will expect to find conditions, benefits, and services as described in the handbook. This fact should present no problem.

However, there is a grey area which can cause trouble. It is connected with the owner-manager's attempt to convince employees that his company is a good place to work. A little care can prevent his leaving the handbook open to employee criticism.

For example, be sure that the booklet does not say anything you can't back up. Suppose, for instance, that your most efficient foreman is overbearing by nature. Then you had better not write in your handbook a statement such as "we strive for a friendly atmosphere in which problems can be settled amicably."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Readers interested in exploring further the subject of employee handbooks may wish to consult the following references. The list is necessarily brief and selective. However, no slight is intended toward authors whose works are not mentioned.

Getting Across to Employees by John S. Morgan. 1964. \$6.95. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 330 W. 42d St., New York, N.Y. 10036

Effective Communication on the Job. 2d ed. 1963. \$7.50. American Management Association, 135 W. 50th St., New York, N.Y. 10020

Industrial Editing by Bernard Smith. 1961. \$6.75. Pitman Publishing Corp., 20 E. 46th St., New York, N.Y. 10017

Personal Management Guidelines for Small Business. SBMS No. 26. 1961. Small Business Administration. Available for 25 cents from Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402

An Employee Suggestion System for Small Companies. SBMS No. 1. 1964. Small Business Administration. Available for 15 cents from Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402

"Matching the Applicant to the Job," Management Aids for Small Manufacturers No. 185. Free from SBA, Washington, D.C. 20416 (or nearest SBA Office)

"Checklist for Developing a Training Program," Management Aids for Small Manufacturers No. 186. Free from SBA, Washington, D.C. 20416 (or nearest SBA Office)

BYELORUSSIANS FIGHT FOR THEIR FREEDOM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today Byelorussians throughout the free world will celebrate the 51st anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic in 1918.

In spite of the great sacrifices made by the Byelorussian people in gaining their independence, their young state was unable to preserve its independence against the onslaught of overwhelming Bolshevik forces. And the Russians, after crushing their nation, and bestowing one-third of their territory to the Russian Republic, created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in its place, as a colony to Soviet Russia.

As a tribute to the continuing effort of the Byelorussian people who hope to see their nation again free of Communist domination, I am pleased to include at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by the Byelorussian-American Association for this occasion, and I commend it to my colleagues for sympathetic consideration:

Byelorussians fight for their freedom on the 51st Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

"We, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off the last fetters of political servitude which has been imposed by the Russian Czars on our free and independent land.

"From this day, the Byelorussian National Republic is declared a free and independent state. The peoples of Byelorussia, through their elected Constituent Assembly, will henceforth decide the future relations of Byelorussia with other states"—March 25th,

1918, Minsk, "The Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic."

This document climaxed almost 130 years of continuous struggle by the Byelorussian people against Russian imperialism when, for the first time since 1795, the Byelorussian nation was once again able to re-emerge as an independent state and renounce its enforced incorporation into the Russian empire.

The principles and objectives laid down by the new state—The Byelorussian Democratic Republic (BNR)—were enunciated to be:

The inclusion into a Byelorussian state of all former areas where the Byelorussian population constitutes a majority;

The creation by direct and closed ballot of a Byelorussian Legislative Assembly based on the proportional vote of all citizens who are to be enfranchised regardless of origin or religion;

The extended guarantee of all freedoms of speech, press, assemblage and association as well as the protected legal right to strike;

The insurance of full national and cultural autonomy for all peoples of the Republic;

The institution of an eight-hour working day, and the acknowledgment of public ownership of the woods, lakes, and natural resources.

The independence of the Byelorussian National Republic was recognized *de jure* by Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Finland, Poland, Turkey, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, and Georgia. It was recognized *de facto* by most other countries of the world.

Unfortunately, the young Byelorussian state was unable, for very long, to enjoy the freedom and sovereignty to which it aspired. In a few short years, the entire territory was turned into a battlefield when the Republic was crushed by the invading forces of the Red Army and the people found themselves once again in captivity.

To subvert the aspirations of the Byelorussian people, the Russian Bolsheviks created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic while simultaneously bestowing one-third of the original Byelorussian ethnic territory to the Russian Republic. The creation of the BSSR was to serve as naught else but a camouflage for the colonial exploitation of Byelorussia.

The Byelorussian SSR is not a sovereign state and her political, economic, and social position today is as a colony to Soviet Russia.

Russians occupy almost all key positions in the Byelorussian Republic and as a consequence drain the Byelorussian economy of its wealth and resources. The industrial development of the BSSR serves primarily to foster the goals of Russian imperial expansion and is accompanied by the steady channeling of Byelorussian man-power for the express purpose of building a Russian empire in Siberia and Soviet Central Asia. Coupled with the additional practices of genocide and deportation by the Soviet Russian regime in Byelorussia, the staggering loss of nine million Byelorussian lives has resulted. Moreover, the Soviet regime has been conducting an intensive and systematic "russification" of its captives. The net result has been that the Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated, not only from official use in administrative circles, but also in the higher educational institutions, in the secondary schools, and in a large number of elementary schools. By implementing policies of religious suppression, the Soviet Government has almost completely eradicated all public religious worship in Byelorussia.

One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, Byelorussia has continuously maintained its struggle against the imperial forces. There were armed uprisings in the Slutsk region in 1920 and similar uprisings during 1922-26 in Vializ, Homiel, Cervien, and the Barysau districts. Despite the purges of 1929-30, 1933, and 1937 and the

mass deportations during 1939 and the 1950's, and despite the mass murders and the starvation programs of 1946-48, the Communists have failed to suppress, let alone exterminate, the spiritual and moral resolve for establishing freedom in Byelorussia; on the contrary, the will of all Byelorussians has been strengthened in their desire for achieving independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25th, 1918, is commemorated by all Byelorussians wherever they live—by the Byelorussian-American community, by the emigrants throughout the free world, and by the members of the Byelorussian underground in the BSSR. To these and to all other freedom-loving people, March 25th, 1918 symbolizes the unquenched spirit of the Byelorussian people. Thus, the fight for Byelorussian independence is also the fight for the emergence of all other captive national states everywhere and is a necessary step toward the ultimate establishment of world freedom and world peace.

DR. V. D. MATTIA—CORPORATE
HEAD WITH A CONSCIENCE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. RODINO. A welcome breath of candor and conscience in the drug industry is being provided today by Dr. V. D. Mattia, president of Hoffmann-La Roche of Nutley, N.J. Testimony of the unique position which Dr. Mattia occupies within the industry is given in two recent articles in Life magazine and the American Druggist, which eloquently express his deep-seated sense of social responsibility and action.

Having known Dr. Mattia for many years, I hold him in the very highest esteem, and find it especially gratifying that so truly genuine a humanitarian is given such well-deserved recognition. I am pleased to bring these articles to the attention of my colleagues, for they represent the convictions of a man whom we would all do well to emulate.

The articles follow:

[From Life magazine, Mar. 7, 1967]

A PILL-GIVING MAVERICK

Except that it is affluent to the point of embarrassment, nothing seems to be quite right for the drug industry these days. What with congressional investigation, charges of profiteering and tacit admissions of price-fixing (five major manufacturers recently agreed to refund \$120 million to municipalities and other purchasers who felt they had been overcharged), the industry could certainly use a bit of good publicity, and Dr. V. D. Mattia may be just the man to provide it.

Ironically, however, the 45-year-old president of Hoffmann-La Roche is distinctly at odds with the normally clubby members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. He has refused to help pay for a huge advertising campaign aimed at improving the industry's image. Instead, his company—the nation's fourth-largest producer of pharmaceuticals—each year simply gives away some 37 million pills worth about \$1.4 million. The drugs are distributed by doctors to needy cases, lists of which have been solicited from the doctors.

"Barney" Mattia is himself an M.D., a churchgoer and the possessor of a strong social conscience. While he now pulls down a salary (\$150,000 a year) that permits him

to indulge his love of pre-Columbian art, he had to depend on the GI Bill for his medical education, and work as a researcher for years before taking over Hoffmann-La Roche. "I can't honestly say that drug prices are cheap," he admits. "I think they're reasonable only for those who can afford to pay the price." In helping those who cannot afford them, he feels, his giveaway program is also sound business. It is fully tax-deductible, and although other manufacturers may call it grandstanding, at least two of them may follow suit.

In an interview with Life Reporter Judy Gurovitz, Barney Mattia spoke about the drug industry and his own position in it:

"If there are generic drugs alike in activity and safety with trademark drugs, then I think it's folly to force physicians, patients or government agencies to pay more. Ultimately I think we're going to find that generic producers are going to be able to duplicate the therapeutic value of many drugs, though it may cost them a bit more. But it's not as simple as it may seem. Even with products that we're manufacturing we have problems such as sterility and quality control.

"I think everyone is entitled to purchase drugs at the lowest cost possible.

