

fornia, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FARBSTAIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GI-ALAIMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HUNGATE, and Mr. LONG of Maryland):

H.R. 9896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. MAD- DEN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. SCHWENGER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 9898. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,500 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9899. A bill to authorize the lease of burley tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9900. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in which individuals are receiving training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9901. A bill to provide for better administration of the National Park Service and of the electric power marketing programs of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9902. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 622. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr.

FLYNT, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. STUCKEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 623. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the completion of the carving on Stone Mountain, Ga.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MINISH, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. HICKS):

H.J. Res. 624. Joint resolution to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.J. Res. 625. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating December 1969 as "National Women's Suffrage and Equality State Month" in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of women's suffrage in Wyoming and the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution relative to Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KYL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. ZION):

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to an international agreement among major dairy product producing countries providing for orderly and equitable disposal of surplus dairy products; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 356. Resolution relative to the hi-

jacking of U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 357. Resolution providing for an additional clerk for all House Members; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

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

99. By Mr. HICKS: Memorial of the Washington State Legislature recommending use of Mountain View Hospital at Tacoma, Wash., as a veterans hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

100. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to financial qualifications for veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9903. A bill for the relief of certain Philippine nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9904. A bill for the relief of Marlies Soraperra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9905. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9906. A bill for the relief of J. Burdette Shaft and John S. and Betty Gingas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9907. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal for Merit to Oskar J. W. Hansen in recognition of his extraordinary artistic achievement in the execution of the sculpture Liberty at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Acerno and her children, Regina, Giuditte, and Diana Acerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9909. A bill for the relief of Fulvo De-Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9910. A bill for the relief of Mr. Hannibal B. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

87. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Terpon Hriston Sarron, Varna, Bulgaria, relative to a veteran's pension, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE SERVICE AND CHARACTER OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

#### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my service in the Congress during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration carry with it

many cherished memories of Dwight David Eisenhower. These memories of my President and my leader are personally very dear and are historically significant chiefly because in essence they bear out the character and integrity of this great American.

From the time General Eisenhower visited Seattle and I had the privilege of presenting him to a huge audience during his first presidential campaign, until now, when his service to the Nation is completed, I have associated his life and

achievements with the line of Alfred Lord Tennyson describing Sir Galahad, "His strength is as the strength of 10 because his heart is pure."

No man I ever met, save only my own father, represented so much in the way of personal integrity.

Today I cannot add to what has been said during the past few days when a grateful and grieving nation, and indeed the world, paid tribute to the general's life and service. But, in all humbleness

as an American, I do honor and pay my respects to him and to his family.

In addition, my greatest sympathy goes to his devoted wife, Mamie, who has given us strength during these past few trying days.

Meanwhile, in our hearts Dwight D. Eisenhower will live while we live, and after we are gone, his monumental achievements will live throughout history.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER,  
1890-1969

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower, the wartime leader of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, the 34th President of the United States, passed on to his Heavenly reward after a long battle against an overwhelming illness.

He was a great patriot and as a soldier and statesman has earned our thanks and our respect. America's heart is heavy with sorrow because of its deep affection for this man, and mankind owes a massive debt to his memory for he has left a legacy of devotion to duty and to his fellow man.

The historian of the future will have to assess the many accomplishments of Dwight Eisenhower; however, we do not have to wait for some future date to determine his strong character and his determination to complete the tasks to which he was assigned.

When "Ike," as he was known throughout the world, left the United States for Europe on an assignment that led to his choice as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, he was unknown to the American people. When he came home several years later he was known to everybody. He was then a world figure, winning fame during the war which carried over into the peacetime years and into the political arena as our President.

What would have been the future of Dwight Eisenhower if he had entered the Naval Academy instead of West Point cannot be assessed by any living mortal. It was only by a quirk of fate that "Ike" entered West Point. He had taken competitive examinations for both academies; finishing first in the Annapolis test and second in those taken for West Point. He was appointed to the Naval Academy, only to find out that he would be over the age of 20 years before the term started and which age was the limit for the new naval cadets. As fate would have it, the first man on the West Point list was unable to accept the nomination and it went to Dwight Eisenhower.

His military achievements alone would have given him the greatness he gained throughout the world, but a brief portion of his civilian life added much to it, the office of the President of the United States.

Elected in 1952, and reelected in 1956,

he served his Nation during a predominantly relaxed state of mind of the American citizens, which became known as the "Eisenhower years."

President Eisenhower was consulted many times by the two men who followed him into the White House—President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson. In this way he showed the American people his continued interest in politics and in the affairs of our Nation.

A grateful Congress restored to General Eisenhower the title he once held—before assuming the office of the Presidency—General of the Army, again, a grateful Nation paying its respects to a great man.

Dwight David "Ike" Eisenhower always marched in the ranks of honor; he will always live in the minds of men as one of character and honor.

A great man, an American-minded citizen, a truly honorable man has answered the final rollcall. The Nation has paid homage to his memory and the spirit of this outstanding American should rekindle in the hearts of the people of this Nation, a dedication to our country, which was the foremost quality of our former President, and soldier.

"Ike" is gone. May he gain his reward promised to us all who serve, and serve well.

Today, Mr. Speaker, my sorrow and prayers are with his family and loved ones. My deepest sympathy goes out to the Eisenhower family for their loss is shared by the entire country—yes, even the entire world.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of General Eisenhower we all feel that we have lost a personal friend, whether we really knew him closely or had just read about him and seen his pictures. His passing comes as something of a surprise because in these past few months Dwight Eisenhower had made such a valiant and vigorous fight against recurring illness that all of us had come, I am sure, to regard him as virtually indestructible. His passing makes us sad, and yet there is also a feeling of quiet pride in the very full and very rich life which he lived, and the great inspiration and leadership that we were able to benefit from during the years that he occupied positions of great responsibility in our Nation. The sadness that we feel today is not so much the sadness of what has been left undone, what might have been accomplished, that we felt in the sudden passing of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert F. Kennedy; but instead a certain sadness for ourselves that we should henceforth be left without his wise counsel and encouragement, and sadness for our country and the world in realizing that with the departure of Dwight Eisenhower a

unique and brilliant era in our history has finally come to an end.

Though I first saw General Eisenhower in the summer of 1952 when he returned from Europe to run for the Presidency; stood on the fringes of the crowd in January 1953 at his inauguration; and served in the Congress during the last 2 years of his administration, it was not until September 1965 that I actually met the general personally. He came to Seneca Falls, N.Y., in my district, to turn the first shovel-full of earth in the construction of the new Eisenhower College, named in his honor. The general's close friend, Bob Hope, was on hand for that historic occasion and Mr. Eisenhower joined in the laughter and applause when Bob Hope quipped:

Where but in America could a poor Kansas farm boy grow up to be a 5-star General and President of the United States, and then end up as a ditch-digger in Seneca Falls!

I had another opportunity to chat with the general at his office in Gettysburg in 1967. At that time he was considering an invitation to fly to Vietnam to see the situation there at first hand, and I encouraged him to go, because I knew he would be a tonic to the troops out there, and his personal appraisal of the war when he returned would be valuable to all of us. The general told me he was eager to go if his doctors would permit it, and I believe he would have gone, but unfortunately, only a couple of weeks later, he was rushed from Gettysburg to Walter Reed with the first of several acute stomach upsets.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud of the fact that I was the original author of the legislation, enacted last year in the 90th Congress, to establish Eisenhower College, now in full operation, as the living national memorial to President Eisenhower, and to extend to that new college some \$5 million in matching Federal funds in tribute to the former President. I was pleased to notice that Eisenhower College was one of the five charitable causes which members of the general's family had specifically urged friends who so desired to send their contributions to in lieu of flowers.

Eisenhower College will, I am confident, keep alive the magnificent buoyant spirit of Dwight Eisenhower that we honor today, so that in years to come he may continue to be for succeeding generations of young Americans as great a source of inspiration and encouragement as he has been to ours, to those of us who served in uniform with him, if not directly under him, during the historic days of World War II.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE  
DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER**

OF FLORIDA  
Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, America has lost one of her greatest sons. His legacy of personal warmth, exemplary leadership, and religious and family de-

votion will live forever as an inspiration not only to Americans but to people throughout the world.

Having served under him in the military and with him as our President, I am saddened by his passing, but inspired by his life.

No greater honor, privilege, or inspirational experience could befall any American citizen anytime in the history of our country, than to have served in Washington under the Eisenhower administration, and in the military during World War II under Dwight Eisenhower's watchful and guiding hand.

Having attended numerous conferences at the White House during his administration, I recall many discussions about the future of our country, the necessity of a balanced budget, and the tough decisions on preserving peace. The ever-present compassion for the people of this country stood out as the touchstone of his convictions and of his administration. He was a man who practiced what he preached and during his 8 years in office set the highest moral tone of this century for the National Government.

His philosophy, which supported the federal system through a strengthened local-State-Federal relationship, was clearly enunciated when he proposed in his famous Williamsburg address that certain taxing powers be turned back to the States in an overall attempt to strengthen State and local government and to preserve and strengthen the true federal system.

The depths of his convictions were clearly evidenced by his vetoes of bills which could have had a budget-busting effect. In particular he vetoed numerous public works bills. He vetoed them because he believed they were too costly, yet knowing full well that sustaining vetoes in the area of public works is extremely difficult. He succeeded in removing the unnecessary fat from public works appropriations until the last year of his administration, when the only Eisenhower veto ever overridden was one relating to public works. Even though the votes sustaining his veto became closer and closer, he never wavered from his deep conviction on this subject and was willing to run the risk of being overridden in order to try to control inflation through responsible Government spending. This is just one example of the dedication and firm convictions which President Eisenhower displayed as our Nation's leader.

Despite what some historians have already suggested as their judgment of the Eisenhower administration, President Eisenhower proved to be a man of action, compassion, and a man who was loath to make unattainable promises or to propose programs he knew could not succeed. I believe history will record the Eisenhower administration as the administration which not only kept the peace but brought a period of stability and reasoning to America.

During his first 2 years in office he brought the Korean war to an end, reduced taxes substantially, increased social security payments and coverage significantly, and provided needed leader-

ship to bring our country together. His administration also created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; provided statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; started the most significant highway program in the history of the country, the Interstate Highway and Defense System; began the water pollution control fight; and even though a military man himself, constantly strived to keep military programs and budgets within reason. He commenced the Nation's efforts in outer space, successfully met the challenges of the uprising in the Middle East, and refused to permit the United States to get dragged into the confrontation in South Vietnam. These monumental accomplishments undoubtedly came about largely because of the nature of the man himself, resulting from his basic honesty, unquestionable sincerity, and gentle friendliness, tempered with a firm decisionmaking capability and backed by the love and affection of the people of this country and throughout the freedom-loving world.

No one could be on the scene during his life of service without being impressed by him as a leader.

No one could attend the services in the rotunda of the Capitol where his body lay in state, or the funeral services at the National Cathedral and see the outpouring of love, affection, and respect by the leaders of the countries of the world, as well as by his fellow citizens at home, without realizing that one of the great men of history had passed away.

#### SECRETARY FREEMAN'S PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STYMIED BY SENATE-IMPOSED LIMITATIONS

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, almost daily for the past 2 months I have been reading or hearing a steady drumbeat of criticism of former Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's administration of the food stamp program, coupled with extravagant praise of the new administration's breakthroughs in fighting hunger. Most of the praise of the new administration in this area has evolved around ideas which some reporters and commentators say they understand from reliable sources are being considered, and may be about to be adopted, in the Department of Agriculture. The only breakthrough so far, apparently has been the much-advertised pilot program in two South Carolina counties to give free food stamps to a handful of very, very low-income families.

#### FREE STAMPS A MISTAKE

I firmly believe the free stamp idea is a mistake. However, I am willing to give it a chance to operate long enough to see what the results are. My understanding is that despite the widespread poverty and malnutrition in the two counties involved, only a tiny percentage of families eligible for the food stamp program is

eligible for the free stamps. This is because the free stamps can go only to those families with incomes of less than \$30 a month. Such families normally would pay only 50 cents per person, up to a maximum of \$3 a family, for the same quantity of food stamps they now receive free.

It seems to me that the State, the county, and the civic or charitable organizations in the local community—no matter how low its per capita income—should be able to find some way to help such a family scrape together the pitance required under the food stamp program to purchase a full month's supply of food. This is the best food bargain anywhere in the world—even better than CARE. A family of four, for instance, with income of less than \$30 a month, pays only \$2 a month for \$58 worth of food, under the food stamp program operating elsewhere in the South. In the North, a family of four with an income under \$20 pays \$2 for \$60 worth of food stamps, while families in the North with incomes between \$20 and \$30 a month pay \$6 for the same \$60 worth of food coupons.

#### SHOULD ALL NECESSITIES BE GIVEN FREE?

To relieve participating families of any obligation to pay anything whatsoever for \$58 to \$60 worth of food purchasing power in the grocery store would, I fear, lead to consequences which could undermine and destroy the whole food stamp concept. I do not mean that the added cost of 50 cents per person or \$3 per family would have such a far-reaching consequence if restricted to the very lowest income families. But once you give free food stamps to those with incomes under \$30 per month, the pressures would mount, and soon be irresistible to make them free for all whose incomes are under \$50 or \$100, or \$150, or whatever—and the idea of supplementing what people normally spend for food with an added amount of purchasing power to enable not only very low-income families, but large families of modest income to enjoy an adequate diet would turn instead into a general free food program for all.

Why not free rent? Why not free shoes? Why not free clothing? Why not free bus transportation? Why not free handouts of every necessity? Food is essential, but so are the other things.

And how long would middle-class attitudes in this country stand for a system of free necessities to every family of low income without even a token payment to show it is trying to help itself at least a little?

Just remember, Mr. Speaker, how bitterly and agonizingly hard it has been to extract the authorization, and the funds, from a narrowly divided Congress to get the food stamp program to its present inadequate level of \$280,000,000 for this fiscal year. Certainly, the program is not adequate. Certainly, it is underfunded. Certainly, the purchase requirements for most families participating in the program are higher than they should be, and the value of the bonus coupons given to participating families is not enough to assure what the law actually calls for: an adequate nutritious diet.

**LITTLE WRONG WITH FOOD STAMP PROGRAM THAT SUFFICIENT FUNDS COULD NOT CORRECT**

To correct these deficiencies is the simplest thing in the world. All it takes is the removal of the present, cruelly restrictive ceilings on appropriations—ceilings imposed not by the House but by the Senate—and the appropriation of sufficient funds to enable the food stamp office to put into effect the liberalizing policies former Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has intended to establish last year until the Senate conferees insisted in writing into the bill the present restrictive ceilings on appropriations.

The House last year overturned our Committee on Agriculture to pass a 4-year authorization with no ceilings on appropriations. That was a historic and bitter battle. But in conference, this genuine breakthrough in the program was rejected. And so we have these limits in the law of \$315,000,000 for the current fiscal year, \$340,000,000 for the 1970 fiscal year, and \$170,000,000 for the first 6 months of the 1971 fiscal year. Then the Appropriations Committee approved only \$280,000,000 for this program for this year. That is the history. That is why Secretary Freeman could liberalize the program only for families with incomes of less than \$70 a month.

It would take no earth-shattering Executive decision by the new administration to recommend in the pending supplemental appropriation bill additional funds for this fiscal year. It has not yet done so. If it were to do so, however, and if Congress were to provide additional funds for the remainder of the 1969 fiscal year, then the ceiling in the food stamp law on 1970 fiscal year funds would probably be too low to permit annualizing of the expanded program during fiscal 1970.

**HOUSE VOTED LAST YEAR FOR OPEN-END AUTHORIZATION**

I trust that Secretary of Agriculture Hardin will see the necessity of recommending what the House passed last year—with the sponsorship of 130 Members—and that is, the removal of arbitrary ceilings in this program so that Congress each year can appropriate whatever is necessary to fund the program at the level commonsense and an enlightened and humane attitude require.

Many of the Members have been asking me in recent weeks what I intend to do this year about the food stamp legislation. When Secretary Freeman was in office, I could offer suggestions for which I would then take legislative responsibility for trying to get through. I think Secretary Hardin, who now has responsibility for a program his party never wanted, should have the opportunity to study the program and discuss it within the administration, and, if he wants to expand it, and make it more effective, I will certainly be glad to assist him in eliminating the ceilings and providing more funds.

**IS TRANSFERRING PROGRAM THE ANSWER?**

But if he wants to get rid of the program, or turn it over to another Department, as has been suggested, I would want to know why. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare never

demonstrated any interest in, or affection for, this program when I first began the effort to enact it into law, and from everything I have been able to learn, the people at HEW have always felt and still feel that if you want to help poor people, you just give them more money, and let them spend it for whatever they think they want to spend it for. This is the policy on public assistance—if a family uses the welfare check foolishly, that is their business, according to HEW.

The food stamp program was placed in Agriculture because its purpose is to increase the consumption of food by low-income families at less cost to the Government than the cost of removing surplus food from the market, processing it into storable form—powdered milk, powdered eggs, dried beans, peanut butter, and so forth—and then giving it away. It is infinitely better to enable poor families to buy fresh milk, fresh eggs, fresh fruits, and vegetables, and fresh meats than for the Government to buy up these products under price support, process them, and give them out in far less appetizing or nourishing form. And the food stamp program, as I said, is far cheaper than the direct distribution program. But hand in hand with giving people an opportunity to buy a better diet goes the necessity to help many families to spend their food coupons—their food dollars—intelligently. This is an area in which the Department of Agriculture has always had expertise.

**SECRETARY FREEMAN'S FINAL REPORT ON THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM**

Mr. Speaker, many of the widely publicized ideas said to be circulating in the executive department for improving the food stamp program are actually suggestions made by former Secretary Freeman in a report he made to Congress on January 20, 1969. Such an annual report was first required under the food stamp amendments we passed last year. I have not seen a word in print about this Freeman report. I never saw the report itself until I called over to the Department to ask for a copy. Perhaps few of the other Members have seen it. I am, therefore, including it below as part of my remarks.

I do not agree with all of Secretary Freeman's final recommendations.

**SHOULD THE PROGRAM BE INSTITUTED WITHOUT STATE AND LOCAL COOPERATION?**

For instance, I do not agree with his suggestion that the law be changed so that food stamp projects can be initiated in States or counties which refuse to institute it, and which will not accept responsibility for it.

This is apparently a rather popular idea among some of the individuals and groups now waging a rather belated campaign against hunger in the United States. Better late than never—but this battle over malnutrition in a rich, abundant country has been raging since 1954, and some of those now issuing the strongest statements about the problem were not giving us much encouragement in the Benson days when we could not get any help whatsoever in passing a food stamp law, and when the Benson regime would not put a food stamp program into effect even after the 1959 Food Stamp Act was passed. President John F. Ken-

edy and his Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, had the courage to start the food stamp program, and to expand it, and President Lyndon Johnson backed me 100 percent in getting through the 1964 act—which every Republican Member of the House Committee on Agriculture opposed.

Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, is the only Republican Member of the House who voted for this program on every vote since 1957. Perhaps 35 other Republican Members have supported it in recent years, and I am grateful to them. But this program was initiated, expanded and developed almost entirely as a Democratic effort.

To the extent that we have obtained funds, and improved the law, it has been a tremendously successful program. But it requires State and local participation, encouragement, and responsibility, to make it work. It is not self-administering.

So I do not think it should be initiated in any area where the Federal Government has to step in and certify the eligibles, investigate their income every three months, handle the stamps which are the same as money, and do what is essentially a local enforcement and administration job.

We do not establish public housing where the local communities will not assist and participate and take responsibility. We do not provide public assistance in any categories where the State and county or municipality will not participate and guarantee to administer it carefully and fairly.

Through legislation we have passed assuring every American the right to vote, people who live in areas which refuse to shoulder their responsibilities to the poor can overturn the policies of their local officials by replacing them with officials more attuned to the needs of the public.

So I do not agree with this particular proposal of Mr. Freeman.

**FREEMAN PLANS FOR EXPANDING THE PROGRAM**

Most of the other suggestions in the Freeman report of January 20 are worthwhile and should be put into effect. To carry them out, more money is needed. At least \$500,000,000 would have to be appropriated in the coming fiscal year, according to Secretary Freeman's final report, to reach more of the poor people who need this food assistance in the areas which now have the program. But under present law—thanks to the Senate's position last year—only \$340,000,000 can be appropriated in fiscal 1970.

And, I might add that, because of a Senate amendment to the food stamp bill of 1967—unanimously agreed to by every member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, according to the debate in the other body that year—no section 32 money can be spent on the food stamp program. I think Secretary Hardin may perhaps be in violation of that restriction for using a section 32 item to institute the pilot free food stamp program in the two South Carolina counties—but if so, that is the Senate's problem. It was their amendment which prohibits use of any section 32 money for food stamps.

I applaud the attention now being given in the other body to the hunger issue. But I resent any implication that

Secretary Freeman was responsible for the food stamp program's shortcomings. Those who make the charge should read the debates in the Senate on the food stamp bills and note the restrictions on funds voted there.

TEXT OF SECRETARY FREEMAN'S REPORT TO CONGRESS OF JANUARY 20, 1969

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit Secretary Freeman's final report on the food stamp program as follows:

A REPORT ON THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED

INTRODUCTION

P.L. 90-552, approved October 8, 1968, amended the Food Stamp Act of 1964. Among other provisions, it requires that on or before January 20 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth operations under the Food Stamp Act during the preceding calendar year and projecting needs for the ensuing calendar year.

This is the first annual report submitted to the Congress under the provisions of P.L. 90-552.

PROGRAM OPERATIONS DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1968

*Number of Food Stamp Areas:* There was a substantial increase in the number of areas operating a Food Stamp Program in the calendar year 1968.

In January 1968, a total of 848 food stamp areas were in operation in 41 States and the District of Columbia. In December 1968, a total of 1,219 food stamp areas were in operation in 42 States and the District of Columbia.

At the end of calendar 1968, an additional 334 areas had been approved for participation and USDA representatives were working with State and local officials to help them finalize their plans for the opening of these new programs.

If State welfare agencies are able to meet their schedules, a total of 1,553 food stamp areas will be in operation by June 30, 1969.

The designation of additional areas for participation in the latter part of calendar year 1969 will depend upon the level of funding authorized for the program for the fiscal year 1970.

*Program Participation:* At the beginning of calendar year 1968, a total of 2.2 million persons were participating in the Food Stamp Program.

By October 1968, participation had increased to 2.7 million persons. When information is available on the level of participation in December, it is expected to be at least 100,000 more than in October.

*Participating Retailers and Wholesalers:* The number of participating retailers and wholesalers increased from 72,000 at the beginning of calendar 1968 to 90,000 in December 1968.

The substantial participation of retailers provides participants with a wide choice in the selection of the store or stores in which to purchase food with their coupon allotment. The Consumer and Marketing Service individually authorizes each store that wishes to accept food coupons to insure that store owners understand their obligations under the program. C&MS will authorize any retail food store in the area that wants to accept food coupons and almost all food stores do elect to participate.

Food wholesalers are authorized by C&MS to act as an intermediate coupon redemption agent for a retailer if the wholesale firm wishes to provide this service to retailers. Most retailers redeem their coupons through the commercial banks in the area. Through the cooperation of the commercial banking system, retailers are able to promptly re-

deem for cash (or for deposit) the coupons they accept from participating families.

C&MS is also directly responsible for the supervision of participating food retailers and wholesalers. Personnel located in field offices—each office covers an average of four or five operating areas—carry out this responsibility at the local level. Every effort is made to obtain voluntary compliance with regulations and restrictions on the use of the food coupons. However, if store owners do violate these regulations, the Act provides that they may be disqualified.

A high level of cooperation is obtained from retail food stores. Since the passage of the Act in 1964, it has been necessary to disqualify only 480 stores for periods ranging from 30 days to three years. Another 1,345 stores have received a official warning because of the minor nature of the violations that took place. On the other hand, a total of 1,152 stores for which available evidence indicated violations might be taking place, were found to be free of violations.

*Funding Limitation:* During the calendar year 1968, funding limitations made it necessary to defer the opening of 136 new food stamp areas. These areas had been approved for participation in December 1967, and were scheduled to open during the summer of 1968.

This deferment action was necessary because actions, taken in July 1967, to increase participation in operating areas were more effective than had been anticipated.

The deferment of the opening of these 136 areas was lifted by the Department in October 1968, when final action of the 1969 fiscal year appropriation for the program was completed.

*Program Modifications:* The two major program modifications which helped to extend the program to more needy people early in calendar year 1968 were announced by the Department in July 1967. These modifications were:

(a) Reduction in the minimum purchase requirement to 50 cents per person per month (up to a total of \$3 a month for a family of six or more). The previous minimum purchase requirement had been \$2 per person per month, with a family maximum of \$16 a month.

(b) Reduction in the first month's purchase requirement for all families entering the program for the first time to half the regular monthly purchase requirement. This reduction applied to new families purchasing coupons on a semi-monthly or weekly basis as well as to those who purchased coupons on a monthly basis.

In addition to these program changes, the Department had intensified its efforts to assist State and local welfare agencies in an outreach program to bring more eligible families into the program. In addition to field personnel of the Consumer and Marketing Service—the Department agency responsible for administration of the program—the resources of the State and county Technical Action Panels were used in this outreach effort. In selected areas, low-income people were employed on a part-time basis to work with other low-income families in their own communities.

During the calendar year additional modifications were made to increase program effectiveness. The two principal administrative modifications were:

(a) authority was provided to State welfare agencies to provide a prompt and preliminary certification to obviously needy families, with a 30-day time period in which to make the final eligibility determination;

(b) increased authority to States to issue coupons by mail. The Department agreed to underwrite the value of any coupons lost in the mail if the State observed minimum security standards. These minimum standards required that the coupons be mailed under the first-class postage rate.

A major program modification was announced by the Department in December 1968—to be effective not earlier than February 1969. The timing of this modification was designed to provide the necessary lead time to State welfare agencies to plan for the local implementation of the modification.

This program modification reduced purchase requirements and increased bonus coupon allotments for families with less than \$70 a month in income. It resulted from an intensive review within the Department of current purchase requirements and total coupon allotments authorized for participating families. The group undertaking the review concluded that low-income families will spend less for food than we had previously assumed if their expenditure patterns were considered over time.

This review, together with our program experience, indicated that month after month, most of the poor would be able to allocate about 24 to 33 percent of their income for food, depending upon family size and level of income. It was also concluded that bonus coupons allotments for families in the lowest income ranges should be increased in order to increase the total food stamp purchasing power of such families. The recommended increase was to be the first in a series of increases which would be necessary to insure that the stamp purchasing power of all participating families was in line with the full cost of a low-cost adequate diet.

When the cost of full implementation of the recommended issuance schedule changes were projected, it was estimated that an additional one million people could be brought into the program. It, therefore, would have required the program to be funded at its authorized level of \$315 million in 1969 and over \$500 million would have been required to provide full-year financing of the recommended modifications in 1970.

A total of \$280 million was appropriated for the program in 1969 and the maximum authorization for the program in 1970 was established at \$340 million. Within these funding levels, the modifications announced in December 1968 represented a partial implementation of the recommended changes and the changes were limited to families with incomes of less than \$70 a month.

Table A which accompanies this report shows the specific changes that were authorized in the December announcement.

PROGRAM FUNDING—CALENDAR 1969

The Food Stamp Act now authorizes a maximum appropriation of \$340 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and a maximum authorization of \$170 million for the six months of July–December 1970. Action by the Congress to further amend the Food Stamp Act will be necessary to authorize appropriations for periods subsequent to December 1970.

It is now estimated that it will require about \$325 million in fiscal 1970 to finance the program scheduled to be in operation by the end of the fiscal year 1969, i.e., June 30, 1969. If the full \$340 million appropriation authorized for fiscal year 1970 is appropriated, some additional areas can be approved for participation in fiscal 1970. In the absence of any amendment to the Food Stamp Act, the number of additional areas that could be designated in the latter half of calendar 1969 would need to be limited to those that could be funded at an annual rate of \$340 million during fiscal 1970 and the first half of fiscal 1971.

As an alternative in 1970, no new designations could be made—using the unallocated fund of approximately \$15 million to make additional program changes. That amount would not be sufficient to make any major modification in the program in fiscal 1970.

FUTURE PROGRAM NEEDS

Action should be taken now to place the Food Stamp Program on a sound legislative

base—one on which concerned Federal, State and local agencies can plan for the future expansion and improvement in the program.

The Food Stamp Program should be operated in every county in the 50 States, replacing the Commodity Distribution Program for needy families.

The cost of the coupons should be reduced as soon as possible.

Bonus levels should be progressively increased until all participating families are provided with the full purchasing power for a low-cost diet.

National minimum eligibility standards should be authorized in the Food Stamp Act.

Authority should be provided to the Secretary of Agriculture to directly operate the program in an area when State or local authorities will not accept responsibility for it.

Consideration should be given to the increased sharing by the Federal Government of the costs of intrastate program administration, especially for the lowest income counties. If such increased Federal payments were provided States and localities should

be required to offer certain minimum levels of certification and issuance services to eligible households and should be required to undertake a continuing outreach effort to maximize the participation among those that are in need of food assistance.

Supportive foods and nutrition education program for poor families should be expanded and strengthened.

In addition to the specific legislative changes outlined above, the uncertainties of Federal financial support should be eliminated. Permanent appropriation authorities should be provided similar to those provided in the National School Lunch Act. Congress should also be free to determine during each annual appropriation process the actual level of funds required for the program in the ensuing fiscal year. Limiting several years in advance the maximum amounts that may be appropriated in specific fiscal years substantially limits the ability of the program and its Federal, State and local administrators to meeting the evolving food and nutrition needs of the poor.

In the year 1969, and in the immediate years ahead, one of the most pressing needs for our nation will be housing. An estimated 1,900,000 units for normal construction and up to 500,000 units (50,000 in 1969) for Government-sponsored low-income housing. In order to meet these goals, we will need increased lumber production. The key to lumber production is logs. The key to logs—allowable cut.

The best minds we have consulted indicate the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service could increase the allowable cut enough to meet the demands of the housing industry and . . . still not rob future generations of their share of our Western forests. This would take a new and dynamic approach by those Federal agencies. This would take an increase in budget for these agencies. *Here is where you come in.*

Please write to your Congressman and Senators giving them an outline of the problems you have experienced in obtaining adequate supplies of forest products and suggest to them they support a budget increase for the Forest Service and BLM for the express purpose of investigating the maximum allowable cut consistent with the broad National interest.

For your information, we are attaching a letter we received from Schneider Lumber Products and Hult Lumber Products, divisions of American Can Company, outlining their log problems, a cartoon expressing the attitude of the arch-conservationist and an article from the Eugene Register Guard indicating the campaign has already begun.

Please act now!  
Enclosed is a letter we sent you last month. We don't know how many of you have written to your Congressmen and Senators; but if you haven't, *do it now.*

During the month of February, two sales of Federal timber were bid up to a figure over \$200.00 a thousand. And . . . one of the bidders was a stud mill! (These prices were over three times the appraised value.) These high stumpage costs must eventually reflect themselves in higher lumber prices.

The only way we in the industry can avoid higher prices for lumber is to put pressure on the Federal Government to end the artificial shortage of softwood timber. This could be done in 4 ways:

- (1) A temporary ban on all softwood log exports (except Port Orford and Alaska Yellow Cedar). These exports could resume when the domestic emergency has abated.
- (2) An immediate release, for harvesting, of all wind thrown (blow-down) timber. This would salvage potentially wasted timber since blow downs are susceptible to rot, fire, and insects, as well as increase available timber for prompt cutting.
- (3) A temporary 10% increase of allowable cut in the softwood forest of the Western states. The 10% figure is a minimum increase. (We have heard of experts predicting the possibility of a 60% increase being a potential yield while still maintaining a perpetual yield.)
- (4) A complete inventory of the softwood forests in the control of the Federal agencies. With this in hand, the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management could then set new allowable cut figures consistent with due consideration for future generations.

There is a predicted demand for 26,000,000 new housing units by 1979—an average of 2,600,000 a year! (Last year we built 1,500,000 units.) Two million of these units to be built by private enterprise each year. This will take more lumber and this means more timber. The timber can only come from Federal forests.

Please write your representatives in Washington, D.C. outlining the problems and what has happened to prices in the last year or two. In order to accomplish any of the above steps, budget allowances must be made by House of Representatives, who are considering budget items now.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

MODIFICATIONS IN THE BASIS OF COUPON ISSUANCE ANNOUNCED IN DECEMBER 1968

4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD IN THE NORTH

Monthly net income	Current			Effective Feb. 1, 1969		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
Under \$20	\$2	\$50	\$52	\$2	\$58	\$60
\$20 to \$29.99	8	44	52	6	54	60
\$30 to \$39.99	14	42	56	10	52	62
\$40 to \$49.99	20	40	60	14	48	62
\$50 to \$59.99	24	40	64	20	44	64
\$60 to \$69.99	28	38	66	26	40	66

4-PERSON HOUSEHOLD IN THE SOUTH

Monthly net income	Current			Effective Feb. 1, 1969		
	Purchase	Bonus	Total	Purchase	Bonus	Total
Under \$30	\$2	\$46	\$48	\$2	\$56	\$58
\$30 to \$39.99	10	42	52	8	50	58
\$40 to \$49.99	16	40	56	12	48	60
\$50 to \$59.99	22	36	58	18	42	60
\$60 to \$69.99	26	34	60	24	38	62

CHARLES SOLDIER DIES IN VIET WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. J. K. Carroll, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CHARLES SOLDIER DIES IN VIET WAR—PFC. J. K. CARROLL, 22, WAS DRAFTED IN SEPTEMBER

A Charles county soldier who was the father of a 2-year-old boy, died in combat February 26 in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

He was PFC Joseph K. Carroll, 22, the only son of Marian T. Carroll, of Pomonkey, Md.

Private Carroll was a lifelong resident of Pomonkey until he was drafted into the Army September 10.

A 1965 graduate of Pomonkey High School, he worked as a machine operator for three years at a Navy explosives plant in Indian Head, Md.

Private Carroll was sent to Fort Bragg, N.C., for basic training.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his son, Victor Glasgow Carroll, of Pomonkey.

A requiem mass will be offered at 10 a.m. today at St. Joseph's Catholic Church in Pomfret, Md.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: MEETING NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Denby Mackie, with Oregon's Timberlane Lumber Co., has written to me with suggestions concerning the problems of wood supply for meeting out Nation's housing goals, and for responsive action to the present price crunch in lumber and plywood.

His letter to his customers and the article to which he refers in the Eugene, Ore., Register-Guard are presented herewith:

TIMBERLANE LUMBER Co.,  
Eugene, Ore., March 5, 1969.

To Our Customers:  
"Allowable Cut"—These words mean life to the independent producer of lumber in the West and strike fear in the hearts of the ardent conservationist. But . . . What does allowable cut mean to you? As a practical matter, we in the lumber business have been existing in a state of an uneasy truce with the conservationists. Many of them seem to feel it is a sacrilege to cut any trees for any purpose. We in the industry feel our National forests should be managed for the ultimate welfare of the whole country with a special consideration given to the residents of the producing area.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard,  
Jan. 22, 1969]

**FOREST INDUSTRY VOWS NEW DRIVE FOR  
BIGGER LOG CUT  
(By Dan Wyant)**

The forest industry will make a renewed effort in 1969 to convince the American public more trees must be made available for lumber and plywood products.

Wendell Barnes, executive vice president of the Western Wood Products Association (WWPA), told a gathering of lumbermen in Eugene Tuesday night that the nation's housing goals can't be reached if the raw material base continues to shrink.

He said housing starts are expected to double annually over the next decade while increasing acreages of forest lands are being withdrawn from the timber supply for such "single purpose" uses as wilderness preservation.

Barnes spoke to a district meeting of WWPA members where new officers were named for the coming year. Arthur Lindley of Kimball Bros. Lumber Co. at Dexter was renamed district chairman; S. E. Pittman of Bohemia Lumber Co. at Culp Creek was named vice chairman, and Clark Miller of I. P. Miller Lumber Co. at Monroe was named secretary. The district includes Lane, Douglas and northern Coos counties.

Barnes said the annual allowable cut from federal timberlands must be increased by a "reasonable and scientifically justified amount," increased funds must be made available for access road construction and intensive forest management, and the trend toward withdrawing forest lands from timber cutting must be slowed down.

Right now, he said, there are 177 proposals to "fence off" forest land for the "single use of recreational or sterile wilderness."

Barnes said the forest industry is finding a new ally in the National Association of Home Builders. The association is alarmed at the skyrocketing price of lumber and the lack of availability of many items, he said.

"They now realize we must have a timber supply to meet their housing goals," he said.

The home builders have political power in the nation's metropolitan areas, where most of the members of Congress come from, Barnes said. This can be helpful to the forest industry, he said, which has been hampered in the past by lack of numerical strength in Congress because of the sparse population of the West.

Barnes also reported that various trade groups in the forest industry are joining together in a new promotional program called FACE (Facts, Action, Communication and Evaluation) to help convince the public that "sound" timber harvests are essential to the nation.

Barnes expressed confidence that Gov. Walter Hickel of Alaska will be confirmed as secretary of the Interior and will be a "spokesman for wise use of our natural resources."

In fact, Barnes said, several members of the new Nixon cabinet have backgrounds in the construction industry "so that we should have a sympathetic ear for some of the problems we face on land withdrawals, reforestation and proper land use."

Other speakers were Paul Ehringer of Edward Hines Lumber Co. at Westfir, district director, who said half of a new 10 cent per thousand board feet dues assessment increase to WWPA members will go for wood promotion programs through the American Wood Council, and L. L. "Stub" Stewart of Bohemia Lumber Co., a past-president of the WWPA.

Stewart is scheduled to take over as president of the National Forest Products Assn. at mid-year. He said the three biggest problems facing the industry are the continuing fight against export of logs to Japan, work for increases in the allowable cut on national forest lands, and to "help the American Forest Institute educate the public that to cut a tree is good—instead of a sin."

**INHERITED BUDGET**

**HON. FRANK T. BOW**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon took office on January 20, he inherited a budget for fiscal year 1970 which had been in preparation for over a year. The new administration has been engaged in an intensive effort to cut the budget in order to counter the serious inflationary pressures that now affect the economy. The initial results of that effort have now been presented to the Congress, and I would like to make sure that all of my colleagues appreciate the difficulty and the magnitude of that accomplishment.

In judging the Nixon administration's actions, we must take care that we are measuring them against the reality of the Johnson budget as of this date rather than the situation as it appears in the document submitted to the Congress last January.

I want to make it clear that I imply no dishonesty on the part of the previous administration. However, the Johnson budget document does not accurately portray the fiscal reality that now exists. To a great extent this has been the result of increases in uncontrollable items beyond the estimates presented in January.

The January budget assumed that interest rates would not rise in the remainder of fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Higher interest rates will cause interest on the public debt to rise by at least \$500 million; a lower level of collections of premiums from savings and loan institutions and higher claims against the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will cost an additional \$150 million; and a shortfall in sales of agency assets will affect net spending and particularly so with respect to HUD where the shortfall will approximate \$200 million.

Receipts were sometimes overestimated in the January budget. For example, income from rental of offshore oil lands—used as an offset to Interior Department expenditures—could fall off as much as \$350 million.

Farm price supports as estimated in the budget appear too low. Payments for feed grains, wheat, and soybeans are higher than expected, which will raise costs \$200 million. Erroneous accounting of certificates of interest for CCC will increase expenditures \$500 million.

Additional claims and judgment payments will be required. Payments for Indian tribal claims and other similar assessments could exceed the budget estimates by as much as \$175 million.

There have also been some downward estimates, but the overall net effect at this date has been to add at least \$1.7 billion to the \$195.3-billion expenditure figure contained in the Johnson budget. The Nixon administration, therefore, was faced with a minimum estimated expenditure total of \$197 billion when it began its reexamination of the fiscal year 1970 budget. And, even this sum does not account for possible overruns in defense and other individual programs.

For example the Farmers Home Administration and VA are having difficulty selling agency assets and their shortfalls may be as much as \$500 million.

Welfare programs may have been underestimated. For example, medicare outlays could be up as much as \$150 million above the budget estimate. Estimates of the States were used for the medicaid program. As has often been the case in the past, the States' estimates may very well be too low.

Moreover, it now appears that estimates for other programs were held at minimum levels of expectancy—mandatory VA readjustment benefits may be \$150 million greater; accident claims for Federal employees and unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen will likely exceed the budget by \$24 million; AEC weapons program will probably increase \$23 million; and disaster relief \$2 million.

There can be no doubt that any expenditure figure substantially greater than \$197 billion is too high and if left untouched would contribute greatly to the inflationary pressures now existent in the economy. The Nixon administration must therefore make cuts of several billion dollars just to arrive at an expenditure total only slightly below that projected in the January budget. Yet, such cuts are vitally necessary if inflation is to be stemmed.

Following is a table that summarizes the various over and underestimates that I have mentioned:

<i>Revised 1970 January budget estimates</i>	
[In millions of dollars]	
January estimate .....	195,272
Adjustments:	
Increases:	
Disaster relief .....	+2
Farm price support.....	+194
Certificates of interest.....	+510
Housing and urban development (shortfall in asset sales) .....	+200
Offshore oil receipts.....	+355
Claims and judgments.....	+178
Justice .....	+3
Unemployment compensation..	+19
Accident claims for Federal employees .....	+5
Interest on the public debt...	+800
Atomic Energy Commission (overrun in weapons programs) .....	+23
Veterans readjustment benefits) .....	+150
District of Columbia.....	+36
Federal Home Loan Bank Board (claims and premium income) .....	+150
Subtotal increases.....	(+2,325)
Decreases:	
Economic assistance .....	-22
Advance feed grain payments, 1969 .....	-168
Timber sales .....	-100
Operating—differential subsidies .....	-11
Housing subsidy payments....	-30
Redwood National Park—cash to liquidate .....	-20
Unemployment trust .....	-220
Contributions to international organizations .....	-1
General Services Administration (surplus real property) .....	-5

Revised 1970 January budget estimates—  
Continued

[In millions of dollars]	
Decreases—Continued	
Civil Service Commission-----	-18
Subtotal decreases-----	(-595)
January budget less above adjust- ments-----	197,002
Other possible adjustments:	
Farmers Home Administration and VA (shortfall in asset sales)-----	+500
Medicare-----	+150
Medicaid-----	?

FREEDOM TALK

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. F. Gearhart, 209 East Uhler Avenue, Alexandria, Va., a friend and constituent of mine, has called my attention to two commentaries by Melvin Munn, of Life Line, Freedom Talk, Dallas, Tex., which he feels should receive the wide attention which can be obtained by publication in the RECORD.

As I believe our colleagues and all who read this RECORD will benefit by consideration of the commentaries Mr. Gearhart brought to my attention, with permission, I insert them in full at this point in the RECORD:

[From Life Line, Feb. 6, 1969]  
DEBUNKING THE GHETTOS

This is Life Line, Melvin Munn from Dallas. Each generation, or each decade, perhaps, would appear to have its own unique group of people who are presented to the public by writers and the mass news media on a nationwide scale as most in need of help from the perennial "do-gooders."

Right now, we are reading and hearing the sad story of the "inner cities," or the ghettos, as they are often called. They are the same things which were referred to as slums until a couple of years ago.

It is true that the population of most of our cities has increased tremendously over the past two decades. But much of the population increase can be found in suburban America, and not in the "inner city."

Heart-tug stories which stir the sympathies of people make excellent reading. They stir the imagination. They appeal to the humanitarian instincts of the human race. They sell subscriptions and boost TV ratings. Therefore, it is expedient for the "do-gooders" to have some group about which they can appeal to the public with tear-jerking, heart-rending tales of hardship and disillusionment.

Only a little more than a quarter of a century ago the South was described as "the nation's number one economic problem."

This section of our country, which had been treated ever since the Civil War much like a "red-headed stepchild," was pointed out in newspapers, radio programs, and magazine articles as the prime example of what a portion of our country should not be like.

Pictures were used in magazines depicting the deplorable condition of the sharecropper on the farms of the South. Many of these were Negroes, but many were also low-income whites.

The South was held up to ridicule, and impassioned speeches were made in the halls

of Congress regarding the plight of the poor in the South.

All the while, laws remained on the statute books which had been placed there with the aim of stifling any growth that the South from the rest of the nation, the South might make.

Slowly, and in spite of continued ridicule launched a program of growth and expansion. Today the sharecropper has almost disappeared—having no place in mechanized farming where most farms are tended by the owners. Industry has moved in, offering jobs and regular payrolls.

The area which but a few years ago was the "number one economic problem" has recently been more accurately described as "our number one economic opportunity."

And it must be emphasized that much of the progress which was made has been achieved without outside aid and in spite of attempts at outside ridicule.

Just a few years ago the "do-gooders" went to great pains to describe the miseries of "the aged," and claimed that they lacked proper care, particularly in the field of health and medicine. The result was the passage of "Medicare," which today is helping many but is still in the age of "growing pains," and costing vastly more than forecast.

At other times, sob sisters and welfareists have sought to give to the public visions of other groups which were called "disadvantaged" or discriminated against. Included have been migrant workers and the Indians.

With regard to migrant workers, it should be said that they choose this type of work and this type of life. Most of them know there are disadvantages when they join the migrant crew, but here in America they have the right to choose.

Many migrant workers in the United States earn more and live at a far higher standard than most of the people of other nations.

Right now the hue and cry is over the problems of the people who dwell in the inner cities, in the so-called ghettos. We are told that ghettos breed crime and riots and disorders, and the sociologists go to great lengths to describe the despair they find.

On the one hand, because so much crime is presumably committed there, we are inclined to get the impression that all slum residents are criminally inclined. On the other hand, those who make excuses for criminals, rioters, and lawbreakers keep insisting that the slum people are subjected to police brutality, that the residents hate the police and want no part of them, and that these areas are filled with an air of despair and hopelessness.

Often we are given the impression that the only people living in slums are nonwhite, but any honest statement of the facts will show that this is not the case.

We have long maintained that the criminal element, like the tiny minority of our youth which gains most of the headlines, constitutes only a small percentage of the people, no matter what race is involved, and whether it be in the slums or elsewhere.

But a study made by Senator Winston L. Prouty has failed to achieve widespread publicity. It was very carefully prepared and carried out in three slum areas of Washington, D.C. Polls of this sort are very tricky things, and can be said not to represent the average people or to be controversial. However, Senator Prouty's survey consisted of personal, detailed interviews with 447 people. While this may not seem like many, do not forget that this study was conducted in three areas in a single city, whereas some of our pollsters claim they can get indications of nationwide attitudes with surveys taken among just a few thousand people in a nation of 202 million.

Senator Prouty did not conduct the interviews himself. They were carried on by a team of Negro interviewers on the sound theory that slum residents would be more

likely to reply honestly to questions coming from members of their own race.

Here are just a few highlights of Senator Prouty's survey results:

First, about that "despair and hopelessness" that is supposed to be so prevalent in slum areas. Eighty-two per cent of those interviewed by Senator Prouty's questioners declared that they thought an individual can earn almost anything he wants if he tries hard enough. Most of those surveyed said they thought opportunities for jobs, as well as life in general, were improving.

On the question of financial need, the majority felt their most important need was money for education and housing.

Incidentally, Senator Prouty, who is from Vermont, noted a most interesting fact—that these answers in slum areas in Washington were strikingly similar to the answers he got from a similar survey in a predominantly white, middle-class city in his native state of Vermont.

This survey, then, would seem to bear out the idea that the problems of the city—and they do exist—are being exaggerated all out of proportion by the bleeding hearts and do-gooders who find it absolutely essential to keep the sympathies of our people stirred up about some area, group, or class at all times.

Today it is the slum dweller. Who or what will be their favorite subject tomorrow?

OUR UNCERTAIN FOREIGN POLICY

The question is being asked many times these days as to why the United States is supporting communism in Africa while at the very same time sacrificing thousands of lives and billions of dollars in South Viet Nam.

This question should be aimed at the State Department, that portion of the executive branch of government which deals most directly with foreign affairs and the making of policy regarding relations with other nations.

A large portion of the southern half of Africa is under attack by the communists. Included are Rhodesia, Angola, and Mozambique. Terrorists are threatening the peace and tranquility of these nations, and the best information available is that this terrorism is being incited or supported by Red interests.

But the United States has refused to support independent Rhodesia, preferring to bow to the wishes of the numerous emerging states of black Africa and the demands of Britain.

Rhodesia, incidentally, offered to send troops to fight alongside Americans in Viet Nam.

To our everlasting shame, as one writer put it, we continue to participate in what is becoming the physical dismemberment of our African friends—both black and white—by black hordes armed and guided by our enemies.

The story of our perfidy in this situation should arouse the indignation of every citizen, black or white. Here is the United States stabbing good friends in the back, even going against our allies, as we go along with the United Nations in imposing sanctions against Rhodesia.

An American, recently returned from a safari in southern Africa, said: "The countries of Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, and Rhodesia are being invaded by organized bands of communist terrorists trained in Cuba, Russia, and China; armed by Cuba, Russia, and China with the most advanced automatic weapons."

He paid tribute to the progress being made in South Africa, and reminded Americans: "The soldiers of southern Africa died by the side of the American and Allied soldiers in World Wars I and II. Rhodesian and South African fliers were among the most prominent in the Battle of Britain. Today we refuse to sell them a single shell, a single gun,

a single plane—no, not even a single 4-wheel-drive jeep with which to defend their beloved countries against the terror of communism, though we do supply armaments to their communist enemies."

It will be remembered that on July 29, 1968, President Johnson signed an executive order that prohibits any and all trade between the United States and Rhodesia. The reason for this act was the support of the illegal and unprincipled sanctions instituted by the United Nations at the insistence of Britain.

The sanctions against Rhodesia are aimed at producing conditions which will cause the downfall of Premier Ian Smith's government and the Rhodesian leadership which is struggling for freedom.

Actually, in supporting these sanctions, we are becoming in a very real sense partners with the Red-supported hordes of terrorists seeking to invade Rhodesia's borders.

Here is a former colony and commonwealth of the former British Empire, seeking independence in an orderly manner by the expressed will of the people and by peaceful declaration. In most other new and emerging nations accorded independence since World War II there have been strife and bloodshed—but Rhodesia has had a stable government supported by its people.

Oddly enough, the United States leads in the ban on trade with Rhodesia, a nation with which we are at peace. But our government does not demand that sanctions be applied against North Viet Nam, whose communist forces have inflicted heavy casualties on American military forces. And we are buying chromium from the Soviet Union instead of Rhodesia, where we once secured most of our supply.

Such treatment of friends, nations with which we are at peace, miserably fails to make sense while we are trading with nations sworn to bury us.

Surely, in the cold light of world opinion, our policies must seem naive and strange indeed!

[From Life Line, Feb. 28, 1969]

#### GOVERNMENT WASTE

This is "Life Line," Melvin Munn from Dallas.

Inflation has been a problem of this country for a number of years now, and the dangers of continued inflation were brought dramatically to the attention of the people of the United States last year.

We awoke from a long period of complacency and smugness with regard to our dollar to find that it was no longer the power in world finance that we had believed it to be.

One of the reasons for inflation in the United States has been the continuation and acceleration of deficit spending. It has been so many years since we ended a fiscal year in the black that it seems improper, somehow, to discuss it.

The fact is that a return to a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility is a must.

One of the principal factors, however, in the inability of the government to balance its budget has been waste and inefficiency in some of the government programs. One of the worst in this respect has been the Agency for International Development, which handles our foreign-aid appropriation and has spent many billions of dollars.

Some years ago Congressman Alvin O'Koniski called our foreign-aid program "Operation Rathole," meaning that the money which we were spending on foreign aid was being utterly wasted.

Certainly we know that the money we have given away in aid, plus the interest on the money we borrowed to give away, is approaching the staggering figure of \$150 billion.

This has been strewn around among more than 100 nations, both friend and foe.

Roads have been built into jungles. Industrial plants have been constructed where nobody knew how to operate them and where products could be transported to market only with extreme difficulty.

Our laxness has often allowed our communist foes to claim credit for projects which were entirely or largely constructed with American foreign-aid dollars.

The American people would be shocked to learn some of the items which have been purchased for petty rulers in Africa and elsewhere, solely for their own gratification.

Let us make no mistake. It was your money and mine which was thus spent in foreign lands. You and I paid it to the federal government in taxes, or we will have to pay it yet. The federal government does not produce or create wealth. It obtains its funds from taxing the productive efforts of its citizens. It digs deep into the pocketbooks of every American family.

Americans have always supported in a very fine way the essential government programs and services enacted by their representatives.

But they do not and they should not be asked to support government waste and inefficiency.

Senator Stephen M. Young of Ohio gave to the Congress some revealing information in an address printed in the *Congressional Record*, following a personal visit to Viet Nam. Here is a portion of his address:

"Last January while in Viet Nam, I encountered many hundreds of civilian officials. They were all over the place, enjoying high salaries and allowances and doing little, if anything, to earn them. Never have so many been sent so far at such great expense who have done so little.

"The fact is that of AID (Agency for International Development) officials in South Viet Nam, the Director receives in excess of \$44,000 per year; 26 receive in excess of \$41,700 per year; 82 receive \$35,500; 262 receive in excess of \$30,000; 409 receive in excess of \$24,600; and 76 receive more than \$19,000 per year.

"This is outrageous. What justification is there for the AID head in Viet Nam to receive almost \$5,000 a year more than the Chief Justice of the United States? What possible reason can be given for paying 110 other AID officials a greater salary than that received by members of the Cabinet, Senators, and Congressmen? What excuse for paying 262 additional AID officials salaries the same as received by Members of Congress?

"It is scandalous that 782 AID officials in Viet Nam are now being paid \$25,000 a year or more. In addition to their base salaries these officials are given a 25 per cent hardship allowance, a \$3,000 separate maintenance allowance, and fringe benefits including air-conditioned housing, and medical care, and all PX and commissary privileges.

"There is evidence that many sell cigarettes, whiskey, radios, and other PX and commissary merchandise to the South Vietnamese. . . .

"Many of these overpaid and underworked AID officials are expected to work in refugee camps, so-called, and some have refused to remain in refugee camps because of 'lack of security.'

"A typical example of AID maladministration concerns five forestry experts, so-called, each with an annual salary including fringe benefits exceeding \$38,000. They live in air-conditioned, high-rent apartments paid for by our taxpayers; and they work—or supposedly work—in an area where there has been no timber for many years."

The situation as cited by Senator Young regarding the AID operation in Viet Nam is but one of almost countless examples of gross government waste and inefficiency which have been uncovered and made public at one time or another.

When we hear of such waste, such maladministration, we realize that it is no won-

der our government has not been living within its income.

Some bureaucrats have become "fat cats" at the expense of the American taxpayer.

There can be no justification for paying these AID workers, experts though they may be, larger salaries than are received by members of the Cabinet and many highly placed and responsible government officials. Nor do we need timber experts in areas where there are luxurious apartments—but no timber.

It is time for a government housecleaning. We need to get rid of the bureaucrats who have been feeding at the public trough without paying their way, those more interested in building little empires for themselves within our government than they are in rendering the services for which their agencies were created.

We know there are many conscientious government employees and officials. But far too many of these, like Otto Otepka, have been sidetracked or persecuted because they sought to do their duty.

Our government cannot continue to operate in this fashion. Our inefficiency will make us the laughingstock of the world or our deficit spending will cause such runaway inflation that the value of the dollar will collapse. One of the answers to our dilemma is to streamline our governmental operations, cut out all nonessential programs, eliminate duplication of effort, and put our government on a businesslike basis.

If we fail to do this we are courting disaster as a nation and endangering the cherished freedoms we claim to want preserved.

#### REFORM ELECTORAL COLLEGE

During the Presidential campaign last fall, when it became obvious there was a possibility the election might end in a deadlock among the three candidates, a wave of concern and confusion swept across the nation—and the world. After all, the Presidency of the United States is the most important single office in the world, and the prospect that there might be confusion or delay in naming the man to succeed President Johnson caused widespread concern.

Under the machinery by which our Presidents are now elected, an election stalemate could conceivably leave the country without a President or Vice-President-elect for an indefinite period. As the election turned out, an inconclusive result was avoided.

In our age, when tensions are very evident around the world and nuclear war a possibility, the hazards of a vacuum in national leadership hardly need elaboration. More than ever, authorities believe constitutional changes in national election procedures are a must.

For most people, electing a President appears no more complicated than marking an X on a secret ballot. But the polling booth merely sets off a chain of events beginning with the voters and ending in Congress, as prescribed by law and custom to insure, as far as possible, a free and wise choice of a fellow citizen to occupy the highest office in the land. The reason for the existence of what we call the Electoral College goes back to a day when choice of a President through popular vote was virtually impossible—due to difficulty of travel and communication.

It was felt there was no way for people to determine the character or qualifications of candidates. Thus, a method was worked out whereby voters chose Presidential Electors from each state—supposedly citizens of high standing in the local community—and they in turn selected a President.

In practice, as the years went by, the Electors have cast their ballots in accordance with the wish of the voters.

But this is not legally required, as can be illustrated by an incident in the 1968 election. North Carolina cast a majority of its popular vote for President Richard M. Nixon.

North Carolina's Electors did the same—except one, who decided he would cast his vote for George Wallace, the candidate of the American Independence Party. Not being bound by the vote of the people, the Elector was free to do this.

While it is not likely that many Electors will stray from the vote as expressed by the majority of the people, it obviously could happen.

Many now favor a change in the system of electing the President and Vice President. Many bills will be offered in the Congress this year to effect this change. Those in favor of change say the present system—popular vote in November, Electoral College vote in December, and Congressional canvass in January—is cumbersome and confusing.

They also say the present system gives the large states excessive leverage in Presidential elections. At present, it is possible for the 12 largest states to carry Presidential elections over the remaining 38 states.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has adopted a policy declaration supporting an amendment to the Constitution that would abolish the Electoral College and provide for the election of the President and Vice-President of the United States on either a nationwide popular vote which would provide direct election of a President, or by the district method which would preserve the principle of the electoral vote.

While only once under the Electoral College system—in 1876—did the candidate receiving a majority of the popular vote fail to win the Presidency, there have been many anxious moments.

It has been evident for years now that changes are needed in the system under which our two highest offices are filled. We need to simplify the process so that no doubts linger in the world after the election by the people has been held.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March, 31, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, this is a time of sadness for America. With the passing of our beloved former President Dwight David Eisenhower, our Nation has lost an outstanding leader and a great man.

General Eisenhower will be remembered for many things. He was highly successful both as a soldier and as a statesman, achieving the ultimate of success in our Nation by being elected our 34th President.

He was a devoted family man, a man of religion, and a staunch patriot. He was passionately dedicated to achieving and maintaining peace. Above all, he will be remembered as a very warm and compassionate human being.

I feel greatly honored to have had the privilege of serving in the Congress during the Presidency of Dwight Eisenhower. His terms in office were marked with many accomplishments.

Ike's life and achievements and the high principles he stood for will continue to serve over the years as an inspiration to us all.

To Mrs. Eisenhower and their son John and family we express our deepest sympathies.

**SPECIAL STUDY PROPOSED ON NEED FOR RESEARCH ON USE OF BEES FOR MOST EFFICIENT CROP PRODUCTION**

**HON. TOM STEED**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article by Mr. Glen Gibson, of Minco, Okla., executive secretary of the American Honey Producers Association, ably points out the need for research on the use of bees and other pollinating insects for the most efficient production of food, feed, and fiber crops.

This proposal for a study and report by the Department of Agriculture on the nature and requirements of an adequate research program is timely and significant.

The article follows:

Agriculture is usually regarded as the production of honey and beeswax. In the U.S. 4,770,000 colonies of honey bees produce 200 million pounds of honey and 4 million pounds of beeswax with a total value of \$36 million.

However, bees are much more important for pollination of crops than for the production of honey and beeswax. About 90 crops grown in the U.S. valued at \$1 billion are dependent on insect pollination. Additional crops valued at \$4 billion are benefited to some degree by insect pollination.

Currently a few beekeepers rent their colonies to farmers for the pollination of numerous fruit, vegetable, oilseed, and legume seed crops. Many colonies that are not rented also inadvertently contribute to the pollination of nearby crops. Nevertheless, rental and use of bees strictly for pollination has been relegated to a secondary position in the minds of most beekeepers and researchers. However from the standpoint of benefits to the nations economy as a whole, bees perform a greater function as pollinators of crops than as producers of a desirable food item.

The beekeeping industry in the United States is in a declining condition. For the last 20 years the number of colonies in the United States has declined consistently at the rate of 1% per year. Many beekeepers are finding it an unprofitable enterprise and are going out of business.

Rental of bee colonies for crop pollination has not stopped this decline. Primarily because of incomplete information on pollination there has been poor communication between the grower and the beekeeper on the value of bees for pollination and on the expense involved in maintaining and supplying strong colonies. As a result most pollination fees are "starvation wages" for beekeepers and some colonies supplied for pollination have been of inferior quality.

Management of two species of wild bees for pollination has developed into a small industry within a few areas of the Pacific Northwest. The use of other species of wild bees on different crops may be feasible and profitable if adequately studied. However the bulk of the pollination load, because of the versatility of the honey bee, will fall primarily upon its shoulders.

The honey bee can be moved into an area in mass numbers when desired. In addition honey bees consistently visit flowers from early spring to late fall, they visit a wide variety of plants, and their biology is well known as a result of studies by amateur and professional apiculturists for centuries.

The basic pollination requirement of most crops has been determined with bagged or caged flowers. However, the practical, exact need and proper use of pollinating insects

on those crops that require such pollination is not known. Knowledge is needed on the number of insect visits to the flower that are required for its best pollination, the time the visits should be made, and the influence of the inadequate number of visits on quantity and quality of fruit or seed produced. For example research has shown that the highest production of market-quality cantaloups is obtained if each flower receives about 12 bee visits between 9 a.m. and noon. The number of colonies of honey bees, their relative strength, their distribution in the field, and their general condition necessary to give this desired visitation is unknown. Similar information on the various varieties of some 90 of our agricultural crops is also unknown. Also new crop varieties are being developed and introduced each year. New crop introductions from abroad are being made. Information on the value of honey bees and other pollinators needs to be kept current as crop varieties and growing practices change.

We propose that appropriate agricultural committees in Congress request the U.S. Department of Agriculture to undertake a special study and make a report to Congress on the nature and requirements for an adequate research program on the honey bee and other pollinators to assure maximum use of these valuable insects for the benefit of our nations agriculture as well as the bee-keeping industry.

The study should consider but not necessarily be limited to the gathering of information on the following:

1. Pollination needs for various crops.
2. The potential value of different species of wild bees as pollinators.
3. The proper management and selective breeding of honey bees and different manageable species of wild bees as pollinators for maximum utility in crop pollination.
4. Methods of increasing populations of pollinators when and where desired.
5. The economics of providing adequate pollination service.
6. The regions in the U.S. where such research should be conducted.
7. Factors affecting crop attractiveness to pollinators with a view to improving pollination.
8. The value of grants to Land Grant Institutions to conduct research on crop pollination with bees and other insects.
9. The facilities, personnel and research support needed to provide for the type of program outlined.

**THE WAR IN VIETNAM**

**HON. OGDEN R. REID**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, an unofficial press report from Saigon points out that the number of U.S. men killed as a result of hostile forces in Vietnam has today exceeded those of the Korean war, and this is not to speak of those young men who have been killed as a result of an accidental attack by their allies or those who have died of sickness. The Vietnam war now ranks in deaths only behind the Civil War, World War I, and World War II. Vietnam has drawn the strength of our men not for a mere 3 or 4 years, but for at least 8, with no real end in sight. It is time now to escalate our efforts for a negotiated political settlement. Today's report underlines the urgency of the peace talks, for any delay will surely mean more casualties and a further loss of life.

MICHIGAN NEWSPAPER SPEAKS  
OUT AGAINST HIGH INTEREST  
RATES

**HON. WRIGHT PATMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Muskegon, Mich., Chronicle, has spoken out in unmistakable terms for an end to the high interest policies of the Federal Reserve Board.

In its lead editorial, the Muskegon Chronicle says:

The Reserve Board's policy—until now a sanctioned administration policy—patiently has not worked. And we don't think it will. Worse, it carries with it the seeds of disaster. The fiscal vise should be loosened now, before its threads are stripped—and with it the vulnerable gears of the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, the comments in the Muskegon Chronicle are part of the growing concern about the excesses and the misguided policies of our Federal Reserve System. The Members of the 91st Congress, I hope, will realize that the tide of public opinion has turned against the Federal Reserve Board and its Chairman, William McChesney Martin.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the editorial from the Muskegon Chronicle:

UNTIE FISCAL STRAITJACKET BEFORE IT'S TOO  
LATE

Well, it happened. As had been forecast for weeks, major banks across the country have raised their prime rate from 7 to 7½ per cent—the highest in American history.

But don't blame the banks.

The action was inevitable, the result of a designed and deliberate government response to the pressures of inflation.

The bankers' move was defensive, related to their own financial positions. The cost of money the banks borrow has been rising sharply in recent weeks due to pressure from the credit-restraining policies of the Federal Reserve Board.

The board has been trying to dam off the inflationary surge at the same time that business demand for loans to finance inventories, buy equipment and build plants has been running at fever pitch. Despite a series of prime rate increases, the pinch on bank profits has been intensifying. Last Dec. 2 the prime rate was 6½ per cent. By Dec. 18 it was 6¾. It hit the 7 per cent level Jan. 7, and Tuesday it broke through the ceiling.

The Federal Reserve believes that tightening measures, including bigger reserve requirements for commercial banks, will rein in an inflation that became almost runaway during the last two years of the Johnson administration. President Nixon is aware of the crisis and, for the present at least, he has "bought" the board's counterinflation tactic—making money hard to get.

But is it working?

We doubt it.

Is it dangerous?

We think it is.

A gentleman we have disagreed with rather strenuously in the past—Rep. Wright Patman, the Texas Democrat who is chairman of the House Banking Committee—has urged the President to force a roll back of the record-shattering interest rates. He says he believes that if the interest rate spiral is not stopped, this nation will be "plunged into depression."

We're very much afraid he is right.

John R. Bunting, president of the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., of Philadelphia, one of the nation's largest banking institutions, says he doubts that this week's hike in the interest rates will do much to slow inflation.

"These increases haven't done a thing so far, and I don't think the latest increase will have the desired effect either," he said, "Borrowers feel that inflation is here to stay and that it's better to borrow now than later."

"Better now than later." That's the nitty gritty of it—a predictable response which reveals the flaw in governmental tinkering which affects interest rates.

The Federal Reserve, only 24 hours after the prime rate skyrocketed to 7½ per cent, talked of applying new turns of the screw to the nation's credit. Businessmen CAN read. If they didn't get the money they needed when it cost 6 or 6½ per cent, and it's now at 7½ and pressing toward 8, they are going to get it today before it blows completely out of sight.

Where will it end?

Congressman Patman—and we're inclined to agree—fears it will end in a thunderous crash, leaving millions of people owing huge debts at high rates of interest and, perhaps even worse, leaving the government holding the bag on a \$350,000,000,000 debt (the taxpayers' debt), financed at interest rates twice what they were a decade ago.

And if the taxpayer—Mr. Little Guy—is caught up in the maelstrom of a monetary mess which makes it impossible for him to shell out 25 to 45 per cent of his earnings in federal income taxes—where; we repeat, where—is government going to get money enough even to cover the interest on its debt, let alone finance day-to-day operations currently budgeted at close to \$100,000,000,000 a year?

When a major corporation wants to borrow money badly enough, it will do so—even at today's astronomical rates. The "interest"—whether it be yesterday's 4 per cent or the 7½ or 8 per cent of today—is a "cost of operation" which is charged off in the corporation's annual tax accounting to the government. The result, of course, is reduced tax revenue unless the cost has been passed on to the consumer by way of increased prices.

Mr. Little Guy? He can't turn the trick so easily.

If he and the Mrs. had planned a 1969 start on that "dream house" they immediately face a small army of problems—virtually all of them created, or permitted to exist, by the government. Borrow money? Even if he is willing to pay the prime rate (and he should be prepared to have to pay more) can he get the money? Mortgage money is not abundant—for the reason that government continues to soak up most of the available funds for the financing (or re-financing at higher rates) of its own operations.

The whole chain of events—including the soaring interest rates designed to curb inflation—fuels demand for even greater compensation for the services of men. The cost of the Little Guy's home goes up, not down. And if a lot of families like his decide not to build, they add to unemployment. This does nothing to end the demand. It is still there; just deferred. Experience would indicate it won't be deferred forever. Eventually, the dam will burst and Little Guys, first one-by-one, later in droves, will build "at any cost." With this kind of pressure in the home building industry, inflation could run rampant—a "monster" created instead of controlled by government policy.

A principal reason advanced by the government's fiscal experts for a "tight money" policy was to put the brakes on industrial expansion. There is precious little evidence of deceleration. One after another, corpora-

tions have announced 1969 and 1970 expansion programs described as the largest in their history. It should be pointed out that many of these corporations are able to do this without turning to the money markets and paying those sky-high interest rates.

Not so for most of the nation's utilities—which are facing one of the worst fiscal crunches in their history. But theirs is a crunch which will be passed onto the consumer—thus heating up instead of dampening the fires of inflation. Utilities must expand to meet the constantly growing needs of the areas they service with power or natural gas. No one can reasonably contend they should stand still, denying service to new customers in a growing nation.

A few years back these utilities could operate profitably within the framework of a 6 per cent return on their investment, and carry out expansion programs from reinvested profits or by way of low-yield bonds generally floated at returns ranging from 2½ to 4 per cent. Now we have the unprecedented spectacle of bluechip utility companies floating bond issues with yield rates exceeding 7 per cent—with a likelihood that the 8 and 9 per cent bond is near at hand.

Who pays for this financing? The utility customer, of course, sooner or later, through higher rates for power, light and heat.

Is this how to halt inflation?

Hardly!

Also to be considered is the effect on the stock market—which, in its turn, could have a withering effect on Washington. A sharp decline in security values, widely expected by market observers early this year, opens the door to widespread tax-loss selling. Thus, even though market values could return, within the year, to their highest points, the trader wins a government-offered opportunity to dump "loss" stocks and obtain tax-cut advantages when reporting 1969 income.

All of this means reduced income for the government, and the irony—no, the tragedy—of it is that the government will have brought it about itself.

The Reserve Board's policy—until now a sanctioned administration policy—patiently has not worked. And we don't think it will. Worse, it carries with it the seeds of disaster. The fiscal vise should be loosened now, before its threads are stripped—and with it the vulnerable gears of the American economy.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. E. ROSS ADAIR**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who have already publicly expressed their sorrow at the passing of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. His death is a time for national mourning and also for renewed idealism.

We who knew him both in time of war by serving under his command in Europe and in time of peace as a Member of Congress during his administration know well how he fully committed himself to the United States of America. He constantly endeavored to make the words "individual freedom and liberty" in the Declaration of Independence meaningful both to Americans and to nations of the world which were threatened with outside aggression or internal subversion.

Although we are saddened by the passing of this friend and great leader, we

can be heartened by the inspiration which his life will be for today's and tomorrow's leaders. His unselfish devotion to the service of his country will serve as a constant reminder of the quality of leadership required to preserve freedom. The decisions which he had to make both in war and in peace were oftentimes "hard" decisions requiring thoughtful answers. General Eisenhower's courage and ability to make such decisions, rather than take the easier or more politically expedient way out, marks him as a true patriot.

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the book on "The Vulnerable Russians," has received extensive reviews in the past year, most of them favorable, some unfavorable. Regardless of the criticism, all reviewers have agreed that the book reveals a type of analysis and a course of action with regard to the Soviet Union that are new to most Americans.

Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, "The Vulnerable Russians," is available at Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravener Building, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. As to why the book is challenging and forward-looking, the following reviews by Twin Circle publications and one by Prof. Joseph S. Rouck in the Political Scientist Journal, Randhi, India, stress certain highlights of the book's general thesis:

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky, Pageant Press, \$5.95)

Dr. Dobriansky's latest book fills a gap found all too often in one's approach to the Soviet Union. He bares the USSR for what it is: the unwilling union of many once-sovereign states, some of whom have their own distinctive language, customs, and heritage.

Dr. Dobriansky points out that the Soviet Union is not Russia. When the Captive Nations are mentioned, too many people think only of those countries absorbed by Russian expansionism after World War II. Those non-Russian nations within the borders of the Soviet Union are captive nations in the truest sense of the term. Ukraine, White Ruthenia, the Baltic states, and Turkestan are just a few. The author notes that of the total population of 230 million in the USSR only 110 million are Russians. Moscow thrives on these non-Russian colonies within the USSR. They form her greatest strength, as well as her greatest weakness. The industry, the resources, and the people form the strength; the flames of nationalism, which still burn in the hearts of these once-free, still proud people, form the Soviet Union's major weakness.

The surest way to emasculate the Soviet Union, asserts the author, is to detach these Captive Nations from the grip of Moscow. To do this the flames of healthy nationalism in these states must be fanned. Dr. Dobriansky maintains that emphasis should be given to psycho-political warfare, an area in which the United States lags far behind the Russians. The U.S., which for too long has held a continuously defensive posture in the Cold War, must take the initiative.

We must make no mistake, emphasizes Dr.

Dobriansky, that we are at war, a Cold War, yet one directed toward the goal of our final subjugation. We must approach this war with a view towards victory. Explaining the nature of this war and the nature of the enemy—an indispensable element toward any victory—becomes the prime task taken on by the author. He traces the threads of Russian imperialist expansionism back to the early days of Muscovy. (Even then Moscow was master of psycho-political warfare, propaganda, and power diplomacy.) Dr. Dobriansky concludes that it is not the ideology of Communism we are fighting, today in Vietnam, yesterday in Korea, Greece, Turkey, China, or the Philippines. It is the new wave of the old Russian imperialism that lies masked under the banner of ideological "communism."

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(Review by Joseph S. Rouck)

Although this book is frankly on the anti-Russian side, its academic approach and quite an impressive erudition make it one of the best current volumes on "what goes on" in Soviet Russia. Here Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky exposes the hoax that Soviet Russia, under the guise of Marxism, has united the captive nations within its imperialistic framework, using this claim to attack the free nations, whether in Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America. As a matter of fact, these "captive nations," although they have a total population of 123 million, are held in a constant checkmate by the classic Red weapons of deceit, lies, subversive propaganda, and the myth of "peaceful coexistence."

The pawns are represented by the rest of the world, which the Red power nibbles on, devours, or casts away. One of the pawns is the mightiest nation of the world—the United States. Unwilling to fight the Cold War the Soviet way, unable to convince itself of the heartlessness of the Russian Bear, the U.S., according to Dr. Dobriansky, allows itself to be fooled, used, and thus loses more ground every day in a war which can never be won by lack of involvement.

After all, the author states, why should Soviet Russia start a nuclear war, when she gets what she wants without it? This shows the lack of positive reaction by the world against the continual Soviet Russian aggression; it points out the fallacy of the words "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." There is no Soviet Union, per se—only Russia and her prison of nations.

Dobriansky is firm in demanding that the only way to stop the Russian empire from its continued expansion is by using their own tactics against them and he puts down point after point, showing the ways and means in which this can be done. He covers such varied but related instances as Nixon's ill-fated Russian visit, the vulnerability of the Voice of America, the devastating effect of Captive Nations Week on the Soviets, the opportunities which are bypassed by the State Department, and implements his writing with cold, hard facts.

There are many books on the Soviet Union and on the Cold War. Dobriansky's presentation, one can safely say, supersedes them all. And its "References and Bibliography" is invaluable.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, few men have ever enjoyed such

universal respect from their countrymen as Dwight David Eisenhower.

He was beloved because of his great accomplishments, of course—accomplishments which, with the perspective of time, we are beginning to appreciate even more.

But he was also beloved because of his noble character which inspired trust and belief. No man had a deeper love for his country or a stronger desire to do what was "right" for all of us. And I think most of us instinctively recognized this.

Even those who did not always agree with his views or actions did not question his integrity or sincerity. Because of his character he had the unique ability to inspire the best in all of us. As Field Marshall Lord Montgomery said last week, "He had only to smile at you and there was nothing you would not do for him."

As others have pointed out, as a general and as President he fought to defeat tyranny and to achieve lasting peace in the world. These efforts arose from the depth of his character. I can personally testify that his intense dedication to freedom and peace was apparent in his private discussions as well as in public.

I am grateful, therefore, not only for his accomplishments but also for the spiritual inspiration and example he has given us.

I feel a great personal loss and I join the Nation in mourning the death of a great hero and patriot.

SELF-DEFEATING MANDATORY CONTROLS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the overseas investments of American corporations have resulted in great economic benefits for our own country and for our free world friends and trading partners. The United States has been the leader in committing capital, technology, management skills, and other private resources to world development.

These foreign investments have created and expanded foreign markets, strengthened the competitive position of American companies and increased the flow of exports. At the same time they have contributed to the growth and prosperity of other members of the free world community. American business ventures in Latin America and in the less developed countries have been of critical importance in establishing the conditions for stability and progress.

Due to serious balance-of-payments difficulty, temporary restrictions were reluctantly imposed on U.S. foreign direct investments in February of 1965. Businessmen rendered magnificent cooperation in the voluntary program to reduce capital outflows as did the American banking community in limiting foreign lending.

It was evident to everyone, however, that these emergency measures must be of brief duration because U.S. exports and the foreign income received from our dollar-earning assets abroad are the mainstay in our balance of payments.

Restrictions on American overseas investments and lending are now in the fifth year. The temporary measure is being extended into the long term. This will result in serious damage to the Nation's economic interests and reduce the inflow of foreign earnings needed to sustain our worldwide commitments.

Gen. George H. Decker, retired, president of the Manufacturing Chemists Association, addressed himself to this question in an appearance before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. He spoke for the great American chemical industry which, both as an exporter and foreign investor, is one of the largest sources of our foreign earnings.

He impressively has stated the case for removal of these self-defeating mandatory controls and under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enter his comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 85 PRESENTED BY GEN. G. H. DECKER, USA, RETIRED, ON BEHALF OF THE MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 27, 1969

My name is George H. Decker. I am President of the Manufacturing Chemists Association (MCA), a nonprofit trade association of 180 United States company members representing more than 90 percent of the production capacity of basic industrial chemicals within this country. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before your Committee today and acquaint you with our members' views concerning mandatory controls on foreign direct investments by U.S. corporations.

The member companies of the MCA have been surveyed to determine their attitude toward the present restrictions on overseas investments. Those engaged in foreign operations are overwhelmingly in favor of eliminating mandatory controls as rapidly as practicable. They point out that continued restraint on investment abroad will have a serious adverse impact on the U.S. balance of payments by limiting the potential earning capacity of foreign affiliates and by limiting expansion of the export market for chemicals.

#### BENEFITS DERIVED FROM FOREIGN INVESTMENT

The rapid growth of international investment has been one of the most dynamic forces at work in developing the world's economy in the years following World War II. It has opened up new fields of production, employment, and income. It has increased the flow of technology and trade. It has enhanced the wealth of nations and the prospects for a more durable peace. United States industry, and particularly the chemical industry, has been a leader in international investment.

Foreign investments by U.S. corporations have contributed materially to the U.S. balance of payments by return of earnings and by the creation of overseas markets for U.S. exports.

Historically the return flow from U.S. investments abroad has exceeded considerably the level of new capital movements from the United States.

Table I sets forth the relationship between outflow of funds on direct investment and income or dividends returned to the United States.

TABLE I.—U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—OUTFLOW, INFLOW, AND NET ON DIRECT INVESTMENTS<sup>1</sup>

	[In billions of dollars]		
	Outflows from United States	Remitted to United States <sup>2</sup>	Net balance of payments impact
1958.....	1.2	2.4	+1.2
1959.....	1.4	2.6	+1.2
1960.....	1.7	2.8	+1.1
1961.....	1.6	3.2	+1.6
1962.....	1.7	3.6	+2.0
1963.....	2.0	3.8	+1.8
1964.....	2.4	4.4	+2.0
1965.....	3.4	4.9	+1.5
1966.....	3.5	5.1	+2.0
1967.....	3.4	5.3	+1.9
1968 <sup>3</sup> .....	2.8	6.4	+3.6

<sup>1</sup> "Maintaining the Strength of the United States Dollar in a Strong Free World Economy," U.S. Treasury Department, January 1968.

<sup>2</sup> Includes direct investment fees and royalties.

<sup>3</sup> Statement by Charles E. Fiero, Director, Office of Foreign Direct Investments, U.S. Department of Commerce, before the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee, Jan. 15, 1969.

#### CONTRIBUTION OF U.S. EXPORTS TO BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Exports are the cornerstone of a favorable balance of payments and there is a direct and positive relationship between foreign investment and the flow of exports to support such investment. About 25 percent of all U.S. manufactured exports are shipped to overseas subsidiaries. Over two-thirds of the exports of some chemical companies are shipped to their overseas affiliates. These exports involve raw materials, intermediates, and certain other materials marketed directly by these affiliated companies. It is our opinion that mandatory controls, if continued much longer, will have serious adverse effects on U.S. exports, which would more than offset any short-term benefit to the balance of payments stemming from the curtailment of direct investment.

Table II indicates the contribution of the chemical industry to the balance of payments and balance of trade.

TABLE II.—BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND BALANCE OF TRADE

Year	[Dollar amounts in billions]			
	Balance of payments	Balance of trade (total)	Balance of trade	
			U.S. chemical	
			Amount (Percent) total	
1960.....	-\$3.9	+\$4.4	+\$1.4	31.8
1961.....	-2.4	+5.2	+1.4	26.9
1962.....	-2.2	+4.3	+1.4	32.5
1963.....	-2.7	+5.0	+1.5	30.0
1964.....	-2.8	+6.6	+1.8	27.3
1965.....	-1.3	+5.0	+1.8	36.0
1966.....	-1.4	+3.7	+1.8	48.6
1967.....	-3.6	+4.5	+1.8	40.0

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTROL PROGRAMS

Due to the persistent balance of payments deficit and the resultant drain on the Nation's gold reserves, American companies were asked in 1965 to cooperate in a voluntary program of restraint in direct foreign investment. Nearly 700 companies, including many chemical companies, voluntarily acted to curb the dollar outflow, modifying or postponing overseas projects, financing through foreign borrowings, accelerating the repatriation of earnings, and taking other measures to meet the short-term need of the United States to balance its international accounts.