"I have violently objected to the advertising program of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. We should not be investing in such a program, but should be investing in research in drug metabolism to learn how to better control side effects.

"The most satisfying aspect of the job of president is the ability to exert leverage for good—to take the massive resources of this company and assign them to projects which offer promise and hope therapeutically, to mobilize its talent and resources to help in the community.

"You live in the fear that you may make a decision or not recognize when a decision should be made and that someone may be penalized for this. One could market a drug after it had been thoroughly tested and had been approved by the government. Then after several months, untoward effects may develop which place the health of patients in jeopardy. Nobody did anything wrong, but somehow or other people were hurt. You just hope it never happens to you.

"I came to the conclusion a long time ago that a man can reap the benefits of this great society for only so long before he's in debt to it. And I've been a very fortunate man. So many good things have happened to me that at some point I must dedicate myself and whatever talents and energies I possess toward helping others on a full-time basis. At some point in my life I'm going to do just that. I don't know where or how.

"One of the things we're doing now, in collaboration with one of the local rehabilitation centers, is to train our people who are about to be retired, to permit them to go to work in one of these centers. This I think will achieve two goals: to help staff these activities properly, enabling them to raise substantial sums of money and institute more efficient business methods and public relations, and to permit the individual who feels he's being put out to pasture an opportunity to maintain his place in the sun.

"If American industry were doing enough we wouldn't have need for such programs as the Job Corps. This is an excellent program, but American industry could solve the job problem quickly. After all, the government would be a partner in such ventures because of the tax benefits. When you allocate part of your profits for such programs, you're in effect making Uncle Sam a half-partner.

"Two days after I took over as executive vice president of the company, when the then chairman of the board and the president were abroad, representatives of CORE visited the plant. They called to my attention the

low percentage of non-whites in our employ, and then picketed my home since I was the highest-ranking officer present. I decided that we had to do more. I felt then that the only way you could remain conscious of this responsibility day after day, week after week and month after month was if you got reports and you did an accounting just as you do in your fiscal programs. So each month personnel sends me a social balance sheet which tells exactly the number of people who were interviewed for jobs and the reasons why individuals were not hired. This has helped us hire far more socially and economically disadvantaged people and also the physically handicapped."

[From American Druggist, Mar. 10, 1969]
EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Stanley Siegelman, editor-in-chief
American Druggist)

Like the medicinals he deals with, Dr. V. D. Mattia, president of Hoffmann-La Roche, is a complex compound:

To some in the drug industry, the 45-year old executive is a visionary whose concepts of social obligation often seem incompatible with the harsh demands of the profit-oriented business world.

To his staff and associates, he is a tough minded perfectionist—and, by his own admission, a "restless and impatient man."

To intimates, he is an accomplished storyteller, who never forgets a joke or anecdote.

To researchers, he is generosity incarnate—a man who unfailingly opens both purse and mind to new ideas.

To members of the press, he is an enigma—a corporate chieftain who shuns personal publicity with the same assiduousness with which most other executives seek it.

To fellow board members of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, he is a non-conformist—more apt than not to vote against the majority.

I interviewed Dr. Mattia at his firm's Nutley, N.J. headquarters. He aired his views on a variety of subjects in the carefully enunciated, soft-spoken style which is his hallmark. He held me transfixed with the ardor of his convictions. The subject perhaps closest to his heart is that of the civic and social responsibility of business in general, and the drug industry in particular.

In today's climate, there is certainly nothing original about the topic. Indeed, it is practically mandatory for every speech-making executive to pay verbal homage to that abstraction. But this is precisely the point: Dr. Mattia was among the first to put theory into practice.

FREE DRUGS

He initiated, for example, the "Indigent Patient Plan." It supplies free Roche drugs to any patient who cannot afford them—without limit as to quantity or duration. The drugs are furnished directly to the physician, who is simply asked to confirm the patient's indigency, and his therapeutic need. Only patients of MDs in private practice are eligible.

When Dr. Mattia first proposed the plan a number of years ago, many viewed it as a quixotic idea which would inevitably result in red ink. Skeptics predicted it would be abused by doctors and opposed by pharmacists.

Initially, there were indeed some complaints by drug store owners who felt they were being unfairly bypassed—but they have now ceased.

NO ABUSES

As far as physicians are concerned: "I know of no single instance of abuse by any doctor in the nation," Dr. Mattia said. "In fact, physicians are not making use of the plan to the extent they should." The firm has a computer feed-back system which enables it to pinpoint abuses if they should occur.

At its outset, a few doctors regarded the plan as a manifestation of "socialized medi-

ciné"—but their remonstrances, like those of the druggists, have now stopped, Dr. Mattia indicated.

Another reflection of his social orientation is Roche's medicare reimbursement plan. The firm refunds to hospitals 25 per cent of the cost of Roche drugs dispensed to patients under medicare.

AID-TO-NEEDY

Dr. Mattia, who came up the hard way (he earned his MD degree at New York Medical College while studying under the G.I. Bill and supporting a growing family) displays extraordinary sensitivity to the needs of the under-privileged. For over three years now, Roche has supplied free classroom instruction in basic office skills to ghetto residents of Newark, N.J. The firm has also been training Negroes to be pharmaceutical lab technicians.

"I am far from satisfied with what we have been doing," he asserted. "Yes, we have trained hard-core unemployed. Many of them now have jobs here at Roche. But we hope to do more.

"We are appointing an executive whose sole function will be to expand aid to the disadvantaged.

"I have the strong conviction that no area of our company is beyond the realistic aspirations of these people, if we provide them with the proper training.

"But even this is not enough. We hope to achieve total involvement on the part of the entire Roche family. Everyone is sympathetic, in a general sort of way. But each person needs a more definite role."

"ATTRITION"

Dr. Mattia, who just became regional chairman of the National Alliance of Businessmen's Division in Newark, the city of his birth, noted that well-intentioned managements often make sincere pledges about giving jobs to the hard core unemployed—but attrition occurs.

"It is not sufficiently understood that these persons are not qualified to hold any job, and that a total commitment to training is required.

"But I will say that most corporate leaders seem to recognize the changing role of business in society. The isolation in which we once functioned is no longer feasible.

"Economics are no longer the sole province business. Business must have a sense of social responsibility. Without it, corporations are doomed."

Nor is Dr. Mattia among those who believe the primary difficulty is lack of communication:

"All you have to do is state your goals clearly and simply. The problem of communication has been exaggerated."

He acknowledged, however, that the drug industry has failed, on occasion, to articulate its position well. He cited PMA's continuing ad campaign in the Reader's Digest:

"I voted against the campaign. I have nothing against the Reader's Digest. I just think there are other ways to demonstrate our sense of responsibility. PMA has a Foundation which supports research in such areas as metabolism and toxicology. Why not expand its scope and enlarge its scale? This would be a vivid demonstration to the public of the industry's concern for its welfare.

"It is sheer folly to resort to expensive advertising campaigns to convince people drugs are cheap. Drugs are reasonable, but not cheap.

"When legislative proposals involving the general area of health care come up, the industry is nowhere to be seen—either in support or opposition. At Roche, we have determined to take public positions on all such proposals."

A FEDERAL COMPENDIUM?

Dr. Mattia disagrees with PMA about another important matter: the proposed federal drug compendium, which would list all avail-

able drugs and their side effects. PMA fears such a compendium might tend to stress generics unduly—and has proposed, as an alternative, that the privately published Physicians Desk Reference (PDR) be improved.

"To oppose the compendium idea is virtually indefensible," Dr. Mattia asserted. "There is need for such a publication to keep physicians and pharmacists fully informed—especially as more potent therapeutic agents are introduced.

"The problem is how the compendium should be structured, who should exercise control over it, the calibre of people who would operate it." He was careful to point out he was talking about a compendium—which would list drugs in terms of their pharmacological properties, with no reference to prices—and not a formulary.

THE PRICE PROBLEM

And what about the perennially troublesome question of drug prices? Should a conscientious physician weigh the cost of the drug he is prescribing—or is this factor irrelevant?

"We cannot duck this question. The doctor must consider cost. He must treat the total patient—and this includes his economic status, as well as his heart, lungs, and kidneys. The doctor's first obligation is to select the best therapeutic agent available. But there is no point in prescribing a drug which the patient can't afford. He will end up not taking the drug—and the whole object of therapy will be defeated."

But isn't this an argument in favor of generics?

His reply: "If a generic product is equally effective and equally safe, there is little or no argument to justify spending more money for the brand name product."

Looking into the future, he envisions the pharmacist as playing an increasingly important role in complementing the function of the physician. He sees nothing unrealistic about the concept of the pharmacist as a drug consultant to the clinician. Moreover, he believes the pharmacist can make a real contribution in transmitting drug-taking instructions to the patient in greater detail when the doctor has been cursory.

CURRENT RESEARCH

What, I asked, are the most promising areas of Roche's current drug research?

"We have several compounds in the works. We hope, within the next year or two, to market a new, safe hypnotic. Also on the horizon is a topical preparation for malignancies of the skin. NDA's on both these products have been submitted to the Food & Drug Administration.

"In addition, encouraging tests of a new broad spectrum antibiotic have been underway.

"By April, we should be producing meaningful quantities of L-Dopa, the experimental drug for Parkinson's disease."

"Experimental" is a key word at Roche, dedicated as it is to basic research. By 1970, a \$10 million structure—the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology—will rise on the firm's Nutley, N.J. grounds. Using its highly automated, computer controlled facilities, some 200 scientists from all over the world will probe the shadowy frontiers of knowledge about the life process itself.

The Institute will embody, in concrete form, Dr. Mattia's conviction that drug manufacturers have a duty to conduct basic research, and not merely develop new pharmaceuticals. He regards the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake as an obligation to society.

All the major posts in the Institute have already been filled, and requests for fellowships have been received from 20 countries. In addition, post-doctoral graduates of two local universities will conduct research at the Institute.

ARTIFICIAL HEART?

Roche's medical electronics division—recently acquired from RCA—has already looked into the feasibility of developing an artificial heart. This is an area of considerable interest to Dr. Mattia, who concentrated on the cardiovascular field as a practicing physician.

He believes the flurry of activity in heart transplantation has had a salutary effect.

"Heart transplants have presented a host of interesting problems to the various disciplines. To dismiss this approach summarily is to negate the very basis on which science makes its advances."

ART COLLECTOR

In his spacious, deep-carpeted executive office, Dr. Mattia is surrounded by choice specimens of pre-Colombian sculpture. They project timeless emanations—a certain quality of brooding-in-perpetuity.

"I started collecting these pieces back in the days when they were all I could afford. Their value has increased considerably since then. I own something like 700 or 800 items. But my family still thinks they are pretty spooky."

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, freedom of thought, expression of ideas and the ability to live in peace as an independent nation has been the cherished dream and determined aspiration of the Byelorussian people, an objective they energetically pursued during the decade before World War I.

One year following the Russian revolution and the overthrow of the hated czar, after centuries of foreign domination, the Byelorussians proclaimed their freedom on March 25, 1918, throwing off the yoke of Russian tsarism and forming their own democratic government in the capital city of Minsk. The constitution which they adopted embodied the basic fundamentals of self-government which free men cherish, and the small country of approximately 8 million people made significant advances in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare.

However, following 3 years of tyranny and terrorism, fighting on several fronts in the defense of their country, they were robbed of their independent status by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

Despite the devastation of two world wars, some of the most savage fighting taking place on its soil, and systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level, the Byelorussians never lost faith.

These indomitable people have not given up their national ideals, their right to freedom and national independence. Nearly 50 years of continuous subservience to foreign tyrants has not subdued their free spirit, and they still pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The sympathy and compassion of the entire free world embraces the good people of Byelorussia on the observance of the anniversary of their independence day, March 25, 1918. We fondly hope that they will attain their national goal, their freedom.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a day of commemoration of some outstanding occasion is usually one of rejoicing and celebration. But this March 25, the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia is not one which the Byelorussian people can celebrate as a fulfillment of their dreams, the independence of a nation and freedom from an alien government.

On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian National Republic was born.

Unfortunately, the young Byelorussian National Republic was unable, for very long, to enjoy the freedom and sovereignty to which it aspired. In a few short years, the entire territory was turned into a battlefield when the Republic was crushed by the invading forces of the Red Army and the people found themselves once again in captivity.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is not a sovereign state and her political, economic, and social position today is as a colony to Soviet Russia.

Russians occupy almost all key positions in the Byelorussian Republic and as a consequence drain the Byelorussian economy of its wealth and resources. The industrial development of the Republic serves primarily to foster the goals of Russian imperial expansion and is accompanied by the steady channeling of Byelorussian manpower for the express purpose of building a Russian empire in Siberia and Soviet Central Asia.

The Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated, not only from official use in administrative circles, but also in higher educational institutions, in secondary schools, and in a large number of elementary schools. By implementing policies of religious suppression, the Soviet Government has almost completely eradicated all public religious worship in Byelorussia.

Despite the purges of 1929-30, 1933, and 1937 and the mass deportations during 1939 and the 1950's, and despite the mass murders and starvation programs of 1946-48, the Communists have failed to suppress, let alone exterminate, the spiritual and moral resolve for establishing freedom in Byelorussia. On the contrary, the will of all Byelorussians has been strengthened in their desire for achieving independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25, 1918, is commemorated by all Byelorussians wherever they live—by the Byelorussian-American community by the emigrants throughout the free world, and by the members of the Byelorussian underground in BSSR. To these and to all other freedom-loving people, March 25, 1918, symbolizes the unquenched spirit of the Byelorussian people. Thus, the fight for Byelorussian independence is also a fight for emergence of all other captive national states everywhere and

is a necessary step toward the ultimate establishment of world freedom and world peace.

At this time the Byelorussians in the BSSR do not have any possibility to defend their own national interests. It is for us to take up their aims for liberation from the horrors experienced during these past 50 years of Soviet Russian occupation, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian state. We hope and pray that next March 25, we shall all rejoice in the attainment of the Byelorussian objective for independence.

IF ISRAEL LOST THE WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Richard Z. Chesnoff, of Bayville, N.Y., is one of three coauthors of a new and important novel entitled "If Israel Lost the War." The other authors of the book, published by Coward-McCann, are Edward Klein and Robert Littell.

The plot of the book is simple—what would have happened if the 6-day war of June 1967 had been reversed and Israel were the conquered and not the conqueror.

This hypothetical situation is, of course, a warning about what could happen in the future. The situation in the Middle East is more tense now than at any time since the 6-day war and the possibility of still another war is all too real.

There are those that question the wisdom of American support for Israel. I, for one, have long felt that the future of Israel, as the only democracy in the Middle East, is crucial to the future of the Mediterranean and in that sense crucial to the future of all the world.

If Israel lost the war the country would have ceased to exist and the world would have been put to shame. This did not happen in 1967 and it must not happen in the future.

Mr. Chesnoff and his coauthors have written a highly relevant book that I commend to my colleagues' attention as the United States debates its policy in the Middle East. "If Israel Lost the War" is not only an important novel with a frightening warning to the world, it is also a well-written, exciting book that makes its "what if" plot believable.

The new Prime Minister of Israel, Mrs. Golda Meir, has said of the book:

Belleve me, what Mr. Chesnoff and his colleagues have written could have happened here despite the courage of our people who would have fought to the end with sticks and stones. I really hope that "If Israel Lost the War" will help people understand what the war was all about and why we are determined not to let it happen again.

Mr. Speaker, "If Israel Lost the War" is a book that should be on all the Members' reading lists just as it should be read by all people interested in seeing

Israel survive as the free, independent nation it is.

I am proud that Mr. Chesnoff, a constituent, is a coauthor of this important book.

RED CHINA—NOTHING HAS
CHANGED

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest frustrations felt by the American liberal is his inability to wield enough national consensus to force an administration into recognizing Red China or supporting U.N. membership for this regime.

Each year the liberals gather their weapons for another onslaught on the Chinese question, and with perennial regularity they go down to defeat. But the liberal is not a gracious loser, and his demands of late have become so vociferous as to be shocking even for a liberal. The latest pronouncement was among the cruelest blows of all, namely that of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). As most of us know by now, the Senator made some rather astounding observations about Red China before a group of Chinese experts meeting in New York recently.

Of course, he failed to mention a few points which are of minor concern to the liberals, such as our treaty obligations with the Republic of China, the blatant defiance of the U.N. and its principles by Red China, the open aggression against the U.N. in Korea by Red China, the active role played by Red China in Vietnam, and so forth. As we all know, the list is practically endless.

It is just incredible how some well-meaning—and I give them the benefit of the doubt—Americans can actually suggest that we abandon our allies and good friends on Taiwan in favor of recognition and support of Red China.

Mr. Speaker, down my way in South Carolina, we have a rule of thumb when we are stocking a pond or lake with good game fish. We never dump a load of mature catfish in with bass, trout, etc. The reason is obvious. Catfish are scavengers and they thrive on the eggs of other fish. Certainly, no offense is intended toward the catfish. As a matter of fact, I will compare South Carolina catfish stew and hushpuppies with that found anywhere. Nevertheless, it is difficult to keep catfish out of a well-stocked pond, but it can be done. Now, Mr. Speaker, Red China is a great deal like that catfish. However, like the catfish, it can be contained.

Now, if the liberals have their way, Red China will gain world respectability while actively working for territorial conquests at the expense of its neighbors. For Mao and his gang of international gangsters the entire world is a giant lake and they are the scavenger fish. By thrusting this regime of dedicated revolutionaries on the world community, all

of our efforts in the last 20 years to hold it in check will go for naught.