At the outset, the voluntary program was recognized and described as a stopgap measure which would only temporarily interrupt the process of direct foreign investment which so successfully served the economic interests of the United States and its free world friends and trading partners. The positive contribution of direct foreign invest-

ment and the export growth it generates constitute one of the more significant factors in our international transactions. As a result of serious deterioration in our international accounts in the fourth quarter of 1967, when the deficit reached an annual rate of nearly \$7 billion, the President announced on January 1, 1968, a mandatory investment control program. Its implementation has provided some temporary relief on dollar outflow, but at the expense of mortgaging our future balance of payments.

#### PROBLEMS GENERATED BY IMPLEMENTATION OF MANDATORY CONTROL PROGRAM

The imposition of mandatory direct investment controls has had various detrimental effects on the foreign operations of our member companies. For example:

The controls have required them to take certain financial actions which are unsound from a business viewpoint and which otherwise would not have been taken. These include foreign borrowing at rates higher than in the U.S. and restricting of trade credits to foreign affiliates. Under the controls as they presently exist any increase in export receivables (particularly in Schedule C countries) requires local borrowing to finance any increase in working capital. Often this either proves to be impossible or the costs are prohibitive. Euro-Dollars and other local currencies are becoming increasingly scarce and the interest rate continues to rise.

The regulation requiring return of dividends is particularly troublesome. Under certain circumstances plants must be built in foreign countries. Many of our companies have followed the practice of putting in the minimum amount of equity capital and the maximum amount of loans in the currency of the country involved, obtained from local lending institutions. Regardless of how profitable a given company may be, the loans must be paid off before there can be any significant flow of dividends to the stockholders. Our members report that this particular facet of the problem became worse in 1968 and will be more so in 1969. It should be recognized that repatriation of foreign earnings is influenced to a very great degree by the laws and regulations of the foreign country. It is anticipated that situations will arise wherein a corporation will be placed in a position of violating either U.S. Control Regulations or foreign law.

In certain foreign countries a patent of a foreign producer must be worked within a limited period after granting of the patent. This means that the company concerned must manufacture the product within the country or lose its patent protection. Construction of facilities to do this involves the corporation in the kind of financing problems I have just mentioned.

In 1968 one of the effects of the mandatory investment controls has been the curtailment of overseas acquisition programs. The net balance-of-payments results of an acquisition through exchange of shares become positive rather early, since the common stock exchanged for the acquired company is generally held abroad for investment whereas the flow of royalties, management service fees, and dividends to the U.S. parent as well as induced export begin immediately. In other words, from a balance-of-payments point of view, we exchange long-term liabilities for an immediate cash flow which seems highly desirable in the light of our balance-of-payments problems.

Imposition of mandatory controls has made it necessary to forego or postpone exploration operations in certain countries due to the limited exemption allowed under the regulations. This is because there is no assurance that the Government will permit the large investment necessary to bring a newly discovered deposit into production. In addition to the high-cost, high-risk factors involved in exploration operations, the Government has placed an additional risk factor on

exploration operations, through the restrictive provision contained in the regulations.

The excessive costs and time—clerical, accounting, financial, and executive—required to meet the periodic reporting requirements of the Office of Foreign Direct Investments and the time and costs required to prepare, submit, and defend specific authorizations impose a heavy burden on corporate management and prevent prompt, flexible responses to opportunities in the marketplace. One of our member companies reports that in December 1968 OFDI requested an estimate of the year's position; in January it requested an update of the estimate; in January it also requested a forecast of 1969; and by April an actual report for 1968. Our members feel that the management time spent in coping with the control program could have been better spent on furthering the growth and profitability of their businesses, all of which would contribute to the Nation's economic position.

In addition to the counterproductive characteristics of the controls, it is significant to note that insofar as direct investors bid for foreign borrowing these funds are no longer available to contribute to the U.S. balance of payments in other areas such as for the purchase of goods and services from the United States or for investment in U.S. securities.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I express the opinion of our members that continuation of mandatory controls will weaken the chemical industry's competitive position in the world market and inhibit normal growth and sales potential of foreign affiliates of U.S. companies, thus detracting from the long-term interests of the United States. Over the long run market positions in most foreign countries must be protected by manufacturing within the country. If controls impede the efforts of U.S. corporations to establish facilities abroad, the effect will be far reaching since it is most difficult to regain a favorable competitive position once it is lost. Timing is increasingly important in this fast-moving technological world.

The chemical industry cooperated willingly with Government in the Voluntary Program and has worked with the Department of Commerce to facilitate the Mandatory Program. But we have assumed—and we were assured—that the control program would be of temporary duration. Although our member companies have been able to continue their overseas operations within the limitations imposed upon them, they have been faced with many vexing and costly problems which will become increasingly serious and weaken their competitive positions if the mandatory program is continued. They consider it feasible and highly desirable, not only from the viewpoint of the chemical industry but from that of the Government as well, to establish now a firm date for termination of mandatory controls. Rules and procedures should be established to provide for phasing of the liquidation of foreign debt to avoid a massive outflow of dollars once the program is terminated.

Finally I would like to express the opinion that the underlying principle of imposition of mandatory controls of any kind on investment is a dangerous precedent as it impedes the most efficient natural distribution of capital consistent with economic realities.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the country has lost one of its great leaders. Much will be written about his accomplish-

ments, his life, and his service to the Nation. Anything I add here would be redundant.

However, I am deeply conscious that he was a man of his time. No man on the political scene of America could have filled so well the role of leadership which this country needed after the trials of World War II. His great sense of purpose, his overpowering devotion to duty, his perfect sense of integrity brought our country through some difficult times. The struggle for life during his last weeks typifies the character of this great man.

With every American I share deep sympathy for his family in this their tragic hour. Also with every American I share a great sense of gratitude for the life which this native Kansan gave to his fellow man in public service.

#### REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently compiled a report to my constituents in Pennsylvania's 16th Congressional District. It contains the results of a poll I conducted at the beginning of the 91st Congress and some observations as follows:

#### A NEW LOOK

Beginning with this issue, my newsletter adopts a new name and a new format. Its new name, I think, is more reflective of the general content of these reports to you—a coverage of thought and opinion about the Washington scene. The new format, I hope, will make each newsletter a little more readable. Furthermore, this design will permit me to utilize pictures in issues to come which should add extra interest for those of you who are regular recipients of the newsletter.

#### AGE OF DISSATISFACTION

The present time has been called the "age of anxiety." It has also been referred to as the "age of dissatisfaction." Perhaps, the "age of paradox" might be yet another description. Never has this Nation been so powerful; yet never have we been so uncertain and anxious. Never, as a Nation, have we been so prosperous; yet, the welfare rolls in our major cities mount each week and bring costs of welfare to unprecedented heights. Never have we had so much; yet, never have we been so discontented. Youths privileged to go to college rebel against the established order. Some people, with just causes to promote, let their enthusiasm lead to grave injustices that threaten the historic principles of our society. The dissatisfactions and the results of the dissatisfactions call for legislative response and in many ways chart the course for the 91st Congress.

#### GOALS NOT SO DIFFERENT

Too often, we hear about those areas where various segments of our society are at odds with each other. Too seldom, we are reminded of our views that show basic similarity. Especially in the efforts to combat poverty, the antagonisms between the taxpayer and the welfare recipient have been stressed over and over again. A recently completed study suggests that the goals of the two groups are not so different. The report concluded that there remains in America a shared belief in the value of work. The poor themselves were repeatedly shown to express a preference for jobs at adequate pay over dependency and public handouts. That finding certainly

should inspire some thinking toward welfare reform for it points us in a most promising direction. It is regrettable that Government, after assembling unemployment statistics for so many years, is only now beginning to collect information on job opportunities. Besides aiding job seekers, this information could provide guidance for private and public job training programs. And, at least, we are beginning to turn away from the proven failures in attacking poverty, and starting anew with people themselves.

#### IMPORTANT WORK AHEAD

The House Education and Labor Committee, the one on which I serve, has some of the most important work of the 91st Congress within its jurisdiction, especially in the field of education. A great American faith is faith in education as a means to a rewarding life. Endowed with that faith, recent Congresses have adopted a whole series of landmark Acts to provide young people with education from the preprimary years (Project Head Start) to graduate training after a student has obtained a bachelor's degree. For young people who are not academically inclined, the Congress has broadened the scope of the Federal vocational training program. The entire educational program will be studied thoroughly in this Congress in an effort to permit every American youth with the capacity and interest to get a college education, or vocational training at work that interests him. Some of the general questions, as we proceed with this work, will be: How can legislation influence the overall environment of young people across the land to make them interested in higher education or job training? How can a chain of dependency on relief from one generation to the next be broken? How can stagnation, crime, and militancy be made less attractive to young people as a career? How can youths be influenced to seize and appreciate the many opportunities in this country?

#### NOTABLE QUOTE

From philosopher Will Durant: "Civilization begins with order, grows with liberty, and dies with chaos."

#### TAXES

Tax matters have wide public interest, and the subject is one that Congress is investigating right now. The House Ways and Means Committee is looking into broad areas of tax reform and my hope is that they will be able to plug some of the tax loopholes which now allow some millionaires to escape payment of personal income tax. Congress has not revised the tax structure in over fifteen years, and there are reforms that are long overdue. In addition, the First Session of the 91st Congress must decide what to do about the 10 percent surtax imposed on corporate and personal income which is due to expire June 30, 1969. Congress must decide whether to: (1) allow the 10 percent surcharge to lapse; (2) continue at the 10 percent rate; or (3) continue at a reduced rate. That decision will be based primarily on what Vietnam needs are projected, and the amount of overall spending reduction which can be accomplished.

#### CHOICES AND PRIORITIES

With limited resources to meet great problems, the Federal Government must make choices among various courses of action. The whole range of problems facing the Congress cannot be met in one year not even in the four years of the new Administration. The problems, it seems, can be met only over a generation with long-range plans covering the next decade. The necessity is to pinpoint the priority areas. In the foreign sphere the Government is confronted with decisions as to the roles we undertake around the world. Are we to assist our friends anywhere in the world when they are threatened by Communism? Shall we assist them only where our vital interests are at stake? What is to be the nature and scope of our assistance—military, economic, or both? In our domestic affairs, Congress must set forth a definition

of the problems which demand a concentration of effort and indicate the nature and scope of the programs to meet those problems. Certainly the crisis of the cities, crime, education and taxes will be among the subjects receiving Congressional scrutiny.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The results from the poll published in the last edition of my newsletter are in, and I believe you might find them as interesting as I did. If nothing else, the questions brought forth a wide range of comment from the 16th District on issues of importance. I was interested particularly in your responses regarding Vietnam. As you can see from the figures listed below, no one option received overwhelming support and the greatest percentage of you chose to give me an indication of your personal theory for resolving the Vietnam conflict. Many of those personal viewpoints were quite well thought out, and I appreciate the time you spent letting me know how you would go about ending the war in Southeast Asia.

The final figures looked this way:

- (1) Vietnam:
  - (a) 12% of you felt the United States should withdraw its troops from Vietnam and let South and North Vietnam fight it out themselves.
  - (b) 18% of you favored resuming the bombing and trying to get a military settlement of the conflict.
  - (c) A policy similar to the present one of limited fighting while negotiating was favored by 13% of the respondents.
  - (d) 18% wanted the United States to assume a more forceful negotiating role, but begin a gradual pullout of troops.
  - (e) 9% felt the United States should turn most of the talking and most of the fighting over to the South Vietnamese.
  - (f) The proposal to have the United States talk about troop withdrawals with the North Vietnamese while letting the South Vietnamese work out the political settlement with the Viet Cong was the choice of 6% of those responding.
  - (g) 24% of you offered your own thoughts about resolving the Vietnam War.
- (2) Social Security:
  - (a) 51% of the respondents favored providing for automatic cost-of-living adjustments to Social Security benefits.
  - (b) 9% said that benefits should be increased overall by 13 percent and the minimum amount raised from \$55 a month to \$80.
  - (c) An enactment of both of the above proposals was called for by 23% of you.
  - (d) 17% wanted none of the above ideas put on the books.
  - (e) 65% of you were not in favor of the pay raise for government officials. 32% of you indicated that the pay hikes were justified, although many of those respondents felt that the percentage of increase was a little high. No opinion was registered on 3% of the questionnaires received.
  - (f) A reorganization of the Postal Service drew a "Yes" response of 73%. 19% said no and 8% stated no preference.
  - (g) 55% registered an opinion that the tax surcharge should be extended to meet Vietnam needs, while 42% opposed the extension. 3% had no opinion.
  - (h) 59% of the respondents said they did not want the first class postage rates raised even with the guarantee of air mail delivery. The people favoring that proposal came to 36% of the total while 5% expressed no choice. On this question, quite a few people commented that "junk mail" rates should be pushed upward.
  - (i) A partial dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity with a transfer into Cabinet-level Departments of some of the more effective anti-poverty programs drew favorable opinion from 81% of you. 10% did not want such a move and 9% had no preference shown.
  - (j) 74% would like to see tax credits used

as an incentive for involving private industry in social problems and 19% do not feel that the tax credit program should be enacted. 7% registered no opinion.

(9) Reform of the Electoral College system was favored by 81% of those responding. 15% said "No" on this question and 4% indicated no choice.

(10) 66% of you agreed with substituting a runoff election process for the present system of the House of Representatives choosing the President in deadlocked contests. 28% of you did not agree and 6% did not respond.

(11) A more "evenhanded" approach by the United States in the Middle East was favored by 82%. 11% said "No" and no preference was indicated on 7% of the questionnaires received.

My thanks to the over 2200 of you who let me know your views and made the above results possible. While I could never, and would never, claim that these polls are a complete indication of the opinions of the 16th Congressional District, I do think they provide a valuable way of letting me determine the feelings of a pretty good cross-section of the people in Lancaster, Lebanon and Lower Dauphin Counties. As we get into the summer months, I plan to send out another questionnaire, and I am hopeful that as many of you as possible will see fit to respond at that time.

#### A REMINDER

I try to remain completely accessible to you to talk about problems you are facing with the Federal Government or about your views on the issues before the Congress. If you want to talk to me, I am available almost every Friday in the Congressional Office in Lancaster. In addition, I travel to Lebanon and Middletown to meet with constituents on two Saturday mornings out of each month. You can call my Lancaster office to make sure that I will be there when you want to see me, or you can just drop by. When I'm in Washington, a "hot line" telephone is at your service in my office on the second floor of the Lancaster Post Office Building. Feel free to stop in and place a call about those matters that demand my urgent attention.

### VOLUNTARY ARMY IS THE ANSWER

#### HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Senator MARK HATFIELD has improved the quality of the debate over the conscript-volunteer question by a penetrating analysis of the case for returning to a voluntary Army.

In an article written for the New York Times Magazine on Sunday, March 30, 1969, Senator HATFIELD uses an impressive array of facts to deal with the wobbly opinions that have been levied against the volunteer Armed Forces concept.

Specifically, he pins down the contentions that the voluntary system would be too expensive, would result in a black army, and would breed a mercenary armed service. Under his analysis, these fears prove to be groundless.

After arriving at basically the same general conclusion, the Nixon administration has taken the initiative—as promised in the President's campaign—to return to our national heritage of basically voluntary recruitment. In addition to ordering a Department of Defense study called "Project Volunteer,"

the President has created a commission to prepare a plan of action. Like Senator HATFIELD, the administration is moving ahead on the belief that "A Voluntary Army Is the Answer," the title of the magazine article.

The article by Senator HATFIELD follows:

SENATOR HATFIELD ARGUES THAT THE DRAFT IS WRONG—A VOLUNTEER ARMY IS THE ANSWER

(By MARK O. HATFIELD<sup>1</sup>)

I have always been somewhat annoyed by people who consistently look disaster in the eye and announce that "something good will come of it in the end." I generally suspect that such people either do not comprehend the nature of the calamity or are callous to tragedy.

So it is with certain misgivings that I assert that something positive may result from our involvement in the senseless and unpopular war in Vietnam. Without the war I doubt that opposition to our system of conscription would have gained the momentum it has, momentum which may eventually lead to the abolition of the draft and the establishment of a volunteer military, the only system that allows the maximum personal liberty and eliminates the major inequities inherent in conscription.

The draft has forced young men who abhor the war to make difficult choices. My files are filled with letters from troubled youths who must reconcile their duty to their country with their duty to their consciences. They have desperate alternatives: choose to move to Canada, to declare themselves conscientious objectors, to go to jail, or choose to kill men they do not hate in a war they cannot justify for a cause they do not believe in.

This horrible dilemma is very much a part of the tragedy of Vietnam. The pain and suffering of this war are not limited to the battlefields or the orphanages and refugee camps of Southeast Asia. They are felt by young men like Peter Danielson, a 19-year-old philosophy major at the University of Michigan who was quoted in this magazine: "If I was on the battlefield, would I justify killing, or would I go crazy? Wrecking my career by trying for C.O. [conscientious objector status] scares me. Five years in Leavenworth for refusing to serve scares me. But if becoming a soldier means killing innocent people, that scares me, too. The choices are so big I can't handle them."

Sensitive young men like Peter will be forever haunted by the choices they must make on the draft. But opposition to the system is by no means found only among its primary victims. Greater and greater numbers of people are joining me in the conclusion that we must end the draft, we must have a volunteer professional army. I believe that conscription cannot meet the requirements of an effective military manpower-procurement system: (1) to preserve individual liberty and freedom as much as possible from unjustified intrusion by the Government; (2) to insure that every young man receives equal treatment and no one is required to make sacrifices that are not demanded of his peers; (3) to provide the maximum national security with the greatest efficiency and economy.

It can be shown, I believe, that the Selective Service program now in use does not meet these criteria. First, the draft denies individual liberty. As *The Wall Street Journal* pointed out editorially in March, 1967: "We should recognize that [the draft] is about the most odious form of Government control we have yet accepted. We should not forget that it is a basic violation of our traditions of freedom and individualism."

<sup>1</sup>Mark O. Hatfield, Republican Senator from Oregon, has introduced a bill embodying the proposals he sets forth in this article.

I feel strongly that each man has a moral obligation to serve his country, but he must be granted the freedom to accept his responsibility and the right to determine the form his service shall take. Individual liberty is not a concession that can be withdrawn or that must be paid for by military service. It is the ultimate right in a democracy.

The draft also fails to meet the criterion of fairness, for it is not equally applied. There has been a great deal of resentment because the Selective Service System is not administered uniformly throughout the country, because of the uncertainty young men must live with and because of the many inequities of the deferment system. But the most basic inequity is the fact that a smaller and smaller minority of our young men is carrying the burden of national defense. Even under today's crisis conditions, the military services draft only about 350,000 men out of a draft-eligible pool that totals 12 million. We should not tolerate a system that capriciously requisitions two years out of the lives of some youths while allowing the majority their liberty.

Even the third criterion, that of efficiently providing the necessary quantity and quality of men, is beyond the system of conscription. Why? Because the Selective Service System is designed only to provide large numbers of men; it is inherently incapable of supplying well-qualified personnel.

The nature of military needs has changed dramatically since World War II, when our conscription process was designed. In the nineteen-forties it was necessary to maintain a large "generalist" army. But today the need for great numbers of combat troops has been reduced by modern weapons capable of undertaking assignments formerly performed by men and by the changed nature of warfare. It is highly unlikely that we shall ever again be engaged in nonnuclear hostilities similar to World War II. Future military engagements will probably be guerrilla or counterinsurgency operations such as the one in Vietnam, where a small, highly trained and experienced army is more effective than a large, inexperienced and transient force. Conscription, designed to provide great numbers of men, cannot supply men with the technical know-how to operate modern weapons or the training and experience to be effective guerrilla fighters.

Draftees, who have been taken from civilian life against their wishes, spend their two years of military service counting the days until they get out. As soon as the required period is over, the vast majority of them return to civilian life—producing an average yearly turnover rate of 90 percent. This high rate prevents specialized training during a period when, in the words of one observer, "the new demands imposed by warfare suggest that what we need is not only super-weapons but supermen in uniform." Lieut. Gen. Ira Eaker, a retired Air Force officer, commented: "Weapons are now so complicated and require such technical competence and skill for their operation and maintenance that it is absurd to expect short-term trainees to man them effectively."

The draft, based as it is on compulsion, not free choice, aggravates the turnover problem; inasmuch as it does, it must be counted a negative factor in national security. It continues to amaze me that the public officials most vigilant in seeing that every defense request is met (from F-111's to the costly and questionable A.B.M.) are often the very men who most adamantly defend the draft—which is clearly the most vulnerable aspect of our national security.

It is easily demonstrable that the draft is not a just and effective method of procuring military manpower. And there is no way of making procedural reforms in the Selective Service System that will enable it to meet the three basic criteria. For instance, the lottery approach, under which draftees would

be selected on a random basis from a pool of eligible 19-year-olds, falls on all three counts. Substituting Lady Luck for General Hershey does not alter the fact that young men are forced into service and denied their individual liberty. The random selection process does not alleviate the basic injustice of the draft—the fact that a few serve while many escape—though it could reduce some of the inequities in the deferment system and the lack of uniform administration by the 4,000 draft boards. I find it very difficult to think—as those who support the lottery system must—that injustice handed out by a machine is more tolerable than injustice handed out by men. As Bruce Chapman points out in his book "The Wrong Man in Uniform," the lottery "would be a supremely callous, a dehumanizing, a frivolous Government-sponsored game of Russian roulette."

And, finally, the lottery system would not improve the quality of servicemen or the efficiency or economy of the system. Men would still be serving against their wills and the turnover rate would be no different. Our military forces would still be composed of inadequately trained, inexperienced men and would remain a liability to our national security.

The lottery approach should not be made to represent anything more than it is: a limited reform in the operation of the conscript system, which would still be undemocratic, inequitable and inefficient. The lottery is a patchwork proposal designed to cover some of the gaping holes in the fabric of military conscription, but it does little to retainer the flaws in the basic design of the draft.

I am convinced that the only solution to our problem is the abolition of the draft and the return to a voluntary military. This is the system that would allow maximum personal liberty and freedom from Government interference, for no one would be forced to serve in the armed forces against his will. A volunteer military would eliminate the inequities of the Selective Service System and end the injustice of forcing some to serve while allowing the majority to escape. And, with its reduced turnover, it would provide a more efficient and effective military establishment.

An all-volunteer force is usually first challenged on the ground that it would never provide the armed services with the number of men needed. The evidence indicates otherwise. We are talking about rather small numbers of men. In peacetime, according to the economist Walter Oi, a volunteer military, with its reduced turnover, should need to recruit only about 333,000 young men into the enlisted ranks each year. Statistically, this comes down to less than 2 per cent of the draft-eligible pool—young men between 18 and 26. Even if this pool were limited to men 18 through 20—the ages at which the majority of youths are making career decisions—the military would need to recruit only about 6 per cent of the group into the enlisted ranks each year.

Even more relevant are statistics on the difference between the total number of men needed annually and the number of true volunteers the military can expect to recruit without improving the conditions of service: the difference between supply and demand. This difference is astonishingly low. Professor Oi—who served as a consultant to the Pentagon during a 1964 study of military manpower and who uses Defense Department statistics in developing his estimates—points out that by 1970, with a peacetime force of 2.65 million men, the shortage would amount to only 75,000. In other words, all but 75,000 of the men needed to maintain the armed services would volunteer anyway if pay levels were not changed.

Let me point out parenthetically that President Nixon has pledged to move toward an all-volunteer force and the Defense Department is conducting a study called "Proj-

ect Volunteer." Nixon's plan to request a military pay raise—recently dropped in an effort to insure a budget surplus—represented a step in the right direction, but the increase, if it does finally come, will have a delayed rather than an immediate impact for it will be spread over all ranks. Very little of it or the \$1.8-billion Congress has already approved will filter down to new recruits, and the increase that will do the most to encourage a volunteer army is the one that will give substantially more money to the first-term enlistee.

The task of making a military career attractive and rewarding enough to induce 75,000 men to volunteer is not insurmountable. We could, for instance, raise the pay scales considerably and improve such fringe benefits as educational and recreational facilities. We might also try to increase the social status of the career military man, ease rigid promotion schedules and raise re-enlistment bonuses. Professor Oi has concluded that salary increases alone, totaling about \$4-billion, would supply all the incentive needed to maintain the peacetime armed forces (Dr. Harry Gilman, who took part in the 1964 manpower study and later headed an investigation of compensation and re-enlistment problems for the Pentagon, is even more optimistic. He believes that the extra budget outlay would be only \$1-billion). According to Professor Oi's figures, the price for maintaining an all-volunteer military establishment would double, to about \$8-billion, in wartime. Oi ridicules the Defense Department's estimate that a volunteer system might cost an additional \$17-billion in salaries. Such a pay increase would result in an average annual salary of well over \$8,000 for first-term enlistees—an absurd estimate of the economic reward necessary to attract an additional 75,000 men.

The budgetary increase of \$4 billion represents only a 5 per cent increase in our national defense budget and does not reflect the reduction in force levels—and corresponding economies—that can be achieved under a voluntary system or the savings that would be produced by the increased efficiency of a professional military.

The head of the Army's enlisted personnel directorate has stated that "the current strength of armed forces could actually be reduced if the annual turnover of men was reduced," and a professional military would experience less turnover. An all-volunteer force, Professor Oi estimates, would have a 30 per cent reduction in turnover. That means 30 per cent fewer men would have to be recruited and trained each year, and that means fewer men would be needed to train them—resulting in the reassignment of approximately 80,000 of the 265,000 men engaged in training functions at peacetime manpower levels. Thus, force levels could be reduced by 80,000 men without any reduction in defense capability. (It should be noted that this reduction in personnel would more than compensate for the 75,000-man deficit predicted for a voluntary military operating under present pay scales and enlistment rates.)

An armed service of professionals would perform much more efficiently than one composed of conscripts. Robert Lekachman estimated in an article in *Challenge* in 1967 that the productivity of the draftee or reluctant volunteer averages about 20 per cent less than that of a professional soldier. A voluntary military composed of about 2.43 million men would therefore be the effective equivalent of a peacetime armed force of 2.65 million men, 40 per cent of whom were draftees and reluctant volunteers. (These statistics suggest that reductions totaling nearly three times the 75,000-troop deficit could be made with no loss in defense capability.)

As force levels are reduced, the cost of maintaining the military is reduced. But

other economies growing out of lower turnover rates would be realized with an all-volunteer military: smaller expenditures for veterans' benefits, savings in the maintenance of complicated equipment now mistreated by inadequately trained men and reductions in the cost of maintaining boot camps. In fact, five Congressmen estimated in "How to End the Draft," a book published in 1967, that a voluntary system would have saved more than \$1.7-billion in personnel costs alone during 1966. This represents almost half of the \$4-billion Professor Oi calculates would be needed in increased salaries for a professional armed force.

But to discuss the price of a voluntary military establishment in terms of its increased budget costs is to miss the point. In real economic terms, an all-volunteer force would not be any more expensive than our current Army of conscripts, but the bill would be sent to a different party. Under a voluntary system all taxpayers would share the true cost of supporting our armed forces. Under the draft system the young men we force into the military subsidize their own service. When a youth is capable of earning \$350 a month in civilian employment and is drafted and paid, at a conservative estimate, only \$210—including tax benefits and allowances for room and board—the lost income is his extra contribution for the maintenance of the armed forces. We must remedy this injustice by placing the financial burden of our national defense where it belongs—on the general taxpayers rather than the hapless young men we force into uniform.

On the basis of 1964 statistics, Professor Oi has estimated that the difference between what a young man could earn as a civilian and his pay as a draftee is \$1,680 a year. But during that year taxpayers over 21 paid an average Federal tax of only \$633. In Professor Oi's words: "The typical draftee [was] thus saddled with a hidden tax that [was] over twice as high as the Federal income-tax burden of an individual taxpayer."

If we paid young men salaries high enough to induce them to volunteer, we would merely be paying the true value of their service; the added budgetary cost would be only a reflection of the actual cost of our armed services. The argument that an all-volunteer force would cost too much is not, in reality, an argument for conscription but an argument against the extent of our military commitment. This point was most effectively made in "Why the Draft?" a book by seven young political economists:

"The volunteer army forces taxpayers to recognize the true cost of military activity. If they would be unwilling to pay this cost, it must be because the benefits from such activity are less than its cost. In such a case, the activity should be curtailed, and not, as under a draft system, merely have its cost concealed. . . . The volunteer army does not increase the real cost of national defense; if anything, because it is more efficient, it reduces that cost. What it does do, however, is make the cost apparent while distributing it more evenly."

A second common criticism of the proposal for voluntary military service is that it would produce an all-black army. (Sometimes the charge is that it would be a poor black army; the fact that the draft system produces a poor army is overlooked. It is the upper-lower class and the lower-middle class that are drafted in disproportionate numbers. A volunteer army, because of improved pay, status and conditions, would be much more a middle-class army.)

I will defend the volunteer military service against the charge that it would be disproportionately black at some length—not because the argument has any validity, but because it is an emotional issue raised by men who evidently have not taken the time to discover whether their charges have any basis in fact. I submit that they have not.

Simple arithmetic establishes that a volun-

teer armed force would not result in a "black army." The argument of the critics is that since black youths don't have many economic opportunities they would flock to recruitment offices if the military offered them a decent wage. What is overlooked is that 2.5 times as many white youths as black youths are classified "poor" by the Government. So if you accept the critics' assumption that salary and poverty levels alone would determine the enlistment rate, there would be 2.5 white volunteers for every black one.

There is little reason to believe that black men would join the military in great disproportion to the number of white young men who would be drawn to this career. In fact, the national advisory commission on the draft stated in its report, "In Pursuit of Equity," that qualified white and black youths volunteer at rates about equal to their over-all proportion in society. (Blacks between 18 and 26 represent about 12 per cent of their age group and they voluntarily enter the service in approximately the same proportion.) I find it difficult to anticipate any reason for this pattern of equal enlistment rates to change under a totally voluntary military, and would expect, therefore, the proportion of blacks entering the armed forces to be in the neighborhood of 12 per cent.

It just cannot be logically argued that an all-volunteer force with higher pay rates and improved benefits would be disproportionately attractive to blacks. Economist Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago argues convincingly that present pay levels are "comparatively" more advantageous to the Negro than would be the increased wages of a professional military. For, even as low as military pay is, it still offers more than 50 per cent of draft-age black youths higher incomes than they could earn in civilian life, according to the Census Bureau. But only about 33 per cent of the white youths are earning wages below what they could get in the military. What it means, then, is that more than 50 per cent of the black youths who would be attracted to the military because of pay have already had the financial incentive to join. Higher pay would be a potential incentive to less than 50 per cent of young blacks, but would be potentially attractive to about 70 per cent of young whites.

Even in the unlikely event that a professional military *did* produce unequal racial enlistment rates, it would not cause an unacceptable imbalance. Prof. Thomas Schelling, an economist and defense analyst at Harvard's John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, has estimated that if black men *should* find military service to be three or four times as attractive as whites did, their high rejection rates would mean that they would still represent only 20 per cent of the armed forces.

Critics may attempt to argue that the re-enlistment rate for blacks is considerably greater than it is for whites, and assert that this will eventually cause a significant racial imbalance as more blacks elect to remain in uniform. This possibility exists, however, whether men are drafted into the service or volunteer. And Army figures show that the re-enlistment rate for blacks who were drafted is 30 per cent higher than the re-enlistment rate for white draftees. But the black re-enlistment rate of first-term volunteers was only 25 per cent above the white volunteer re-enlistment rate. Furthermore, as the conditions of military service more closely approximate what the white young man can expect to enjoy as a civilian they will provide greater incentive for him to re-enlist; the comparative advantages of military life already provide this incentive for most black young men. A voluntary military, then, could be expected to produce more comparable racial re-enlistment rates.

While converting to a voluntary system, the military should provide greater flexibility in enlistment standards so that young men

with slight educational or physical inadequacies could be accepted and given special training and appropriate assignments. Although the rejection rate for blacks is double the rate for whites, this would not result in the acceptance of twice as many Negroes. Army figures show that for every black youth who attempted to volunteer and was rejected in 1968, three white youths were rejected. In other words, under the flexible enlistment standards, 75 whites would be accepted to 25 blacks.

Another factor which will temper any trend toward a black army is our national commitment to improving the economic opportunities of our black citizens. As we expand the opportunities in the civilian job sector, fewer black men will find the military to be the most attractive road to higher economic and social status, and this will tend to place an effective ceiling on the proportion of blacks who enlist.

Finally, I believe it is difficult to argue convincingly that it would be undesirable for the United States to have a military establishment in which the ratio of black men was two or three times that in society. The five members of Congress who wrote "How to End the Draft" put it this way:

"There is nothing wrong with the fact that military service in an all-volunteer army might offer some Negroes better living conditions, better education, more secure employment, a better chance of assuming responsibility and a more dignified life than the civilian economy can offer. It is not our military system which should be condemned for offering a chance to the Negro, it is the civilian sector of our society which should be condemned for failing to allow the Negro to share fully the fruits of America's prosperity."

Another charge brought against the voluntary-military proposal is just as fallacious and emotional as the predictions of a black army. This is the argument that a professional military would be composed of "mercenaries"—men who would join the service only for the money and whose loyalty would therefore be questionable.

This line of reasoning presupposes that young men would choose military careers solely because they were well-paid. But young people who pick careers as teachers or carpenters certainly don't reach their decisions purely on the basis of economics, and there is no reason to think that those who enlist in the military would be motivated entirely by good pay and improved benefits. John Mitrisin, a former research associate at the Institute for Policy Studies, recently pointed out in an article in *Current History*: "Monetary gain, training and veterans' benefits are not the only reasons men join the armed forces; if they were, there would be almost no true volunteers today. Men join because of patriotism, family tradition, the military's image of manliness and the chance to travel. These attractions are strong . . ."

Our military officers have traditionally been well-paid and they have not been characterized contemptuously as "mercenaries." Indeed, as the prestigious magazine *Science* asked editorially in January, "Why is a volunteer officer a 'dedicated career man' but an enlisted man a 'mercenary'?"

The conclusion that a well-paid military would be less loyal than an army of conscripts is questionable. Is it really logical to expect that a man whose service is adequately compensated, whose status is enhanced by a new professionalism and whose contribution is recognized and appreciated will be less loyal to his nation and its ideals than a man who is forced into service, is inadequately compensated and who enjoys all too little esteem from the general public?

A volunteer force will not be an exclusive, stable body of men isolated from all contact with civilian society and influences. (After all, we don't demand that volunteers take vows of celibacy or renounce their parents.)

Between 1960 and 1965, an average of 520,000 men entered the service each year. Under a voluntary military, there would still be more than 360,000 entering and leaving the force each year to maintain a "civilian" influence and dissipate any tendency toward military elitism.

Yet alarmists have gone so far as to predict military coups if we move to a professional army. Their predictions, however, are not accompanied by any evidence. They certainly can't point to history. Except for the last 30 years and brief periods during World War I and the Civil War, our nation has relied almost exclusively on a volunteer or professional army. Civilian control of the Government has never been threatened. And the experience of other nations does not verify the predictions of military takeovers. There is, historically little correlation between the method of recruitment and the frequency of military coups—and, incidentally, civilian rule was overthrown recently in two countries that rely on conscription, Greece and Argentina.

Those who are determined to find a direct relationship between militarism and a voluntary recruitment system should look closely at what is happening to our two closest allies, Canada and Britain. Both have volunteer programs and it can be argued that militarism is declining in these two nations. Both countries are reducing their international military commitments, and Britain has significantly reduced the size of her forces.

Frankly, I believe that the method of recruiting enlisted men is unrelated to the possibility of a rise in militarism. Draftees, who are only in the service for two years and who are at the very bottom of the military power structure, have very little ability to exert a "civilian" influence on the military hierarchy. The danger of military elitism comes primarily from the officers, who are and almost always have been volunteers or "professionals." We should continue our tradition of drawing officers from widely divergent social, economic and geographic backgrounds. We should also continue our Congressional selection of the student bodies at our military academies, maintain voluntary R.O.T.C. programs on college campuses and provide for expanded opportunities for enlisted personnel to attend officer-candidate schools.

If we want to protect our nation from the threat of militarism, our primary concern should be to exert civilian influence at the top, not the bottom, of the military power structure. The office of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force should remain in the hands of civilians.

A volunteer military would inherently provide an effective check against a loss of civilian control over the military because it would take a bigger bite out of the tax dollar. My nearly 20 years as a public official have convinced me that there is no more effective way to interest the voters in Government policy than through their pocketbooks. Taxpayers and elected officials can be expected to watch closely and to debate rigorously attempts by the military to expand. (The heated controversy over the passing of the 10 per cent surtax to finance the war in Vietnam substantiates this conclusion.) In the words of the economist Robert Tollison: "... one could speculate that the increased financial costs of the volunteer army would lead to even greater civilian activity in the conduct and direction of military operations such as in Vietnam. In general, therefore, this closer scrutiny of military personnel arising from an all-volunteer force would serve to establish even more effective civilian control over the military and guard against the dangers of militarism."

In fact, civilian control over the military should be extended a step further. The Government's authority to draft young men into uniform should be ended and it should be

possible to reinstate it only by an act of Congress upon the recommendation of the Commander in Chief. This provision would modify the President's unilateral ability to involve us by administrative decree in military adventures abroad. The assured ability to put young men into uniform is vital to any major commitment to war. One man—The President—now has this ability and there exists no effective check on it. The Executive Branch of Government has declared that the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to send American men, in any number he chooses, to any spot in the world without the approval or even the consent of Congress. A volunteer military would force the President to rely on persuasion rather than conscription in committing us to long-term conflicts. Since the armed services would fill their ranks with volunteers rather than draftees, it would be difficult for the President to commit us to an unpopular war—such as the one in Vietnam—and still induce the necessary number of young men to volunteer. Before intervening in a conflict, the President would be forced to consider very carefully whether our involvement could be justified to the public.

A further check would be the President's awareness that if he couldn't sell the war to the American public, he would have to sell it to Congress. If insufficient numbers of young men believed in the commitment enough to volunteer, the President would have to ask Congress to reinstitute the draft. (Only at this point, if a voluntary system proves inadequate, should we explore such reforms of the conscript program as the lottery, the draft, whether by lottery or through the Selective Service System, should be used only as a last resort, not relied upon as the easy way out.) Before the President decided to intervene in conflicts he would be sure that he could justify his action to Congress; this would reduce the possibility of an ill-considered commitment of troops.

Peacetime conscription is essential to the President's self-proclaimed, singular ability to involve our country in war by administrative decree. The draft allows him to bypass and nullify the constitutionally defined role of Congress to declare war. The story of how we became involved in Vietnam demonstrates the necessity to correct this imbalance of power and to place checks on the President's unilateral ability to involve our nation in long-term conflicts. Aside from a constitutional amendment, I know of no other effective means of restoring to Congress its power role in committing us to war than by placing in the hands of the House and Senate the authority to conscript armies.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, so many tributes have been paid General Eisenhower that it is difficult to add anything new. But I do want to be among those who have expressed their deep appreciation of the life and character of this great man.

To me, the lasting impression I have is that in a world that questions some basic beliefs such as religion and clamors for the leisure life and a permissive society he was a steadfast Christian gentleman who rigidly believed in discipline—including self-discipline. To him the rules of the game were made for some good purpose and should be followed without complaint or equivocation.

Loyalty was bedrock in his character.

Whether it was West Point, his country, his church, or his party, he felt that his association with these institutions demanded allegiance and loyalty.

These virtues of loyalty and discipline are part and parcel of America's greatness, and for that reason make Eisenhower one of the great men of our day and give him a place of prominence in the history of our country.

Possibly above this, or at least part of it, was his personal and family life. Here he was an example of the kind of man Americans want to see in their leaders.

All of these qualities made him a great soldier and a great President. His passing has emphasized them in the tributes that have been paid him during these recent days. But they are enduring virtues which will fill a place in the hearts of Americans for all time.

JUDGE PEREZ' PEOPLE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the other day I inserted in the RECORD my statement and a New Orleans newspaper article about the death of my longtime friend, Judge Leander H. Perez, Sr.

Friend and foe alike will not soon forget Judge Perez, and I want to include at this point in the RECORD a story from the *Plaquemines Gazette*, the newspaper from Perez' home parish.

This story gives an indication of what his own people thought of him and demonstrates the love and respect which the judge enjoyed from his friends and neighbors. And he loved and respected them.

Mr. Speaker, here is the article, which speaks for itself.

[From the *Plaquemines Gazette*, Mar. 28, 1969]

THOUSANDS MOURN DEATH OF JUDGE PEREZ—  
HALF CENTURY OF DEDICATED SERVICE ENDS

The thousands of mourners who attended the funeral services and burial of Judge L. H. Perez March 21st were eloquent in their manifestations of grief, love, devotion and admiration, for a man who they believed to be a true friend, a leader of vision and compassion, a noble statesman, an astute lawyer, a defender of the people's rights and one of the greatest American patriots this country has known, a man who had the courage and ability to dissent when principles and his convictions were in jeopardy.

Judge L. H. Perez, revered in Plaquemines as not only the leader but the father of the Parish, died Wednesday evening, March 19 at six o'clock in his Idlewild Ranch home—but only after he had fulfilled his promise to rebuild Plaquemines after it had been devastated by Hurricane Betsy in 1965. He was 77.

He was alone in his study when he breathed his last, when his stout heart stopped, causing him to topple from a chair where he was found within a few short minutes by his late wife's sister, Mrs. Marguerite Foret.

Like his beloved wife, Judge Perez had been told that day by his doctor that he could plan resuming his activities in moderation. He had even stopped off at his New Orleans office. Returning to Idlewild, he enjoyed his dinner—and then it happened.

He had been under treatment following a heart attack January 10th.

## DEATH IS SHOCK

Word of his death shocked his relatives, friends and associates and the countless thousands who looked upon Judge Perez as their protector, their friend.

The following evening, thousands stood in line to pass the silver casket where their silver-haired friend lay. A funeral director of the House of Bultman, New Orleans, said it was the largest funeral he had known of in the city during the past 30 years.

The next day for the services, thousands again came and formed the procession to the Holy Name of Jesus Church where a Requiem Mass was said. The procession was over 200 cars long.

Adding to the tribute of their presence, it appeared that every Catholic in the church during the Mass received Communion. The 1000 seat church overflowed into the streets.

In addition to relatives, dignitaries, parishioners and other friends, there were school children who carried a heart-shaped floral arrangement; a group of scouts, and even a cab driver was said to have locked up his cab and attended Mass.

## HEAR US OH LORD

The faces of the mourners were grief stricken as Father Peter Boerding of St. Thomas Church in Pointe-a-la-Hache, celebrant, intoned many times during the Mass, "Hear us Oh Lord . . . answer our prayers for Leander." Father Boerding, sprinkling the casket with holy water, said of Judge Perez, "God has taken him to Himself from the trials of this world." He entreated, "Make him a companion of Your Saints and grant to him everlasting rest and happiness."

Father Boerding was assisted by Father Stanley Gootee, pastor of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church, Belle Chasse.

The reconciliation of Judge Perez with the church was done quietly about a year ago.

## INTERRED BESIDE HIS WIFE

Following the Mass, the long procession of cars wound its way across the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River bridge to below Belle Chasse where Judge was placed next to his wife in the family Chapel at Idlewild. Judge Perez had built the Chapel for his wife in her death.

As the thousands in cars drove down the Belle Chasse Highway, the business places closed and people lined the highway to pay their respects as this, "once in a century man" made his last trip.

## BIRDS SING REQUIEM

It was a beautiful day. The sun came out from behind the morning clouds as if to throw light on this man's soul as his casket was carried by his seven grandsons—J. Douglas Eustis Jr., Thomas P. Eustis, Geoffrey Eustis, Richard J. Carrere Jr., Thomas A. Carrere, Chalin O. Perez Jr., L. H. Perez III and Harold (Dutch) Asevedo, loyal friend and aide of Judge Perez.

They carried his casket blanketed with red roses along the stone path that leads to the chapel in the rear of the ranch home. The flowers were bursting with fullness. The moss from the giant Oak trees tossed in the gentle breeze. The birds sang like in a Requiem in his honor. Otherwise there was silence, a dignity befitting this great man.

The mourners stood numb as the last ritual was performed by the priests attended by altar boys. Then the scraping of the coffin being put into the crypt, cut into the hearts of those who stood by helplessly.

The rose blanket was placed in front of the crypt and the entourage passed through the Chapel to see where their loved one and friend was lain.

It was the end. The end of a full and fruitful life, so well acknowledged that governors, statesmen, judges and other dignitaries and people from various walks of life, came from other parts of the country to pay their last respects.

Among those officials from out of the Plaquemines, St. Bernard and New Orleans area who attended, were former Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama, Mississippi Gov. John Bell Williams, La. Gov. John J. McKeithen, U.S. Senator from Miss. James Eastland, Senator from La. Allen J. Ellender, Miss. Supreme Court Justice Tom P. Brady, La. Lt. Gov. C. C. (Taddy) Aycock and La. Speaker of House, Rep. John Garret.

The family of Judge Perez set the example of the quiet dignity of the funeral and burial. They greeted each of the mourners at the funeral home and led the funeral procession. They are the two sons of Judge Perez, Leander H. Perez Jr., Chalin O. Perez; his two daughters, Mrs. J. Douglas Eustis and Mrs. Richard J. Carrere. In the procession with the family were Judge Perez's sisters Mrs. A. M. Walker, Mrs. W. E. Anderson and Mrs. Olympe P. Giordano; Mrs. Foret and all of his 19 grandchildren.

The deceased relatives of Judge Perez are his wife Agnes Octave Chalin; brothers Rosellus E., M.S., B. J. Eldridge and sisters Mrs. Edwige Switzer, Mrs. Frank Eloise Giordano, Mrs. Ollie Pujol. Judge Perez was the son of the late Gertrude Solis and Rosellus Perez.

## THE PRYING CENSUS

## HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of H.R. 4791, a bill which would restrict the Census Bureau's ability to snoop into the private lives of our citizens, I was pleased to read a recent editorial of support for the bill in the Leader-Times of Kittanning, Pa.

The editorial points out that support for this proposed legislation transcends ideological and partisan positions, and that there is support for the measure by approximately one-fourth of the House membership.

I agree completely with the conclusions of the editor when he says:

It (the Betts bill) deserves support from other Members of Congress and the public whose privacy it is intended to protect.

I present the editorial to be reproduced here:

## THE PRYING CENSUS

Concern over the increasing invasion of the individual's privacy by the government transcends ideological barriers. Both liberals and conservatives fear the incessant prying of Big Brother into private affairs of the average citizen.

Republicans and Democrats alike have expressed distaste for such measures as wire-tapping and electronic eavesdropping and have tried to restrict such evidence-gathering to cases involving organized crime and national security.

Too often government snooping has had no other purpose than harassment, as in the case of the Internal Revenue Service, or simple bureaucratic nosiness, as in the case of the Census Bureau.

The Census Bureau over the years has expanded its constitutional role by counting heads every 10 years in a general information quest which has nothing to do with its assigned duties.

In an unusual display of bipartisan togetherness, 109 members of the House of Representatives have co-sponsored a bill which would reduce the Census Bureau's power to pry.

Rep. Jackson Betts, R-Ohio, author of the

bill, has for several years been concerned about the questionnaire which the bureau has prepared for the 1970 census. Betts doesn't believe the government has any right to demand to know a person's marital situation, for example, or how many television sets or bathtubs he owns.

The Betts bill would remove the compulsion presently attached to questions not relevant to learning how many people are living in the United States. The proposed legislation calls for "repeal of the jail sentence entirely (now 60 days) and removal of the \$100 fine from all but a few subjects essential to the population count."

A person could answer the other questions voluntarily.

The bill has the initial support of one-quarter of the House. It deserves support from other members of Congress and the public whose privacy it is intended to protect.

PRESIDENT DWIGHT D.  
EISENHOWER

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the loss of another great American leader, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. But our sorrow is tempered by the knowledge of the fullness and richness of his life; a life that was devoted entirely to the service of his country.

Involvement and service were the hallmarks of his life which encompassed all of the great trials and the great victories of this Nation in the 20th century.

From his early manhood at the time of World War I, Dwight Eisenhower moved inexorably to the leadership of the most powerful military forces ever assembled in the history of the world. He led those forces with valor and devotion and presided at their victory in World War II.

One might have expected that to be the end and the zenith of a great general's career, but for Dwight Eisenhower, it was only the beginning. The unprecedented faith and affection which he inspired in his fellow Americans moved the Nation to call him to still further service in the highest office in the land where he served as long as the law allows.

He was a great leader in war and a great leader in peace.

Today we grieve at his passing, but we rejoice in his life which is an inspiration and an example for all of us.

His words as he ended his second term as President of the United States shall continue to be of particular significance to me. Let us never forget that being a great military leader, and as a President leaving office, he still warned us against the dangers he saw ahead:

In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together.

I join the multitudes to pay him homage and tribute that he so justly deserves.

MARXISM-LENINISM AND SDS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Communist direction in student youth movements is becoming increasingly clear. This is particularly so with reference to the more violent of student groups labeling themselves of the "new left" type. Among such is the so-called Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—which actually is anything but a movement for democracy.

In this connection I find the report by Robert Krim appearing in the Washington Post entitled "SDS Philosophy Edges Toward Marxism" to be revealing and I commend its reading to all who seek to recognize the forces arrayed against American social order for what they are. The article follows:

SDS PHILOSOPHY EDGES TOWARD MARXISM

(By Robert Krim)

AUSTIN, TEX., March 30.—"Our primary task is to build a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement," declared Michael Klonsky, executive secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), in his report to the SDS National Committee meeting at the University of Texas today.

Klonsky's belief in revolutionary communism is typical of the political beliefs of most of the leaders and many members in SDS today.

During this three-day conference with 1000 SDS leaders from across the country, delegates have phrased their arguments in Marxist terms. "Imperialism," "the working class," "class oppression" and "wars of liberation" had been continually referred to in debate.

NEW SDS TERMS

This Communist rhetoric and philosophy is relatively new to SDS. Two or three years ago virtually no student radical seemed to believe in Marxism.

"The revolution" was still a joke to most of the new left in 1966. The new left of that period was anti-ideological.

Only three years later "the revolution" is far from a joke. There is an ideology now which all factions in SDS adhere to. It advocates a Marxist analysis of classes in America. It attacks the United States as a capitalist, imperialist, and racist state that is ruled by a small elite. American involvement in Vietnam is seen as a natural extension of the elite's "capitalist imperialism."

The debate within SDS at this conference centers on the future of the nine-year-old radical movement. The student radicals feel they must broaden their constituency if they are to bring about "the revolution."

TWO DIFFERENT FACTIONS

At least two different factions in SDS advocate different approaches to the problem. The "worker-student alliance" believes that the students should consider themselves "oppressed people" like white and black workers. The second group, commonly referred to as the "New Left," endorses the principle of an alliance between workers and students.

The New Left faction within SDS (known as "the Right") retains much of the humanism and individualism of the mid-1960s. Many of its members are pacifists who, though intellectually accepting the need for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

revolution, will not accept violence as a means.

For the New Left group the style of life is still an important factor in their radical beliefs. The student subculture from marijuana to the new sounds in rock, underground movies and the underground press is all part of the "radical life style."

This group accepts Marx as an economist who is relevant to the society for which he wrote, but not completely applicable to the modern American society.

Said one SDS leader in the New Left, "Mao, Che and Lenin were all very relevant to the Chinese, Cuban and Russian societies, respectively. They each won a revolution. That was a good thing to happen." But he goes no further in applying them to American problems.

MARX, LENIN, MAO

This is not the case among the members of "the worker-student alliance." Marx, Lenin and Mao are the theorists—"all others are revisionists." This group makes no bones about it; they accept the Marxist-Leninist political philosophy.

The members of the worker-student alliance are not members of the Communist Party, however. Many of them are members of the Progressive Labor Party (PL). They ally themselves with "the revolutionary communism" of Mao Tse-Tung and Communist China.

The worker-student alliance faction does not go along with the radical life style of the New Left. They wear their hair short, their clothes are "straight" and they refuse to use drugs. This faction's resolution at the SDS conference here to condemn the use of drugs by students was defeated.

The New Left faction accuses PL of being controlled by Peking. PL, while admitting that they are Maoists, replies that the New Left is made up of "fascists" and employs the fascist rhetoric of "anti-communism."

FIGHTS BREAK OUT

The battle between these two factions has come several times to fist fights in local campus SDS meetings and at this conference in Austin. Many believe that SDS eventually will split apart along these factional lines.

In fact, the New Left spread rumors at this SDS meeting that they would withdraw if their resolutions were defeated by the worker-student alliance faction. The New Left faction won all the votes at the conference.

As is the custom, the delegates at the December SDS conference rose at their last session and sang the old trade union hymn "Solidarity Forever." This year, however, the song was interrupted by the chant "Defeat Faults Unity." It will probably become nearly impossible for SDS to sing "Solidarity Forever" in the not too distant future.

GENERAL EISENHOWER: AN AMERICAN SAGA ENDS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower has passed away and America is much the poorer because of it. Reared in its heartland, he personified traditional virtues. Born to service, he lived his entire life on behalf of his country. Inured to sacrifice, he gave unstintingly of himself whenever his country asked anything of him. Altruistic to the core, he set an example for the entire Nation.

Leading America's military forces to victory in World War II against Germany, he was an exemplary soldier in a

democracy. Standing firmly against the Soviet menace in the cold war, he lent his strength to our international role. Stepping out of the service, he answered the call of his country as its President.

In all of these endeavors, he showed what the American spirit and fiber were really made of. Through every challenge and crisis, he maintained his courage, bringing honor to our country. Never was that courage better displayed than during his last illness.

History will treat him kindly. America will always be in his debt. He left us many legacies. That of courage in combat, honesty in office, and devotion to country.

He also left us a warning—one that it would do us well to heed. It stays in my mind always. He warned us of the military-industrial complex, and what dangers it poses to our society. Never was he more correct than when he delivered that warning.

His message has been taken to heart along with his other legacies. May God give him peace and receive his soul.

HALT, BIG BROTHER

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while I am not a cigarette smoker, I feel that much more is involved in the recent FCC proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television than the issue of smoking or not smoking. I feel that the FCC is going too far in banning advertising of a product, the manufacture and sale of which is legal. It is proper to require that advertising fairly represent a product, but until such time as there is a legal ban on the sale and use of the product, it should be legal to advertise it, and I feel that the FCC has no right to arbitrarily ban such advertising.

I include editorials from two newspapers with wide circulation in the Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Feb. 7, 1969]

HALT, BIG BROTHER

Step by step, America appears headed away from freedom and toward regimentation. One of the steps in fateful march will be taken if the federal communications commission is authorized by congress to ban radio and television advertising of cigarets.

What disturbs us about this proposed new prohibition is the effect it has on American principles of government. It cuts down the principle of voluntary rule and promotes in its place the principle of compulsory rule.

There has been, to be sure, a growing tendency for government to tell people what they can and cannot do. One would have thought that the nation's experience with the 18th amendment would have taught it something. But if it did, the lesson has been forgotten. Big Brother is coming on with a vengeance.

So after cigaret advertising on radio and television has been prohibited, then what? To stay in the area of the specific concern, suppose that it is established—and perhaps it already is—that air pollution, particularly from the internal combustion engine, is as much of a cause of lung cancer as cigaret smoking. Then shouldn't gasoline advertising be banned? In the end such laws and

regulations could make life in America as safe as a burial vault.

Congress should reverse this trend toward having government run every aspect of our lives. A good place to start would be by denying the FCC the authority to prohibit cigaret advertising on radio and television.

[From the Waukesha (Wis.) Freeman, Feb. 14, 1969]

#### BAN ON CIGARETTE ADS CAN'T BE DEFENDED

Senator Frank E. Moss (D Utah) has urged the nation's cigarette manufacturers to abandon voluntarily all broadcast advertising in a Senate speech that was, in reality, an ultimatum. Moss said the broadcast industry has made efforts to "counterbalance cigarette advertising with public service announcements on the dangers of smoking" but he noted that nothing less than a full ban on TV and radio cigarette advertising is acceptable.

While many share the Senator's concern over the harmful effects of cigarette smoking, congressional action of the sort suggested by Moss would be improper if not unconstitutional. Educational programs on the use of cigarettes fall well within the government's responsibility. These have been carried out for many months and should continue. But for Senator Moss or anyone else to dictate what products may or may not be advertised and sold is still another question.

On the heels of Moss' ultimatum the Federal Communications Commission proposed a ban on radio and TV cigarette advertising on the grounds that cigarettes cause "an epidemic of death and disabilities." The next logical step, of course, would be to ban the sale of cigarettes. From there the do-gooders could perform a public service by banning the advertising and later the sale of motor vehicles because of the "epidemic of death and disabilities" they are causing.

#### ANOTHER DERAILMENT

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the rash of railroad accidents and derailments is continuing.

Despite the yeoman efforts of the undermanned Federal Railroad Administration to make the fullest use of the laws and jurisdiction at its command, the incidents continue to increase.

Remedial legislation is essential and thorough study by the appropriate congressional committees is mandatory.

Just this past weekend, there was another serious derailment in the backyard of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y. Fortunately, there were no injuries, nor was there any volatile or other dangerous cargo involved.

The industry is not policing itself, so it is necessary that Federal officials be given the tools to impose and enforce adequate safety regulations.

Following are articles from Buffalo newspapers reporting the latest derailment:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 28, 1969]

#### THIRTY-SEVEN OF FREIGHT'S 85 CARS JUMP TRACKS IN HAMBURG

Thirty-seven cars of a 50 mph, 85-car Norfolk & Western freight train jumped the tracks just off Rogers Rd., a half mile south of Route 75 in the Town of Hamburg's Mt. Vernon section, about 3:45 this morning. No one was hurt.

Preliminary reports by Hamburg police said at least a half mile of track was torn up. Officers blocked off Rogers from Cloverbank Rd. to Route 5 because two auto part carriers crashed onto the highway.

Other cars stayed on the five-track railroad right of way or came to rest in Lakeside Cemetery on the other side of the tracks, Police Chief Robert G. Williams and Lt. Patrick Poose reported.

Nineteen of the cars were grain carriers and three were auto carriers, officers said. Others were box cars and auto parts carriers.

The auto carriers remained upright, just off the tracks. Patrolman Paul H. Zuppinger discovered the wreck at 3:53 a.m. while checking the source of a momentary power failure in that area. The train came from Onio and was bound for Buffalo.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Mar. 29, 1969]

#### THIRTY-SEVEN CARS DERAILED IN HAMBURG

The last 37 cars of an 85-car Norfolk & Western freight train jumped the tracks near the Rogers Rd. crossing in the Town of Hamburg shortly before 4 a.m. Friday. No one was hurt.

The train, bound for Buffalo from Chicago, was traveling at 50-m.p.h. when the wreck occurred. The cause of the derailment was not immediately known.

#### CARS OVERTURN

About half of the derailed cars overturned, spilling their contents of grain, cantaloupes and other merchandise. Three cars carrying new autos remained upright. A half-mile of the railroad's east line was torn up.

The adjacent west line, which had been blocked by the spilled merchandise and overturned cars, was back in operation Friday night.

Railroad officials estimated it would take about two days to repair the damage to the east line. Trains were being re-routed on Penn Central tracks.

### COL. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL HONORED

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to attend the 83d annual meeting of the Trade Relations Council at the Mayflower Hotel, March 26, 1969.

Col. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., and honorary chairman, North American Rockwell Corp., was presented the Distinguished Service Award, "For Distinguished Service to American Business in Foreign Trade Policy."

I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the splendid introduction of Colonel Rockwell by Mr. George P. Cheney, Jr., counsel, government affairs, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries, Inc., and chairman of the 83d annual meeting and I commend to the attention of my colleagues Colonel Rockwell's timely and superb address:

#### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY GEORGE P. CHENEY, JR.

Our next guest is the founder of two major U.S. manufacturing corporations. One is a leading producer of electronic and mechanical equipment and systems for measuring and controlling the flow of liquids, gases, and solid materials, and of power tools. The other is the world's largest producer of me-

chanical elements for vehicles, of industrial gears and power transmission devices, and of textile machinery.

Colonel Willard Frederick Rockwell is Chairman of the Board of the Rockwell Manufacturing Company, the first of these companies and the Honorary Chairman of North American Rockwell Corporation, with which his second company, the Rockwell Standard Company, merged in 1967 to form one of our Nation's largest corporations.

Colonel Rockwell is a pioneer in the automotive industry having invented many of the engineering improvements embodied in today's vehicles. Colonel Rockwell has served his Nation in many capacities. He was a specialist in the Motor Transport Division of the Army in World War I, and the Director of Production of the Maritime Commission in World War II, in which capacity he contributed to the recordbreaking production of ships required to support U.S. military operations overseas.

He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Munitions Board and acted as chairman of the Board during the Korean Emergency. He served as Deputy to Governor Stassen in the Mutual Security Agency in 1953, serving in Europe and in NATO until nominated Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of logistics by President Eisenhower.

Colonel Rockwell has been decorated by the Governments of Belgium, Brazil, Italy, and Venezuela. He has been honored by countless organizations for distinguished leadership in many areas of American life. He is a Fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. He is a director in a long list of manufacturing corporations, insurance companies, the former New York Central Railroad System, and has served as president or director of many trade associations.

Colonel Rockwell was one of twenty-one American industrialists chosen by Time, Inc., to make a trip to Moscow and visit political and military leaders in many European nations in 1963. His interests know no horizon. In 1965, he was a scientist's observer on the recordmaking polar flight on which for the first time a single flight around the world by way of both the North and South Poles was achieved.

Colonel Rockwell has long served as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Trade Relations Council. His broad experience and service to our Nation in many capacities and his magnificent industrial leadership richly qualify him for the honor which we are privileged to present to him this evening.

#### REMARKS OF COL. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL

Thank you for your generous statement of my background, and for this handsome award. I am glad to be here.

The United States has a full agenda of momentous policy issues, some so urgent that it may seem strange for the perennial issue of foreign trade policy again to be competing for recognition. My experience in matters affecting the national security has given me strong interest in the related topic of foreign trade policy.

My companies, and I am sure the companies of every executive in this room, have important responsibilities in the mobilization preparedness to support our country's efforts in resisting aggression and meeting any emergency which threatens our national security. One cannot carry these responsibilities as the chief executive officer of a manufacturing corporation without being concerned about the impairment to those capabilities which can be caused by adverse foreign trade developments.

The Rockwell companies have 120 manufacturing plants in the United States and 81 in foreign countries. We have a major interest in the United States market, but we have also staked out a major claim to the foreign market through the establishment of plants operated by affiliates, subsidiaries, and

licensees in every part of the free world. In the United States, our plants are producing goods which are classified in 25 major industries under the Standard Industrial Classification.

Reviewing the impact of foreign trade on these industries and on the Rockwell companies is quite an undertaking. Fortunately, the computer analysis of employment, output, and foreign trade by Standard Industrial Classifications which has been carried out by the Trade Relations Council makes such an analysis possible.

The study which the Council is releasing tomorrow at this annual meeting contains such data for 13 of the industry sectors in which we are active. In many of these, imports are insignificant and the United States is enjoying substantial and growing exports. In others, a once-favorable export experience is being turned around with declining exports and increasing imports. In a few, increasing imports dominate the foreign trade picture.

Examples of the latter category include steel springs, where imports have captured 11% of the domestic market; textile machinery, where the import penetration of the domestic market has jumped from 5% in 1958 to 18% in 1966; and private and commercial aircraft, where imports have now captured 11.5% of the domestic market.

Examples of the second category of industry in which we are involved, where a once-dominant export position is being turned around with a decline in the pace of the exports and a sharp increase in the pace of imports, include internal combustion engines other than those for motor vehicles, where imports have increased at ten times the rate of our exports and import penetration, which was less than 1% of the market just a few years ago, is now over 3% of the domestic market. In electrical measuring instruments, imports had risen steadily to claim 4.5% of the market in 1966, with a further increase in 1967. There has also been a great surge in the imports of electronic communications equipment in the past few years.

These specifics concerning imports, however, are not the major matter which concerns me. Our experience in overseas markets has made us very much aware of the fact that other nations in their own self-interests pursue a foreign economic policy which gives primary emphasis to fostering the strength of their domestic industries rather than the pursuit of free trade objectives regardless of the cost in jobs and investment at home.

It may interest you to know that the primary reason the Rockwell companies have established so many manufacturing plants abroad through subsidiaries and invested in other plants with affiliates, and licensed still other plants in situations where we have not taken a capital investment, is in recognition of the practical impossibility for U.S. exports to enter those markets on a sustained basis.

The Rockwell companies make in their product categories the best that the world has to offer in construction equipment, automotive parts, industrial control equipment, and production machinery. Our products are needed in every nation that is industrialized or seeking to become industrialized. Given equality of opportunity, we can compete with producers in any country.

But in the real world, equality of opportunity in the sense in which I use the term is not available. Other nations recognize that products of basic importance to the functioning of an industrial economy such as we manufacture are essential to their own economic well-being and their national security. They, therefore, encourage manufacture of these articles in their own countries through investment and tax incentives and through an affirmative policy for the regu-

lation of imports consistent with the growth needs of their home industries.

As a practical matter, we learned that if we were to serve foreign markets with our products, we must establish foreign manufacturing plants inside of those markets rather than depend upon access through the practice by such countries of a liberal foreign trade policy.

The tragedy is that the art of propaganda has been used so effectively to make the United States feel ashamed when it considers reasonable means to regulate imports consistent with the interests of its own industries and their workers. If we did nothing more than to practice the type of policy which our companies have found to exist virtually everywhere else in the world, our Nation could not be fairly criticized. My business associates in other countries may publicly support their governments by viewing with alarm the rise of protectionism in America. But privately they express to me their puzzlement that the United States is so reluctant to act in her own interest in those cases where vital American industries are being badly damaged or even forced out of the country by an inundation of imports.

The cause of those industrialists who seek some realism by our Government in this area I have found to be grossly misrepresented. The very suggestion by some industries that the Government should impose quotas or adopt other means to bring the rapid rise of imports under some reasonable control seems to excite a barrage of criticism which is eagerly repeated by the public press in a fashion which demeans those industry executives who are attempting to protect the welfare of their employees and their shareholders.

The caliber of the men who have been honored here this evening and the many other spokesmen for reasonable import regulation in the steel, textile, footwear, and electronic industries should in itself command respect within Government circles for their point of view. The studies of the Trade Relations Council of the impact of foreign trade on manufacturing industries show that we have lost our favorable balance of trade in manufactured products, that we are suffering a net loss of employment due to the growing trade deficit in manufactured articles, and that many industries, highly labor intensive in the character of their manufacturing operations, have already suffered the penetration of their markets by imports to such a degree that action is required.

I should like to add my voice to those which have been raised here this evening urging the chief executives of American manufacturing corporations, regardless of their present circumstances in the foreign trade area, to join forces to secure from the Congress legislation which will at least provide the machinery to make it possible for seriously affected industries to secure some reasonable regulation of imports in the future. In my opinion, the long-range national security interests of our Nation require constructive action by the Government on these requests.

LETTER FROM CHARLES B. CHRISMAN, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS, TO PRESIDENT NIXON

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY  
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS, INC.,

New York, N.Y., February 27, 1969.

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I feel a special urgency at this time to voice the very deep concern of our 36,000 member agencies and, I am sure, of hundreds of thousands of other agents throughout the country, about the increasing involvement of banks in the insurance industry through the holding company device.

This urgency has developed from the realization that certain persuasive forces within the banking industry are seeking to influence the passage of legislation which will aid them in this involvement.

We are deeply alarmed by some of the implications of this trend, not the least of which is that the purpose of a bank to extend credit could give it a forceful opportunity to coerce a borrower in placement of his insurance. This constrictive channeling of business cannot serve the best interests of the insurance-buying public nor of the insurance industry itself.

We have always attached great significance to the Congressional mandate of 1916, wherein national banks were restricted to the sale of insurance only in the small communities of up to 5,000 population. This attitude of an earlier Congress was reemphasized by the Congress in 1958 and as recently as 1967-68 was held by the courts to be valid.

We who provide our experience and knowledge of the market, as well as our finances, to meet the personal and commercial needs for security are truly frightened by the prospect of banks eliminating competition in the sale of insurance. Most particularly are we concerned about the entrance of bank conglomerates and congenics into the business of insurance.

All of us recognize the firm resolve of your office and of your Administration to promulgate meaningful legislation in the public interest. The public press has voiced your awareness of the problems in point and we applaud and rely upon your dedication to grasp the full and complete impact of this most important economic development in the lives of our people. Our association, therefore, requests only an opportunity to offer its views as an aid toward the right decision.

The officials and representatives of independent insurance agents are ready to submit their views, opinions and knowledge to any and all governmental agencies and legislative committees before final action is taken on legislation affecting this involvement of the banking industry in insurance.

Such thorough airing of the issues involved will, I know, be in the best interest of the public whose interest we all serve.

Respectfully,

CHARLES B. CHRISMAN,  
President.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Americans throughout the Nation and free people the world over join together in mourning the passing of a great American, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

His was a full and fruitful life dedicated to the services of his country as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces

when the drums of war sounded in World War II, and later as a leader for peace as Chief Executive of our Nation. He was blessed with an inherent ability to unite people and infuse in them the spirit of mutual assistance and collective action under the most trying circumstances.

He had about him a very sincere and genuine love for his fellow man and though he walked with kings, he never lost the common touch. It was this common touch that endeared him to his fellow Americans. This faith, trust, respect, and admiration accorded him by the American people was a reflection of the deep love and respect he had for his country.

His brilliant and illustrious career has come to a close. A Nation grieves, the world mourns, and people of all nations join together in final tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower; general, President, statesman, patriot, and above all, a most remarkable human being.

NILS V. "SWEDE" NELSON AWARD  
DINNER, GRIDIRON CLUB OF BOS-  
TON

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nils V. "Swede" Nelson Award for sportsmanship is one of the outstanding awards of its kind in the Nation.

In fact, there is not another athletic award precisely like it, since it stresses character qualities, as emphasized by exceptional, instinctive reactions of football players, having to do with conduct on the gridiron, personal judgments, and attitudes toward competitors in the game.

This year's Nelson Award was presented by the superb, extraordinary "Swede" Nelson himself, at a largely attended, enthusiastic reception and dinner marking the award.

As I indicated, the award is not given for performance on the gridiron alone, but, commendably, also for posture, talent, achievement, and leadership, not necessarily totally associated with the playing of the game itself.

The famous recipients, without exception, are outstanding football players, inspiring leaders—sterling young Americans, representing the very best of their generation.

The 23 young men who have received this award since it was originated, in most instances, have combined outstanding football ability, with scholarship, curricular distinction, concern for their fellow athletes and humankind, and deep devotion to the tenets of equality, fairness, and justice for all that are at the very heart and essence of our American society, even though they are not always observed.

Football players are known for their skills, their gameness, quick thinking, courage, and unfaltering spirit. They follow the code that any game worth playing is worth winning, that they must never give up, that they must work as a team, and that they must demonstrate

loyalty and consideration for their fellow players, in turn, for their friends, their commitments, and, above all, they must always play the game fairly, honorably, and with due regard for the rules and for others.

To men schooled in the football code of sportsmanship exemplifying the virtues, the loyalties, the civic spirit, the patriotism, the sense of justice, and love of all their fellow men, it follows logically that the boys selected for this award are, without exception, boys who reflect and adhere, not only to an athletic code, but to a code of human relations and social concern for others that we need more of in our society.

When the Boston Gridiron Club in its wisdom founded the Nelson Award, they made a great enduring contribution to football and athletics, but it made a much greater one to our young men, and to the country, because it furnished example, encouragement, inspiration, and recognition for all boys who strive in athletic contests to hold to highest standards of conduct. This is something that is of inestimable benefit to the Nation.

Even a casual look at the long career of "Swede" Nelson and his outstanding service to football, education, business, community relations, human brotherhood, and the greater togetherness of people of every race, rank, class, and creed, demonstrates the great worth and value of this cherished award.

To emulate the standards and sportsmanship of such a great American as "Swede" Nelson is indeed a lofty goal for any young athlete, young scholar or young man, whatever his calling.

The most recent Nelson Award was conferred upon a young man who played a leading role in what was perhaps the greatest 42 seconds in football history, Capt. Victor E. Gatto, of Harvard.

For it was in the last 42 seconds that he and his teammates in the 1968 Harvard-Yale game scored 18 points to tie the score in an unforgettable and, doubtless, an unprecedented achievement of its kind.

Great as that is, it is only one of the many striking incidents that marked the brilliant football and college career of this fine, outstanding young American from Harvard, Vic Gatto.

As the Boston sportswriters and Baron Pittenger, director of sports information at Harvard, agree, "the name of Vic Gatto will be indelibly transcribed on Harvard's athletic records."

Ranking second only to the legendary Charlie Brickley, the greatest of all drop-kickers, he scored 120 points in three years as Harvard's backfield ace. He excelled also as a passer, pass receiver, and as a punt return and a kick return specialist.

As his famous, beloved trainer, Jack Fadden, says: "Some players perform with injuries; Gatto played against them; he can ride against pain and overcome it."

As the writers point out, it is in the realm of these character qualities defying measurement that Gatto's impact is the greatest, his sportsmanship instinctive, and his leadership ability truly inspirational.

His concern for the health, welfare, and comfort of the players both on and off the playing field, his sterling leadership in numerous organizations working to improve the overall welfare of the student body, the university, and the community, his unselfish work with deprived youngsters, most of them black, as well as disadvantaged youth—all these attest to the fine qualities of this wonderful young man.

As usual, it remained for the incomparable "Swede" Nelson, peerless raconteur, wit, and humanitarian, to put the frosting on the cake. Nelson said:

Vic may only measure 5 ft. 6 in. in height, but on the football field, he is nine feet tall, and in life he will be a giant.

I take great pleasure, pride, and honor in heartily congratulating Vic Gatto, and his devoted family and Coach John Yovicsin and staff, and Harvard College, upon the award of this highly merited, outstanding Nelson Award to Vic Gatto.

It would be difficult to find words that would adequately express our admiration for this fine young man, inspiring leader, and promising young American.

The illustrious Nelson Award Committee, comprised of highly gifted experts and leaders, in making the award to Vic Gatto, have done themselves proud, because he is in the highest traditions of the precious Nelson Award and American college football.

We are confident that purposeful, dynamic, committed Americans like young Vic Gatto, moved by loyalty to American institutions that gave them their chance, devoted to every good cause for the people will provide the leadership, dedication, and courage we need to preserve our freedoms and solve the challenging problems of today and tomorrow.

Meanwhile, it is for the rest of us, inspired by the unquenchable spirit, talents and bright promise of the leaders of this young generation, to confirm our determination that this country and its freedoms shall survive every test.

Under unanimous consent I include background information about the award and the remarks of "Swede" Nelson delivered at the 23d annual Nelson Award dinner:

#### "SWEDE" NELSON SPORTSMANSHIP AWARD DINNER, GRIDIRON CLUB

President Jack Daly—reverend clergy—guest of honor—Vic Gatto—your lovely mother—beautiful bride—dad and all the wonderful family—all our distinguished head table guests—beautiful ladies—members of our own Gridiron Club family. The Harvard senior football players—the Harvard Club—the incomparable Harvard Band—and all the Phi Beta Kappars in double-breasted coats.

I am proud to extend to you nice folks the warm Gridiron Club welcome.

This award could truly be named for many men in this room. I want to share this 23rd national award with all of you—made possible—by my life long friends—the incomparable Gridiron Club—my family join me in our sincere thanks.

It is so pleasant to have all the clergy with us—my life long great friend—Bishop Minihan—Rabbi Shubow—Reverend Rankin. Their contribution was kindly, significant and wonderful.

In the interest of genuine sincerity and time—I want to thank these distinguished speakers—all of whom were great—and every-

one who helped in this dinner honoring this fine young Harvard captain—Victor Emanuel Gatto.

Thanks must include Kenny O'Donnell—President Jack Daly—our toastmaster Charles Fitzgerald—John Carver—John Kelleher—Joseph Blumsack—Murray Lewis—Tom Lynch—John Cavanagh—and Arthur Barry. Thanks to Bob Coyne—the famous cartoonist—all the newspaper men, radio and television. Thanks to everyone who helped.

To all the Gridiron Club family—our appreciative thanks are warm and many.

We will forever miss all our immortal Gridiron Club members and we welcome many of their devoted families, who are with us tonight.

All of our six grandchildren are here—together with my lovely Esther—my great son-in-law George Red Hill and sweet Natalie.

If the Hill family gets any larger—next year I'll be sitting on the fire escape—on the Boylston Street side.

Tonight we happily honor Vic Gatto—and in honoring him—we honor one of the best—he is the 23rd name to be added to this distinguished list of American athletes—great—not alone for football ability—but great for the dedication and devotion to all that is decent and dignified in our system of sports.

He is a symbol of service and sacrifice and tonight his unselfishness is gratefully recognized and rewarded.

His command presence—his concern for the welfare, health, and comfort of players both on and off the field—his kindly interest in the sick and unfortunate—Vic, at times injury ridden—he could rise above pain and still lead with his inspirational example—this young man is very real and genuine.

Moreover—off the field—he always had time to help the young folks with student involvement in the urban crisis.

It was a complete success—you didn't have to measure the height of these youngsters on the wall—they had started to grow up straight.

We all know of his records—an excellent captain and a brilliant half back he will live forever in Harvard history and he belongs with our football greats.

This outpouring of friends clearly indicates—both by right—and example—that Vic is one of Harvard's most highly respected sons.

He is truly representative of his loving parents and lovely bride—and he too has had the inspirational example of extraordinary men—gifted John Joviczen—a truly wonderful coach—and his able staff—athletic director Dolph Samborsky—one of the outstanding athletic directors in this country—leads the whole successful Harvard system—Jack Fadden—one of America's greatest trainers who has a tremendous understanding of all athletes—thanks to distinguished Harvard University—all Vic Gatto's terrific teammates.

Our local college teams had fine seasons—Boston College—Tufts—Northeastern and Boston University—all this made us happy.

Harvard had an undefeated season—their quarterback was always great—their defense and offense was highly developed—and their leadership was also extraordinary—it produced winners.

The sixteen points in 42 seconds will always linger in my memory—Harvard played like Charleston defending Bunker Hill from the British—and while I couldn't get on my feet as fast as my wonderful teammate Phil Philbin—he kept me fully informed—he said—Swede—we are going to take it all—Gatto has just scored—and 25,000 Harvard rooters joyfully swarmed on the field—sang Fair Harvard—and half of them knew the words.

Vic—you are a complete success as a human being and you never took a backward step. Vic may only measure 5'6"—but on the football field he is nine feet tall—and in life he will be a giant.

Distinguished Harvard demands the best of her selected sons.

This son in giving his brilliant honest best—receives the respect of Harvard University—her great alumni—the entire student body—and community—as he now marches in the long crimson line of great men.

Vic Gatto—you are a credit to your wonderful family—your great coach and your fine teammates—your dedication is clearly told in these pages and to paraphrase from one of the greatest and beloved Americans of all—the late President—John F. Kennedy—it was not what Harvard could do for you—it is what you could do for Harvard.

I am proud to present to you the Gridiron Club trophy—signifying that the Gridiron Club considers you one of the greatest sportsmen of them all—ladies and gentlemen—Vic Gatto.

THE AWARD

"The Nils V. Nelson Award for Sportsmanship" is presented annually by the Gridiron Club of Boston on a basis of the following requirements:

*"To the player who, by his conduct on or off the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree."*

In selecting a committee to decide the winner of the "Nelson Award" great emphasis is placed on the knowledge and experience of its members with respect to the American game of football over the years. Numbered among our committee this year are men who have played in both college and professional ranks. Others are presently engaged in collegiate or professional officiating, coaching and physical education pursuits at the college level. The serious manner in which all nominations are studied, combined with the wealth of experience possessed by the individual members of the committee, insures a selection which may readily be accepted as the best.

The Nelson Award for Sportsmanship has aroused the interest of leaders in the World of Sports throughout the entire nation. Nominations for the Award have been received from every state in the Union, having been contributed by college coaches, sports writers, radio announcers and others. This widespread source of information and the enthusiasm expressed by the contributors points to the Nelson Trophy as being firmly established as one of the nation's outstanding football awards.

We of the Gridiron Club of Boston are confident that the objectives of the Award will ever serve as an inspiration for all that is praiseworthy and good wherever the game of football is played.

THE COMMITTEE.

COMMITTEES—TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL DINNER, THE NELSON AWARD FOR SPORTSMANSHIP

John J. Daly, *President*.  
John F. Kelleher, *General Chairman*.  
John J. Cavanagh, *Treasurer*.  
Joseph Blumsack, *Secretary*.  
Charles S. FitzGerald, *Toastmaster*.

AWARD COMMITTEE

Arthur J. Barry, *Chairman*, John J. Carver, William I. Cloney, John J. Daly, D. Leo Daley, Mark H. Devlin, John J. Donahue, Harry Downes, Clarence E. Dussault, Charles S. FitzGerald, E. A. Flumere.

Andrew Gaffey, John L. Heaphy, George H. Hill, Robert W. Hotin, John F. Kelleher, LeRoy J. Kelley, Herbert M. Kopf, Murray Lewis, Thomas E. Lynch, Jr., Gerald S. Maloney, Robert McCabe, Joseph McKenney, Thomas H. McNamara, William H. Ohrenberger, David J. Lucey, John Pesky, William A. Regan, Robert Whelan, Joseph Zapustas.

DINNER COMMITTEE

Co-chairmen: Dr. Francis X. Maguire, Joseph Blumsack, John Bane.

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

Murray Lewis, *Chairman*, John Ahern, Timothy J. Horgan, Joseph J. Shortall.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE

Co-Chairmen: John S. Keohane, Charles Meirick, George Ellison, Edward J. McCarthy, Richard E. Blumsack.  
John J. Carver, *Program Coordinator*.

EULOGY TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken in honor of Dwight David Eisenhower, but few of us will ever realize how much we asked of him as a man. We should indeed mourn his passing but also be grateful for his life as an American. He rose through the ranks of the service and led us through a world crisis as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe in World War II. We turned to him again and asked for his leadership as President of the United States. His great deeds and efforts toward the fight for peace in his capacity as both Commander and President will long be remembered.