Really, I am shocked and dismayed that the Senator from Massachusetts would even dare suggest that this Nation sanction the Peking government. In what possible way has Red China changed? Has it mellowed? Has it shown any inclination toward accepting the peaceful charter of the U.N., or for that matter any interest in even joining the U.N.? Why, of course, the answer to these questions is negative.

Mr. Speaker, beginning with the illegal takeover of the Chinese mainland by Mao and his Communist cronies, every President of the United States, including the brother of the gentleman in question, has unalterably opposed seating Red China in the U.N. and according diplomatic recognition to it.

American men are dying this very minute from weapons manufactured in Red China. Just over 15 years ago, American men were dying as a result of weapons fired by the Red Chinese. Recognition of Peking now or in the future would be a horrible and sad testament to every one of these brave Americans.

If admitted to the U.N., the Red Chinese would only use this organization as a forum from which to spew further venom on this country and other freedom loving nations. If the United States accepted this government as a diplomatic equal, the free nations of Asia and the Pacific would justifiably lose confidence in our pronouncements to oppose the spread of communism in that part of the world.

TESTIMONY OF GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the strong statement by Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania, in support of extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, presented in testimony before the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Senate Committee on Public Works on Wednesday, March 5, 1969:

STATEMENT BY HON. RAYMOND SHAFER, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. SENATE, CONCERNING EXTENSION OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Senators, I am here today at the request of Governor Rhodes of Ohio who is currently State Chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission to present testimony on behalf of all 13 Governors of the Appalachian States concerning S. 1072 which extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

As Governor of Pennsylvania, I also appear as a Member of the Commission and,

with your permission, will also present a statement concerning the impact of this program upon my own Commonwealth.

Mr. Chairman, the 13 Governors like this program. We like it for many reasons.

It enjoys a direct line of communication with the President on matters affecting the welfare of 17 million Americans.

It is the kind of partnership between the Federal and State Governments which most Governors have advocated for a long time.

It provides a new kind of flexibility in Federal assistance that helps assure that public dollars are being spent on the right problems.

It is helping the states to bring many local jurisdictions together to solve their problems.

It provides a new way for states, localities, and the Federal Government to share talent, experience, and expertise in order to find the best answers to difficult problems.

Mr. Chairman, we Governors feel so strongly about the Appalachian Program that I felt compelled to discuss the program personally with President Nixon. In those conversations, I told him that the Appalachian experiment represents the kind of reform we need to make the American Federal system operate more efficiently. He agreed. He assured me that he was committed to this program and that it was his intention to keep the program answerable to the Office of the President in carrying out its mission.

Most of the Governors feel that the Appalachian Regional Development Program can serve as a model for the rest of the country—a model whose application to the rest of the United States is worth serious study by this Committee, the Executive Branch, the National Governors Conference, and other groups.

At my suggestion last June, the 13 Appalachian Governors subscribed to just such a recommendation and forwarded it to the Platform Committees of both political Parties. Since that time, many other Governors around the country have joined us. Last week, a special committee of the National Governors Conference, on which I serve, was directed to study the question of the nationwide application of regional commissions.

THE APPALACHIAN PROGRAM WORKS

Over 175 vocational-technical schools have been built with Appalachian assistance. They are capable of training 110,000 additional students in commerce, trades, and industry.

Since you approved creation of the Appalachian Housing Fund, the Appalachian Regional Commission has approved six times as many housing units for construction in the six months of the program's operation as were approved for construction under Federal housing programs in the preceding six years.

When we started in 1965, Appalachia, with over 9 percent of the American population, was receiving only 7.2 percent of Federal grants-in-aid because many of its communities were too poor to participate in regular programs. With the new supplemental grant program which you approved under the Appalachian Act, Appalachia is now receiving 9.7 percent of Federal grants-in-aid.

Over \$425 million in Federal, state, and local funds have been committed under this program for improving health and education in Appalachia.

New highways are being constructed, though not as quickly as we would like, and their impact is already detectable. In my own State, we can cite industries which are expanding or locating because of new locational advantages. And the same is true in many other states.

Many of the serious physical problems of Appalachia are being solved with help under this Act. By the end of this calendar year, every major mine fire in anthracite Pennsylvania will be under attack with Appalachian assistance. Land reclamation pro-

grams under the Appalachian Act have given a whole new sense of direction to Federal programs in this field.

THE IMPACT OF THIS PROGRESS IS NOW MEASURABLE

Employment is now increasing faster in Appalachia than in the rest of the U.S. and rate of unemployment is falling faster.

Per capita incomes in Appalachia are now rising more quickly than in the rest of the U.S.

And out-migration from Appalachia is only one-half of what it was in the previous decade.

All these are healthier signs than those of the 1950's—signs that progress has begun in Appalachia and that conditions are better.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Governors would be the first to admit that the task is barely begun. We have a long way to go. Unemployment in Appalachia as a whole is still higher than the U.S. and incomes in many areas are barely half those in the rest of the country.

That is why the extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act is so critical. We cannot stop a job barely started. We cannot disappoint the millions of people who are banking on this program to help solve the problems which have afflicted our mountain areas for generations.

In your consideration of the bill, I urge you to review the current authorizations for the Appalachian Development Highway System. When Congress first authorized the Appalachian Development Highway System, that authorization was based on engineering estimates developed in 1963, or earlier.

As you well know, because of the international situation, it has not been possible for Congress to provide the level of appropriations necessary to provide that authorized amount within the six-year period in which the Highway System was originally scheduled to be constructed.

As a result, inflation has taken its toll. The original estimates of the costs of construction are now seriously out of date because of rising costs. And the longer it takes to construct the System, the more these costs will increase.

The Governors have recognized that Congress could not provide the annual appropriations originally anticipated and in June of 1968 they prepared a resolution recommending that the period for funding the Appalachian Development Highway System be extended by two years so that Congress might be able to appropriate the full amount of the authorization.

In doing so, however, they recognized that the longer it takes to construct the System, the more expensive the System becomes because of inflation.

To build the most effective System with the limited funds available, the states and the Commission determined the adequacy of existing highways within the designated Appalachian Development Highway System. We have concentrated construction on the least adequate sections of these highways. Because of the limited funds available, we estimate that we will be able to construct only 1,263 miles of the 2,600 miles of the Development Highway System. Construction of slightly over 1,000 miles of the presently approved System has been deferred out of sheer necessity.

It is obviously in the national, as well as Appalachia's, interest to build the entire Appalachian Development Highway System if the highways are to achieve the objectives Congress and the states have established.

It is our hope that this Committee will consider the situation and make it possible for us to assure that the entire System, as originally envisioned by Congress, is built.

We cannot overstress the importance of the Appalachian Development Highway Sys-

tem to the ultimate success of our whole undertaking. Not only will the Development Highway System make it possible for us to link the key economic centers of the Region to national markets so that they can support development of new employment, it will also make it possible for people in the Region to commute to jobs and services and for our children to reach better schools.

We frequently describe the Appalachian Development Highway System, together with the Interstate System, as a giant framework upon which we intend to concentrate the location of most of the new facilities and services being developed under the Appalachian Program. We are doing this because we believe it is the most effective way to assure that as many people as possible will have convenient access to these new services and facilities.

To date, 82 percent of Appalachian investments have been concentrated along the Interstate and Appalachian Highway Systems.

We are well aware that highway improvements alone are not the answer to Appalachia's problems. But without a good transport system which provides access to new educational, health, and other services—and, most importantly, to jobs—we cannot solve the problem at all. In the first four years of this program, we have invested more in Federal, state, and local funds in health and education—investments in the people themselves—than we have in the Appalachian Development Highway System. But the System is one of the important keys to our success.

Mr. Chairman, we have been extremely pleased with the administration and effectiveness of this program. But the Governors have recognized that a number of improvements could be made to the Act which would reinforce the program's effectiveness and accelerate our efforts to solve the Appalachian problem.

Our amendments deal, in the main, with increased efforts to provide manpower retraining and to assist smaller communities in dealing with their problems.

On behalf of the Governors, I respectfully submit to the Subcommittee for its consideration a number of amendments which would improve the operations of the Appalachian Program. We believe their incorporation into the Act would speed attainment of the goals you have set for us in Appalachia.

We owe this Committee a great vote of thanks for making it possible for us to begin to solve our problems in Appalachia.

Appalachia Pennsylvania exemplifies that which the program can accomplish for economic development, and better conditions of health, education and housing for the citizens of a State. It is bringing new life and hope where before lethargy and stagnation all too widely were accepted conditions of everyday life.