"Ike" will not merely be a figure for future generations to recall as just the 34th President of the United States; he was a part of the history of our Nation. Throughout the world he gained lasting friendships for America as was demonstrated by worldwide leaders attending his funeral services.

In his retired life "Ike" was referred to as the "father image." Many leaders and politicians turned to him for his advice and wisdom. His unique leadership qualities assisted in uniting clashing political views, and he was loved and respected by all. His warmth and sincerity can only be measured by those who knew him personally; but Americans at home will always be indebted to him for his contributions as a great leader.

WHAT ABOUT A DIPLOMACY OF EXTRICATION?

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, at present, a military solution to the Vietnamese war seems to remain prevalent in the thoughts of the administration. We are bent upon preventing formation of a coalition government in which the NLF would have a role. Recent reports indicate that they are not yet defeated, nor does military victory seem imminent. Our generals have, to put it kindly, misjudged realities of the military situation. Nor are they likely to be more accurate in future, for that would require admission of failure. Therefore, the military solution is unworkable and is not a direct road to an end to American involvement there.

We must allow the NLF a role in the

regime, and show we mean this by some type of military withdrawal, even if it is a token one. This and only this will serve notice upon military rulers in Saigon that they must act to effect meaningful changes in the situation. By this act, we would pave the way for actual discussions between all Vietnamese factions involved. The only route to a meaningful settlement lies in this direction. We cannot and should not seek to impose a solution. It would not be viable, for it would not last beyond a few months after our military presence there ceased.

Today jails of South Vietnam bulge with critics of the military regime. These people may or may not be anti-Communists, yet we have been a party to their imprisonment by the military regime.

From all elements a meaningful and broad coalition government could be constructed. Then a resultful dialog could begin. Yet, as long as we show no sign of withdrawing soldiers and allow jails to fill without protest, the Saigon generals will feel they do not have to compromise. One result will be a prolongation of war, further fragmentation of Vietnamese society, and greater eventual power for the Communists.

Therefore, we require a new type of diplomacy—that aimed at extrication, not military triumph. This would require candor on the part of the administration. Why does Government not have a little more faith in the maturity of the American people? Winston Churchill began one of his most memorable addresses to the people of Britain by stating:

The news from France tonight is very bad.

Britain prevailed and her people triumphed in part because of honesty.

Following such truthfulness and an avowed abandonment of the diplomacy of military triumph, the administration could follow a policy aimed at one goal—extrication and disengagement. Instantly the Saigon military would note that the game was up, ease inner terror, allow some opposition elements freedom, and governmental participation and significant discussions would commence. A meaningful NLF role would guarantee honest talks between all sides, and, without a sense of outside imposition of a settlement, progress should be meaningful.

The major requirement is a forthright statement of a goal of disengagement and extrication by the United States. Only such a policy would serve notice on the Saigon generals that the military game is up, and the American soldiers will soon be coming home.

**THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION'S  
YOUTH ACCOMPLISHMENT PROGRAM**

**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be a member of the Federal Bar Association, an association of law-

yers who are or were employed by the Federal Government.

One of the association's most ambitious and worthwhile projects is the work of its law observance committee, which is engaged in a year-round program of promoting respect for the law.

Among the variety of approaches the law observance committee believes that respect for the law is best learned when one is young. To implement this view, the committee operates a youth accomplishment program.

This program has been tried in various parts of the country and has been noticeably successful in my own home city of Philadelphia. One of the reasons for the program's success has been the vigor and dedication of a fellow Philadelphian, Harry D. Shargel, who is national chairman of the Federal Bar Association's Law Observance Committee.

I would like to include in the RECORD a recent talk given by Mr. Shargel to the Philadelphia Board of Education which explains how the youth accomplishment program works in my city:

Youth Accomplishment is designed to direct the energies of youth into constructive channels and to instill in them a sense of civic responsibility. We take into consideration the fact that outstanding children can usually find means of securing recognition, whereas the average child or the retiring child goes unrecognized and unrewarded and is therefore susceptible to seeking recognition in anti-social activity. We say to the children: "Each of you has ability which you should develop. It doesn't matter whether or not you are better than your colleagues. What does matter is that you are doing your best with the ability you have. Do your best in a project of your own choosing and we will reward you." The quality of the result is measured, not competitively, but against the child's own best effort.

The first reward is a certificate evidencing the fact that he has done his best in his own project. Other rewards based on chance selection rather than competitive accomplishment are trips to places of interest which develop respect for our government and the law. The major trip is a day in Washington. Chartered buses take the children to Congress where they meet Congressmen from this area, have lunch in the Congressional cafeteria, visit the House and Senate, get a behind the scenes tour of the Supreme Court and the F.B.I., meet high officials of the Department of Justice and then have dinner on the way home.

The Youth Accomplishment Program is not a separate youth activity but rather a tool made available to existing youth serving organizations to help them to accomplish their own objectives in serving youth.

This program has been adopted by District One of the Philadelphia Public Schools, under the leadership of Dr. Marechal-Neil E. Young. Each year since 1966 about 10,000 students in 14 schools have been involved in the project, with about 2,000 students completing projects under the guidance of about 300 teachers. Dedicated teachers and principals have created a special lesson guide for teachers related to social studies in order to explain the place of the child in society, the rule of law and the law enforcement process. They have stimulated discussions, debates, and essays. Students have also been encouraged to utilize their capabilities in such diverse fields as arts and crafts, public speaking, literature, poetry, and public service. Of special interest is a project of the Cary School, which developed a project in conjunction with a home for the aged (the Stephen Smith Home) where the boys helped

spruce up the Home and the girls acted in a capacity similar to the candy strippers. In addition, they invited the aged to their school, engaged in discussions with them, and repaired their clothes. They learned to work and were offered jobs. The Catto School developed programs involving arts and crafts and discussion groups. At another school, the Holmes School, pupils, under the guidance of their teachers, set up panels to discuss gangs and arranged discussions on this subject in a church, in the presence of students, parents, and school and police officials.

Last May, some of the visible products of the children were exhibited at the Civic Center Museum. Children also read and spoke about their projects which could not otherwise be exhibited. Of great importance was the fact that the parents, too, were stimulated to take an interest in the children's activities and to take pride in their accomplishments. All this was made possible by the dedicated efforts of Dr. Young and her colleagues.

One important aspect of this program is that it has required no additional expenditure of public funds. It is a community project supported by lawyers, the Philadelphia police and other law enforcement officials, service organizations, labor, and business. Norris Harzenstein and other volunteers of the F.B.I., the U.S. Attorney's Office, and other Federal agencies have devoted their own time and efforts to provide the necessary tools and promote the community interest to make this possible. We have had support from various sources, but I want to especially mention the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, which has participated most generously. James Gassaway of Strawbridge & Clothier administered the program in its formative stages. The Sears Roebuck Foundation and service organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Kiwanis, Optimists, Boosters and others have provided funds, as have Atlantic-Richfield, Abbots, and other business firms. General Electric Re-Entry Systems, Drexel Institute, and the West Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce are participating in planning for the future.

The Curriculum Office of the Board of Education through the former Community Relations Coordinator, Mr. Byron Lukens, has given excellent cooperation. Norris Harzenstein is now working to expand the program into other school districts. We are happy that the school officials have recognized the value of the program and desire to expand it. We will endeavor to marshal the resources of the community to provide the wherewithal to make the project work. I want you and everybody else to know that in all our dealings with the superintendents, principals, teachers, and staff of the Philadelphia School System we have always been impressed with their ability and their dedication to the best interests of the pupils.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and all Americans in the expression of my sorrow and heartfelt sympathy on the death of a truly great American—Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower will be remembered by all as a man of high integrity, a man of great determination and, most of all, a man of such loyalty and patriotism that he will stand out for centuries

to come as one of the greatest of American patriots.

We who have been fortunate enough to have lived in his lifetime will not forget this great general, who epitomized the American ideal of a devoted public servant. We will also remember him as our Chief Executive—and we will look back in years to come on his earnest devotion and loyalty during his tenure of office which will in no way diminish as time goes by.

We have indeed lost a great American, but we can proudly recall his name and the principles he represented with deep and everlasting pride.

America is sadder today—but we should also give thanks that we were fortunate to have had Dwight David Eisenhower in our midst—for he now "belongs to the ages."

Although mere words at such a time are grossly inadequate, I believe the following sensitive and expressive editorial and accompanying articles from the Savannah Morning News come close to perfection in describing the man we affectionately thought of as "Ike":

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Mar. 29, 1969]

#### DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Death came finally for the General. He had suffered too long, bedridden for months at Walter Reed Hospital, victim of at least seven heart attacks in less than 15 years. One marveled at his endurance.

Dwight David Eisenhower, much loved, reflected an image which was comprehended by every American, and yet the whole man seemed to be beyond our understanding.

We liked Ike. So did millions of his countrymen who twice elected him to the nation's highest office by an overwhelming number of votes. As Washington, Jackson, Grant—he, too, had won his honors on the battlefield and did not need the presidency for his page in history. He smiled, and that was all that was needed, and in a certain era it was all that most of us wanted. We trusted him. There were ignominious embarrassments during his second term and the country despaired, but if the postwar Republicans had not fought so hard for the 22nd amendment, his tenure of office might have equalled Franklin D. Roosevelt's.

He had his critics, Douglas MacArthur, his former chief, disparaged his abilities and saw him first as an equal in Europe and later as a rival for the Republican nomination. He was a man of the people, and this, of course, earned him the enmity of intellectuals.

But the people liked Ike. If the public came closer to having a common love for a President, without the opposing hatred which also was directed toward FDR, it was with this man they entrusted it. Lyndon Johnson was also a man of the people, but his mistakes were never forgiven. For the most part, Mr. Eisenhower's were. If he, unlike Washington, was not first in the hearts of his countrymen, he was close by, particularly to a generation which yearned for a proud America.

His success which led him to the highest office has been waved aside by some as political charm first recognized while he was an Army officer. There were intricate maneuverings by politicians on all sides of the Allied cause during World War II. Charles de Gaulle wanted immediate action to recover France from the Nazis. Winston Churchill, wary of a second front which would aid the Russians, and mindful that a premature invasion might be defeated and thus injure British morale, differed with Gen. George C. Marshall who also preferred a cross-Channel in-

vasion early in the war. Mr. Churchill wanted instead to move through the "soft underbelly of Europe." A compromise resulted, but it also led to Gen. Eisenhower being named commander in chief of Allied forces. The General, whom many were to call apolitical later on, led this often haggling Allied army to victory.

If he served also as a mediator during the war, bringing opponents around and making true allies of the Allies, he is still best remembered as the President. And it is this which poses the problem of what the man was really like.

It was something basically American in his makeup, a certain honor which most of us yearn to see in the leaders of our country. It was a quality rare enough to cause us to forgive his errors, his stumblings in foreign affairs because many of us still think we have no business being in such things and that the rest of the world is out to despoil us. He was native American who made good. He was, to Americans, "There but for the grace of God go I—but I'm rather pleased that it's he."

We admired his honesty. Through his administration, Mr. Eisenhower seemed above politics rather than incapable of understanding. He was a man grasping at the straws of peace, at a time when the Communists wanted anything else but. If he had any political coloration, it was that of a moderate, unwilling to turn the clock back and yet steady enough to sound warnings about government plunging into areas previously unknown.

This was how many saw him. Whether he was always thus, or whether he became this, matters little. Perhaps for the first and only time a contemporary politician and his image were true to each other.

Mr. Eisenhower, in truth, represented America as much as the Stars and Stripes in his time. It is a decency, a reverence in fact, that finds constant belittlement today. It is feared that he may one day represent in the minds of many something of a vital cog in the machinery of war, just as some today take the flag to represent all that is deplorable about this country rather than all that is represented as the hope of free men. It is a vile twisting of history to meet ideologies that are currently in fashion, and the damage is never completely repaired.

But today, in our own hearts, the man stands tall. The critics are stilled. The country has halted momentarily, to go forward again within a few days. What Dwight Eisenhower bequeathed us was his unblemished honor, and we must protect it. It is the key to what we continuously reach for, and to lose it, to lose him entirely, is to open the door to an existence which we have long fought against, which is the obituary of the American nation.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News-Evening Press, Mar. 30, 1969]

**IKE'S EXAMPLE: WILLINGNESS TO LISTEN: A STERLING QUALITY**  
(By Tom Coffey)

A few months back when General Eisenhower was fighting (and for the moment winning) one of his battles to stay alive, I wrote a column about Ike's smile, his strong point.

We alluded to that smile in yesterday's beautiful editorial tribute, written by Dave Hardin—"He smiled, and that was all that was needed, and in a certain era it was all that most of us wanted."

But the General was not one who made his way just by smiling. There was more to the man than his countenance.

So many have attempted to fathom Dwight Eisenhower. We have read reams about his organizational ability, his perception of the big picture, how he could rise above politics, etc., etc.

But I think one who was close to the Gen-

eral summed it up best of all. "His willingness to listen" was the Eisenhower quality cited by Maj. Gen. Henry B. Saylor, who lives here in retirement, during an interview he granted me Friday afternoon, about an hour after General Eisenhower had died.

General Saylor was in the famous West Point Class of 1915, eighty per cent of whom became generals. Eisenhower, Bradley, names like that, General Saylor became Eisenhower's ordnance chief in Europe. He passed the ammunition in the biggest single fight the nation ever waged.

There's something almost of a virtue in a willingness to listen. General Saylor said this was why Eisenhower was a great organizer, why he could bring differing factions together. He listened to what they had to say, then made his decisions based upon what he had heard.

Don't all of us wish that we could? Aren't so many of us so headstrong, so pre-conceived in our notions that we fall to listen?

I couldn't help noting a similarity between what General Saylor said about his former chief and what President Nixon said in his inaugural speech.

The President said that for too long we have been shouting. He exhorted us to listen—to one another, and to learn, each from the other.

I am certain now that President Nixon listened to his former boss—and learned.

It might well be that if Nixon sensed Eisenhower's willingness to listen, and identified it as a sterling quality, it was the most important single piece of the basic training that our present President received during his eight years as Vice President under Eisenhower.

Surely it was the most important piece of advice that he could give to the nation when he took office.

I pass this along, and note the similarity aforementioned, merely through circumstance of General Eisenhower's death and my acquaintance with a Savannahian who knew him better than a great many people did.

But I consider it highly significant, not only in offering a keener insight into Dwight Eisenhower but its sobering impact as an example by which we can profit.

Coincidentally, this column makes print at the beginning of Holy Week, a period when solemnity dictates, and four days before Passover, which involves the historical ideal of freedom.

We can solemnly contemplate the idea of listening.

It might enhance our freedom.

[From the Savannah Morning News, Mar. 29, 1969]

**B-17 CREW RECALLS IKE**  
(By William H. Whitten)

For two Savannahians the news of former President Eisenhower's death Friday came home much more personally than perhaps for the millions to whom "Ike" was mostly a public figure.

To V. J. Romagosa and William G. Nelson the news brought memories of many hours of close association with Eisenhower as members of the crew of his World War II Flying Fortress plane.

Both men described their former commander as one of the finest officers and nicest men with whom they had ever served.

#### MYSTERY ASSIGNMENT

Nelson, a flight engineer who served with Eisenhower for 14 months, recalled Friday the day in 1942 when he learned he was assigned to the Allied commander's crew.

"I thought I was coming home," he said. "We had taken off from England with sealed orders not to be opened until we were airborne. Heading into Gibraltar I learned instead I was assigned to Ike's crew with headquarters in Algiers."

"I was with him during the North Africa

campaign and the landings in Italy. At the Italian surrender some newsreel cameramen photographed all of us together but I didn't know it until my wife saw the newsreel at the Lucas Theatre and recognized me," he said.

#### ROMAGOSA CALLED IN

It was through the action of Nelson that Romagosa was assigned to the crew.

"We needed an expert mechanic because of all the flying he had to do so we got Romagosa on the team. I had never met him before the war," Nelson said.

"I sort of fell into the job," Romagosa recalls. "I flew about 500 hours with Gen. Eisenhower over 18 months. When the general went back to England he chose a B-25 to fly in, that became the plane that took him first to the battle in Normandy.

"The general spent most of his time at the rear of the plane. There he would work on plans and maps. To relax, he'd read wild west stories, which I understand he enjoyed a lot."

#### WELL-PROTECTED GENERAL

Asked about protection for Ike and the crew, Romagosa said, "our plane was always well escorted. We had gunners in the crew while in Africa but not after that. We were never bothered by Jerry (German) fighters. They wouldn't have had a chance anyway," he said.

Nelson, however, remembers at least one incident where there was immediate danger.

"It was in Africa," he said. "The officers had left the plane and gone off in three staff cars. We saw two cars returning and Eisenhower came aboard and told me to get that plane up in a hurry—the Germans were coming.

"Sure enough, just after we took off the field was bombed."

There was more to the crew's responsibilities than maintaining the plane, Nelson recalled Friday.

#### EMERGENCY RECALLED

"We were on our way to the Casablanca Conference," he said, to meet President Roosevelt when a propeller shaft broke. We were afraid the engine would catch fire (it didn't) so I put a safety harness on the general. I remember him saying, 'I hope I don't have to use this thing.' I told him I hoped he didn't have to either."

Being that close to the Supreme Allied Commander meant that most of the top-ranking generals of the war were seen close-up by these men. One of the most remarkable was "Blood and Guts"—Gen. George Patton, tank commander, innovator, egotist and always controversial.

"When the Germans started getting too close Eisenhower would say 'Sergeant, bring me my steel helmet.' Patton fined men \$25 if he caught them without their protective helmet.

"When I didn't have mine on Eisenhower would remind me that Patton wasn't above fining a member of the commander's crew."

#### IKE GOT MEDAL

This was during the dark days of the war when the outcome was still in doubt. As victories came and D-Day moved closer to a reality Sgt. Romagosa's mother in Savannah attended a nine-day Solemn Novena for Peace and about a week before the invasion of France sent a letter and Miraculous Medal to Eisenhower. His personal reply came on the 29th of May, seven days before the Allies swarmed into France.

After the war, when Eisenhower began visiting Augusta to play golf and later as President, Nelson and Romagosa had an open invitation to see Ike.

"We did see him one time," Nelson said, "and spent about three hours with him but he was so busy as President that we did not want to bother him."

## TRIBUTE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, America and the world lost a great leader, a great man, in the death of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. His name will live in history as the architect of a great crusade for freedom, an apostle of peace. He was universally loved. He was respected alike by friend and foe.

The life of General Eisenhower is an inspiration to all. Born of poor, humble parents, he proved again to what heights a man can rise on his own strength of character, hard work, ambition, and perseverance.

For his efforts as a world military leader, educator, an outstanding President, and elder statesman, he added beyond words to the strength of America and the free world.

It was my very great fortune to meet and visit with this extraordinary citizen. It was a privilege I will never forget.

His valiant fight against the ravages of ill health typified his courage and tenacity. His death brings an end to the "Eisenhower era."

The entire world is saddened by his passing.

My prayers and sympathy go to his bereaved family.

## THREE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Benjamin J. Rawlings, Sp4c. William E. Price, and Pfc. William J. Schaaf, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLAND GI'S DIE IN VIETNAM—B. J. RAWLINGS, W. E. PRICE, W. J. SCHAAF ARE KILLED

Three more Maryland Army men have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The dead are:

Spec. 4 Benjamin J. Rawlings, 22, of Upper Marlboro, who was killed by enemy bullets March 4 while he was trying to extinguish a fire near Saigon.

Spec. 4 William E. Price, 22, of East Pines, in Prince Georges County, who was killed February 24 in an enemy attack on Pleiku.

Pfc. William J. Schaaf, 20, of 4637 Hazelwood avenue, who was fatally wounded February 27 in an enemy ambush in the Central Highland.

Specialists Rawlings and Price had served more than a year in Vietnam and were scheduled to return home when they were killed.

Specialist Rawlings was thinking of buying a house and wanted to become a sheet metal worker when he received his discharge in September, his wife said yesterday.

Mrs. Linda L. Gardiner Rawlings said their

married life consisted of a two-week honeymoon. When asked if her husband had any hobbies, she said: "I guess I never had a chance to find out."

#### NEVER SAW SON

He had never seen his baby son, Benjamin.

Born in Upper Marlboro, Mr. Rawlings attended Frederick Sasser Senior-Junior High School and worked on his uncle's tobacco farm before enlisting in the Army.

Besides his wife and son, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Blanche Richards Rawlings, of Upper Marlboro; a sister, Mrs. Ann Turner, of Waldorf and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Florence D. Richards, of Upper Marlboro.

Specialist Price, whose regular one-year tour of Vietnam duty was to have expired in February, was a tank driver with the 40th Infantry Division, his brother said yesterday.

A motorcycle enthusiast, Mr. Price enjoyed riding his motorcycle on hill climbs. He was a member of St. Bernard's Catholic Church in Riverdale, where a requiem mass for him will be offered tomorrow at 10 A.M.

Beside his brother, he leaves his father Clyde K. Price, and his mother, Mrs. Mildred J. Kotur Price.

Private Schaaf had been in Vietnam about five months when he was fatally wounded while on patrol in the Central Highlands.

In a letter written to his parents two days before the ambush, he said he was in good spirits because of the lack of enemy activity, his aunt said yesterday.

He died March 3, a week after being wounded.

He is survived by his father, Elmer L. Schaaf and his mother, Sophia Ustaszewski; a brother, David J. Schaaf, of Baltimore, and his paternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. William J. Schaaf, of Baltimore.

## THOUSANDS IN HONOR TO ATTUCKS

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on March 30, as Representative of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, to observe and participate in the Crispus Attucks Day festivities in Newark.

In this day and age when the battle for freedom from tyranny and oppression still marks our world, it is well to recall our first Negro hero, Crispus Attucks, and his role in our struggle for freedom from English tyranny during colonial times. For Crispus Attucks was the first to lose his life during the Boston Massacre in 1770. It was this courageous act that places him among the great patriots of American history.

Many historians believe that Crispus Attucks was born into slavery in Framingham, Mass., and later ran away to become a seaman on a whaling vessel. It was as a seaman that Crispus Attucks was swept into the tides of the colonial struggle for independence from England.

In the middle of the 18th century, the American colonies in effect existed solely for the purpose of profits for England. Consequently, taxes were heavily levied on all colonial products. British troops were sent to enforce tax regulations and the colonists were required to support the royal troops.

Unrest marked the Colonies. Taxation without representation and the presence of the Crown's troops enraged the colonists. Finally, in 1770, Samuel Adams, prominent leader of the movement to free the Colonies from British tyranny, called upon the dockworkers and seamen of Boston to demonstrate against the English troops guarding the customs commissioners. Crispus Attucks responded to Adams' plea.

On March 5, 1770, Attucks, with 40 or 50 other patriots, led an attack upon the British guards stationed at the customhouse. Suddenly there was an order—"Fire," and the British troops responded with a barrage of rifle fire. Crispus Attucks was the first to fall in the battle now known in our history as the Boston Massacre of 1770. The Boston Massacre was the first act of violence which was to lead to the American War of Independence. Crispus Attucks, in death, thus became one of the first martyrs in the cause of American independence.

Crispus Attucks gave his life for freedom. His death is even more significant when viewed as a demonstration of loyalty to a country in which he was not actually free. He was a Negro slave—and yet the first to fall for American independence.

Today a monument stands in Boston as a tribute to Crispus Attucks and his fallen comrades who, on that still night in 1770, laid the seeds for the formation of a new nation founded on freedom and justice. It is because of men like Crispus Attucks that we stand in the world as a nation dedicated to independence and self-determination for all mankind. And so today it is a privilege to pay tribute to Crispus Attucks—the first American who gave his life for our country. At this point I would like to have an article from the Newark Evening News of March 31, 1969, describing the fourth annual Crispus Attucks Day Parade, included in the RECORD:

**THOUSANDS IN HONOR TO ATTUCKS**  
(By Robert C. Ruth)

Thousands braved the cold yesterday to watch bands, cheerleaders and decorative floats pass along Broad Street in the fourth Crispus Attucks Day parade.

The parade, honoring the Negro patriot who was one of five killed on March 5, 1770, in the Boston Massacre, lasted three hours. The unseasonably cold temperatures probably kept the size of the crowd down.

Although spectators lined the sidewalks 15 deep for about a block on either side of the grandstand in front of City Hall, the crowd thinned out at either end of the mile-long parade route from Lincoln Park to Washington Park.

But in front of the grandstand there was no lack of enthusiasm from the residents that lined the streets as 27 bands, 14 drill teams and dozens of small floats filed by.

This year's parade was dedicated to the late Dr. Martin Luther King and the late Timothy Still, who was president of the United Community Corp., Newark's anti-poverty agency. John A. Thomas, founder and president of the Crispus Attucks Society, referred to Dr. King's philosophy in pre-parade ceremonies. He said he could envision the same "ethnic togetherness" in future parades that "brought so many of us to walk with the late and sainted Dr. Martin Luther King in the March on Washington.

"In my vision, I see Black Panthers walking side by side with members of the NAACP.

I see Joe Louis striding with Muhammad Ali (Cassius Clay, former heavyweight champ). I see black Americans, young and old, affluent and poor, all joining in a spirit of unity like this nation has never seen before."

Jackie Robinson, baseball Hall-of-Famer, was the guest speaker. He noted that Crispus Attucks represents Negro America's desire to learn more about its heritage. He said this desire does not result from "hate for anyone but from love for black people.

"Some may ask, what do you want?" Robinson said. "All we want is what everyone else wants, education and employment." He added that yesterday's parade was a way of honoring not only Attucks but all Negroes who "have sacrificed for and contributed to" this country.

The only sad note in the day's festivities was noted by Capt. Roscoe F. Jennings of the New Jersey National Guard and general chairman of the parade committee. In the pre-parade ceremonies, he asked for a moment of silence in honor of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The floats included one sponsored by the Newark Pre-School Council featuring a large red basket with children dressed as bunnies inside. A large bronze Liberty Bell hanging from a blue and white arch was supplied by the UCC.

The wind obviously had its effect on the marchers. Many of the girls manning the floats and convertible autos wore overcoats. The temperature caused concern among parents of some marchers. "Tell Jimmy to pull his collar up," one worried mother said from a sidewalk as her young Cub Scout passed by.

Special marchers included Army Sgt. Dwight A. Johnson of Detroit, a Negro Medal of Honor winner; Miss Gail Fisher, co-star of the CBS-TV series "Mannix," and Negro chiefs of police from Lawnside, Palmyra, Salem, Rahway and Manchester Township.

**REA TELLS HOW TO GET MOST OUT OF AN AUDIT**

**HON. TOM STEED**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration was one of the very first agencies to pioneer the concept of using independent, community-based auditors to audit Federal borrowers, under agency-established requirements. REA's program, for example, has greatly assisted this agency's overview of the loans made to electric and telephone borrowers over the years. Certified public accountants, from the borrower's own area, perform nearly 1,800 independent audits of REA borrowers each year, subject to final agency review. Over the years, some 80 programs in more than 30 other Federal agencies have also made use of independent auditors. I was recently pleased to run across a column, which I would here like to insert in the RECORD, based on an address by Mr. Leslie Surginer, Director, Borrowers Financial Management Division, REA, to the 15th annual meeting of the National Telephone Cooperative Association. Mr. Surginer's subject, "Getting the Most Out of Your CPA Audit," I am sure has application to the many other Federal programs which utilize independent auditors. This insert appeared in Mr. Lyman Bryan's "Washington Background" column in the March issue of the Journal of Accountancy, as follows:

WASHINGTON BACKGROUND

(By Lyman Bryan)

One of the real "old-timers," among federal agencies requiring use of certified public accountants, is the Rural Electrification Administration. Its electric co-operatives and telephone borrowers engage independent auditors in 1,800 instances each year.

"Getting the Most Out of Your CPA Audit" was, therefore, a particularly logical subject for a recent address by Leslie Surginer, CPA Director of REA's Borrowers' Financial Management Division, before a seminar for members of REA Boards of Directors prior to the 15th Annual Meeting of the National Telephone Co-operative Association.

Noting that REA requires an audit acceptable to it, as a part of its loan agreements, Surginer said that the audit was one of the major means of assistance to borrower boards of directors in carrying out their own responsibility. To assist in this, Surginer said borrower boards must:

1. establish clear-cut written responsibilities, goals and policies for boards, and for operating management;
2. see that good accounting records and procedures are adopted and maintained.

"I cannot," said Surginer, "over-emphasize the responsibility the board has to the co-operative membership for establishing and maintaining strong and effective internal control procedures. This is a matter of closing the barn door before, and not after, the horse is out."

Two simple things, Surginer stated, could help prevent "irregularities": (1) maintain an atmosphere that discourages questionable practices and (2) devise and maintain an adequate system of internal control.

On the latter front, Surginer commented bluntly: "Fundamentally what is required is that the duties of one employee serve as a check on the duties of another employee. It is dangerous for any single employee to have (1) sole access to cash and securities, (2) sole responsibility for making bank deposits and for confirming bank statements, (3) sole responsibility for originating and billing accounting entries, (4) sole responsibility for making cash disbursements, or (5) sole control over inventories.

"The independent public accountant is the keystone to effective internal control," Surginer stated.

"An audit does not guarantee that irregular practices on the part of employees will not occur nor does it assure that such practices will in every instance be detected," noted REA's top accountant. "However, closely related to this matter, and of vital interest to the board of directors, is the auditor's review of the co-operative's system of internal controls. This review covers the co-operative's arrangements and practices to accomplish its daily activities. Good internal control reduces to a minimum the opportunity for irregular actions by employees. Irregularities are never expected but occasionally do occur. Any irregularity found by the auditor should be reported immediately to the board president and REA."

Surginer then spoke of engagement and relationship aspects, noting that, "to meet our objectives of good internal control the auditor and the arrangements for the audit should be reserved to the board of directors. Under no circumstances should this very important responsibility be delegated to the manager or to any employee. Mr. Seidman, a former president of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, has suggested that auditors be selected and fees fixed by a committee of stockholders. As you know, in many of the large corporations management picks the firm and the selection is approved by the stockholders. Mr. Seidman believes that the selection by stockholders would negate management's influence on the auditors.

"We recommend the selection of the CPA and the audit arrangements be made by an

audit committee composed exclusively of members of the board. In making its arrangements, the committee should assure that an open avenue of communication is maintained at all times between the chairman of this committee and the CPA.

"As in the selection of any consultant, other key personnel or procurement of a critical component of plant, the choice of an auditor should be made with great care. The committee should assure itself the auditor is truly independent and of high professional standing. It should use the same care in selecting the CPA as it would a doctor [or] attorney. The committee should seek to obtain integrity and know-how. The selection should be made on the basis of known competence and independence. The auditor selected must feel his obligation for full disclosure to REA as an interested third party. As in . . . other professional services, fees should be of secondary consideration. . . .

"We strongly urge that at the conclusion of the audit," continued Surginer, "the audit committee ask the auditor to meet with the board and present his report. If the committee has not restricted the scope of the audit, the auditor should be able to report to the board that he has examined the balance sheet of the co-operative as of the audit date as well as the related statements of revenue and expense and patronage capital and other equities for the period audited. He should be able to assure the board his examination was made in accordance with the generally accepted auditing standards and that his audit included such tests of the accounting records and other such auditing procedures as he considered necessary in the circumstances.

"Also, the auditor should be able to report without reservation that in his opinion the co-operative's balance sheet and statement of revenues and expenses, and patronage capital and other equities, present fairly the financial position of the co-operative at the audit date and the results of its operations for the year then ended in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year."

#### DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

### HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide improved disability insurance for the blind.

In spite of the numerous provisions of the social security system, the blind in this country are still largely unprotected by disability insurance. Under current regulations, in order for a blind person to qualify for benefits, he must have worked for 5 of the last 10 years at a social security-covered job. His earnings must not exceed \$140 per month.

The inequities of this arrangement are obvious. Immediately after the tragedy of blindness occurs—during the period when assistance is most needed—many people are denied aid because they lack the requisite job tenure. Blind people unable to obtain regular employment are often disqualified for this same reason. Blind with annual incomes above a meager \$1,680 are refused benefits even though their disability necessitates extra expenditures.

This bill would relax the stringent re-

quirements for disability insurance for the blind. The tenure requirement would be pared from 5 to 1½ years. The income ceiling would be eliminated.

The disability insurance for the blind was introduced in the 88th Congress by Senator Humphrey and in the 89th and 90th by Senator HARTKE and others. Although never explicitly rejected, the measure has never been passed. I hope that a bill so critical to the livelihood of our blind citizens will not again be ignored.

#### THE UNSAFE ATOM

### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would strongly recommend for my colleagues' consideration an article appearing in the March 1969 issue of *Natural History* which discusses the dangers to humanity through the so-called peaceful uses of atomic energy. The authors, Richard Curtis and Elizabeth Hogan, warn us of the potentially catastrophic dangers to human life through a major nuclear plant accident and the slow saturation of our environment with radioactive wastes.

Many distinguished scientists are convinced that nuclear powerplants represent an incredible and unique hazard for human life. Radioactive substances emanating from these plants into the air and water have been called an evil of an incomparably greater dimension than anything mankind has known before and that this radioactive pollution poses the greatest threat to man's survival on earth.

The potential hazards from nuclear power production include the emanation of radioactive substances into the air and the water of streams used for cooling the nuclear plants, the handling of waste material which remains after the useful life of the nuclear fuel has been exhausted, and the possible sudden release of large quantities of radioactive material into the atmosphere.

Although only a dozen or so nuclear powerplants are now in operation, more than 100 are being planned. In view of the warnings from the scientific community, the entire question of the safety and the desirability of these reactors is a most disturbing one and it demands the attention of the Congress.

The article follows:

#### THE MYTH OF THE PEACEFUL ATOM

(By Richard Curtis and Elizabeth Hogan)

"What is past is past, and the damage we may already have done to future generations cannot be rescinded, but we cannot shirk the compelling responsibility to determine if the course we are following is one we should be following."

So said Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky on February 29, 1968, upon introducing into Congress a resolution calling for comprehensive review of federal participation in the atomic energy power program. Admitting he had been remiss in informing himself on this "grave danger," Morton said he had now looked more deeply into nuclear power safety and was "dismayed at some of the things I have found—warnings and

facts from highly qualified people who firmly believe that we have moved too fast and without proper safeguards into an atomic power age."

Senator Morton's resolution on nuclear power was by no means the only one before Congress in 1968. Indeed, more than two dozen legislators urged investigation and reevaluation of this program. This fact may come as a surprise to much of the public, for the belief is widespread that the nuclear reactors being built to generate electricity for our cities are safe, reliable, and pollution-free. But a rapidly growing number of physicists, biologists, engineers, public health officials, and even staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission itself—the government bureau responsible for regulation of this force—have been expressing serious misgivings about the planned proliferation of nuclear power plants. In fact, some have indicated that nuclear power, which Supreme Court Justices William O. Douglas and Hugo L. Black described as "the most deadly, the most dangerous process that man has ever conceived," represents the gravest pollution threat yet to our environment.

As of June, 1968, 15 commercial nuclear power plants were operating or operable within the United States, producing about one per cent of our current electrical output. The government, however, has been promoting a plan by which 25 per cent of our electric power will be generated by the atom by 1980, and half by the year 2000. To meet this goal, 87 more plants are under construction or on the drawing boards. Although atomic power and reactor technology are still imperfect sciences, saturated with hazards and unknowns, these reactors are going up in close proximity to heavy population concentrations. Most of them will be of a size never previously attempted by scientists and engineers. They are, in effect, gigantic nuclear experiments.

As most readers will recall, atomic reactors are designed to use the tremendous heat generated by splitting atoms. They are fueled with a concentrated form of uranium stored in thin-walled tubes bound together to form subassemblies. These are placed in the reactor's core, separated by control rods that absorb neutrons and thus help regulate chain reactions of splitting atoms. When the rods are withdrawn, the chain reactions intensify, producing enormous quantities of heat. Coolant circulated through the fuel elements in the reactor core carries the heat away to heat-exchange systems, where water is brought to a boil. The resultant steam is employed to turn electricity-generating turbines.

Stated in this condensed fashion, the process sounds innocuous enough. Unfortunately, however, heat is not the only form of energy produced by atomic fission. Another is radioactivity. During the course of operation, the fuel assemblies and other components in the reactor's core become intensely radioactive. Some of the fission by-products have been described as a million to a billion times more toxic than any known industrial chemical. Some 200 radioactive isotopes are produced as by-products of reactor operation, and the amount of just one of them, strontium-90, accumulated in a reactor of even modest (100-200 megawatt) size, after it has been operative for six months, is equal to what would be produced by the explosion of a bomb 190 times more powerful than the one dropped on Hiroshima.

Huge concentrations of radioactive material are also to be found in nuclear fuel-reprocessing plants. Because the intense radioactivity in a reactor core eventually interferes with the fuel's efficiency, the spent fuel assemblies must be removed from time to time and replaced by new, uncontaminated ones. The old ones are transported to reprocessing plants the contaminants are separated from the salvageable fuel as well as from plutonium, a valuable by-product.

Since no satisfactory means have been found for neutralizing or for safely releasing into the environment the radioactive liquid containing the contaminants, it must be stored until it is no longer dangerous. Thus, reprocessing plants and storage areas are immense repositories of "hot" and "dirty" material. Furthermore, routes between nuclear power plants and the reprocessing facility carry traffic bearing high quantities of such material.

Even from this glimpse it will be apparent that public and environmental safety depend on the flawless containment of radioactivity every step of the way. For, owing to the incredible potency of fission products, even the slightest leakage is harmful and a massive release would be catastrophic. The fundamental question, then, is how heavily can we rely on human wisdom, care, and engineering to hold this peril under absolute control?

Abundant evidence points to the conclusion that we cannot rely on it at all.

The hazards of peaceful atomic power fall into two broad categories: the threat of violent, massive releases of radioactivity or that of slow, but deadly, seepage of harmful products into the environment.

Nuclear physicists assure us that reactors cannot explode like atomic bombs because the complex apparatus for detonating an atomic warhead is absent. This fact, however, is of little consolation when it is realized that only a conventional explosion, which ruptures the reactor mechanism and its containment structure, could produce havoc on a scale eclipsing any industrial accident on record or any single act of war, including the atomic destruction of Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

There are numerous ways in which such an explosion can take place in a reactor. For example, liquid sodium, which is used in some reactors as a coolant, is a devilishly tricky element that under certain circumstances burns violently on contact with air. Accidental exposure of sodium could initiate a chain of reactions: rupturing fuel assemblies, damaging components and shielding, and destroying primary and secondary emergency safeguards. If coolant is lost, as it could be in some types of reactors, fuel could melt and recombine, forming "puddles" that could explode upon reaching a critical size. If these explosions are forceful enough, and safeguards fail, some of the fission products could be released outside the plant and into the environment in the form of a gas or a cloud of fine radioactive particles. Under not uncommon atmospheric conditions such as an "inversion," in which a layer of warm air keeps a cooler layer from rising, a blanket of radioactivity could spread insidiously over the countryside. Another possibility is that fission products could be carried out of the reactor and into a city's watershed, for all reactors are being built on lakes, rivers, or other bodies of water for cooling purposes.

What would be the toll of such a calamity?

In 1957 the Atomic Energy Commission issued a study (designated Wash.—740), largely prepared by the Brookhaven National Laboratory, that attempted to assess the probabilities of such "incidents" and the potential consequences. Some of its findings were stupefying: From the explosion of a 100-200 megawatt reactor, as many as 3,400 people could be killed, 43,000 injured, and as much as 7 billion dollars of property damage done. People could be killed at distances up to 15 miles and injured up to 45. Land contamination could extend for far greater distances; agricultural quarantines might prevail over an area of 150,000 square miles, more than the combined areas of Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

The awful significance of these figures is difficult to comprehend. By way of comparison, we might look at one of the worst in-

dustrial accidents of modern times: the Texas City disaster of 1947 when a ship loaded with ammonium nitrate fertilizer exploded, virtually leveling the city, killing 561 people, and causing an estimated \$67 million worth of damage. Appalling as this catastrophe was, however, it does not begin to approach the potential havoc that would be wreaked by a nuclear explosion occurring in one of the plants now being constructed close to several American cities.

The scientists and engineers who produced the Brookhaven Report optimistically ventured to give high odds against such an occurrence, asserting that the structures, systems, and safeguards of atomic plants were so engineered as to render it practically incredible. At the same time, though, the report was replete with such statements as:

"The cumulative effect of radiation on physical and chemical properties of materials, after long periods of time, is largely unknown."

"Much remains to be learned about the characteristics and behavior of nuclear systems."

"It is important to recognize that the magnitudes of many of the crucial factors in this study are not quantitatively established, either by theoretical and experimental data or adequate experience."

Even if the report had been founded on more substantial understanding of natural and technical processes, many of the grounds on which the Brookhaven team based its conclusions are shaky at best.

For one thing, all of us are familiar with technological disasters that have occurred against fantastically high odds: the sinking of the "unsinkable" *Titanic*, or the November 9, 1965, "blackout" of the northeastern United States, for example. The latter happening illustrates how an "incredible" event can occur in the electric utility field, most experts agreeing that the chain of circumstances that brought it about was so improbable that the odds against it defy calculation.

Congressional testimony given in 1967 by Dr. David Okrent, a former chairman of the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, demonstrated that fate is not always a respecter of enormously adverse odds. "We do have on record cases where, for example, an applicant, appearing before an atomic safety and licensing board, stated that a mathematical impossibility had occurred; namely, one tornado took out five separate power lines to a reactor. If one calculated strictly on the basis of probability and multiplied the probability for one line five times, you get a very small number indeed," said Dr. Okrent, "but it happened."

A disturbing number of reactor accidents have occurred—with sheer luck playing an important part in averting catastrophe—that seem to have been the product of incredible coincidences. On October 10, 1957, for instance, the Number One Pile (reactor) at the Windscale Works in England malfunctioned, spewing fission products over so much territory that authorities had to seize all milk and growing foodstuffs in a 400-square-mile area around the plant. A British report on the incident stated that all of the reactor's containment features had failed. And, closer to home, a meltdown of fuel in the Fermi reactor in Lagoona Beach, Michigan, in October, 1966, came within an ace of turning into a nuclear "runaway." An explosive release of radioactive materials was averted, but the failures of Fermi's safeguards made the event, in the words of Sheldon Novick in *Scientist and Citizen*, "a bit worse than the 'maximum credible accident.'"

The atomic industry has attempted to design components and safeguards so that failure of one vital system in a plant will not affect another, resulting in a "house of cards" collapse. However, two highly regarded authorities, Theos J. Thompson and J. G.

Beckerley, in a book on reactor safety advise us not to place too much faith in claims of independent safeguards: "A structure as complex as a reactor and involving as many phenomena is likely to have relatively few completely independent components." Many manufacturers and utility operators have resisted the idea of producing "redundant safeguards" on the grounds of excessive cost.

Investigations of reactor breakdowns usually disclose a number of small, seemingly unrelated failures, which snowballed into one big one. A design flaw or a human error, a component failure here, an instrumentation failure there—all may coincide to contribute to the total event. Thompson and Beckerley, examining several atomic plant accidents, pinpointed 13 different contributing causes in three of the accidents that had occurred up to the time of their 1964 study.

Among the many factors contributing to reactor accidents, the human element is the most difficult to quantify. And perhaps for that reason, it has been largely overlooked in the AEC's assessments of reactor safety. Yet, a private researcher of nuclear accidents, Dr. Donald Oken, M.D., Associate Director of the Psychosomatic and Psychiatric Institute of Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago reported: "A review of reports of past criticality and reactor incidents and discussions held with some of the health personnel in charge reveal a number of striking peculiarities in the behavior of many of those involved—in which they almost literally asked for trouble."

AEC annuals are full of reports of human negligence: 3,844 pounds of uranium hexafluoride lost owing to an error in opening a cylinder; a \$220,000 fire in a reactor because of accidental tripping of valves by electricians during previous maintenance work; numerous vehicular accidents involving transport of nuclear materials. None of these accidents led to disaster, but who will warrant that, with the projected proliferation of power plants and satellite industries in the coming decade, a moment's misjudgment will not trigger a nightmare? Perhaps worse, the likelihood of sabotage has scarcely been weighed, despite a number of incidents and threats.

It should be apparent that if men are to build safe, successful reactors, the whole level of industrial workmanship, engineering, inspection, and quality control must be raised well above prevailing levels. The more sophisticated the technology, the more precise the correspondence between the subtlest gradations of care or negligence and that technology's success or failure. When meters, grams, and seconds are no longer good enough, and specifications call for millimeters, milligrams, and milliseconds, the demands made on men, material, and machinery are accordingly intensified. Minute lapses that might be tolerable in a conventional industrial procedure will wreck the more exacting one. And when the technology is not only exacting but hazardous in the extreme, then a trivial oversight, a minor defect, a moment's inattention may spell doom.

While there is little doubt that American technology is the most refined on earth, there is ample reason to believe that it has more than met its match in the seemingly insurmountable problems posed by the peaceful atom. Societies of professional engineers, and others concerned with establishing technical and safety criteria for the nuclear industry, have described between 2,800 and 5,000 technical standards that are necessary for a typical reactor power plant in such areas as materials, testing, design, electrical gear, instrumentation, plant equipment, and processes. Yet, due to the rapidity with which the nuclear industry has developed, as of

March, 1967, only about 100 of these had been passed on and approved for use.

It is not surprising, then, to learn that serious technical difficulties are turning up in reactor after reactor. At the Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant, a relatively small reactor near Charlevoix, Michigan, control rods were found sticking in position, studs falling or cracked, screws jostled out of place and into key mechanisms, a valve malfunctioning for more than a dozen reasons, foreign material lodging in critical moving parts, and welds cracked on every one of sixteen screws holding two components in place. A reactor at Humboldt Bay in California manifested cracks in the tubes containing fuel: in order to keep costs down, stainless steel had been used instead of a more reliable alloy. The Oyster Creek plant in New Jersey showed cracks in 123 of 137 fuel tubes, and welding defects at every point where tubes and control-rod housings were joined around the reactor's vessel. Reactors in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Connecticut, Puerto Rico, New York, and elsewhere have experienced innumerable operating difficulties, and some, such as the \$55 million Hallam plant in Nebraska have been forced to shut down for good, owing to plant malfunction.

Chilling parallels can be drawn between failures in nuclear utility technology and in the nuclear submarine program. In October, 1962, Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, Director of AEC's Division of Naval Reactors, took the atomic industry to task in a speech in New York City:

"It is not well enough understood that conventional components of advanced systems must necessarily meet higher standards. Yet it should be obvious that failures that would be trivial if they occurred in a conventional application will have serious consequences in a nuclear plant because here radioactivity is involved. . . ."

Rickover went on to cite defective welds, forging materials substituted without authorization, violations of official specifications, poor inspection techniques, small and seemingly "unimportant" parts left out of components, faulty brazing of wires, and more. "I assure you," he declared, "I am not exaggerating the situation; in fact, I have understated it. For every case I have given, I could cite a dozen more."

The following April, the U.S. atomic submarine *Thresher*, while undergoing a deep test dive some 200 miles off the Cape Cod coast, went down with 112 naval personnel and 17 civilians and never came up again. Subsequent investigation revealed that the sub suffered from many of the same ailments described in Rickover's speech. "It is extremely unfortunate," said Senator John O. Pastore, chairman of the joint congressional committee that held hearings on the disaster, "that this tragedy had to occur to bring a number of unsatisfactory conditions into the open." We must now ask if the same will one day be said about a power plant near one of our large cities.

If a major reactor catastrophe did occur there is good reason to believe that the consequences would be far worse than even the dismaying toll suggested by the 1957 Brookhaven Report, for a number of developments since then have made the threat considerably more formidable.

The Brookhaven Report's accident statistics, for instance, pertained to a reactor of between 100 and 200 megawatts. But while the 15 reactors currently operating in the United States average about 186 megawatts, the 87 plants going up or planned for the next decade are many times that size. Thirty-one under construction average about 726 megawatts; 42 in the planning stage average 832; 14 more, planned but without reactors ordered, will average 904. Some, such as those slated for Illinois, California, Alabama, and New York anticipate capacities of more than 1,000 megawatts. Con Edison has just announced it intends to build four units of

1,000 megawatts each on Long Island Sound near New Rochelle in teeming Westchester County—four nuclear reactors, each with a capacity five to ten times that of the reactor described in the Brookhaven Report.

These facilities will accordingly contain more uranium fuel, and because it is costly to replace spent fuel assemblies (this delicate and dangerous process can take six weeks or longer), the new reactors are designed to operate without fuel replacement far beyond the six months posited in the Brookhaven Report. As a result, the buildup of toxic fission products in tomorrow's reactors will be far greater than at present, and an accident occurring close to the end of the "fuel cycle" in such a plant could release fantastic amounts of radioactive material.

Most serious of all, perhaps, is that tomorrow's reactors are now slated for location in close proximity to population concentrations. While the Brookhaven Report had its hypothetical reactor situated about 30 miles from a major city, many of tomorrow's atomic plants will be much closer. Although the AEC has drafted "guidelines" for siting reactors, the Commission has failed to make utilities adhere to them. In 1967, Clifford K. Beck, AEC's Deputy Director of Regulation, admitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that nuclear plants in Connecticut, California, New York, and other locations "have been approved with lower distances than our general guides would have indicated when they were approved."

Also, we must remember that while a reactor may not be near the legal boundaries of a metropolis, it may lie close to a population center. Thus, while Con Edison's Indian Point plant is 24 miles from New York City (two more plants are now being built there), it is within 10 miles of an estimated population of 155,510. It need only be recalled that the Brookhaven Report foresaw people being killed by a major radioactive release at distances up to 15 miles to realize the significance of these figures.

In a recent study of nuclear plant siting made by W. K. Davis and J. E. Robb of San Francisco's Bechtel Corporation, the locations of 42 nuclear power plants (some proposed, some now operable) were examined with respect to population centers inhabited by 25,000 residents or more. Their findings are unnerving: only two plants in operation or planned are more than 30 miles from a population center. Of the rest, 14 are between 20 and 27 miles away, 15 between 10 and 16 miles, and 11 between 1 and 9 miles.

Is it necessary to build atomic plants so big and so close? The answer has to do with economics. The larger a facility is, the lower the unit cost of construction and operation and the cheaper the electricity. The longer the fuel cycle, the fewer the expensive shutdowns while spent fuel assemblies are replaced. The closer the plant is to the consumer, the lower the cost of rights of way, power lines, and other transmission equipment.

On a few occasions an aroused public has successfully opposed the situation of plants near population centers. When the Pacific Gas and Electric Company persisted in trying to build a reactor squarely over earthquake faults in an area of known seismic activity—the site was Bodega Head, north of San Francisco—a courageous conservation group forced the company to back down. It has been suggested, though, that the group might not have won had not the Alaskan earthquake of 1964, occurring while the fight was going on, underscored the recklessness of the utility's scheme.

Announcement by Con Edison at the end of 1962 of its proposal to build a large nuclear plant in Ravenswood, Queens, close to the center of New York City brought a storm of frightened and angry protest. Although the utility's chairman noted, "We are confident that a nuclear plant can be built in Long Island City, or in Times Square for

that matter, without hazard to our own employees working in the plant or to the community," David E. Lillenthal, the former head of the AEC, had a contrary opinion, declaring he "would not dream of living in Queens if a huge nuclear plant were located there." Outraged citizens and a number of noted scientists prevailed.

For the most part, however, the battle has been a losing one. Con Edison, for example, after its defeat in the Ravenswood fight, has just announced an interest in building a reactor on Welfare Island, literally a stone's throw from midtown Manhattan. Also, New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller has gone on record advocating an \$8 billion electric power expansion program based extensively on nuclear energy. The state legislature approved of the program, and in 1968, voted to bolster the plan with state subsidies.

Some of the deepest concern about the size and location of atomic plants has been expressed by members of the AEC themselves. "The actual experience with reactors in general is still quite limited," said Harold Price, AEC's Director of Regulation, in 1967 congressional hearings, "and with large reactors of the type now being considered, it is non-existent. Therefore, because there would be a large number of people close by and because of lack of experience, it is . . . a matter of judgment and prudence at present to locate reactors where the protection of distance will be present."

Price's statement is mild compared to that made in the same hearings by Nunzio J. Palladino, Chairman of the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards for 1967, and Dr. David Okrent, former Chairman for 1966: "the ACRS believes that placing large nuclear reactors close to population centers will require considerable further improvements in safety, and that none of the large power reactors now under construction is considered suitable for location in metropolitan areas [our italics]."

The threat of a nuclear plant catastrophe constitutes only half of the double jeopardy in which atomic power has placed us. For even if no such calamity occurs, the gradual exhaustion of what one scientist terms our environmental "radiation budget" due to unavoidable releases of radioactivity during normal operation of nuclear facilities, poses an equal and possibly more insidious threat to all living things on earth.

Most of the fission products created in a reactor are trapped. Contaminated solids, liquids, and gases are isolated, allowed to decay for a short period of time, then concentrated and shipped in drums to storage areas. These are called "high-level wastes." But technology for retaining all radioactive contaminants, is either unperfected or costly, and much material of low-level radioactivity is routinely released into the air or water at all reactor sites. These releases are undertaken in such a way, we are told, as to insure dispersion or dilution sufficient to prevent any predictable human exposure above harmful levels. Thus, when atomic power advocates are asked about the dangers of contaminating the environment, they imply that the relatively small amounts of radioactive materials released under "planned" conditions are harmless.

This view is a myth.

In the first place, many waste radionuclides take an extraordinarily long time to decay. The half-life (the time it takes for half of an element's atoms to disintegrate through fission) of strontium-90, for instance, is more than 27 years. Thus, even though certain long-lived isotopes are widely dispersed in air or diluted in water, their radioactivity does not cease. It remains, and over a period of time accumulates. It is, therefore, not pertinent to talk about the safety of any single release of "hot" effluents into the environment. At issue, rather, is their duration and cumulative radioactivity.

Here then are clear illustrations of the ways in which almost undetectable traces of radioactivity in air, water, or soil may be progressively concentrated, so that by the time it ends up on man's plate or in his glass it is a tidy package of poison.

That nuclear facilities are producing dangerous buildups of radioisotopes in our environment can be amply documented. University of Nevada investigators, seeking a cause for concentrations of iodine-131 in cattle thyroids in wide areas of the western United States, concluded that "the principal known source of I-131 that could contribute to this level is exhaust gases from nuclear reactors and associated fuel-processing plants."

In his keynote address to the Health Physics Society Symposium at Atlanta, Georgia, early in 1968, AEC Commissioner Wilfred E. Johnson admitted that the release into the atmosphere of tritium and noble gases such as krypton-85 would present a potential problem in the future, and that, as yet, scientists had not devised a way of solving it. Krypton-85, although inert, has a 10-year half-life and tends to dissolve in fatty tissue, meaning fairly even distribution throughout the human body. Krypton-85 is particularly difficult to filter out of reactor discharges, and the accumulation of this element alone may exhaust as much as two-thirds of the "average" human's "radiation budget" for the coming century, based on the standards established by the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement.

Further, many radioactive elements taken into the body tend to build up in specific tissues and organs to which those isotopes are attracted, increasing by many times the exposure dosage in those local areas of the body. Iodine-131, for instance, seeks the thyroid gland; strontium-90 collects in the bones; cesium-137 accumulates in muscle. Many isotopes have long half-lives, some measurable in decades.

Two more factors controvert the view that carefully monitored releases of low-level radioactivity into the environment are not pernicious. First, there is apparently no radiation threshold below which harm is impossible. Any dose, however small, will take its toll of cell material, and that damage is irreversible. Second, it may take decades for organic damage, or generations for genetic damage, to manifest itself. In 1955, for example, two British doctors reported a case of skin cancer—ultimately fatal—that had taken forty-nine years to develop following fluoroscopic irradiation of a patient.

Still another problem has received inadequate attention. Man is by no means the only creature in whom radioactive isotopes concentrate. The dietary needs of all plant and animal life dictate intake of specific elements. These concentrate even in the lowest and most basic forms of life. They are then passed up food chains, from grass to cattle to milk to man, for example. As they progress up these chains, the concentrations often increase, sometimes by hundreds of thousands of times. And if these elements are radioactive. . . .

Take zinc-65, produced in a reactor when atomic particles interact with zinc in certain components. Scrutiny of the wildlife in a pond receiving runoff from the Savannah River Plant near Aiken, South Carolina, disclosed that while the water in that pond contained only infinitesimal traces of radioactive zinc-65, the algae that lived on the water had concentrated the isotope by nearly 6,000 times. The bones of bluegills, an omnivorous fish that feeds both on algae and on algae-eating fish, showed concentrations more than 8,200 times higher than the amount found in the water. Study of the Columbia River, on which the Hanford, Washington, reactor is located, revealed that while the radioactivity of the water was relatively insignificant: 1. the radioactivity

of the river plankton was 2,000 times greater; 2. the radioactivity of the fish and ducks feeding on the plankton was 15,000 and 40,000 times greater, respectively; 3. the radioactivity of young swallows fed on insects caught by their parents near the river was 500,000 times greater; and 4. the radioactivity of the egg yolks of water birds was more than a million times greater.

That "low-level" waste is a grossly deceptive term is obvious. In his book *Living with the Atom*, author Ritchie Calder in 1962 described an "audit" of environmental radiation that he and his colleagues, meeting at a symposium in Chicago, drew up to assess then current and future amounts of radioactivity released into atmosphere and water. Speculations covered the period 1955-65, and because atomic power plants were few and small during that time, the figures are more significant in relation to the future. Tallying "planned releases" of radiation from such sources as commercial and test reactors, nuclear ships, uranium mills, plutonium factories, and fuel-reprocessing plants, Calder's group came to a most disquieting conclusion: "By the time we had added up all the curies which might predictably be released, by all those peaceful uses, into the environment, it came to about 13 million per annum." A "curie" is a standard unit of radioactivity whose lethality can be appreciated from the fact that one trillionth of one curie of radio active gas per cubic meter of air in a uranium mine is ten times higher than the official maximum permissible dose.

Calder's figures did not include fallout due to bomb testing and similar experiments, nor did they take into account possible reactor or nuclear transportation accidents. Above all, they did not include possible escape of stored high-level radioactive wastes, the implications of which were awesome to contemplate: "what kept nagging us was the question of waste disposal and of the remaining radioactivity which must not get loose. We were told that the dangerous waste, which is kept in storage, amounted to 10,000 million curies. If you wanted to play 'the numbers game' as an irresponsible exercise, you could divide this by the population of the world and find that it is over 3 curies for every individual."

Exactly what does Calder mean by "the question of waste disposal"?

It has been estimated that a ton of spent fuel in reprocessing will produce from forty to several hundred gallons of waste. This substance is a violently lethal mixture of short- and long-lived isotopes. It would take five cubic miles of water to dilute the waste from just one ton of fuel to a safe concentration. Or, if we permitted it to decay naturally until it reached the safe level—and the word "safe" is used advisedly—just one of the isotopes, strontium-90, would still be damaging to life 1,000 years from now, when it will have only one seventeen-billionth of its current potency.

There is no known way to reduce the toxicity of these isotopes; they must decay naturally, meaning *virtually perpetual containment*. Unfortunately, mankind has exhibited little skill in perpetual creations, and procedures for handling radioactive wastes leave everything to be desired. Formerly dumped in the ocean, the most common practice today is to store the concentrates in large steel tanks shielded by earth and concrete. This method has been employed for some twenty years, and about 80 million gallons of waste are now in storage in about 200 tanks. This "liquor" generates so much heat it boils by itself for years. Most of the inventory in these caldrons is waste from weapons production, but within thirty years, the accumulation from commercial nuclear power will soar if we embark upon the expansion program now being promoted by the AEC. Dr. Donald R. Chadwick, chief of the Division of Health of the U.S. Public Health Service,

estimated in 1963 that the accumulated volume of waste material would come to two billion gallons by 1995.

It is not just the volume that fills one with sickening apprehension but the techniques of disposing of this material. David Lillenthal put his finger on the crux of the matter when he stated: "These huge quantities of radioactive wastes must somehow be removed from the reactors, must—without mishap—be put into containers that will never rupture; then these vast quantities of poisonous stuff must be moved either to a burial ground or to reprocessing and concentration plants, handled again, and disposed of, by burial or otherwise, with a risk of human error at every step." Nor can it be stressed strongly enough that we are not discussing a brief danger period of days, months, or years. We are talking of periods "longer," in the words of AEC Commissioner Wilfred E. Johnson, "than the history of most governments that the world has seen."

Yet already there are many instances of the failure of storage facilities. An article in an AEC publication has cited nine cases of tank failure out of 183 tanks located in Washington, South Carolina, and Idaho. And a passage in the AEC's authorizing legislation for 1968 called for funding of \$2,500,000 for the replacement of failed and falling tanks in Richland, Washington. "There is no assurance," concluded the passage, "that the need for new waste storage tanks can be forestalled." If this is the case after twenty years of storage experience, it is beyond belief that this burden will be borne without some storage failures for centuries in the future. Remember too, that these waste-holding "tank farms" are vulnerable to natural catastrophes such as earthquakes, and to man-made ones such as sabotage.

Efforts are of course being made toward effective handling of the waste problems, but many technical barriers must still be overcome. It is unlikely they will all be overcome by the end of the century, when waste tanks will hold with 6 billion curies of strontium-90, 5.3 billion curies of cesium-137, 6.07 billion curies of promethium-147, 10.1 billion curies of cerium-144, and millions of curies of other isotopes. The amount of strontium-90 alone is 30 times more than would be released by the nuclear war envisioned in a 1959 congressional hearing.

The burden that radioactive wastes place on future generations is cruel and may prove intolerable. Physicist Joel A. Snow stated it well when he wrote in *Scientist and Citizen*: "Over periods of hundreds of years it is impossible to ensure that society will remain responsive to the problem created by the legacy of nuclear waste which we have left behind."

"Legacy" is indeed a gracious way of describing the reality of this situation, for at the very least we are saddling our children and their descendants with perpetual custodianship of our atomic refuse, and at worst may be dooming them to the same agonizing afflictions and deaths suffered by those who survived Hiroshima. Radiation has been positively linked to cancer, leukemia, brain damage, infant mortality, cataracts, sterility, genetic defects and mutations, and general shortening of life.

The implications for the survival of mankind can be glimpsed by considering just one of these effects, the genetic. In a 1960 article, James F. Crow, Professor of Genetics at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and president of the Genetics Society of America, stated that for every roentgen of slow radiation—the kind we can expect to receive in increasing doses from peacetime nuclear activity—about five mutations will result per 100 million genes exposed, meaning that "after a number of generations of exposure to one roentgen per generation, about one in 8,000 . . . in each generation

would have severe genetic defects attributable to the radiation."

The Atomic Energy Commission is aware of the many objections that have been raised to the atomic power program: why does it continue to encourage it? Unfortunately, the Commission must perform two conflicting roles. On the one hand, it is responsible for regulating the atomic power industry. But on the other, it has been charged by Congress to promote the use of nuclear energy by the utility industry. Because of its involvement in the highest priorities of national security, enormous power and legislative advantages have been vested in the AEC, enabling it to fulfill its role as promoter with almost unhampered success—while its effectiveness as regulator has gradually atrophied. The Commission consistently denies claims that atomic power is heading for troubled waters, optimistically reassuring critics that the plants are safe, clean neighbors.

The fact that there is no foundation for this optimism is emphasized by the insurance situation on atomic facilities. Despite the AEC's own assertion that as much as \$7 billion in property damage could result from an atomic power plant catastrophe, the insurance industry, working through two pools, will put up no more than \$74 million, or about one per cent, to indemnify equipment manufacturers and utility operators against damage suits from the public. The federal government will add up to \$486 million more, but this still leaves more than \$6 billion in property damages to be picked up by victims of a Brookhaven-sized accident. And no insurance company—not even Lloyds of London—will issue property insurance to individuals against radiation damage. If there is so little risk in atomic power plants, why is insurance so inadequate?

The knowledge that man must henceforth live in constant dread of a major nuclear plant accident is disturbing enough. But we must recognize that even if such calamities are averted, the slow saturation of our environment with radioactive wastes will nevertheless be raising the odds that you or your heirs will fall victim to one of a multitude of afflictions. There is no "threshold" exposure below which we can feel safe.

We have little time to reflect on our alternatives, for the moment must soon come when no reversal will be possible. Dr. L. P. Hatch of Brookhaven National Laboratory vividly made this point when he told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: "If we were to go on for 50 years in the atomic power industry, and find that we had reached an impasse, that we had been doing the wrong thing with the wastes and we would like to reconsider the disposal methods, it would be entirely too late, because the problem would exist and nothing could be done to change that fact for the next, say, 600 or a thousand years." To which might be added a sobering thought stated by Dr. David Price of the U.S. Public Health Service: "We all live under the haunting fear that something may corrupt the environment to the point where man joins the dinosaurs as an obsolete form of life. And what makes these thoughts all the more disturbing is the knowledge that our fate could perhaps be sealed twenty or more years before the development of symptoms."

What must be done to avert the perils of the peaceful atom? A number of plans have been put forward for stricter regulation of activities in the nuclear utility field, such as limiting the size of reactors or their proximity to population concentrations or building more safeguards. As sensible as these proposals appear on the surface, they fail to recognize a number of important realities: first, that such arrangements would probably be opposed by utility operators and the government due to their prohibitively high costs. Since our government seems to be com-

mitted to making atomic power plants competitive with conventionally fueled plants, and because businesses are in business for profit, it is hardly likely they would buy these answers. Second, the technical problems involved in containment of radioactivity have not been successfully overcome, and there is little likelihood they will be resolved in time to prevent immense and irrevocable harm to our environment. Third, the nature of business enterprise is unfortunately such that perfect policing of the atomic power industry is unachievable. As we have seen in the cases of other forms of pollution, the public spirit of men seeking profit from industrial processes does not always rise as high as the welfare of society requires. It is unwise to hope that stricter regulation would do the job.

What, then, is the answer? The only course may be to turn boldly away from atomic energy as a major source of electricity production, abandoning it as this nation has abandoned other costly but unsuccessful technological enterprises.

There is no doubt that, with this nation's demand for electricity doubling every decade, new power sources are urgently needed. Nor is there doubt that our conventional fuel reserves—coal, oil, and natural gas—are rapidly being consumed. Sufficient high-grade fossil fuel reserves exist, however, to carry us to the end of this century; and new techniques for recovering these fuels from secondary sources such as oil shale could extend the time even longer. Furthermore, advances in pollution abatement technology and revolutionary new techniques, now in development, for burning conventional fuels with high efficiency, could carry us well into the next century with the fossil fuels we have. This abundance, and potential abundance, gives us at least several decades to survey possible alternatives to atomic power, select the most promising, and develop them on an appropriate scale as alternatives to nuclear power. Solar energy, tidal power, heat from the earth's core, and even garbage and solid-waste incineration have to some degree been demonstrated as promising means of electricity generation. If we subsidized research and development of those fields as liberally as we have done atomic energy, some of them would undoubtedly prove to be what atomic energy once promised, without its deadly drawbacks.

Aside from the positive prospect of profitability in these new approaches, industry will have another powerful incentive for turning to them; namely, that atomic energy is proving to be quite the opposite of the cheap, everlasting resource envisioned at the outset of the atomic age. The prices of reactors and components and costs of construction and operation have soared in the last few years, greatly damaging nuclear power's position as a competitor with conventional fuels. If insurance premiums and other indirect subsidies are brought into line with realistic estimates of what it takes to make atomic energy both safe and economical, the atom might prove to be the most expensive form of energy yet devised—not the cheapest. In addition, because of our wasteful fuel policies, evidence indicates that sources of low-cost uranium will be exhausted before the turn of the century. Fuel-producing breeder reactors, in which the nuclear establishment has invested such high hopes for the creation of vast, new fuel supplies, have proven a distinct technological disappointment. Even if the problems plaguing this effort were overcome in the next ten or twenty years, it may still be too late to recoup the losses of nuclear fuel reserves brought about by prodigious mismanagement.

The proposal to abandon or severely curtail the use of atomic energy is clearly a difficult one to imagine. We have only to realize, however, that by pursuing our current civilian nuclear power program, we are jeop-

ardizing every other industry in the country; in that light, this proposal becomes the only practical alternative. In short, the entire national community stands to benefit from the abandonment of a policy which seems to be leading us toward both environmental and economic disaster.

Man's incomplete understanding of many technological principles and natural forces is not necessarily to his discredit. Indeed, that he has erected empires despite his limited knowledge is to his glory. But that he pits his ignorance and uncertainty, and the fragile yet lethal technology he has woven out of them, against the uncertainties of nature, science, and human behavior—this may well be to his everlasting sorrow.

#### CHALLENGES CONFRONTING THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN FOREST INDUSTRY

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Rocky Mountain Forest Industry started a 2-day conference at the University of Wyoming in Laramie. In a keynote speech delivered by John F. Buchanan, manager of Douglas Studs, Inc., of South Fork, Colo., Mr. Buchanan asserts that there is a burden of understanding that must be borne by the forest industry with respect to the use of our public lands—but not exclusively so. It is a burden, he continues, that must be shared by all actual and potential users of our national forests. The role of education in bringing about this understanding is clearly indicated and I recommend this speech to my colleagues:

#### CHALLENGES CONFRONTING THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN FOREST INDUSTRY

We are fortunate that Governor Hathaway had the perception to realize our forest industry is but one facet of the environmental inter-relationship of all the factors involved, this is more than a forest industry conference because I see before me many conservationists, preservationists, recreationists, wildlife people, fish and game representatives, government people, and people from the communications media. We are pleased that there are more of you than there are of us.

We thank Governor Hathaway for this broad participation. We of the forest industries extend to all of you a most hearty welcome. We welcome you because we realize your myriad attitudes and the attitudes of your counterparts nationwide, will emerge, in the end, as the public attitude toward our industry.

It is, indeed, a privilege to address you at the outset of this conference in order to convey to you the determination of this Region's timber industry to contribute a more meaningful participation in the areas of environment, education, and communication.

Today, not only in the Rocky Mountains, but in the whole of the West, we are a troubled industry. Troubled and confused, because we have not understood the rapid shift in public attitudes regarding the use of natural resources. Not abreast of this shift in public attitude, we find ourselves the target of some deserved and some undeserved public criticism. We are determined to alter this situation.

We are faced with a seemingly unsolvable paradox. Mandated by Congress, the home building industry is required to build 26.0 million family living units in the next ten years. Jobs, food, homes are the social imperatives of our ever-increasing urban society. It is specious to argue that this overwhelmingly-accepted goal can be met without substantial, increased production of softwood building materials. Others, today and tomorrow, will give you the specifics of the supply-demand imbalance, its causes and suggested solutions.

Compelled to increase the domestic lumber production by urban society's demands, we are confronted with this same urban society's demands that vast increases be made in public land withdrawals for wilderness preservation, national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, recreation areas, and other restricted land uses. Not only are these demands levied on public lands, but on private lands as well.

It is not strange that our industry is somewhat bewildered by these conflicting demands when, in simplest terms, we are told, "Give us more and better housing but stop cutting trees."

A review of the past is necessary to an understanding of our present unfavorable situation.

At the turn of the century, "Cut out—move on" was the dictate. "Let daylight in the swamp and the devil take the hindmost" was the social philosophy of that day.

I have seen it all—from horse logging to balloon logging. Share with me the nostalgia of standing with my father on his mill dock, almost sixty years ago, watching the loading of a sailing schooner; or going with him on a week-long journey, by boat and buckboard, to his Shelton logging camp to see, for the first time, a 9x10 single-drum Tacoma yarder (a horse pulled the line back to the woods).

At that age, little did I realize I was witnessing the passing of the era of the ox and the horse in the woods and sail on the seas, and the beginning of the era of steam in the woods and on the rails.

The Panama Canal opened. Tacoma was the "Lumber Capital of the World." Unheeded was the pall of smoke that hung over Puget Sound, summer long, from fire in the slash and forest alike, for the forest seemed inexhaustible and the smoke smelled like money.

Heavy capitalization, burden of high fixed-charges, forced liquidation of cheap stumpage, glutted markets, was the name of the game, on the Pacific Coast, from 1910 to World War I.

Production was the god of the woods and mills—from the 9x10 yarder to the giant Lidgerwood Skyline; from the 50m a day mill to the 500m a day mill; from the ox to the railroad—take the best and leave the rest. This was the order of the day.

The conservationists of that day could well cry "devastation." There for all to see was the wasted wood, the abandoned, cut-over lands of that migratory age. This was the legacy of free land and free timber. Little chance for conservation in this time of boom and bust. It's easy, today, looking back, to condemn the liquidation philosophy of those years. How, with a free economy and cheap stumpage, could a stable base be achieved?—the stability so necessary for the practice of conservation forestry.

Seemingly, we, alone, are the unenviable inheritors of that migratory age with its cut-overs and its ghost towns. Yet we were not alone. The free land farmer and the placer miner shared in the devastation of that era. Yet, they opened the West—spanned a continent in two generations—were not those giants of free land, free timber, free minerals, truly the children of manifest destiny?

Concurrently, with those days of exploitation were the rising ground swells of conservation. Loud was the cry of "Timber Famine." The era of free land and free timber

was passing. Out of the controversy over federal regulation of all timber lands came the compromises of McNary, Clarke and Sweeney; came the adjustment from ad valorem to harvest-yield taxes; came a new determination to "keep the fire out of the woods."

Out of the depths of the depression, the NEA Lumber Code gave birth to industrial forestry conservation in Article X, which committed the industry to leaving "its cut-over lands in good condition for reforestation."

The "American Tree Farm" and "Keep Green" movement, started in Southwestern Washington in 1939, has spread to 48 states, with over 33,000 tree farms having over 75 million acres under the certification program. Farm wood lots to huge industrial forest holdings now have a common purpose of continuous production of forest crops.

No longer does the haunting cry of "timber famine" echo through the woods. The billions in invested capital in the wood processing industry is the best assurance that our available, private land will be kept in trees.

So the saga of "cut-out and move on"—"free land and free timber"—has come to an end, to be replaced by "grow and cut"; "keep the fire out"; "keep the land green." We have passed from "timber mine" to "timber crop." It could not have been otherwise—and all of it in the span of one man's life.

Our past ties us to the present. As an industry we have been engrossed with production. Crude, wasteful production at the turn of the century, more sophisticated production today. We think and act in terms of man-hours per thousand board feet; product and market development; harvest and mill machine improvement; by-product utilization; and the production of trees and suppression of fire. The ethic of private enterprise, private property, and the concept that hard work brings its own rewards is bred in the very bones of our generation, who manage our western forest industries.

We believe, as an industry, that we have been doing a reasonably good job, the last quarter century, in growing what we cut, in doing our part to house the nation, and in increasing our utilization and protection of the forest crop. We cannot understand, in the face of what we believe to be our worthwhile accomplishments, why, today, we are in disfavor with the public. Make no mistake about that. Today we wear a black hat. If you believe anything I say, today, you better believe this.

Today, the public believes little of the good and all of the bad. We believe that, on the whole, we have done a creditable job.

There are others that do not. The large mass of the public, particularly the young public, is neither interested in nor involved with economic issues. They don't care, this public, about the gross national product. Furthermore, they are not at all impressed, that in importance, economically, we are the fourth largest industry; and they are not at all interested in what we tell them is good for them.

Do you realize that of all the people who ever lived in the United States, half of all these people are alive today; that the median age—that middle age today—is 27 years old?

This future public, the public we raised under a permissive philosophy, is not an unintelligent public. Yet, these people are filled with misinformation about our industry. They believe the old myths and some new ones as well. An eminent behaviorist scientist called it the "frontier syndrome." It is the gut feeling on the part of this new public that they inherit the forests; that the frontier is part of their birthright. It puts the people of our industry, particularly those harvesting public lands, in the role of interlopers and

trespassers. Logical? No. Things don't have to be logical to be believed. The belief is the essence of reality.

I sympathize with this feeling of the public, that when things get too tough, and too over-crowded in their urban hives and cement ghettos, they can move out to some frontier.

There is another problem we face. The mores of the old days allowed a terrible waste of natural resources. Only recently have people begun to take a real interest in environmental affairs; now, the winds of change blow strong. So it is that the "environmental isolationists" exploit the "frontier syndrome" and "environmental desecration" to strike fear that we (we the forest industry) will destroy the last frontier. The fear that we will deplete the forest for all time, deplete and destroy the frontiers which are the last natural inheritance of the American people. You and I know that nothing is further from the truth, but the public doesn't know this.

I am saying that we are facing a problem to which there appears no solution, as yet. We are confronted with this dilemma; we are squarely up against the incompatibility of a fixed land base needed by a seemingly endless multiplication of users. A hopeless situation? Yes, unless we as an industry can face up to the realities of what threatens us. They are:

- First, a rapidly growing population.
- Second, a changing ethic.
- Third, a lack of information about us and the good as well as the bad things we do.
- Fourth, an attack from many sides—"Don't cut a tree, but give us lumber at reasonable prices."
- Fifth, groups which perpetuate the old and new myths that we are the plunderers, rapers, destroyers who would deny the American public the use and enjoyment of the last frontier.

What can and must we do?

First, we must relate to our emerging public, the young generation. It matters little whether you disagree with them, their campus riots, their obscenities, their lack of real knowledge and real experience; the fact is it exists! It is there! Like it or not, agree or not, that is our public.

We must, I believe, accept one of the good things that emerges from all their clamor. We must accept and understand that they are concerned. That concern is the key that we may use in getting their attention so we may inform them. To do that, we must also be concerned. They don't think we are. They don't think we are concerned about the right things.

We must relate to this new public, we must inter-react with them.

Today, people do not care about our industry, they don't care about the abstracts of economics, nor do they care about wood. They say, "So who needs lumber?" They say, and with some truth, "half the things in our lives, today, were only in the test tube twenty years ago."

But they do care about trees. They couldn't care less about lumber, but they do care about trees. To relate, then, we have got to let them realize that in producing wood, we are taking care of their trees.

We must inform them that we want the same things they do. They want clean air, so do we. They want clean water, so do we. They want green, open spaces for their use—this expanding, crowded public which must have some escape from the increasing urban pressures—we, too, want this open space environment. They want responsive, workable programs for decent dwellings, the 70% of the people who live and work on 1% of our land, so do we. This is one of our basic commitments. These, then, all of them, must be our goals in the future. We must try to understand that future so our place in it will have a relevance to the needs of all the people in that future.

What, then, have we begun, as an industry, in Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota (Region II of the Forest Service), and what more can and should we do to demonstrate our honest concern for the welfare of the environment, a concern for both the inner cities and the open spaces.

Our first and paramount concern is the total open space environment. A proper perspective is essential to an understanding of the timber harvest impact on the open spaces. Almost 100% of our harvest comes from the National Forests. There are over 11.0 million acres of National Forest commercial timber lands in Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota, with an inventory of over 45.0 billion board feet of commercial timber.

We are harvesting approximately 350 million board feet annually, from less than one-half of 1% of the commercial timber area. At any given time, our harvest is leaving untouched over 99½% of the timbered area.

Notwithstanding this small percentage of harvest-disturbed land, in the shared forest area, we are commencing to do a better job. Starting a year ago, the harvest pattern in the Spruce sub-region was changed from block clear-cutting to block over-story cutting, with emphasis being placed on leaving undisturbed young and advanced reproduction.

The timber operators in the Spruce areas are cooperating with the Forest Service in this new harvest method to the extent practical within the economic limitations imposed by the Forest Service sale appraisals for felling, skidding, and roading.

This method of over-story harvest partially screens the unavoidable logging debris and shortens the time it takes for new growth to heal the harvest scars. The land is returned to a forest cover more rapidly than by the previous method of pile, burn, and replant.

In our three states the annual tree disease and insect losses are over 500 million board feet, half again as much as is harvested by the wood-using industries. Some way must be found, with an economically realistic harvest program, to prevent this staggering loss. Without such a program the forest environment will continue to suffer a needless blight and will return less than it should to the recreation users who want and are responsive to a forest cover of green, flourishing, growing trees.

A joint committee representing the Colorado Open Space Council and the timber industry has agreed to a policy of less permanent road intrusion in the multiple use area, with a corresponding greater mileage of temporary roads for use in timber harvesting. We have agreed that most of these temporary roads should be blocked off on the completion of harvest, so that the temporary road areas will be quickly returned to growing trees. We have agreed that a limited mileage of these temporary roads be kept open and restricted to use by four wheel drive and tote goat vehicles. We are hopeful that the Forest Service will agree to and implement this suggested road policy as a major step in enhancing the open space environment.

Our industry has taken a third significant action, one in the area of air pollution. The Colorado operators have sponsored a state legislative act entitled "An Air Quality Improvement Fund." This act, if passed, will create a research fund through a self-imposed tax of \$0.15 per m feet on all Colorado lumber production. The funds are to be used by the appropriate Colorado State University research facilities, to conduct market and product research in the exclusive field of wood waste. Such research of wood waste creating new products could end plant air pollution and increase rural employment. I am confident the Colorado Act will be the forerunner of similar legislation in the other Rocky Mountain states.

If we are to relate to people, their needs, their aspirations, if we are to still their fears and uncertainties about the future of the

open timber lands, we must broaden their opportunity to a more meaningful share in them.

It is well to look at what the owners of the private industrial forests have done in sharing their private lands with the public. A 1968 "Forest Industry Recreation Survey" highlights these statistics. Companies surveyed, 234; over 65.0 million acres surveyed. Over 85% of these lands were open free of charge to berry picking, picnicing, hiking, swimming, camping, winter sports, boating, and organized recreation. Company facilities included 1,832 overnight tent or trailer camp sites, 2,300 picnic tables, 19 ski areas, for a total expenditure of over \$7,000,000. Over 95% of these lands were open to hunting and fishing.