On the attached exhibit are shown the more than 180 projects that have been funded in Pennsylvania with Appalachia aid. The exhibit map that you see locates these projects. A total of \$101,525,028* in Appalachia dollars has been channeled into these much-needed undertakings to add to the human and material wealth of our Commonwealth. There is no doubt that without the Appalachia program most, if not all, of these projects would still be little more than wished-for dreams: 26 access roads to reach industrial, recreational or school sites previously inaccessible; 32 mine fires being combatted; 7 mine subsidence projects undertaken; 4 strip mine areas being restored or corrected, to turn blighted lands into "promise lands"; 19 vocational technical schools to make realities out of promising new employment opportunities for our young people; 4 airports being ex-

panded and improved to place communities in the main stream of transportation; 15 higher education facilities, to enhance the learning advantages of our college-age sons and daughters; 20 hospitals, 4 nurses' training facilities, and 13 mental health facilities to upgrade the health care of our citizens, and more, as you will note.

Pennsylvania has discovered in the Appalachia program a new vehicle for uniting Federal, State, and local financing for the solution of pressing problems. More than that—but less easy to measure—it has found in the Appalachia program a new means for uniting the will, the determination, and the spirit of men and women of diverse backgrounds and experiences into a cohesive force for the common good.

The experience I have related could be matched in most particulars by the other Appalachian states, each of whom I am confident views the Appalachia program as a successful experiment in creative federalism.

You have also made it possible for us to demonstrate that the three levels of government in the Federal system can work more effectively together than they have in the past.

The Governors believe that more effective ways for the states, the Federal Government, and the localities to work in partnership have become essential.

Federal assistance now covers the entire spectrum of our domestic concerns. The responsibilities of state government cover that same range of problems. So do those of a county commissioner or a mayor.

We cannot continue to work as if we were isolated entities within the Federal political system.

As far as the people are concerned we should all be working toward the same ends and should be finding better ways to discharge our responsibilities working together.

We believe the Appalachian experience will ultimately prove of greater value than any of us originally anticipated. Through this new venture in government, we may not only be able to find answers to Appalachia's problems; we have also come upon a new model with implications for the Nation as a whole.

It is for this reason that the Governors enthusiastically recommend extension of this Act.

**THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC WHICH IS NO MORE
SHOULD NOT BE EQUATED WITH
THE BYELORUSSIAN S.S.R.**

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in order to eliminate possible confusion regarding an important part of the world, I deem it advisable to invite the attention of my colleagues in Congress to the fact that the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, which unfortunately exists no longer, is not the same as Byelorussian S.S.R. This distinction becomes all the more important because this year is the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian S.S.R.

Byelorussia is a country located at the crossroads of Europe where Western culture and freedom met Eastern barbarian despotism.

At the time of World War I, the czarist Russian empire was disintegrating, the

non-Russian nations liberated themselves as independent sovereign countries and on March 23, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed.

In connection with the marking of this day, one should also take cognizance that Byelorussians are often mistaken for Russians, yet they have, since the beginning of history, developed quite independently of Russia. To preserve their independence the Byelorussians had to endure severe trials for over five centuries, from the beginning of the 13th to the end of the 18th, and it was not until nearly the start of the 19th century that their destinies were linked with the czarist empire.

The Red Soviet Russian Government, in opposition to the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, created a fictitious democracy for the Byelorussian people, thus camouflaging their actual colonial status. For the past half century, this unhappy land has been subjected to a systematic and ruthless persecution on a national level on orders from Moscow. During a very short period in 1937, over 13,000 innocent Byelorussians were shot in cold blood by the Soviets. The Byelorussian Orthodox Church was completely liquidated that year and all its 2,000 clergymen were killed or deported into concentration camps and all religious life was ruthlessly suppressed by the atheistic Reds.

Former President Eisenhower said:

To be successful in bringing peace with freedom and justice to the World, we must increase our joint efforts to make peoples around the World more aware that only in freedom can be found the right road to human progress, happiness, and fulfillment.

By the United States marking the anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, though it no longer exists, and by unmasking the true nature of the puppet regime in Byelorussia, we follow our former President's wise words. Not only that, but by noting this day, the United States shows the world that it gives the people of Byelorussia moral support in their hard struggle against the evil forces of oppression and darkness and demonstrates that the free world does indeed care for suffering and oppressed humanity.

At this holy season, we all have faith that in the end a new day of freedom, justice, and liberation will most surely dawn and that Byelorussia will again be a "democratic republic" in every sense of the word.

**RELIGIOUS LIBERTY DENOUNCED
IN ZAMBIA**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the threat of Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda against Jehovah's Witnesses constitutes a religious threat to international peace.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news release from Lusaka, Zambia:

*This figure includes all approved Appalachia projects under Sections 201A, 201B, 203, 205, 207, 211, 212, 214 and 302.

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

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

LUSAKA.—President Kenneth Kaunda declared the days of Jehovah's Witnesses in Zambia are numbered.

He told the national council of his ruling United National Independence party the sect's policy amounted to anarchy and chaos.

The sect has been the victim of a violent campaign by the party since last December's general election, when it refused to vote for religious reasons.

THE FCC REACHES OUT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of editorial comment all over the country on the recent FCC proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television. The following, from the Indianapolis Star of February 9, 1969, correctly terms this as "glaring evidence of the evils of unbridled regulatory power":

THE FCC REACHES OUT

The proposal of the Federal Communications Commission for a ban on radio and television advertising of cigarettes is glaring evidence of the evils of unbridled regulatory power.

As things now stand the FCC is prohibited from issuing such an order. The 1965 law requiring a health warning on cigarette labels forbids the FCC to impose changes in cigarette advertising. This law will expire in June, unless extended.

Thus the FCC proposal amounts to fair warning of the sort of thing the commission will do if it has a free hand.

The power of the FCC to make such a ban—if the present prohibition should expire—was immediately challenged by the National Association of Broadcasters. We hope the NAB is right.

The power to ban—by decree—the advertising of a legal product would be an awesome power for the FCC or any other regulatory agency to have. This is power to strike a severely damaging blow to whole industries, on the basis of nothing more substantive than the opinions of the commission members.

Even more than that is involved. If the FCC has power to ban the advertising of a particular product, what is to prevent the extension of that power to complete control over all advertising and programming on radio and television?

The FCC has in fact been moving toward assertion of such power. Last June the FCC issued an order that broadcasters who carry cigarette advertising must also broadcast "a reasonable amount" of anti-cigarette announcements. It claimed authority to do this under its "fairness doctrine."

That was a precedent-setting action. It was the first time the fairness doctrine had been applied to advertising. If the precedent stands, who knows what other demands the FCC may make on broadcasters to give time for answers to their advertising?

Even more significantly, this order of the FCC imposed on broadcasters the obligation to give time to a specified kind of propaganda. If this precedent stands, what other kinds of propaganda may the FCC decree to be imposed on the ears and eyes of American radio and television audiences?

The power to do that is terrifying in its potential.

As to the specific controversy about cigarettes and health, decisions on action to be taken should be made by Congress. They should not be made by a regulatory body, and especially not by one whose competence and jurisdiction lie far outside the field of health.

In the absence of an authoritative, documented finding that cigarettes are so injurious that their manufacture ought to be prohibited, Congress has already gone about as far as it ought to go in attempting to discourage their use.

More urgently, Congress should review the authority of the FCC and the ways in which it is using its authority to control what Americans hear and see. On its present course, the FCC has the makings of a powerful manipulator of the feeding of propaganda to the public.

That's not what it was intended to be, nor what it should be. Congress should trim it back to proper size.

**LETTER FROM A CONNECTICUT
TEENAGE LEADER**

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress I had introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to extend the right to vote to persons over the age of 18. Unfortunately, the previous Congress took no action on the resolution.

I am now reintroducing my resolution. I believe that events during the past year or two have clearly demonstrated the need for such modification of our Constitution to provide greater participation by younger people in public affairs.

In the light of these developments, I wish to bring to public attention the text of a letter which I have received a few days ago from the president of a teenage group in my home town of Putnam, Conn. Robert L. La Rochelle, president of the Teenage Democrats Club, informs me that his club is presently circulating a petition in favor of lowering the voting age to 18 and that the petition will soon be forwarded to the Connecticut State Legislature.

I think the approach of these young people is commendable and deserves to be encouraged. They are using the democratic way and process, rather than force and violence. They speak well of American youth and its role in a free society. I am therefore pleased to insert in the RECORD the text of their letter, as well as a brief news item from a recent issue of the Norwich Bulletin:

TEENAGE DEMOCRATS CLUB,
Putnam, Conn.

DEAR MR. ST. ONGE: As you may probably know, the Teenage Democrats Club of Putnam is circulating a petition in favor of lowering the voting age to 18 in the State of Connecticut. The people's response to this drive has been overwhelming and we are soon planning to visit the Connecticut State Legislature and forward the petition to the legislators.

We hope the State of Connecticut will set a precedent for the rest of the Nation to follow. We bring this information of the petition to you because we feel you can help forward our greatest cause: the participation of youth in a free society.