Do not we operators on public timber lands also have some measure of social responsibility to the public who seek recreation on these shared lands? I am sure you will agree with me that we do. May I suggest some criteria concerning our industry's involvement in expanding the recreation opportunity for the general public: First, the initiative and action must come from local communities—must come from the grass roots. Second, the project must involve a local citizens' group such as a rod and gun club, an Izaak Walton club, a local wildlife group, or a service club; it must also involve the public land agency and a local operator. Third, the projects should be located on state or federal lands. Fourth, upon completion, maintenance and supervision should be the responsibility of the public agency involved. I envision projects such as community picnic grounds, modest overnight camp sites, stream improvement, demonstration denuded-site tree plantings, boat launching sites, etc. Modest signs should identify the participating partners.

Improved logging practices, less permanent road impact, reduction of forest cover blight caused by insects and disease, control of air pollution through wood-waste research, and involvement at the local level in expanding the shared land recreation opportunity, these are the continuing and enlarged commitments our industry makes to the open space environment.

We are facing the fact that our many publics do not yet understand that the forest harvester opens the way through roads; through harvest of an ever renewable resource, keeps the forest green; through involvement will improve their opportunity of sharing these lands.

Only through the public's understanding that timber harvest is essential to the perpetuation of their heritage will come the realization and appreciation that we are protectors, not despoilers. Only if we reach this degree of understanding will the public realize that timber harvest, not preservation, is the best way to protect and improve these shared lands.

Contrary to the misinformation and propaganda being spread by the Sierra Club, our industry has no thought of dismembering the areas now under the Wilderness Preservation System. I will go further, our industry will not oppose the incorporation of the remaining, existing primitive, or wild areas (subject to minor boundary additions or deletions), into the Wilderness Preservation System. We, too, recognize the place and purpose of wilderness as defined under the Multiple Use Act.

We would be less than honest, however, with that great majority of the American people, if we acquiesced in the withdrawal for wilderness preservation of double or triple the acreage now in the wilderness, wild, or primitive areas. For the present and, yes, for the future, the road to escape from urban pressures, for the many, runs to the shared forest lands, both public and private. For the hardy few, the wilderness lies beyond.

We know that the root cause of today's unrest in our urban centers is the denial of

equality, social, economic, and cultural benefits to the dwellers of the inner city. The impenetrable suburban wall is an effective barrier to equal opportunity and participation in the whole of the city's life, a wall that will not soon, if ever, be breached by the inner city's disadvantaged people.

Surely, we do not want to perpetuate this pattern of social injustice in our western forest lands. Not for long will we have the option of making socially acceptable judgments regarding future people-use of these lands.

Doubling or tripling the areas in wilderness, wild and primitive classification will close and lock the door to equality. Wilderness, by its very nature, imposes restrictions on equality of use. Why? For the simple reason that wilderness imposes barriers that are as real as the suburban barriers. The wilderness creates, if not a social barrier, at least an economic and physical ability barrier to the full sharing of use.

The wilderness is restricted in use to the affluent few who can afford the guided horse-back tour and the sturdy few physically able to backpack in. Wilderness will not be used by the average urban family seeking a recreation escape from inner city pressures.

Rather than expansion of wilderness, should we not strive toward improving the shared land environment, open and accessible to all? Compatibility of uses, each use contributing meaningfully to the total welfare of the open spaces, is the goal we should seek. Only through attainment of that goal will we be responsive to the desires, needs, and dreams of the American people.

Let us turn to education, the second major area in which our three-state industry will participate with renewed purpose.

At the local grade and high school levels, we must become involved in creating a conservation conscience in tomorrow's citizens. We shall arrange plant and woods tours of our operations. We will see that American Forest Institute educational aids are made available to the local schools.

We must become involved with and participate in joint meetings with conservation oriented scholars and teachers who will do so much in the shaping of a sound conservation policy.

We propose to fund a non-profit natural resource educational foundation. The main purpose of the foundation will be to grant scholarships to junior and senior college students majoring in timber management and wood science. These scholarship awards will be based on merit and should increase the number of students graduating in these disciplines.

Coupled with these scholarship grants will be summer work programs, not only for the scholarship recipients, but also for other students in the general field of natural resource education.

And finally, we are determined to do a better job of communicating with the public. Our local public, the state, and the national public. First of all, we will communicate the truth. We are going to recognize problems. We are going to practice disclosure. We are going to recognize the bad as well as the good.

We've got to make people, a lot of people, realize that we do have a comprehension of the values that they place on our public lands.

Through communication we can and will inform these publics that we are concerned about the open space environment, that we will try and relate our activities to their concern about the future of our western forested lands, that we, too, want to protect the good things we hold dear to our way of life.

Our only defense and protection is the armour of good performance, publically appreciated. Our real potential will only come through our profound understanding of this country, and our accurate assessment of how

to relate to the American public which needs us so much, but which knows it so little.

We have another responsibility that we must meet if we are not to be sidetracked from the mainline of social opportunity. Not only must we be increasingly responsible to the forest environment, to education, to communication, we must also do our part in providing decent homes for the American people.

These commitments are not lightly made, nor will they be easily come by. Not all of the Region's mills will participate in all of these programs, but most of them will. With honesty in our hearts, with firmness in our purpose, with a better understanding of the goals we seek to attain, we as an industry, pledge ourselves to a better future for the American people.

#### TAX REFORM: THE EQUITABLE PATH TO INCREASED REVENUE

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the April 15 deadline for the payment of Federal income taxes is approaching. As that date draws near, the issue of tax reform once again is placed squarely before Congress. It is an issue we can no longer ignore. Threats of a taxpayers revolt were transformed to action in many cities throughout the year, as evidenced by the school bond issues defeated by voters. Whether by oversight, error, or silent protest, some 30 percent of all incorrect tax returns already filed for 1968 failed to show the addition of the 10 percent surcharge.

Americans are angry, and rightfully so, over the vast loopholes in our tax system and our failure to correct them. The average taxpayer is incensed by the fact that he must pay hard-earned money to support Government spending while 155 Americans with incomes of over \$200,000 paid no Federal income taxes at all last year. He is upset that an estimated \$50 billion a year of possible tax revenue is not collected because of loopholes in the system. Dissatisfaction is compounded when, in addition to the Federal tax, he is required to pay ever-increasing State and local taxes.

The President and Congress have talked about the need for tax reform for years. Congress has been seriously considering tax reform for a decade, yet the average taxpayer sees little improvement in our laws. When President Johnson asked for approval of the 10-percent surtax, I, in a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speech of August 17, 1967, called on the President to couple tax reform with the measure. When the tax measure was enacted I insisted that the President be required to submit reform proposals before his term expired. This requirement was made law. However, the President chose to cavalierly ignore it. Hopes for reform were raised again this year when the Ways and Means Committee initiated hearings on tax revision. However, the chairman of that committee has stated that so much reform is needed, Congress may not have time to act this year.

Congress should not take full responsibility for the failure to revise our tax

laws. President Nixon has recommended extending the 10-percent surtax for at least another year. He has also expressed some desire for granting tax credits to business. Such a practice would create more loopholes faster than Congress can correct the inequities that already exist. To our Nation's 110 million taxpayers who are assured every year that tax reform is high on the Government agenda, revision is a myth. The time has come for the administration to make reform a reality.

Today I will outline a bill I will introduce to close 15 loopholes in our present system and raise approximately \$17 billion. Changes in individual and corporation taxation are included, as well as changes in gift and estate taxes. Restrictions on the operation of tax-exempt foundations and modification of tax laws regarding them are also included.

Eight revisions of the individual income tax structure will raise approximately \$1.5 billion by increasing the taxes of the wealthy. A minimum income tax will assure that the 21 persons with incomes of over \$1 million who escaped taxation last year will be taxed in the future. Preferential treatment of capital gains and losses will be stopped. Hobby farmers will not be permitted to deduct all farm losses from nonfarm income. The unlimited charitable deduction will be phased out over a 10-year period, and the \$100 dividend exclusion and special tax treatment of stock options will be repealed. The many wealthy who obtain large sums of tax-free income will no longer be permitted to subtract all their deductions from taxable income. Instead, the deductions will be allocated between the taxed and untaxed income.

Four revisions in the corporate tax structure will yield over \$4 billion. Most of this sum will be raised by eliminating the tax-free status of industrial development bonds, repealing the accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, and the revoking of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

Three revisions of estate and gift taxes will eliminate existing disparities and will increase Federal revenue by \$2.7 billion. My bill will discontinue the separate treatment of gift and estate taxes and will collect taxes on capital gains which now are untaxed at death. In addition, it will repeal the provision that permits government bonds to be redeemed at par value for the payment of estate taxes.

Finally, the treatment of tax-exempt foundations will be modified. Each will be required to pay a nominal income tax, but it could yield the Government around \$10 billion. Regulations regarding the operation of foundations will be tightened to assure that the institutions are not used for personal gain or self-dealing.

A section-by-section analysis of the proposed bill follows:

#### ESTABLISH A MINIMUM INCOME TAX

This provision would require everyone with an income above the poverty level to pay taxes, including the 155 persons with incomes over \$200,000 who escaped Federal taxation last year. It would help

assure that people in similar income brackets pay similar tax rates on their total income, irrespective of the source of that income. Existing laws give tax breaks to some because they treat different sources of income in different ways. Interest on State and local government bonds is not taxed; one-half the profits of capital gains are not taxed, and the remainder is taxed at a low 25 percent. Persons receiving most of their income from these sources may still have some taxable income. However, this sum can be reduced by giving an unlimited amount to charity, by deducting farm losses from nonfarm income, and by deducting depletion costs in excess of the cost of drilling. After all of these deductions, the amount of income on which taxes are levied may be small or nonexistent. Persons who receive most of their income from a salary do not benefit from these tax loopholes. Most of their income is taxed.

The result is grossly inequitable treatment for persons with equal total incomes. Some of them pay 65 percent of their total income to the Federal Government; others pay only 2 percent. The minimum income tax would restore equity. It would guarantee that most individuals with total incomes of \$500,000 or more would pay taxes at the rate of 30 to 40 percent.

The minimum tax would be imposed on a base broadened to include all sources of income. The income would be taxed at rates ranging from 7 to 35 percent, roughly one-half the current rates. No one would be required to pay more than 50 percent of their total income to the Federal Government.

This tax will raise \$420 million in Federal revenue.

#### ALLOCATION OF DEDUCTIONS BETWEEN TAXABLE AND NONTAXABLE INCOME

Tax laws give individuals with large incomes a double benefit: first, much of their income, because of its source, is not taxed; second, all deductions are subtracted from the taxable portion, even though they may be assigned more properly to the nontaxed income.

The effect of the law is evident by this illustration: An individual receives an income of \$1,284,718. Of this sum, \$74,292 represents a salary and \$1,210,426 represents long-term capital gains. One-half of the capital gains is deducted, reducing the income to \$679,405—allowing for the \$100 dividend exclusion. Personal deductions of \$616,419 and personal exemptions of \$1,200 are subtracted, reducing taxable income to \$1,786. He pays a tax of \$274.

Allowing persons to reduce their tax bill substantially in this fashion cannot be justified. Deductions should be apportioned between both taxable and nontaxable income.

This provision would eliminate the present inequity. It would require taxpayers to allocate all deductions for non-business expenses between taxed and nontaxed income.

Closing this tax loophole would increase Federal revenue by \$405 million. Most of this sum would be paid by approximately 40,000 persons with incomes of over \$50,000.

#### REVISE THE TREATMENT OF FARM LOSSES FROM NONFARM INCOME

Those who farm as a hobby receive tax advantages under a provision enacted to aid genuine farmers. They use liberal accounting procedures, designed to ease the task of computing income for the genuine farmer, to realize considerable tax savings. They deduct from taxable income farm losses which usually represent investment in farm assets, not true economic losses. Then, the gentleman farmer often sells the investment and it is taxed at low capital gains rates. This creates another savings. Under such a practice, the Federal Government loses taxes and the farm economy is distorted, at the expense of those who farm for a living.

My proposal would help remedy this situation by limiting to \$15,000 the farming expenses that can be deducted from nonfarm income in one taxable year. Additional losses could be carried over to the following year. Only farmers using cash accounting methods would be affected by the \$15,000 limit.

#### REPEAL THE UNLIMITED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION

The unlimited charitable deduction provision offers another tax haven for the wealthy by permitting them to further reduce an already low taxable income.

They may deduct an unlimited amount from taxable income if, in 8 out of 10 years, their contributions to charity plus income tax exceed 90 percent of their taxable income. At first sight, it would appear that the wealthy should be rewarded for giving away so much of their income. Yet, the inequity of the provision is revealed when one remembers that a substantial percentage of the income of the wealthy is obtained from capital gains, State and local bonds, and oil depletion allowances, all of which are taxed at low rates if they are taxed at all. For the wealthy, the 90-percent requirement for the unlimited charitable deduction is not difficult to meet.

The unlimited charitable deduction provision should be phased out over a 10-year period. The Federal Treasury would receive \$25 million in 1980, when the proposal takes effect. This sum would be collected from the wealthiest, those with incomes in excess of \$1 million.

#### REVISE CAPITAL GAIN AND LOSS TAX LAWS

It is illogical and inequitable to tax capital gains at 50 cents on the dollar and permit the full amount of capital losses to be deducted from taxable income. Such a provision grants unfair advantage to those who are able to realize their gains and losses in alternate years. For example, if a property is sold one year and \$1,000 capital gain is realized, the taxpayer would be required to pay \$500 capital gains tax on the transaction. If, in the next year, a property is sold for a \$1,000 capital gains loss, the entire \$1,000 could be deducted from taxable income. In such a situation, the taxpayer over a 2-year period would realize a considerable tax advantage. Compare this treatment with the situation where the property owner sells both properties in the same year. Then the \$1,000 capital gains would be offset by the \$1,000 capital loss, with no net tax effect. By realizing the capital

gains and losses in alternate years, a clear tax advantage is offered.

This section of the bill calls for equal treatment of capital gains and losses. Capital gains would be treated as they are currently. However, only 50 cents of capital loss would be permitted to offset \$1 of gain.

This provision would increase Federal revenue by \$60 million the first year. The ultimate level of increased income will be \$100 million, which will be reached after 6 years.

#### REPEAL SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR STOCK OPTIONS

Companies often reward top executives with stock options instead of salary increases. The option gives the executive the right to purchase company stock within a specified time, at the price for which the stock was selling when the option was granted. If the stock increases in value, and he exercises the option, the capital gains is taxed at the low 25 percent rate. Other executives who are rewarded with salary increases and bonuses instead of the stock option are required to pay income taxes at the regular rates. The stock option privilege has no rational or equitable basis. It should be eliminated.

My proposal would continue the efforts begun with the Revenue Act of 1964 to tighten the terms for qualifying for this privileged treatment. As the result, the Treasury would receive \$150 million.

#### ELIMINATE THE \$100 DIVIDEND EXCLUSION

Special treatment is granted to those who invest in stocks which is not granted to citizens who keep their money in savings accounts or invest in Government bonds. The stockholder can deduct the first \$100 in dividends from his taxable income. People investing in other ways are required to pay income tax on the interest received. There is no justification for favoring investment in corporation stock. The ostensible reason for the privileged treatment is to compensate for double taxation of dividends. However, the logic of this reasoning falters when one remembers that corporations and their stockholders are separate legal entities. The purpose of incorporation is to limit the owners' liability by separating his income from the company's assets. The law should continue to separate the corporation from the stockholder.

My proposal would repeal the \$100 dividend exclusion, and raise \$225 million.

#### RESTRICT THE DIVISION OF MULTIPLE CORPORATIONS FOR TAX PURPOSES

Big corporations now take advantage of differential income tax rates which were enacted to assist small businesses. The situation arises because corporate income is taxed at 22 percent for the first \$25,000 income and 48 percent for the remaining income. Although the law passed in 1950 was designed to give a tax break to small businesses, many large corporations have abused it by carrying out their activities through a series of small separate corporate units, each of which declares the 22 percent rate for the first \$25,000 income.

This provision would limit the surtax exemption to one per business entity, re-

gardless of whether the corporation is operated as one or a series of businesses. To give the corporations time to adjust, the provision would not take effect for 8 years.

The revenue increase from this provision will be \$200 million.

#### REMOVE THE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

Tax-exempt municipal industrial development bonds merely subsidize plant construction for large corporations, most of which are capable of absorbing the building costs themselves. The situation arises because municipalities, in an effort to attract industry, issue bonds to construct plants to the company's specifications. The plant is then leased to the corporation, and the rent is used to retire the development bonds.

Issuance of the tax-exempt industrial development bonds serves no public purpose. The practice would be outlawed. Repeal will yield \$50 million.

#### ELIMINATE THE ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ON SPECULATIVE REAL ESTATE

Real estate speculators take unfair advantage of accelerated depreciation provisions and use the higher-than-normal deductions to offset ordinary income. They deduct more than their normal amount of depreciation during the early life of the building and then frequently sell the property before the lower-than-normal deductions go into effect. The next owner in turn begins with the higher-than-normal deductions and repeats the process. If the property is sold at a profit, the speculator pays the low capital gains rates on the entire amount, including the profit on the "book profit" resulting from accelerated depreciation. The advantages brought about by accelerated depreciation should be eliminated. The repeal would increase Federal revenues by \$150 million.

#### REPEAL THE 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The credit, enacted in 1962, permits business firms to deduct 7 percent of the value of eligible new equipment installed during the year. It was designed to stimulate the economy, and should be repealed in light of today's inflation, and overstimulated economy. Three billion dollars would be added to the Treasury by this action.

#### DISCONTINUE PAYMENT OF ESTATE TAXES BY REDEMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR

Government bonds are an attractive investment to those who want to reduce their estate taxes. This is true because the Government allows the bonds to be redeemed at par value in payment of estate taxes. Thus, a person can buy \$60,000 worth of U.S. bonds, and, if his estate redeems them later at \$80,000 the estate tax bill will be cut by \$20,000.

This provision would close the tax loophole, and increase Federal revenues by \$50 million.

#### UNIFY GIFT AND ESTATE TAXES

Estates of comparable size may be treated differently for tax purposes. The inequity arises because gifts distributed from the estate and the estate itself are taxed at different rates. A person with a large estate may give at least \$30,000 in gifts during his lifetime without being

taxed, and gifts exceeding this amount are taxed at low rates. The amount of the gifts is subtracted from the estate, and thus is not taxed as a part of it when the donor dies. Estates, on the other hand, are taxed at higher rates.

Because the gifts are actually part of the estate, it is unfair to tax them at lower rates than those imposed on the estate. The inequitable practice would be eliminated by taxing both gifts and estates at the same rates. This would be accomplished by imposing a single transfer tax. Under the transfer tax, lifetime gifts and transfers at death would be combined to determine the total wealth subject to taxation, and a single exemption and rate schedule would be applied to the total. In addition, the base of the gift tax would be broadened.

The Federal Government would receive \$150 million.

#### TAX CAPITAL GAINS UNTAXED AT DEATH

Wealth from wages, salaries, and other sources of ordinary income is taxed as it is accumulated. Appreciation of capital assets is also taxed when the assets are sold. However, some capital gains are never taxed. This occurs when the stockholder whose assets have appreciated in value dies and the property passes to an heir. The heir does not pay taxes on this increase in value; his only responsibility for taxes is on any future profit they earn. This loophole favors the wealthy who can afford large estates. It also freezes the assets of older persons who would rather pass on their money to relatives than to the Federal Treasury.

This provision would impose a capital gains tax on the assets just as if they had been sold immediately before death. The gains would be taxed as ordinary capital gains are now taxed, and this amount would be deducted from the estate before the estate tax would be computed.

An additional \$2.5 billion would be added to the Treasury by closing this loophole.

#### PROHIBIT "GENERATION SKIPPING" IN THE TAXATION OF ESTATES

The wealthy can preserve their family's favorable financial position by transferring their property to a second generation instead of to the next succeeding generation. These arrangements allow the estate to be transferred without being taxed. If the practice is continued throughout the years, taxation could be avoided for generations.

Normally, accumulated family wealth is passed from one generation to the next succeeding generation, and a tax is paid with each transfer. However, our laws permit property to be transferred to a second generation through elaborate gift and trust arrangements that are designed to avoid the transfer tax. Under certain trust arrangements, the middle generation can escape taxation while maintaining virtual control over the trust and enjoying its income.

The proposed law would impose a transfer tax even though the estate was passed to the second generation.

The donor or the next succeeding generation would have the option of deciding which one of them would pay the tax. The next generation could elect to pay a

substitute transfer tax as if the property had actually been transferred to it and then retransferred to the succeeding generation. The donor could elect to pay the normal transfer tax plus an additional fee to represent the payment by the skipped generation.

This scheme would make the transfer tax more equitable and would eliminate tax differences in alternate methods of distributing property. No estimate can be made of additional Federal revenue to be generated.

#### TIGHTEN CONTROLS OVER TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR DONORS

The assets of some foundations are being diverted to the advantage of the donor or his relatives. Such a practice does not advance the charitable or tax-free purposes of the institution, and should be outlawed. This provision would prohibit foundations from lending their income or corpus to the donor or his relatives. It would prohibit foundations from purchasing or leasing property from the donor or his immediate family, and would not allow the tax-free organization to sell or lease property to the donor or his family.

#### PROHIBIT ACCUMULATION OF FUNDS

In many cases, a lot of time elapses between the transfer of gifts to charities and their use by the tax-free foundation. To prevent this delay, the proposal would require tax-exempt foundations to distribute all their net income annually to charity. The contribution would have to be made to publicly-supported charitable organizations or to privately supported operating charities. The foundation could also decide to use the income on its own charitable programs or to buy assets devoted directly to charitable activities. Provision would be made for the foundation to accumulate some income for more expensive, long-term charitable projects.

#### RESTRICT INVOLVEMENT IN UNRELATED BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

Many tax exempt foundations engage in business activities unrelated to their tax exempt functions. This activity gives the foundations unfair competitive advantages over privately owned businesses, and wield important, unchecked weight on the American economy. The unfair practice would be restricted under the proposed law. It would not permit tax-free foundations to own directly or indirectly more than 30 percent of the total combined voting power or equity of an incorporated or unincorporated business, if that business were engaged in activities unrelated to the charitable functions of the foundation.

#### REQUIRE DONORS TO RELINQUISH INTEREST IN CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS BEFORE A TAX DEDUCTION IS ALLOWED

Some persons who donate property to charitable foundations deduct the contributions from their income tax, but retain controlling interest in the gift. This practice should not be permitted. My bill would not grant the income tax deduction on the gift until one of three events occurs: First, until the foundation disposes of the contributed asset; second, until the foundation uses it for an active

charitable operation; and third, until the donor ceases control of the asset.

#### BROADEN THE BASE OF FOUNDATION MANAGEMENT

To further guard against using tax-free foundations for private advantage, the bill would require the institutions to broaden their management. It would limit the degree of permanent control a donor or his descendants could retain. After the foundation had been in operation for 25 years, the donor and certain relatives would be required to give up all but 25 percent of the control of the managing board.

#### RESTRICT FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Foundations should not be permitted to jeopardize their funds by making risky loans and investments. This provision would restrict the lending operations of foundations. It would require that foundation loans to third persons unrelated to the donor be limited to charitable purposes or to activities that are safe. It would require that all loans made by foundations for purposes unrelated to tax-exempt functions be clearly safe and necessary.

#### IMPOSITION OF A 20-PERCENT INCOME TAX

Foundations are receiving tremendous amounts of income from capital gains and other sources in addition to their charitable gifts. In 1966, 596 foundations studied by the House Small Business Committee had a gross income of \$1,089,627,732, including capital gains. A substantial portion of this sum would be subject to taxation if it had been received as income by businesses, individuals, and other taxable institutions. By allowing tax exempt foundations to get income from businesses they control, from capital gains, from interest, and other sources, the American public is being cheated out of much Federal revenue. This unfair practice would be curtailed by requiring that foundations pay a tax equal to 20 percent of their gross income. The gross income would be computed to include revenue from business activities, interest, dividends, gross rents, gross royalties, and gain or loss from the sale of assets. Income related to charitable purposes would not be affected. Money from contributions, gifts, and grants would not be taxed.

The income tax would yield \$200 million annually from 596 foundations. The total yield from all 29,666 foundations could well be nearly \$10 billion.

These reforms will show American taxpayers that Congress is serious about restoring equity to our tax laws. Equal treatment for all must be the keystone of our tax system. We expect 110 million Americans to compute their tax bills voluntarily. Our revenue-raising scheme would be reduced to chaos if taxpayers refused or could not be trusted to do this. Yet, inequities in the laws reduce the willingness to comply. A person does not like to make out a check to the Internal Revenue Service when he thinks his neighbor is getting an undeserved tax break. Congress must act now before dissatisfaction with taxes becomes more widespread. The reforms I have outlined will help restore fair treatment and confidence.

## PHILIPPINE SUGAR QUOTA

**HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an item that appeared in the March 8, 1969, issue of the Manila Times. The news item points out that the U.S. AID mission chief, Wesley Haraldson, is "boiling mad" that Philippine orders for new sugar mills are being placed with Japan and not with U.S. suppliers despite the fact that the Philippines earns large amounts of foreign exchange from its preferential sugar market in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud Mr. Haraldson's efforts, and I sincerely hope he is successful in changing the current Philippine pattern of buying their sugar mills from Japan.

After reading this news item, I made several inquiries of the executive departments concerning the Philippine sugar quota and its plans for expanding the sugar milling industry. I find Mr. Haraldson's position essentially correct.

The Department of Agriculture informs me that the current sugar quota for the Philippines is 1,126,000 short tons, all but 59,000 tons to be filled in raw sugar. Under the Sugar Act, the preference rate paid for raw sugar is 7.78 cents per pound. If you adjust the preferential rate for duty and freight of about 1 cent per pound for comparison to the world market rate, you find that the direct benefit to the Philippines under the Sugar Act is \$60 a short ton, or \$67.5 million annually.

Chiefly to assure the fulfillment of the Philippine raw sugar quota under the U.S. Sugar Act, 15 new centrals have either been approved for construction or are in the process of approval. The overall cost of these new sugar centrals is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$200 million. Ten projects, costing about \$136,000,000, were approved for construction prior to March 1968, and five additional applications have been favorably recommended to the President for approval. The mill machinery for nine of the initial projects currently in operation or under construction was purchased from: Japan, six; France, one; United Kingdom, one; and Puerto Rico, one. Negotiations for the 10th mill were under way with a U.S. supplier, but were broken off because the proposed millowner died.

It is my understanding that U.S. equipment is price competitive when performance and expansion capacity characteristics are fully considered, although financial terms are somewhat tighter. It is also my understanding that U.S. companies have not been entirely excluded from participation since U.S. construction companies operating in the Philippines have obtained contracts for the erection of the mills. Also, some U.S. equipment, such as a turbine driver and generator, has been used in the expansion or modernization of old sugar centrals. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty discouraging picture for U.S. equipment suppliers.

Mr. Speaker, in approving new sugar centrals, I believe greater consideration should be given by the Philippine Government to the United States as a source for future milling equipment. There are obviously great advantages to both countries where sugar quotas are involved to have, in part, U.S. machinery and equipment milling the sugar. I would hope that the U.S. Congress, as well as U.S. officials administering the act, might so consider this factor in the allocation or reallocation of future quotas.

## THE EISENHOWER LEGACY

**HON. CHESTER L. MIZE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, many have been the words of tribute written and spoken these last few days to honor the memory of Dwight David Eisenhower. Standing out among them is a statement by Dr. John Wickman, director of the Eisenhower Center in Abilene, Kans. In carrying out his duties at the center, Dr. Wickman has probably been exposed to more of the many-faceted greatness of General Eisenhower than anyone outside the Eisenhower family. I find his words particularly appropriate at this time and consider it my obligation to bring them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

## THE EISENHOWER LEGACY

We can do no better, I believe, than ponder the words with which former-President Eisenhower began his address upon his homecoming to Abilene, Kansas, on June 22, 1945. Looking back over the ordeal and triumph in his role as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, he said, "Every boy dreams of the day when he comes back home after making good. I, too, so dreamed, but my dream of forty-five or more years ago has been exceeded beyond the wildest stretch of imagination."

Today we look back over a career which spans 24 additional years after that warm, soggy June day in Kansas, and nod our concurrence. Few men came from such humble beginnings to rise to such heights. Few men have been able to make the journey as did Dwight D. Eisenhower, and still preserve, as he did, the affection and respect of his fellow citizens.

In General Eisenhower's life there was a concept which is still appealing to young and old in this country. It was the concept of service. Not a self-negating service, which so easily slips into the servile; but rather service performed for country and family, and accomplished out of the genius and strength of the individual.

Where did that concept come from? Was it born out of a necessity dictated by a large family living on modest means in an Abilene, Kansas, at the turn of the century? Was it the result of loving and devoted parents who understood that character development in the young is neither easy, nor necessarily enjoyable, for both teacher and pupil?

Whatever its source, there is no question that President Eisenhower had it throughout his adult life. In choosing pathways, whether through the maze of organization which is the Army, or the complications and intrigues of the Supreme Allied Command in Europe,

or through the politics of his party and country, he always chose those roads which lead to duty and honor.

Such choices were not easy for him, any more than they are easy for any of us. That they were not more difficult may be attributed to strengths of practicality, perseverance, intelligence, and self-knowledge which came from his inheritance, and his early development in America's heartland. It is too easy to wish away the influence that his early environment had on this man. He was not the product of what the America of his day deemed the best education, nor favored with the best of economic circumstances, nor thrust forward by reason of his parents' social standing. Yet the shaping forces, so necessary and so mysterious in their combinations, were there. The positive strengths were there for life's greatest challenges.

At the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene there is a slide-sound show which all visitors to the Center may see. For a portion of it General Eisenhower recorded these words which seem especially fitting today:

"... As you enter these buildings do not think of them as a monument to one man, or to one family. Rather, regard them as a tribute to our nation and to those who have defended it throughout its history. These structures are above all a tribute to what America gives to its children, no matter what the circumstances of their upbringing—the opportunity to aspire and achieve."

Dwight D. Eisenhower took hold of his opportunity, and his aspirations and achievements have become his monument. That monument is a full measure, and measuring up to it is the legacy he has left to each of us.

## DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. WALTER S. BARING**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I join in deep sympathy with my colleagues and my fellow citizens as we mourn the death of one of our greatest American leaders, President and General Dwight David Eisenhower. In my eulogy to the general, I want to state that his heroic and lengthy struggle to live these past days exemplifies the life the great general lived during his years as a soldier, military commander, and President of the United States. He dedicated himself to every job he took on.

On behalf of my State of Nevada, Mrs. Baring, myself, and fellow Members of the House of Representatives, I am honoring the life of Dwight David Eisenhower.

It was always President Eisenhower's integrity and dedication to duty and mankind that guided him then and for which he will be remembered forever.

Another note about the general is the statement I recall him making regarding how much he detested war and the killing that regrettably always comes with war. Mr. Eisenhower said, as he spoke referring to his rank in the military, that he hoped someday soon people in his own type of employment would be permanently out of work. He hoped then as we all do now, that there will nevermore be a need for our country or other nations to maintain great armies.

So, as the general now is history, it will be remembered that, despite his distaste for war, his leadership as a military commander will be well marked when he directed allied armies to put an end to the terrorism and devastation of countries and mankind during World War II.

Then too, his role as peacemaker in the Korean war shall not be forgotten when he served as President of the United States.

And, at all times, President Eisenhower felt deep compassion for his fellow man and wanted the best for everyone.

Truly he was a leader and truly will he be missed.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT DELAYS "LOOPHOLE" HEARINGS

### HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Thomas Talburt in the Washington Daily News of April 1 reveals that the Ways and Means Committee is not receiving much cooperation from the Treasury Department in the committee's drive to close tax loopholes.

The American smaller taxpayers are aroused and demanding that tax reform succeed in the first session of the 91st Congress.

The executive department should aid the Congress in this important legislation.

#### TAX REFORMERS TO EXAMINE RETURNS (By Thomas Talburt)

The Treasury Department's slowness in discovering and telling Congress about intricate new income tax dodges that may cost the government millions of dollars in revenue has emerged as a key issue in tax reform hearings now entering their seventh week.

Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., of the House Ways and Means Committee and Rep. John W. Byrnes (Wis.), the committee's ranking Republican, both have zeroed in on what they view as a clear-cut communications gap between Congress and federal tax law administrators.

While the tax-burdened public feels Congress already has an abundance of well-identified loopholes that have long needed closing, Rep. Mills and Rep. Byrnes make it clear they do not want to zip up one tax loophole only to have another replace it and go for years undetected.

#### WANT QUICKER TIPOFF

"What concerns me more than anything else that has come out of these hearings is why the red flag is not raised earlier on some of these newly developed tax gimmicks," Rep. Byrnes told Sheldon Cohen, former internal revenue commissioner, who testified at the hearings.

Rep. Mills expressed the same concern. He noted that, as new patterns of legal tax avoidance emerge, word of them should be relayed to Congress with reasonable promptness.

This is one reason Rep. Mills intends to have the committee examine in closed session later this month the tax returns of 155 persons with annual incomes of \$200,000 or more who paid no incomes taxes in 1967.

"I want to know precisely how it happens that these individuals avoided paying federal taxes," Rep. Mills said.

CXV—532—Part 7

#### AVOID PUBLICIZING LOOPHOLES

He added, however, that he will not make the information public to avoid advertising tax loopholes.

Rep. Mills and Rep. Byrnes also intend to ask newly named Treasury officials in the Nixon Administration to set up some kind of precise information-relaying system with Congress when these officials appear before the committee in mid-April.

Some of these new officials already have told reporters they are trying to devise methods to spot quickly "what the current tax gimmicks are . . . new gimmicks that spread like rumors at the lunch table or the golf club."

Some of the mysterious loopholes worrying the congressmen are devised by attorneys for corporations and wealthy individuals. They are intricate methods of combining special tax benefits voted by Congress to enable their clients to avoid all or most income taxes.

#### PREPAYMENT DEVICE

A far simpler device, spotted by Treasury officials in the Johnson Administration and apparently closed by the issuance of a new IRS regulation, involved prepayment of interest in one year for the entire life of a long-term loan.

By using this tax escape route, a wealthy individual could subtract from his taxable income for one year all the interest he normally would pay over, say, a 25-year period and thus bring his taxable income for that year virtually to nothing.

#### ANOTHER YEAR OF SURTAX

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very concise and objective commentary on the request of President Nixon to extend the 10-percent surtax was carried by the Chicago Daily News, Thursday, March 27.

In my opinion, this editorial in its clarity and preciseness was as sound in its explanation of the need to extend the surtax as any commentary I have seen.

The editorial follows:

#### ANOTHER YEAR FOR SURTAX

Hardly less important than his expected request for a year's extension of the 10-percent surtax was President Nixon's promise to lop more billions of dollars off Lyndon Johnson's proposed budget.

So clearly necessary was the surtax extension and so nearly unanimous was opinion in its favor that the President's formal request caused barely a ripple of public reaction. With interest costs, house prices and the costs of food and other necessities spinning upward there is broad awareness of the need to cool inflation by whatever means are needed.

There will, of course, be outcries when the President's broad promise of economies begins to be translated into cuts of specific programs. Mr. Nixon proposed to trim the spending level "significantly below" the figure of \$195.3 billion estimated in the 1969-1970 budget prepared by his predecessor. That suggests that every facet of governmental operation—foreign spending, defense, welfare, education—will have to feel the ax, and some of the programs will fall short of meeting the needs.

But a still more distasteful prospect is the alternative—runaway inflation that would finally bring the economy down in ruins.

#### GENERAL EISENHOWER, 1890-1969

### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Talcott and I feel inadequate to eulogize General Eisenhower. We can merely express our gratitude to have lived in his era and to have known him.

His appeal was almost universal—which is quite extraordinary for a military or political figure.

When we contemplate what contemporary times or our future might be without his influence, we could shudder with forboding or tremble with trepidation.

The most his small, miniscule detractors could say was that "the Nation took no bold new courses during his Presidency." Perhaps, but he held us on course during perilous, troublesome times. He rescued us from the ravages of war in Korea and returned us to peace—a most welcome new course for us—and he avoided new wars for the world—no mean accomplishment. We enjoyed domestic tranquillity. We had pride in ourselves. We believed in the worth of the individual human being more than in the power of government. We can ask little more of leadership.

A few writers who excel in turning a phrase more than reporting the facts or drawing logical conclusions from correct premises, suggested that "as a general, he was a good politician and as a politician, he was a good general." We believe he had the unique, superior qualities of both and used them appropriately in each role. He also had the attributes of an ordinary man which affected and moderated his every decision, including those at the summit.

We like a general who can lead a coalition of nations yet who is compassionate and cares about each individual in his command. We like a politician who is straightforward, honest, and humble. We liked Ike.

We liked and admired his basic honesty. This may be his greatest, most impressive contribution to politics, diplomacy, and societal living. We believe it will endure.

We remember the U-2 incident. All nations spy; they must. The diplomatic code among spies was simple and well known. If a spy was caught, everything was denied. Our State Department initially followed the conventional universal rules of spying and denied the incident. When President Eisenhower learned the facts he admitted them straightforwardly—a diplomatic first and a strong leap forward in returning integrity and mutual confidence to diplomacy and international relations.

General Eisenhower was a humble man. This characteristic made him beloved. His life and service demonstrated that humility contributes to greatness.

As Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe and as President of the United States, he possessed more power than any individual in history. He used that enormous power prudently. He care-

fully matched responsibility with power. He made many momentous and delicate decisions, but he always assumed full responsibility for his decisions. He was so universally respected and his decisions so nearly always correct, simply because he was basically such a good man.

Because of his basic honesty he evoked trust; because of his genuine humility, he was beloved by all regardless of nationality, age, or station in life; he understood the meaning and demands of duty and was therefore one of our greatest patriots; he applied the full dimension of responsibility to himself, his family, his countrymen, his fellow man.

From an obscure background and an ordinary childhood, he developed into one of the world's most uncommon leaders. I trust his simple virtues of decency, honesty, humility and responsibility will be his legacy to future generations. No greater legacy could one man leave to posterity—in his day or ours—to us as individuals or to nations.

We extend our condolences to his Mamie and his family.

**THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY ITSELF  
MUST GUARANTEE THE PEACE  
AND STABILITY OF THE NATION'S  
CAMPUSES**

**HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as we view with alarm and dismay the disorders which have spread to so many academic institutions in the past few months, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that they are caused by only a very small minority of students. The publicity which attends each sitin, riot, or administration building capture is so blatant that one begins to think the entire student body of a given college is in revolt.

This is not the case, and I believe we should always keep in mind that beneath the headlines there is a much larger group of students who are striving to attain that which they came to college for—an education.

This was effectively brought home to me by a letter to the editor of the Binghamton, N.Y., Sunday Press, which I present to be reprinted at this point:

**"OVER-THIRTIES" ASKED FOR SUPPORT**

BINGHAMTON.

To the EDITOR:

I am a student at Harpur College. I do not riot. I do not take drugs. I do not write obscenities on walls. I go to school because I want an education.

The vast majority of students are like me but we rarely make news. We have faith in people over 30 and we look to our elders for guidance and help. We need your help now.

They are threatening to turn our campus and others like it into bootcamps for their revolution.

While we study, they conspire to destroy our liberty.

At Harpur they deface our student center; deny freedom of speech to all who don't agree with them, preventing students from talking to recruiters and shouting down speakers who oppose them; they claim immunity from punishment for their acts and threaten violence if they are not given their way.

President Dearing and other administrators can not stand alone in the face of threats from howling barbarians.

They need and must have, strong backing from students and the community. Some of the students have the courage to speak up but we must have public support.

You, the over 30 generation, can bolster our faith in you by giving us your support.

You can write your congressman and legislators demanding strong action be taken against members of the academic community who use force to gain their ends and show no respect for common decency and the rights of others.

You can help by speaking up in your churches and organizations to express support for courageous administrators.

You will be defending freedom of speech and the rights of majority and minority alike from those who would rule by the fist.

Expelling rebellious students will not be denying the poor an education. The poor are not the rebels. The agitators are over privileged, upper middle class youths who know nothing of poverty and very little about work.

America's free and open, public and private educational systems have made our country the land of equal opportunity.

If the rebels are allowed to close or subvert our schools they will be closing the door of opportunity and hope on the poor, for it is the poor who need a good education the most, to escape from poverty.

I know, for I am as poor as anyone. Don't let us down, please.

KONRAD B. LANGLIE.

Quite naturally, Mr. Langlie's letter prompted a goodly number of my constituents to write me, expressing support for him and the many serious students he represents. Many of the writers asked for congressional action to penalize campus disrupters. The fact that they did not know of the two provisions which Congress passed last year to withhold NDEA and other Federal benefits from students who disrupt is not surprising. I would be amazed to find of many, or any, cases where such laws have been invoked, because of reluctance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to do so, and because of the unwillingness of college administrations to report the names of students who have rioted, or otherwise disrupted the teaching processes of their colleges. In short, the two provisions of the 90th Congress are unknown, unenforced, and, therefore, ineffective in stemming campus disorders.

The real answer, it seems to me, lies, not with the Congress but right back where the trouble is, on the campus. College administrations and boards of trustees must realize that it is their major responsibility to provide an education, in an orderly atmosphere, to those large numbers of students who want it, and to take firm steps to rid themselves of the bad apples who are spoiling the barrel.

At colleges where this basic fact has been realized, there has been little or no violence. Some of the student suggestions are good, and they have been recognized as such by administrators and adopted. Others are patently ridiculous, and offered only to goad, annoy, or produce a "confrontation," and they have been given the short shrift they deserve.

College administrations in institutions now may face another group of adversaries—the law abiding, education-seeking students who demand that the college live up to its part of the bargain by

providing them with the education they seek, unhampered by the antics of radical rioters.

I was interested to note a recent news story reporting that 12 students whose education at Columbia University had been disrupted by the outbreaks at that institution have banded together to sue the trustees of Columbia, basing their case on the contractual relationship which exists between the university and themselves. They maintain that the university contracted with them to make an education available to them, and that by coddling the rioters and permitting them to halt classes at Columbia, the university has failed to keep its part of the contract.

So let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the worm is beginning to turn, that the majority of students who do not riot but who have, to date, sat on the sidelines of the battle between the rioters and the colleges are now ready to mobilize to fight for the education they, and we as taxpayers, are paying for. Let us give our support to the Konrad Langlies who call for our recognition of their sincerity and worthiness and, further, let us let college administrators and trustees in our congressional districts and throughout the country know that we will back them with further legislation if need be, but that the basic need is a firm policy in dealing with those who would destroy the colleges they attend.

It is also encouraging to note that President Nixon has made a statement on this problem which is moderate in tone, but which also stresses that Federal involvement is only a part, and a rather small part in my view, of the solution. As the New York Times editorialized on March 24:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1969]

President Nixon was well-advised to resist his earlier impulse to send the Federal Government charging headlong into the troubled college and university scene. His sound restraint, however, makes it still more essential for the academic community itself to oppose any lawless acts within its own domain. Immunity from Government sanctions must not turn the campuses into sanctuaries for disorder.

The provocations by a small but destructive group of adolescent revolutionaries, aided by some camp-following teachers, have been severe; but after a week's consideration, the President has now reaffirmed the principle of campus independence from governmental interference . . . it . . . leaves the initiative to the campus authorities.

It would be irresponsible in the extreme for the academic world merely to approve of Mr. Nixon's hands-off statement, without heeding the second principle reaffirmed by the President. This is that violence or the threat of violence cannot be permitted to influence campus life. "Once it does, the community . . . ceases to be a university," the Chief Executive warned accurately.

The academic community—through a consensus of law-abiding and freedom-minded faculty, students and administrators—must now match the President's wise restraint by its own determination to guarantee the peace and stability of the nation's campuses.

Mr. Speaker, unless the academic community can curb these disruptions, government—Federal, State, and local—will be forced to do it for them, and I for one do not feel this should be necessary, nor will it be desirable.

## ANOTHER INDICATION OF MOUNTING ANTI-ABM SENTIMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the opposition to development of an anti-ballistic-missile system by some of the Nation's most outstanding scientists and academicians has become apparent through testimony at recent congressional committee hearings and conferences.

The growing extent of this opposition, is making itself felt also in the increased volume of mail that is coming into my office and, I am sure, into the offices of other Members. One of the most impressive pieces of mail I have seen came from the University of Minnesota, which is located in my district. It was a petition of opposition to the construction and deployment of an ABM system by the United States, and it was signed by more than 400 students and faculty members.

A covering letter from the university's ad hoc committee of concerned scientists stated:

The more than 400 signatures were gathered in less than a week through an informal effort centered in, but not confined to, the Institute of Technology and a few other scientific departments of the University of Minnesota. It is worth noting that, while no attempt was made to poll the entire staff, about a third of the IT faculty (including its Dean and most of its department chairmen) signed the petition. On the other hand, we found little evidence of support for ABM deployment.

We believe that opposition to the ABM is rapidly growing on the nation's college campuses, and urge your active support of this movement.

It is obvious from this statement, Mr. Speaker, that a concentrated signature-collecting effort could have produced thousands more signatures at the University of Minnesota, which is one of the largest universities in the country. The message of the petition deserves the most serious consideration of every Member of Congress, because it is indicative, I think, of informed sentiment in the Nation today. The petition and its signers follow:

We, the undersigned members of the faculty and staff of the University of Minnesota, strongly oppose the construction and deployment of anti-ballistic-missile systems, including Sentinel. This opposition results from our scientific interpretation of many published arguments. Each of us has his own individual reasons for taking this stand. Without going into all the well publicized details, we are convinced that the national security would be decreased by deployment of ABM systems. Among the more compelling reasons for this conviction are:

1. These systems will inevitably reactivate the arms race and increase the danger of preemptive war.

2. The ABM concept is technically unsound from a system viewpoint and cannot be tested.

3. The deployment of thousands of missiles throughout our country and their maintenance in instant readiness creates a serious risk of accidental nuclear explosion.

4. The ABM system is an unwise use of resources urgently needed to solve social and environmental problems at home.

Many distinguished scientists and engineers, some of whom are or have been associated with the government, and including two recent Presidential Science Advisors, have already come out in opposition to the deployment of ABM systems. Some of these people have had access to classified information that we do not have. We join them in opposing the deployment of ABM systems.

## SIGNATURES

W. L. Adams, Department of Physiology.  
John A. Johnson, Department of Physiology.

Richard L. Purple, Department of Physiology.

H. Suura, School of Physics.  
J. W. Halley, School of Physics.

Earl Peterson, School of Physics.  
Walter Jackson McClure, School of Physics.

R. H. Stuewer, School of Physics.  
E. Marquit, School of Physics.

Donald A. Geffen, School of Physics.  
Benjamin F. Bayman, School of Physics.

Keith Ruddick, School of Physics.  
Peter Roll, School of Physics.

Alfred O. C. Nier, School of Physics.  
Phyllis S. Freier, School of Physics.

Timothy F. Cleghorn, School of Physics.  
W. Robert Scarlett, School of Physics.

Philip Debenham, School of Physics.  
Yousef Makdisi, School of Physics.

Gregory C. Alvord, School of Physics.  
Peter Kriesman, School of Physics.

Francis M. Gasparini, School of Physics.  
Javed Aslam, School of Physics.

Carl H. Smith, School of Physics.  
David C. Black, School of Physics.

James G. Bradley, School of Physics.  
Leo R. Lake, School of Physics.

Michael A. Oothoudt, School of Physics.  
James A. Riley, School of Physics.

Ralph H. Hofmeister, Department of Economics.

Peter Gregory, Department of Economics.  
Francis M. Boddy, Department of Economics.

Alban D'Amours, Department of Economics.  
Lowell W. Johnson, Department of Economics.

N. J. Simler, Department of Economics.  
Gestur Davidson, Department of Economics.

Barbara S. Zoloth, Department of Economics.

Charles A. Rambeck, Department of Economics.

Allan Maslove, Department of Economics.  
James D. Likens, Department of Economics.

Edward Foster, Department of Economics.  
Malcolm Burns, Department of Economics.

Perry L. Brown, Department of Economics.  
Preson J. Miller, Department of Economics.

Ken Tiedemann, Department of Economics.  
James Pella, Department of Economics.

David L. Sjoquist, Department of Economics.

Paul B. Manchester, Department of Economics.

F. Scott Wilson, Department of Economics.  
John Hause, Department of Economics.

Eileen Yumbe, Department of Economics.  
Marjorie C. Gritzke, Department of Economics.

Frank Slesnick, Department of Economics.  
Francisco F. Thoumi, Department of Economics.

William C. Myslinski, Department of Economics.

H. David Crain, Department of Economics.  
Jeffrey B. Miller, Department of Economics.

Albert Kuhfeld, School of Physics.  
Michael R. Moldover, School of Physics.

Heinz Horner, School of Physics.  
William Zimmermann, Jr., School of Physics.

Walter H. Johnson, School of Physics.

Peter Rauen, School of Physics.  
Carl H. Poppe, School of Physics.  
Wayne A. Stein, School of Physics.  
James H. Werntz, Jr., School of Physics.  
Richard C. Chase, School of Physics.  
Javed Aslam, School of Physics.  
Paul D. Lane, School of Physics.  
Homer T. Mantis, School of Physics.  
Morton Hamermesh, School of Physics.  
Norton M. Hintz, School of Physics.  
Nancy Strebe, School of Physics.  
A. R. Barnett, School of Physics.  
Hajime Ohmura, School of Physics.  
Dietrich Dehnhard, School of Physics.  
J. M. Blair, School of Physics.  
William Makofski, School of Physics.  
Russel K. Hobbie, School of Physics.  
D. L. Watson, School of Physics.  
R. J. Holliday, Chemical Physics.  
Robert L. Lipnick, Department of Chemistry.

Ken M. Johnson, Department of Zoology.  
A. K. Ahmed, Department of Biochemistry.

Gilbert Atkinson, Department of Psychology.

Ronald C. Haglund, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Ernest Eckert, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Thomas N. Meyer, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Warren E. Ibele, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

A. O. Wood, Jr., Department of Mechanical Engineering.

M. J. Kaluza, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Donald A. Frohrib, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John S. White, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Stanley C. Johnson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

James L. Reynolds, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Richard C. Jordan, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Rodney G. Loper, Office of the Dean of Students.

C. J. Waddington, School of Physics.  
Wentworth Quast, Department of Psychiatry.

Anne W. Oren, School of Social Work.  
Paul T. Steen, School of Public Affairs.

R. E. Comstock, Department of Genetics and Cellular Biology.

R. B. Holloway, School of Business Administration.

H. Berman, Social Science Program.  
C. Robert Morris, Law School.

Elaine R. Parent, Bureau of Institutional Research.

Peter J. Reed, Department of English.  
Leonard H. Unger, Department of English.

Daniel Levine, Department of Mathematics.

Louis T. Safer, General Arts.  
Jacques R. Chipault, Hormel Institute.

Alan H. Roberts, Medical School.  
Auke Tellegen, Department of Psychology.

Franz J. Roehmann, Department of Music Education.

B. Robert Froehlich, Department of Economics.

E. Scott Maynes, Department of Economics.

Ronald I. Rainey, Department of Economics.

Donald John Roberts, Department of Economics.

Susan Edelman, Department of Economics.  
John Buttrick, Department of Economics.

Marvin Kraus, Department of Economics.  
Dennis Olson, Department of Economics.

Jeff de Bevac, Department of Economics.  
Yuki Kiyokawa, Department of Economics.

Wayne Stevenson, Department of Economics.

John Tillman, Department of Economics.  
Lorraine Wise, Department of Economics.

- Richard Towber, Department of Economics.
- Thomas Pinfeld, Department of Economics.
- Thomas J. Muench, Department of Economics.
- Maurice B. Visscher, Department of Physiology.
- Irwin J. Fox, Department of Physiology.
- Jui S. Lee, Department of Physiology.
- Eugene D. Grim, Department of Physiology.
- Nathan Lifson, Department of Physiology.
- David G. Levitt, Department of Physiology.
- Richard E. Poppele, Department of Physiology.
- James Bloedel, Department of Physiology.
- John E. Burton, Department of Physiology.
- N. Paul Rosenthal, Department of Physiology.
- Thomas A. McKean, Department of Physiology.
- Ernest A. Greene, Department of Physiology.
- Rodney B. Haney, Department of Physiology.
- Warren Stenberg, School of Mathematics.
- Hillel H. Gershenson, School of Mathematics.
- Robert C. Sine, School of Mathematics.
- L. N. Argabright, School of Mathematics.
- Daniel Fife, School of Mathematics.
- Hans F. Weinberger, School of Mathematics.
- Mario Miranda, School of Mathematics.
- David S. Kindersburr, School of Mathematics.
- Edward Cline, School of Mathematics.
- Charlotte Striebel, School of Mathematics.
- John O. Kiltinen, School of Mathematics.
- Eugene Fabes, School of Mathematics.
- Joseph G. Rosenstein, School of Mathematics.
- Peter A. Rejto, School of Mathematics.
- George H. Knightly, School of Mathematics.
- Walter Littman, School of Mathematics.
- Robert Ellis, School of Mathematics.
- Harvey Keynes, School of Mathematics.
- Gordon Keller, School of Mathematics.
- B. V. Haxby, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- F. N. Bailey, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- R. Y. Kain, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- V. D. Albertson, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- B. A. Shenoi, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- L. M. Chanin, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- T. S. Lee, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- W. F. Brown, Jr., Department of Electrical Engineering.
- G. K. Wehner, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- D. E. Speltis, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- D. F. Pindar, Department of Microbiology.
- Paul A. Chapman, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Howard J. Hickman, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Peter B. Moyle, Department of Zoology.
- David W. Gimmestad, School of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering.
- Sarat C. Prahara, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.
- Ved P. Gupta, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.
- John Osborne, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.
- H. K. Prasad, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.
- Gary Stroebel, School of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering.
- Wendel Maegley, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.
- David L. Sippel, School of Mineral Metallurgical Engineering.
- Lajpat Utreja, Department of Aeronautical and Mechanical Engineering.
- Vinod P. Gupta, School of Mineral and Metallurgical Engineering.
- John Wells, Department of English.
- Bill Heath, Department of English.
- Robert J. Reddick, Department of English.
- Charles V. Stone, Department of English.
- James A. Houlding, Department of English.
- Donald Vanouse, Department of English.
- Richard R. Malmshelmer, Department of English.
- Philip D. Noer, Department of English.
- K. Starosciak, Department of English.
- J. Wetzel, Department of English.
- Nigel J. Potter, Department of English.
- Harry Foreman, Office of International Program.
- Lawrence F. Merl, School of Social Work.
- A. K. Wickesberg, School of Business Administration.
- George R. Sell, School of Mathematics.
- C. L. Vaughan, General College.
- Gover Maxwell, Department of Philosophy.
- I. M. Kolthoff, Department of Chemistry.
- R. M. Dodson, Department of Chemistry.
- R. F. Borch, Department of Chemistry.
- Marvin L. Stein, Computer, Information and Control Science.
- K. S. Frankowski, Computer Science Department.
- Jay A. Leavitt, Computer Science Department.
- Edwin C. Thiede, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Frederick M. Waltz, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Walter J. Maier, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Keith S. Champlin, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Larry L. Kinney, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Warren B. Cheston, School of Physics.
- John S. Dahler, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- S. R. Hibarger, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Richard W. Coyne, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Theodore A. Wilson, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.
- Herbert S. Isbin, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Rutherford Aris, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Michael R. Overcash, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Robert W. Carr, Jr., Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Patrick Meagher, Department of Economics.
- John P. Moran, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.
- John W. Hayden, Department of Civil Engineering.
- John T. Hanley, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Lawrence E. Goodman, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Walter K. Johnson, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Paul P. Christiano, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Daniel L. Gerlough, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Lyle P. Pederson, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Jesse E. Fant, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Matthew J. Huber, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Larry W. Gubbe, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Ronald M. Kohner, Department of Civil Engineering.
- John K. Arntson, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Barry Whiteaker, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Douglas M. Mattich, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Thomas A. Sturm, Department of Civil Engineering.
- James A. Moudry, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Gary Lee Bowen, Department of Civil Engineering.
- Don Wetlaufer, Department of Biochemistry.
- James W. Bodley, Department of Biochemistry.
- James F. Koerner, Department of Biochemistry.
- Nelson D. Goldberg, Department of Pharmacology.
- Joseph Lerner, Department of Biochemistry.
- Finn Wold, Department of Biochemistry.
- R. D. Edstrom, Department of Biochemistry.
- Peter Shaw, Department of Psychology.
- Sid Reichelson, Department of English.
- Bennett Carriere, Department of English.
- Sharon Rubin, Department of English.
- Robert E. Steller, Department of English.
- E. W. Gibbs, Department of English.
- Anne G. Munro, Department of English.
- Catherine J. Keane, Department of English.
- Dorothy Lamberton, Department of English.
- Judith Galt, Department of English.
- Elizabeth Foster, Department of English.
- Carole Becker, Department of English.
- Toni McNaron, Department of English.
- Elsa Greene, Department of English.
- Maeve B. Beck, Department of English.
- William Stephenson, Department of English.
- John Cole, Department of English.
- Sandra Holstein, Department of English.
- Martin Dworkin, Department of Microbiology.
- R. W. Bernlohr, Department of Microbiology.
- K. G. Brand, Department of Microbiology.
- Dennis W. Watson, Department of Microbiology.
- David E. Peterson, Department of Microbiology.
- E. L. Schmidt, Department of Microbiology.
- James R. Bolton, Department of Chemistry.
- Starke R. Hathaway, Division of Clinical Psychology.
- Bruce E. Balow, Department of Special Education.
- Robinson S. Abbott, Division of Science and Mathematics, Morris.
- Henry Borm, General College and College of Education.
- Thomas Bender, School of Architecture.
- H. J. Oskan, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- A. Nussbaum, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- R. J. Collins, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- LeRoy T. Anderson, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- M. Riaz, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- C. M. van Vliet, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- S. C. Larson, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- J. Freudenthal, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- R. F. Lambert, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Stephen J. Kahne, Department of Electrical Engineering.
- Larry D. Schmidt, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- H. M. Tsuchiya, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- A. G. Fredrickson, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Frank Verbrugge, Computer Services.
- Kenneth H. Keller, Department of Chemical Engineering.
- Arnold Walker, Radio and TV.
- L. Hurwicz, Department of Economics.
- Mark Daniel, Department of Economics.

Susan L. Smith, Department of Economics.  
Edward Coen, Department of Economics.  
James L. Weatherly, Jr., Department of Economics.

John Simpson, Department of Economics.  
Harlan Smith, Department of Economics.  
Jan R. Parkinson, Department of Economics.

William C. Miller, Department of Economics.

Russell Hill, Department of Economics.  
George L. Perry, Department of Economics.  
Walter W. Heller, Department of Economics.

J. E. Anderson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

J. L. Smith, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

William J. Pennell, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

W. H. Scheffler, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Dennis Kreid, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John C. Anderson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Keith McIntire, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Robert M. Redden, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

George J. Slechta, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Victor B. John, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Sylvester E. Gross, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Eugene Hanson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Rubin H. Falldin, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John H. Rogness, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Patrick J. Starr, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Kent D. Wall, Control Science.

S. C. Nayak, Division of Industrial Engineering.

E. Griffith, Control Science.

Mohammad Jabbari, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Roger Schmidt, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Nicholas J. Barsic, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Steven Deneroff, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Edvard A. Fletcher, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Layne E. Fuller, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

William F. Pohl, School of Mathematics.

Jonathan Brezin, School of Mathematics.  
Jesus Gil de Lamadrid, School of Mathematics.

Donald W. Kahne, School of Mathematics.  
Henry Romer, School of Physics.

K. P. S. Menon, School of Physics.

Thomas R. Lindquist, School of Physics.

George K. Parks, School of Physics.

David G. Cartwright, School of Physics.

Robert A. Windsor, School of Physics.

Thomas W. Lezniak, School of Physics.

Richard W. McEntire, School of Physics.

Richard A. Hendrickson, School of Physics.

John R. Winkler, School of Physics.

Charles Reibert, School of Physics.

Thomas W. Jones, School of Physics.

Harry H. Zeman, School of Physics.

William W. Dykoski, School of Physics.

George B. Burnett, School of Physics.

Jurgen Fohlmeister, School of Physics.

Thomas Walsh, School of Physics.

Richard C. Fuller, School of Physics.

Robert M. Saenger, School of Physics.

Rufino H. Ibarra, School of Physics.

Michael Chandler, School of Physics.

Steve Landowne, School of Physics.

Jonathan L. Rosner, School of Physics.

Robert K. Snyder, School of Physics.

Allan Sourkes, School of Physics.

Jerry S. Sievers, School of Physics.

Daniel H. Fitzgerald, School of Physics.

Jones W. Chlen, School of Physics.

Thomas S. Lundgren, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Robert Plunkett, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

P. R. Sethna, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

A. S. Berman, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

A. A. Blatherwick, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Jack L. Dais, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

D. D. Joseph, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

William H. Warner, Department of Aeronautics and Engineering Mechanics.

Sandra Spear, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

T. Y. Chu, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

E. M. Sparrow, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Cesare Boffa, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Joachim Heberlein, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Win Aung, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Jeff Swanson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Fateh Sakal, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Luciano de Socio, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

David J. Wilson, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Dietmar K. Hennecke, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Dean R. Pedersen, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Manuel Ruis, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

C. T. Dorner, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Gren Yuill, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Paul W. Bullen, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

Lewis G. Palmer, Department of Mechanical Engineering.

John T. Anderson, School of Physics.  
David L. Roohk, School of Physics.

Clayton A. Gearhart, School of Physics.  
Stephen Kral, School of Physics.

Brian B. Sabo, School of Physics.  
Frederick Schaefer, School of Physics.

Clayton F. Giese, School of Physics.  
Paul Kintner, School of Physics.

Janet Rae Smith, School of Physics.  
Phillip E. Pooley, School of Physics.

Jonathan Cole, School of Physics.  
John S. Lesko, School of Physics.

William R. Hitchens, School of Physics.  
Daniel N. Bell, School of Physics.

Glenn Dahlbacka, School of Physics.  
Everett Harvey, School of Physics.

Rod Britten, School of Physics.  
David Kayser, School of Physics.

Jim Thompson, School of Physics.  
Wes Petersen, School of Physics.

David Dayton, School of Physics.  
Irving B. Crandall, School of Physics.

Rick C. Fultz, School of Physics.  
James C. Solinsky, School of Physics.

Roger Jones, School of Physics.  
Carole Williamson, School of Physics.

Kenneth G. Dzugan, School of Physics.  
Donald W. Strecker, School of Physics.

Tycho von Rosenvinge, School of Physics.

GOD IS NEAR, DO NOT FEAR,  
FRIEND, GOOD NIGHT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, tributes from dignitaries the world over have

left little unsaid. Perhaps the most eloquent and fitting expression of gratitude and farewell to former President and General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower is embodied in the words which accompany that simple but chilling melody of "Taps," the final Godspeed of military men:

Day is done,  
Gone the sun,  
From the lake,  
From the hills,  
From the sky;  
All is well,  
Safely rest,  
God is nigh.

Then goodnight,  
Peaceful night,  
Till the light,  
Of the dawn,  
Shineth bright;  
God is near,  
Do not fear,  
Friend, good night

LT. PAUL S. TOMPKINS AWARDED  
BRONZE STAR MEDAL

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it always gives me great pleasure when a soldier from the First District of Massachusetts is recognized for bravery on the battlefield. Such is the case with Lt. Paul Stuart Tompkins, U.S. Navy, of Worthington.

Last year Lieutenant Tompkins was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for meritorious achievement while serving in Vietnam. I would like at this point to submit the Navy citation which describes in greater detail the courageous actions of Lieutenant Tompkins:

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to Lieutenant Paul Stuart Tompkins, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For meritorious achievement while serving with friendly forces engaged in armed conflict against Communist insurgent forces in the Republic of Vietnam from 2 May 1967 to 22 December 1967. Lieutenant Tompkins was, from October 1966 to 22 December 1967, assigned as Officer-in-Charge of the USS *Beneviah* and USS *Colleton* pre-commissioning details at Little Creek Amphibious Base Norfolk, Virginia. During this nine week period, he performed invaluable and exceedingly professional services toward preparing both commands for combat operations in the Republic of Vietnam. Immediately upon arrival in the Republic of Vietnam, the *Beneviah* became flagship of Commander River Assault Flotilla ONE and Commanding Officer 2d Brigade Ninth Infantry Division, which formed the Mobile Riverine Force. The demands placed on the *Beneviah*, as flagship and as a major supporting unit of a newly organized force involved in a new and different concept to warfare, were tremendous. On 29 June 1967, Lieutenant Tompkins assumed the duties as Executive Officer and Navigator of the USS *Beneviah*. His organizational and leadership abilities and overall outstanding performance were prime factors in creating a highly efficient administrative and combat organization. Lieutenant Tompkins was a major contributor to the overall outstanding success of the Force with his participa-

tion in each of the Coronado Operations. During these operations, the USS *Benevah* was required to move in coordination with operational commitments up hostile enemy rivers of the Mekong Delta often under cover of darkness for close support of the river squadrons attached. Lieutenant Tompkins unselfishly volunteered his professional services in order to further enhance his knowledge of riverine warfare and to more closely assist the combatant forces in the Delta. During Operation Coronado III, conducted in the Rung Sat Special Zone and Dinh Tuong Province, the monitor he was riding came under intense enemy small arms fire. Through his calm and collected manner and without regard to his own personal safety, he assisted the boat captain in properly positioning his boat and suppressing the enemy machine gun fire. Lieutenant Tompkins consistently demonstrated the most outstanding professionalism and extraordinary dedication to his duties. His performance was in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

Lieutenant Tompkins is authorized to wear the Combat "V."

For the Secretary of the Navy.

JOHN J. HYLAND,

Admiral, U.S. Navy,

Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet.

#### FINAL TRIBUTE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

#### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Dwight D. Eisenhower served his country nobly both in times of war and peace.

As one of our Nation's few five-star generals, he was instrumental in leading us to victory on the battlefield in World War II, a crucial time in our history.

As one of our most popular Presidents, he devoted his best efforts to achieving peace, progress, and prosperity at home.

For his magnificent contributions, a deeply sorrowful nation can only express its humble appreciation of a man who became a legend in his own time. He stood with the giants of our history.

I join with all Americans who now are personally saddened by the loss of so great an American, and call to the attention of our colleagues the editorial tributes paid to General Eisenhower by the Miami Herald, the Miami News, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Beach Sun:

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 29, 1969]

**GREAT HEART AND GRIN AND IKE HAVE LEFT US**  
Ike and his grin are gone. And a great nation mourns.

If the American people had one authentic, consistent hero in the 20th century he was Dwight David Eisenhower. A superb soldier, he was no politician. A man of instinctive common sense, he had little finesse as a statesman. A very human person, he could not bear the minutiae and red tape which every successful administrator must master.

He was simply Ike, an antidote to the political boredom of the postwar years and pacifier of a people weary of government bureaucracy.

President Eisenhower's first term was distinguished by budget reductions, economy and an income tax cut. His second appeared inconsistent with his first, for there then

emerged "Modern Republicanism." An element in the party had succeeded in beating its way back to the 19th century, and it was critical of Ike. Many forgot his credo:

"We will be liberal in programs that affect the lives and welfare of people, and conservative in the handling of their money."

Both are possible. The Eisenhower administrations proved it. A budget can be balanced. The needs of people who cannot help themselves can be met.

If there was any slippage it was in foreign policy under the unfortunate aegis of the late John Foster Dulles. As generals must do, Gen. Eisenhower delegated authority—too much of it. Surely he must have been privately appalled by the course of history which has led to a hapless land war in Asia.

The people, however, will remember the man—big, genial, straightforward, amusingly wrathful, tender, word-boggler, loyal and courageous.

Countless times men sat down as we do now to write his obituary in momentary expectation of his death. Then that great heart rallied to the amazement of medical science. At last it has worn itself out. The 34th President, the Ike everyone loved and none could hate, the President whose popularity exceeded Washington's (a man often reviled, as an examination of history will show)—Ike is gone.

The lines written on Gladstone's retirement seem appropriate:

"Behold him in the evening time of life . . . By imperceptible degrees he wears away, yet like the sun, seems larger at his setting."

[From the Miami News, Friday, Mar. 28, 1969]

#### ABLE PRESIDENT: EISENHOWER SERVED HIS COUNTRY WELL

Dwight D. Eisenhower didn't want to be President of the United States. He was talked into it. As with every President, General Eisenhower had his pluses and his minuses, but the former far outweighed the latter.

When the historians finally get around to writing about the years of 1952 to 1960 in the United States, they will surely record that the most important event of the Eisenhower Administration was the beginning of the end of racial segregation.

The General had a special talent in the complex business of matters military, and one of his greatest achievements was in commanding, with success, the likes of Field Marshal Montgomery, Charles de Gaulle and George S. Patton, among others. He was able to create an order which successfully concluded World War II, and in turn this led to the general being talked into a campaign for the Presidency.

As President, Mr. Eisenhower was very much aware of George Washington's Farewell Address in which the first President warned the nation against unnecessary foreign entanglements. Mr. Eisenhower accented his understanding clearly when he refused, despite pressure from his friends and his own Secretary of State, to send American combat soldiers to Vietnam.

This was a difficult decision for the President because his old friends were Generals and members of the Chiefs of Staff with whom the President had served in the European conflict.

Mr. Eisenhower was a popular General and a popular President who suited the happier mood of the American people in the '50s.

[From the Key West Citizen, Mar. 30, 1969]

#### IKE WAS THERE

If the essence of Dwight David Eisenhower could be summed up in a one-word epitaph, it would be simply: "Ike."

Here was the professional soldier who rose from relative obscurity at the beginning of the greatest war in history to supreme com-

mand of the greatest assemblage of armies in history, who later served his country for eight years in the highest position of responsibility any man can attain.

Yet he was always "Ike."

Looking back from the turbulent present, the years of the Eisenhower administration seem calm and stable. They were not, but if they seemed so then as well as now, it was only because of the presence of this immensely popular president in the White House. There was something about this most uncommon common man that inspired confidence and faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crises and challenges, nothing dire would happen as long as Ike was there.

Beset the nation was:

Those were the years when the cold war was really frigid—when a man named Khrushchev came to power in Russia to strut the world's stage for a time with his rhetoric of nuclear diplomacy and ballistic blackmail; when a man named Ho Chi Minh was mauling the French in Indochina; when a man named Joe McCarthy was finding Communists in every State Department closet and setting neighbor suspiciously against neighbor; when a man named Faubus in Little Rock, Ark., was fomenting the gravest federal-state crisis since the Civil War; when a U.S. vice president was being spat upon in South America; when the world hovered on the edge of Armageddon as war broke out in the Middle East; when freedom-loving men everywhere agonized as Hungary was ground under the heel; when the nation plunged briefly into its worst recession since the 1930's; when Americans indulged in an orgy of self-doubt because Russia had launched something called a Sputnik into space; when words like "agonizing reappraisal," "brinkmanship," "U-2," "summit" and "missile gap" were part of the vocabulary of reproach against the administration.

Yet they seemed like calm years, because Ike was there.

Now the general has lost his last battle, after beating the scythe-bearer in encounter after encounter. He went down fighting, he surrendered reluctantly. More than that can be asked of no soldier.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is not rated as one of America's great or even strong presidents, and it is not likely that another generation of historians will differ with this estimate. Of one thing we can be certain, however:

If, in their study of this man, his life and his accomplishments, Americans of the future can come at all close to knowing him as his contemporaries did, they will call him "Ike."

[From the Miami Beach Sun, Mar. 30, 1969]

#### AN EDITORIAL

Dwight D. Eisenhower will be remembered by his fellow Americans and a multitude around the world for whatever endeared him to them personally.

In history, however, there will stand out the fact that he devoted a full lifetime—from youth to old age—to this land of ours.

The fact that he rose, on moment's notice, from a desk-bound lieutenant colonel in Washington to the general in London who welded together the manpower of some 24 free nations and forged that striking force which sailed across the British Channel to storm the fortress of tyranny and man's bestiality to man.

The fact that there came, in the history of this nation, the day when the need to fill the White House with a man of stature became so dire that both Republicans and Democrats tried to claim him.

And, beyond all that, this other one: That in the final days of his Presidency he had the courage and the vision to warn America

and Americans of the ever growing, overpowering influence of the "military-industrial establishment" on its domestic and foreign policy. Of the threat that has since become reality!

It is for these marks left behind—marks that will stand as tall tomorrow as they stood yesterday and thus remain indelible in the annals of American and world history—that this newspaper salutes him and bids him farewell.

**FAREWELL TO GENERAL EISENHOWER FROM AN INFANTRY SOLDIER**

**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as the family of General Eisenhower travel with their memories and our beloved Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower to Abilene, our hearts and our deepest sympathy are with them.

I feel a special sense of loss at the passing of this old soldier who indeed will never fade away.

It was my privilege and honor to serve under General Eisenhower when he commanded the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces—SHAEF—and I was an officer in the 104th—Timberwolf—Infantry Division.

As we attended the services in National Cathedral I looked around me at the general's officers and others who were his pallbearers and I heard again the sounds of armor and small arms fire and the thunder of artillery as they once sounded in Normandy and along the Maas River in Holland, along the Rhine, over the bridge at Remagen, and the dash to the encirclement at the Ruhr, and the sudden silence of V-E Day. Through all of this I was with General Eisenhower and down to the last man in every squad we felt his presence, his guidance, and his comradeship. Not only did we all wear the Eisenhower jacket but as trained, determined soldiers we wore the Eisenhower breastplate which meant cool courage under fire and the eye constantly on the objective of driving tyranny from the fields of Europe.

Under his command I was privileged to be advanced in a battlefield promotion and when I received his orders advancing me to the rank of major I suddenly aged from a man in his 20's to one with a sense of the full responsibility for the lives and leadership of men which he managed to instill in all his officers by his own example.

Once again from his life I take this example that a great general is as much known for finding ways to peace as he is for the winning of wars. During his time as President he found that uneasy and unsettled peace but it was peace of a sort. In his memory I hope our generals of this day and all others who lead us will have his courage to seek the ways of peace for I know this would be his wish for all of us as he leaves this world for his eternal reward.

**PRE-SENTINEL MEMOIR: AN UNMISSED MISSILE**

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, many of us here in the House and on the Senate side are engaged in resisting the efforts of President Nixon and his administration to impose the ABM system heretofore called Sentinel and now called Safeguard upon this country. I am one of those who accepts the reports of the scientific community which state that the anti-ballistic-missile system does not and will not work.

An article recently appeared in the Village Voice dated March 20, 1969, authored by Clark Whelton and relating to the Nike-Ajax system. The material is so well presented with respect to an earlier system touted at the time to be as effective as President Nixon now claims for the ABM, that I feel it is an instructive parallel to be pondered.

I am bringing the article to the attention of this House with the thought it could have an effect upon the decision ultimately to be made by my colleagues:

PRE-SENTINEL MEMOIR: AN UNMISSED MISSILE

(By Clark Whelton)

In the autumn of 1953, with the Korean armistice signed and sealed and American economy experiencing a classic case of the post-bellum blues, the Department of Defense announced the birth of the Nike-Ajax anti-aircraft missile. It was welcome news. Things hadn't been going too well for the military establishment up to that point. The U.S. Army's inability in Korea to do anything other than rearrange the wrinkles in the battle line had angered and frustrated the Pentagon. American prisoners of war had proven alarmingly vulnerable to brainwashing techniques. Morale was low. Worst of all, with the fighting stopped, the defense budget was certain to be slashed.

But the Nike-Ajax promised to provide an answer to many of their worries. Deployed in a nation-wide network of more than 200 sites, the Nike-Ajax would shield over 40 per cent of the population from hostile aircraft and help keep out foreign enemies while Joe McCarthy tracked down the ones who were already here. The Nike-Ajax program would also restore a rosy, billion-dollar glow to the pale cheeks of the defense budget. So bunkers were built for the missiles and towers were built for the radar and all through the Eisenhower hiatus the army honed its rockets and waited for the bombers that would never come.

"They work fine if the target flies nice and steady at a medium altitude and if the pilot doesn't know how to avoid them," Sergeant Shoback answered. "Sure, they break down a lot—1,500,000 parts in the system and they all have to work at the same time."

Sp-5 Simmons, who marked time with us in the acquisition radar van, confirmed that the Nikes often seemed to be out of whack at the various sites where he had been stationed. "But what the hell," he cautioned, "if war breaks out you'll be stationed right here in this country, sitting on your ass in an air conditioned van like this one. Would you rather be lugging a rifle? Then don't make waves. The officers get invited to parties by the guys who manufacture these things and we get to sit here in the shade and watch the scopes. Everybody's happy."

In February, we were bused up into the New Mexican desert to observe the actual firing of a Nike-Ajax missile. We sat in grandstands and watched a Nike roar off its launcher, streak toward an R-CAT target drone, and explode, just like they told us it would. But the R-CAT kept flying, heading across the desert toward Arizona and happier times. The loudspeaker said: "Had that been a real aircraft it would have been destroyed." We looked at each other. The R-CAT vanished over the horizon.

In March our six months active duty came to an end. We assembled in the company street. The captain addressed us.

"Men," he said, "you'll be going home in a few days and naturally you'll want to tell your families about your experiences here. But let's not go home and tell your folks that these missiles don't work. That could only lead to misunderstanding. So when you leave here, stress the positive aspects of your training." We looked at each other again. The captain wasn't kidding.

And now, with the specter of peace looming large in Vietnam, the Pentagon has rolled out another expensive cure for which there is no disease: the Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile. While Nixon and Congress debate what the ABM will do for the country, it might be interesting to take a closer look at the founding father of the defense missile family, the Nike-Ajax. Nike-Ajax missiles are obsolete now. Very soon they will probably appear as Washington's Birthday specials in Army-Navy stores. But once they were king of the guided missiles and I was taught how to fire them.

In 1960 I joined a National Guard Nike unit in central Connecticut. In case the commies ever wanted to zap the insurance companies in Hartford with an A-bomb, our rockets stood ready to intervene. It was a highly visible defense. Motorists driving along a state highway on their way to work in the insurance companies could look through a chain-link fence and see the underground missile bunkers. In the middle of the base, on top of the Launch Control Van, was a standard three-color traffic light. It indicated the alert status of the unit. It also indicated the mood of world politics so the passing motorists could also get an idea of how good their chances were of making it through the day. Green light: Eisenhower was teeing off at Augusta. Amber light: Khrushchev was banging his shoe in the U.N. Red light: head for the cellar. The status light was amber the day I left for basic training at Fort Dix and advanced training at Fort Bliss (El Paso) Texas, as a Nike-Ajax radar fire control crewman.

At Fort Bliss the trainees were housed in cinderblock barracks on the scorched, stony slopes of Logan Heights. Every morning we were marched down to the radar and missile area for instruction. We sat in the darkened radar vans and listened to the sergeants explain what to do if the Russians came. We were shown films of a Nike-Ajax missile destroying an old B-17 target plane. We learned how to operate the three radar systems and the command guidance computer. We learned how to track a target and launch a missile. Then, toward the end of January, 1961, we began to learn something new about the Nike-Ajax missiles: they didn't work.

"It's not that they don't work, exactly," Sergeant Shoback said one afternoon. "It's just that they work best under certain conditions." We were sitting in the greenish glow of the target tracking scope. The training cycle had ended earlier than expected and for two weeks there was nothing for our class to do except keep out of sight. Sleeping in the vans was permitted provided you could remain upright in your chair and get your eyes open in a hurry if an officer dropped in unexpectedly. We did a lot

of talking with the cadre sergeants. We asked questions. How come the three radars never seem to be in a state of repair at the same time? If the missiles work, how come we keep hearing stories that they don't? What are the conditions they work best under?

In April I reported to my National Guard unit in Connecticut. My first night I was in the Launch Control Van during a practice alert. The commanding officer, up in the radar site on a nearby mountain, was running through the pre-launch check list. "Are you getting a green light on the board?" he asked through the intercom. "No, sir," I said. "A red light?" "No, sir." "What are you getting?" "Nothing, sir." "Nothing?" "No, sir." Twenty minutes of mumbling, then: "All right, we blew another condenser. We're coming down."

"You'll get used to that," a sergeant said. I got used to it. In the time I spent with that unit, I never met a man who honestly thought a Nike-Ajax could shoot down a plane that didn't want to be shot down.

In May I spoke with an old friend who was a navigator on a B-52. "We used to run training missions over Nike sites to give them practice tracking a target," he said. "But they could hardly ever find us. We usually had to turn on our IFF (Identification Friend or Foe) signal to give them a clue."

A year later the Nike-Ajax was declared obsolete. The Nike site in Connecticut was abandoned. One night someone drove up in a truck and stole the plumbing and toilets. That same year, 1962, the Pentagon tried to sell the anti-missile Nike-Zeus to John Kennedy. They almost succeeded but finally managed to sell him involvement in Vietnam instead.

Now, with that war slowly running out of steam, President Nixon has judged that the nation's gravest dangers can be warded off by an electronic amulet of radar and rockets. But if high Washington officials visit the cities this summer they may wish they had spent less money on anti-missile missiles and more on developing a good anti-rock rock.

Or perhaps, in the grand design of things, these officials may at last discover a use for those 3000 Nike-Ajax missiles. The slums should be easy to hit. They're big enough.

FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, an American hero has passed from this world to his reward after a last fight as gallant as any of those he waged before. His death reduces further the dwindling band of those who led the forces of the free world in World War II. All of us owe an immeasurable debt to those men who led us to victory in those dangerous times, and to no one do we owe more than to General Eisenhower, the supreme commander of our military forces. His is an American success story—from a poor boy at Abilene to our President and Commander in Chief—and General Eisenhower carried all his honors with a modesty possible only to a great gentleman. The Nation and the people he served, and the world he did so much to save, join in mourning his passing.

IN THE HOUSE THAT ADLAI LOVED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is a whole generation of Americans who like to think of themselves as Stevensonian Democrats, for Adlai Stevenson was above all else an inspirational man.

Those of us who come from Illinois feel a special pride that his idealism continues to attract and inspire people throughout the world.

John Bartlow Martin, biographer and friend of Governor Stevenson—and himself a distinguished public servant—has captured some of the poignant essence of Adlai Stevenson in a Life article entitled "In the House That Adlai Loved."

I insert it in the RECORD:

IN THE HOUSE THAT ADLAI LOVED

(By John Bartlow Martin)

The house in Libertyville—Adlai Stevenson loved it more, probably, than any place else on the earth he wandered; and in the winter of 1965-66 when I began research for his biography, my family and I lived in it for a few months. We had visited him there often during his lifetime, and that winter it was at first hard to realize that we would not see his slightly dumpy figure waddling up the sloping field from the Des Plaines River, picking up dead tree branches as he came; to enter through the sun porch, blue eyes wide, cross the living room and, looking slightly perplexed, hesitate by the fireplace; then, grumbling about "this appalling task," go into his study to work on a speech.

The place was not quite the same that winter as when he left it. For one thing, the sheep were gone. He had raised sheep on his 70 acres (to save the cost of cutting hay and grass, I suspected), and they used to sweep across the lawn, scattering distinguished guests. Adlai III, his eldest son, had had the sheep butchered and given to his father's friends that first Christmas of his father's death, a hard thing for him.

Well, to work. A researcher and I catalogued his library. It was a working library—reference books and bound copies of his own speeches nearest his desk. But genealogies and family histories were not far away, nor were the Lincoln shelves. He was a man of Illinois, always; even after he belonged to the world, Illinois history, the Illinois prairies, and above all these 70 acres held him. The other books were a disorderly assortment of old and unread "sets" of such writers as Byron and books on politics and world affairs by Lippmann, Finletter, Bowles, Byrnes, and other of Stevenson's associates. Many were inscribed to him; few showed much sign of having been read. He was not a reader, he learned by listening. Scattered about were gorgeous pictures of a cruise on a private yacht during the U.N. years; a bust of President Kennedy and an autographed photograph of President Johnson; plaques and awards, gavels and a collection of plaster donkeys; exotic mementos of his travels. (He used to have a basement room full of travel mementos and at Christmas gave them to friends—stuffed alligators, keys to cities, spears, Oriental bric-a-brac.) Under his desk blotter was a scrap of paper containing in his handwriting a notation that Artie, his Dalmatian, was buried by a tree outside his study window.

The living room, like the study, was comfortable. The upholstered chairs and sofa that flanked the fireplace were frayed; the

lamps were rickety. Yet it, and the whole house, was light and airy, filled with sunshine, cheering. The house was bigger than it looked from the outside, where trees and shrubbery screened it. It sat far back from a gravel road. When he was a young lawyer and not long married, he used to drive down the long lane and on to Lake Forest, drop his children off at school, park his car at the railroad station, and take the commuters' train to his La Salle Street law office. In later years hundreds of tourists found their way here, and even if he was working in seclusion, he received them courteously. The north 30 acres were planted in soybeans; the south 40 was all lawn, hay, big old trees, a tennis court. Nonetheless, he always called the place "the farm," and dutifully reported its profit or loss on his income tax returns. We searched the house, a search, really, for Stevenson. And, using it, found traces of him, too—his highball glasses were decorated with Princeton's orange and black tiger and "22," his class. He was only somewhat less a Princetonian than an Illinoisian. The freezer was full of lamb and mutton. Over the big double bed in the master bedroom hung two gilded cupids, melancholy when one reflected on his disastrous marriage. On the night table beside his bed lay a book—the Social Register. So many of his Social Register friends voted against him for President. In a drawer of the night table was an envelope; on it he had written, "Tender Bits"; inside it were scraps of poetry, much of it love poetry. He was a lonely man.

Off the bedroom was a sundeck; Stevenson loved sun-bathing. The dressing room suggested luxury—vast initialed towels, a shoe shiner, a silent valet, a full-length mirror, leather cases and silver brushes embossed and engraved "AES," oval pictures elegantly framed of himself; Bill Blair, his aide; Ernest Ives, his brother-in-law; Mary Lasker, Hubert Humphrey, Chet Bowles, Jane Dick, his friends. (They were gifts of a friend, who made her own selection of his friends.) More leather-framed pictures—of Eleanor Roosevelt and Marietta Tree. And family pictures too—an old one of his sister or his mother (they looked quite alike), and pictures of Adlai III and his wife Nancy and their children. Stevenson used to return from the U.N. at Christmastime, and Adlai III and Nancy would bring the grandchildren out from Chicago, and Stevenson would romp with them, delighted—for a time.

On a telephone note pad Stevenson had written "Penelope is 21," a reminder. Life-long he was good to his friends' children, helped raise them, in a way. He was thoughtful, and affectionate. Forgetful, too—we found nine identical trench coats in a downstairs closet, bought no doubt while traveling, having forgotten to bring a coat.

On the wall of the basement stair was a lithograph from the campaign of 1892, when Stevenson's grandfather and namesake, Adlai E. Stevenson, was elected Vice President, the running mate of Cleveland. And another from the campaign of 1900, when he lost with Bryan. Stevenson's father, too, had gone into politics and, dying, had advised Stevenson to shun politics, it was an ungrateful business. In the basement, we found an old filing cabinet. One drawer was stuck tight. I finally pried it open—and found Stevenson's daily appointment books covering his entire four years as governor.

It was quiet here at Libertyville. Time and time again, harassed by official duties, chasing around the nation on political errands and, later, caught in the U.N. vortex, Stevenson said how much he "pined"—a favorite word—to escape to the peace and serenity of Libertyville. But when he did manage to come here, in a few days he would become restless, would be telephoning friends around the country, and soon he would plunge back into the

world. Lifelong he declared he sought serenity, peace, time to think, time to write. He never found it; never really, deeply, wanted it. He loved Libertyville but could stand it only in small doses.

One wintry day Adlai III and I sat in front of the fireplace with my agent and publisher and worked out the contract for the biography. As a writer and lawyer, Stevenson would have enjoyed it. Then we had a drink, and he would have enjoyed that too. Soon I moved on, to Washington, and he would have approved.

When we left, the flag that had draped his casket still lay on a bookshelf in his study. Since then, everything has been removed and the house is for sale. This year the military proposed to install an ABM site at Libertyville. It seemed an odd monument to a man of peace.

## LUMBER AND PLYWOOD PRICES

### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, my very able colleague, Congressman JOHN DELLENBACK, of Oregon, recently presented a very important and very articulate statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee, on the subject of lumber and plywood prices.

The views expressed are, in my judgment, the most conclusive, comprehensive, and constructive views, thus far offered in testimony before any of our congressional committees.

My congressional district on the north coast of California is immediately contiguous to Congressman DELLENBACK's Fourth District of Oregon. Many of the same factors affecting his area are identical to those of my heavily forested redwood country. Therefore, as I said to the committee, I want to associate myself completely with the content of his testimony because it accurately portrays the situation of my area as well as the State of Oregon.

Because of the concern of our colleagues on the lumber question and the relevancy of Mr. DELLENBACK's remarks, I felt these comments should be brought to the attention of the entire Congress—thus permitting all Senators and Congressmen to have immediate access to these very accurate and descriptive comments and suggestions.

For a number of years, I have pleaded with the Appropriations Committees and the administrations to increase the funds for forest access roads and trails development—in order to permit intensified management of our federally owned timber lands.

As a member of the House Roads Subcommittee, I can testify to the fact that we recognized the upcoming problem and actually increased the authorization to \$170 million.

I am firmly convinced that we could have avoided this so-called lumber price crisis, if the previous administration had adhered to our request and provided the required funds.

In fact, the tight timber management policies of the past have contributed to the tight money policies of the present.

I strongly suggest that every Member of Congress read Congressman DELLENBACK's remarks because it tells the full story and I can testify to its accuracy. The suggestions contained therein could provide the blueprint for action necessary to bring about realistic and stabilized timber management policies and lumber prices that will benefit the worker, the consumer, and the manufacturer—all of whom are concerned with this perplexing problem.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN DELLENBACK BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate very much the opportunity to testify before you this morning. I have also appreciated the Chairman's and the Committee's courtesy in permitting me to sit with you during the last three days of testimony.

May I preface my testimony by indicating to you why I take such a deep interest in these issues of lumber and plywood supplies and prices, and demand for these products. I represent the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, within whose borders is situated roughly 10% of the standing commercial softwood timber in the entire United States, including Alaska. The vast public and private land holdings from which our timber resource is harvested in my District account for a very significant share of the economy of Southwestern Oregon. No other part of the United States has as much at stake in any issue involving lumber and plywood as does the area comprising the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon. This holds true in the short run, but it also holds true in the long run, for the heart of the problem into which this Committee is conducting its very worthwhile investigations is the question of the availability or unavailability of softwood timber in sufficient amount to meet the needs of this nation. It is my District which can make that timber available to the nation. It is my District which suffers most when, as is the case at the present time, it is not allowed to make that timber available.

A crisis in lumber and plywood prices has brought about these hearings. Just as blessings are often a mixture of bad and good, so the curse and trouble of this crisis is also a mixture of bad and good. The bad is obvious. The good lies in the very fact of the attention that has finally been focused, on a nationwide basis and in this Congress, on the deeper and much more critical crisis underlying our troubles of the moment. Lumber and plywood mill operators are, quite frankly, delighted to have the opportunity to present to you ladies and gentlemen the facts underlying the present critical situation. You have heard the warning ring out in testimony these last three days. The warning that, unless this nation makes a radical change in its present practices and procedures in the management of its forests, we will not have the absolutely essential lumber and plywood required to meet such national goals as those set in the Housing Act which came forth from this Committee last year. Lumber and plywood are not only a good building material; they are an almost essential building material. But present practices and procedures simply will not yield lumber and plywood in the right places at the right times and at the right prices to make possible the attainment of our essential national objectives.

There are special short-range factors which, added to the basic underlying causes, have helped bring on the crisis of the moment. These special factors include:

Weather—Severe and most unusual storms have helped bring on a serious slowdown in

logging operations and a bad down drain on timber inventories at mills.

Boxcar and flatcar shortages—A perennial problem in the Pacific Northwest almost every year, a shortage has been acute in recent months, and has helped prevent the timely shipments of lumber and plywood to the market place.

Longshoreman strike—The strike on the East coast aggravated the transportation situation by tying up railroad cars and ships carrying lumber to East coast ports.

Expectation of rising demand—The imminence of the early arrival of the building season, coupled with expectation of increased demand and a simultaneous expectation of short supply, coupled with continued inflationary pressures, helped shoot prices up to an abnormal and all-time high.

But underlying these short-range factors have been the basic forces which are moving us steadily toward a time of major disaster in this field. These forces are affecting both the demand side and also the supply side of the scale.

On the demand side lie the factors of a steadily expanding and increasing population, high mobility in this population calling for an abandonment of the old and construction of the new, and a steadily expanding economy calling for steady construction of new facilities and bringing prosperity.

The Housing Act of 1968 in setting a goal of 26 million residential units to be built during the next 10 years was both recognizing a fact of what these steady pressures will call for and at the same time setting challenging goals for us as a people to see and to be prepared to meet. And the residential demands for lumber and plywood account for only 35% and 50% respectively of the national demands for these products. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development sounded the alarm before this Committee just the other day when he expressed his own grave fear that even the goals of the Housing Act of 1968 will not be met unless an additional output of 15 billion board feet of lumber is forthcoming. The demands are all around us, steadily rising and raising the spectre that the supply will not be sufficient.

The critical and essential point for this Committee and for the Congress to understand is that these demands can be met. We have in the national treasury at this moment the necessary supplies of standing timber, coupled with the necessary acres of fertile land to grow replacement for cut timber, to meet these demands. But not under present practices and procedures. If practices and procedures of timber management of the nation's forests be changed and improved, we can continue to meet expected demands of the future on a continuing and sustained yield basis, a principle which we dare not abandon.

The burden of doing what is necessary in the way of changing practices and procedures to meet rising future demands really falls upon both private and public sectors. In our primary concern with Federal resources, we should not forget that private ownerships comprise some 72% of the approximately 500 million acres of commercial forest land in the United States. While some 61% of the recent harvest of softwood saw timber has come from these private ownerships and an estimated 71% of the saw timber growth has taken place on these private ownerships, these same private ownerships embrace only approximately 35% of the present inventory of standing timber, and they embrace approximately three million individual ownerships. So while in the long run much needs to be done with private ownerships for the sake of the nation's future, initial and principal action on the part of the national government should and indeed must relate to the National Forests. It is here that more than 50% of the present inventory of standing softwood saw timber

is and it is here that we have the greatest opportunity for intensive forest management on a sustained yield basis.

The Chief of the U.S. Forest Service has cited in his testimony before Congressional bodies the present rate of timber losses due to fire, insects, and disease. The majority of the approximately 10 billion board feet of timber annually being lost to these causes can be salvaged—if the proper investment is made in the way of increased appropriations. Present funding of the Forest Service permits necessary salvage operations only of an estimated 5% of this dead and dying timber. The remaining 95% is pure waste, which the nation cannot afford.

The Chief of the Forest Service has also described how the allowable timber cut from public lands has been doubled over the past 20 years (rising from approximately 5.6 billion board feet per year to some 11.4 billion board feet per year). But he has also estimated that at present levels of timber management this country will face a lumber deficit of about 10 billion board feet per year by 1985. These present levels of timber management are, in part at least, a result of inadequate past investment policies on the part of the Congress. The testimony of the Chief of the Forest Service is to the effect that, for Fiscal Year 1970, the Forest Service will receive approximately 30% of what it needs for reforestation and stand improvement, and approximately 60% of what it needs for access roads and trails. Without adequate access roads and trails in particular it is impossible to reach the resources which are available to be cut and which indeed in many instances if not cut soon will be lost forever. And he has made it abundantly clear that this level of funding by the Congress has been the rule rather than the exception during recent years.

Several witnesses during the last few days have testified before this Committee on the log export situation. After watching the export of unprocessed logs, largely to Japan, rise from a relatively modest few hundred million board feet just a few years ago to more than 1.6 billion board feet in 1967, the Congress finally acted in 1968 to place a limitation on allowable exports from Federal lands. This was the so-called Morse Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968. Without seeking to repeat the testimony on this point, let me alert the Committee to a few points of concern in this area. First, this amendment places a mandatory limitation on exports only on logs coming from Federal lands, the discretionary authority in the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to prevent substitution of logs purchased from Federal lands for logs exported from private lands has not yet been exercised by either Secretary and the basic amendment itself expires at the end of 1971. Unless the Act is extended before that time, its definite but limited value will expire and our problem will be that much more acute.

Questioning by members of this Committee of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce just the other day made clear that no decision has yet been made to utilize the available provisions of the Export Control Act to further increase supplies of logs for domestic use by limiting exports, in full or part, even though the "short supply" criteria of the Act have apparently been met for approximately one year. Admittedly there are complications of a serious nature involved in the application of this Act, but we should not forget that it is on the books and available for use.

This Committee, and indeed the Congress, should not forget that the National Forests are expected to be managed on the declared principle of multiple use. While there are good and sufficient reasons why areas of the great timbered lands of the nation should be withdrawn for single purpose wilderness uses, we dare not forget the fact that every such withdrawal further accentuates our position

of short supply of standing timber for commercial purposes. Any proposals for further withdrawals should certainly be measured against recreation and aesthetic needs, but they should also be measured against the other great needs of the nation.

But whatever is done in the areas of further limitation of exports or of the exercise of great care in permitting any further withdrawals of timber lands from multiple purpose use, the really great potential for vastly increasing our future supply of softwood timber lies in intensified forest management. And if this is to be accomplished, the Congress must do two essential things. First, it must make additional appropriations available to those who manage the National Forests in order to make possible the construction of an adequate system of forest roads, reforestation of current cutover lands and other nonstocked or poorly stocked lands, commercial and noncommercial thinning of the forests, increased salvage of timber killed by fire, insects, or disease, and enhanced research to develop new ways to grow timber faster, use wood more efficiently, and reduce the cost of production. And second, some method must be devised to give to the managers of our National Forests a certainty of the continued availability of funds in these increased amounts for the indefinite future. The Congress must realize that expenditures for these purposes really constitute an investment, proven to be economically sound and certain to yield revenue to the Federal Treasury far more than the amounts expended for these purposes. Mr. Greeley, Associate Chief of the Forest Service, has testified before this Committee that for some few years it would be necessary to invest in these purposes more than the increased revenues that would be yielded to the Treasury from enhanced sales of timber. But the testimony is also clear, from industry spokesmen and from officials of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, that, after some few years of this level of expenditure, when the backlog of need in these areas has been brought current, a substantial excess of revenues over expenditures would very definitely accrue to the government.

The return on the investment would be two-fold. First, this way and only this way do we have any chance of assuring to the nation the supplies of softwood lumber and plywood which it needs in order to reach our great national goals. And second, to have our cake and to eat it too, there would end up being a direct and steady economic surplus accruing to the Treasury from these stepped-up and improved operations.

I have been disturbed by some of the concern I've heard expressed in questions from members of the Committee about the possibility of price fixing being involved in the present escalation of prices on lumber and plywood. Let me make brief comment on two levels on this question of control of prices. First, on the factual level of the existence or nonexistence of illegal price fixing by producers. We should not forget that there are still about 10,000 lumber producers and about 170 plywood producers throughout the nation. Certainly there are some giants, but there are far too many individual producers to make effective any concerted attempt to agree upon prices. In addition, the Justice Department, asked to investigate this matter by the President, has indicated that it finds no evidence of violation of any Federal laws in this area. But second, and more importantly, on the broad scale policy level of Government control of prices, certainly the Congress ought not to consider opening the Pandora's box of attempting to establish selective price controls in any field under present circumstances. If we were once to begin such action, our troubles would be certain to be legion. And, when our basic

problem is one of insufficient supply, and when our efforts should be directed toward encouraging increased production, the establishment of price controls would certainly be disastrous.

I am sure that I join the members of this Committee in being pleased at the announcement by President Nixon and his Cabinet-level Committee of recent decisions to improve the short-term situation in this time of crisis. The most significant action proposed and decided upon was, of course, the authorized additional sale of 1.1 billion board feet of timber in the next 15 months. This calls for an additional \$450 thousand in this fiscal year's budget for the Forest Service and a little over three million dollars additional in Fiscal Year 1970. Some of us concerned about the problem feel strongly that this is not enough. Representatives of the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management testified before the Senate recently that they could meet these additional requirements for sale of timber. But there is an immediate requirement of an annual increase of from two or three billion board feet, the amount of estimated present deficit in lumber and plywood supply, and this is the minimum increase in this area which must be met if the pressure is to be taken off the present high-price situation. But this action is at least a beginning, and for it we are grateful.

But if the basic underlying crisis is to be met, then this Congress must take some basic action. The underlying causes must be dealt with, and not merely the symptoms. May I propose for this Committee's consideration the following specific actions by the Congress:

1. Legislation which would establish for the United States Forest Service, manager of the greatest amount of commercial softwood saw timber in the United States, a special funding program committing all or a substantial portion of the receipts from the sale of timber from U.S. Forest Service lands to assure to the Forest Service long-term guarantees of the increased funds that would be necessary to permit intensified forest management of the National Forests.

2. Increased appropriations immediately for forest roads and trails, with a goal of \$205 million annually within the next few years. This is the amount testified to by the Chief of the Forest Service as being in order, is the most critical immediate need and, because of necessary construction time delays, should be implemented without waiting for funds to begin to accumulate under the special funding program called for under point one above.

3. Congressional insistence that the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management make a complete and early report to the Congress on present timber management policies, short and long-range projections and goals in all areas of multiple use, including amounts of timber that could be made available for commercial purposes under levels of funding potentially providable under the procedures outlined in point one above. These reports should include a full and complete inventory of all forest lands at present used for multiple use purposes as well as all such lands, set aside under either Congressional directive or by administrative rule and regulation, used for single use purposes. In the event that such projections of allowable cut do not indicate yield of sufficient quantities of lumber and plywood to meet other national goals, the Congress should consider re-studying these plans and procedures on an independent basis.

4. Extension of the log export limitation amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968 and insistence that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior issue the regulations permitted thereunder to prevent substitution

of timber purchased from Federal lands to replace timber exported from private lands. This amendment is due to expire at the end of 1971 and should be extended at the earliest possible opportunity so as to eliminate any question about the intention of the Congress to continue it and enforce it.

5. Legislative modification of the Jones Act, perhaps in the form of a product exemption, so as to allow forest products to be shipped from one United States port to another on a competitive basis that will enhance the supply of forest products fed into domestic markets from Alaska.

6. Study of possible additional legislative action as well as of present Interstate Commerce Commission policies intended to put an end once and for all to the boxcar and flatcar shortages suffered by West coast producers and shippers of lumber and plywood.

The nation and the Congress face a problem of supply of lumber and plywood which *must* be solved. It is one which *can* be solved if we move swiftly and wisely. I commend this Committee for the important contribution to which these hearings can lead in the way of necessary Congressional action.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, once again Washington prepared and the Nation participated in another large "state" funeral. This time it occurred because of the death of former President Eisenhower. These proceedings were not made with shock, but with sober reverence and appreciation for a giant of a man that had played a dominant role in world affairs for the last generation.

During this period of time "Ike"—as he was affectionately known—represented the best qualities of America. His compassion, humility, and friendliness made him beloved, by millions throughout the world. His ability to disagree without being disagreeable, contributed to his success in dealing with both quarreling allies and the conflicting interests in American society. That big Eisenhower smile served for nearly 30 years, as one of the best prescriptions for a troubled and sick world.

Beyond this, Dwight Eisenhower represented men's aspirations for individual freedom, justice, and peace with honor. He certainly believed in the worth and merit of the individual. He knew the enormous qualities and capabilities that the individual possesses, and he knew the accomplishments they can produce. In this regard, he spoke frequently of the "uncommon man." He perceptively observed that it is the "uncommon man" that produces a better life and world, and he quite correctly discovered this quality in every man. He further knew that these qualities could only be developed in an atmosphere of freedom.

Coupled with this individual freedom, President Eisenhower believed that justice was an essential ingredient to development of man's aspirations. His "crusade in Europe" was just such a quest

for restoring justice and freedom—from the Nazi tyranny.

He realized that peace could not exist without justice. His entire term as President was dedicated to this quest. As a successful warrior he knew too well the horrors of war. This prepared him as a "warrior for peace." Not peace at any price, but a peace where the weaker nations would be protected from the stronger; a peace where men would not be subjected and forced to live under a government that was not of their own choosing.

As in war, Dwight Eisenhower waged a successful fight for peace. His years in the Presidency were marked with a period of stability unseen since the days following the First World War. Communist aggression was curtailed, the Korean war was ended, and the letting of American blood on foreign soil all but stopped.

The lack of strife and conflict on the domestic scene was also quite apparent during the Eisenhower years. There was no exploding racial antagonism nor were our cities in flames. General "Ike" showed that economic and social progress could be made without violence and demonstrations.

Much more could be said concerning this man who had a humble beginning on the Kansas plains. His life was lived as a classic example to all. I doubt that there is a mother and father who would not want their son to emulate Dwight Eisenhower's personal qualities and life. He is no doubt our greatest soldier-statesman since George Washington. There is no doubt that like George Washington, "he is first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 28, 1969, was a bright and sunny day in the Nation's Capital. The brightness suddenly turned to gloom at 12:25 p.m., with the announcement that General of the Army and former President Dwight David Eisenhower had passed away.

Probably no President in history received greater recognition as an "all-America American." The phrase "I like Ike" was a three-word testimonial to the great affection which people had for him, not only in his native land but throughout the world. He remains both at home and abroad one of the most beloved American figures of all time.

His was a remarkable life in that he served in so many capacities, all of them marked with distinction—as a military man, as an educator, as President of the United States and, finally, after a full life of public service, as a private citizen. Few men in history could match his profound dignity or his deep sense of humility.

Some men seem to have been born for a distinct purpose. Dwight D. Eisenhower was such a man. He will forever be associated with the great Allied effort to free the European Continent from tyranny brought about by a madman. He was chosen because he possessed the qualities of humanity, tolerance, and an outstanding ability to work with others and win their trust and cooperation. History shows this selection was a wise choice.

While he was supreme commander of the largest body of fighting men and the greatest army of armament ever assembled, Dwight D. Eisenhower will always be remembered by those who knew him best as a man of peace.

I was privileged to know Dwight David Eisenhower. He was my best known constituent. "Ike" had that unique blend of friendliness and competence that is too rarely found in men today. Against the background of these rare traits he had the distinction of living to see himself become a legend, certainly a fitting reward for his outstanding service.

This is an hour of great sadness because Adams County has lost a true friend and neighbor, Pennsylvania has lost a grand citizen, America has lost a great leader, and the world has lost a man it loved, respected, and revered.

We can take consolation, however, from the realization that as Dwight D. Eisenhower gave so generously and unselfishly of himself, so, too, did he succeed in weaving himself into the fabric of America and into the hearts of all men. As we mourn his passing, we should recall his strong spirit which can guide and sustain us in whatever troubled days might lie ahead. This man was an inspiration to untold millions, and ours is a better world because he walked among us.

To paraphrase the poet's words, "Dwight David Eisenhower has joined the innumerable caravan that moves to that mysterious realm. He went sustained and soothed by an unflinching trust. He approached his grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

COST OF LIVING INCREASES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY ANNUITANTS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which should greatly improve the social security system by providing for annual increases in benefits tied to the upward movement of the consumer price index.

At the present time, about 25 million people are receiving over \$2 billion per month in social security benefits. Congress has increased the benefit level periodically in the past. Only last February we raised the benefit level across the board by 13 percent. However, since that legislation was enacted, the cost-of-living has increased by 4½ percent and it

appears as though the earliest that the Congress will be able to take action to maintain the buying power of social security beneficiaries will be next year. By then, it is conceivable that the cost-of-living will have increased by almost 10 percent. I believe that something must be done to speed up the process. Therefore, I have introduced legislation today which will provide that each December, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine exactly what the increase—if any—in the cost-of-living has been during the previous calendar year and then make this increase applicable to benefits paid in the following January.

Studies by the Social Security Administration have shown that social security beneficiaries, as a group, have little other income besides their annuities. This means that, when the cost-of-living goes up 4½ percent as it has since last February, each recipient must lower his standard of living by just that much. This may mean one less slice of bread when the cost-of-living increases by only a small percentage but it could mean another meatless day if the inflationary spiral is not brought under control.

Because of the lag between benefit increases and increases in prices, social security beneficiaries are probably the group that is hardest hit by inflation. The civil service retirement program has a provision which provides for cost-of-living increases when the Consumer Price Index increases by 3 percent and remains over this figure for 3 consecutive months. Legislation which passed the House last year and which will hopefully pass again this year and be enacted will provide that, in addition to this annuity increase, civil service retirees will receive another 1-percent increase to cover the increase in the cost of living that occurs between the time that the 3-month Consumer Price Index increase period occurs and the time that the annuity increase is reflected in retirees' checks. I believe there is no good reason why social security benefits should not also be increased when the cost of living goes up.

The bill which I have introduced today does not follow the procedure provided for the civil service retirement system. I have adopted the yearly increase instead because of the time involved in recomputing benefits and the size of the social security program. I do not think any other approach is feasible.

The expense of providing for annual increases in social security benefits cannot be foreseen with any degree of accuracy because we have no way of knowing exactly what the cost of living will do from one year to the next. Therefore, my bill provides that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must submit to the Congress his recommendations for any additional financing that may be necessary to meet the cost of providing additional benefits.

Whether any additional financing will be needed will depend entirely on the relationship of increases in wages to increases in prices. When wages rise, the income of the social security program

also increases because the program is financed by a payroll tax. In some years this additional income may not be enough to finance the needed cost-of-living increase and in other years it may be necessary to adopt other measures. By requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to warn the Congress when any additional funding is needed, we will be able to have the lead time necessary to take appropriate action to avoid any financial strain on the program.

The idea of cost-of-living increases in social security benefits was endorsed by both the Democratic and Republican party platforms last year. The measure I have introduced today should have bipartisan support and I am hopeful that enactment of this legislation will be achieved in the shortest possible time so that we can insure that social security beneficiaries will no longer be second-class citizens.

IN MEMORY OF DWIGHT D.  
EISENHOWER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the death of General Eisenhower removes from this Nation, the world, and all of us a towering and noble figure.

General Eisenhower led the most powerful military machine that has ever existed in the history of this world. From north Africa, through the "great crusade" at Normandy on June 6, 1944, and on to the unconditional surrender of Germany at Rheims, France, on May 7, 1945, he gallantly led and inspired his forces.

But above all, he was a "soldier of peace." His foremost desire and hope was to witness the establishment of peace upon this earth. His Presidency was characterized by a fervent belief in the goodness of man, and therefore in the possibility of man achieving this peace.

He stood out magnificently above the frictions that existed during his administration. His humility and honesty defied the efforts of his most ardent critics. His character earned the respect and admiration of all humanity.

As a previous generation looked back upon the pre-World War I era, so we look back nostalgically to "the Eisenhower years." They were the last great period of peace this country has enjoyed.

Peace did not just come. President Eisenhower worked to achieve and maintain it. He worked with all that was at his disposal. Foremost among these "weapons" for peace was he, the human being, deeply concerned about our Nation and about all of us.

It was during the last 2 years of his Presidency that I came to Congress. I then had the privilege and honor of getting to know him personally. This was one of the truly great experiences of my life. I shall treasure the memory not only in these days of national mourning but

also in the years to come. And in those years, I hope that we will all work to achieve the goals he set for himself and our country.

The general told President Nixon just the other day that "understanding" is the most needed thing in the world today. He knew that understanding, and not the "acquisition of unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex," was the key to the survival of this Nation and of the human race.

Let us all strive toward this understanding. The future may well depend upon our achieving it.

I speak for all the people of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts in extending my deepest sympathies to his beloved widow, Mamie Eisenhower, to the entire Eisenhower family, and to all his close associates. May they be comforted by the knowledge of our great love and affection for Dwight D. Eisenhower.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: INCREASES IN SUSTAINED-YIELD TIMBER SUPPLY

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the House and Senate hearings on the high price of lumber and plywood, and the Presidential task force now reviewing this matter, I call to the attention of my colleagues and all parties interested an article which recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian on this subject, written by our respected business editor, Mr. Gerry Pratt.

In this article he describes how one company, with visionary and effective leadership, has increased its timber production markedly, and within the important concept of sustained yield.

This program could serve as a model for the Federal agencies charged with management of the U.S. huge timber resources. Such intensified management would not only solve our supply and price crisis, but would return many additional dollars to the Government for every single dollar invested.

Here then is Mr. Pratt's excellent article:

MAKING THE DOLLAR: FAST GROWTH MARKS GEORGIA-PACIFIC RISE

(By Gerry Pratt)

Georgia-Pacific Corp. has come a long way from the days when the old-style timber operators used to fold hands on their belly lines, chuckle quietly to themselves and tell each other with knowing glances: "Just watch, they will fall like a deck of cards."

Those were days when Owen Cheatham and a quiet understudy, Robert P. Pamplin, were paying prices for timber that spelled pure ruin in the eyes of any legitimate timber operator.

G-P bought the big Boeing tract that way and the C. D. Johnson Lumber Co., and then in a fantastic \$90-million proxy battle, the old Booth-Kelly timber out of Springfield and ruin seemed to go glimmering in a flurry of profit and growth figures that made G-P stockholders better off than had they got in

on the ground floor of International Business Machines.

And the skeptics stopped chuckling; many of them have since gone out of business, while this week Georgia-Pacific brought out an annual report that shows the upstarts are doing more than \$1 billion a year in business.

It would have been presumptuous perhaps in those years for a G-P officer to become a spokesman for the timber industry, though Pamplin was even ten years ago trying to convince people his was not a cut-and-run company, but one that believed in a new concept in sustained yield.

NEW TREE-GROWTH CYCLE CONSIDERED

G-P's cutting cycle disregarded the old style sustained-yield concept of 14 years and more, and moved into a 60-through-90-year cycle that increased raw material production beyond what anyone else had planned. I can remember Pamplin back in the mid-'50s standing on the executive floor of the G-P headquarters explaining with the ornamental butt end of a log how a tree grows faster in its younger years and slows down in the years of old growth.

Once, back then when he did venture out as a spokesman, I told Pacific Northwest Trade Association members, and with candor and courage, that they should forget Canadian-American borders and begin to consider their mutual interest and develop an English-speaking community of nations for an economic as well as a secure future. The Canadians in particular ridiculed the very idea government statesmen in both countries are now repeating as original concepts in future planning.

But G-P's image and the reputation of the company's executives have developed to where no one is disparaging the remarks of R. B. Pamplin this week on the new crisis, the imbalance of supply and demand in the wood products industry. The recent recovery from near-record lows of plywood prices. Pamplin says, "has been too rapid for builders' construction programming."

But, he points out, "the largest part of the industry's plywood production is still selling at mill prices slightly below the level of 20 years ago. However a worse and more permanent shortage faces us in the future if remedial action is not taken now," he warns.

"An increase in the allowable harvest of overripe federal timber is urgently needed, but it must be done within long-term sustained yield timber growing programs to assure a continuous supply of raw material," he says.

Pamplin points to U.S. Forest Service studies indicating demand for timber will double during the next 30 years. He says two temporary factors are blamed for the current shortage. They are the worst winter logging weather in over half a century, coupled with log exports from federal lands.

EXECUTIVE HITS TOO MANY RESERVES

Pamplin has never been known for a reluctance to tackle the hornets, either the built-in "establishment" of the timber industry or zealous "wilderness" exponents. And he says bluntly now:

"We must not lock up too much timber growing land in single use, wilderness-type withdrawals. With the long-range demand for forest products expected to increase sharply, a permanent supply-and-demand squeeze will develop soon if federal timberlands are not brought up to their full growth and harvest potential."

Federal lands comprise 65 per cent of all commercial timberlands in the nation. Pamplin points out. "Industry owns only 15 per cent of the total.

"As the basic supplier, the federal government must assume basic responsibility. This means Congress should reinvest more federal timber sale revenues to grow more and better trees and to provide access roads into over-

ripe timber stands. This is a necessary part of our nation's multi-purpose wood fiber, watershed and recreational improvement program," he contends.

In defense of current prices, the G-P chairman points to current price lists that show sheathing plywood \$6 a thousand below what prices were for the same items 20 years ago. Yet he leaves the idea that this may not continue.

"The next 20 years will see much more pressure on raw material supplies to meet the nation's needs. Unless federal timberlands, not vitally needed for other purposes, are geared to growing more and better trees faster, as modern timber management can, we face much more serious supply-demand-price problems."

Pamplin is perhaps the one industry spokesman who can talk like that today and be accepted as knowing what he's talking about. He has been right before.

STATEMENT BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN ON BEHALF OF THE AGUDAS ISRAEL WORLD ORGANIZATION, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Commission for Social Development discussed, at its recent session, a report by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—on the role of education in economic and social development.

In this report, UNESCO dealt with such topics as educational planning, the quantitative expansion in education, the cost and yield of educational systems, the structures and content of education, higher education and youth problems, and research. The report examined how educational planning can best be geared to the needs of development. It emphasized the need for high-quality and continuing education at all levels.

In the discussion participated the representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Greece, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, India, Spain, and, as the only representative of a nongovernmental organization with consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, Rabbi Dr. Isaac Lewin, of the Agudas Israel World Organization.

I have known Dr. Lewin for many years. He is a highly respected member of the West Side community in Manhattan. He is a very learned individual, is the author of several books in the field of medieval and modern Jewish history, and a professor of history in the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Yeshiva University. Dr. Lewin has contributed greatly to the work of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and its subsidiary, the Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, over the last 21 years.

In his statement, delivered on February 18, 1969, Dr. Lewin suggested that

the United Nations call on all governments to include in the school curricula on primary and secondary levels special courses on international understanding and peace, stressing simultaneously the need of elimination, in the future, of war and of racial and religious conflicts.

The text of Dr. Lewin's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN ON BEHALF OF THE AGUDAS ISRAEL WORLD ORGANIZATION, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, FEBRUARY 18, 1969

In the very valuable report of UNESCO on the role of education in the economic and social development, one chapter has to be singled out as particularly important. This is the chapter called "The Objectives of Education." May I be permitted to say a few words in connection with this chapter, as well as on the chapter called "Problems of the Content of Education: The Adaptation of Education to Life."

UNESCO rightly emphasized the fact that "all education is intended to prepare students for life." Indeed education and life cannot be separated. Only if the life and daily practices of individuals as well as entire groups conform to the teachings received in school, can one say that education has achieved its purpose and its aims, and that education has been integrated in the social structure.

The report mentions that "originally . . . education handed down a set of moral and cultural values bequeathed by preceding generations. These enabled the individual to find his place in a relatively stable ethical and spiritual universe."

How is it today? We live in times of almost unprecedented tensions. The danger of war—and probably of a more destructive war than ever before—is greater today than it was at any time since World War II. Millions of innocent lives were destroyed in the last war due to Nazism and its unbelievable social and cultural retrogression. Unfortunately, however, the racial and religious conflicts have not been diminished today.

In such times the United Nations should give guidance to all nations by urging them to include in the education of the young generation the moral principles based on the teachings of the Bible and the Prophets, and to call all human beings to mutual understanding and peace.

It is not enough to say, as the UNESCO report concludes in its chapter on "The Objectives of Education," that "most governments and educational authorities, whatever their political and social systems or beliefs, are attaching not less but more importance to the teaching of morals, ethics, spiritual values, international understanding and cooperation, love of peace, and solidarity with the rest of mankind." Rather, I would suggest that a more definite step be taken by this Commission and later by the Economic and Social Council—namely, that a resolution be adopted calling on all governments to include in the school curricula on primary and secondary levels special courses on international understanding and peace, stressing simultaneously the need of elimination, in the future, of war and of racial and religious conflicts.

This would undoubtedly be an important step in the march toward social development of mankind for three reasons.

First of all, it would integrate education into the social structure of the world.

Secondly, such action could certainly be considered as an improvement in the quality of education.

Thirdly, it would also mean that the United Nations is taking part in educational planning, which is essential for social and economic development.

The grave crisis demands immediate action.

## THE NEW CARDINAL

## HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Francis Cardinal Spellman was a great loss to New York, to the Nation, and to the Roman Catholic Church. Fortunately, his successor, Archbishop Terence J. Cooke, just recently elevated to the College of Cardinals, possesses the same qualities of compassion, understanding, perception and initiative which distinguished his predecessor.

A perceptible profile of the new cardinal appeared in last Saturday's New York Post. It merits the attention of all of us and I present it herewith for insertion in the RECORD:

TERENCE J. COOKE: THE NEW CARDINAL

(By Anthony Mancini)

Now the scarlet mantle falls to Terence J. Cooke and, with it, an extra dimension to an already burdensome and influential ministry. As one of the youngest of the 134-member College of Cardinals, the 48-year-old Archbishop of New York will participate in the highest councils of the Roman Catholic Church. The College helps the Pope to govern and, as the occasion arises, chooses a new Pope from within its ranks.

Yesterday Cooke greeted the news of his elevation with the humility and directness that has become his trademark: "Just to be a good priest," he said of his goals.

Word that he was designated by Pope Paul as one of the four new American cardinals came to him in Washington, where he was attending a meeting of the National Commission on the Cause and Prevention of Violence.

"I thought I was much too young," he told newsmen, flashing his buck teeth in a ready smile. "And I know of others through the world I felt more deserving."

It is safe to say—despite the expressions of modesty—that the man who last year took over the spiritual stewardship of nearly 2 million Catholics in one of the richest sees of the Church will approach this fresh challenge with the quiet confidence that has marked the first year of his reign here.

Innovation without fanfare has characterized his administration so far and there is hope in both the liberal and conservative wings of the local Church that Cooke, as cardinal (his elevation takes place at a secret consistory in Rome on April 28), will prove something special, indeed.

He has proved a masterly conciliator. The conservatives, while recognizing the need for social change, are heartened by his traditional views on matters of faith and dogma. The liberals, on the other hand, while respecting his sense of tradition, are encouraged by his avowed interest in social justice and some of the steps he has taken in that direction.

"We sincerely hope," said a liberal priest here, "that now that he's got the red hat, he will be even more free to be his own man. It's still a waiting game for us and he is still very much an unknown quantity."

While some of the liberals are ever mindful of Cooke's apprenticeship under his conservative predecessor, the late Cardinal Spellman, they gave him fair marks for his first year.

Although little substantive change has been made during the Archbishop's short tenure, there is widespread satisfaction with the gestures and his establishment of liberal organizations whose goal is the attainment of social and racial harmony and equality.

For example, they cite his generally progressive action in the fields of race relations and Church democratization. But—and this is a real sore point—they also cite his quick endorsement in a pastoral letter of Pope Paul's unflinching encyclical on birth control.

Some of the steps the Archbishop has taken to liberalize the traditionally conservative Archdiocese recently have included: Setting up a Social Justice Task Force to explore the problems of race, poverty and urban renewal.

Appointing the Archdiocese's first Negro pastor, Father Harold Salmon of St. Charles Borromeo parish; Salmon was also named Vicariate Delegate of Harlem, with authority over all parishes in Harlem.

Cooke's endorsement of the Kerner Report on civil disorders.

The institution of new scholarship programs to train more Puerto Rican and Negro priests.

Urging "a careful study" of New York State's proposed abortion reform laws, instead of condemning them outright.

His cautious but encouraging response to a memorandum of priorities by an organization of priests calling for sweeping reforms in democratizing the Archdiocese.

Aside from the substantive issues, Cooke's warm personal style and his pastoral emphasis have impressed many prominent laymen and priests.

"He is a very communicative Archbishop and very close to the people," said John Sweeney, president of the Guild of Catholic Lawyers. "He always has a willing ear for us and is most accessible. He's really very easy to reach and talk to."

The Guild supports the Archbishop's stand in backing the Papal Encyclical on birth control and many of his other conservative positions in matters of dogma.

There is general pleasure among conservatives and liberals alike in the Archbishop's pronounced habit of soliciting advice from laymen and low-ranking priests before making decisions.

"His advocacy of the parish council is quite heartening," said one layman who counts himself among the conservatives. "And we like the idea that, soon after he took office, he sent his priests from the chancery around to everybody in the archdiocese asking our opinion on all matters, particularly education."

To grapple with the urgent problems of the parochial school system—plunged into financial crisis by the flight of middle-class whites to the suburbs—Cooke last April set up an elite panel of educators and civic leaders, including such prominent laymen as Schools Supt. Donovan and former Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance.

"He's moving surely with the tide of secularization which is sweeping the Church," one priest said.

In the meantime, Cooke—whose political prowess was once a question mark—has shown a definite flair in this realm. From a relatively obscure start, he has begun to carve out a national reputation for himself.

Some of his success here can be attributed to tragic coincidence. On the night of his investiture as Archbishop on April 4, 1968, Martin Luther King was slain in Memphis. In the succeeding days, Cooke's solemn countenance was flashed across the nation, hands clasped with James Farmer and Mayor Lindsay, singing "We Shall Overcome" at a ceremony in King's honor in Central Park; and later at the Memphis funeral.

Two months later, he delivered before the nation a eulogy for Robert F. Kennedy.

Then, after the Kennedy assassination, President Johnson named him to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Father Joseph Fitzpatrick, S.J., a sociology professor at Fordham University, has been assisting the Archbishop in his work with the Commission.

"He has made a great contribution here," Fitzpatrick said yesterday. "He made an impressive and effective intervention in having special hearings on the role that the private sector, namely schools, churches and welfare agencies might play in the effort to correct violence in the United States. I think this is in keeping with his sense of a pastoral mission."

His pastoral approach has impressed others as well.

"He is more available to the people of the archdiocese—his flock—than any other archbishop in the history of the archdiocese," said James E. Foley, state deputy of the Knights of Columbus. "Shortly after his installation he visited every county in the archdiocese. You can sit with him, explain your problems and get answers."

His main accomplishments, in the view of many, have been in the field of race relations.

"I really think it's quite an improvement over the kind of attitudes there used to be" in the Chancery, remarked a spokesman for the Catholic Interracial Council, a civil rights organization.

Specifically, the spokesman pointed out that on April 23, Cooke will present the Father John LaFarge Award for Interracial Justice to Urban League director Whitney M. Young Jr. (Previous recipients have included Nelson Rockefeller and George Meany.) He also cited Cooke's appointment of Father Salmon as spiritual adviser of the Council and encouragement to add more black persons to the organization's board.

"It's a beginning, a step," the Council spokesman concluded. Cooke's apparently genuine concern for the plight of the underprivileged was forged in the crucible of his own poor origins and early labors as a priest in social work and Catholic Charities.

"Clearly, he knows the social problems," said a prominent Catholic lawyer-layman, Dr. John Connorton. "He is a professional social worker."

His official biography unfolds almost like a parody of the poor-boy-makes-good stories.

Terence James Cooke was born in Manhattan on March 1, 1921, the son of an Irish immigrant from Galway. His father, Michael Cooke, was at first a chauffeur whose employers included the actor John Barrymore.

In the early 1920s, the family moved to the Throgs Neck section of the Bronx where Cooke was reared while his father worked as a tile layer. The family eventually bought a stucco house at 2897 Coddington Av. From his earliest years, young Terry is remembered by his neighbors as a studious and devout boy with a passion for music. He studied and played the violin.

"Yes, I loved the violin," he told a Post reporter last year. "I won't say how well I played, but I played—and thank heavens we weren't living in an apartment house with neighbors all around to lodge complaints." Later the Cookes escaped the city to a ranch house in Rockland County, where the father stayed until his death at 75.

Cooke's mother Margaret died when her son was 10, but her place was taken by his aunt, Mary Gannon, who helped raise him and his brother and sister. Miss Gannon is now a retired salesclerk living in Stuyvesant Town.

The Cardinal-designate's sister Katherine, who is unmarried, lives with the elderly aunt and his brother Joseph lives in Niagara Falls with his family.

The seed of young Terry's vocation to the priesthood was planted when he was a student at a Benedictine elementary school in West Nyack. He went on to Cathedral Prep and St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers. Ordained in the priesthood by Cardinal Spellman on Dec. 1, 1945, he was assigned to parish work at St. Athanasius in the Bronx. Despite his pastoral approach now, Cooke's experience as a parish priest was short. After two years, he was sent to Catholic University for graduate work in social sciences and later

took a Master's degree in sociology at the University of Chicago.

In 1949, he took up duties on the staff of Catholic Charities, giving part of his time to St. Jude in Manhattan, his final parish assignment.

Teaching assignments followed at Fordham and St. Joseph's until Spellman appointed the young priest his personal secretary in 1957.

From that time on, Father Cooke's rise in the hierarchy was rapid. He was consecrated an auxiliary bishop in 1965 after handling all the arrangements for Pope Paul's visit to this country. Before then, his promotions had included vice chancellor of the archdiocese (1958), chancellor (1961) prothonotary apostolic (1964) and Archdiocesan vicar general (1965). And it was Spellman himself, according to reports, who told Pope Paul that Cooke would be a worthy successor as Archbishop of New York.

Now, less than a year after that elevation, he has—as expected—reached the pinnacle of Church ranks, just below the papal office itself.

How will he fare in the near-Byzantine byways of Vatican politics?

"He has been sitting for years at the feet of a man (Cardinal Spellman) who was a consummate expert on the Vatican," one close associate said.

"If he has had anything to do with New York City and its political and social life," added Sweeney of the Catholic Lawyers Guild, "he comes well-equipped to handle the political relationships of the Vatican. If you wanted to really sum it up—he is a diplomat."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
OF NEW JERSEY

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and Americans everywhere in mourning the loss of a great man, a great leader, and a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower.

I was temporarily assigned to General Eisenhower's command during World War II, and it was my personal pleasure over the years to meet him on several occasions. I knew him to be a man of high moral character, impeccable integrity, and possessed of a rare quality; namely, wisdom, born of inherent compassion for his fellow man, an understanding of the times in which he lived, a depth of insight known from experience, and a capacity to apply the lessons of history to contemporary realities.

As the 34th President of the United States, General Eisenhower was to deal with yet another war whose conclusion was a prelude to an era of peace, prosperity, and stability. He brought to this Nation the highest respect among the free nations of the world, the confidence of its people, and a renewed faith in our American heritage as set by his own example. His courage and leadership were dedicated to the moral right that men everywhere might live in peace and freedom, and his memory will live on in our hearts as an inspiration to give us the spiritual strength to meet the challenges both present and future. He once said:

Faith is our surest strength, our greatest resource.

Mrs. Hunt and I extend our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and her devoted family.

THE 1968 NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONFERENCE

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Federal regulations governing the application of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1968 became effective. The way is now cleared for the administrative implementation of those significant amendments which comprise one of the most constructive products of the 90th Congress. I am proud to have been a part of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which, under the able leadership of its chairman, CARL D. PERKINS, and the subcommittee chairman, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, developed this legislation. These amendments were a fitting climax to the public career of Senator Lister Hill, who headed the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare handling this matter and who for decades gave magnificent leadership to health and rehabilitation public policy.

I mark this occasion because the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments, unanimously approved by Congress, call for a very significant expansion of the rehabilitation program. VRA at all levels is called upon to adapt its excellent services to the socioeconomically disadvantaged, to the poor in the ghetto, to the delinquent youth, to the undereducated, and to others whose employability has been severely limited by their status in our society. There is a new mandate to the rehabilitation system to serve the long-term hard-core jobless.

Of course, I am personally especially gratified that these new amendments call for a new careers program to be developed both to meet manpower needs in rehabilitation and to provide new job opportunities for the handicapped. The new careers provision in the VRA legislation of 1968 is patterned on the new careers provision of the Economic Opportunity Act which I sponsored in 1966 and reflects the promise and success of that program.

I am hopeful that Congress will adequately enlarge the appropriation for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to permit the full development of the new dimension Congress added in 1968. Under the distinguished leadership of Miss Mary Switzer and Dr. Joseph V. Hunt the VRA has been one of our most successful public service programs and deserves our full funding support in its new responsibilities.

Congress and the administration have been greatly assisted in their program development in this area by the professionals, experts, and program operators working in rehabilitation. They are

largely and well represented by the National Rehabilitation Association led by its executive director, E. B. Whitten.

The NRA at its recent convention in New Orleans, La., gave special attention to this new dimension in rehabilitation. The opening address at the NRA convention was prepared by one of our country's outstanding experts in the manpower and anti-poverty fields, Prof. Russell A. Nixon, of New York University. Dr. Nixon's address very clearly analyzes and describes the significance of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and should be of great interest to my colleagues:

THE 1968 NATIONAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONFERENCE

(Address by Russell A. Nixon, Ph. D.)

The decision of the National Rehabilitation Association to focus its 1968 conference on "Rehabilitation in a Troubled World" reflects alertness and sensitive concern for the significantly changing setting in which vocational rehabilitation is to function and develop in the period ahead. This is characteristic of the progressive and enlightened leadership long given in the field of rehabilitation by the Association, by its membership, and by the Federal, State, and local officials, and the Congress with which NRA works. Implicit in this focus on our "troubled world" are two other relevant descriptions of the present stage setting of efforts at "human reinforcement" as we enter the last third of the 20th Century: It is not only a troubled world, but it is a changing world—and it is a challenging world. It is within this troubled, changing, challenging scene that rehabilitation must define its enormously growing and increasingly central role in the development of human services to meet the needs of our nation and its people.

You who are so sensitive to the "human condition" and concerned with the state of our society, need hardly be told that these are "troubled times". Our most thoughtful men are constantly underlining the urgency and the danger of what is now generally referred to as a crisis in our society:

At the beginning of this year, the then Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner said "I cannot speak with assurance, only with concern . . . (people fall to see) the alarming character of our domestic crisis . . . we are in deep trouble as a people . . ."

We are told by Mollie Orshansky, the Social Security Board's expert statistician, that at last estimate for 1966, there are 50 million persons—25 percent of our population—who are "economically deprived". The Office of Juvenile Delinquency tells us that "at any given point in time, there are approximately 2 million young men (aged 10 to 17) who are either currently or have recently been delinquent."

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders concludes that "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." This distinguished Commission of responsible men studying the violent and bloody disorders of 1967 emphasized that these "disorders are not simply a problem of the racial ghetto or the city . . . They are symptoms of social ills that have become endemic in our society and now affect every American . . . and the resulting discontent and disruption threaten democratic values fundamental to our progress as a free society."

We have lagged in "cleaning up the hideous legacy of the industrial revolution" and of our slave system, and in building a genuinely humane and equitable society. A huge gap exists between our enormous technological and social potential and our achievement. Our actions have not matched our

promises. We are being told by a restless and dissatisfied people "Today is yesterdays' tomorrow, and you promised." Our society, our institutions, are being called to account by a "revolution of rising expectations", not in Asia or Africa, but right here within our own nation, a "revolution" which cannot and should not be evaded.

But if these are troubled days, it is also true that as the poet-singer Bobby Dylan says "The times they are a 'Changin'". As never before, the social and economic ills of our time are acknowledged and are declared unacceptable. The facts of poverty and the ghetto were well known long before the so-called "War on Poverty" was declared—but they were conveniently put aside and largely out of sight insofar as public policy and attention was concerned. Now, regardless of the limits or even failures of that "War", out of the complex developments of this decade it seems certain that as long as poverty and slums and discrimination remain in our society they will be on the main agenda of our public policy and programs.

As Marshall McLuhan writes in *The Medium is the Message*

"The shock of recognition! In an electric information environment, minorities can no longer be contained—ignored. Too many people know too much about each other. Our new environment compels commitment and participation. We have become irrevocably involved with, and responsible for, each other."

The focus shifts from degrees of progress and service to the *unmet needs*, to the things still to be done. This is the significance of the Declaration of the Urban Coalition representing major industrial, financial, labor and civil rights forces led by Henry Ford and David Rockefeller which sounds an alarm and calls for a million new human service jobs. This is the meaning of the finding of the National Committee on Civil Disorders—a bipartisan Commission which included the Governor of Illinois, the Mayor of New York City, the head of Litton Industries Inc., and the Chief of Police of Atlanta, Georgia—that "only a greatly enlarged commitment to national action—compassionate, massive and sustained, backed by the will and resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on the earth—can shape a future that is compatible with the historic ideals of American Society."

For rehabilitation, this changing focus and emphasis is acutely relevant for it is increasingly clear that rehabilitation of the disabled cannot advance in isolation from the social and economic strains, problems and convulsions which challenge our country today. These new developments are significantly reflected—as we shall see—in the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and in the splendid *Report of the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation*. These changes arising in these troubled times add to the traditional mission of rehabilitation in several very difficult and very challenging ways:

First.—New quantitative dimensions shift emphasis from satisfaction that 207,000 persons were rehabilitated in fiscal 1968—the long waited 200,000 barrier was broken—to the fact that over 300,000 new physical and mental disability cases needing vocational rehabilitation went unattended and a backlog of over 5 million unserved mentally and physically handicapped persons continued to grow.

Second.—A new emphasis and a new mandate is given to reach and service adequately the toughest cases, develop on-the-job training and employment contacts with private industry for handicapped workers, to extend followup services and attention after initial job placement, to provide services to families of the handicapped, and to raise

to a new level the vocational and work adjustment services of rehabilitation.

Third.—The experience, processes and resources of vocational rehabilitation are now to be extended beyond the traditional physically and mentally disabled to serve the needs of those suffering socio-economic handicaps which limit employability.

Fully implemented, this new legislative mandate will make vocational rehabilitation a central factor in the toughest and most intractable part of our national manpower, urban, and anti-poverty problem—the vocational rescue of the hard-core unemployed. This is a new ball game for VRA with new rules, and new methods of scoring. Is VRA ready—if not, what needs to be done to get ready?

Finally, a significant new approach to the manpower needs of rehabilitation is opened by the provision for "new career" employment and training projects aimed at increased utilization in a radically new way of nonprofessional workers recruited from the handicapped of all categories and from the general working force. Building on the existing experience in rehabilitation in the utilization of support personnel, this new Amendment adds an important new qualitative and quantitative dimension to the manpower supply program of the rehabilitation services.

These enormous enlargements of the rehabilitation mission have been gestating in the developing work of vocational rehabilitation during the recent years—they are now made specific and formal in the 1968 Amendments. They suggest that a major transformation under way for rehabilitation:

In size—from a program which spent \$116 million five years ago to a program already authorized by Congress in three years, in 1971, to start spending around \$1.25 billion annually.

In content—from a well conducted but relatively small program performing magnificent services for a special group of especially needy persons, to a major program in the center of the socio-economic storm, significantly involved in the labor market, in the antipoverty, ghetto, minority participation, and urban decentralization problems that stir our society.

This expanded and changed role of vocational rehabilitation is not the product of any special bureau or service agency drive for expansion—in spite of the fact that distinguished Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW, Mary Switzer is the most legislatively charismatic government official appearing before Congressional committees. It is growth that has not been sought and certainly not contrived, but is rather the inevitable consequence of public policy and program experiences which have validated the rehabilitation philosophy and process as the best way to meet many of our most difficult human problems. This growth is, really, a price paid for success.

There is a gratifying inner consistency between the developments I have briefly outlined—they are rooted in the same social developments and needs and reinforce each other. Let me illustrate by discussing two of the most significant new provisions in the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968—

Sec. 15—which provides "vocational evaluation and work adjustment services" to "disadvantaged individuals" and their families; and Sec. 4 (a-1-6) which provides grants for programs to utilize "New Career" nonprofessional manpower in vocational rehabilitation.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR THE SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

In an entirely new provision, Section 15, Congress has authorized \$50 million during the current fiscal year (\$75 million next year and \$100 million for fiscal 1971) for grants

to the states to cover 90 percent of the cost of "evaluation and work adjustment services furnished to disadvantaged persons." This new term "disadvantaged persons" has long been familiar in manpower and anti-poverty programs. Here it is defined to add to the familiar VRA target population of "individuals under a physical or mental disability" the following:

"Individuals disadvantaged by reason of their youth or advanced age, low educational attainment, ethnic or cultural factors, prison or delinquency records, or other conditions which constitute a barrier to employment." In addition, services are to be furnished "other members of their families" whose needs affect the rehabilitation prospects of the client.

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

Two basic observations can be made regarding this new legislative provision:

First. The definition of disadvantaged persons now included in the VRA program is a complete and clear description of what is generally referred to as the "hard-core" unemployed—the residual section of the counted or potential labor force remaining unemployed after 9 months of economic upswing with the official unemployment rate at 3.5 percent and 2.8 million reported as unemployed. It is the employability and employment—the vocational rehabilitation—of this residual group which is the main problem and the main purpose of existing manpower and human resource programs. It is this "hard core" unemployment which is described by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders as "the most persistent and serious grievance" in the urban ghetto.

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

There was an enlightening written exchange in the Senate VRA Amendment Hearings this year between Senator Jacob Javits of New York and Commissioner Joseph V. Hunt of the Rehabilitation Services Administration. The Senator raised a question based on the observation of two of the nation's most expert manpower authorities, Dr. Sar A. Levitan and Dr. Garth Mangum that "It becomes increasingly difficult to differentiate vocational rehabilitation, either in clientele or services, from other manpower programs." Commissioner Hunt very appropriately described the difference between the manpower and the vocational rehabilitation programs, particularly as they have operated in the past. But Mr. Hunt also described the developments, especially in the manpower programs, which have moved them towards the vocational rehabilitation process. When these manpower trends are added to the trends, and now the legislative mandate, in vocational rehabilitation it becomes clear that the Levitan-Mangum description of the tendency towards the convergence of VRA and manpower is increasingly accurate.

There can be no doubt that the extension of vocational rehabilitation services to the socio-economically disadvantaged is a highly significant and calculated expansion of VRA by Congress. The *Report of the House Committee on Education and Labor—Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968*—states:

"The Committee would like to emphasize its strong endorsement of the extension of serv-

ices to additional people in ghettos as well as to the rural poor. The committee believes that it is extremely important that the program of vocational rehabilitation be expanded in this direction. Now, especially in the light of the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, it is vital that these disadvantaged people receive increased attention. They should be able to look to the rehabilitation program as one of the resources available to them and to know that it is ready to serve them whenever possible. This includes the full range of vocational rehabilitation services to disabled ghetto and impoverished rural people, and evaluation and work adjustment services to all such persons. Broadening our capability to serve all the disadvantaged will make rehabilitation evaluation services available to individuals in the several multiagency programs in order to determine a plan of action through vocational rehabilitation or through other programs."

After emphasizing the entire range of vocational disabilities, the House Committee said:

"The vocational rehabilitation agency, with long and successful experience in providing comprehensive (vocational evaluation and work adjustment) evaluation services to its clients, is the best equipped by working philosophy and experience to provide these kinds of services."

If underlining is necessary, it should be noted that the Committees of Congress, the House and Senate Labor Committees, assigning this increased responsibility to Vocational Rehabilitation are the same committees which handle all national manpower and anti-poverty legislation.

It should be noted that the treatment of socio-economic disabilities in the 1968 legislation is significantly different than in the VRA Regulations which applied the 1965 VRA Amendments and defined "behavioral disabilities" as "deviant social behavior or impaired ability to carry out normal relationships with family and community which may result from vocational, educational, cultural, social, environmental, or other factors." For one thing, the new extended definition is now spelled out in the law and the legislative history of the law. Moreover, as Commissioner Hunt effectively pointed out to Senator Javits in the 1968 Hearings "new language is needed in order to allow evaluation services to disadvantaged persons." That language is now supplied.

If any confirmation is required to establish the fact that this vast new thrust for VRA is a profoundly serious and deeply rooted development, it is furnished by the *Report of the National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation*. Headed by Dr. Howard Rusk and including in its membership, its subcommittees and its collaborators, the most authoritative persons in vocational rehabilitation, this *Report* states

"Vocational rehabilitation, with its history of service to handicapped people, needs a law and implementing regulations which are straightforward in their intent to serve all those who are vocationally handicapped, regardless of the cause. Many of our citizens, in addition to the physically and mentally disabled, are socially and culturally disadvantaged, the public offender and the illiterate are included in this larger group. Vocational rehabilitation has always had a vocational focus and should continue to do so. The major thrust of the program should be assist individuals to achieve a measure of economic independence commensurate with their potential, regardless of the nature or origin of the handicapped condition."

To this end, the *Report* calls for "a substantial increase in Federal funds" to permit State agencies to enter this new field of services "without doing it at the expense of the severely physically disabled."

The "die is cast." A whole new and radi-

cally different dimension has been added to vocational rehabilitation. Now the tough questions—and the tough challenges—have to be faced!

Is vocational rehabilitation ready to take on this new obligation—at the Federal, State and local levels, at the governmental and the voluntary agency levels? Are the traditional resources and processes of rehabilitation "ready, willing, and able" to deal with a new target population that is drastically different in background, motivation, and handicap?

To what extent are the attitudes of rehabilitation staffs "middle class", oriented to well motivated handicapped individuals, and to a case by case psycho-therapeutic approach rather than to poor, ghetto, black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican Americans with socio-economic disabilities that have destroyed motivation and created deep alienation to work and society? How ready is rehabilitation to apply what C. Wright Mills called "the sociological imagination" to the treatment of the hard core poor and unemployed, the slum youth and delinquent, the "career" welfare case, the dope addict? How much bias and prejudice, subtle and even unconscious, will have to be rooted out of rehabilitation staffs in order to really do this new job?

How does rehabilitation proceed so as to not diminish in any degree—actually to increase greatly—its traditional service to the physically and mentally handicapped while at the same time assuming this huge new responsibility that Congress and "the march of time" have thrust on all of you and your colleagues?

What changes have to be made? What research is necessary—what new planning—what new demonstration and pilot efforts are required to chart and take this new course? What has to be done?

These questions have to be asked. They are easy to ask, but hard to answer. Looking for some answers is a major goal of this NRA Conference. While I can join you in posing these problems, I must be very modest about my ability to provide answers. I must be modest for the reasons suggested by Winston Churchill who responded to a remark that his political rival Clement Attlee was "a very modest man" with the observation "He has much to be modest about." But let me make a few comments which relate to these questions.

The present developments reflect trends and changes both in the anti-poverty and manpower programs, and in the rehabilitation program.

The manpower programs have slowly learned some basic lessons. They have learned that the socioeconomic wounds of ghetto, racist, and poverty life are deep wounds, traumatic injuries which cannot simply be wiped away by traditional manpower training, superficial refresher courses, and the employment opportunities that come with "national prosperity." This lesson has been painfully taught by the failure of existing manpower programs to meet the problem of "hard core" unemployment. It is a point emphasized in 1964 by Gunnar Myrdal in *Challenge to Affluence* when he said that an important part of American unemployment was structural resulting from the fact that poverty, poor training and education, and previous unemployment had "destroyed" a part of the labor force.

A second lesson is that the "hard core" jobless have multiple wounds, that poverty, physical deficiencies, low education, lack of training, alienation, psychological disabilities, age and race and cultural problems, are all bound up together.

As a consequence of these experiences, manpower programs have increasingly had to move to more intensive and continuing attention to the unemployed on a case by case basis.

Moreover, it has been necessary for man-

power programs to provide comprehensive and integrated services to the jobless, to add a whole range of remedial and supportive services to the traditional activities of training and placement. These are basic service moves by manpower toward vocational rehabilitation methods and content of service. These moves have been forced by experiences. As Dr. Mangum and Dr. Glenn observed in their recent report *Vocational Rehabilitation and Federal Manpower Policy* the manpower and antipoverty agencies "were largely unaware of SRS's existence . . . Until attempts to attack the employment problems of the various disadvantaged groups reached deeply enough to demonstrate how entwined ill health and mental and emotional maladjustments were with social and economic handicaps."

Similarly, vocational rehabilitation is called on to change—or perhaps it is better said "to add to"—its arsenal of services. While preserving the quality of its case by case multi-service case, VRA now must move into an area where the usual psychological tests do not apply—indeed they may be perverse—where the usual physical therapy and some aspects of counseling will not apply. It now becomes necessary to go beyond attention to "individual pathology and personal failure" or handicap into consideration of social and political factors.

The views of John Martin, Father Fitzpatrick, and Dr. Gould in the new HEW Office of Juvenile Delinquency publication *Analyzing Delinquent Behavior: A New Approach* suggest the needed change, and what they say applies to the entire area of socio-economic disability.

"A revolution is stirring in national thinking about crime and delinquency. Instead of the old emphasis on changing the individual offender, the new movement stresses changing the manner in which various social institutions relate . . . to him . . . Leaders of the new movement . . . see the need to reform social institutions through community action, and to win fair decisions for the poor as just as important as the use of therapy, casework, and counseling . . . (they) take a structural view of causation and seek to introduce at the individual case level an interdisciplinary perspective with a heavy social science emphasis." This suggests a new approach for vocational rehabilitation in its new mission.

Both private industry and government agencies have learned some important lessons in the recent experience with the hard-core unemployed—the socio-economically deprived. For one thing, new human resources have been uncovered. Once initial handicaps are uncovered, private employers are reporting amazement that workers previously looked upon as "beyond the pale" for employment have exceeded expectations and come up with work and turnover records about the same as regular new hires.

It has been found necessary to change personal methods of operation and to struggle against biases and bureaucratic inflexibilities in hiring and training. Companies have found that old hiring standards were unrealistic, unrelated to actual work requirements, and grossly discriminatory. They have found that commonly accepted tests were totally unsatisfactory. A struggle has been necessary to change the attitudes of supervisory staff, personnel staffs, and even other workers in order to make it possible to utilize the "hard-core" jobless. The Federal and State Employment Services have had to devise new tests, new personnel, new methods, and decentralized service locations in their effort to relate to the poor, minority, slum population.

The experiences of the Office of Economic Opportunity especially in its Community Action Program, have illustrated the great potential for "human reinforcement" amongst the poor, as well as the need for

new methods of work to realize that potential. There is a powerful drive both for increased participation of the clients—the poor, the handicapped, the disadvantaged—in planning their own and their families' "rehabilitation" and in having a major part in its realization. The drive for decentralization to bring human services closer to the people has deep roots and will inevitably be a major factor in the development of rehabilitation's new programs.

Experience has shown that the socio-economically deprived present a complex and varied problem. Some of the "hardcore" dissolves when washed with opportunity, some of it dissolves when the solvent of more care and new methods is applied, but for some of the "hard-hardcore" we have yet to discover the solvent formula.

Obviously, VRA cannot deal with this huge problem alone. The new mandate for rehabilitation makes imperative a new level of linkage with other human resource and service programs, agencies, and departments at Federal, State, local, and neighborhood levels. Much will depend on how well this coordination can be effectuated. This new challenge calls for new relationships with the new services from the voluntary agencies which so often represent the increasingly crucial community tie. With this enlarged effort there is an increased urgency for each State to raise its sights, to go beyond simple matching of Federal funds, and create the ways and means for VRA to play a major role in State plans for human resources, for elimination of poverty, and end the human blight of the ghetto.

#### NEW CAREERS

The New Careers amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is intimately related to the new dimension of rehabilitation service. The new supply of manpower which the New Career program can open up is absolutely necessary if vocational rehabilitation is to meet its new service obligations. This is true, obviously, because more people will be necessary. But even more important than numbers, a new type of rehabilitation staff recruited from the disabled and disadvantaged is now required and can be supplied by the New Careers program.

The Special Projects section of the 1968 Amendments:

"Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to '(C) make grants to State vocational rehabilitation agencies and other public and private nonprofit agencies to enable them to develop new programs to recruit and train individuals for new career opportunities in order to provide manpower in programs serving handicapped individuals and to upgrade or expand those services.' And (D) specifically calls for such grants 'to recruit and train handicapped individuals to provide them with new career opportunities in the fields of rehabilitation, health, welfare public safety and law enforcement, and other appropriate public services employment.'"

The Reports of both the Senate and the House Labor Committees discuss this New Career provision and significantly establish the legislative intent of the New Career amendment as follows:

"New Career opportunities—The committee recognizes the outstanding work being accomplished by the professionals in vocational rehabilitation. It also acknowledges that a disproportionate amount of their time is occupied by routine and clerical duties. In order to alleviate this condition and at the same time upgrade and expand existing services for nonprofessionals, funds have been authorized to be made available through grants to agencies working with the handicapped. In meeting their manpower needs, agencies should not be limited to employing handicapped individuals but should draw

from the entire population of potential workers.

Furthermore, with this provision the committee seeks not only to fill manpower needs but to promote job development which offers new career opportunities and the promise of advancement. Grants should be allotted on the basis of the degree to which the new positions enhance an agency's capacity to improve services and the employee's potential or vertical progression.

The committee in recognizing the further needs of the handicapped has also included a new grant proposal for the recruitment and training of handicapped individuals in order to provide them with new career opportunities in the varied fields comprising public service employment."

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

The New Career program was initiated legislatively in the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. The New Career Amendment was sponsored in the House Education and Labor Committee by Congressman James H. Scheuer of New York City. In 1967 Congress reconfirmed the Scheuer Amendment and refined the language of the law providing for work and training programs which included:

"Special programs which provide unemployed or low income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;"

This is the basic, and official, statement of what Congress means by "new careers." It is the definition spelled out by the committees which wrote the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968 and the New Career provisions they contain. The House and Senate Labor Committee Reports on the 1967 Economic Opportunity Act "Amendments" underline the very special and particular meaning Congress has given to its "New Careers" legislation. The Senate Labor Committee Report, emphasizes its concept of New Careers in a special section:

"Primary emphasis is upon training which will lead upward on a career ladder. The first step would be work under professional supervision at an entry level job with supplementary education, including basic education if necessary and enrollment in courses at training institutions. The second step would be the performance of work assignments requiring greater skill, emphasizing on-the-job training. The third step would be

a permanent position on an agency staff, with certification as necessary, such as for a practical nurse, an occupational therapist, an assistant teacher, a patrolman, and other civil service positions . . . It will not be easy to break down traditional barriers, such as civil service regulations and professional "standards," which block the disadvantaged from moving into public service occupations, but considerable effort must be made in this regard if the program is to succeed."

The House Report, somewhat critically, states "The need to create new careers with advancement opportunities was additionally stressed in the 'new careers' program. The committee notes that 'new careers' projects have been funded which provide only the most superficial attention to the career ladder concept of the requirement that permanent jobs be available at the end of training. The committee expects the Labor Department to act decisively in correcting these situations." The Labor Department which administers the Scheuer New Career program, responding at least in part to this admonition, early this year issued tough new guidelines for its "New Career State Plans" designed to enforce the Congressional intent by assuring that the plans provided clearly specified "Career ladders and lattices for upward and diagonal job mobility," restructured job specifications of both professionals and non-professionals, guaranteed "career development training resources" including on-the-job training and "compensated time for other career advancement training," and permanent employment.

I have gone into this detail purposely at some forensic risk to make perfectly clear that in the New Career provision "something new has been added"—in VRA something very important, very big, very difficult, and very promising has been added.

New Career program is responsive to three major aspects of vocational rehabilitation:

First. It is essential to help meet the enormous manpower shortages in the rehabilitation services. These shortages are well documented and well known. They have already limited the necessary expansion of rehabilitation and promise—unless drastic action is taken—to gravely curtail work in the future. As the Advisory Committee says in its excellent summary "Finding and Training the Manpower," the "quantitative (training) accomplishments . . . seem . . . at a dangerously low level in view of the estimated numbers needed." Perhaps anticipating the New Careers legislation not then enacted, the Advisory Committee called for "recognition of the tremendous need to augment health manpower shortages through training of auxiliary personnel;" and for "intensive recruiting efforts to minority and economically deprived groups, emphasizing opportunities for status and advancement in the professions associated with rehabilitation."

Second. The new careers program fits into efforts to direct rehabilitation services increasingly into the ghetto, to the non-English speaking population, into the community and neighborhood on a decentralized basis, and to the socio-economically disadvantaged. Dramatic experiences in other human service fields are revealing the enormous capacities represented by "new careerists" and their ability to bring new and unique levels of communication, understanding, and service. We are finding that offenders can be used effectively in corrections and juvenile delinquency programs, that former narcotics addicts can help other addicts, that a person who reads at the eighth grade level can teach someone who reads at the 4th grade level—and incidentally learn himself in the process—that a welfare mother can serve well in the welfare system. The time has come when human services can no longer be given a simple "do good to the poor", on a

"for them" basis—but must proceed on a "by them" basis with professionals serving as partners rather than as commanders. New Careers meets this need. We are learning that New Career personnel can be more than helpful—New Careerists are proving essential to meet the new quantitative and changing qualitative demands of the human services.

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

"New Careers" is of special significance for the Social and Rehabilitation Services of HEW, since SRS integrates the Department's concern with welfare, juvenile delinquency, children, the aging, and rehabilitation. Welfare recipients have already proven to be one of the most fruitful sources of New Career personnel. SRS can expect effectively to combine its interest in jobs for welfare recipients and delinquents with the job opportunities which can be opened by the New Career program in rehabilitation.

It should be noted that there is an enormous growth under way generally in the New Careers program. Since the concept was originally popularized in 1965 in Frank Riessman and Arthur Pearl's *New Careers for the Poor*, and since the original Scheuer Amendments in 1966, some type of "New Careers" amendment has been added to most major legislation in the human service area. Much research, analysis, evaluation, and experimentation is under way on the many problems and alternatives confronted in implementing New Careers programs. A national organization of professionals and nonprofessionals active and concerned with New Careers has been set up. Within HEW, explorations proceed regarding the closer coordination of New Career developments in education, health, welfare, corrections, and surely now, rehabilitation. Just a short time ago, the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Manpower Research established a subcommittee on New Careers research with Dr. Bernard Yabroff of the HEW office of Education as Chairman to enhance inter-departmental coordination as this program expands.

Of course, there are many problems connected with New Careers. It cannot be an "instant" program. Careful research, planning, and experimentation are essential to make sure that "New Careers" enhances human services and validates the role of the professional. There has been enough experience to temper the early euphoria and excessive expectations some New Career advocates have expressed. But that experience has also confirmed the enormous potentialities and the vital contributions which New Careers can bring to the human services and to the workers involved. In the 1968 New Career amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Congress has directed the rehabilitation services to a new undertaking of crucial importance to their expanded mission.

Passing reference must be made to several other important areas of new emphasis where vocational rehabilitation relates in a larger role to this troubled world:

1. Rehabilitation becomes much more concerned and related to the general labor market. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee concerning rehabilitation counseling curriculum was for "greater emphasis on nature and content of jobs, job families, interrelationships of jobs, structure of industry, techniques of placement, practical aspects of the world of work, how to get labor market information and selective placement techniques." This really applies to all levels and phases of vocational rehabilitation.

Vocational rehabilitation, as its target population grows in number and complexity, becomes increasingly dependent on a high general level of economic activity—on prosperity and a "tight labor market." As the perceptive Dr. Rusk wrote in the *New York Times* early in 1962 the generally high unemployment rate then had a grave effect on jobs for the handicapped in spite of progress in the service itself. A return to jobless rates of 5 or 6 percent would have a disastrous effect on vocational rehabilitation.

It is significant in this connection that powerful and responsible influences are increasingly advocating that the government must become the "employer of last resort" to guarantee jobs for all. It is important to analyze how this trend can and should relate to sheltered workshops and subsidized employment for the physically handicapped—especially given the new interest of rehabilitation in the "hard-core" unemployed.

2. Increased critical and analytical attention must be given to the quality of vocational placements and to the longer range follow-up. Significantly, a research report just completed by the Jewish Occupational Council has effectively demonstrated that "a continued counseling process after completion of work adjustment training adds significantly to the ability of handicapped clients to secure and maintain employment." In the manpower programs we have learned that "a job" is not enough. What kind of a job? under what conditions? how close to the workers capacities? What chances for advancement? These become crucial job development and placement questions. We know that the activists in ghetto disorders mostly have not been unemployed, but rather underemployed in menial, frustrating, undesirable jobs. We have learned that manpower training programs have proven futile, dropouts excessive, and placements transient where the quality of the job was disregarded. Can we be sure that greater care in this respect is not necessary to avoid the danger of locking handicapped persons with their relatively limited vocational mobility into such deadly and unnecessary occupational frustration?

But to conclude—  
Vocational rehabilitation moves into this troubled and changing world with a significant new legislative mandate given by a unanimous Congress. No social program has commanded such legislative approval so consistently. But the Advisory Committee Report says that "in this time of social crisis and upheaval, rehabilitation should become controversial." I am sure we all hope that the purposes and the quality of the work done by the rehabilitation services will continue to have the unanimous support of every responsible person in and out of Congress. But advocacy—and with advocacy, controversy—will surely be required to meet the new challenges rehabilitation now confronts.

It is necessary to become an advocate in the battle of resource priorities—of appropriations and program size. Would it not have been better this year to have had a doubled VRA appropriation with a vote in the House, let us say, of 250 to 185 rather than to have the actual unanimous vote for the allotted \$369 million?

As suggested earlier, it is gratifying that in fiscal year 1968 207,918 persons are reported as rehabilitated in VRA's programs. In 1962, Mary E. Switzer wrote:

"Looking ahead to the day when 200,000 men and women will be made whole in 1 year and will be functioning members of our society in the fullest sense is like looking through a telescope to the most distant star—like the dream of scientists planning for the conquest of the moon, or even the more mysterious dream of starting plant life

on Venus. We know we can and will reach that 200,000 goal because we are halfway to it."

So here we are—beyond 200,000—but Miss Switzer's statement appropriately appeared in an article titled "The Work Is Never Done." It is sobering to remember that the goal of 200,000 rehabilitants was set by President Eisenhower in his 1954 health Message—and that goal was to be achieved in 1959, not 1968. Today our goal is that all handicapped persons will be served by 1975. Yet there is a backlog of 5 million persons plus a yearly addition of some 300,000 persons needing rehabilitation who are not now being served. To dissolve this backlog and serve all the new cases during the next 7 years to 1975 will require that approximately a million persons be rehabilitated each year. This is five times the present program. To achieve the stated goal by 1975 will require annual expenditures of about \$2 billion for vocational rehabilitation. These are rough calculations which make no adjustments for new services to the socio-economically disadvantaged.

Two billion dollars a year for vocational rehabilitation? Impossible—inconceivable—unrealistic—visionary! But is it—can it be permitted to continue that our goals are merely fantasies and dreams? We are in the midst of spending \$43 billion to beat the Soviets to the moon—and over \$30 billion each year is spent in the war in Viet Nam. The U.S. Ambassador to India, Mr. Chester Bowles, recently worried in the *New York Times* about our failure to come to grips with our domestic crisis and called for "a new economic order of battle" with new priorities for use of our "stupendous national income to fight our grave contemporary social problems." And speaking for the Urban Coalition before the Republican National Convention Resolution Committee, John Gardner called for the resources programs, and commitment necessary for "a far-reaching effort to build a better America, not just to the emergency measures that we surely must take immediately but to the long-term task of transforming our society."

In this setting and in this spirit, vocational rehabilitation confronts the challenge to enlarge its services to new numbers and classes of needy Americans, to build its skills and resources for the task, and to advocate the priorities for our country which will make full rehabilitation by 1975 a reality. Shall we duck this challenge and stick to the safer, more comfortable, and splendidly popular traditional role of vocational rehabilitation? Or shall we grasp the moment with all its import?

The effort will be worthy of the better natures of us all:

As professionals and nonprofessionals eager to use our talents, training, and energy to confront the difficulties and urgent needs of our people;

As citizens seeking to aid our country as it confronts tough dangerous problems;

And above all, as human beings concerned and compassionate about the well being of our fellows in the society of man.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply touched over the passing of one of our country's greatest leaders. The entire world is paying tribute to the late

Dwight Eisenhower for the great leadership he gave, not only the United States, but the entire world during the time we were giving our lives to preserve peace in the world. I think General Eisenhower was unanimously liked by the generals of all the armies in the world when he was the commander in chief during World War II when armies from many countries served under his command. We all know that he did the best he could to solve some of the numerous problems confronting this country during the time he was President of the United States and his service shall be long remembered. As a Member of Congress during the time he was President, I did not always agree with everything suggested by the Eisenhower administration. However, I never at one time doubted the President's sincerity and his extreme desire to keep this country solvent and at peace with the world.

We must all admire the great fight he has made over the years in conquering numerous heart attacks and other types of illness which would have taken the life of an ordinary citizen. His fight to live was equal to his fight to keep peace throughout the world during the time he was serving as commander in chief of all the armies and as President of the United States. I am certain that everyone will agree that this country is a better place to live by having General Eisenhower serve as one of our military leaders and statesman. My heart goes out to his wife and son and his brothers.