Our fight for 18-year-old voting isn't limited just to that subject. We ask for greater youth participation in all the affairs of government, because we feel we have something to offer.

We ask you to mention our work in the Halls of Congress as an example of progressive youth political action.

In this time of campus turmoil, we feel that we are doing something peaceful and constructive to reach our ends.

We have succeeded in sending teenage representatives to the Democratic Town Committee, being the first area political group to succeed in this attempt.

With an election in 1968 behind us and a new 1969 slate of officers ready to keep us moving for justice and peace, we wait the coming events concerning our projects with anticipation and a desire to succeed.

We feel our attempts at constructive action deserve recognition, because we believe we represent the majority of American teenagers.

Enclosed are copies of our latest activities. We would appreciate a mention of our petition drive in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which would help us in our efforts.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT R. LA ROCHELLE,
President.

TEENAGE DEMOS GET INVITATION

PUTNAM.—The Putnam Democratic Town Committee, recognizing that youth is interested in politics invites Teenage Democrats to send representatives to Democratic Town Committee meetings.

The committee felt the Teenage Democrats had earned the opportunity to express the viewpoint of youth because of its help in the last election.

At the January meeting, the town committee voted to invite teenage Democrats to choose from its membership of youths between the ages of 16 and 20 those to attend the meetings of the Democratic Town Committee.

These representatives will have the opportunity to express the views of the youth, but, not being committee members, will have no voting power.

President of the Teenage Democrats is Robert R. LaRochelle, son of Alderman Roland V. LaRochelle of Putnam. Other youth group officers are Peter Johnston, vice president; James Morey, secretary; Patricia Tetreault, treasurer; and James Dion, public relations director.

JANUARY 29, 1969.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia. I am pleased to pay tribute on this occasion to the brave Byelorussians whose brief period of freedom was cut short by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly

does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

May I take this opportunity to commend the many Americans of Byelorussian origin who continue to strive for the eventual restoration of freedom for their homeland.

This anniversary serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and that the desire for independence and self-government continues to be the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union.

It is my hope that the new Director of the Voice of America will work to improve the broadcasts to the non-Russian people. It is also apparent that Radio Free Europe is not providing as an effective program as it could. Theoretically, Radio Free Europe as a private organization would be in order.

At this point in history we should emphasize the right of the people of Byelorussia to enjoy the self-determination of which they have been deprived by Communist dictators of the Soviet Union. The heroic people of Byelorussia have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit their spirit and determination to be in vain.

HAWAII EDUCATOR KIYOTO TSUBAKI URGES ISLAND TEACHERS TO DEVELOP WARM HEARTS AS WELL AS KEEN MINDS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, more and more, it is becoming evident that we are living in a decade of dissent, an age of ferment and an era of social revolution. There lies beneath the restless searchings and the dissent, which rocks the temple walls of colleges and universities throughout the country, a warning. Unless we rise to meet this spiraling feeling of discontentment voiced by our young people, our future looks bleak.

On February 24, 1969, Mr. Kiyoto Tsubaki, a distinguished member of Hawaii's State Board of Education, voiced this very warning to two gatherings of Maui Island schoolteachers. Speaking at the Hawaii Federation of Teachers annual institute and at a meeting of teacher members of the Hawaii Government Employees Association, Mr. Tsubaki told the teachers that they should try to develop not only keen minds, but also warm hearts—"skills and knowledge are not enough."

Mr. Tsubaki's frank warning and advice makes good sense, for as he stated in his speech:

Attitudes beget attitudes. What we are hearing and what we are watching in circumstance are something of our own creation.

We need to develop what the Greeks call a "good man"—a man with humanistic considerations, or a man possessing humanistic attitudes.

Mr. Tsubaki's speech is an excellent one, and one which I know my colleagues will find enlightening; therefore, it is with pleasure that I submit his speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF KIYOTO TSUBAKI

Ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed my pleasure to once again bring you greetings and aloha from the Chairman of the State Board of Education, Dr. Richard Ando.

I was invited here this morning to extend greetings. I have said it and thus ends my official function. Aloha!

But inasmuch as I still have a few minutes left, may I be permitted to make another entry right here and be allowed to share with you my anxiety and some of my personal thoughts relative to the kind of society in which we live today.

Please understand that I am reading my remarks this morning because I have another meeting to go to and I want to be sure that I say the same things here as I would be at the other meeting. I certainly do not wish to be accused of exercising some kind of expediency just because I am speaking to this group separately or to the other group separately.

If I can say any one thing about the present decade in our history, I think I can safely say that we are now living in a decade of dissent, an age of ferment, and an era of social revolution, if you will. We find many manifestations of this social enigma amongst the blacks, the economically and culturally deprived, our employed and unemployed, our youth in the colleges and high schools, our parents, our teachers throughout the country, and even in some of our churches. In fact it appears that all of us are in one way or another involved in some kind of turmoil from the home on up to international level. Indeed, our future looks mighty dim, rather frustrating and gloomy at times, and apparently every thinking individual is asking the question, where do we go from here?

But before asking ourselves that question, perhaps we should first try to analyze the causes—not so much the apparent, superficial causes; but rather the deeper, more fundamental causes behind the causes.

As I try to observe the way dissenters act and react, it appears to me that this whole bit revolves around two basic considerations—reason and attitudes.

It seems that in our schools we are trying our level best to give our youngsters the skills and knowledge, the so-called tools with which to reason; but are we teaching them enough about the true scientific reasoning process? To me, just giving our youngsters the skills and knowledge alone is not enough. I say this because I judge that skills and knowledge in the hands of the wrong people can be a very dangerous thing. It scares me no end every time I look at the five-year projections of achievement objectives of a PPB or Program Planning and Budgeting format now being used by the Department of Education. I find that these are always expressed in terms of achievement scores of skills and knowledge. And immediately I find myself asking the question, what is being done about developing what the Greeks called a "good man"—a man with human concerns, a man with humanistic considerations, or a man possessed of humanistic attitudes?

As we look around us, I suspect that some of us are saying, "Oh my, what's wrong with our people today? Just look at the way they are behaving. Their attitude is just terrible."

If life can be said to be a two-way street,

I submit it is high time we realize that attitudes beget attitudes. Just listen to what people are saying. If we listen carefully, it won't take us long to realize that perhaps what we are hearing and what we are watching in circumstance are something of our very own creation. An educational philosopher back in the 30's once said that the success of an educational system can be measured only in terms of what kinds of parents our youngsters become. And not so long ago when an elderly gentleman was asked to define education, he pondered for a while and said, "Well, education to me is that which remains after I have forgotten everything else I learned in school."

I suspect what these two people were alluding to was that skills and knowledge alone are not enough—that perhaps in our curriculum we should try to develop not only a keen mind; but also a warm heart.

At the moment I am trying to get some of our curriculum revisors and developers to think about establishing humanistic values as the core of our state curriculum around which every program shall revolve—all pointing toward developing a "good man".

In the meantime, right amongst us in the Department of Education, in all our dealings with all our people, it may be well for all of us to begin practicing some humanistic considerations, re-orienting our own individual attitudes perhaps, to see if we can't work out our mutual problems on a mutual basis. This attitude of mutuality is mighty important to me as we relate ourselves day by day from the bottom up. This same attitude of mutuality becomes even more important when we relate ourselves especially from the top down because, in my estimation, the higher one goes the broader his base becomes and much, much greater the concerns and responsibilities as his attitudes and decisions begin to affect the welfare and happiness of more and more people like you and me.

And so, as a group, may I say let's begin to talk about it at least and let's see if we can't begin to mutually create a happy, warm society—a society of humanistic human beings.

I think it's worth trying.

Thank you.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, March 25 occupies a very special place in the annals of man's struggle for freedom. On that day, in 1821, the people of Greece rose up to proclaim their independence after centuries of domination by the Ottoman Empire. Invoking the memory of past battles and past heroes, the Greek nation set forth to regain the liberty established during the Athenian golden age.

Several days previously there had been brief skirmishes between Ottoman troops and Greek irregulars. March 25, however, marks the feast of the annunciation, which to the Greek people means "the day of the good message." Independence was proclaimed. On March 25, 1821, the good message was that the struggle for freedom had begun anew.

Leaders and common citizens alike of the Western World, steeped in the traditions of classical antiquity, rallied to the cause of Greek independence. The

spirit of philhellenism swept through Europe and across the Atlantic, a far vaster divide in those days than now. Many persons from our own proud and young Republic joined in common struggle with the Greek people. Our own young men fought side by side with the Greek patriots. Other Americans contributed their savings, their intellectual talents, and their artistic work to the cause that was Greece's.

Bound together by a common loyalty to Hellenic ideals and a common passion for freedom, enduring bonds were forged between our Nation and the Greek people. These ties have not diminished during the ensuing years. During two World Wars and in struggles against Communist troops in the mountains of Greece and again in the mountains of Korea, our nations have stood together as one. Many citizens of Greece have come to this country, joining in the writing of our own Nation's historic saga.