#### THE PASSION OF GREECE TODAY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1969, I placed in the RECORD an article by George Anastaplo entitled "Greece Today and the Limits of American Power." That article dealt with the present realities in Greece, and the foreign policy options with which the internal political situation in Greece presents the United States. Since placing that first article in the RECORD, I have been fortunate enough to obtain two additional articles by Mr. Anastaplo. One short piece consisting of selections from an address to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. It is useful for the brief glimpse it gives of the situation which existed after 1 year of military rule in April 1967. The second and longer article, "Retreat From Politics: Greece, 1967," gives an excellent, balanced presentation of how Greece appeared to an experienced and knowledgeable American observer who saw it firsthand during 1967.

The articles referred to follow:

#### THE PASSION OF GREECE TODAY

(By George Anastaplo)

"So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said."—Exodus 18: 24.

We find ourselves this Wednesday afternoon at midpoint in the Great Week—the

*megali evdomada*, the Holy Week—of the Greek Orthodox church year. This coming weekend, on April 21, the Greeks celebrate not only the first anniversary of the seizure of power by a handful of Army colonels but also the "fair and radiant festival" of Easter Sunday; "the first of Sabbaths, the Queen and Mistress, the feast of feasts, and the festival of festivals."<sup>1</sup>

On Wednesday of Holy Week, in the services of the Greek Church, events still hang in the balance: much has already happened this week to Jesus and His disciples, but the worst is yet to come. The precarious uncertainty of things is reflected in two markedly different stories which are brought together and emphasized in the traditional Wednesday service: the betrayal of Jesus by one of His disciples is anticipated in today's service; but it is also remembered in this service, "as it has been ordained by the Holy Fathers, that there should be commemoration made on Wednesday in Holy Week of the anointing of the Lord with myrrh by the woman who was a sinner, for this occurred shortly before the Passion of the Savior."

These two stories—of the anointing woman and the conspiring disciple: of joyful liberation and impending disaster—are explicitly compared in the church service for this day of crisis:

"When the woman who was a sinner was offering the myrrh, then the disciple was making terms with the lawless men; she rejoiced in emptying out that which was all-precious, he hastened to sell Him who was above all price: she recognized the Master, he severed himself from the Master: she was set free, and (he) became a slave of the enemy...."

The Greeks have, over the centuries, compared the passion of their Country with that of their Saviour: Greece is often regarded by them, with both dread and hope, as the distinctive ethnic embodiment on Earth of the Christian drama.

Indeed, it sometimes seems that it is the nature of Greek life to be constantly in crisis, and even at that very moment of the crisis when everything hangs in the balance. It is this sense of drama that makes Greek politics both exciting and fatiguing, both tedious and engaging: it is constantly changing and yet always the same: again and again, supreme liberation beckons and ultimate disaster threatens.

Thus, the "today" of Greek life often turns out to be the Wednesday of Holy Week.

It is particularly appropriate that this be the occasion for our review of how things stand with Greece today.

Here, then, is a summary of my impressions—one American's impressions—at the end of the first year in power of Greece's military government. (I refer you, for my extended discussion of this subject, to the winter 1968 issue of the *Massachusetts Review*.)

We should not be surprised to learn that the military governors of Greece are, despite their good intentions, no more competent to assess and run the political and economic affairs of their country than twentieth century Greek politicians have been to conduct the military campaigns in which they have meddled from time to time. One curious result of the past year is that the army of Greece, our faithful NATO ally, has been seriously damaged by a handful of junior officers who consider themselves entitled to dismantle the army in their effort to retain power. (This development should move conscientious officers to try, hereafter, to keep

the army out of Greek politics. In any event, the colonels have now shown civilians how an unruly army can be brought under control, even when most of it remains unfriendly to the government in power. These two lessons could contribute to the eventual political stability of the country.)

No one denies that there continues in Greece vigorous suppression of civil liberties. It seems from afar that there continue as well the serious economic disturbances resulting from mismanagement of and loss of confidence in the economy which were evident last summer. Certainly, there is in Greece today a situation in which no one knows what to believe of what the government says and permits to be said. The longer the colonels stay, the more apparent it should be that they had no business seizing power in the first place. Even when desirable corrections of long-standing abuses have been made by the colonels, they have often been made in such a way as to induce people to remember the abuses as less significant than they had once been thought to be. The visitor is reminded of the tone and effects of a mild Communist regime.

It should be noticed, in assessing the military intervention of April 21, 1967, that during the two years of unduly publicized demonstrations and crisis prior to that coup, the gross national income of Greece continued to rise at a remarkably high rate (to the very eve of the coup), law and order were maintained throughout the country (only one Greek, a student, was killed as a result of these political agitations, and he accidentally by the police, during that 1965-67 period), and elections (not a resort to organized violence) were obviously regarded by practically everyone as the only legitimate way to resolve the constitutional crisis brought on in July 1965 by the imprudent confrontation between the King and his liberal Prime Minister.

Nothing that happened before the coup justified, in my opinion, that fear of the triumph of Communism which the colonels have made so much of to defend what they have done in subjugating the army and the country, in dismissing their political leaders and their generals, and in suppressing the King and the Constitution they had sworn to uphold. Nothing discovered since the coup supports the colonels' claims about the dangers from which they would have us believe they have saved Greece and the free world. Instead, the colonels stand revealed as patriots entangled in the Civil War slogans of a generation ago, a time for them of great sacrifice and little recognition.

The failure of the King last December to displace the colonels testifies not to the popularity of the current regime but rather to its effective use of that minority of the officer corps loyal to it. The colonels have had the advantage of a virtual monopoly of communications facilities within Greece, so much so that we here in Chicago probably knew of the King's short-lived attempt long before most of the Greek army, to say nothing of the Greek people, suspected anything was going on. The wild spontaneous reception given the King even in anti-royalist Kavalla on December 13, when he appeared there during his well-intentioned but badly-timed campaign to return Greece to constitutional government, suggests how much the silenced Greek people resent their military rulers.

Where do the colonels and their country go from here? What should the United States, which has had to be deeply involved in the affairs of Greece for a generation, do now? One's answer to such questions can further indicate how one understands the situation.

I have made, ever since my visit to Greece last summer, the suggestion that the most prudent immediate resolution of the current Greek crisis would be the return to power of Constantine Karamanlis. Mr. Karamanlis, who served as Prime Minister from 1955 to

<sup>1</sup> The four quotations in the text are adapted from *The Services for Holy Week and Easter Sunday* (published by The Greek Orthodox Theological Institute Press, Brookline, Mass., 1952), pp. 281, 272, 82, 86.

1968, is a conservative politician of proven effectiveness, a man who has shown he can exercise power vigorously without having to silence his critics. He is more apt than anyone else today to secure the support of all factions in Greece, to be received by genuine public approval (not merely by the tolerant apathy or by the silent resentment found among many Greeks today), and to be respected by his country's invaluable ally, the United States. He is remembered as the disciplined architect of the great task of reconstruction needed in Greece after the terrible destruction of both the Second World War and the even crueller Civil War which followed.

The United States should, therefore, encourage the King to call upon all Greek political personalities, both in that country and abroad, to unite behind Mr. Karamanlis. We should use our remaining influence with the colonels to induce them to surrender power, as bloodlessly as they seized it, to the one Greek politician who can still establish a stable government made up of major figures from all parties, including supporters of both the Army and the colonels. Mr. Karamanlis is equipped to get the economy back on its feet even as he promotes the social and economic reforms he recognizes his country to require. He is politician enough to know when and how to let bygones be bygones. Indeed, he can do for Greece what General DeGaulle did, in like circumstances, for France.

I do not know what is going to happen in Greece in the next few years. Nor do I know anyone who might know. It has been my opinion since last August that the early months of 1969 should see Mr. Karamanlis return as Prime Minister of his country. We may now be, that is, at midpoint of the colonels' regime: it remains to be seen which way the balance will be tipped in the effort, by us as well as by the Greeks, to dislodge the colonels from the place they have usurped in their sincere but misguided attempt to serve their country. One alternative to an anticipated return of Mr. Karamanlis to power during the coming year is the beginning of a desperate, even bloody, conflict which can do neither Greece, her friends nor the world community any good.

No one can know what would happen if such conflict should come, and it is not in our interest to find out.

CHICAGO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.  
CHICAGO, ILL., April 17, 1968.

RETREAT FROM POLITICS: GREECE, 1967  
(By George Anastaplo)

*I am very little inclined on any occasion to say anything unless I hope to produce some good by it.*—Abraham Lincoln (1862).

I have noticed in the "1968 Program for Trips Broad" sponsored by Americans for Democratic Action that "Greece which is normally included in the [Mediterranean] tour was omitted [for 1968] because of the repressive policy of its Government." I think it only fair to observe, after spending the summer there, that Greece today is no more repressive than almost a dozen of the countries that are included in the tours described in that "1968 Program": Bulgaria, Portugal, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Spain, Poland, Rumania, Taiwan, Russia and perhaps Turkey and Yugoslavia.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have visited since 1960 all these countries except Taiwan, Rumania and Portugal. See *London Observer*, August 14, 1960 (Letters to the Editor); *University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol. 30, pp. 717-718 (1963).

Certain of my publications on the subject of civil liberties may be useful to consider in assessing this article: [1] "Closing Argument," *Lawyers Guild Review*, Vol. 19 (Winter, 1959), pp. 143-164 (see 366 U.S. 82 [1961]); see, also, *American Political Science*

Review, Vol. 61, p. 783 [Sept., 1967]; [2] Book Review: Leonard W. Levy, *Legacy of Suppression* (Cambridge, 1960), in *New York University Law Review*, Vol. 39 (June, 1964), pp. 735-741; [3] "Freedom of Speech and the First Amendment," *University of Detroit Law Journal*, Vol. 42 (October, 1964), pp. 55-73; [4] "Due Process of Law—An Introduction," *University of Detroit Law Journal*, Vol. 42 (December, 1964), pp. 195-216; [5] Book Review: Shri D. Gopalakrishna Sastri, *The Law of Sedition in India* (Bombay, 1964), in *Law Library Journal*, Vol. 58 (May, 1965), p. 197; [6] Book Review: Harry V. Jaffa, *Equality and Liberty* (New York, 1965), in *New York University Law Review*, Vol. 41 (May, 1966), pp. 664-677; [7] *The Constitutionalist: Notes on the First Amendment* (a book to be published by the Southern Methodist University Press).

I set forth here how things look to me at year's end. I draw primarily on what I learned in Greece during my summer of intensive study of that country's affairs. I trust that what I have to say does not draw too much on the ephemeral, even as I reserve for the book I am preparing an examination of what lies beneath the surface of Greek life. One is reminded of the unpredictability of political developments, and especially those of Greece, when one finds virtually overnight that the King is an exile from a country governed by "his" army while Andreas Papandreou (that army's "nemesis") walks again the streets of Athens.

Greeks today, I have said, stand at a precipice. They have gotten there mainly because of their folly. They are in danger of being trapped, as we Americans have foolishly allowed ourselves to be, in a costly, ugly and ultimately purposeless conflict for which brave young men will be required to make unnecessary sacrifices.

II

It had been evident from early in the summer—I suspect it was evident in the spring—that the current rulers of Greece would not surrender power after six months or even a year. Consider, for instance, the obvious implications of the rigorous purges of the armed forces, as well as of the ministries, begun in the spring and continued during the summer. My own opinion upon leaving Greece in late August was that the colonels would stay a couple of years. I also believed that the King had handled himself reasonably well since April and that he would be useful in easing out the colonels when the opportunity came to return to constitutional government.

King Constantine tried from the beginning to secure from the colonels a promise of an early return to constitutional government. (I refer to the governing revolutionary council as "colonels," even though at least one of them was a recently-promoted brigadier and others of them were majors and perhaps captains at the time of the April 21st coup.) The

colonels did concede that a constitutional revision committee appointed in June would submit its draft constitution in six months. Nothing was said, however, about a schedule thereafter for approval of the constitution and, even more vital, for implementation of its provisions. Whether such implementation would be a return to constitutional government must remain in doubt: one would have to see, for instance, what provision is made in the new constitution both for the qualification of candidates for public office and for the composition of the electorate, to say nothing of how elections are conducted.

The sometimes quixotic character of the regime's activities did induce some to believe the colonels did not intend (or, in any event, would not be able) to stay long. There was not about their measures the mark of assurance and continuity. Decrees announced one day would be withdrawn on another (or, even more likely, simply not implemented for months, if at all). Arrests and releases from confinement would come and go in waves. This instability was dramatized in August by the five-year sentence meted out to a former foreign minister and withdrawn the morning following.

Suggestive of this instability were the press conferences conducted almost daily during the summer by Brigadier General Stylianos Pattakos, Minister of the Interior and now Deputy Prime Minister as well (perhaps the most personable member of the Government). These were informal affairs (sometimes five minutes long, sometimes an hour), conducted for the benefit of however many of us showed up in his office at six o'clock of a weekday afternoon. It was not unusual in these meetings to have announcements made which corrected what other ministers had said. The most memorable visit with Mr. Pattakos was when he (in response to an inquiry whether Andreas Papandreou had been moved from Averoff Prison) finally decided to resolve our doubts, and perhaps his, by telephoning the prison and asking to speak personally to his most notorious prisoner. The dozen reporters present edged close to the desk for the bizarre conversation that followed.

It is difficult for anyone accustomed to professionalism in the conduct of public affairs to take seriously men who carry on in this way. But one should be put on notice by this very naïveté: the usual rules of the political game are not being observed by the colonels. Certainly, their predecessors knew how the game was played—and conduct such as this from them would have been a sure sign of disintegration and imminent collapse. But disregard of the usual rules by the colonels (except perhaps in the conduct of foreign affairs) suggests, it seems to me, what is suggested by other signs as well, the intrinsic (although not even yet generally evident) radical character of this regime.

Opponents of the regime were encouraged as well by the economic difficulties encountered by the colonels during the summer. Most obvious of all, because it was there for all who know the country to see, was the marked decline in tourist trade. This was not exclusively the colonels' doing: the Israeli-Arab War and the financial restrictions in Great Britain had reinforced the effect of a coup which had taken place at the very time in the spring when large-scale bookings are made by travel agencies. Not only did people in the tourist service industries fail to enjoy the substantial increase they had come to expect from one summer to the next, but they failed even to match their receipts of the previous summer. Business was bad in many consumer industries as well: Greeks were holding onto their money, waiting to see what would happen. The same was also true in the construction industry, which had been so vital to Greek economic life since the Civil War: I talked with several engineers

I am grateful to my University of Chicago colleague, Professor William H. McNeill, a long-time student of Greek affairs, for his informed review of this report.

[Dozens of unauthorized editorial changes (some major, some minor) were made in this article before its publication in the *Massachusetts Review*, several of which it has been convenient to correct in this reprint.—G.A.]

who reported that they and their colleagues had had little to do since April 21. These developments, which may have begun in late 1966 and which may eventually require massive foreign financial assistance (especially if the significant decline in the net inflow of capital in 1967 is not reversed), had been reinforced by a recession in Germany which affected the remittances that could be sent home by Greeks working there.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Statistics from the Bank of Greece, for the period of January-September 1967 (as reported by the Greek Embassy Press and Information Service in Washington, in its release of December 5), compare for the same period in 1965 and 1966 several items bearing on Greece's chronic balance of payments problems:

	[In millions of dollars]		
	January-September		
	1965	1966	1967
Imports.....	745	841	851
Exports.....	220	259	292
Deficit in commercial transactions.....	-525	-582	-559
Surplus in invisible transactions.....	298	353	352
(a) Invisible earnings.....	(401)	(467)	(486)
(b) Invisible payments.....	(103)	(114)	(134)
Deficit on current account.....	-227	-229	-207
Net inflow of capital.....	191	217	135
Final (net balance on external) transactions.....	-36	-12	-72

One can see here that although the 1967 deficit in commercial transactions (line 3) shows a marked improvement since 1966, the surplus in invisible transactions (line 4) shows almost no change (compared to a sharp increase between 1965 and 1966 and in previous years). Exports and invisible earnings (receipts from shipowners', seamen's and emigrants' remittances and from the tourist trade) now seem to cover in Greece about three-quarters of total imports: this leaves the capital inflow critical with respect to balance of payments. Line 6 shows a sharp reduction (by about one-third) of capital inflow since 1966 (even less than the capital inflow in 1965), putting the country (despite the improvement in the deficit in commercial transactions) sixty millions of dollars further behind (for January-September 1967), with respect to net balance on external transactions, than it had been the year before.

Ominous as this set of figures seems to be, they may look better than they really are, since almost half of the nine months of 1967 here referred to are before the coup of April 21 (during which business, enjoying a steady improvement, was probably much better than it has been since). In addition, the more rigorous tone of the colonels' government may have induced Greeks to turn in to banks whatever foreign exchange they had been holding (as had been required by law under the previous regime as well), thereby permitting the government to credit to this year's account both remittances from abroad and receipts from tourists which may have been accumulated before the coup. The year-end and subsequent statistics could be instructive in this respect.

Thus, repercussions of the colonels' first year in power may be felt in the Greek economy for at least a decade. Foreign aid of perhaps one hundred to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars may be necessary in 1969 or thereafter. Unless capital inflow can be dramatically increased or massive foreign aid can be anticipated, austerity (which may already be evident in lines 1, 2 and 3) will become the order of the day. The political consequences of such austerity, and of the rise in unemployment or underemployment

It is, however, easy to overestimate the effects of economic conditions on political life. The coup itself took place at an unlikely time, in economic terms—at a time of general prosperity and in the face of prospects that encouraged businessmen to plan for increased business in the year ahead (no matter who won the elections scheduled for May 28). Political developments are immediately affected by economic conditions when public opinion is readily translated into either parliamentary maneuvers or electoral returns. But in the colonels' regime there is obviously much less sensitivity to public opinion than formerly. Besides, the colonels could claim with some plausibility that their measures were such that it would take time to exhibit the results intended.

One difficulty for the colonels, however, is that the talents that are effective in conspiracies may not be useful in more pedestrian enterprises. (The career of General George Grivas illustrates this.) One cannot successfully conspire to make an economy prosperous or a bureaucracy efficient. One cannot organize the daily life of a people the way one organizes a coup (where all must be ready before anything public can begin). In directing an economy, one must allow provisional decisions to be made, to help keep things moving. Otherwise, the machinery can grind to a halt (as happened in the construction industry this year in Greece), with long-run repercussions much more serious than the defects (such as bribery, waste and favoritism) which may be avoided by detailed preparation and supervision.

### III

An appraisal by an American of the regime in Greece today cannot rest solely on his response to the suppression there of civil liberties—but neither should such suppression be neglected.

I have since 1962 made annual summer visits to Greece. (I had been in the country in the winter of 1946-1947, while still a United States Air Force flying officer, as well as in the summer of 1960.) There was this past summer a great change with respect to civil liberties. I had not thought, when Greek friends complained before 1964 of the suppression of civil liberties under Mr. Karamanlis, that they were realistic. Certainly, one felt more free in Greece at that time than in Yugoslavia. But in summer 1967, for the first time, one could feel upon moving into Yugoslavia that one was moving from more repression to less: perhaps it had something to do with the fact that Yugoslav repression is now familiar.

I should add, however, that I myself was not interfered with this summer. I applied immediately upon arrival in Athens for accreditation as a foreign correspondent (on the basis of commission for articles received from the Chicago *Sun-Times* and the Massachusetts *Review*). I came with introductions to a number of people in all walks of life, including several ministers in former govern-

ments, whom I was able to engage in conversations several hours in length. I saw as well a number of officials in the current government. I have no reason to believe I was ever followed. I know of no one having been molested for having talked to me (although several of the people I had talked to were arrested in the days following the King's December rebellion). When I left the country, on a ship sailing by way of Yugoslav ports for Venice, I did so with a dozen large canvas bags filled with research materials I had gathered during my two-month stay. (I had been as free to move about the country last summer as during my previous visits to Greece.) Care was taken on my departure from Piraeus to make sure my name was not on a master list at Immigration—but no examination was made of my luggage. Finally, I do not anticipate that what I say here will prejudice my ability to return to Greece, and to conduct myself as I did this past summer.

There can be no doubt, however, that there is severe repression among Greeks, especially with respect to political matters. People would talk frankly to me, an American academician, but not publicly and usually only upon being assured that I would respect their confidence. (I recall only three people among the many dozens I approached who would not speak to me at all about political matters.) Anyone familiar with Greek outdoor social gatherings would have been struck as I was by the lack of any political discussion—indeed, of any reference at all to political matters—even by supporters of the regime. It was as if the life had gone out of the country.

What may be special about repression in Greece today is not its intensity but its unpredictable character; the colonels had not decided last summer just how severe they wanted their measures to be. The confusion about the recent Christmas amnesties suggests that this uncertainty continues, reflecting perhaps a deep division among the colonels themselves. It should also be observed that a number of repressive measures publicized abroad since the April usurpation were the revival of measures previously enacted by Greek governments and still on the books. There have always been features of Greek life casually accepted by citizens which seem oppressive to an American: the identity card requirements, the price control regulations, the officiousness of the police, the arrogance of bureaucrats, the callousness of army officers toward enlisted men.

One must nevertheless say, despite such qualifications, that the suppression of civil liberties by the colonels is harsher than anything the Greeks have known since the Civil War. It is not as harsh as what the Germans did—everyone would admit that. One would hear arguments, however, as to whether it was as harsh as the Metaxas regime just before the Second World War.

The press has been rigidly controlled since April. Not only has all copy had to be submitted for official examination each night before publication the following morning, but government handouts have had to be printed as news. The censors of the press have gone so far as to prescribe to editors precisely where various articles should be run, how much space should be devoted to them, even what size headlines should be used. Before the coup Athens had more than a dozen daily newspapers; by the end of the summer the number had been cut in half.<sup>3</sup>

Two of the suspended newspapers are the conservative journals of Helen Vlachou (who has recently escaped to London from house arrest in Athens). Her refusal to publish a precensored newspaper aroused first the concern and then the hostility of the colonels: her papers had been precisely the ones that many of the potential supporters of the colonels would certainly have respected before

the press has been rigidly controlled since April. Not only has all copy had to be submitted for official examination each night before publication the following morning, but government handouts have had to be printed as news. The censors of the press have gone so far as to prescribe to editors precisely where various articles should be run, how much space should be devoted to them, even what size headlines should be used. Before the coup Athens had more than a dozen daily newspapers; by the end of the summer the number had been cut in half.<sup>3</sup>

Two of the suspended newspapers are the conservative journals of Helen Vlachou (who has recently escaped to London from house arrest in Athens). Her refusal to publish a precensored newspaper aroused first the concern and then the hostility of the colonels: her papers had been precisely the ones that many of the potential supporters of the colonels would certainly have respected before

Two of the suspended newspapers are the conservative journals of Helen Vlachou (who has recently escaped to London from house arrest in Athens). Her refusal to publish a precensored newspaper aroused first the concern and then the hostility of the colonels: her papers had been precisely the ones that many of the potential supporters of the colonels would certainly have respected before

Two of the suspended newspapers are the conservative journals of Helen Vlachou (who has recently escaped to London from house arrest in Athens). Her refusal to publish a precensored newspaper aroused first the concern and then the hostility of the colonels: her papers had been precisely the ones that many of the potential supporters of the colonels would certainly have respected before

Two of the suspended newspapers are the conservative journals of Helen Vlachou (who has recently escaped to London from house arrest in Athens). Her refusal to publish a precensored newspaper aroused first the concern and then the hostility of the colonels: her papers had been precisely the ones that many of the potential supporters of the colonels would certainly have respected before

The number of newspapers no longer matters, since they have become for practical purposes virtually identical politically. This does ease the task of any student of current Greek affairs: he now need only look at one newspaper—and even one of the two English-language newspapers will do—to learn what is being said in the daily press of Athens. But, on the other hand, the task of the student is complicated by the fact that what is presented in the press is merely the officially-sanctioned surface of things. I was again and again struck by the ignorance in which previously well-informed Greeks, even prominent politicians, found themselves as a result of the control by the government over the press. Since they had to be much more careful than I about whom they talked with—I let it be known, for instance, that I was interested in talking with Greek Communists, something very hard to arrange these days—they were often unaware of the most obvious developments.

Some uncensored information about the affairs of their country could be secured by Greeks able to read the foreign press. One could freely and regularly purchase in Athens last summer newspapers and magazines published in England, France, Germany, Italy and the United States (including a number of publications appealing merely to "prurient interests"). Dealers sometimes advised customers they knew as to which newspaper had that day a long article on Greece. Information in Greek was available from radio broadcasts originating in England, Rumania, Russia and, I believe, France. But none of these sources can match, either in detail or in interest, the information about one's own country available in one's local press.

Even more disturbing than these features of the regime were the arbitrary imprisonments, both in the first few days and during the course of the spring. Everyone has heard of the detentions on the island of Yaros, the difficulties of life there, the lack of both of specific charges and of the prospect of trials. I visited the home one day of an artist who had been fearful of possible detention; his work consequently had suffered, as had his family, for three months: Guests happened to drop in while I was there, including someone who had had a spouse on Yaros since the last week in April. These were all people in their fifties—they had been active Leftists a generation ago: it was from the records of that period that most of the six to ten thousand people picked up the first few weeks (out of a population of eight and a half millions) were evidently selected. I was able on that occasion to listen in on a conversation that must have been repeated thousands of times throughout the country during those months: Has Christos been picked up? Where is he? Can medicine be gotten to Maria? Who is taking care of her children? How are you explaining all this to your own children? It was evident that the anguish resulting from these imprisonments was severe, whereas the danger thereby averted was trivial. It should be noted that these people were prosperous, middle-aged, quite successful in their professions, quite different (if left alone) from the radicals they might have been in their youth. It may be difficult to restrain such people should an opportunity for revenge come to them. Even an ordinary Athenian shopkeeper, who had told me on several occasions how

the coup. But, Mrs. Vlachou told me, she was, with this censorship, in effect, "like a ship whose water has been taken away."

A couple of newspapers that had been associated with the extreme left in Greece were promptly closed down by the colonels.

There has been considerable comment abroad on the censorship by the colonels of classical plays produced in Greece—but the evidence in support of this charge is uncertain.

much he liked things to be orderly and quiet, unexpectedly exploded one day: "This government is trying to make soldiers out of citizens. I have already served my time in the army. They are treating me—and I am 44 years old—as a recruit. . . . When this government falls, it will fall hard. What right do five or six people have to take over a country and tell everybody what to do?" I do hope that the colonels will be able to give up power as bloodlessly as they seized it, and that the families which have the bitterest grievances will be satisfied by monetary compensation for their deprivations. I also hope, however, that if resistance and revenge come, they will not be condemned abroad as merely Communist-inspired.

On several occasions during the summer I visited the court-martial conducted in Athens. One could see here the regime at its most callous. Five army officers, in uniform, would constitute the court. (The presiding officer I saw most of displayed the "sense of humor" one associates with Russian prosecutors during the Purge Trials of the 1930's.) These were run-of-the-mill cases. The offenses charged were often trivial; the self-righteousness of the court, oppressive; the sentences, savage. For every notable prisoner who attracted the attention of the European press, there must have been scores of ordinary people who came, appeared briefly in court, and were then hustled off to prison. Defendants were brought in from miles around: the jurisdiction of the Athens court-martial extended throughout Attica, into Boeotia, and to several distant islands. An old *soufaki* seller had charged a drachma too much for each stick of meat he sold; a young man, celebrating in a village near Levadia, had gotten too exuberant late one night and had assaulted the police who had been summoned to make him share the dance floor with others; a taxi driver had asked too much for a fare, compounding his error by having previously passed on to his vindictive customer what he had heard about Greece on the B.B.C. that day; some teenage boys, out fishing and swimming, had written forbidden political slogans on their caps (the court was filled on this occasion with a number of villagers who had come down to Athens to do what they could for "these good boys" who were to draw sentences ranging from two to five years); a lady had reciprocated earlier hospitality by taking in overnight an out-of-town guest without notifying the police. Little, if anything, was made of these trials even in the local papers. (Almost all Greeks I talked with were surprised that the proceedings were open to the public. I was, on the occasions I was there, perhaps the only observer present, certainly the only one taking notes.) But the effect of the court-martial on the general public was evident: people heard that infractions of various rules, old as well as new, would draw the harsh attention of the military. The year before, I had sat in on a number of trials in Athens and had found them most interesting, especially the effectiveness of the examinations conducted by the presiding judges. But the court-martial last summer was something else: I found these military proceedings most disturbing, so much so that I decided I should not spend much time there: I was afraid the trials would so anger and depress me as to make me unable to examine adequately other features of the regime. I should add that these public exhibitions have made more plausible for me the reports of secret torture one has heard from time to time since April 21.

In any event, I can understand why so many Greeks spoke to me last summer of feeling both suffocated by this regime and humiliated at the thought that Greece, at a time when the rest of Europe is at peace and becoming more liberal, should be governed in this way. They did not even have, they reported, the high spirits and great hopes of

the Occupation, but rather the despair and resignation of the Civil War. The impressions of the regime I formed while still in Greece are reflected in the exchange I had, midpoint in my visit, with Mr. Pattakos, the Minister of Interior (and effective commander, now as then, of the armored corps that had been critical in the taking of Athens on April 21). This exchange, conducted in both Greek and English, took place at his press conference of August 1 (and was published in the Chicago Sun-Times, September 3, 1967). Mr. Pattakos began the conference on that occasion by asking what the correspondents present thought of the regime. The Greeks he called upon said they did not consider themselves in a position to reply at that time. He then turned to me for an exchange which went something like this:

"Would you, if you were a Greek citizen, approve of what we are doing here?"

"Do you really want to know?"

"Yes. Would you approve?"

"Probably not."

"No?"

"No."

"Why not?"

"First, I don't like the censorship you have here. Second, I don't like what you have done in putting those people on Yaros. Third, I don't like the quite disruptive effects of what you have done in changing so many employees in the Ministries—"

"I will take care of each of your points."

"I have other objections, as well as some points in your favor."

"As for the censorship. What do you know about Greece? Have you been here before?"

"Yes."

"How many times?"

"Seven."

"You must know then what our newspapers were like before April 21st?"

"I have some idea."

"They were full of lies and slanders, stirring people up and promoting disorder. It was a terrible thing."

"I know that. But what you have now is even worse."

"You have newspapers in America provoking Negroes to kill and burn. Is not that terrible?"

"Yes, it is."

"Censorship is better than that, isn't it?"

"Those are not the only alternatives."

"But you admit that what is happening in America now is bad?"

"Bad as that is, and good-intentioned as you are, what you have here is worse."

"Now, for Yaros. What is better, that those people out there be killed by us or that they be kept alive and allowed to return home if they sign the required declaration?"

"That they be kept alive is certainly better."

"Then why do you complain about that?"

"Because for this, too, the alternatives you present are not the only ones to be considered."

"If you were to go to Yaros—"

"I have been trying, as you know, to get permission to go."

"You can go, if you like, any time you wish."

"For two or three days?"

"No, if you go, you will have to stay."

"I wouldn't like that."

"I tell you the people we have out there would have killed us."

"I have seen nothing to support that charge."

"Do you know everything?"

"No, but I have been looking hard the past month for evidence of what you say. I have found none."

"Do you know that the Chief of Police of Athens is missing an ear because of those people?"

"An ear?"

"Part of an ear."

"Whatever may have happened to the Chief of Police does not mean the 2,000 people still on Yaros would have killed you."

"That was what they were saying, that they would kill us.

"It hasn't been shown, so far as I can tell, that they were even saying that. Where are the weapons they planned to kill you with?"

"We found some.

"Where are they?"

"At the police station.

"Why have we not been shown them?"

"You can see them.

"Did you find any tanks among those weapons?"

"No, there were no tanks; nor were there any cannons or airplanes or atomic bombs.

"Then how could they kill you with the army you have?"

"One doesn't need guns to make a revolution. We didn't have to fire the guns on our tanks when we made our revolution.

"But you did have all the tanks.

"Don't you Americans remember how you criticized the English in 1945 for giving guns to the Communists here?"

"You are talking about something that happened more than twenty years ago. I am asking about what those people on Yaros have done today.

"It is all right for you Americans to fight Communists in Viet Nam—"

"A good many Americans don't think it is all right. That's another problem, though.

"But you Americans won't let us stop Communists here, so that we do not have such a war also. Which is better, to have calm as we have here now, or war as in Viet Nam?"

"This is better. But I must say again, those are not the only alternatives.

"We are stopping Communism.

"You may think that is what you are doing.

"You Americans may not like what we do, but we like it.

"You personally may like it.

"We Greeks like it.

"You," Mr. Pattakos, not "we."

"How can you know what people here like? Have you taken a Gallup poll? Have you spoken to all the Greeks?"

"No, but I have gotten some idea of what people here think.

"We will have to talk together. You have a lot to learn yet.

"That is what I am here for.

"But I can tell you this now. I know what Greeks think. And they like what we are doing.

"No, General Pattakos, you cannot know and that is dangerous for the country. People dare not talk to you as they talk to me. This I do know."

Mr. Pattakos was for some reason obliged to concede ten days ago. "I do not say that the people want us, but they do tolerate us because the situation makes it necessary."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> New York Times, December 19, 1967, pp. 1, 13. Important members of the government often did not know what was going on in other ministries: they had no ready access to information that would ordinarily be available in the local press. Chance and rumor become much more important, while efficiency suffers, in such circumstances.

My last encounter with Mr. Pattakos was at a press conference a couple of days before I left. I had to insist several times that afternoon, on the basis of what I knew from my contacts, that Andreas Papandreu (about whose health in prison some question had been raised in the foreign press) had not been examined by his own doctor. Mr. Pattakos had heard otherwise from his sources, but was finally moved by what I had said to check with the warden of the prison.

The alleged abuses which justify the coup of April 21 have been picturesquely described in the [Athens] *Estia* of December 12 (as translated in the Athens *Neos* of December 13, 1967): "It is necessary that a book [be] printed, as soon as possible, in English, in French and in German, where all the crimes that have been committed

iv

It is important, for the future of Greece, that the country (and with it the Army) learn a lesson. The story that has come down since 1949 is that the Army could not win the Civil War until the politicians were induced to stand aside and allow the military to do their jobs. Equally salutary, it seems to me, should be the story that the politicians could not properly govern the country until the Army learned from bitter experience that it is not equipped to run a modern state or even to preserve military efficiency. By the end of 1968 this should be evident to every intelligent army officer; the colonels will then have seen the result of their second year in power, the crucial period (it seems to me) for testing their social and economic efforts. This is one reason why I have thought the return of Mr. Karamanlis might better come after there has been time for this lesson to be driven home even to the Army itself.

No modern European state can prosper, especially one which requires sensitive economic and financial guidance, without the extensive cooperation of intellectuals. But Greek intellectuals are, even if only superficially, Westernized and hence liberal. They have heretofore felt that they belonged in the Government, in the banks, in the academic institutions of their country. They had seen the quality of their contribution constantly improving and the standard of living steadily rising. They had seen the country prosper for several years and they had hopes for even more progress in the years ahead.

The intervention of the Army could be seen—and indeed should be seen today in many countries of Africa and Asia—as an effort by disciplined, trained and technically-competent personnel to bring order and rationality to primitive conditions. But this view of the Army's role is difficult for the Greek intellectual to accept for his own country. Greece is certainly poor; but she is not primitive. The army officer is not regarded

against the country since 1944 will be listed, as briefly as possible, but without any omissions: Naturally, precedence would be given to Mr. G. Papandreu's frauds against Winston Churchill and King George II, and then would follow the bloody orgy of Communism and its fellowtravellers, the unconstitutional and illegal imposition of the 1952 constitution, the scandals of Karamanlis and of Papandreu, the betrayal of the Cyprus struggle by the three authors of the Zurich agreements, the scandalous sinecurism of Andreas Papandreu, at the request of his father, his subsequent assault on Greece, though he was an American citizen, the systematic violations of the military rules by the two big parties, the orgy of favoritism under Papandreu's regime of virtue and science, the campaign of G. Papandreu and his urchins against the top officials of justice, the disgraces revealed during the ASPIDA trial and the two Papandreu's abusive behavior towards justice, the statements of them both in favor of Moscow and against NATO, the constant violations of the constitution at the time of both Karamanlis and Papandreu, the best known samples of illegal enrichment of people close to the previous regimes, and so many other things which, of course, we cannot remember all as we write this comment impromptu today."

A competing (but much calmer) description of this same period, by an American friendly to Andreas Papandreu, may be found in Maurice Goldbloom's "What Happened in Greece," *Commentary*, December 1967, p. 68. Another account, even more partisan on Mr. Papandreu's behalf, is Stephen Rousseas's *The Death of a Democracy* (Grove Press, 1967). Cf. Eliot Fremont-Smith, "Good Cause, Weak Book," *New York Times*, Dec. 18, 1967, p. 45.

by the intellectual as particularly well-endowed: the social origins of the officer are suspect, his training is no more than technical, and he is anything but sophisticated.

The early pronouncements by the colonels, some of them puritanical in tone, did not help matters; the colonels not only made mistakes; they made themselves look ridiculous, which (in Greek eyes) is far worse than mere mistakes. This confirmed for intellectuals what they had "always known" about the army officer. The colonels made their task more difficult by the measures they took in various ministries: wholesale suspension of civil service employees, many of them veterans of the Karamanlis Administration, not only disrupted public business but also confirmed the intellectuals' expectations about how army officers would behave. Even when desirable corrections of long-standing abuses were made, they were often made in such a way as to induce people to remember the abuses as less significant than they had once been thought to be.

I found that people who were tolerant of the colonels the last week of June had become disillusioned by the end of August. Significant in this respect was the resignation early in August of the Governor of the Bank of Greece, and of the Deputy Governor, both of them respected in European banking circles. The Governor's defection—they had remained in office as long as they did, I was told, only at the insistence of the colonels—was merely the most conspicuous of the breaks between the regime and the intellectuals of the country.

The Cyprus crisis of November suggests the extent to which the regime has made the country vulnerable. It was thought, when the coup came, that Cyprus might be exploited by the colonels to solidify behind them public support. Considerable effort was made by the colonels during the summer to arrive at a permanent settlement with the Turks, one which would permit them to go to the people and show that they had been able to do what previous governments had not. But this proved unsuccessful: Archbishop Makarios evidently would not concede enough to interest the Turks. When the November crisis came—provoked by the slaughter of twenty-four Turkish Cypriots by General Grivas's men—the colonels realized that Greece could not stand up to the Turkish threat; that is, they must have realized they could not fight Turkey with the purged army they had at their disposal.<sup>5</sup> Full-scale mobili-

<sup>5</sup> Navy and Air Force officers, who are considered somewhat better travelled, more sophisticated and less scarred than Army officers by old struggles and intraservice feuds, were not involved in the coup. I understand that the officer corps of the Navy has been thoroughly demoralized by the purges and that the Air Force officers are considered by the colonels to be completely unreliable.

Richard Eder's long front-page story from Athens in the *New York Times* of December 18, "Upheavals Shake Greek Military," began with the report, "After two bitter convulsions in eight months, the Greek armed forces have been damaged to the extent that foreign military observers believe they have lost much of their effectiveness." The report continued, on page 3, "The other day, speaking with deep distress, a senior Western military man said: 'What has happened is quite simple. A modern Western army has been turned into something on the level of what was used in the Balkan wars at the turn of the century.' He went on to say that there were not more than two or three officers left in significant command positions who had received the long, intensive training provided by service in the Korean war and in NATO staff courses. 'The men running things now,' one observer said, 'are the officers who were

zation of the reserves, which would have been ordered by their predecessors in such circumstances, would have required the colonels to arm and put in positions of trust many officers and men decidedly unfriendly to the regime. This the Turkish government evidently appreciated as it drove home a bargain which humiliated the Greeks, calmed the Turks and forestalled a possible military coup on Cyprus against the Archbishop. (The bargain itself was not unreasonable, if the Turks do not press further their present advantage, but the Greek government's moderation came from weakness, not from strength.) The humiliation, and consequent dissatisfaction, among Greeks must extend as well to some of the officers who had participated in the April coup. I found among the younger officers this summer both a readiness to identify Greece with Israel and Turkey with the Arabs and a reckless eagerness to put this identification to the test. These officers, too, may have to be either purged or safely diverted by a revival of the "Northern Epirus" question. (One should not be surprised now to see the Albanians begin to re-establish better relations with the Yugoslavs.)

What has happened in the Army—the sacrifice of military efficiency for perhaps a decade to an effort to insure the loyalty of the Army to the colonels—is merely a dramatic version of what has been evident in various (but not all) government services since mid-summer. I had occasion, just before I left Athens, to ask a team of economists at one of the Embassies what programs and policies of the new government had been successful. Their mood was by then so gloomy that they could insist that nothing had been done right by the colonels. Two of the men were Greeks—all of them had been critical, prior to the coup, of the politics of Andreas Papandreu—but they were unanimous in this assessment. What is important is that they should be this disillusioned by the efforts of the colonels—for some of them had had hopes at the beginning. Such disillusionment, and consequent disaffection, was evident among professionals and intellectuals throughout Greece.

In short, people suspected that the colonels really did not know what they were doing. But then, why should they? Mrs. Vlachou made the decisive observation on this point at the very beginning, upon closing down her press: "I cannot drive their tanks; they cannot edit my newspapers."

## v

I myself believe, however, that certain measures taken by the colonels have been salutary. Whether they have been worth the price paid for them—in the suppression of civil liberties, in the long-run distortion of the economy and of the civil service, and in the weakening of Greece militarily and politically—is another matter.

I begin with the Post Office. Strikes and slow-downs had seriously impeded the delivery of mail. Service had gotten so bad (in December, 1966) that the central post office building in Athens was said to be in danger of collapse under the weight of accumulated parcels. Mail service is now very good, the best Greece has had for several

left behind and whose main experience is 15 years of plotting." The article concluded, "This is not only a question of the reduced ability of Greek troops to fight a shooting war. It is also a fear that the Greek Army [of about 160,000 men], having lost many of its Western-trained officers and most of its morale, can no longer provide much of a stabilizing force in Greece, especially in opposition to the junta results in a rebirth of the once-powerful Communist guerrilla organization." Compare Dean Acheson's letter-to-the-editor, published in the *Washington Post* of December 20, 1967.

years.<sup>6</sup> Much the same can be said of public transportation services and, indeed, of all services that had been affected by the sporadic strikes that had accompanied the political crises of 1965-1967. Thus, there has been an improvement with respect to all services that could be improved by the mere prohibition of strikes, demonstrations and disruptive labor union practices. Such improvement is not, of course, permanent, depending as it does upon the prospect of a ruthless exercise of power by the central government. The same may be said of the colonels' suppression of bribery of civil servants.

Some of the announced reforms have been with respect to matters that political governments had not ventured to touch, but which had been generally regarded as desirable to correct. Prominent among these matters are agricultural subsidies and monopoly licenses. One cannot yet regard the announced reforms as permanent: the abuses they address may reflect Greek conditions. That is, such preference are likely to return in some form or other when political life returns, as will the quarrels and even the corruption among deputies which gave Parliament a bad name. Indeed, it is far from certain that the more critical of the announced economic reforms have in fact been implemented. It should also be observed that the colonels and their followers have in some cases substituted their form of preferment for that of their predecessors. I recall sitting at the desk of one of the officers of the government—an army major associated with the conspiracy for several years—and watching him dispense jobs in his department. Loyal officers were rewarded, either directly or through relatives seeking jobs. There was something natural and even innocent about these transactions: certainly, no attempt was made by the major to hide from me the business he had to transact before we could go out for the luncheon we had arranged. Several key appointments by the colonels, even to the highest posts in critical ministries, did not make sense until blood and marriage ties to influential army officers had been traced.

The reforms brought about either by fear among the people or by lack of concern among the colonels for the usual political considerations are not likely to endure when normal conditions return. Furthermore, the colonels have not been innovating in these matters but rather have been doing what everyone has long agreed should be done. This was more evident in the spring, which means that the colonels had their greatest effect during their first few months in power: people could immediately acknowledge certain government measures as long overdue. It is comforting, if you are a small shopkeeper, to know there will be a bus to take you home for lunch; it is comforting to find that civil servants are not as arrogant as they used to be (even though you take care to be more respectful than you have been toward the neighbor who is related to an Army officer); it is also comforting to notice that consumer prices have stopped rising (and in some cases have even been cut, by government decree), even though you doubt that employment opportunities are as good as the government keeps insisting they are.

The colonels have declined in influence as they themselves have had to innovate and as political considerations began to undermine even the obviously needed reforms they

<sup>6</sup> There was for a few weeks after the coup censorship of foreign mail. One heard often this summer of "politically unreliable" professionals and tradesmen summarily "punished" (with no charges, trial or appeal) by being deprived of telephone service. I believe several thousands may have been treated in this manner.

It was generally assumed this summer that one's telephone might be tapped.

had endorsed. They recognized from the outset the need, for instance, for decentralization of government administration. But, it seems to me, effective decentralization is possible only in circumstances where the central government is essentially of one mind with many people throughout the country, not when a handful of men holds power by force. There was evident in Greece this year the concentration of more and more power in Athens as all kinds of local civic, professional, industrial and agricultural councils (many of them elected) have been suspended or completely reconstituted. Perhaps the only one of such actions by the colonels which will be approved by their successors is the reform of the Church hierarchy, a reform long overdue, one that previous governments did not consider themselves strong enough to effect. The Synod was reorganized. The feeble Archbishop was replaced by a much younger, vigorous man who will be much more inclined than was his predecessor to modernize the Church and to come to terms with the ecumenical movement as represented by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

There remain the distinctive reforms proposed by some of the colonels, the moral and constitutional regeneration of Greece which the more radical element among the military intends to establish if the opportunity presents itself. This radical element, which seems to me egalitarian in tendency, has its roots in the people at large. It is this element which has sustained Greek Communists since the Second World War, despite all their blunders. It is this element which Andreas Papandreu, perhaps inadvertently, exploited in his meteoric career in Greece. This radical element goes deep in Greek life: it is a kind of negativism, a centuries-old longing, a fundamental dissatisfaction with the established order. It came to the surface, if only for a moment, in a remark made on April 27 by Colonel George Papadopoulos, long before he became Prime Minister in speech as well as in deed:

"As far as concerns us, we are not influenced in our actions by anyone. No one knew us. No one was known to us. No one knew who we were facing. Nowhere did we look. Nowhere did we seek help."

## vi

The opportunity for such a coup as this presented itself as the result of the efforts of practically every political figure of consequence working in Greece during the past decade. To list the principal figures of this period is to list those who played a part in creating the conditions out of which the colonels could emerge.

The figures I refer to are members of the Royal Family, leaders of the National Radical Union (which is immediately right of center), leaders of the Center Union (which is immediately left of center), and "the Americans." If any one of these had played a more prudent part, things would have been far different in 1967. It should be noticed, by the way, that all these groups are now clearly aligned against the regime of the colonels. It has seemed to me that they have been thus aligned since April.

The Royal Family made two major mistakes in recent years. King Paul (who was encouraged in this matter by Queen Frederika, a lady of considerable intelligence and energy, but not of judgment) insisted in 1963 against the advice of Prime Minister Karamanlis that the Queen and he should visit London. King Constantine insisted in 1965 that Prime Minister Papandreu could not replace his Defense Minister by assuming the portfolio himself. King Paul's action removed from office (and, in effect, from the country) the most successful Greek prime minister of recent decades. King Constantine's action attempted to capitalize upon, and may have instead impeded, the impending collapse of George Papandreu's support

in the Center Union Party. In both cases, questions were provoked about the power of the monarch under the Constitution. In both cases, also, the underlying difficulty may have ultimately been the question of the proper relation between the monarch and the armed forces. And in both cases, the action of the monarch precipitated a constitutional crisis. (It should be noticed, that is, that the constitutional issue raised by Mr. Karamanlis was essentially the same as that raised by Mr. Papandreou two years later. It should be further noticed that the colonels are taking virtually the same position that Mr. Karamanlis and Mr. Papandreou had in turn taken as prime ministers, that the monarch "should reign but not rule," that he should not interfere in the formulation and execution of the policies and programs of the Government, and that the Government should control the Army. The colonels have now shown civilians how the Army can be brought under control, even when most of it remains unfriendly to the government in power.)

We turn now to the mistakes of the National Radical Union leaders, particularly Mr. Karamanlis and thereafter Mr. Kanellopoulos. Mr. Karamanlis permitted overly-zealous supporters to organize on his behalf military interference ("The Pericles Plot") with the elections of 1961, elections which Mr. Karamanlis's party might otherwise have won honestly but against which plausible charges of fraud could be made. These charges, which led to another election in 1963, left behind sufficient bitterness to poison Greek politics for several years. (It is difficult to see how any elections conducted while the colonels retain power can escape similar charges and repudiation.) Mr. Karamanlis failed to impress upon his colleagues the fact that, in a modern democracy, it is almost as important to seem to be fair and competent as it is to be fair and competent. One cause of his difficulty in this respect may have been the remarkable fear of Communism that otherwise responsible Greek politicians (as well as the King) retain: it has clouded their judgment again and again, and has contributed to the loss of civilian control over the Army. Mr. Karamanlis's second mistake may have been to leave the country when he did without having prepared Greeks devoted to him to accept with grace the government of his critics. (Just as Mr. Papandreou seems to be made primarily for opposition, Mr. Karamanlis seems to be made primarily for ruling. No doubt, Mr. Karamanlis was exhausted from his eight years at the head of a Greek government.) One cannot know what he might have been able to do in Greece since 1963: but we do know that the most successful and generally respected Greek politician today—one might even say the only Greek politician to emerge since the Second World War—has not been available in Athens for four years. (The colonels might have been obliged to defer their coup if it had been known that Mr. Karamanlis would return for the May 1967 elections.) But, however that may be, his absence can now be turned to advantage, since he has not been associated with the passions and failures of recent years.

Mr. Kanellopoulos was the one man in Greece about whom everyone spoke respectfully to me last summer, men of the left, center and right, as well as his captors of April 21. It was generally recognized that he (as Prime Minister in April) had had nothing to do with the coup, that he had resisted it when it came, that he continued to speak harshly of the colonels (it was even said that he had reminded them on one occasion that he was "still the Prime Minister of Greece"), and that he had conducted himself honorably in the face of military usurpation. One must wonder, however, whether he conducted himself strictly as he should have when confronted by the earlier usurpation, that of the King in the summer of 1965.

Should he have refused to throw the support of his party behind the handful of deputies (popularly known as "the Apostates") who left the Center Union to form the governments called into being by the King? Should he, that is, have insisted that a respect for parliamentary government, and hence for the protection of parliamentary processes against royal interference, required his party to support (or, at least, not to attack) Mr. Papandreou in his confrontation with the King? (Mr. Kanellopoulos, it can be said in his defense, did no more in this respect than Mr. Papandreou himself had done in 1963 when Mr. Karamanlis confronted the King.) In any event, it was not good for Greece's political health that it should have been ruled for eighteen months by a handful of deputies, sustained by shoddy deals, who were neither of the majority nor even of the principal minority party but who were, at most, of what could be called the King's party. Mr. Kanellopoulos would have done better, considering the political passions in the country and the posture in which things found themselves, to have called publicly (in the summer of 1965 as well as in the winter of 1966-1967) for a government of national unity in which both major parties would be represented. (I have been told on the highest authority that there was some understanding, behind the scenes, between Mr. Papandreou and Mr. Kanellopoulos as to what would happen after the May elections—but the political depends in great part on the apparent, and the apparent was that of possible strife, something which the politically naive took more seriously than was justified.)

The most dramatic recent leaders of the coalition now known as the Center Union have been the Papandreous, father and son. (One cause of trouble within that party has been the sudden eclipse by the talented son of others who had regarded themselves as likely successors to the old man.) Should Prime Minister Papandreou have insisted in 1965, against the King's strong resistance, upon himself assuming the Defense Ministry, especially when his son was implicated (however unfairly) in the "Aspida" military conspiracy? In any event, it was a mistake on Mr. Papandreou's part to permit himself to be maneuvered out of office: for had he not threatened to resign, but had instead remained Prime Minister and addressed himself with his absolute majority in Parliament to other problems of the country (leaving the Defense Ministry problem for more favorable circumstances), the King could not have done much to dislodge him without, at the same time, providing for new elections. It seems that Mr. Papandreou overestimated the power of public demonstrations and underestimated the capacity of the King eventually to come up with a viable Parliamentary alternative (without resort to elections). To allow the issue to become one simply of the royal power, and to do so through the use of demonstrations that sounded much more fearsome at a distance and in the press than they in fact were (I saw what they amounted to in the summer of 1965), was to frighten impressionable people unduly concerned with the maintenance of order. (It should be said for Mr. Papandreou that upon being arrested he asked for Thucydides, and not for playing cards as did other politicians.)

Andreas Papandreou has had a remarkable effect on politics in the few years he has been active in Greece. He was revered by some as "the Greek Kennedy," and dreaded by others as an agent of international Communism. It should have been clear to every thoughtful observer that he was neither: he was not yet enough of a politician to be the former, nor enough to the left to be the latter. Indeed, his politics, and in some respects even his temperament, seem to be those of the Hubert Humphrey of 1948. He managed to win the adulation of a number of people,

particularly among the young and among intellectuals; he managed also to frighten a number of people in the Army and close to the throne. He spoke of curtailing Greece's reliance upon NATO, of subjecting the monarchy to review by the people, and even of forming a government (when the May 28 election returns were in) at Constitution Square, rather than having to wait on the King's mandate. He said a number of things of this tenor that appealed to the dispossessed and to the ambitious, things which were not necessary to say and which he himself probably did not take as seriously as did his enemies. He predicted the people would smash any attempt by the military to seize control of the government—and this, too, was mere talk, for there seems to have been nothing prepared to counter military intervention. He had been considered by some an agent of America, or at least too American for Greek conditions, and this he tried to refute. He managed, in the process, to alienate a number of Americans in the Embassy, people no more to the right than he is in their politics and in their economic policies. Perhaps, indeed, he was too American for Greek conditions: he did not seem to realize what the effects were of what he was saying. A more political man, one who had had to work his way in Greece to the eminence at which he so quickly found himself, would have had to learn while still young how to curb careless speech. What I have heard about his prison reflections suggests that he is now more prudent than many of his admirers abroad.

The Americans, too, have played their part in bringing things to such a pass as we find them. Not that I find it necessary to believe that the United States, or any of its agencies, had anything to do with the coup of April 21. Many, perhaps most, Greeks believed last summer that the United States (and especially the C.I.A.) was involved, partly because they thought the coup was carried off too efficiently for Greeks alone to have run it. A NATO contingency plan, to be used in case of Communist or other uprisings, was evidently exploited by the colonels. I could not find anything anywhere, however, to suggest immediate American involvement. More important, I could not find anything that requires such an explanation: the story is complete without that. We have now seen, in the efficient way in which the King's rebellion

<sup>7</sup> I was told by one of the officers associated with the conspiracy for some time prior to the coup that the military takeover began to move the evening of March 23, 1967, but was stopped for some reason at nine o'clock that night. I was also told that the April coup was timed to catch the principal military leaders of the country in Athens for a conference: they were thus not in immediate command of their units.

I have heard from a number of sources that the King and the officers loyal to him initially regarded the coup as a Communist uprising. The failure of the colonels to find any Communist weapons at all, although the Communists were caught completely by surprise, reveals how misinformed the King and his officers (loyal and disloyal alike) had been about what was going on in Greece. One unexpected result of the colonels' well-planned and superbly executed coup was to make a farce of the dreaded "Aspida" enterprise. (Greek Communists seem to me to be tired and demoralized people. One should remember that many of the enterprising young men who might once have been recruited into the Communist Party, or into the Resistance, have been for years gainfully employed in Western Europe. Many of them will no doubt express their opposition to the Colonels by reducing the money they send home to Greece and by discouraging tourists from visiting the country. *Autres temps, autres moeurs.*)

was put down by the colonels (clearly without American aid), that what certain of the colonels are good at is conspiracy (and hence, counter-conspiracy).

It was impolitic for the United States to have allowed itself in recent years to be identified in Greece as determined to impede a more equitable distribution of the growing wealth of the country. It was unfair that Greeks should have come to see the United States as interested in Greece primarily as part of its bulwark against Communism in the Eastern Mediterranean. It was short-sighted for the United States to have permitted many Greeks, and particularly the Army, to retain such an unrealistic view as they have of what Communism is today and in what the Communist threat consists. This may be how the colonels have been most influenced by the United States. Colonel Papadopoulos did proclaim on April 27:

"And we hope that by our actions and through economic progress we'll find ourselves in the position of Western European governments where Communism plays an insignificant role in the country's political life."

He should have been instructed long ago by the Americans that Greece was already on her way toward an effective neutralization of Communism. He should know that the government of Metaxas made more dedicated Communists than it suppressed.

I am sure that most Americans in the Embassy in Athens recognize that Greece's problems today have little to do with any Communist threat, either domestic or foreign. I am persuaded that they were not seriously alarmed at the prospect of Andreas Papandreu returning to power. (It should be recognized that the Government of the United States intervened honorably on his behalf when his life seemed in danger last spring.) But Embassy personnel allowed it to be rumored about that Andreas Papandreu was someone the Americans would not be able to work with and that Communism was an immediate threat to the country. Experienced politicians no doubt took such speculations for what they were worth. One could say that the imprudence displayed by Andreas Papandreu was exhibited by the very Americans among whom he had grown to maturity.

I suspect that the underlying cause of difficulty for the United States in recent years has been the lack of a clear policy for Greece. Even as late as August several officials I talked with in the American Embassy in Athens were honestly puzzled as to just what the policy of the United States Government was toward the government of the colonels. I suspect also that the United States has less influence in Greece today than at any time since the Second World War, certainly less influence than it would have had if the rumored generals' coup (which, some say, awaited only the King's consent) had seized power in the spring. When the colonels begin to exploit publicly their relative independence of American influence, and thereby to profit from the sporadic resentment among Greeks against foreign interference in their affairs, they will then have a better idea of why Andreas Papandreu spoke as he did about the United States.

There is no reason to believe that the colonels consulted with any responsible American officials about their coup. They were evidently confident that what they were doing to save and regenerate the country would meet the approval of the men who had trained them as soldiers. One found, again and again during the summer, bewilderment and resentment when Americans did not respond as the colonels thought they would.

The leaders among the colonels received their commissions around 1940, just in time to endure the cruelties of the German Occupation and the even bitterer cruelties of the Greek Civil War. They were, so far as I

could gather, men who conducted themselves honorably during the Occupation, associating themselves with legitimate resistance activities in Greece or with their country's forces in the Middle East. Most of them had come into military life from the small towns and villages of Greece, from poor, respectable families. The Army provided them an opportunity for a career, one in which both technical training and advancement according to merit seemed available. The opportunities afforded by the Army seemed to them much more sensible than those in civilian life. There is for the Greek career officer from the villages something American—that is, modern and rational—about the way the Army works. What America itself means to certain Greeks today is suggested by a conversation I had a few years ago during the course of a tour of archaeological sites. I had gone into a small town bank to cash a traveller's check—and had been struck by a majestic photograph over the manager's desk of a prosperous, self-confident and vigorous businessman. The manager, noticing my curiosity, took great pride in announcing:

"That is the greatest mind in Greece."

"Really?"

"Yes. He owns three bank chains, more than one hundred boats and much valuable real estate. And he made most of it himself."

"Where does he live?"

"In Athens; but he has homes all over the world—in Paris, London, all over."

"Do you ever see him?"

"One can see him only in Athens—and even there it is very difficult."

"Does he not ever come here?"

"Why should he come here? He has a thousand men to do his bidding."

"But can they do his looking? What about the ruins you have here from ancient times—does he not come to see them?"

"I would not know if he came for that."

"How do you know he is the greatest mind in Greece if you never talk to him?"

"By his deeds. You see, it is like America in this country."

"In what way?"

"A smart man can make money and become very rich."

The Army, too, is seen by the career officer as a community in which virtue is most likely to be rewarded.

The colonels heard dangers magnified. They saw governments fall with ease. They had little confidence in the ability of politicians to deal with the dangers about which they had heard so much. Their attitudes had been influenced by their memories of the Civil War. These officers had fought as young men in the mountains of Northern Greece: they bled and suffered; their comrades died; and all the while their leaders back in Athens were getting what they could for themselves. They learned during that cruel war to respect and to be wary of the Communists (whom they outnumbered, but whom they barely defeated despite superiority of firepower). They also learned to despise the professional politicians and the wealthy (but untaxed) cosmopolites—and the crisis of 1965-1967 gave them the opportunity and incentive to do what they thought the country needed.

The colonels—and in this they are like many other Greek army officers—believe they are the only true patriots, the only citizens (beside the great body of inarticulate, exploited poor) who truly care for Greece, who are willing to sacrifice for it. They believe that only they are capable of bringing order and moral regeneration to the country. One principle guides their thinking about constitutional reform: as Mr. Pattakos said in the spring, when asked what he would change in the Constitution. "We want to change those parts of the Constitution which permit politicians to make mistakes."

It was perhaps inevitable, given their temperament, experience and training, that the colonels should have taken as seriously

as they did what politicians said about each other. (Inexperienced civilians, on the other hand, would no doubt be terrified by battle noises that the colonels would ignore.) Matters were not helped by the Greek press, which is (with a few exceptions) about as irresponsible and certainly as inaccurate a press as one can find in the Western world. The colonels have seen rural life disintegrate, the family weakened, the customary way of doing things seriously challenged. They are determined to preserve in themselves and revive in others the virtues of their grandfathers. But they are "American" enough to want, also, to further the economic development of the country through the encouragement of foreign investment and the attraction of tourists. They reflect, in their attempt to align themselves with Western European developments and to come to terms with the modern world, the mood that drove Andreas Papandreu and his allies. They do not appreciate that the very measures they are eager to promote (including Church reform) prevent moral regeneration of the kind they long for. It is curious, moreover, that their program for infusion into the body politic of the military spirit should have had, as its corollary, the weakening of the army itself by making it far more politically organized than even the Greek army normally is.

One further anomaly should be noted: if the officer corps is to be regarded as the source of regenerative power for Greece, how can one justify the mutiny within the army by these colonels? That is, why should colonels and not the generals they overpowered lead the revolution? If the Army can be depended upon to shape true patriots, if the Army is the source of legitimacy, if the Army is (unlike the community at large) rationally ordered and appreciative of merit, why should not the leaders of the country be those whom the Army has selected and raised to the very top? If the colonels justify themselves as entitled to what they can take, then they are merely doing (despite their self-righteous talk) what the politicians they despise have done.

## VIII

The truly political man knows that he must take into account the prejudices of his people. He takes account of prejudices both by changing them when he can and by conforming to them when he cannot change them. The Army's, and to a lesser extent the people's, fear about the present Communist threat to Greece has to be moderated. This, at least, can be altered, even though the memory and hence the effects of the fierce Communist atrocities of the Civil War (prepared for by the harshness of Metaxas and by the bestialities of the Germans and their collaborators) cannot be erased for generations. The Greek politician who seeks to contain politically the Greeks' blinding anti-Communism should exploit domestically the NATO assurances. That is, politicians of the Left should consider the advantages for them of the fact of such protection for Greece: properly explained, the NATO arrangement can be used to persuade Greeks that they are free to take domestic reconstruction far more seriously than any threat, foreign or domestic, from Communism.

The Army needs reassurance. The relation between the Army and the Government needs to be redefined. The colonels themselves may need the guarantee that nothing will be done to them personally upon the surrender of power: assignments abroad as military attachés might be good for those who wish to stay in the Army. It would probably be healthy for the appropriate authority to promise a general amnesty for all offenses associated with the coup, for the Aspida and Pericles conspiracies, as well as for other activities of like nature.

I do not believe that any reforms by the colonels or by their successors will make basic changes in the Greek character or in

Greek conditions for many decades, and perhaps even for a century or two. But certain constitutional and political reforms can make that character and those conditions less serious in their immediate effects. (Various of these reforms are likely to be included in the constitution the colonels will offer the country: the reduction of the size of Parliament, the establishment of an executive power somewhat insulated from the vagaries of Parliament, the limitation and more precise definition of the King's power.) Perhaps the economic development of the country and its gradual incorporation into European life will have a moderating effect on Greek political life, even though such Westernization would be partly at the risk of obscuring in the process what is now attractive about the country and its people.

The status of the monarchy is likely to be questioned after the colonels go. Many will see the monarchy merely as an expensive prejudice of the Greeks. But it is the mark of a liberated man that he can recognize and take due account of the prejudices of those less fortunate than himself. Educated "democrats" would do better to "capture" and, in effect, direct the monarchy rather than to attack it: for no matter what they do, a substantial minority in support of the monarchy will remain in Greece for many years. It was apparent, before the ill-conceived campaign by the King earlier this month, that the King can provide a restraining influence upon men inclined to excess. The King's misadventures of July 1965 and December 1967, on the other hand, display essentially the same failings. It should now be apparent to the King that he can do his best when he is subject to the direction and has the confidence of ministers and a parliament responsible to the people.

The Left—if the liberal Center Union can be called that!—was on the verge of a major victory at the polls in 1965–1967. The colonels have certainly blocked that for awhile. But if Mr. Karamanlis does his job well, a peaceful acceptance thereafter by the country of rule by the responsible Left (perhaps in the form of Archbishop Makarios) should open a new era in Greek politics.

## IX

The colonels will go—and while they remain they may even be employed to make useful changes with which no politician would care to be identified—when it is apparent that the country has united behind leadership endorsed by the King and anticipated by everyone in Greece and out, in the Army and out, as the colonels' successor. Some would prefer to have Greeks fight (with what, it is not clear) to throw off their oppressors—but this is irresponsible romanticism, an imitation of the colonels' approach to the political problems confronting Greece today. It is impossible to foresee the consequences of such resistance today.

Mr. Karamanlis's government could prudently employ in key positions the services of George Papandreou (perhaps as Deputy Prime Minister), of Panayiotis Kanelopoulos (perhaps as Minister of Defense), of George Mavros (of the Center Union, perhaps as Minister of Coordination), and of Andreas Papandreou (perhaps as Minister of Education, the post which his father did so well in many years ago and in which imagination and experience are so much needed today in Greece). Such a coalition could be announced in advance of the restoration of constitutional government, with the understanding that it would be submitted to the people for ratification in due course. Anyone familiar with Greek politics knows that a coalition of this character would be neither as difficult to establish nor as easy to maintain as it might seem to an outsider: there is really very little difference between the policies of Panayiotis Kanelopoulos and those of George Papandreou (after

all, they like others, have shifted back and forth among political parties over the years); nor is there likely to be very much practical difference between the policies of Andreas Papandreou and those of Constantine Karamanlis. It was Mr. Karamanlis, it should be remembered, who brought Mr. Papandreou back to Greece and established him in the Center for Economic Planning. My impression of Mr. Karamanlis's social program is that he has deliberately moved (during his self-imposed Paris exile) toward such an explicit concern for the development of social services and welfare programs as would satisfy the typical supporter of the Center Union.

The influence which Mr. Karamanlis continues to command in Greece (and which I should like to see utilized in a peaceful transition from the colonels) is indicated by the fact that the colonels were obliged on December 5 to allow newspaper publishers to print Mr. Karamanlis's perceptive (though somewhat impolitic) denunciations of the government (which had appeared in *Le Monde* on November 29 and in the *Times* on November 30). His influence was evident this past summer in the respect I heard tendered him from even his former critics. Mr. Karamanlis, I suspect, would enjoy and perhaps even endorse in its entirety, the tribute of one liberal foreign correspondent of many years' experience in Greece: "Karamanlis was a right-wing S.O.B., dictatorial, and not cultured. He ran the only effective progressive government Greece has ever had." "We would upon his return spread flowers in his path," one longtime Leftist critic of his admitted to me in Delphi.

An awareness of political realities seems to me to require a public mustering behind Mr. Karamanlis of all political personalities within Greece and all friends of Greece abroad. And this in turn should induce the colonels to believe that they can safely surrender the power they have seized for the good of their country. Certainly, such a truly national government, supported as it should be by all the men and institutions that count in contemporary Greece—including the bulk of the Army, as well as the King—would then be the only legitimate government available to the country, one that could properly call upon and expect the other NATO powers, especially the governments of the United States and of Great Britain, to render all possible aid toward the reestablishment of a constitutional regime.

No matter what happens now, problems will remain and crises will return. Neither reform nor revolution can yet settle permanently the difficulties that both threaten and enliven Greece. But a breathing space can be gained, during which men would have an opportunity to make repairs, to reflect on what has happened, and (most important at the moment) to avoid the senseless killing and enduring bitterness that Greece has already had too much of.

Thus, the colonels should be induced to withdraw, taking with them the assurance that they have united all of Greece behind a government of sobriety and progress.

CHICAGO, ILL., December 28, 1967.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower we are witnessing also the passing of an era, and we are all the less for it.

This great general, this beloved man represented a time in our history in which men spoke with unabashed pride of their love for our country, in which men professed Christian moral codes because they were proud to be called Christians, in which men had no hesitancy to stand up for right because they were taught that honorable men did not deal in expediency.

He was the epitome of that era, as much the exemplification of all that makes a man great as was George Washington in his time. He ennobled mankind with his simple honesty and his strength of character.

The Nation was fortunate to have had this man as its son. He discharged with full honors every obligation imposed upon him by God, family, and country. We have stood in the shadow of a noble man and I am grateful for the opportunity.

God rest you now, Mr. President.

COMPUTERS CAN HELP IMPROVE  
CONGRESSIONAL SERVICES

HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives were privileged recently to see in the Rayburn Building a demonstration of a computer operation featuring speedy retrieval of information essential to Members of the Congress. This exhibition provided occasion for Warren Weaver, Jr., feature writer for the *New York Times*, to compose a news article discussing interest on Capitol Hill in the use of computers to improve the quality of our legislative services.

Among the forward-looking computer-orientated programs referred to by the author of this article is the legislation offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania—Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD—a measure in which I have been pleased to join as a cosponsor.

The advantages of utilizing the new computer techniques in facilitating and improving our work in this body is presented in the following illuminating article:

COMPUTER SYSTEM IS EXHIBITED FOR POSSIBLE  
CAPITOL HILL USE

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 30—The belated dawn of the computer age on Capitol Hill is threatening to put knowledge—if not necessarily wisdom—literally at the fingertips of Congress.

In a fourth-floor room of the Rayburn House Office Building, curious Representatives and apprehensive aides were lining up last week for a few minutes at the console of a computer that is a sort of hybrid television set, typewriter and duplicating machine, activated in part by touching the screen.

This \$13,500 unit is part of a demonstration authorized by W. Pat Jennings, the clerk of the House, to interest members in the whole range of new services that a broad computer system could bring.

By pressing key words on successive printed message on the screen, any operator in search of a bill can move, for example, from "legislation" to "armed services" to "combat assignment" to Representative Spark M. Matsunaga's H.R. 2098 to a concise synopsis of that measure.

SYNOPSIS IN 11 SECONDS

A rank amateur was able to produce a synopsis of the bill on the screen in 11 seconds, plus three or four seconds more for the duplicating section to disgorge a copy on paper. If the machine were fully programed, the same could be done in the same time for any of the 29,000 bills introduced during a Congressional session.

By contrast, a request by Representative William S. Moorhead through conventional channels for a copy of a bill from the House Document Room in the Capitol produced one in 43 minutes. His staff called this unusually fast service.

The demonstration computer, called a Digiscriber by the manufacturer, Control Data Corporation, could also flash on its screen in a few extra seconds a lot more facts about the bill, including its status in Congress, its history and a list of related measures.

The growing band of computer-conscious leaders on the Hill—Mr. Jennings, Representative Moorhead, a Pennsylvania Democrat, and a number of others—are hopeful that the almost magic facility of the Digiscriber will build more support for an extensive installation of automatic data processing equipment to assist Congress.

Currently, Congress is far behind. The executive branch of the Federal Government is operating some 4,600 electronic devices of varying degrees of sophistication, but there are just three computers on Capitol Hill: one in the Senate, one in the House and one in the Library of Congress.

USED FOR HOUSEKEEPING

So far, the machines are largely restricted to pedestrian housekeeping functions. The Senate restricts its I.B.M. 360 to addressing the members' outgoing mail. The House's N.C.R. 500 makes out the payroll and keeps an inventory of mechanical equipment.

At that, the results of computerization have been dramatic. According to Mr. Jennings, the House payroll, which took three weeks to prepare by hand, can be completed in 40 hours by the present computer and will take only three hours when a newer model is put into service.

The potential services that computers could offer to legislators are far more impressive. Representative John Brademas, an Indiana Democrat who is also a computer promoter, sees a future system providing:

Legislative research reports transmitted from the Library of Congress to members' offices in seconds.

Schedules of committee meetings and hearings automatically printed or flashed on screens in committee rooms and members' offices.

Status information on all Federal contracts.

A full index of all the information on file in the executive branch data banks, which could then be tapped by Congress.

Detailed analysis and background on the President's budget proposals, now almost totally lacking.

Although it may be a long time before the touch-controlled television screens appear in Hill offices, a less exotic information retriever is already in use by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is an I.B.M. printer hitched to the Library of Congress computer system.

With this machine, the committee staff records titles, digests and the status of all bills under its jurisdiction. The printer will produce any of this information in seconds after receiving an order like "GHBCHR2,"

which translates as "get, for House Banking Committee, status of House Resolution 2."

COST IN MILLIONS

What would a real computer system cost? Representative Moorhead, who is working for a single compatible coordinated system for all of Congress, estimates up to \$45,000 for design, \$1.7-million to \$2.7-million for equipment and an annual operating cost of \$1.4-million to \$1.7-million.

Pressure for action on the computer issue is considerably heavier in the House than in the Senate, apparently because Senators have much larger staffs to dig out information.

The Senate, in fact, was only provoked into acquiring its computer when the old Addressograph machine became so overburdened with lead nameplates that the mall room floor buckled.

A serious obstacle to a real computer program is political jealousy over jurisdiction. Some Congressmen want the system directed by the General Accounting Office, others by the Government Printing Office. Mr. Jennings is anxious that the House proceed to meet its needs, not wait for the Senate.

Mr. Moorhead, joined by Representative Robert McClory, Republican of Illinois, is pressing for creation of a new legislative data processing center, operated by professionals and administered jointly by the Senate and House.

There are other problems. Some committee chairmen are privately concerned that total access to information will weaken the importance of seniority, making a diligent freshman with data retrieval equipment just as knowledgeable as his superiors in the hierarchy.

Then there are the Congressional staff workers who see their status going the way of the quill and pen and the snuff box. On his way to the computer demonstration, Mr. Jennings asked one such senior clerk if he had seen the touch-controlled television apparatus.

"You know what that's going to do," the House employe replied sourly. "It's going to take my job away."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower lived a full human life; he used his great abilities in long and successful service for his fellow Americans. We have mourned other heroes in recent years: President John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Senator Robert Kennedy. How different it is when death cuts off men whose work is not yet done, whose potential is not fulfilled. While we are saddened at the death of Dwight Eisenhower, we are grateful for his long and full life among us.

He rose from obscurity in a time of crisis when leadership was needed to direct the military forces of threatened nations against a common foe. The peoples of Europe remember with gratitude how he united and organized American, British, French, Canadian, and the other Allied forces in that mighty and victorious campaign against Nazi oppression. After the war, Eisenhower continued to serve this Nation at Columbia University, at NATO, as President of the United States; a world-famous leader and a remarkable man.

He was a man of inner strength. Resolute and determined in the cause of peace and justice, he held unequalled power as Supreme Allied Commander of the greatest military force ever put in the field, and again as President of the greatest Nation in mankind's long history. Yet his strength of character was such that military and political power did not corrupt or distort his moral power—his integrity, his humility, and his respect for his fellow man.

He was a man men trusted. There was no question about his motives. He was not self-serving. His fellow Americans knew that he was totally dedicated to the service of his country and its people. His straightforwardness earned respect and admiration both at home and abroad.

He was a man of compassion; a man of heart and of conscience determined to bring peace and freedom to mankind. He believed firmly in the dignity of man; and because of this, in spite of the awesome power at his command, he kept a gentle spirit and displayed that extraordinary comradeship with his subordinates that made him so beloved.

It has been said that Eisenhower embodied the American ideals, that the American people felt that his virtues were somehow the virtues of the Nation as a whole. His death may remind Americans to ask if the strength of character which was so strong in him to the end, and which he symbolized for the Nation, has somehow weakened in our land. How we need his strong and compassionate spirit in today's world. Our greatest tribute will be to maintain and, where necessary, to restore in full measure for our Nation the strength and spirit of Dwight Eisenhower.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and our people mourn the passing of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

If one word were used to describe General Eisenhower, I believe that word would be "dedication." Dedication to his country, dedication to his duty, and dedication to his family.

His military career spanned the victorious conclusion of the greatest world conflict in history.

His political career was climaxed with the ending of hostilities in Korea, the first direct armed conflict our Nation faced with Communist aggression.

He was truly a man of peace.

Personal integrity and honor marked his years as our Commander in Chief, and its impact was so profound that those years have been designated the "Eisenhower Era."

General Eisenhower, through his example as a leader, as a father, and as a man, exemplified those values we cherish

most highly. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

From the heartland of our Nation, at his birthplace in Kansas, he acquired his basic sense of values of honesty, integrity, love of family, respect for authority, reverence for God, and dedication to country. These were his contributions to the highest office of the land, the Presidency of the United States.

As a patriot, a leader, as a father, and as a man, General Eisenhower exemplified our most cherished values. He was a symbol of the best our country can produce.

He will be missed, and he will be long remembered.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

### HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, everything that can possibly be said about the life and accomplishments of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower has already been said so I cannot hope to add anything new. But I could not allow the occasion to pass without joining my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying a final tribute of respect to his memory.

General Eisenhower has now passed from among us and the entire world mourns his passing. And I predict that he will live throughout all time in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of millions around the world who love liberty and pray for peace.

While in my book President Eisenhower was a great statesman, I shall prefer to remember him as a man of understanding and good will. He was entirely without guile. Although he occupied the exalted position of the Presidency, millions of people in this country always referred to him by his nickname.

While I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting General Eisenhower on numerous occasions before his inauguration as President in 1953, it was not until he came to Charlotte, N.C., to help the people of Mecklenburg County celebrate Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Day that I came to realize the impact his personality had on people in every walk of life. Riding with him from the airport to Freedom Park on that occasion, I was struck by the attitudes of the thousands who lined the streets.

In the crowds were business and professional people, workers in overalls, and many mothers holding small children in their arms. All were smiling, waving and uttering such expressions as: "Hello, Ike" and "I Like Ike." In the course of that ride I did not hear a single formal salute. The people who lined the streets were uniformly informal, which I considered to be a personal tribute to the warm personality of this man who walked with kings yet never lost the common touch. "Ike" loved it and responded to the informal salutations with a wide grin and a cordial wave of the hand.

Since that day I have had numerous opportunities to spend time in his presence, to hear him speak on many formal occasions, and to observe his superb conduct of the affairs of state during his 8 years in the Presidency; but I think I shall always remember him as he was that day in Charlotte—so warm, friendly, and responsive to the multitudes who stood on the streets and who assembled in the park to give him an official greeting and hear him speak.

In my judgment General Eisenhower will be remembered as one of our most beloved Presidents. To the cynics who sneer at the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, I would respond that our country has not in modern times enjoyed 8 more peaceful and prosperous years than during his Presidency. His was a decade of good will among men and I dare say that millions of Americans will always praise him for giving us that kind of an administration.

We have been told that, as the end neared, after expressing his love for the members of his family, General Eisenhower said:

And I have always loved my country.

As we remember Dwight David Eisenhower and mourn his passing, we all realize that—just as he always loved his country—his country loved and will always love him.

### THE HOUSTON POST: EDITORIAL ON BUSING

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent and comprehensive discussion on the issue of school busing appeared in the March 26, 1969, edition of the Houston Post. Because of the many questions raised by a local school board in trying to determine an integration solution able to satisfy the civil rights arm of the Justice Department, the argument put forth by the Post is especially valuable:

The Houston Independent School District is the defendant in this case which is yet to be heard in federal court.

In Houston, the last Negro member of the school board—now resigned—and the last liberal member of the school board—still in office—stated that they did not believe Houston's best solution to integration lay in busing.

Though they and other liberal school board members have urged further integration for a dozen years, they join the conservative majority in the belief that busing is impractical.

To bus children six to 13 miles away from home poses obvious difficulties for children and parents of all races and all financial levels.

If an elementary school child is 10 miles from home, he cannot go home if he gets sick during the day. He cannot stay after school to rehearse school plays, take part in athletic events, or have special tutoring on weak subjects because he would miss the bus. He and his parents find it hard to come back to school for evening events. His parents find it hard to attend PTA meetings or come to private conferences with teacher or counselor. It adds to their work toward Halloween carnivals or May fetes.

The entire experience of being in school would be diminished for the bused child, and he would have his school day tediously lengthened by the long bus ride.

The annual cost of busing thousands of children would be astronomical.

### DAMAGE SUIT HITS BOGUS FARM UNION

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the vicious battle antiunion groups are waging against the struggle of the Nation's farmworkers for decency, fairness, and dignity has taken a new turn. Now they are trying to dupe the workers—and dupe the public—with a phony union. This phony union was formed and financed by the grape growers and others who stop at nothing in their attempt to kill the legitimate union the workers themselves formed—the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO. Charging violation of California law, the UFWOC has now filed suit against the front group, naming among the defendants, the California Right to Work Committee, the John Birch Society, and a number of growers and farm suppliers. Under unanimous consent, I include a story about the lawsuit, which appeared in the AFL-CIO News, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I recommend it to the careful study of all of our colleagues. The article is as follows:

### DAMAGE SUIT HITS BOGUS FARM UNION

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.—A \$10 million damage suit has been filed by the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee against an organization shown to have been formed and financed by grape growers to fight the union.

Named in the suit, filed in a state court here, are the Agricultural Workers Freedom to Work Association, its officers, a long list of growers and farm suppliers, California for Right to Work, and the John Birch Society.

The National Right to Work Committee recently sponsored Jose Mendoza, general secretary of AFWFA, on a nationwide tour to denounce UFWOC, its president, Cesar Chavez, and the boycott of non-union California grape growers.

Jerome Cohen, UFWOC attorney, said the John Birch Society is named because its members were involved in helping to form AFWFA and later supported it.