I am proud to speak again of March 25, 1821, when the flame of liberty was lit again in Greece, when strangers fought together as brothers. May we ever remember this date, and may our common ideals ever endure.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ABM PLAN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Washington Post contained a remarkable collection of letters expressing opposition to the President's proposal for deployment of a thin antiballistic-missile system.

Irony and ridicule are sometimes powerful weapons, as these letters illustrate. They are as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ABM PLAN

This is to register as strongly as possible an undoubtedly futile but heartfelt protest against Mr. Nixon's tragically unwise decision to go ahead with an ABM system. Is it possible he does not know that it will accelerate the arms race further (unless the Chinese and Soviet governments should have the improbable good sense we apparently lack, to use their resources for better things); will divert desperately needed money from domestic programs; will increase the stranglehold of the military on our already military-dominated economy; and will not defend or protect anyone in case of actual attack? We can only hope now that Congress will at least stand up and resist.

I can't think of a clearer case in recent times of "Emperor's new clothes." Certainly Mr. Nixon didn't think that *Mr. Laird* would tell him?

ANN MORRISSETT DAVIDON.

HAVERFORD, PA.

I want President Nixon to know I heartily concur with his ABM decision. It is such a comfort knowing *American* missiles will be left on earth after we are all dead.

SANDRA WEISS.

SILVER SPRING.

Do the President and Senator Jackson seriously believe that deployment of even

a limited ABM system is not an escalation of the arms race? Senator Jackson himself mentioned Russian development of a "third-generation" missile. It seems clear to me that the inevitable result of deployment of an ABM system by either country will be the development in the other country of a more sophisticated offensive system. This has been the pattern of the arms race in the past, and I can see no reason why things will be any different in the future just because the initial step is "defensive" rather than "offensive." The American people are getting another snow job and Mr. Nixon has taken a giant step down the road taken by Lyndon Johnson.

FRANK SIMONS, JR.

WASHINGTON.

For those still confused as to why various students and Blacks are so willing to use violence, the Nixon ABM proposal offers a lucid explanation. After a barrage of scientific evidence against employment, the ABM is still accepted because the military-industrial alliance has the power to move such systems regardless of the opposition. Reasoned argument buttressed by factual evidence is irrelevant. And this is what the protesters so clearly see and adopt as a tactic. The hypocrisy of the Nation's leadership must end before social tensions destroy the country.

GERARD GIOVANELLI.

ARLINGTON.

Your editorial of March 15, dealing with the President's ABM decision, indicates that you have been taken in by his smooth public relations performance and have lost sight of the realities of his decision. His rhetoric cannot hide the fact that he has presented merely a warmed-over version of the earlier Sentinel system, packaged to deflate the intense public resistance which had built up in recent months. Although he chose not to emphasize it, his prepared statement makes clear that the system will still attempt to provide a "thin" defense of cities against a presumed Chinese attack, with all of the dangerous consequences which many people have pointed out—the rapidly escalating costs, the danger of an over-response from the Soviet Union, the added difficulties in attempting to negotiate an end to the arms race, and so on.

All of this is packaged to make it least vulnerable to attack by ABM opponents (in ABM jargon, the decision was surrounded by "penetration aids"), but this is no excuse for your having neglected to analyze its specific consequences. Construction of the system is to start with what appears to be a defense of our missile bases. But at the same time the sites will be selected and purchased to begin construction of the broader Sentinel system—just as the Army was doing when the Nixon Administration began its "re-examination." And how can this minimal system protect our missile bases (each having 150 Minuteman missiles)? If the Soviet Union were to attempt to build an offensive force that could attack our missiles, it would have to utilize thousands of warheads. Against such an attack the proposed system would be totally useless. So even from this point of view, the plan is either fakery or, more likely, the down payment on a very much larger and more costly system.

Mr. Nixon gives clear evidence that he has, in his now familiar style, refused to make a clear decision that might offend the military, while remaining unwilling to move directly into missile talks with the Russians. These, not ABM deployment, are the top priority in dealing with strategic weaponry. If these talks do not begin soon, developments in weapons technology, especially in multiple warheads, may well eliminate the chance we now have to move toward agree-

ments that preserve the present stable balance.

LEONARD S. RODBERG.

SILVER SPRING.

It seems that the U.S. Government is busily trying to destroy itself and all else. The arms race has come to the point of total insanity: the ABM system is an example. With so many experts denying its validity, so many people protesting, ashamed to be part of this plot for total destruction, how can this Administration find a way around it to approve this deplorable monster? How can the military industrialists just think of their own huge profits? Great use they will make of it when, by accident, the whole thing explodes, taking them in the holocaust. Have these people lost all their sense? Can't they see the urgent things that must be done in our disturbed, riot-stricken cities? No security is assured once the "monster" is installed. Only more danger is assured, more wars. By God, we must stop this insane way of "protecting" us. Is the Administration totally blind to the truth?

Mrs. C. N. DOCKHORN.

WASHINGTON.

As an amateur chess enthusiast, I was thrilled by the conceptual purity and inner logical construction of Mr. Nixon's now revealed ABM deployment policy. Having recognized that this policy implies a set of national priorities which probably leads relentlessly to the ruin of our cities (Kt-Q6), the President has correctly abandoned the fatuous notion of trying to protect from hostile missiles that which increasingly can be expected to become less and less worth saving (Kt-K4!). (Having chosen this line of play, it is unthinkable that so astute a player as Mr. Nixon is contemplating the now discredited "guns and butter" continuation.) No doubt in the brave new world to come, in which computers deploy missiles to guard other missiles from missiles launched by other computers (Kt-B3), cities and the hapless creatures who once inhabited them will have long since come to exist only in memory bank (Kt-K5, resigns).

MICHAEL P. STERN, M.D.

ALEXANDRIA.

The same day President Nixon disclosed his decision to establish the ABM system, it was announced that District Head Start funds would be cut by one-third. Result: More games for generals, fewer for kids. I wonder what other good ideas Mr. Nixon has to help this country move forward together.

VICTOR R. HIRSH.

BETHESDA.

Now we are going to have the Sentinel ABM "safeguard" to go with nuclear "sufficiency." Mr. Nixon has picked from his options, but since the phrase is "keeping all the options open" there is another, one recently chosen, that he must have overlooked. Simply follow the precedent of the XB-70, produce not more than two Sentinel ABMs, stop, and put one in the air museum in Ohio where the XB-70 now rests.

This scheme has its advantages. It would be a carefully planned waste of defense funds, as opposed to the more or less hap-hazard methods in effect to date. The museum might be specialized to include only flying anomalies, and others from previous eras might be displayed: the Flying Wing, the B-36, Howard Hughes' flying boat whose maximum altitude was about 10 feet and the Navy's jet-powered seaplane that did little better, the Vanguard (watch it blow up on the pad) and Skybolt missiles, the Air Force's aptly named Dynasoar, and all those that have been overlooked. Room would be saved, of course, for the F-111 and the SST, as well as Spartan and Sprint of the Sentinel.

One problem remains. Projecting from past

experiences and future expectations, should the museum system be "thick" or "thin"? Let's remember to keep those options open.

DAVID JEFFREY.

ARLINGTON.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. But, as the United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee so poignantly expressed it:

In Byelorussia this national celebration is not permitted. This year, instead, marks the 50th anniversary of the existence of the Byelorussian SSR.

In 1919, after less than a year of independence, the people of Byelorussia were forced to accept the rule of the U.S.S.R.

And although the freedom of Byelorussia was so brief, it serves as a constant reminder of the desire of the people of Byelorussia for the basic right of self-determination. Thus it is that we join in commemorating the 51st anniversary of Byelorussia's independence.

On this auspicious day we renew our pledge to the ultimate freedom of all the captive peoples of the world, including the people of Byelorussia. The inalienable right of self-determination will someday be served.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 51 years ago the people of Byelorussia formed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and set down their beliefs in an amazing historical document. Meeting in Miensk, the National Convention proclaimed a constitution which provided equality for all under the law, freedom of speech and assembly, the right to form labor unions and strike, freedom of conscience, the right of minorities to autonomy and the inviolability of person and home. Recognition of the new Republic was granted by more than a dozen states and diplomats were sent abroad. But Soviet Russia could not tolerate the existence of such a free and democratic Republic so nearby and within 2 short years crushed the new government and murdered its leaders. Resistance continued for a few years more but the Bolsheviks had triumphed. Their reign of terror was nothing new

to this tiny country bounded by Russia, Poland, and the Baltic States. For almost 1,000 years that unfortunate land had seen the scene of war, pillage, revolution, and counterrevolution. Through the twenties and thirties the Russian bloodbath was continued to be halted only by the start of World War II. The land was fought over several times by Russian and German armies and more than 2 million persons are believed to have died. At the war's end Russia once again renewed her persecution, charging this time that the Byelorussians had collaborated with the German enemy. What a tragic history for a people whose only crime seems to have been having the rapacious Soviet Bear for a neighbor. As we salute these people today, then, let us be a little mindful of our own good fortune and let us hope and pray that the people of Byelorussia, along with all captive peoples, will soon be free once again.