The court action, an amendment to a suit filed against AFWFA last September, is based on new information revealed when the organization's two top officers filed a report with the Labor Dept. to comply with the Landrum-Griffin amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

"We had some information as a basis for the original suit, but the report gives us more information," Cohen said. "We have named a number of new defendants."

While the federal labor law's reporting requirements apply to all organizations in the labor-management field, its protective provisions do not cover farm workers.

A California law, however, specifically forbids employers to finance, dominate or control organizations ostensibly formed to represent workers. It provides for payment of damages to legitimate unions harmed by such bogus organizations.

In the Landrum-Griffin report, AFWFA Pres. Gilbert Rubio and Sec.-Treas. Shirley Fetalvero said their organization was formed at a meeting attended by Mendoza, Rubio and about 10 employers at a restaurant here last May.

Listed among those attending were John Giumarra, Sr. and John Giumarra, Jr., treasurer and general counsel respectively of Giumarra Vineyards Corp., which has led grower opposition to farm workers' unionization.

Others attending the meeting, according to the document, included Paul Marrufo, head foreman for Sabovich Bros. grape growers; Jack Pandol, another grower, and a number of accountants for growers.

"We were to tell workers not to be afraid of Chavez, to be united . . . and oppose UFWOC efforts to organize and boycott," Rubio and Miss Fetalvero said.

"This meeting and other meetings," they added, "decided AFWFA would also try to enlist workers and obtain information on UFWOC's plans and activities."

The document brought out that Mendoza and Rubio were to be paid \$120 a week and that "the Giumarras" would furnish office space and supplies for Mendoza.

Arrangements were made to pay Mendoza and others in AFWFA through another organization called Mexican-American Democrats for Republican Action (MADRA).

The document lists dozens of checks ranging up to \$500 which were deposited in bank accounts maintained by MADRA and AFWFA during 1968.

Among those identified as issuing the payments were California for Right to Work, many growers' corporations and a number of agricultural suppliers.

Rubio and Miss Fetalvero also reported that Giumarra Vineyards paid a salary directly to Mendoza in "an unknown amount," made "loans" to other AFWFA leaders, and provided them with gasoline for automobiles.

These were some of the activities AFWFA was set up to perform, according to the document:

Counter-picket and "try to drown out" UFWOC members when they picketed grape growers; hold rallies for workers "to listen to speeches against Chavez;" picket advertisers of the Catholic Register which supported Chavez.

Appear on radio, TV and the news with attacks on Chavez; "take action to halt or disrupt" UFWOC activities such as parades and picnics; circulate literature attacking UFWOC and the boycott.

Picket stores selling New York made products after markets in that city decided not to handle California grapes and picket news media in Los Angeles for "biased coverage for Chavez."

"Use all of the above methods to get headlines, newspaper and TV coverage with statements farm workers are not on strike and the boycott is just another trick to force the union on the workers."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Nation mourns the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower, soldier, statesman, and humanitarian; a great American, a great and gentle man whose life and works will stand as a monument to all that is good in 20th century America.

By any measure, he must be counted

among the giants of his age. History will recall him as a great leader; as the brilliant Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II and as a President who gave our Nation a pause from strife, a period of tranquillity and dignity.

Our grief that he is dead is profound, but we are consoled by a rising sense of gratitude that he lived among us and in the service of our Nation.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: 1890-1969

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join in the national mourning for a great leader, a man who placed his country above all else in times of war as well as of peace. President Eisenhower's life and devotion to his Nation will be a permanent guide for the leaders of future generations.

The Long Island Press editorial sums up the Nation's loss in the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. The text of the editorial follows:

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: 1890-1969

In mourning Dwight David Eisenhower, the sorrow is eased by the fact that his 78 years of life mirrored a glowing picture of all that is best in American life.

His initial impact upon his countrymen was as a military leader, but his first achievement as President was as a man of peace, fulfilling his campaign promise to go to Korea to end the slaughter.

Born in Denison, Tex., he grew up in near-poverty in Abilene, his mother a pacifist who wept when her boy was appointed to West Point. Perhaps that is why he was a warrior who hated what he called "this damnable thing of war," and as a President, he wielded power sparingly.

He was also a politician who told a news conference: "I think in the general derogatory sense you can say . . . that I do not like politics."

As a soldier he commanded the greatest military machine in the history of mankind and led it to victory over the most infamous enemy in memory.

A measure of this man was his popularity with the troops. Traditionally generals are fair game for the men in the ranks, but not General Ike. One of the reasons may have been his "enlisted man response" to the ingrained "chicken" of Army life.

For example, at the end of the war soldiers on leave flocked to Berchtesgaden, Hitler's Bavarian retreat. Only one elevator was available to take visitors to the top of the mountain fortress. The alternative was a long, winding climb up a path. The elevator bore a sign: "For Field Grade Officers Only." When Gen. Eisenhower saw it, he yanked the sign off and scaled it down the hillside. After that, field officers stood in line with privates to ride the elevator.

As President, he gave America no ringing slogans and made no glowing promises, but he was elected by majorities matched previously only by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The same warmth that existed between Gen. Eisenhower and his troops carried over to civilian life. "I like Ike" was more fact than slogan, and his appeal was so magnetic that the Democrats sought him as a candidate before he identified himself as a Republican.

As he rode in an open car through Long

Island—as in other parts of the nation—tens of thousands turned out to see the tanned, fit, hero, and to smile back at his famous grin.

Under the Eisenhower Administration the Korean War was brought to an end, the hydrogen bomb was developed and America entered the space age.

It was President Eisenhower who appointed Earl Warren Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and later sent federal troops to enforce the court's order to integrate the schools in Little Rock, Ark. He sent Marines into Lebanon at that country's request, but he avoided massive involvement in French Indo-China when Dien Bien Phu fell.

The cocktail party psychologists talked glibly of the "father image" when he was in the White House. And there may have been some truth in the trite phrases because he came at a time when America yearned for the comfort of a fatherly leader.

Although he was of the military, his outlook was never narrowly militaristic. The generals and admirals enjoyed no special influence over policy or budget decisions while he was President.

His military leadership made him aware of the parallel interests of the makers of arms, and military careerists. When he left the Presidency, he warned the nation to beware of an alliance between these parallel forces, and to guard against the danger of inertia in the defense establishment.

History may not rank him as our most brilliant general or our most extraordinary President, but history occasionally does not measure the quality of integrity or nobility in a man.

He was as popular when he left office as when he entered it, and there is little doubt he could have won a third term had he not been barred by the Constitution from running again.

The affection the nation felt for Ike did not diminish in the years afterward. He was always the elder statesman of the nation more than of his party.

His typically American optimism was deeply rooted in his firm faith in the strength of America. In his last public address—via television to the 1968 Republican convention in Miami—he said: "Let us first remind ourselves of the greatness of this nation and of its people. Let's not waste time this year searching out someone to blame, even though some seem more disposed to concede rather than to stand firmly for America."

A gentle man and a patriot has left us.

AMERICAN LEGION 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people the excellent and provocative speech made at Savannah, Ga., on Saturday, March 22, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the American Legion by my good friend and colleague from the First District of Georgia, the Honorable G. ELLIOTT HAGAN.

This speech, I feel, typifies all of our sentiments about this great civic-minded organization, whose very existence and cause is looked on with pride and appreciation for the wonderful service done on behalf of every American.

Congressman HAGAN's remarks, which follow, merit attention by young and old,

and his personal observations and possible solutions during these troubled times are indeed worthy of consideration:

REMARKS BY HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN AT AMERICAN LEGION 50TH ANNIVERSARY, MARCH 22, 1969, SAVANNAH, GA.

It is a real privilege and honor to be here with you this evening.

I had the pleasure last week of attending several of the functions in Washington in connection with the 50th Anniversary celebration of the American Legion, including the annual "Quail & Grits" dinner. Now, in spite of what my good friend Frank Kelly may have told you, I only had three helpings. . . .

I also had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Efram Zimbalist, Jr., who does such an excellent job in the ABC-TV series, "The FBI." He was honored for the work he has done for the American Legion, both as an actor and as a Legionnaire.

From the moment of that now-historic gathering of men of the AEF in Paris in March of 1919, from which the American Legion was born, there began an almost overnight change in the course of American history.

Born of the chance remark of a convalescing soldier to his commanding officer, the idea to form an organization for mutual assistance of veteran to veteran, later instilled in millions of Americans a sense of obligation to community, state and nation.

Never before in the history of man, had such an organization of war veterans banded together for such noble purposes, as those set forth in the Preamble to the American Legion Constitution.

Only once before in the history of our nation, at the time of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, had men of such keen insight into human nature, such a grasp of the future course of history, and with such a feeling for their fellowman, come together for a common purpose.

The First World War brought them together: Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Thomas Miller, Eric Fisher Wood, Bennett Champ Clark, Hamilton Fish and the other great men who were truly the first in modern American history to "sacrifice their all" to preserve the peace and freedom of the Western World.

Seldom in the course of history, has one organization so influenced the shape of human events—and the world may never again heir to deeds such as those of the Legion during the past half-century.

Now we are celebrating the 50th Birthday of the founding of the American Legion.

It is a milestone which recalls vivid memories of service and self-sacrifice to the one-million, seven-hundred thousand remaining World War 1 veterans, and is an observance of some magnitude for all American Legionnaires, most of whom will never again be privileged to take part in so historic an event.

Spanning the period of September 1968, to November 1969, the Legion's 50th Birthday observance brings to mind the robust days of the organization's infancy, when the passing of the word, "The Legion's in town" brought a new sense of patriotic pride and comradeship to young and old alike.

From its inception, the American Legion has been known for its spirit; for its sense of fairness to all men; for its ability to accomplish whatever job that needs done—and do it properly and efficiently.

That the Legion has been and remains both vibrant and stable is attested to by its many accomplishments down thru the years: the establishment of a Veterans Administration; aid to the sick and handicapped (whether veteran-connected or not); programs for the protection and well-being of the nation's children; advanced education and training for America's war veterans, un-

der the Legion-sponsored and supported GI Bill of Rights.

After twenty-five years, the GI Bill has gained rightful recognition as one of the most forward-looking pieces of educational legislation ever enacted.

These are but a few of the services rendered the American public by the American Legion in its fifty proud years of history.

Add to these the Legion's role as "watchdog" of our nation's security; its many programs which seek to instill in all Americans a spirit of 100% Americanism, thru a love and respect for country, and its many character-building services for our youth, and you begin to get a feeling of the strength from which flows the American Legion force for good.

For the past fifty years, the American Legion has made its influence felt on the American scene as a force for good; a force for the betterment of not only the veteran population, but for every man, woman and child.

We have a proud heritage and one which must be preserved by continuing and expanding upon the good works on which the reputation of the American Legion is based.

If we fail to accomplish the tasks which the Legion must undertake in the years ahead, we will, by our own omission, have failed those far-sighted men who founded the organization.

We who comprise the American Legion today must dedicate ourselves to a far-reaching program of assistance in the search for real solutions to the problems of our society.

We must draw the initial blueprint which future generations of American Legionnaires can follow in striving to attain a better society for posterity.

One of the most serious problems facing our country today is the breakdown of law and order. And one of the most glaring examples is the campus disorders at many of our colleges. We have been blaming the students for these disgraceful incidents, which, if left unchecked, could completely destroy our system of higher education. But apparently some of the teachers have been more responsible than we thought.

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, president of San Francisco State College, revealed recently that some of the radical teachers at the college have been intimidating some of the students, threatening them with retribution if they did not participate in demonstrations on campus.

I certainly cannot speak for all parents, but I for one do not pay out several thousand dollars a year for my two sons in college to major in revolution and anarchy!

Have you ever wondered why our colleges and universities in this state are not plagued with disorders and riots?

In my opinion, we don't have these problems because our young people feel a sense of participation in our political processes . . . because the State Legislature had the foresight over twenty years ago to pass laws allowing our young people to register at age 17 and vote at age 18.

And I don't mind telling you that as a young member of the Georgia legislature, Elliott Hagan supported and voted for that legislation. . . . I'm proud of it, proud of the fact that my beloved Georgia is one of only two states with such laws.

As a Legionnaire, I want to throw out a challenge to this gathering tonight . . . since Georgia led the way in giving the vote to eighteen-year-olds, I think it would be appropriate and fitting for the American Legion in the First District to lead the way in getting the American Legion, as a national organization, behind the effort to give the vote to all 18-year-olds in this country.

And I can't think of a better time and place to start the ball rolling, than at the Legion's national convention here in Savannah in August.

I predict that if the time ever comes when all Americans can vote at eighteen, we will see a younger generation that is far less susceptible to negative leadership from groups like the Students For a Democratic Society . . . because no one can really feel they are taking part in our political processes, unless they can go to the polls and indicate their choice in an election.

Look at it this way; if the President can draft a young man and send him off to be maimed or even killed, shouldn't that same young man be able to vote for or against that President?

During its first half-century of existence, the American Legion has maintained a young, vibrant outlook on the major problems with which our nation has been confronted. The Legion has played a major role in helping solve many of those problems.

Of its past accomplishments, the Legion is justifiably proud. This pride is not of a boastful nature; rather, it is born of a record of offering a helping hand to those in need of assistance.

In this year of 1969, as the American Legion ends its first half-century of service to God and Country, we find ourselves at a crossroad.

Will the organization move forward into another fifty years in which it can be of invaluable service to the whole of American society—or will it lean heavily on past accomplishments?????

This is a crucial issue faced by the American Legion on its 50th Birthday.

The answer rests with the "blue cap" Legionnaires of every walk of life, who man the Legion's more than 16,000 posts, which are the backbone of the National Organization.

Are these two million, six-hundred thousand Legionnaires willing, literally, to roll up their sleeves and come to grips with the down-to-earth problems of our nation at the community level?

I firmly believe that the American Legion can make its presence felt across this nation, by tackling the problems facing Americans at the local level; education, civil disobedience and the attendant breakdown of law and order; the "Permissive" atmosphere which is threatening to destroy our nation's youth.

All are areas in which the American Legion, thru its individual members at all levels can become involved in the coming months and years.

It is time for the American Legion to assume even more civic responsibility.

We must let ourselves become more involved in projects for community and, from this involvement, we will have exhibited the concern of the American Legion for the need for orderly social improvement, through helping solve some of the nation's more pressing community problems.

The Legion's awareness of the need to continue to provide effective service to God and country is evident in the move which led to the naming of a "Task Force for the Future," a seven-member group charged with the responsibility for studying the existing programs of the Legion and establishing guidelines for the years ahead.

A review of our programs in the light of modern-day social, economic and political problems, with projections into the future based on past experience and present knowledge, should provide us with a blueprint for tomorrow, a star by which to chart our course to new heights of service.

The American Legion prides itself in never having failed America when the chips were down.

The American Legion takes the occasion of this golden anniversary observance to pledge anew to our countrymen that as long as the need for our services exists, we stand ready to serve.

MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, Senator Robert Kennedy stepped off a plane in Indianapolis, Ind., and was told the tragic news that the Reverend Martin Luther King had been shot and killed. On the anniversary of that tragic death, it is well to remember the extemporaneous words Senator Kennedy spoke:

Aeschylus wrote: "In our sleep, pain that cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart and in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God."

What we need in the United States . . . is love and wisdom and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our own country, whether they be white or they be black.

Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of the world. Let us dedicate ourselves to that, and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

Just 2 months from that date, Senator Robert Kennedy himself was to be struck down by an assassin. Within two months, the nation was to lose two great and heroic men of vision.

Both had sought peace.

Both had rejected violence.

Both sought to overcome injustice and enslaving poverty.

Both sought to overcome bigotry and prejudice.

Both sought to overcome the vestiges of hatred in our society.

Both of these men had very much in common. Both shared a dream.

Martin Luther King, standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in 1963, gave expression to his dream when he said:

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

Robert Kennedy spoke also of his dream repeatedly when he said:

Some men see things as they are and ask why. I dream things that never were and ask why not.

On this occasion, the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, it is for us to rededicate ourselves to his dream, to the dream of one America. To the dream of peace. No greater monument can be erected in his memory than that which we must all erect daily, as we toil to build the society which he advocated, and for which he gave his life. It is well that we pause today, remembering our great loss, but being ever more mindful that we and our society have been made better because men like Dr. Martin Luther King and Senator Robert F. Kennedy have walked this path before us.

The ancient Greek Euripides wrote, and it can be said of both of these great men:

When good men die their goodness does not perish but lives though they are gone.

REMARKS OF PHILIP HANDLER, PRESIDENT-ELECT, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, MARCH 3, 1969, WESTINGHOUSE TALENT SEARCH AWARD DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, just recently a 17-year-old from Dallas, Lane Palmer Hughston, was awarded the first prize in Westinghouse's annual science talent search.

All of us in Texas are extremely proud of Mr. Hughston and congratulate him for his achievements.

I should also like to point to a remarkably fine commentary which was made on this same occasion by Dr. Philip Handler, chairman of the National Science Board and president-elect of the National Academy of Sciences. I invite the attention of all Members to Dr. Handler's remarks which follow:

It is both a happy privilege and a rather awesome experience to be here this evening to participate in honoring this extraordinarily talented assemblage of young scientists. Awesome because of the recognition by my generation that yours is so much better prepared than were we to embark upon careers in science, and awesome also because of the magnitude of the challenges which confront you. Although you are surrounded by your admiring elders, my words are largely intended for your ears. They may listen, and I shall direct to them an occasional aside, but my message is for your ears.

Among your fellows, you are fortunate, indeed. For most of you, the path of life is clear. You have been invited to enjoy a career dedicated to expanding the frontiers of knowledge or harnessing that knowledge for the betterment of mankind. But it is abundantly evident that you shall do so in a turbulent setting wherein many of your colleagues seek new goals, new directions and new values for our society. Despite the ever increasing pace of science and the expanded opportunities for what Norbert Wiener called "the human use of human beings," many of your colleagues have foresworn the high adventure of science and share with some of their elders misgivings concerning the benefits to be derived from the public support of science. There is a growing disenchantment which has led to disturbing losses of contact, separating science from the general social consciousness, a separation, which, in some instances, has become outright alienation.

This point of view was forcefully thrust upon me in a recent letter from a reader of an account in the *New York Times* of my vision of how biological science might serve our country. Let me quote:

"So, you are promising a biological revolution? Big deal. What have all the scientific revolutions accomplished? See Biafra . . . See the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia . . . See malnutrition across America . . . See our ghettos . . . See the ravages upon the mind by organized religion . . . See the Middle East

hangings . . . See the vulgarity of American doctors and dentists . . . See the humanistic illiteracy of our teachers . . . See the narrow-mindedness of our scientists . . . See the naiveté of our philosophers . . . See Vietnam . . ."

His despair is a measure of the frustration engendered by the fact that we have been unable, as a Nation, to bring our knowledge, wealth and manpower to bear on those very social problems we most wish to solve, problems arising out of the condition of perhaps one-fifth of our citizenry. Yet, I submit that our current awareness of these long-standing problems reflects not the failure of science and technology but, rather, their wholesale success. The revolution of rising expectations stems directly from widespread recognition of the benefits which the scientific revolution has brought to the more fortunate four-fifths of our society.

This state of affairs is all the more ironic in that the greatest contribution to human affairs which science has made in the last several centuries is the new "Enlightenment," the belief that the world and its creatures can be understood, that evident problems have less evident causes which can be identified and analyzed, and that intelligent diligence can then find solutions—in short, that, by understanding, man can hope to control and improve both himself and his environment. In the corrosive atmosphere of our day, that faith is threatened. It is well that the scientist should be reminded occasionally of his tendency toward intellectual arrogance; but the case for the use of rationality in human affairs must also have its hearing lest we lose much that is precious in our heritage and endanger our national future. Accordingly, it is particularly important that a network of trust between scientists and non-scientists be nourished, else our national frustrations may lead some falsely to conclude that new scientific knowledge cannot help us to understand and to control our affairs.

Many young people seem to be telling us that we are self-deluded in the meaningless world. My contemporaries, in turn, have been impelled to ponder on the purpose and meaning of human life—as we had not done in decades. Similarly, you who are rapt in the joys of your initial encounters with science are not free to turn your backs upon either our humanistic traditions or our social problems. If truly you are to appreciate and enjoy science, you must see it in proper perspective as John Tyndall did a century ago:

"The world embraces not only a Newton but a Shakespeare—not only a Boyle but a Raphael—not only a Kant but a Beethoven—not only a Darwin but a Carlyle. Not in each of these, but in all, is human nature whole. They are not opposed but supplementary—not mutually exclusive but reconcilable."

On our campus, two weeks ago, an exasperated body of police used tear gas to disperse a crowd of our students gathered about a building held by an armed band of their black fellows. You will admit that it is difficult to remain disciplined when healthy youngsters call you "pig" and hurl obscenities and brickbats. This unhappy incident will remain a painful memory in the annals of our University. But it was not as illuminating as the performance, one week later, on campus, of "Man of a Mancha." I winced at the cheers our students gave to that deathless line "Facts are the enemy of truth" which seemed to encapsulate their search for a moral truth outside the catechisms of the traditional disciplines. I understood what they meant, and so do you. Even more easily understandable was the starry-eyed reception accorded the song called "The Quest." "to dream the impossible dream, to reach the unreachable star . . ."

For a few poignant moments these students joined in a glorious expression of their own

longing to joust with that which is ugly in a world they had not made.

Those of us who give our lives to study of the cosmos, the origins of life, the nature of matter or that of man, or the creation of those myriad devices which enrich and simplify everyday life or permit man to reach for the stars, must not turn our backs on an entire generation of youth whose ideals represent the best that mankind has yet produced, who reject the crass and the venal and seek for a better world. You young scientists, whose lives are already more sharply focussed than those of your contemporaries, can help. It is true, as Machiavelli noted, that "there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things, because the innovation has for enemies all who have done well under the old conditions and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new," but if desirable goals and specific programs are to be formulated and brought to fruition, you must remind your colleagues of Whitehead's aphorism,

"The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to assure change amid order."

I bid you reject the illegitimate use of force but to join your idealistic contemporaries in persuasion as, tomorrow, they attempt to order our national priorities so as to improve the condition of our fellow men. But when, in self righteousness and moral indignation they are tempted to take the law unto themselves, explain to them that, whereas they may judge themselves by their motives, the world must judge by their actions and react accordingly. In a confused world, anger comes easily—but it obscures the vision, even the idealistic visions of the most rational of men. As the clouds darkened in our Nation in the middle of the last century, James Russell Lowell said,

"Once to every man and Nation comes the moment to decide, in the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side."

Our Nation passed through that crisis but presently is confronting one which may prove to be greater still. For the moment, it may have the appearance of blacks against whites, of youth against their elders, even of haves versus have-nots. And there is no dearth of discussion of these matters in the communications media. For some thoughtful participants and observers, however, underlying the more obvious issues is a renewed concern with such ancient questions as Why am I here? Is there purpose to human life? What value should be placed on an individual human life? I would not venture, this evening, to attempt answers—but soon you must. However, you engage in this national colloquy, let me call to your attention a passage from *The Art of Judgment* by Geoffrey Vickers:

"We have all some responsibility for action, some area, however small, in which each of us and he alone can play the part of agent. There is a second field, wider and not congruent with the first, in which each of us can contribute to the making of policy. There is a third, wider still, in which each of us has power to give or withhold assent to the policy decisions of others. There is a fourth, yet wider, in which the only responsibility of each of us is the neglected but important responsibility of giving or withholding the trust which supports or inhibits our fellows in the exercise of their inalienable responsibilities, as their trust or distrust supports or inhibits us. There is a fifth field, the creative function which shapes the work thus and not otherwise whether the work be a building or an institution, a nation's history or a human life. Here lies the possibility for the vision that is manifest, for good or ill, whenever a 'state of art' is imposed on a 'state of nature' . . . the authentic signature of the human mind."

Let us turn to science itself. The very fact that the corpus of scientific knowledge has been doubling with the passage of each decade indicates that our ignorance exceeds our understanding. Each of you has given evidence that he is well qualified to take his part in that most exciting of all adventures, the exploration of man and nature. By now you will have discovered that, for the scientist, the means—the doing of science—is at least as important as the end—the ultimate research findings. Someone once said,

"Success is a journey, not a destination."

And so it is in science. You may wonder that the world at large should choose to support the efforts of the scientist if that be the case. Indeed, it has been necessary to defend the conduct of fundamental research for some centuries. In a history of the Royal Society published in 1722, Thomas Sprat wrote

"It is strange that we are not able to inculcate into the minds of many men the necessity of that distinction of my Lord Bacon's, that there ought to be Experiments of Light as well as of Fruit. It is their usual word, 'What solid good will come from thence?' They are indeed to be commended for being so severe exactors of goodness. And it were to be wished that they would not only exercise this vigor about Experiments, but on their own lives and actions; that they would still question with themselves, in all that they do; what solid good will come from thence? But they are to know, that in so large, and so various an art as this of Experiments, there are many degrees of usefulness: some may serve for real and plain benefit, without much to light; some for teaching without apparent profit; some for light now and for use hereafter; some only for ornament and curiosity. If they will persist in condemning all experiments except those which bring with them immediate gain and a present harvest, they may as well cavil at the providence of God that he has not made all the seasons of the year to be times of mowing, reaping and vintage."

And so it continues to this time. Fortunately, the nature of the dialogue between scientists and non-scientists has now altered. The qualitative case for science as the well-spring for the generation of new wealth—if we may define wealth as the cumulative capacity to improve the condition of man—is no longer challenged but there will ever remain the necessity rationally to establish the magnitude of the scientific endeavor. It is a feckless exercise to set limits on that enterprise. Historically it has been autocatalytic. Just as science raises more questions than it answers, the technology which it breeds so enriches society as to generate yet more opportunity for the conduct of science. There are those who will insist that, today, science is not "relevant." How, they ask, can you be concerned with pulsars, quasars or the mechanism of enzyme action when there are Americans starving in Mississippi and Harlem and dying in Vietnam? My answer is simple—science and social actions are not mutually exclusive alternatives. It is precisely because of our science-bred technology and the wealth it has provided that we cannot, in good conscience, live with dire poverty, hunger and malnutrition, not only in the United States but on this planet. This society, wealthy beyond the imaginings of man in any previous age can easily afford both the righting of ancient wrongs and the loftiest exercises of the human imagination. And we must undertake both.

Let it not be thought that I am suggesting that each of you pursue a career in fundamental research rather than in more applied aspects of the scientific endeavor. Science is no less scientific or rewarding for being practical, and it may well be as applied scientists that some of you can make your greatest contributions to the well being of your fellow men. I say this particularly in

my capacity as a concerned biologist. Let me explain.

Application of our understanding of the physical world may already have been pushed to the limit of how it may affect our lives. I do not mean that there is not yet much to do both in exploration of the physical world and in application of that knowledge. Far from it. But already a large fraction of this planet's population enjoys communication at the speed of light—an increase in communication velocity by a factor of  $10^8$  since the days of the Pony Express. Jet planes carry us at the speed of sound—only about one hundred times faster than that Pony Express—and a few of us can expect to achieve orbiting or escape velocity. The computational speed of the modern computer has reached the point where it is almost limited by the speed of light, although our society has much to learn with regard to the utilization of this resource. With the advent of nuclear power, particularly when fast breeder reactors are perfected and become commonplace, human endeavors will not again be limited by power requirements. When our society is willing to pay the price, we can restore our physical environment almost to that which our ancestors found on this continent and that abundant power supply will permit us to recycle water so that, in effect, it should be available in infinite supply. The arts of chemistry already provide us with a cornucopia of enormous variety.

Although the ultimate structure of matter remains elusive, understanding of the physical universe is astonishingly orderly. And of all the physical technologies unavailable but in prospect, only management of our weather seems likely to alter our lives in the future as dramatically as the events of the recent past. In contrast, most of the primary problems of biology are unsolved as are those aspects of biology most applicable to human affairs. The greatest threat to the future of the human race is man's own procreation. Hunger, pollution, crime, depopulation of the natural beauty of the planet, irreversible extermination of countless species of plants and animals, over-large, dirty, over-crowded cities with their paradoxical loneliness, continual erosion of limited natural resources, and the seething unrest which creates the political instability that leads to international conflict and war all derive from the unbridled growth of human populations.

Informed demographers tell us that, regardless of any efforts which can be foreseen, the population of this planet will somewhat more than double by century's end. If, even then, when babies born this year will be at the height of their breeding potential, we are to stabilize the earth's population, it is imperative that we understand much more than we do today about human reproductive physiology, that we explore a wide variety of new approaches to contraception, that we find entirely innocuous reversible procedures such that the penalty for carelessness will be failure to conceive a child rather than the reverse, as is now the case. Contributing to that solution would be a boon to humanity of the highest order.

Second only to the problem of overpopulation is the problem of feeding the world. If we are to survive the crisis of the next two or three decades and avoid massive famine, it is imperative that the advanced nations of the world join the underdeveloped nations in markedly expanding and upgrading their agricultural productivity. No event in recent history has been quite as heartening as the successful cultivation, on a substantial scale, of new strains of wheat and rice which have very significantly increased per acre productivity of these crops in India, Southeast Asia, the Philippines and Mexico. All of us are indebted to those at the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations who made this development possible. But the task has been barely begun and we

have much to do to assure that food production will keep pace with human reproduction. What could be more noble a calling than joining this crusade?

Meanwhile, the life sciences offer you their time-honored questions, albeit in increasingly sophisticated forms. The functioning of enzymes, the regulation of metabolism, the operation of the genetic apparatus, the chemical bases for the process of differentiation in multi-cellular organisms, the phenomena which integrate animal life, etc., offer research vistas almost without end. Ecology is but an infant science. And man must still contend with almost every one of his most ancient enemies, the diseases to which he is subject. As our country, rightfully, struggles to provide to all citizens the quality of medical care now enjoyed by the privileged few who find their way to university medical centers, be not content with what even the best of medicine has to offer. Tissue transplantation is a great technical triumph, but it cannot be the wave of the future. We must learn to treat and prevent the degenerative disorders which lead to the seeming necessity for such *tours de force*. Patently, we cannot look forward to half-million heart transplants per year. Nor are we very far ahead in the fights against cancer, nephritis, rheumatic disease, or a hundred other disorders. Even the triumphs of the antibiotics become hollow victories as resistant strains of microorganisms emerge. In each instance, we lack fundamental understanding and we have insufficiently equipped our physicians for their tasks. Those are not windmills; they are genuine dragons, well worthy of your lance. But because we have, here, been concerned with the ethics and morals of our society, there are some special problems in biology to which I would direct your attention, problems which are highly challenging scientifically and which pose complex and challenging ethical questions as well.

In consequence of the increasing success of those medical procedures which Joshua Lederberg has called "euphenics"—successful treatment of individuals with otherwise incapacitating or lethal genetically transmitted disorders—for the first time man has knowingly taken a hand in his own evolution, but unfortunately, by reducing the historical power of natural selection. By assuring survival of the unfit, we are accelerating the spread, through our population of otherwise deleterious genes.

In the long term, this is not in the best interest of humanity, but how shall this process be regulated? Moreover, there are more than five hundred known genetically transmitted diseases which cannot yet be clinically managed in equivalent fashion. Hopefully, one day, many will be. Each of us is the carrier of perhaps a dozen defective genes such that, were any one of them expressed in homozygotic offspring, the result would be a serious disorder. Already, perhaps six percent of all babies are patently defective for hereditary reasons. As euphenics becomes more successful, and more and more genetically defective youngsters survive to have offspring of their own, this percentage will increase substantially. How should our society cope with this problem, the deterioration of our gene pool by virtue of our own scientific success coupled to our traditional ethics?

Much has been written in the lay press concerning the prospects for genetic engineering. It is too soon to assess those prospects and it would be foolhardy to indicate that success is just around the corner. But perhaps one day it will be: if so, it will raise ethical problems of the highest order. It is not too soon to go about finding the answers.

One day we shall consider deliberately guiding our own evolution in a positive manner. This could be done by deliberate breeding, an unlikely notion in our society, or by artificial insemination using sperm from distinguished men as Muller suggested. More dramatic is a possibility familiar to some of

you. It rests on the fact that one can remove the cell nucleus of a fertilized frog egg and replace it with the nucleus from a somatic cell of another frog. The egg then develops into a perfect carbon copy of the frog which donated the second nucleus. If we can do that with frogs, one day we will do it with chickens or cattle and mankind's food supply will be the richer.

But if we learn to do it with cattle, surely it will be but a matter of time before we can do it in man. And then what? For my part, I rather hope that this line of experimentation will fail. I dread to think of the power of that tool in the hands of an authoritarian government. Mankind, as I know it, is just not ready! For now it seems more appropriate to go on sampling the rich variety of the human gene pool.

Only now does it seem possible that, in the reasonably near future, we shall begin to make progress in understanding the human brain and relate its attributes to its cellular and molecular architecture, thereby achieving insight into the underlying bases for our behavior. In all likelihood, this will generate the capacity to design chemical or physical processes to alter behavior in defined ways. But then what? The imagination boggles at the possible consequences. Indeed, they are already posed for us by the dilemma of how to live with marijuana. We already have tranquilizers and mood elevators. Soon, surely, we will have the "soma" described by Aldous Huxley. Accordingly, I call your attention to a letter I received recently from an articulate biochemist. He says,

"It seems to me that we are rapidly closing in on a crucial problem of scientific ethics. Do we have the right to make scientific discoveries, just any kind of discovery simply because we see the problem and its possibilities? Can we in good conscience and truly enlightened self-interest do that without most carefully pondering the political power structure, the maturity of the social organization and the historical age of society? Do we have the right to put an unparalleled new stress on the fiber of the social structure just as a byproduct of our curiosity and intellectual appetite? Perhaps society will not be able, all the time, to learn to deal adaptively and constructively with advances in knowledge particularly in knowledge about man's own nature, at any rate certainly not at the present rapid pace, since even for a highly educated person 'cultural evolution' is proceeding with a dizzying acceleration. We scientists have a historic responsibility and this will not disappear as by magic by denying it or forgetting about it. Would it not be a sad irony of cosmic fate if man's large and richly convoluted brain, his pride and glory, would prove in the long run just as much an evolutionary disadvantage as the huge bulk and brutish force of a dinosaur? Who knows? Maybe there is an optimum brain size to assure maximum adaptability to the environment and so a maximum life span for the entire *species* rather than the individual. I do hope that we are not too clever for what is truly good for us!"

The writer has raised cogent and legitimate questions—but I reject his conclusion. Our society can no more tolerate censorship in the laboratory than in communications media. A free society must be free to think, to seek, to explore. What it finds may not always be comfortable, but we have already survived earlier shocks. The Copernican Revolution placed us on a small planet revolving about an obscure star somewhere in a great cosmos. Darwinian evolution related us to all the brute creatures, plant and animal, about us and traces us back to the inanimate. Having yesterday lost our special place in the universe, surely, tomorrow, we can tolerate understanding ourselves. To be sure, we have not always managed our science and technology with foresight and wisdom. Tomorrow we must, if we are to survive and surrender a decent world to succeeding gen-

erations. Meanwhile, let no one frame constraints delimiting which segments of the endless frontiers of science may be explored. No one has the requisite wisdom and foresight to make such decisions and to do so most assuredly would imperil the national future. But it is clear that it behooves our Nation to sharpen the sluggish mechanisms by which we rest political and social decisions on technical information. Tomorrow is none too soon.

And so, I bid you welcome to the scientific fraternity. Hopefully, some of you will join us in the biological quest. Whichever path you choose, within or without science, I commend to you Emerson's admonition that "Nothing is sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

#### MEMORIAL FLAG HONORING SAILOR LOST AT SEA DURING WORLD WAR II

### HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Veterans' Administration began making available a memorial flag to eligible survivors of servicemen whose remains were lost at sea after May 27, 1941. Apparently not eligible for one of these flags is one of my constituents—a delightful grandmother who now lives in Chapel Hill, N.C., where at least one of her grandchildren is a college student. Upon hearing of the Veterans' Administration flag offer, she wrote me as follows:

I lived in Rutherfordton, N.C. during World War II and my own son was on a PT boat in the Navy with duty in the Pacific area. The messenger boy for our local Western Union office was Charles Prince, the oldest child of a widow with other children. I think he had to drop out of school to help support the family. He was homely, awkward, shy, and courageous. I worked in the district health department, and when he delivered messages to us I chatted with him and we became friends, exchanging greetings as we passed each day.

I could see nothing but hard work and limited rewards ahead for Charles, and friendly interest was the only thing I could give him, since I was supporting three children of my own and financially poor myself. As I recall, he was proud of his involvement in the war; I suppose it offered a certain escape, perhaps a glamor he had never dreamed of experiencing; and then there was the pay and the family allotment. He came to see me to tell me about his new life, and the first Christmas of his term of service he sent me a Christmas card from the Aircraft Carrier Lexington, signing it "Charles Prince, the Western Union Boy," as if I might not remember him!

Well, he was lost when the carrier went down in the Battle of the Coral Sea on May 8, 1942. Now I do not know about Charles' survivors since I have not been in his home area for many years. Nor do I know if they will learn of the offer of the memorial flag or if they will apply for the flag. But I should like very much to acquire Charles' flag and display it on national holidays.

I am today asking that a flag be flown over the Nation's Capitol and sent to this lady. And I would like for her to know that it comes from many Members of Congress who are deeply moved by an unusual request from one who loves her country and the memory of those who have served to keep it free.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. JAMES A. HALEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I think little more need be said about the nature and character of Dwight David Eisenhower than that when death came to him, it found his stature undiminished in the eyes of the American people—his countrymen who had lived intimately with him for more than a quarter of a century.

In those years, the people of this Nation had known General Eisenhower in many roles, as a man of war and a man of peace, as an educator, an author, as a President, and as an elder statesman. And it is nothing less than a tremendous monument to him that the man Eisenhower, known to millions as "Ike," commanded from his fellow Americans the same respect, the same confidence, the same affection he had known at the peak of his public years.

Americans began recognizing the name Eisenhower in 1942 after he was named to direct the free world's first major offensive action of World War II—the invasion and ultimate liberation of North Africa. It was a task demanding more than the talents of a soldier, for the human problems posed by the occupation of North Africa were very nearly as difficult as the military problems. The task required tact, patience, the ability to induce men of divergent backgrounds, views, and personalities to work together for a common end.

It was General Eisenhower's exercise of that tact and patience that marked him as unlike any other military figure in World War II—and these were the qualities that put him in command of the invasion of Western Europe, the most ambitious and elaborate operation in human history. These also were the qualities that accounted for his recall to active duty to command the military arm of the North American Treaty Organization—and, ultimately, these were the qualities that made him President of the United States.

Dwight Eisenhower went into that office with the same purpose with which he approached his military assignments in North Africa and Western Europe. He aspired to unite. He sensed, accurately, I think, that the American people had been wearied by the exertions of two wars abroad and by a long series of conflicts at home, that they wanted more than anything else to pause, to catch their breath, to see how far they had come and how far they had yet to go.

Some will say that the 8 Eisenhower years were years of inaction, and in a sense they were. But they were the kind of years the American people had earned. And this is not to say that the Eisenhower years were empty, for they were not. They were years of repeated American testing on the world scene—years that found the United States reacting, in Lebanon, in the Formosa Straits, in Berlin, in Southeast Asia, with charity, courage and force.

They were the years that produced the concept of massive retaliation, the most effective instrument yet devised for arresting the forward thrust of international communism. They were years that formulated, more clearly than ever before or since, the great moral issues at stake in the confrontation between communism and freedom.

At home, they were the years that saw the launching of the Interstate Highway System—the most elaborate highway-building program in world history. A program without which much of the Nation would be close to transportation paralysis today.

Dwight Eisenhower was moved by the passionate dedication to peace that only one who has known war can have. To build understanding, to avert conflict, to relieve tensions, he was invariably willing to go the second mile—in the spirit that took him to Geneva and Paris, that brought Nikita Khrushchev to America.

The legacy that Dwight David Eisenhower leaves to the people to whose service he devoted his entire adult career is a legacy of devotion to duty, a legacy of leaving America a happier and sounder and spiritually stronger land. As his deeds are weighed in the scales of patriotism and integrity and humanity and duty, Americans know that he was a giant.

And because he was the personification of that which is good in America and in Americans, there is in the Nation this week a universal mourning, universal sharing, in which I humbly join, in the grief of Dwight Eisenhower's wife and of the entire Eisenhower family.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower established a truly remarkable record of accomplishments in his career as soldier and statesman. Editorials published last weekend in the Springfield, Mass., Union, the Springfield Daily News, and the Springfield Republican outline the former President's historic contributions to his Nation and to the world. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I include these editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican]  
A GREAT AMERICAN

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a great American; he was also a typical American, in the best sense of the term, perhaps to a larger degree than any other President of modern times.

In family background, boyhood and youth, in his West Point days and the first part of his Army career, Eisenhower generally resembled thousands of other Americans following the same sort of pathway in life.

Although he had the exceptional qualities of leadership which enabled him to take effective command of the most successful military operation in history, Eisenhower was typically the average American.

In his favorite pastimes, in his buoyant spirit, his progressive outlook, his forthright warmth and unflinching optimism, Ike personally summarized all the qualities that Americans most admire and appreciate.

And while Eisenhower was a professional soldier, he was also a man of peace. Like countless millions of Americans who have served in the armed forces, he fully knew the terrible horrors, agonies and human wastes of war; like millions of servicemen, he was dedicated to the proposition that the nation should never be an aggressor, should fight only for the defense of freedom, and should do all it could to advance the cause of worldwide peace.

Historians may well catalogue Ike for his genuine contributions toward peace as well as for his military achievements.

He typified the best of the American spirit.

He aimed for the general improvement of all people. He sought an elusive peace for the brotherhood of man . . . and he warmed the world with a grin.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union,  
Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Dwight D. Eisenhower, as soldier and statesman and public figure revered in the hearts of his countrymen, came closer to the hallowed tradition of George Washington than any man in American history.

Certainly no other personality made famous by the glory of military victory went so deeply into the civil-political life of the nation and emerged with his popularity still so wide, his record of service still so clean that his critics could do no more than scratch the surface and admit in the process that they "liked Ike," too.

The images of Gen. Eisenhower, President Eisenhower, and Citizen Eisenhower (author of books, once president of Columbia, raiser of cattle) blend into a composite whole, even considering that without the first, the others might well never have evolved. It is, then, all the more remarkable that the career was marked with distinction in one or another degree in each of its undertakings.

Of the military phase, there are no doubts. Gen. Eisenhower was at the top of the small pyramid of Allied strategists in World War II to whom the free world owes its salvation. His genius for military organization was the touchstone of the successful drive for the Continent and the eventual engulfment of the German war machine. Later, as NATO commander, he headed the Allied force designed not to win wars but to keep peace in Western Europe when one old ally, Russia, threatened to disturb it. The Western world's debt to him thus was increased.

Of the political phase, criticism is easier to find. Gen. Eisenhower brought his Crusade in Europe home to a virtually assured presidential victory when he agreed to run in 1952. His innate distaste for politics seemed to grow in the next eight years. His popularity grew, too, enhanced if anything by his conquest of illnesses, but so did political opposition charging in vague and loose terms a standstill at home and ineffectiveness of policy abroad. It is a modern paradox that the Democrats gained against his party in Congress while Mr. Eisenhower himself could have won an easy third term had he chosen to seek it and had the Constitution permitted.

Part of the explanation lies in the sense of national security engendered by the man Eisenhower in the White House. But the fact also is that under the Eisenhower policies the free world was holding its own securely against Communist designs. A common complaint was that it was not doing more than that. But the cycle of events was not then conducive to breakthroughs. Whether the Eisenhower years might have been crowned by significant progress toward world peace

had the summit conference of 1960 not been aborted by the U2 incident is still a matter of conjecture.

History will assess the Eisenhower presidential years in better perspective than is possible now. But one great domestic failure the general admitted himself occurred in his efforts to stem the trend toward federal centralization and to return more power and responsibility to the states. The political system, and the political figures who ran it, were the insurmountable obstacle.

Gen. Eisenhower's unswerving personal integrity was the hallmark of his presidency and doubtless what sustained his immense personal popularity, while that of many around him declined. It encompassed the impeccable patriotism of a great soldier, a sense of duty transcending personal welfare, physical and otherwise, a massive belief in the greatness of the United States, an aversion to war but the will to wage it if need be, and a dedication to moderation.

The respect and love of many millions, in the United States and in the far corners of the earth, were held by this immensely human man, who could wield the awesome power of D-Day force and also exude warmth and friendliness through the famous smile that the world had hoped to continue seeing often for many more years.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Mar. 29, 1969]

#### GENERAL EISENHOWER

When they assess the life of Dwight David Eisenhower, historians will quite likely differentiate between Eisenhower the military man, Eisenhower the educator, and Eisenhower the President.

While these three distinct phases in his life must be considered separately by those who will assign him a place in history, there is no such compulsion for categorization on the part of people the world over who knew him best as Ike and made him one of the most popular figures in the 20th Century.

Perhaps as no other man in this century, with the exception of Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower was the right man for the moment. During World War II, he gave Americans the military hero they so desperately needed. As commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Europe, he was the tactician who shaped D-Day strategy and turned military togetherness into the formula for victory.

It can be said that Eisenhower—the general—was the most successful of the three Dwight Eisenhowers and that nothing he did afterwards—even as President—quite matched his World War II exploits.

His life—from the day he entered West Point in 1911—was oriented to military standards and thinking. However, it has become axiomatic in American life that military men do not translate well to other careers.

As president of Columbia University for several years after World War II, Gen. Eisenhower was not particularly at home as an educator.

As President of the United States for eight years, the military man never quite seemed comfortable in the new world of politics. The politics which is an integral part of the presidency was obviously foreign to his forthright nature and his military background.

Yet, the Eisenhower record during his eight years as President had no direct relation to his personal popularity. Almost certainly, had he been eligible and chosen to run for a third or fourth term, he would have been reelected by large margins.

Whether he was president of a large university or President of the United States, he was still Gen. Eisenhower—the foremost military hero of our times.

In this sense, it is unfair to measure Dwight Eisenhower's place in history in any-

thing but a military context. This was his special cup of tea. As Winston Churchill—despite his many other accomplishments—is primarily remembered as the World War II inspirational leader of Great Britain, so Dwight Eisenhower is inexorably cast as the great American general of this war.

He served his country well—with a full measure of devotion. He was a firm believer in—and a champion of—the ideals of democracy. He was—most of all—a champion for the people and the country he loved so much.

Whatever his eventual place in history, Ike will always be remembered with esteem and affection by countless millions.

#### THE PRESIDIO STOCKADE

#### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 I expressed my concern on the floor of the House over the severity of the charges against those 27 prisoners at the Presidio who were peacefully protesting against the conditions under which they were living.

In the course of my remarks, I noted that I was writing to Secretary Stanley Resor of the Department of the Army and asking for a detailed reply to the allegation that the charge of mutiny was unfounded.

The following is the response I have received from Robert E. Jordan III, General Counsel of the Department of the Army:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Secretary Resor has asked me to reply to your request for information concerning the recent court-martial trials arising out of an incident which occurred last October at the Presidio of San Francisco.

I am enclosing a fact sheet which sets forth in detail the background and current status of the Presidio cases, including the facts concerning the recommendations made by Captain Millard and the other two officers who conducted pre-trial investigations of the cases pursuant to Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. As noted in the fact sheet, each of the three officers among whom the twenty-seven investigations were divided made a different recommendation as to the nature of the offense with which participants in the demonstration should be charged.

Under the military justice system, these recommendations are advisory only; ultimate responsibility for determining the nature of charges to be brought rests with the authority convening the court-martial, in this case Lieutenant General Stanley Larsen, Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army. The commanding General's decision to refer the cases for trial by general court-martial on a charge of mutiny was thus fully within his authority. It was made only after such action was recommended by intermediate commanders and the Sixth U.S. Army Staff Judge Advocate, who had carefully reviewed the entire matter, including the reports and recommendations of the investigating officers.

The legal correctness of this decision is tested not only in each trial in which the law officer and the court must be satisfied that the evidence supports the offense of mutiny, but also at each stage of the review process which I describe below.

In order to place the current status of the Presidio cases in proper perspective, it may be helpful to describe the process of post-trial review available to a convicted military defendant. In the military justice system the sentence adjudged by a court-martial, as well as the validity of a finding of guilt, is subject to review at several levels. In this regard, the military justice system differs from the practice of civilian appellate courts, which ordinarily have only the power to affirm or reverse a conviction.

The convictions and sentences in the Presidio cases will be reviewed in the first instance by the Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army, who convened the court-martial. He will act only after receiving the advice of his Staff Judge Advocate. In addition to the power to approve or disapprove the court's actions in toto, he has the power to reduce the finding of guilty of mutiny to a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense, such as willful disobedience of a lawful order, which carries a maximum punishment of five years' confinement. He also has the power, even if he approves the findings of guilt, to reduce the sentence or the finding in his discretion, even if he finds no error of law in the court proceedings.

If the sentence approved by the Commanding General, Sixth U.S. Army, includes either a punitive discharge or confinement of one year or more, the cases will then be referred to a Board of Review consisting of three military judges. The Board also has the power to reduce the sentence or the crime for which the accused was convicted.

Following action by the Board of Review, an accused may petition the Court of Military Appeals, composed of three civilian judges, for discretionary review limited to questions of law. The Court of Military Appeals has the power to approve or set aside the findings and sentences or to approve a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense which carries a lesser penalty.

Finally, apart from the process of appellate review I have just described, the Secretary of the Army and certain of his delegates have the authority, under Article 74 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, to remit or suspend all or part of the unexecuted portion of any sentence as a matter of clemency.

In the only Presidio case to reach the review stage thus far, The Judge Advocate General, after the convening authority had reduced the court imposed sentence from 15 to 7 years, exercised clemency power delegated to him by the Secretary of the Army to further reduce the sentence to two years. This case, as well as all of the other cases in which sentence has been or may be imposed, will continue through the normal military appellate process in which sentence may be decreased, but cannot be increased.

All of the Presidio cases are being followed closely by the Secretary of the Army. If, after the various stages of appellate review are completed, the Secretary concludes that any of the sentences are unjust or excessive in relation to the offense committed, he is prepared to exercise his power of clemency under Article 74 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I hope that the action already taken in the initial case to reach review, together with the information in this letter, will allay your concern that unjust or excessive sentences may be imposed.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. JORDAN III,  
General Counsel.

FACT SHEET, MARCH 19, 1969

Subject: Stockade, Presidio of San Francisco, California.

1. Prior to 11 October 1968, several inquiries were received concerning alleged brutality, poor sanitary conditions, and insufficient medical treatment for prisoners at the Presidio. These inquiries were based on newspaper accounts in March and July 1968.

Each inquiry was investigated and, in each instance, the allegations were not substantiated.

2. Contrary to the allegation that the Presidio stockade has a 40 prisoner capacity, the fenced in portion of the stockade can accommodate 103 men. A weekly check of the prisoner population for the same day of the week from 15 August 1968 to 31 January 1969 revealed that the population of the fenced in portion of the stockade exceeded 103 men on 6 occasions; these were: 5 September 1968—105; 12 September 1968—110; 19 September 1968—108; 10 October 1968—111; 16 January 1969—112; 30 January 1969—111. As the population fluctuates, the Sixth US Army Commanding General takes continuous action to reduce the population to a maximum of 103 men any time this population is exceeded. The Provost Marshal General has had an investigation made into the conditions at the Post Stockade, Presidio of San Francisco. This investigation revealed that the segregation cells were smaller than the measurements required by DOD directives, i.e., 5' wide x 6'3" long x 8' high as opposed to 6' wide x 8' long x 8' high. A waiver had been granted to allow the Presidio stockade to use these cells as an exception to the standards established. The investigation further revealed that in all other requirements, the stockade meets the required standards set forth by the Department of Defense. The Inspector General, Sixth United States Army has also investigated the conditions at the stockade. This report is being forwarded to Department of the Army for review.

3. On 16 September 1968, Private Richard Bunch was confined at the Presidio, having been charged with absence without leave (three specifications), and breaking restriction (two specifications). At the time of his death, he was awaiting trial by court-martial. On 11 October, Bunch was a member of a 4-man prisoner detail, working under armed guard at Letterman General Hospital. At 0955, he attempted to escape from the detail and was shot by the armed guard from a distance of approximately 60 feet. He was transported to the hospital, but he expired en route and was pronounced dead at 1007 hours.

4. The weapon used by the guard was a 12 gauge shotgun, loaded with number 4 shot (commonly called bird shot). The guard involved related that, prior to the shooting, Bunch had asked what would happen if he ran and he asked the guard to shoot him if he ran. The guard believed Bunch was joking as prisoners will often harass guards in this manner. Another prisoner in the work detail heard this conversation and has also stated that he believed Bunch was joking. Shortly thereafter, Bunch began running. After calling halt two times the guard fired to disable Bunch. Two witnesses heard the guard shout to Bunch, one other witness did not hear the warning. The three prisoners state that they did not hear the guard give warning. Test firings of the weapon after the shooting revealed that it consistently fired higher than the aiming point.

5. At 0730, 14 October 1968, a work formation was assembled at the stockade. When the first prisoner's name was called, 28 Prisoners left the formation, walked away, sat down, and began singing and chanting such things as "We Want Freedom, We Want Hallinan." One prisoner left this demonstration when he heard an officer state that the action constituted mutiny. Despite repeated orders by an officer to desist, the demonstrators continued. Twenty-five military policemen entered the stockade and escorted the demonstrators from the scene. No force was required other than physically carrying some prisoners off.

6. The prisoner who voluntarily left the scene of this activity later related that he was asked to join this demonstration and told that a group of civilian lawyers were

backing the sit down. He was told that the sit down was a demand to end work under armed guards, for better food and conditions, and for less harassment. He was also told it was in connection with a GI and veterans peace movement. One other demonstrator stated he joined because he thought all prisoners were involved. He states he wanted to leave the sit down but was forced to remain by the other prisoners. He stated the sit down was in protest of the shooting of Private Bunch and he had been promised free legal counsel.

7. As a result of this demonstration, 27 of the prisoners have been charged with mutiny in violation of Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The charges were referred to three separate pretrial investigations in compliance with Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. These investigations were conducted by disinterested officers. The accused were all represented by civilian counsel of their own choosing or assigned military counsel or both.

8. One of the three investigating officers, Captain Richard N. Millard, recommended reduction of the charges against the prisoners to willful disobedience and a trial by special court-martial. He recommended further that four of the six prisoners subject to his investigation be administratively discharged on the basis of psychiatric examination. A second investigating officer, Captain James Bradner, Jr., recommended that the prisoners be tried by general court-martial on the lesser charge of willful disobedience. The third investigating officer, Captain Howard McElhattan, recommended trial by general court-martial on the charge of mutiny. Under Army procedure, the reports of the investigating officers are routinely made available to military and civilian attorneys for the accused.

9. The investigating officers' recommendations were carefully reviewed and considered by the Sixth US Army Staff Judge Advocate who, based upon the complete investigation, the allied papers and the intermediate commanders' recommendations that the cases be referred to trial by general court-martial on the offense of mutiny, recommended to the Commanding General that the accused be tried for mutiny by general court-martial.

10. On 10 January 1969, Lieutenant General Stanley Larsen, the Commanding General, Sixth United States Army referred the charge of mutiny in the cases of Privates Oszczpinski, Zaino, Reidel, Yost, Colip, and Dodd to a joint trial by general court-martial.

11. On 20 January 1969, the Commanding General referred the charge of mutiny in the cases of Specialist Four Blake, Privates Duncan, Gentile, Marino, Pulley, Rowland, Sood, Trafethan, and Wright to a joint trial by general court-martial. This trial was tentatively set to begin on 6 February 1969. Also on 20 January, the Commanding General referred the charge of mutiny in the case of Privates Murphy, Rupert, Sales, Schiro, Seales, Shaw, Stevens, Wilkins, Hayes, and Swanson to a joint trial by general court-martial. This trial was tentatively set to begin on 17 February 1969.

12. Privates Mather and Pawloski, also charged with mutiny on 14 October 1968, escaped from confinement in the stockade on 24 December 1968 and have not been apprehended. No further action in their cases has been taken.

13. Although Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provides a person who is found guilty of mutiny may be punished by death, the Commanding General has referred each case for trial as non-capital, and it will not be possible for the courts-martial to adjudge a death penalty if the accused are found guilty. The general courts-martial may acquit the defendants of the charge of mutiny and may instead find them guilty of the lesser included offenses of will-

ful disobedience (maximum punishment 5 years) or failure to obey lawful order (maximum punishment 6 months) or disorderly conduct (maximum punishment 4 months).

14. On 28 January 1969, the joint trial by general court-martial in the cases of Oszczpinski, Zaino, Reidel, Yost, Colip and Dodd commenced at the Presidio of San Francisco.

15. On 28 January 1969, the law officer granted a motion for a continuance until 17 February 1969 in the case of Private John Colip. On 30 January the law officer granted motions for continuances until 5 March 1969 in the cases of Privates Ricky Dodd, Edward Yost and Larry Zaino. Privates Louis Oszczpinski and Lawrence Reidel did not move for continuance, and presentation of evidence in their court-martial began on 3 February 1969. On 5 February, after presentation by defense counsel of psychiatric testimony, the law officer suspended the trial for a complete psychiatric evaluation of the two defendants. This evaluation has been completed and the conclusion of the physicians is that the two accused were mentally responsible for their acts and suffered no significant diminished mental capacity to obey orders. On 14 February the court-martial of Privates Oszczpinski and Reidel resumed and both of the accused were found guilty of mutiny in violation of Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. On 15 February the court, after hearing mitigation and extenuation presented by defense counsel, Captain Brennan Sullivan and Captain Joseph Choate, sentenced Private Oszczpinski to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 16 years, and total forfeitures and sentenced Private Reidel to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 14 years, and total forfeitures.

16. On 6 February 1969 the joint trial of Specialist Four Blake and Privates Duncan, Gentile, Marino, Pulley, Rowland, Sood, Trafethan and Wright commenced at the Presidio of San Francisco. The law officer granted continuances until 18 March for all defendants except Private Sood. In addition, on 6 February, the trial of Privates Murphy, Rupert, Sales, Schiro, Seales, Shaw, Stevens and Wilkins, originally tentatively scheduled for 17 February, was rescheduled for 18 March. On 13 February Private Sood was found guilty of mutiny in violation of Article 94 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The court, after hearing mitigation and extenuation presented by his defense counsel, Mr. Paul H. Hallvonik and Captain Emmitt F. Yeary, sentenced Private Sood to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 15 years, and total forfeitures.

17. In December, Mr. Terence Hallinan, who is the civilian attorney for 17 of the soldiers accused of mutiny, filed a petition in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California at San Francisco. Mr. Hallinan requested a writ of habeas corpus and mandamus and injunctive relief be granted, alleging confinement in the stockade of the Presidio of San Francisco is cruel and unusual punishment in violation of Amendment VIII of the United States Constitution. The District Court dismissed the petition on the basis that the petitioners had not exhausted administrative remedies available to them. Petitioners have recently renewed their habeas corpus action in the District Court, contending that administrative remedies have now been exhausted.

18. On 9 December, Mr. Hallinan, again representing the same 17 of the accused, filed a petition with the United States Court of Military Appeals, requesting that Court grant a writ of habeas corpus and mandamus and other injunctive relief. The petition alleged that the confinement of his clients in the stockade of the Presidio of San Francisco is cruel and unusual punishment in violation of Amendment VIII of the United States Constitution. On 27 December 1968, by memorandum opinion, the court denied the petition.

19. Lieutenant General Stanley Larsen, Commanding General, Sixth United States Army, has declined to meet with Bishop Meyers, Bishop Golden and others. The basis for this decision was the fact that General Larsen is a party litigant in habeas corpus actions filed in the United States District Court, and he regards it as inappropriate to discuss the matters in issue in the pending litigation. General Larsen has indicated that the Staff Judge Advocate, Sixth U.S. Army, would be available to meet with the Bishops and to discuss any matters of concern to them.

20. The records of trial are now being prepared on those cases that have been completed. When the records are completed they will be reviewed by the Staff Judge Advocate at Sixth United States Army. He will concern himself not only with whether there were any errors during the trial which might adversely affect the legality of the findings or sentence, but also with whether the sentence is suited to the circumstances of the case. The Staff Judge Advocate must then prepare written reviews of the cases and must specifically recommend to the convening authority—the Commanding General, Sixth United States Army—the actions which are appropriate in the cases. These written reviews, with the records of trial, will be considered by the convening authority, who may approve only so much of the findings of guilty as he determines to be legally and factually correct, and only so much of the sentences as he finds to be lawful, appropriate and just.

21. Should the convening authority approve the findings of guilty and a sentence including a punitive discharge from the Army or confinement at hard labor for one year or more, the records of trial will be reviewed by a board of review in the Office of The Judge Advocate General. This board—composed of three military judges—will weigh the evidence and determine whether the findings and sentences are legally correct and, if so, whether the sentences are appropriate. The board may set aside the findings and sentences or may reduce the sentences, but it cannot increase the severity of the punishment. Upon appellants' request, qualified appellate defense counsel will be assigned to represent them free of charge before the board of review. They may also retain civilian counsel at their own expense.

22. Should the board of review affirm the convictions, the appellants may petition the Court of Military Appeals—composed of three civilian judges—for a review of matters of law. They are also entitled to be represented before that court by legally qualified military counsel at no cost or by civilian counsel obtained at their own expense.

23. If after completion of appellate review a sentence, including some term of confinement should be affirmed in their cases, the individuals would still be entitled to participate in the Army's clemency program. Through this program deserving individuals are given opportunity to apply for restoration to full duty in the Army, and to demonstrate through excellent conduct and performance of duty that they are fully rehabilitated and deserving of being allowed to complete their military service honorably. If restoration to duty is not appropriate, when eligible, they may apply for parole.

24. On 18 February the trial in the case of Private John Colip was terminated when the law officer ruled that publicity concerning the Stockade mutiny and concerning previous defendants made it impossible for Private Colip to receive a fair and impartial trial in the San Francisco area. The law officer further ruled that the court members assembled to try Private Colip were disqualified as a group to sit in judgment in this case due to the influence of the publicity upon them. A mistrial was declared. Sixth Army made the necessary arrangements to

change the location of the trial. The trial of Private Colip resumed at Fort Irwin, California, on 24 February, using the same law officer but with a different panel of court members. Counsel for Private Colip concurred in these arrangements.

25. On 28 February, at Fort Irwin, California, Private John Colip was convicted of mutiny in violation of Article 94, Uniform Code of Military Justice. The court, after hearing mitigation and extenuation, sentenced Private Colip to a dishonorable discharge, confinement at hard labor for 4 years, and total forfeitures.

26. On 5 March the trial of Privates Zaino, Murphy, Swanson, Hayes, Yost, and Dodd began at the Presidio of San Francisco. All court members were drawn from officers stationed at Fort Lewis. On 11 March the law officer ordered a psychiatric examination for Private Zaino and continued his case until a later date. On 14 March a motion for change of venue was granted. The trial will resume for the remaining five men at Fort Lewis on 19 March.

27. On 18 March The Judge Advocate General of the Army upon review of the complete trial record in the case of Private Nesery D. Sood, one of 27 soldiers charged with mutiny at the Presidio of San Francisco, reduced the sentence to 2 years confinement at hard labor. The Commanding General, Sixth United States Army had previously reduced the sentence from 15 years to 7 years. The Judge Advocate General exercised clemency in this case through powers delegated to him by the Secretary of the Army under Title 10, United States Code, Section 874. Private Sood's case is the first of 27 mutiny cases to reach the appellate stage under established military appellate procedures. No change was made in that portion of his sentence which included dishonorable discharge and total forfeiture of pay.

#### EULOGY TO FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

### HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 31, 1969*

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved as I join my distinguished colleagues who eulogize today the life and accomplishments of one of America's greatest soldiers and statesmen, Dwight David Eisenhower. Words alone cannot adequately delineate the omnibus contributions that this great man gave freely to his countrymen as well as to all the people who have inhabited this planet.

Few men in the annals of our civilizations have experienced so fully and deserved so entirely the public trust and confidence placed in Dwight David Eisenhower as General of the Armies, Supreme Allied Commander, and 34th President of the United States. He has held more positions of public responsibility than most all of the great men of history who have preceded him. But perhaps more significantly, former President Eisenhower was revered both at home and abroad not only for the offices that he held but for the man that he was.

Gentle of spirit, pillar of strength, and dedicated to liberty and justice for all, General Eisenhower was the epitome of the American dream. Born under the

Texas stars, and raised in the open Kansas plains, his was a vision of a world without walls to contain the creeping ambitions of petty tyrants. He dreamed rather of a world where individuals could build their own future, free from the domination of others. It is to his great credit that the worst tyrant of the 20th century was smashed by the allied forces in 1945.

Of General Eisenhower, I believe, it may truly be said that although good men must die, death cannot kill their names.

#### AVAILABILITY OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 1, 1969*

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I introduced a bill to increase the availability of postsecondary education to all segments of the population by establishing a program of Federal grants to the States for the purpose of strengthening, expanding, and improving comprehensive community college. Even though community colleges represent about one half of the institutions of higher education and enroll about one third of the students pursuing a higher education, the Federal Government has failed to encourage these colleges to expand their efforts. Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Allen T. Bonnell, president of the Philadelphia Community College and chairman of the Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents, indorsing my bill.

The thoughts Mr. Bonnell expressed in his letter about the need for the Federal Government to recognize its responsibility and provide a fair share of higher education assistance to community colleges are applicable not only to the situation in Pennsylvania but all across the country. Therefore, I would like to insert Mr. Bonnell's letter in the RECORD:

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA,  
Philadelphia, Pa., March 24, 1969.

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EILBERG: As Chairman of the Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents, and in their behalf, I should like to express appreciation for your sponsorship of the recently introduced Bill H.R. 7957.

While the Community Colleges of Pennsylvania are comparative newcomers in the field of educational service, they have already made their impact felt. The Enabling Legislation for the Colleges was passed late in 1963. The first college became operative in 1964 and the second and third in 1965. There are now 12 in operation, one of which has three campuses.

Three of the Pennsylvania Community Colleges have already earned full accreditation by the Middle States Association and the remainder are on their way toward such accreditation. In 1968/69 they enrolled, during the regular terms, over 24,000 full-time and part-time students. All of the Colleges offer evening and summer programs. Enrollments of over 32,000 are projected for 1969/70

and over 40,000 for 1970/71. In the next six years it is anticipated that the opening of additional Community Colleges will bring the total number in operation to at least 25.

Because of their financial and geographic availability and the types of counseling and educational programs offered the Community Colleges have been particularly effective in reaching and opening opportunities for disadvantaged students. Their capacity to fulfill their mission will depend on the availability of adequate funds to develop plant, facilities, faculty and programs. The bill you have introduced is long overdue.

Members of the Council of Pennsylvania Community College Presidents has asked that I pledge, on their behalf, full support of Bill H.R. 7975. We urge that hearings be conducted at the earliest possible date and would welcome an opportunity to present testimony, collectively and individually.

With all good wishes,

Cordially,

ALLEN T. BONNELL,  
Chairman, Council of Pennsylvania  
Community College Presidents.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, the most popular President of several decades and probably of the history of our country, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, has passed away. But his popularity, great as it was with his infectious smile and his down to earth, "one of us" manner, is relatively unimportant when compared with his many and tremendous contributions to our Nation, and to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of beginning my congressional service at the same time that "Ike" took over as our 34th President. I was honored to be a part of the Republican 83d Congress which helped to smooth the rocky path that faces new Chief Executives and which is especially obstacle-ridden for one who assumes the country's leadership without previous experience in the Congress.

With our help, his success came easier, but with or without it, "Ike" was bound to succeed since this was the pattern of his life. He never learned the definition of failure.

President Eisenhower had a deep and abiding faith in the Supreme Being and did not hesitate to admit his reliance upon Him. As every mortal man does, he made mistakes but these were not prompted by selfishness or greed. He did what he truly believed was in the best interests of the country he had served so many years. He led the Nation to victory in war and thereby brought to a close a bloody and shameful period of history. As Commander in Chief, he was called upon again to stop a conflict that had taken thousands of lives. His policies and his philosophy then allowed peace to continue through the rest of his two terms in office.

General "Ike" has now gone to his just reward. He sleeps in peace and no tears need be shed for him, but rather for his beloved wife Mamie and his family, who will personally miss him so intensely, and for the rest of the Nation who will now be deprived of his great wisdom, his sound advice and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my most sincere sympathy to his wife and family and know that the good Lord, whom Ike served so devotedly, will give them added strength of acceptance and joy that their loved one is now free of troubles and hardships and is resting in the House of the Lord.

THE DEATH OF GENERAL  
EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, the Nation, and the world have eulogized Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. Words are never fully adequate, but they can be truly noble if men live by them. The general has passed on, but he has left us a legacy. Part of that legacy is the words he uttered and by which he lived. I believe they would be an inspiration to us and to our children also. Therefore, I have introduced a resolution to have the Librarian of Congress, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration, publish the speeches of General Eisenhower.

Our grief and that of the world is unbounded. But it is lit by the hope and faith that the man, Dwight Eisenhower, inspired in the hearts and minds of men everywhere.

We pray for the comfort of those who were near to him at this time of bereavement.

He was, as has been said of our first President, George Washington, first in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of the world—both in peace and war.

Who can forget this man who led the forces of freedom onto the shores of Nazi "fortress Europe" on June 6, 1944, with the knowledge that he alone bore the awesome responsibility for their success or failure? Who can forget this man who twice laid down the gauntlet of arms to take on the burdens of peace—first as the president of Columbia University and then of the United States? Who can forget the man who laid down a challenge in his farewell address as inspiring and far reaching as that laid down by President Washington in his farewell?

The man is gone—but not his spirit. We could do no better in these days of eternal crisis and challenge than to live by the ideals he stated in his second inaugural address:

May we pursue the right without self-righteousness.

May we know unity without conformity.

May we grow in strength without pride in self.

May we, in our dealings with all peoples of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice.

And so shall America—in the sight of all men of good will—prove true to the honorable purposes that bind and rule us as a people in all this time of trial through which we pass.

My district, the great State of Wyoming, is still very much a frontier place, similar to that where General Eisenhower was reared to hold great love for his God, country, and family. Therefore, I think it especially appropriate to have published in the RECORD the following editorial by Mr. James Flinchum, editor of the Wyoming State Tribune:

WHY THEY LIKED IKE

In the hindsight of death, every man looms larger than life, miraculously purged of his sins and with his best qualities magnified. Only in rare instances do the eulogies match in the departed the individual in real life. In Dwight D. Eisenhower, there is such an exception.

The General was such a plain and simple man that his almost universal acceptance amounting to near reverence, seems an incongruity. His innate simplicity was manifested in many forms, many of them minor.

One of the highest ranking American military officials of all time, exceeded only by John J. Pershing, General Eisenhower studiously avoided trappings of rank. One small symbol of this was that he refused to wear gilt braid—"scrambled eggs"—on his visored military cap.

He constantly viewed himself as merely one of the millions of Americans who contributed to the winning of World War II; and when the Korean War began, he dismissed himself in one brief, typical statement when someone suggested that he consider himself for active duty in that conflict: Korea needed young soldiers, said Eisenhower, not old generals.

Eisenhower, both as a soldier and as President, was so markedly unostentatious that it was like a silence in a great hall filled with people.

One of his great and enduring qualities was that he was so simple, so approachable and so possessed of the ability to not only put a stranger immediately at ease, but to establish a communion with that stranger at once.

This mystical quality that is not always obvious except on direct contact, somehow emanated from Eisenhower by indirect contact; so that he projected this image of simplicity and of simpatia from a great distance.

So in a sense he was everyman, and identified himself with all persons of all ages and backgrounds, races and creeds; and it is very possible that every person saw himself in the General, the person he thought he might be, or desperately desired to be.

UN Secretary-General U Thant said yesterday that Eisenhower was a good man, and he projected this image of goodness. Walter Cronkite, employing what now has become a cliché, said he was a man for all seasons. Someone else said to many women he provided a father symbol; to many old men the sort of son they would like to have had; to others the kind of leader they most admired.

It is best to remember that all of these things were true, simply because people believed them to be so; and that perhaps is the essence of truth.

Ultimately, the historians shall one day—possibly commencing a half century from now—get around to accurately assessing Eisenhower's place in history and the origin of his exceptional personal influence on others.

For our own part, we can point to the birth of the General, Oct. 14, 1890, and the place and circumstances—a humble home in what remained Frontier America.

Although Eisenhower's father was a railroad worker in Denison, Tex., when the future President and commander-in-chief of the Allied Forces in World War II was born, the time and place still were a part of the Frontier which did not end by agreement of most historians until a few years later.

Dwight David Eisenhower thus was a product of westering, pioneer America, an essentially simple and unsophisticated place with a value system founded on what may be termed loosely the Puritan Ethic.

While basic virtues were not always observed by any means, and there was much lawless and wrongdoing in Frontier America, nevertheless the basic virtues represented chiefly by God, Home and Country were idealized.

People did not put on airs or assume exaggerated notions of their individual importance in the Denisons and Abblenes of the 1890's, and early 1900's, the milieu in which Eisenhower grew up.

If they were notable individuals it was because they were persons like Theodore Roosevelt, himself an easterner but who adopted the ways of the Frontier, an epitome of the direct actionist and the vigorous, simple and wholesome life. Or so it seemed.

Soldiering was an honorable and much-admired profession for that age was still influenced not only by a developing America that had been in vogue since Jefferson's time, and not only by the Spanish-American War just past, but also by the Civil War. Veterans of both these conflicts including such notables as Fighting Joe Wheeler, still lived in that era. Americans universally remained almost without exception, a proud people.

Essentially, then, General Eisenhower was a product of that age, a very different one from that in which we presently live in vast confusion, an era in which values were clear and definite and there was no obscuring of purpose either nationally, familiarly or individually.

Dwight David Eisenhower related that era to the present; he was a remarkable product of its virtues.

Despite what has happened in America in the past two decades and particularly in the past one, this nation was built on an ethical system best represented in such an individual as General Eisenhower.

For the older people he hearkened back to all that was good in an earlier America and what they liked to see in the present.

For the younger, he represented a solidity that the present fails of achieving.

In every respect, then, the General symbolized an ideal that seldom makes its appearance so notably in single individuals; he belonged to an America of heroic tradition, vested in such individuals as Washington, Lincoln, Lee and Pershing; startlingly similar to these persons in many respects, and yet different too in his own way.

Eisenhower was his own man, and yet he also was every man because he symbolized of the best in this country. That is what made him so unique—the very commonness of him, yet uncommon, too.

He was every American, or what every American really wants to be.

And so the man and the country that found such common identity, and a sharing of admiration and love, have come to the physical parting, as it must to all living persons.

It is a sad moment as on all such occasions whether the latter be one involving the great or the small; and as in these latter too, it may be said of General Eisenhower that the greater recognition must be that although death is sorrowful, the life that pre-

ceded it is so much more infinitely greater than the ultimate act is lessened thereby.

America and the world are fortunate to have had among its people such as Dwight David Eisenhower and we who lived during his life, have been particularly favored by his presence.

#### MILLIONS OF NATION'S STUDENTS STILL HAVE EDUCATION AS MISSION

### HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard much in the past months from and about the discontented on our college campuses. A great deal of what we have heard has been so unpleasant that we are in danger, I believe, of indicting an entire college generation for the acts of very few. If this is true, we may, in our reaction to the unconscionable acts of a small group fail to hear the legitimate comments of the many. One of the outstanding newspapers in my State, the Burlington Daily Times News recently published an editorial which gives proper distinction to the differences between our college students in general and the few who have received far too much publicity in recent times.

The editorial follows:

#### MILLIONS OF NATION'S STUDENTS STILL HAVE EDUCATION AS MISSION

On this day, as on all days of a school year, millions of students in higher education across the nation and world failed to make a significant imprint on thoughts of the adult world.

They went to their classrooms, prepared for their professors. They took notes, entered into discussions, listened intently, spent hours in a scientific laboratory, read from their books, wrote their papers, and found themselves constructively accepting these new thoughts and opportunities which had come to them.

They went through the processes of learning, and it was an enlightening experience for them. They were gaining new strength, because they were finding new knowledge.

Back at home, there were parents, brothers and sisters who thought about them on this day. A son, daughter, brother or sister was at college or the university learning and preparing for later life. Yes, there were sacrifices in most of the homes. What may have been a new car had become a payment to the college. What may have been a party had become an extra check for some clothing.

On this day, too, millions of students probably have written a letter home, or received a letter from home. There is a closeness and respect maintained, a love expressed, a pride felt. There is no breakdown as any of them feel it. They don't know much about the "gaps", for they have never felt them. They only know that they love one another, work for one another, respond to opportunity, and accomplish together. Parents work for their children, and the children don't take it for granted.

If many of these students happened to look out the window of a classroom or dormitory, they may have seen some strange sights. Groups assembled. Maybe a soapbox. Possibly a few television cameras around. If

they had listened, they may have heard something about protest. They may have heard words like "burn", or "pig", or something similar.

But they didn't listen nor keep looking. They kept going about their business of education and making time count in the days available to him.

They were on the campus to learn, and they were learning many things, not merely from books and their professors. They were learning that in their young lives they could make a choice, and they were placing a priority on the mission that had taken them to the campus in the first place.

They didn't accept all that was a part of the "establishment" without question. We can be proud that they don't, for improvements come from constructive participation in orderly process.

But they had made a decision. They were seeking an education.

And sometimes we may overlook these millions of students who are doing this as we recognize other students who aren't.

They're not in the limelight.

But they're there. They're there every school day.

They're almost our forgotten people in higher education today as we refer to students, colleges, universities and their involvements. They really deserve better than they're getting, for they are the ones who, through their disciplines and placement of values, keep showing us what higher education is all about.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, an era in the history of our country has ended with the passing of a great American, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. Born of sturdy pioneer parents, in humble circumstances, by his ability and determination he reached the pinnacle of success and popularity. He possessed an intuitive faculty of assessing the movements and motives of our enemies in combat, which was recognized by our allies. His was a life filled with accomplishments.

I had the privilege and honor of meeting General Eisenhower during the close of World War II and on many occasions thereafter.

Just to be in his company one could recognize his dynamic personality and his superlative aptitude for leadership. His brilliant direction of our Armed Forces in World War II won for him world renown. Not only our country but the entire world stood in proud salute to acclaim this able and remarkable man whose dramatic career will long live in the archives of our country.

General Eisenhower will be remembered and revered by all who have stood for the rights which our forefathers sought and those who have fought and are fighting for peace, freedom and justice.

To his family and especially to his widow who has shared his triumphs and who has stood bravely by him in sadness and sorrow, I extend my deep and profound sympathy.

A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF  
MAN; PART I—AN INTRODUCTION

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, a minister of outstanding courage and foresight, and a constituent of mine, was one of this year's winners of the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation Awards.

He is the Reverend Charles Hubbard, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C.

His award was based on a series of sermons he delivered on "The Freedom of Man." The award was well founded.

I have read those sermons. They are inspiring and enlightening. More than that, they reveal an outlook on the part of the author that is found far too seldom in many of the pulpits of our churches today.

Feeling that Mr. Hubbard's message should not be confined to just his pastorate and believing that all of us here will be inspired by his thoughts as revealed in his words, Senator ERVIN and I alternately plan to insert in the RECORD his series of sermons. The first follows:

A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—  
INTRODUCTION

(By the Reverend Charles Hubbard, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Wilson, N.C.)

I will say at the outset that sometimes I preach by compulsion and the subject matter is forced upon me. I will also admit in advance that some of you may say, "Preacher, sometimes you go a little deep and I don't understand you." Before you say it, I want to quote John Erskine, a realistic and progressive thinker. He said, "You have a moral obligation to be as intelligent as you can." Furthermore, I think we had better make up our minds about our philosophy of life, our basic belief concerning man—or else it will be planned for us by somebody else. I admit I am preaching for conviction, and I am preaching for action. I hope that from this series, you will do something about it—here in Wilson, in the state, and in the nation.

I am deeply concerned about the freedom of man. Freedom has many enemies today, and through softness or impatience or selfish thinking or lack of thought and will, we can lose this precious inheritance for our lifetime and for generations to come. My concern is based upon the best of classic theology. St. Augustine wrote in *The City of God* that God willed that man, who was endowed with reason and made in His image, should not rule over men, but over cattle. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologica* insisted it is a grievous matter for anyone to yield to another what ought to be one's own. He admitted man's social nature requires legal attention to the common good, but that all law should be a ministration and not domination.

Nevertheless, some will accuse me of being reactionary. In one sense, at least, they will be right. I am reacting.

I am a liberal under the classic definition of liberality, which grew from the basic Latin root, "liber", to be free. I do not believe that my love of freedom is compatible with the "new" liberality. But at best, labels are inaccurate and misleading.

I think Christian leaders would do well today to re-examine their faith and honest convictions on the point of what they call themselves. One of our modern tragedies is

that many well-meaning Christian leaders have allowed their names, their positions and their good social intentions, often unwittingly and naively, to be made an instrument of an extreme position which, if that position prevailed, would betray every basic Christian principle necessary for the salvation of man.

Those who champion the position of the "far cultural left" today think of themselves as liberals and suppose they are leading a great revolution—some magnificent "wave of the future." An unprejudiced study of history will show the exact opposite is true. Socialist and communist propagandists have twisted liberalism from its true meaning into a contemporary symbol of authoritarian government, which is one of the oldest and most reactionary ideas of all times. It is as old as slavery is old; and it is no better for the soul of man.

The point is—and I want to make it here—that the vast body of honest and responsible lay Christian conviction is moderate. By no means reactionary, this majority is kindly and tolerant, but it is inarticulate and frustrated. This is so, largely because in official church circles there is a distortion at the point where church or denomination or interdenominational committee makes its statements to the press or to television and radio. The committees and commissions who issue statements on social and political matters are largely dominated by the clergy. Busy laymen find it difficult to attend extended and distant meetings, or to study reports in advance. The average clerical delegate is a gentle person and is often inarticulate before the violent tirades of the modern "liberal." The attending delegate is repeatedly victimized by block voting and parliamentary hocus-pocus. Thus points are forced and radical reports are written, and the impression is made that the "liberal" viewpoint is the official position of the church. The true church, back home, is horrified.