FOR LOVE OF CHILDREN

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the importance of a childhood full of attention and warmth in the development of a healthy and well-adjusted individual. Here in the District of Columbia there are children who, for no fault of their own, may not receive proper care in these crucial years of their lives. These are the 550 dependent, homeless youngsters at Junior Village, over half of whom are under 6 years of age.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Washington Daily News of March 3, 1969, which describes the now limited implementation of a broader program recommended by Fred Taylor, executive director of FLOC—For Love of Children. FLOC is a nonprofit, volunteer, interfaith organization here in Washington dedicated to promoting the welfare of all of the District of Columbia's children, those who will, or could be the active, contributing citizens of the future. According to the proposal designed by FLOC, Junior Village would be utilized as a temporary home for school-age children. Pre-school-age children would be automatically placed in a network of group homes all over Washington, such as the one described in the article below. In these homes, young children can receive the attention and care which they deserve and need while they develop as individuals.

I join with Mr. Taylor and FLOC in urging the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare to take the lead in implementing this meritorious change in procedures for caring for homeless children. FLOC's is a 5-year plan to expand the number of group homes to 80, thus cutting costs of Junior Village and this current type of child care by one-half. With the appropriate efforts and emphasis now, this goal can be achieved much sooner than that. Not only that of

each child, but the welfare of the entire community may be at stake.

The article follows:

FOR LOVE OF CHILDREN

(By Sarah Booth Conroy)

Mrs. Olive Robb is 75 years old. She has four babies, all under seven months.

At 7 in the morning, Mrs. Robb picks up the first baby to greet the day—or the loudest of the four. She changes his diapers. Tickle his toes. Warms his bottle.

Then she starts all over again with the next baby, and the next baby and the next baby.

DOUBLE MOTHERS

At 8 a.m. Mrs. Martha Walker joins Mrs. Robb.

A year ago, neither woman knew the other. Then they became involved with For Love of Children (FLOC). FLOC recruits foster parents to take care of children from the D.C. Welfare Department and contributes 20 per cent of the costs of running the home, buying the house if necessary.

FLOC played matchmaker to bring Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Robb together to make a home for babies who would otherwise be in an institution. The two women moved in together on Nov. 21 and the babies arrived within 10 days.

"We can see such a change in the children when they are petted and snuggled," Mrs. Robb said as she buttoned up the boy in the pink suit.

As she talked the five-month-old boy practiced the high jump in a swing hanging in front of a mirror between the living room and dining room. The other five-month-old boy sat in a baby holder on the kitchen table. The seven-month-old girl was in the play pen, thoughtfully looking at a brightly colored book. The baby sat in her carriage.

Mrs. Robb has already raised two sons of her own who live in this area. She has eight grandchildren, all now out of the baby category. A widow, she has a master's degree in German and taught at Roosevelt and Coolidge High Schools and the District's Americanization School before she retired.

"I'm taking care of these babies because I like the instant rewards," Mrs. Robb said. "What better job than to be grandmother in residence?"

Mrs. Walker, a divorcee, without children of her own, has a master's degree in child development. Until November, she was head of the pre-school nursery at Foundry Methodist Church. "But I wanted to work with babies," she said.

The two women agree they both like liver, Russian tea, music, books and babies. Nowadays all they have time for are the babies. "I haven't sent out my Christmas cards yet," said Mrs. Walker.

Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Robb do have some help tho. One of FLOC's eight mission groups, serve as Friends of the Family. At least one friend stops five times a week, including an evening, to relieve Mrs. Walker or Mrs. Robb. If there should come an emergency in the middle of the night, one of the friends would willingly answer the call.

Hopefully, the babies will be adopted, or placed in a more permanent foster home by the time they are a year old, leaving their bassinets for new babies for Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Robb to cuddle.

OUR GOOD TRUCKDRIVERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these days it is a pleasure to compliment our truckdrivers on their

good driving and responsible citizenship on our highways.

It is a pleasure to note the wonderful cooperation and assistance which so many of our truckdrivers give to our citizens in distress on the highways.

Having been helped myself several times by the willingness and voluntary assistance of truckdrivers, I want to add my compliments to our good truckdrivers, and particularly I want to compliment Major Gray, of Mid-South Co., from Memphis, Tenn.

I am inserting in the RECORD the following article by Virginia Payette from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Friday, February 28, 1969:

COMMENTS

(By Virginia Payette)

It's every driver's bad dream. There you are, 50 miles from nowhere, it's pitchblack outside, bitter cold, and your engine has just started gargling nuts and bolts.

You know darned well there are cutthroats and robbers lurking out there in the frosty

dark, just waiting to pounce when the motor gasps its last.

And while you sit there, dead by the road, a stream of luckier humans, snug and warm and motor purring, zips endlessly by.

But when someone does stop at night, legend has it, it's almost sure to be a truck driver. And as of last week, 30 miles up the hill from Nashville, that legend came true.

There we sat, old Betsy hissing with high fever and harboring an alarming clank somewhere in her gizzard.

Then, before old Dad could even start to look for his tools (which Sonny had probably sneaked off to college, anyway), there was a whoosh of air brakes and a trailer truck pulled in and parked 50 feet ahead.

From the comparative safety of what seems like a 10-story cab, as you stand there alone in the cheerless dark, the driver decides you look honest and climbs down—a combination of helpful mechanic, highway counselor and emergency chauffeur, to say nothing of angel-from-heaven.

Our truck driver turned out to be Major Gray, a handsome prototype from Memphis, who's been hauling trailers for 36 years. He makes the 10-hour Memphis-to-Nashville

round trip daily, five days a week—100,000 miles a year.

He stuck a flashlight down Betsy's throat, diagnosed her garglings as a messed-up water pump, advised us to lock her up and leave her there, ride into Nashville with him, check into a motel, and call a wrecker in the morning.

How many people get a chance to bounce over the mountains in a heated cab, watch an expert handle a 10-speed shift, and be delivered to the front door of your motel in a 22-ton taxi?

And for all his service and advice Mr. Gray would take absolutely nothing.

"Wouldn't think of it," he said with a grin. "But if you ever have to ship anything ship Mid-South."

Turned out he was a good mechanic, too. It was the water pump.

So the next time your jalopy collapses on one of those super highways carefully engineered to avoid civilization, don't panic. Pray a little, look respectable, and I guarantee some angel in a noisy monster will happen along and help you out.

And may yours be as nice as our Major Gray.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 26, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of our life, judge of men and nations, our times are in Thy hands and we commit all our ways to Thee. We ask Thee not to lift us out of life, but to prove Thy power within it; we ask not for tasks more suited to our strength, but for strength more suited to our tasks; not to take our burdens from us, but to give us grace to carry them; not to banish our problems, but to give us higher wisdom to solve them. Give us the vision that inspires, and the grace of Jesus Christ who wore our flesh and walked the earth like a conqueror and abides with us now. In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 24, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 25, 1969, received the following message from the President of the United States, which (with the accompanying report) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the report for fiscal year 1968 on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256). During fiscal year 1968,

6,777 teachers, scholars, and distinguished leaders were involved in this program in the United States and in 126 other nations and territories. This was a reduction of 10 percent from the preceding year. Since 1949, a total of 125,777 persons have participated in the exchanges.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 25, 1969.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 25, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For nomination received on March 25, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, March 26, 1969.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, the following executive reports of committees were submitted, on March 25, 1969:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Jerome M. Rosow, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

John B. Waters, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 24, 1969, Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably, without amendment, on March 25, 1969, the bill (H.R. 8508) to increase the public debt limit set

forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and submitted a report (No. 91-116) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE PROBLEM OF INFLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-92)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

Clearly this Nation must come to grips with the problem of an inflation that has been allowed to run into its fourth year. This is far too long, and it has already caused substantial distortions in our economy.

Inflation is a form of economic aggression against the very young and the very old, the poor and the thrifty. It is these Americans who are largely defenseless against the kind of price increases for food, clothing, medicine, housing and education that have swept over the Nation in the last few years.

Government has two major instruments for dealing with this problem. One is monetary policy, which should continue its program of restraint. The other is fiscal policy—the management of the Federal budget—which must turn away from budgets which have propelled the inflation, and turn instead to one with a strong surplus that will help to curb it.

The prospect of a thin budget surplus or a return to deficits would again nudge monetary policy off course. The result, as always, would be further increases in interest rates, a dangerously overheated economic engine, and the threat of accelerating the advance of the price level.