So, in sweeping, self-righteous statements knotty theological and social problems are glibly "solved." It is tragically funny. For these are the same enigmas of human sin that have tortured the best brains of the past and will continue to trouble man in the ages to come.

I am sure that humble Christians sometimes have the same thoughts as the anonymous poet who wrote:

"I don't pretend to know the things  
That's hid from most of folks;  
Of which came first, the hen or egg,  
Or why the eggs have yolks.

"Or who the Lord was speaking to  
When He said, "Let's make man,"  
If woman was an after-thought  
Or part of His first plan.

"I don't pretend to know too much,  
I'd like to know enough;  
When some wise guy comes flashing by,  
To simply call his bluff."

Now, the Christian position, of course, is not determined by a vote of any majority, and the glorious thing about an enlightened faith is that we are free to think as we will. The "liberal" Christian claims that freedom for himself; and then often proceeds to denounce other opinion as not Christian or reactionary. I claim freedom for everybody—everybody! I claim freedom of speech for people who are conservative as well as for people who are modernly liberal. I claim the same freedom for myself, and I use it now.

I claim the right to believe in a limited Constitutional government as was organized in the United States of America by one of the greatest groups of geniuses ever to appear upon the scene of history. I do not desire a "big brother government" that forces its control in all my affairs. Does not such a gov-

ernment assume the image of God and the power of God? I believe it does. And I do not believe it has the right to do this. I don't care by what democratic name you call it, I oppose it.

I claim the freedom to recognize and be grateful for the record and progress of all the people in the United States, including our Negro citizens. Today this is a free land in which Negroes were held in abject and deplorable slavery a little more than a hundred years ago. I insist there is much unfinished business for any Christian in America at this point and every person of goodwill knows it.

Nevertheless, we should declare to the entire world the achievements of the Negro in America, a record that is unparalleled in modern times and is vastly superior to that of any other colored people anywhere else in the world.

I thank my God that my nation cares for the old, the poor and the sick, but I claim the freedom to believe in responsibility and in self-reliance as two of the chief means to secure my personal economic security. I also recommend them to you.

I claim the freedom to oppose those who would have the United States to disarm and cease fire unilaterally, and, if necessary, to surrender abjectly to Communist subversion in Viet Nam, in Cambodia, in Laos, or anywhere in the world. My Christian faith is not such a nebulous or disembodied idea that it believes that human dignity and freedom are expendable qualities in this world. Do you think for a minute that they are expendable?

Right here in America I claim the right to protect and defend our most precious national possessions, the dignity and freedom of the individual citizen. I claim the right to search out and oppose by every honorable and legal means all subversive influence in this great nation. Intelligent Americans do not have to resort to "witch-hunting" to recognize a thinly disguised hammer and sickle behind many a "peace march" or black-militant demand. I reject the deliberate effort of many "liberals" today to associate responsible anti-communists with cranks and super-patriots. A God-fearing Christian should be totally opposed to what may well be the most treacherous and dangerous outside enemy—atheistic communism—and any of its parts.

I will not be so ungrateful that I shall not claim the right to believe in and honor in my pulpit the greatness and hope I see in my country today. I will humbly confess our national sins, but I will not apologize for our national achievements before other nations who first scorn us, then look to us for help, and then are largely sustained by our charity. I claim the freedom to point out that many of those nations bear a huge guilt of injustices.

They harbor unspeakable poverty in the midst of a rich elite. They sustain iron-bound caste systems, racial deprivation, and the restriction of human rights and opportunities far beyond anything that has ever existed in the dimmest history of the United States. Why should I be ashamed of the plenty and prosperity that has come to this nation through the genius of the private enterprise system? The current failures of communistic and socialistic economies around the world prompt me to pray that the major business and industry in America shall always be private, competitive and free.

Finally, I claim the freedom to challenge all who hold that the saving message of the gospel has no place to work today except in coercive social reforms. Does Christianity have nothing to say anymore about morality and integrity and honesty and faith and love? Is our total church program to be poverty and job placement and welfarism? Responsible citizenship demands the solving of our social problems of race and poverty and injustice and unemployment and peace,

and every Christian has got to be deeply committed. However, I insist that history has shown this can best be done in a climate of political, economic and religious freedom. I say, *freedom!* I realize that the gospel is revolutionary and I want it to be revolutionary; but the revolution has got to come from within man. It has got to revolutionize our hearts and our minds first. I tell you the Kingdom of God is not going to be superimposed on anybody by Federal law! It can't be done that way. We will correct our inequities within the framework of freedom or we will lose our souls while we juggle our material and social structures.

So much more I would say, but this homily is only an introductory statement on freedom. Permit me to emphasize how necessary it is for you and for me and for all free men and women of God to learn the disciplines of freedom and to beware the pitfalls of Utopianism. America must re-learn the lessons of history, and submit itself to the disciplines of human experience. America must, at all costs, maintain free inquiry; and must learn again the virtue of patience. America must humbly be willing to accept unflattering truth; and must subject itself to the spiritual laws of love and growth and faith and understanding.

There are going to be no short-cuts to a better world. We must renew our allegiance to the laws of God; and we must accept the gospel of our Lord. "I will walk at liberty, for I seek Thy precepts," said the Psalmist. I claim that a responsible Christian position holds that the human spirit finds its highest fulfillment in the framework of personal, economic and political freedom.

Man's struggle for freedom has been a long and wearing thing, and we cannot now lightly cast it aside. Throughout history man has been confronted by a never-ending struggle against tyranny, and we are desperately fighting this battle today. However, history clearly witnesses that free societies have invariably proved to be more adaptable, more creative, more fulfilling than any under totalitarian yoke. The ultimate guarantee against authoritarian encroachment is a deep and abiding awareness on the part of every Christian citizen that freedom is not expendable. Freedom has no price!

Respect for the freedom of the individual is the one value which underlies and is an inherent part of all other values. Only under such freedom do other human values acquire any real purpose. Only under this value can other values grow. Without freedom, all other virtues lose their luster; some, in fact, lose all meaning. Try to find the meaning for democracy in Russia or China today! It has no meaning. What value is there in prolonging human life through medical science if that life is to be lived in semi-slavery? What value is there in achieving a high rate of literacy if an individual is not free to read or write what he chooses? What value is there in a high rate of voter participation if there is no choice of candidates? What value is there of advanced scientific inquiry if that inquiry must be channeled to the support of pre-determined political and social position?

Our ancient faith upholds us when we believe that in a complicated society such as ours we must, through our elected representatives, make certain political, social and economic agreements that become respected laws for the common good; and these laws must always protect the greatest freedom for all. A wiser man than I, John Stuart Mill, said this: "The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it." This I believe. This I will live for. I hope and pray you will, too.

A CASE OF SMART STAFFING

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the new administration has made an outstanding choice for Director of the Peace Corps in the selection of Mr. Joseph H. Blatchford. I am delighted that he has agreed to serve in the field of public action after being so highly successful in his private effort, Accion International. His experience and expertise will be extremely valuable in furthering the Peace Corps and its role of service. For others who will be interested I insert the excellent article by John Chamberlain which appeared in the Boston Herald Traveler on March 26:

A CASE OF SMART STAFFING

(By John Chamberlain)

Paradox, with the Nixon administration, is the name of the game. To head the Peace Corps, which is public action, Nixon has picked a "voluntarist," Joseph H. Blatchford, who has perhaps done more for providing the case for the superiority of private action in the foreign aid field than any other man living.

Blatchford, a former touring tennis champion who had been horrified by poverty in Latin America, started something called Accion en Venezuela back in 1961 on a shoestring, with the intention of getting people in the Caracas slums interested in doing something for themselves.

I have written about him from time to time as Accion en Venezuela grew from something working on a \$150,000 annual budget, raised chiefly in the United States, to a \$1,500,000 budget, most of it coming from local sources in Venezuela itself.

Blatchford, in turning Accion en Venezuela into a larger organization called Accion International with affiliates in Brazil and Peru, has never had the taxpayer behind him; he has had to scabble for every nickel that his self-help organizations have spent.

So, in running his own "private peace corps," Blatchford has had to apply a strict "cost-benefit analysis" to the business of spurring individuals to organize self-improvement on their own behalf. He has now put himself on the spot, taking over a government venture in which he will be relieved of the necessity of drumming up his own cash.

But if Blatchford is true to every precept which he has followed in his thirty-four years of action-packed life, he will do with the public Peace Corps what he already has done with Accion International.

The choice of Blatchford is an example of brilliant staffing by the Nixon administration. Last Autumn Blatchford was one of the casualties of the Republican election campaign. He had gone back to his home state of California to run for Congress from the Los Angeles harbor district, an area which traditionally goes heavily for Democrats. Nixon's friend, Bob Finch, knows this part of the world well, for he himself had lost elections there.

Blatchford organized his campaign as he had organized the slum barrios in Caracas, Lima, Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo to go to work on community projects. He lost the election by a hair. But by running ahead of Republican Senatorial candidate Max Rafferty and Nixon in his district he established himself as a political comer in addition to

being a go-getter in the field of private foreign aid.

As head of the Peace Corps Blatchford starts with tremendous good will in Latin America. Working through slum leaders his Accion en Venezuela organized 400 separate improvement projects last year. In Brazil, Acao Comunitaria built bridges and schools. Ironically, Blatchford will now be competing with his own Accion International for talent.

He is leaving a vital young man named Terry Holcombe, a college football player who was graduated from Yale in 1964, to run the various Accion affiliates in Venezuela, Brazil and Peru. Holcombe has made Blatchford promise to refrain from raiding Accion, which derives its name, incidentally, from the acronym standing for Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations. Since Accion under Blatchford has helped train workers for the Peace Corps in the past, Blatchford is in a position to get service from his old organization without raiding its existing personnel.

Accion's own idea has been to use North Americans as sparingly as possible in doing its Latin American work.

If Blatchford remains true to his philosophy, he will try to make the Peace Corps self-liquidating over the long term, using North American volunteers to bring skills to developing nations that will, in time, learn to go it on their own.

It is up to Blatchford to keep his sense of paradox alive. The only justification for the Peace Corps is to end the need for a Peace Corps.

ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, shall we repair the old wreck, or buy an entirely new model?

That is the question editorialist Merlo J. Pusey poses regarding reform of the system for electing our President.

Pusey, writing in the Washington Post, likens the current congressional deliberations on alternatives for electoral reform to a motorist who checks over his old wreck of a car and attempts to decide whether he should pay for extensive repairs—and still have a potentially defective vehicle—or buy a new model.

In the case of the electoral system, mechanical changes, such as abolishing the electoral college but retaining the electoral vote system, would be tantamount to repairing the wreck.

Approval of the direct popular election of the President would be the equivalent of buying that brand new model.

In his discussion of proposals for repair, Pusey examines the proportional system, most lately espoused by President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell.

Under the proportional system, a State's electoral votes would be divided in proportion to the popular vote each candidate received.

Acknowledging that the President and Mr. Mitchel did propose some valid corrective changes in the mechanics of the system, Mr. Pusey concludes:

For with all the "mechanical" changes outlined by the Attorney General, it would retain critical weaknesses.

What are they?

Foremost of these—

Says Pusey—

Is the possibility that the so-called proportional system . . . might hand defeat to the candidate winning the highest popular vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fatal weakness of the proportional plan and the so-called district plan.

Only the direct popular election of the President would absolutely guarantee that the people's choice would be elected President.

In recent testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, voter research expert Richard M. Scammon said that the purpose of a desirable reform plan "is to make a winner a winner and a loser a loser and not to make a loser a winner."

I agree wholeheartedly.

The direct popular election of the President is the only way to insure that the winner of the popular vote is the winner of the Presidency.

I place the article "Is the Old Wreck Worth Patching Up?" by Merlo J. Pusey, in the RECORD at this point:

IS THE OLD WRECK WORTH PATCHING UP?

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

The dilemma of Congress as it surveys the weaknesses of our electoral system is not dissimilar to that of a motorist as he contemplates the 1958 wreck in his driveway. Shall he have it repaired at substantial cost and disregard the fact that it would still be a risky means of transportation? Or shall he recognize that it is obsolete as well as badly worn and fork out the price for a new model?

Some eminent witnesses before the House Judiciary Committee are contending that only mechanical repairs to the electoral system are essential. The extravagance of ordering a new model might offend the folks back home and cause the whole thing to be rejected. This was essentially the argument of Attorney General Mitchell the other day.

There will be little if any quarrel with the repairs that Mr. Mitchell and President Nixon wish to make. First, they want to do away with individual electors. Last November George Wallace took the country much closer than it wanted to be to the possibility of third-party electors actually selecting the President of the United States. There can be no doubt about it. The dummies who, under the present system, stand between the President and the people must go.

The second repair for which Mr. Mitchell spoke is that the Presidency go to the top man if he receives 40 per cent of the vote—instead of the electoral-vote majority required at present. Third, the Administration plan calls for a run-off in case no candidate receives as much as 40 per cent.

Then there are a number of repairs designed to reduce uncertainties under the present system. If a presidential candidate who had received a clear electoral-vote plurality should die before the votes were counted, the successful vice presidential candidate would become President. If the winning vice presidential candidate should die before the votes were counted, the incoming President could fill the vacancy under the terms of the Twenty-fifth Amendment.

If both the winning presidential and vice presidential candidates should die before the electoral votes were counted, Congress would be authorized to order a new election. Congress would also be given power to pro-

vide for the possible death or withdrawal of a presidential or vice presidential candidate prior to the election.

Undoubtedly these would be useful repairs. But the question remains as to whether our ancient tottering electoral system is worth the time and effort that would be necessary to patch it up in this fashion. For with all the "mechanical" changes outlined by the Attorney General, it would retain critical weaknesses.

The foremost of these is the possibility that the so-called proportional system, which both the President and Mr. Mitchell regard as a satisfactory alternative to direct popular election of the President, might hand defeat to the candidate winning the highest popular vote.

There are some who believe that the danger of elevating the popular vote loser to the White House would be increased under the proportional system. With all its defects, the electoral college system, as it is currently employed, gives an advantage to the large states as well as to the small states. The small-state advantage is readily apparent. Alaska and Delaware, for example, have three electors each (one for each Senator and Representative) although a distribution of electors on the basis of population would give them only one apiece, or less. They would keep this advantage under the proportional system, and all electoral votes would be divided among the candidates in accord with their standing in the popular vote.

Under the present system this favoritism of the small states is offset in some measure by the general-ticket arrangement which gives the winning candidate in each state all the electoral votes of that state. A candidate may, for example, win only a slight plurality in New York and California, but the result is to give him all the 83 electoral votes of those states. Candidates from the big states thus have an inside track, and the presidential campaigns tend to center in the large states favorable to them.

Under the proposed proportional system, this big-state advantage would be largely gone, for electoral votes would be divided to reflect each candidate's popular strength. The small-state advantage would remain. So it would be possible for a candidate with special standing in the small states to obtain a winning electoral percentage without a popular majority.

Several studies indicate that Richard Nixon would have won in 1960 over John F. Kennedy if the proportional system had been in effect. In 1968 the proportional system would have given Mr. Nixon a fairly substantial edge, in part because most of the small states were in the Nixon column. It is interesting to note that a gain of 1.6 per cent in the votes for Vice President Humphrey would have made him the popular vote winner, but it would have taken a 2.74 per cent gain in his electoral vote under the proportional system to make him a winner.

This point calls for more detailed analysis. To what extent would the elimination of the big state advantage through the general ticket system magnify the effects of the little-state advantage? If the splitting of electoral votes would indeed increase the likelihood of electing a President who is not the choice of the people, the proposed amendment would, to that extent, be moving away from electoral reform, not toward it.

This critical defect in the proportional system, even though the risk has not been precisely measured and may not be susceptible to precise measurement, has turned most of the reformers to the proposal for direct popular election of the President. It might be better to work a little harder a little longer for a new model that is sound in every particular before resigning ourselves to costly repairs to an obsolete mechanism that would never be satisfactory.

## THE WORLD OF MELVIN LAIRD REVISITED

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the March 26 Washington Post contains an editorial which issues a timely challenge to Congress which I hope will be accepted by my colleagues during the coming weeks of this session.

The editorial expresses the concern of the Washington Post over the lack of balance in Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's comments before both the Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate. As the editorial points out, while the opinions of the military were extensively quoted and discussed by Secretary Laird, the opinions of other nonmilitary experts in the Government who are familiar with the aims and postures of both China and the Soviet Union were sadly lacking. Moreover, Secretary Laird gave no indication of the views of the President himself with respect to such vital issues as the long awaited negotiations with the Soviets on mutual reductions of armaments and weaponry, or the war in Vietnam itself.

As the Washington Post says, the lack of balance in Secretary Laird's testimony makes it "all the more incumbent upon the Senate committees currently studying our armament needs to balance out this presentation" with other views. I am sure the Washington Post would agree that that statement must apply to the House as well. We have seen this Nation dragged further and further into an ill-conceived and tragically wasteful war at the urgings of our military planners. If we are to avoid future involvements of this nature, it is imperative that we not rely solely upon the opinions of the military but rather seek out the broadest possible range of advice and testimony.

I hope my colleagues will heed the warning of the Washington Post and balance out the one-sided views so far received from the Department of Defense.

The editorial follows:

THE WORLD OF MELVIN LAIRD REVISITED

We return, reluctantly but compulsively, to the world of Melvin Laird (and David Packard, to be quite fair about it), to the Defense Secretary's annual "posture statement," to the testimony of the Pentagon's two top civilians before the Senate, and specifically, like a moth to a flame, to Mr. Laird's apocalyptic estimate that "never have the challenges of our National Security exceeded in number and gravity those which we found upon taking office."

There is something about this and other rhetoric in the "posture statement," something about the tone as well as the content, that makes it sound like a senior thesis, written, one might surmise, almost wholly on the basis of an intensive interview with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Tasks are "monumental," threats are "grave," challenges are of "serious import." The incomprehensible jargon of the professional military man is passed along by a civilian Defense Secretary as if it were the stuff that Senators, not to mention ordinary folk, deal in every day ("The

Soviets may configure their SLBM's for depressed trajectory launch"). And there is, finally, the mark of the deeply partisan politician, and the former Congressman, self-conscious about his new position on the other side of the table, defensive about the "tremendous and complex problems" he inherited, gratuitous in his effort to downgrade his Democratic predecessors for the organizational and functional shambles these supposed efficiency experts left behind them.

The move from the relative obscurity of a "posture statement" to the public stage of a televised Senate committee hearing had something less than a sobering effect. As the going, and the questioning got rougher, the Secretary got tougher and the world of Melvin Laird became a still less congenial place. For example, the details of the new Soviet SS9 supermissile, which apparently was not thought to be a proper subject to include in a formal "posture statement" were abruptly declassified and trotted out as Exhibit A in the case for Soviet aggressiveness as it was presented live for all to see and hear. By this time, with the ABM selling sluggishly, it was apparently thought necessary to state as a simple fact that the Soviets were beyond a doubt moving to a first strike capability with the potential wherewithal to knock out substantially all of our 1000 Minutemen missiles, which comprise a significant part of our retaliatory force.

All this may be true, of course, or at least the military experts at the Pentagon may sincerely believe it to be true—that this country has never been more gravely menaced, that the Russians are embarking on a recklessly provocative new nuclear strategy, that Communist China "still constitutes the most dangerous potential for threatening the peace in Asia." In any case, there is nothing wrong with military men taking the darkest possible view of things in the interest of eternal vigilance. We pay them to be prepared to defend us and they deserve better than to be assailed or ridiculed for their preoccupation with the intricacies and complexities of a level and a form of warfare which most of us find almost impossible to contemplate, let alone countenance.

But we also pay civilian leaders in the Defense Department to weigh the always exorbitant demands of the military against other evidence—political estimates of realistic enemy intentions, for example—in reaching some measure of our needs which can be reconciled with our other priorities. And that is what is so disquieting about what we have been listening to the past week or so; there is no sign that the anxieties of the military about the theoretical potential of our adversaries has been balanced off against the political realities as assessed by the Kremlinologists and the Sinologists. The opinion of MACV in Saigon is recorded, but not that of the many civilian experts who are known to have a different view. The dire projections of the Joint Chiefs are faithfully set forth. But where is the indication that other views have even been heard—the dissents of a John Fairbanks on Red China's aggressive intents, for instance, or the thinking of a Llewelyn Thompson or a Charles E. Bohlen on the nature of the long-range Soviet threat. When, for that matter, are we to hear what one would take to be the view of the President himself on the prospects for constructive negotiations with the Soviets.

Perhaps we misconceive the purpose of a "posture statement" or even that of a Secretary of Defense. If so, it is all the more incumbent upon the Senate committees currently studying our armament needs to balance out this presentation, so to speak; when billions of dollars and the Nation's security are being discussed live and in color, the public is entitled to hear other witnesses, with other perspectives about a different world than the one portrayed by Melvin Laird.

## SUBSTITUTES MUST GO

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. postal service is beset with many problems, and many people have offered many suggestions as to how best to solve them.

One of the soundest ideas I have seen recently was proposed by James H. Rademacher, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in the April edition of the NALC publication, the Postal Record.

Mr. Rademacher puts his editorial finger on the substitute employee, and declared simply and bluntly:

The substitute must be eliminated from the postal service.

I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Rademacher, and with unanimous consent, I place this editorial in the RECORD, and recommend its reading and careful consideration by my colleagues:

### SUBSTITUTES MUST GO

Regretfully we must admit to a growing suspicion that offering advice to the new administration of the Post Office Department is a little like shouting down a well. Occasionally, when the wind is right, an echo is heard, but never a meaningful response.

However, one must try. The National Association of Letter Carriers has been in business for 80 years, and from the beginning we have been pledged to the primary objective of the improvement of the postal service, the fundamental and essential means of communication available to the citizens of the United States. We feel an obligation to preach the concept of service, even when we feel the congregation of new managers exhibits symptoms of endemic surdity.

Our recommendation for the improvement of the service this month is simple and sweeping: the substitute must be eliminated from the postal service!

The postal substitute is an anachronism in a modern-day industrial-type operation. At a time when jobs are plentiful and pay is good in the private sector, it is ridiculous to believe that talented and ambitious young people will apply for postal employment as long as the present system prevails.

A letter carrier substitute, once he gets on the rolls, is paid at the rate of less than \$3 an hour when called upon to work. He has no guarantee that he will be paid anything at all, except for the provision that, if he is called for work, he will receive pay for a minimum of two hours. His life is completely at the service of the post office, since he is technically on call twenty-four hours every working day. This condition makes it extremely difficult for a substitute to supplement his income with a second job, since he has no idea when he will be called for postal work.

There is no way for a substitute to know how long he will have to wait before becoming a regular. In some communities the turnover is fast, as career regulars, in increasing numbers, quit the service to take easier and more remunerative jobs elsewhere. In other communities, the wait is interminable. We learned last month of a substitute carrier in the thriving community of "96," South Carolina, who is still "subbing" after 21 years of employment. We also know of cases in other areas of the country where men have retired with full annuity after spending their entire postal careers as substitutes. Thirty to thirty-five years without ever becoming a

regular! What kind of a career inducement is this?

Old-line postal supervisors claim that the substitute system is necessary because it gives them the flexibility necessary to assign manpower to handle volume peaks or to deal with unexpected conditions. We doubt that this is true. Many industries in the civilian world have problems similar to those in post offices, and they solve them through intelligent scheduling, through modern systems and procedures, through skillful mechanization. Why should the Post Office be unique among the industrial operations of America in finding the employment of substitutes a necessity?

The new administration of the Post Office contains many men who have most impressive histories of accomplishment in private industry. We think that some hard and imaginative thinking by these men, and their staffs, could develop practical methods of eliminating this archaic system from the Postal Establishment, thereby folding every substitute into the career regular service.

The National Association of Letter Carriers in several of its conventions has passed resolutions demanding the elimination of the substitute system. The national officers of the N.A.L.C. have made vigorous presentations to postal management, all to no avail. Now we have a new management team in the Post Office composed of men to whom the employment of substitutes must seem the ultimate absurdity. We strongly urge that they attack this absurdity with vigor and determination.

The quality of the postal service depends upon the quality of those who work in it. It is no secret that the quality of applicants for postal jobs is deteriorating with each passing year. (The wonder is that the Post Office gets as many desirable new employees as it does.) This steady erosion of quality, combined with the catastrophic percentage of turnover among those who do take postal employment, can only add up to serious service degeneration in the near future.

When a talented, bright young man today is in the process of choosing a career, he walks right by the Post Office door without giving it a second thought. He will continue to ignore the postal service as long as he knows that he must work as a substitute, at low pay and uncertain hours, for years before he can expect to be placed on the roster of regulars. There are simply too many better career opportunities available to him.

The Post Office is not truly competitive in the American labor market today. This is because of many reasons, but one of the most important is the survival of the substitute system. It has got to go.

## THE NEED FOR SPECIAL PAY FOR CERTAIN NUCLEAR QUALIFIED SUBMARINE OFFICERS

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my firm and wholehearted support for H.R. 9328, which provides a special pay incentive for the reenlistment of certain qualified officers of the U.S. Navy who have experience with naval nuclear propulsion plants.

Our nuclear submarine officers are confronted with long, potentially hazardous, and demanding tours of duty beneath the surface of the seas. They are

unable to communicate with their families for days and weeks on end. With the increasing number of attractive civilian employment opportunities available to these men, it is not surprising that there is a growing resignation rate among junior officers in the nuclear submarine program. As this resignation rate increases, those remaining on duty are even less able to obtain occasional shore assignments, thus compounding one of the very conditions which is producing the current shortage of these officers.

The past experiences of the U.S. Navy with reenlistment bonuses indicate that enactment of this legislation will successfully retain a considerable number of officers who would otherwise resign from active duty upon termination of their obligated service. Given the extremely high training costs for nuclear qualified submarine officers, the granting of a bonus for reenlistment should actually result in cost savings.

I would like to stress the importance of our nuclear submarine program as a highly significant means of preserving world peace. The invulnerability of these vessels insures our Nation a potentially devastating second-strike power, deterring any potential aggressor from the temptation of a military attack upon our Nation. While international stability remains a precarious matter, our missile-armed nuclear submarine force remains one of the foremost guardians of the peace. It is obviously necessary to man these ships with the most competent and dedicated officers and crews available. As it appears necessary to provide certain incentives to satisfy these demanding manning requirements, H.R. 9328 should be approved without delay.

#### HIGH JINKS ON THE HILL

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post which stresses opposition to the appropriation for the House Internal Security Committee.

The editorial follows:

#### HIGH JINKS ON THE HILL

In its present lavish mood followings its own recent lavish pay raise, the House of Representatives is liable to spend money—public money, that is—for almost anything, even for the House Internal Security Committee. HISC but lately had its name changed from HUAC; but nothing has changed the ardor of its swollen staff for being supported in the style of indolence and arrogance to which it has grown accustomed. For this purpose, HISC asked the House to grant it an allowance of \$425,000. The House Administration Committee, stern but never stingy, cut this request back to a nice, round \$400,000. And this morning the House itself is scheduled to vote on the proposed appropriation.

There are people so passionate in their distaste for HISC as to declare extravagantly that is the idlest, most useless and most mischievous instrumentality in the whole

Federal establishment. That is unfair, of course. It is foolish to employ such superlatives as long as the Subversive Activities Control Board remains in operation. One should really say no more about HISC than that it is idle, useless and mischievous.

You can get an idea of what HISC will do with that \$400,000 if the appropriation is approved. It has already announced that it intends to investigate campus disorders. For some time now, hearings on campus disorders have been in progress before a House Education and Labor subcommittee under the chairmanship of Rep. Edith Green; and, indeed, Mrs. Green has pretty clearly indicated her intention to introduce legislation designed to deal with these disorders. That campus disorders have a relationship to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor can hardly be disputed. But why does HISC need to muscle into the act?

The House of Representatives is apparently not yet ready to abolish the roving inquisition now called HISC. But it really ought to cut it down to some sensible size. If the money saved can be employed to pay for one new school building, it will contribute far more to the country's internal security than all the pillories HISC has ever been able to contrive.

#### THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian people. I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to these brave people, whose courage and determination are inspiring.

Since the beginning of the 13th century, the people of this nation have struggled to preserve their nation's identity. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, the concept of Byelorussia as a distinctive national entity emerged, first as a cultural manifestation, later in a more political form.

The outbreak of World War I created unique opportunities for the Byelorussians to establish their own national independence. After the Russian March Revolution and the breaking up of czarist Russia, this much aggrieved nation enjoyed a brief respite from foreign domination. On March 25, 1918, the Rada solemnly proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia in the following words:

A year ago, the peoples of Byelorussia, 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 Byelorussian 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 Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states.

We know that the Byelorussian Government was soon toppled by the power

of the Red army, and divided between Poland and Russia, later reoccupied by Germany and then again by Communist Russia. But on this anniversary of the proclamation of independence of these brave people, we wish to reassert our encouragement and our sympathy. We hope that one day their aspirations for independence will be realized.

#### GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF ST. PAUL, MINN., CELEBRATES THEIR FIRST HALF-CENTURY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

### HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this year Goodwill Industries of St. Paul, Minn., celebrates its 50th anniversary of service to our community. This golden anniversary is significant on a number of counts and I wanted to bring this to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

Two men were chiefly responsible for the formation of the St. Paul Goodwill Industries back in 1919. The first of these was Dr. Edgar J. Helms, a Methodist minister. Dr. Helms had begun the first Goodwill Industries in Boston. Seventeen years later, in 1919, Dr. Helms arrived in St. Paul. During the intervening years he had seen his idea blossom and grow in other States and he was determined to begin a branch in the great Upper-Midwest.

Shortly after his arrival he met Dr. Frank A. Cone, a trustee of Hamline University, one of St. Paul's fine private colleges. Dr. Cone was a person dedicated to helping his fellow man and in Goodwill Industries, he found an outlet for such dedication. A charter was granted the fledgling organization with Dr. Cone serving as president of the board of directors. He continued to serve in that capacity for 34 years until his death in 1953 at the age of 93.

Operations were begun in the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd in St. Paul, Minn. In this small parish the young organization occupied just one room. Some 40 to 60 workers occupied this cramped space, without complaint, as they were trying to prove their ability to take their place in the community.

After a temporary shift to larger facilities at the House of Hope Church, the organization was forced to return to its original site with its inadequate accommodations. Thus, a growing group was forced to curtail activities because of space limitations.

When everything looked bleak another of those endowed with the spirit of will, necessary to the challenge, took over as superintendent of St. Paul Goodwill Industries. Mr. A. F. Carlyle gave the kind of leadership that resulted in new community involvement and interest. Soon new, expanded facilities were available to provide more space for more people to help themselves by helping each other.

In quick succession the organization opened three health clinics plus a day

nursery, which illustrates the depth of their concerns. Within 1 year there was established the Goodwill Chiropody Clinic, a dental clinic, and a health service for mothers concerned with baby care. In addition the Goodwill Day Nursery was established and the Goodwill Community House for many employees and others who could not afford high rental fees.

Americanization classes were instituted as many of the people in need were immigrants. An employment service was begun to aid the new Americans in gaining eventual employment when the language barrier was overcome.

The St. Paul Goodwill Industries suffered through the great depression along with other groups and individuals. However, this fine organization survived through that crisis plus World War II and the Korean conflict. Survive they did with ever increased efforts to do good and deal justly with all.

Dr. Helms, Dr. Cone, and A. F. Carlyle would scarcely recognize their great handiwork were they to see it now. Today, the St. Paul Goodwill Industries has a seven-story plant with modern machinery, plus five Goodwill stores in St. Paul, Thompson Grove, and Austin, Minn. More important than the brick and mortar were the increased numbers of people helping themselves through the good offices of Goodwill Industries.

Today some 300 people are employed and the income in 1968 was \$674,000. Not content to consider this dramatic growth sufficient, plans are afoot for a new building to accommodate at least twice as many handicapped workers and several new stores.

John Metz, the executive director of St. Paul Goodwill Industries has continued in the inspiring tradition of his predecessors. Of course, his efforts have been supported and vastly strengthened by the voluntary board. The officers, executive committee and the board of directors reads like a who's who of concerned citizenry in our great area.

I know that all the citizens of my congressional district join me in saluting this great organization on the occasion of their 50th anniversary. I am certain too that we can look forward to another half-century of dedicated service on the part of St. Paul Goodwill Industries.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. BEN REIFEL**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past sad week I have shared the sorrow of all Americans at the loss of Dwight D. Eisenhower. General Eisenhower very literally gave his life to his country; first as a soldier who became one of our Nation's greatest military leaders, and then as a President who sought daily to bring peace to this troubled world.

General Eisenhower was a man to whom the words "Duty, Honor, Coun-

try" were more than just a slogan. He was a man of great stature, integrity, and patriotism. He will be justly remembered as one of our most beloved Presidents.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

**HON. SIDNEY R. YATES**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the passing of a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower. To freedom-loving peoples everywhere, he was the symbol of the surge of a united world to eliminate the viciousness, the barbarism, the antihumanism. His reknown as an astute and victorious military commander was later succeeded by appreciation of his outstanding personal qualities as a man and leader for peace.

It is a measure of his strength that he was able to translate his wartime experience as a general into an earnest desire for peace matched by few national leaders in our generation. As one who has served at the United Nations, I recall particularly the speech he delivered while President before the United Nations in 1953. It made a profound impact. As President, it was Mr. Eisenhower's duty to preside over the assembling of our nuclear arsenal, and he understood well the awesome implications of that activity. At the United Nations that day he made explicit the moral challenge confronting nations armed and capable of destroying the world. He was appalled at the prospect and urged a turning back before it was too late. His words were eloquent. He declared:

But for me to say that the defense capabilities of the United States are such that they could inflict terrible losses upon an aggressor—for me to say that the retaliation capabilities of the United States are so great that such an aggressor's land would be laid waste—all this, while fact, is not the true expression of the purpose and the hope of the United States.

To pause there would be to confirm the hopeless finality of a belief that two atomic colossi are doomed malevolently to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world. To stop there would be to accept helplessly the probability of civilization destroyed—the annihilation of the irreplaceable heritage of mankind handed down to us generation from generation—and this condemnation of mankind to begin all over again the age-old struggle upward from savagery toward decency, and right and justice.

Surely no sane member of the human race could discover victory in such desolation. Could anyone wish his name to be coupled by history with such human degradation and destruction.

Now, he said:

There was no longer any alternative to peace.

One of the world's great military leaders, he knew the importance of peace, more important in the nuclear age than ever before.

I will remember Dwight D. Eisenhower as a man of peace.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE: A TOTAL LANDSCAPE

**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House the most urgent park conservation issue facing us this year.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes region is a magnificent area along the northeastern shore of Lake Michigan. It encompasses a great diversity of natural values and recreational opportunities. It is a region of values which should be protected in the public interest as the heritage of all the people of this and future generations.

As I have said before, Sleeping Bear Dunes offers us a legacy—the best remaining—of the unspoiled Great Lakes scene.

A LAST LANDSCAPE

The means of fulfilling our public trust and preserving these important public values is the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. As embodied in S. 1023 and H.R. 4287 this proposal has been carefully refined to assure the preservation of those key elements of the landscape which make the areas—as a whole—attractive and indeed, nationally significant.

Thus, what we need to preserve is the total landscape. This idea is a new emphasis, reflecting the broadening and maturing of conservation thought in recent years. For if we do assure the protection of this landscape—as a whole—it will serve, as few other areas in the region can, the recreational needs and the simple needs for green and open spaces when, in the not too distant future, the Midwest is twice as populous as it is today.

Recently Senator PHILIP A. HART, who has led this Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore campaign, expressed this new, total landscape concept in an article in American Forests magazine. Here Senator HART has outlined the history of the proposal and the delays it has faced. And he points out that these delays have meant the loss of important public values:

The delay from year to year has not been cheap—it never is. Postponement has cost us all in the quality of the landscape and in escalating land prices. With the pressures now redoubling on this land, further delay will cost us the entire proposal. We all stand to gain much if the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore comes into being; and we stand to lose a great deal if it does not.

I believe this concept of protecting a total landscape is a major thrust of the new conservation, and I commend Senator PHIL HART and the American Forestry Association for expressing it. For the information of my colleagues, I include this fine article at this point in the RECORD:

THE TOTAL LANDSCAPES OF SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

(By Senator PHILIP A. HART)

What is a landscape? It is more, I think, than a collection of objects and visits of natural beauty. A landscape is a whole; it

tells a story. A landscape is a total environment composed of many elements, yet more, somehow, than the sum of its parts.

I have thought of this increasingly as I have worked to secure establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan. This unit of our National Park System, would consist of 61,000 acres along the northwest coast of Michigan's Lower Peninsula. Here a secession of forces, natural and cultural, has contributed to a landscape of remarkable diversity. To the extent that an area's landscape is diverse, the opportunities for its appreciation are multiplied; and diversity is the crowning feature of the Sleeping Bear region.

The basic framework was created by the glaciers which once covered all the Lake States region. As the ice retreated northward, a "recent" 15,000 years ago, it left a molded landscape of glacial deposits. Where today the northern end of Lake Michigan bends to the east, the individual lobes of the glaciers piled up a series of great moraines, forming headlands extending as parallel fingers into Lake Michigan. Shallow bays extend between these high ridges.

As the level of Lake Michigan changed over the centuries, small, clear inland lakes were created in these lowlands. Here are some of the most spectacularly beautiful lakes in the world, set in an intriguing landscape as if for deliberate comparison with the Great Lake just beyond.

#### CONSPIRACY OF WIND AND WATER

The dunes which characterize the area have resulted from a conspiracy of Lake Michigan waters and Lake Michigan winds, prevailing from the northwest. As the level of ancestral Lake Michigan varied, its waves cut at the headlands, sharpening their western faces into 350-foot bluffs dropping almost vertically into the Lake. These exposed bluffs are now being eroded by the winds off the Lake which carry the sands up across the headlands. In the lee of the moraines this sand is dropped, to form ever-moving dunes. Thus, the currents wash the headlands away, carrying the debris to the north to fill the bays, and the winds move the sands eastward, carrying the eroding headlands in that direction in a slow progression. The land here is unfinished, on the march.

Plants and animals too have worked on the face of the land, varying its texture and giving it a coat of hardwoods. A fascinating variety of species and communities has developed. In the lowlands, pines alternate with low, grassy meadows. On the high moraines, beech-maple woods shelter colorful spring blooms—baneberry, yellow trout lily, and magnificent large white trillium. Most of the forest is second-growth, leaving few hints of the great white pines which were the source of great fortune before the turn of the century.

This is the character of the landscape on the mainland. It is further enhanced by two great islands lying just offshore, South Manitou and North Manitou. These were once fueling stops for the wood-burning Lake Michigan steamers working the Chicago run. South Manitou harbors three of the AFA's record tree specimens, including the largest Northern White Cedar in the United States.

Sleeping Bear is a young landscape, a land still in the making. There is a succession of human history, too. Man has had his impact on the land, and has given it visible aspects of his own character—the good, the bad, and too often the ugly. Here the fur trappers gave way to the lumbermen of the last century. Field agriculture was tried, but in the lowlands the sandy soils were not productive. Fruit production has been a notable industry, and apples and cherries have been raised in orchards in this climate. Even so, it is an economically depressed area now turning more and more to recreational uses. In particular, it has been a favorite summer home

area, and cottages line the shore of the inland lakes.

And so, a landscape. A whole. A total landscape with immensely captivating beauty in its broad stretches of inland lakes, forests, shining dunes, and the Great Lake beyond.

Here is something special, a landscape of unusual diversity, yet its elements are concentrated in a unified area. Here is the story of the landscape, written on the land, awaiting interpretation to the visitor. Here, too, is a wealth of opportunities to enjoy the outdoors. Here, in short, are public values of a nationally significant character.

And this is what we want to perpetuate as a National Lakeshore—the right mix of natural and pastoral beauty, the story-telling capacity of this landscape, and the opportunity of the public to know it through recreational visits.

#### LEGISLATION PENDING SINCE 1961

In 1958 the National Park Service identified the Sleeping Bear area as a "paramount" remaining shoreline opportunity on the Great Lakes, our "fourth shore." On the basis of detailed surveys and natural history studies, a National Lakeshore plan was drawn up, and I introduced legislation to implement it in 1961.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposal has gone far since then, but it has not yet become a reality.

The original proposal raised concern among local residents. They themselves had been drawn here by the beauties of the area, yet many felt threatened by the prospect of a National Park unit. Some 1,600 summer homes were included in the original proposal. The early field hearings in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area were lively exchanges, but they helped us air the differences.

Since 1961 the sponsors of the bill and the Park Service have worked to meet the reasonable objections of local residents. Strong guarantees are written into the bill, providing perpetual protection for the property rights of owners of improved properties within the boundaries. The only condition is adherence to local zoning standards or to the standards set forth in the bill.

Studies undertaken by Michigan University have shown that the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will be a major economic boost to the region, and this has helped allay fears of depleting local tax revenues. In the balance, all will gain from the proposal: the local residents through special property protections and careful planning to handle increasing recreational use without disrupting established patterns; and the public through assurance of the opportunity to visit the area, knowing that its special values are being protected.

My bill has made progress. It passed the Senate in both the 88th and 89th Congresses. In the 89th, the House Interior Committee favorably reported the bill, after adding important additional lands at the urging of Senator Robert Griffin, who was then the Congressman representing that district in the House of Representatives.

But the bill has never passed the House. The landscape remains unprotected, for only minimal zoning regulations have been applied locally. Thus, with the pressures of land speculations and second-home subdivisions, the quality of the area is coming under increasingly serious threat.

The delay from year to year has not been cheap—it never is. Postponement has cost us all in the quality of the landscape and in escalating land prices. With the pressures now redoubling on this land, further delay will cost us the entire proposal. We all stand to gain much if the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore comes into being; and we stand to lose a great deal if it does not. And so, early in the 91st Congress, Congressman James G. O'Hara of Michigan and I, and others, will again introduce the legislation needed to bring the proposal into

being. With the help of America's conservation-minded citizens, we will make a major effort for its enactment.

#### GREAT LAKES MEGALOPOLIS

In the not too distant future—and the signs are all around us—there will be a Great Lakes megalopolis, merging the urban centers of Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, and Chicago into a concentrated urban zone extending from Buffalo to Milwaukee. We cannot hope to avoid this, but we can plan for it. There will be a tremendous need for open spaces and natural areas for people to enjoy.

The need is great now—it will be greater in the future. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore can be a major part of our efforts to meet it. The proposal stresses protection of the existing scene, to serve these needs. Neither a complete return to a wild condition, nor complete dominance by more and more of man's activities is desirable here. What we seek to maintain is a proper mixture of wildness, natural beauty and man's influence; and while protecting existing private rights, to provide public recreational opportunity—the opportunity to enjoy this spectacular landscape—the total landscape of Sleeping Bear Dunes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially note Senator HART's closing statement about the purpose of this 61,000-acre Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore for the public:

What we seek to maintain is a proper mixture of wildness, natural beauty and man's influence; and while protecting existing private rights, to provide public recreational opportunity—the opportunity to enjoy this spectacular landscape—the total landscape of Sleeping Bear Dunes.

AMERICA ALMOST ADOPTED  
GREEK AS OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, my attention has been called to an article in the American magazine, the Reporter, which throws an interesting footnote on American history. I am grateful to Attorney Constantine G. Economus, noted American scholar of Greek-American history, for calling my attention to the fact that but for a single vote in the Continental Congress, America's native language would have been Greek instead of English.

The Reporter article follows:

Well, what do you know? If it was not for a dissenting vote by Benjamin Franklin, the United States would have adopted the Greek language instead of the English. And here is the story as it has been written in a current issue of the American Magazine The Reporter by the well known author George Bailey: Shortly after the American Declaration of Independence, a motion was introduced in the Continental Congress to adopt Greek as the national language. Many of the Founding Fathers considered Greek to be the most fitting form of expression for the direct successor in spirit to the Athenian Republic. The motion was defeated by one vote. Benjamin Franklin, one of the dissenters, explained that he considered it more practical for the Americans to keep English and let the British learn Greek.

USE OF FOREIGN MARBLE ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

**HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY**  
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the plans for the proposed Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden to be constructed at Seventh Street, Independence Avenue, Ninth Street and Madison Drive, and to be under the administration of the Smithsonian Museum call for the use of foreign marble.

At this time, particularly when our country is faced with a serious balance-of-payments deficit, how can our Federal Government even consider using the tax moneys to buy imported marble? Our policy is well known to those who are responsible for this decision.

We have always supported the theory that all Federal, State, or Government buildings using tax moneys in their construction should and must use domestic materials whenever and wherever these materials qualify, particularly in a depressed industry.

I cannot speak for the other marble producing States, and I would not profess to when my able colleagues from those States are so well versed on the matter.

At best, however, I can support the dean of my own Georgia delegation, the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, who knows better than anyone, and who has informed me that the State of Georgia can furnish the marble of superior quality to that of a foreign market. And, in addition, it is a known fact to anyone familiar with the marble industry in our country that it is a depressed industry.

In accordance with the Buy American Act of 1954, I just do not believe that any producer could bring in rough foreign stock and finish this job within 6 percent of foreign-finished prices delivered. For purposes of clarification I would like to cite here the provisions of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10d):

19. BUY AMERICAN ACT

(a) Agreement. In accordance with the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10d) and Executive Order 10582, December 17, 1954 (3 CFR Supp.), the Contractor agrees that only domestic construction material will be used (by the Contractor, subcontractors, materialmen, and suppliers) in the performance of this contract, except for nondomestic material listed in the contract.

(b) Domestic construction material. "Construction material" means any article, material, or supply brought to the construction site for incorporation in the building or work. An unmanufactured construction material is a "domestic construction material" if it has been mined or produced in the United States. A manufactured construction material is a "domestic construction material" if it has been manufactured in the United States and if the cost of its components which have been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States exceeds 50 percent of the cost of all its components. "Component" means any article, material, or supply directly incorporated in a construction material.

(c) Domestic component. A component shall be considered to have been "mined, produced, or manufactured in the United

States" (regardless of its source in fact) if the article, material, or supply in which it is incorporated was manufactured in the United States and the component is of a class or kind determined by the Government to be not mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality.

If the Congress stands by and allows this proposal for the use of foreign marble to become effective, we will not only have begun an extremely dangerous precedent, for I remind my colleagues that never before has a Federal building been built with foreign marble, but we will have set this precedent at a time when our balance-of-payments deficit can ill afford another blow.

How then can we ask our private citizens as we have, to spend their private moneys in this country on American products, when we as their representatives allow their tax moneys to be spent on foreign products which are of no better quality than what we can find right here in our own country.

BUT YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT IT'S LIKE OVER THERE

**HON. FLOYD V. HICKS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, many poignant and heartbreaking things have been recorded about the Vietnam war, as we all can testify. One that comes very close to home was printed in the News Tribune of Tacoma, Wash., on March 16, 1969. It expresses a point of view which I believe is quite widely held among the men serving in Vietnam. The News Tribune explains it as well as anyone could, and I commend the explanation and the poem to my colleagues.

For some reason, men at war frequently express their thoughts as poems.

A great deal of poetry has come out of the Vietnam War. Most of its rhyme is amateurish; its meter worse. But the thoughts expressed usually are uniform, and make us reflect on what these young men are doing for us—in contrast to what we are doing for them.

The poem which follows was written by Pfc. Grover C. (Skip) Bowen, a 20-year-old graduate of Mount Tahoma High School.

Bowen, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Bowen, of 3409 S. Monroe St., wrote and sent the poem to his parents a few days before Feb. 21—the day he was killed in a helicopter crash.

"LIVING AND DYING"

"Take a man, then put him alone,  
Put him 12,000 miles away from home;  
Empty his heart of all but blood,  
Make him live in sweat and mud.

This is the life I have to live  
And why my soul to the devil I give;

You 'Peace boys' pout from your easy chair,  
But you don't know what it's like over here;

You have a ball without near trying,  
While over here the boys are dying;

You burn your draft card and march at dawn,  
Plant your flags on the White House lawn;

You all want to ban the bomb;  
'There's no real war in Vietnam.'

You use your drugs and have your fun,  
Then you refuse to use a gun;

There's nothing else for you to do,  
And I'm supposed to die for you?

I'll hate you to the day I die,  
You made me hear my buddy cry;

I saw his arm, a bloody shred,  
I heard them say: "This one's dead."

It's a large price he had to pay:  
Not to live to see another day;

He had the guts to fight and die;  
He paid the price, but what did he buy?

He bought your life by losing his,  
But who gives a damn what a soldier gives?

His wife does, and maybe his son,  
But they're just about the only ones.

So you put this man there, all alone,  
And he died for you—12,000 miles from home."

L. S. STEGINS, SR., PASSES AWAY

**HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of my good friend, L. S. Stegins, Sr., publisher of the Screven County News, Sylvania, Ga., an era in journalism passed on also.

At a time when the character of journalistic methods is being questioned all over the land, it is inspiring to reflect on a man who has served the people with both integrity and truth.

He believed that the most important thing in his work was to chronicle what is happening among the people in his community. He had a love and appreciation of the people regardless of their station in life. He would give his precious time and personal attention to their letters, discuss their problems with them, and yet somehow find time in his busy schedule to give himself in service to his community as an active church member, a member of the city council, membership on various boards, and service in many other positions of civic responsibility.

The warmth of the expressions with which he heralded the accomplishments of his fellow citizens and the tender words he used in the chronicling of their passing were heartwarming to read. Indeed, there is a void which cannot be filled and an institution has passed away.

I was 22 years old when I was given the privilege of taking over the editorship of the Sylvania Telephone which he had served several decades before we began our association, prior to his establishing the Screven County News. I shall never forget the long hours "Stig" gave me in the painful, early stages of my becoming a newspaperman. A warm friendship developed between us over the years that was of such a fiber it could not be breached by occasional political differences or other diversions.

During my years in the Georgia House and Senate and during my years in the Congress of the United States, I have never known him to waiver in his sup-

port, backing, and encouragement of the principles I espoused. We had many talks together and his commonsense ideas were always good!

I shall long remember L. S. Stegins. A leader with compassion for his people, a human being who believed in the dignity of man; an individual whose very existence personified goodness, the most noble quality of all mankind.

#### DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

### HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending a Virginia State Leadership Conference in the field of distributive education.

I was impressed not only by the conscientious interest of educators and employers who attended this conference, but, particularly, by the outstanding qualities of potential business leadership manifested by the students present.

Because of the importance of this element of the vocational education program in our free enterprise system, I should like to share with colleagues the remarks made at the conference by Mr. Robert V. Guelich, vice president and public relations director of Montgomery Ward & Co.

REMARKS BY ROBERT V. GUELICH, VICE PRESIDENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, MONTGOMERY WARD & CO. BEFORE THE VIRGINIA DECA STATE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, ARLINGTON, VA., MARCH 22, 1969

It's an honor to be a participant in your Annual Leadership Conference. The excellent panel of vocational education students and graduates, as far as I am concerned, was good enough to be the finale.

Of the many DECA Leadership Conferences being held this month, I believe your conference is the most challenging for several reasons: (1) The State of Virginia has the largest DE program of any state. This is a tribute to the leadership and diligence of many dedicated adults, particularly Jim Horan, and your outstanding supervisors and teacher-coordinators. This team has boosted your Virginia program to the top in quality and quantity. (2) This meeting brings together the right people—DE students, educators, employers, and legislators and congressmen—all the people who hold the magic key to the future of education, business, government and American democracy.

All of us are advocates of one "cause"—constructive vocational education. Being a native of Dayton, Ohio, I became aware of educational co-op work many years ago, as Antioch College and the University of Cincinnati pioneered in this field. My personal interest for the past eight years has been related to Distributive Education through the National Advisory Board of the Distributive Education Clubs of America.

As a member of Montgomery Ward management, I can assure you of our Company's strong interest in and support of vocational education. A full spectrum of career opportunities is available in the retail industry for young people, particularly those who get their head starts through DE programs.

Finally, I have a personal conviction that one of the great shortcomings of our educational systems for young people in an affluent society is the lack of opportunity for constructive work experiences—and cooperative vocational education can help solve this problem.

We've been so enamored by Ph.D.'s since Sputnik that too many personnel managers have overlooked the thousands of students who already have made up their minds to work for companies like those represented here today.

Distributive Education is the fastest growing program of all cooperative vocational education programs. Although DE has a history of accomplishment, I believe its true significance is as a pioneer and pacemaker of the future. I believe it is the harbinger of the direction that urban education should take.

While others may talk about campus-industry relationships and the difficulty of getting young people interested in business, in DECA we are partners in a program in which 90,000 high school students and 7,000 junior college students already have declared themselves as being interested in *business as a career*.

As employers, we find that these young men and women are proving to be better employees and management trainees than many college graduates. And, as president of the Board of Education of a high school system with close to 6,000 students, I know that today's high school graduates are better educated than many college sophomores and juniors of the 1950's.

Because of good teachers, good business training experience and good curricula, students of Distributive Education are mature in their judgments, actions and ideals. They have found their personal identities; they have confidence in themselves and they are eager to build careers in the personalized people-to-people business of retailing. They respect hard work, achievement and leadership; they are not cowed by the size or complexity of our world; they are not satisfied with mediocrity in either their personal or their business lives. They are the type of men and women who will be running our business and the world in a few years, whether or not they earn college degrees.

Although about 2,000 high schools are providing instruction in Distributive Education to about 200,000 students, the potential is for DE courses to be offered in 20,000 high schools to 2 million high school students.

The challenge for businessmen, educators and legislators is to build on the foundation of success that you already have established. And the principal responsibility of retailers is to provide effective on-the-job training for all DE trainees. By doing so, (1) we are helping the employees who work with the students; (2) we are helping the students; (3) we are earning the appreciation of the community and the school teachers and administrators; and (4) of primary importance, we are preparing young men and women to be gainfully employed citizens in our community—possibly, as permanent employees of our companies and stores.

The list of DECA's donor organizations is a blue ribbon list of major youth-oriented corporations: General Motors, General Electric, Firestone, Goodyear, most of the major oil companies, J. C. Penney, Sears Roebuck and 50 others. My employer, Montgomery Ward, employs approximately 1,000 DE students throughout the country.

In one of our largest metropolitan markets, we currently employ 128 high school and 10 post-secondary distributive education students in 11 stores. I hope we can match this record in this area soon. We do have 8 DE students in our store in Winchester, 9 in Hampton, 9 here in the D.C. area, and several in Staunton and Charlottesville.

Nationwide, we have many store managers who are former DE students as well as staff executives of our large metropolitan districts. The vice president who heads the largest of our company's four regions, Don Ward (no relation of the founder of the Company) is a graduate of a cooperative education program in retail selling—a direct forerunner of the DE program.

Having told you how wonderful we think

you are, let's ask ourselves a provocative question: "If DE students are such fine employees, why do we employ so few of them?"

One of the principal reasons is that too many retailers persist in those practices and policies that, in the past, have proved successful in discouraging or preventing aggressive and knowledgeable young people from entering or staying with the retail business. We know the criticisms:

Initial salaries are not competitive with the manufacturing and service industries. Job satisfaction often is missing because responsibility is not delegated to trainees.

Early jobs are uninteresting and menial; students should be moved faster up to their levels of capability.

We should spend more time helping those young people already working with us part time.

I conducted an informal survey among corporate members of the National Advisory Board of DECA to find an answer to the question: "What can be done about the problem of recruiting and holding qualified young people?"

Here are some of the answers: Stores should (1) develop better relationships with high school and college counselors; (2) establish closer working relationships with students interested in retailing; (3) do a better job of "selling" the strong points of careers in retailing.

Action is needed by retailers to (a) pay higher starting wages; (b) higher salaries to junior store executives upon completion of initial training; (c) provide more compensation and corollary benefits to management employees to keep them from jumping jobs.

We retailers, acting individually and collectively, must take those actions that will make us competitive with other industries, including appropriate salary differentials, regularly scheduled working hours, good working conditions and well-planned job training programs with scheduled promotions to positions of increasing responsibility.

With a little bit of encouragement, most major retailers can be persuaded to establish more DE training stations, employ more students in existing training stations, and pay wages according to local competitive practices.

Looking ahead, most retailers foresee the need for an increasing proportion of part-time employees in 1970 and 1971, with most guesstimates approximating a need for a 10 percent increase of such employees. This means there will be many more job opportunities available for the increasing number of high school students who will be enrolling in DE programs this year.

A cooperative vocational education program means cooperation in building the career of a young person. Let us remember we are cooperating. It is more than a student-teacher or employee-employer relationship. It is a commitment to cooperation between student, school and employers. And, all of us need to do a better job.

It is easier to get to our destination when we know where we are going, and when we have a road map, than when both destination and pathways are unknown. This is a trite way of restating that employers and teacher-coordinators must continually re-emphasize the objectives of their programs. We offer more than a part-time job. A career training program must be constantly monitored and adapted to each student. It isn't a contract you can sign in September and accept payment for in June. Students are trainees, not part-time job fill-ins. We must keep our eyes focused on the ultimate objective of building tomorrow's managers from today's students.

And we must keep in mind that the primary goal of each program must be to serve young people. If they are well served, the school fulfills its responsibility well and the employer gains vital new talent for his business. In serving the student, the first

essential is to find out his vocational and career interests, then help him attain them through both curriculum and work experience. I am less concerned with the right choice of the right vocation than I am that the student will be enthusiastic about the type of study and work he or she is doing. We must do our best to develop and preserve interest and enthusiasm. They, along with integrity and responsibility, are more important in the jobs of the future than are skills that are quickly obsolesced in our business system.

Young people are asking basic questions about their futures—and their careers. I believe that the world of business generally—and retailing in particular—can provide positive answers to their questions and concerns.

Many of today's students—and this applies to most DE students—want a challenge—a challenge that includes opportunities for personal growth, career advancement and meaningful contribution.

Many are concerned about social problems. It is becoming increasingly evident that business can—and is—working effectively to help meet social challenges in basic areas—including education, employment, training, housing, community betterment.

As an example of this type of action, Montgomery Ward, in cooperation with the National Alliance of Business and the U.S. Government, has hired—and is training—some 300 hard core unemployed people. Those trainees have very little education, are unskilled and not oriented to a work situation. The results to date are most encouraging; the trainees, for the most part, want to learn, want to do a job, want to advance. Other businesses are engaged in similar programs. This type of effort can have a significant impact in meeting a key area of social and economic challenge.

A different type activity—and one in which any of our Chicago headquarters employees can take part—is our tutoring program. A group of employees, on a volunteer basis, spend one evening each week helping boys and girls who are residents of public housing improve their reading and communication skills.

Our college cadet program, although not cooperative education in the sense that school-job coordination is required, is proving increasingly effective in developing future management. In this program, college juniors and seniors work 20 hours per week and full time during summer vacations. Upon completion of their college work, they move into junior management training programs that prepare them for key positions in merchandise, operating or personnel departments.

An example of the potential, and actual, inter-relationship of programs is provided by one young man who began with us as a DE student six years ago. He progressed through the high school program, four years of college (during which he was in our college cadet program), the junior management training program—and is now a key department manager in a multi-million dollar retail store—all while working in the same store (Maryville) in his home town (Phoenix).

In increasing value and effectiveness of vocational education, national youths organizations have made major contributions. The Future Farmers of America and Distributive Education Clubs of America, to mention only two, have been extremely important in instilling challenge, drama, competitive spirit and long-range career relevance. As job opportunities increase, these organizations will be increasingly important in expansion of cooperative programs to meet our ever-increasing needs. Educators and employers must provide increased support for such groups, at all levels.

We are pleased with the progress being reported in vocational education, but cannot be satisfied.

Young people want a chance to prove themselves, to move up quickly. In retailing, because of its growth and its dynamism, the chances are excellent. We live, work and play with our neighbor customers and we are personally interested in the youth of each community. We know that the future of our businesses is completely dependent upon the type of young people we can attract, hold and advance to leadership positions.

So, what is our message to you young people?

It is, in the words of well-known business management expert Peter Drucker, that "Retailing is one occupation where the things that count are character and temperament; that is, qualities rather than things one learns at school."

Professor Drucker also makes the poignant and stinging observation that: "The greatest opportunity for any business in America today lies in organizing a systematic advancement program for able young people in its employ who has not sat four years on their backsides in college, but have instead gone to work when eighteen or nineteen . . . and the retail business seems to be particularly well suited to do this."

Education can be broadly classified in two categories—education for living and education for making a living. Those of us here believe and are committed to the principle that education for living, alone, is not enough.

Since World War II, our economy has become increasingly mechanized, automated, technology-oriented. The past is fast. Demands on employees' skills, knowledge, expertise and adaptability are increasing. Education must be relevant to those demands—not for jobs, but for careers for young people.

Today's age of abundance is an abundance of career choices. And it is this very abundance that distinguishes retailing.

There are 1,540,000 retail establishments in our country—six times the number of all manufacturing establishments. Each of these retail units employs managers who are selected from the eleven million men and women who work in the retail industry. It is a conservative estimate to state that more than one million men and women are rated and paid as executives in our industry.

With such a high ratio of executives to employees, and being a fast-moving business that must adapt almost daily to the changing attitudes and needs of customers, there is a constant demand for aggressive and alert executives at all levels, so promotions are rapid.

Junior executives make from \$7,500 to \$11,000; managers and buyers earn from \$12,000 to \$30,000—plus bonuses. Division heads commonly earn in excess of \$30,000 in large organizations.

This brief sketch should give you a picture of what this business actually can be worth to young people. It also explains why we find more young executives in retailing than in any other industry.

Retailing is a "people business." If you like working with people, with customers, with fellow employees, retailing provides this in abundance. As our president, Edward S. Donnell, stated in an article in the DECA Distributor last year: "The most important key to the future is people. In terms of consumers, our nation's population continues to increase; personal incomes are increasing; more people have more discretionary income. As the complexity of retailing increases, employees must be better educated. The other key element in the people equation is employees. Ours is a people business, and it is the enthusiasm of our people that is the prime ingredient in producing the extra sales that are the base for better profits as well as for continued expansion. We want employees who are people oriented, who are sensitive to merchandise and to market problems, and who have fun in getting their daily quota of sales and profits."

I believe there no longer is any question

that reputable retailers believe in serving the consumer—with integrity and with efficiency.

The concept of consumer protection dates from our "Satisfaction Guaranteed or Your Money Back" policy first stated in the Montgomery Ward catalog of 1875. And this marked the beginning of the end of the centuries-old maxim of "caveat emptor"—let the buyer beware.

As stated in Montgomery Ward's most recent annual report, "We firmly believe that well-informed consumers are Montgomery Ward's best customers. For this reason, Wards is in favor of well-written laws that are designed to help consumers make sound buying decisions."

"We supported the step forward which Congress took in acting upon 'truth in lending' legislation and will continue to work for workable state laws which provide customers with accurate information on the cost of credit, so long as such laws are applied uniformly to all who are offering credit services."

Currently we are supporting efforts to pass Uniform Consumer Credit Code legislation in the respective states. The code serves to bring uniformity and order to the complex field of consumer credit—to the good of both business and consumers.

But, our concern must go far beyond the laws. We must adopt a program of action to seek out, educate, train, and then, year by year, reeducate and retrain the young men and young women who will be needed to adapt our businesses to the rapidly changing economic and social environment of every country.

It is not important to review at this time the growth of vocational education in this country. It is important, though, to recognize that we have not kept pace with changes in job and career requirements. Our vocational education in this country is fine for the 50's, no longer satisfactory for the 60's, and totally inadequate for the 70's—not 1979 but 1970, the school year that begins six months from now.

It is gratifying to note that the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 did not draw a single dissenting vote in either the Senate or the House. It is more gratifying to see this Conference in action to urge even greater changes in this session of Congress.

Having quoted from thought and opinion leaders of the business and academic worlds, let me also quote from our third partner—government.

The chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education in the House of Representatives is Congressman Roman C. Pucinski. In recent remarks about our common concern of educating young people, he stressed that cooperative education helps break down artificial barriers between school and life. In pointing out that a very small percentage of our schools have cooperative vocational education programs, he advocated that "Less than 15% of the nation's high schools and junior colleges offer cooperative education, programs. We must double, or even triple, this percentage during the next two years. . . . And I (the Congressman) predict that because of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, a large percentage of this increased enrollment will come from vocational education."

Congressman Pucinski further stated he advocates that, through such devices as advisory councils on cooperative programs, businessmen, school administrators and teachers can be drawn closer together in their common concern: the balanced education of our young people.

Now let's take a few minutes to discuss some topics that employers are concerned with:

I don't believe I am divulging any top secret information when I call attention to the challenge that either the government or the retail industry is going to chart the future course of our business. Because of the

lack of aggressive leadership by the retail industry as well as colleges and universities, our industry today is oversaturated with employees whose productivity is below the minimum standards of most other industries. Because we have not kept pace with other industries in the transfer of routine, repetitive functions to machines and automated systems, our employment and wage costs have continued to rise and our profit margins have continued to narrow.

Strange as it may seem, a major by-product effect of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 has been to force the retailing industry to accelerate the automation and mechanization of many of its functions because many retailers are not able to afford the higher costs of the 1967 and 1968 minimum wage rates for manual labor on such functions. This, in turn, has placed greater emphasis upon the productivity of those employees whose results depend upon their competence in handling person-to-person relationships, primarily selling and managing.

To restate this proposition in the words of government administrator and educator, John Beaumont, who recently retired from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare after a lifetime of service to vocational education, "*Retailing must impersonalize low-level jobs into machine systems and concentrate on the personalizing of all other jobs so they will be more attractive to men and women and students who have better-than-average talents and education.*"

In speaking of Federal legislation, I should mention the extensive Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which authorize greatly expanded efforts in cooperative vocational education programs.

In representing business at the National Conference on Cooperative Vocational Education in Minneapolis last month, I suggested that all possible encouragement should be extended to members of Congress to assure that appropriations for vocational education be consistent with funding authorized through the Amendments of 1968.

State legislators can be most helpful in working for expanded state financial support of vocational education in order to provide matching funds for increased federal money in implementing programs authorized by the 1968 Amendments.

Funding of Vocational Education represents wise use of public moneys—and is far less costly than the likely alternative—funding of "retrieval" programs for unskilled and unemployed.

I believe all of us should work to assure that the administration and operation of vocational education remain in the public schools rather than be taken over by other local, state and federal agencies.

As the term "vocation" stems from the Latin "voco" and thus suggests "a calling," let us work to assist the great numbers of today's young people in finding their "callings" and then in "doing their thing" so it will be meaningful, constructive and rewarding for them as individuals and as citizens of our ever-changing nation.

I really am fearful that we are allowing a large new group of culturally deprived individuals to grow up in our midst. As the University of Minnesota's Dr. Henry Borow recently pointed out, "College-bound, upwardly aspiring students are being denied access to opportunities for learning about the world of work or about themselves as potential workers."

Statistics of the failure of college graduates to adjust to jobs point up the fact that they have not been oriented to the world in which we live. They are almost as disoriented from occupational awareness and occupational literacy as the young people at the opposite end of the economic and educational scale upon whom we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to salvage them from being permanently unemployable.

You who are combining your education

with work experiences are indeed the most fortunate of your generation. You are well adapted and experienced in the social and economic environment in which you will be living as a breadwinner or homemaker. You have not been detached from the world of work. Although still in adolescence, you already are gaining vocational maturity and, because of your self-confidence, you are able to raise your educational aspirations and broaden your perspectives of new and more challenging careers than the economically deprived—both high and low—are able to comprehend.

It is obvious that many adults also need retraining for shifts into new vocational and career interests, and this is a most important service of the educational-business relationship.

Counseling of students is all-important as we help them find their career interests; this is primarily the responsibility of the school through supervisors and teachers; a student who adjusts to good counseling at school can also adjust to good counseling on the job. And let us not overlook the fact that the majority of our students now go into white-collar jobs where people-to-people relationships are all-important.

It is increasingly difficult to evaluate the complete work-study program as job specifications become more volatile. I'm not sure that it is better to train a person for a job and then be proud of your performance because he is in the same job 10 years later. I would rather evaluate the income he has attained and his progress as a citizen, even if he has moved through several unrelated jobs. In evaluating programs, let us not depersonalize the rating scale so it looks good on a chart.

One question frequently asked of employers is "What kind of competencies are you seeking?" Implicitly, I have already made the point that a well-motivated and interested worker can be more important in the long run than a person with specialized skills. If we can have both, so much the better. And sometimes we must tailor programs to specific skills because of the nature of an employer's business. So, help them develop excellence in whatever skills they may have. With excellence, comes confidence and maturity and adaptability to changing work situations. Our objective should be to help the student excel in his present job situation as a foundation on which to build broader vocational competence and progress.

To improve the "image" of retailing, we must upgrade the competence of our managerial employees. We must improve educational curricula; we must improve management training programs; we must improve pay, hours, and working conditions. Retailing offers the greatest opportunities of any industry for young people who want to work with and serve the needs and desires of others. It is the biggest establishment in the world that specializes in person-to-person relationships. This is the type of job satisfaction our young people are seeking today—in the Peace Corps, in tutoring programs, in education, and the professions.

We—businessmen and educators—must not neglect our responsibility to improve the quality of vocational education programs so they will attract better students and lead to better preparation of students for the better jobs which retailers must fill.

While we recognize the point of view of those who advocate the education of "A Man For All Seasons," all professions and all careers, we also are aware that most of the "thinkers," the "philosophers," and the liberal arts students must accept the responsibility of being breadwinners early in their lives.

Educators and businessmen have no difficulty in recognizing the need for greater investments in the buildings, machines and systems of our economy. There must be a similar enthusiasm for investments of time, talent and money in the education and train-

ing of people because people are our most essential form of managerial capital.

Above all, we need to train leaders. As many of you will recall, John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, has pointed out that some parts of our educational establishment seem to be inculcating our students against leadership. This revolt against leadership seems to be evident in some of the school demonstrations we are witnessing.

Again borrowing thoughts from psychology professor Borow, you are being trained to assume responsibility for the rational and effective planning and management of your own careers. Your outlook must be realistic but, above all, it must reflect your belief that your actions in your environment will make a significant difference in your life. . . . You can be, in the words of a young Korean student, the kind of person who, when the days get windy, will yearn for wings instead of shelter.

Today we are encountering a dichotomy of idealism and cynicism, of dedication and despair, and these moods pose a challenge to all segments of our society and economy. Education should be the key to meet such challenges—and it is my hope that mature idealists, such as many of us in this Conference, can make impossible things happen.

Together, we must increase our investments in the vocational educational of young people. Only by doing so can we expect to increase the productivity of retail workers, improve the competence of men and women in managerial positions and, as a result, restore to the retailing industry a new vitality in its jobs and its services to our American consumers.

It is our task, our responsibility and our opportunity to help make your Impossible Career Dreams come true. In the spirit of togetherness, this is our calling for the 70's.

#### CONGRESS OPENED 180 YEARS AGO: REFORM INFREQUENT

### HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Eric Sevareid, concluding a CBS news broadcast one evening, suggested that among the several qualities needed by a President of the United States, two were really indispensable: a sense of history, and a sense of the ridiculous.

Perhaps these qualities are only slightly less important to a Member of Congress.

It is with a mixture of humility, seriousness of purpose, and a sense of irony that I call the attention of my colleagues to the following news item in the New York Journal of Thursday, April 2, 1789:

Important Intelligence. We have the satisfaction of informing the respectable public, that yesterday the hon. the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States formed a quorum—when the hon. Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, member from Pennsylvania, was elected Speaker; after which the house proceeded to choose a Clark (sic), when John Beckley, Esq. of Virginia, was appointed to that office. No other business was transacted yesterday.

The italics are not mine. The New York Journal apparently felt that these two portions of information deserved emphasis.

The first Congress was supposed to convene, in New York City, on March 4, 1789. An editorial in the New York Daily

Gazette of that date welcomed the first arrivals as follows:

The corporation of this City having appropriated the City Hall for the accommodation of the Congress of the United States; and the same having been elegantly improved and repaired for that purpose, the Common Council have resolved that the Recorder communicate the same to the Congress of the United States accordingly.

Yesterday evening the guns at the Battery were discharged, as a farewell to the old Confederation, and a welcome of the new general Government. Willing to adopt on this occasion the good old adage, "*De Mortuis Nil Nisi Bonum*," \* we wish repose to the ashes—for good.

she expired in a blaze of eloquence—of this venerable Phoenix, once the glory of the western world; and fervently expect in her blooming offspring a revival of those graces and virtues which rendered her parent both respectable and lovely. So deeply are her charms engraved on the hearts of many, that for years to come, "her glorious and immortal memory will be celebrated by thousands, who, whilst they lament her death, will gratefully transfer their respect and tenderness to her worthy heiress."

Unfortunately, only 13 Members of the House appeared on March 4 to take their seats in the new Congress. Others were delayed by bad roads, at least one shipwreck, and in the view of some historians, a certain lack of interest on the part of some of the new Representatives.

So the first House met and adjourned from day to day until a quorum finally was assembled, 180 years ago today, on April 1, 1789.

I include at the end of my remarks the record of the first House of Representatives, from March 4 through April 1, as set forth in volume 1 of the Annals of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to appreciate the failure of the first House of Representatives to get to work on the appointed meeting day, and I think we can sympathize with the delay of the first appropriation bill until Thanksgiving of that year.

Today, on the 180th anniversary of the first business meeting of the House of Representatives, I am introducing still another duplicate copy of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969." Today's bill brings the total cosponsors of this legislation to more than 100 Congressmen.

I would like to remind my colleagues that in the nearly two centuries of our existence only once have we undertaken a comprehensive reorganization of our operations and procedures, and this was more than 20 years ago, in 1946. Additional delay on the reorganization bill in the 91st Congress is indefensible on any grounds.

Again, I extend an invitation to Members of the House of both political parties to cosponsor H.R. 6278.

ANNALS OF CONGRESS, VOLUME 1

Proceedings and Debates of the House of Representatives at the first session of the first Congress, begun at the City of New York, March 4, 1789.

Wednesday, March 4, 1789: This being the day fixed for the meeting of the new Congress, the following members of the House of Representatives appeared and took their seats, viz: From Massachusetts, George Thatcher, Fisher Ames, George Leonard, and

\* About those who are dead, nothing but

Elbridge Gerry. From Connecticut, Benjamin Huntington, Jonathan Trumbull, and Jeremiah Wadsworth. From Pennsylvania, Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, Thomas Hartley, Peter Muhlenberg, and Daniel Heister. From Virginia, Alexander White. From South Carolina, Thomas Tudor Tucker. A quorum of the members not being present, the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Thursday, March 5: Several other members attended, viz: from New Hampshire, Nicholas Gilman; from Massachusetts, Benjamin Goodhue; from Connecticut, Roger Sherman and Jonathan Sturges; and from Pennsylvania, Henry Wynkoop; and no other members arriving, a quorum not being present, the House adjourned, from day to day, until the 14th instant.

Saturday, March 14: The following members took their seats, to wit: James Madison, Jr., John Page, and Richard Bland Lee, from Virginia. A quorum not being yet present, the House adjourned, from day to day, until the 17th instant.

Tuesday, March 17: Samuel Griffin, from Virginia, took his seat.

Wednesday, March 18: Andrew Moore, from Virginia, took his seat. No other members appearing, the House adjourned, from day to day, until the 23rd instant.

Monday, March 23: The following members appeared, to wit: From New Jersey, Elias Boudinot; and from Maryland, William Smith. No additional member appeared on the 24th.

Wednesday, March 25: Jonathan Parker, from Virginia, appeared and took his seat. No additional member arrived until the 30th instant.

Monday, March 30: George Gale, from Maryland, and Theodorick Bland, from Virginia, appeared and took their seats. No additional member on the 31st instant.

Wednesday, April 1: Two other members appeared, to wit: James Schureman, from New Jersey, and Thomas Scott, from Pennsylvania, who forming a quorum of the whole body, it was, on motion:

"Resolved, that this House will proceed to the choice of a Speaker by ballot."

The House accordingly proceeded to ballot for a Speaker, when it was found that a majority of the votes were in favor of Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, one of the Representatives from Pennsylvania. Whereupon, Mr. Muhlenberg was conducted to the chair, from whence he made his acknowledgments to the House for so distinguished an honor.

The House then proceeded in the same manner to the appointment of a Clerk, when it was found that Mr. John Beckley was elected.

On motion, Ordered, that the members do severally deliver in their credentials at the Clerk's table.

FARSIGHTED COMMUNITY PLANNING BY ALLEN PARK, MICH.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Allen Park, in my congressional district of Michigan, recently received a \$927,749 Federal grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to construct a two-story apartment building for senior citizens.

Approval of this grant was the culmination of many months of work by Allen Park city officials working with my office and with the Chicago regional office of HUD.

I would like to take this opportunity

to publicly express my congratulations to the city of Allen Park, its officials, and its citizens for their farsighted community planning.

I would like, also, to bring Allen Park's plans to the attention of my colleagues, to show them how one typical American city is utilizing one of the many programs that we have authorized to help communities solve their local problems.

Allen Park is a city of some 40,000 persons, with an area of 7.16 square miles. It lies just south of Detroit, and is bisected by several of the metropolitan area's major thoroughfares. Incorporated as a village in 1927, and as a city in 1957, Allen Park has won acclaim for intelligence and foresight in its municipal planning. The result has been a community of fine homes, a conveniently located shopping district, and a well-planned industrial sector.

Several years ago, the need became apparent for low-cost housing to serve the community's elderly residents. City officials contacted my office, and application was made for Federal funds to begin planning a senior citizens housing project.

A program reservation was approved in September 1965, and a \$7,600 preliminary loan was granted in June 1966. Approval of the final grant last month has brought the project to the construction stage. Ground is to be broken in about a month, and completion is scheduled for next February.

The general contractor, M. Herbert Construction Co., will erect the 62-unit apartment building, and then turn it over to the city under the turnkey concept.

The apartment building will be located adjacent to the city's public library, on a 2.2-acre site near the intersection of Allen and Champaign Roads. It will have 61 one-bedroom apartments, and one two-bedroom unit. Rental costs will be about \$50 a month, including utilities, which will enable retired persons to have adequate housing, at a cost they can afford.

Each apartment will have a fully tiled bathroom, sound-proof walls, nonskid vinyl floors to eliminate the need for carpeting, and an entrance vestibule. The building will have a large sitting room, a community room, lobby, meeting room, outside terrace, and some outdoor recreational facilities, including a shuffleboard court.

Eligibility requirements for renters will be established by the locally appointed housing commission, which will set up criteria based on income, length of residence in Allen Park, and other factors.

The apartment project was conceived and brought into being by a dedicated city administration headed during the past 4 years by Mayor Leo Paluch. Other present members of the administration are Clerk Sal Scarpace, Treasurer George Moore, and Councilmen Osborne Pat Dunn, Frank Bodnar, Ralph C. Cunningham, Anthony Foresi, Frank J. Lada and Ronald E. Weston. Others who have served as city officials during the 4-year period include Frank Rodwell, clerk, and Clarence Harold Duda, Omer O'Neil and Lawrence Murphy, councilmen.

Kenneth Maher is now acting housing director and city controller. Barrett Laf-

ferty was formerly housing director, and is now assessor.

Members of the housing commission are Edward Wagonsomer, chairman, and Joseph Chetcuti, Lorell M. Ford, Mrs. Elvira Machinsky and Francis Peck. Others who have served on the commission in the past 4 years include Foresi, Elvie R. Adcox, Mrs. Rosemarie Herbert, Alfred L. Johnson and Mrs. Elizabeth Klopfer.

To this outstanding group of public servants I offer my sincere congratulations for a working example of how enlightened cooperation on the local and Federal level can help progressive communities plan for the future and put Federal tax dollars to work on local projects benefitting our citizens.

POPE PAUL VI NAMES BISHOP JOHN J. WRIGHT OF PITTSBURGH, CARDINAL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh, Pa., are especially proud that Bishop John J. Wright of the diocese of Pittsburgh was named a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church by Pope Paul VI on Friday, March 28, 1969.

A man of exceptional talents, Bishop Wright is the first American to advance directly from bishop to cardinal without first having been an archbishop, and he is the first Pittsburgh bishop ever elevated to cardinal.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Bishop Wright on this high honor and fine recognition from the Vatican of his eloquence, intelligence, and competence.

We in Pittsburgh also want to salute Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, former bishop of Pittsburgh, who was another of the four Americans named as cardinals.

I want to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Robert Schwartz, religion editor of the Pittsburgh Press, on Bishop Wright's elevation and his long career of contributions to the Catholic Church, as well as editorials from the Pittsburgh Press and the Pittsburgh Post Gazette praising this most recent recognition of Bishop Wright's abilities, and Bishop Wright's own statement on learning of the appointment.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 28, 1969] "News to Me"—WRIGHT: RISE IN CHURCH RAPID

(By Robert Schwartz)

Bishop John J. Wright today was designated a prince of the Roman Catholic Church.

He became the first Pittsburgh bishop ever elevated to cardinal, a fact of which he was notified in a telephone call at 6 a.m. by Apostolic Delegate Luigi Raimondi of Washington.

"This is news to me as much as it is to anyone else," he said shortly thereafter. "I'm bewildered by it. I'm not sure what it means in terms of future work and I have no letter, or detailed information concerning it."

This is the first time that an American has advanced directly from bishop to cardinal without first being an archbishop.

The bishop, who observed his 10th anniversary here just last week—March 18—had often been rumored as a prospective successor to Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston, under whom he once served.

[Vatican sources said there is a "good possibility" Bishop Wright will be transferred from the Pittsburgh post and made president of the Vatican Secretariat for Christian Unity.

[The Christian unity post has been vacant since the death of German-born Augustin Cardinal Bea last Nov. 16.]

A Pittsburgh Press reporter was accidentally cut in on Bishop Wright's private phone line later this morning.

"I'm doing a few double-takes here today," the bishop said. "I'm not sure what I'm doing."

"I'm still waiting for a letter. I'm watching for the mailman . . . If you see him tell him to hurry, will you?"

Bishop Wright wrote the American bishop's pastoral letter in support of the Pope's encyclical on birth control last July.

The Pope had reaffirmed the church's opposition to birth control, specifically the birth control pill, and the bishop's letter underpinned his position, under attack by some laymen.

Bishop Wright's predecessor here—Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit—also was among four Americans selected to become Cardinals.

Bishop Dearden presided over the Pittsburgh Diocese for nine years before he was succeeded by Bishop Wright in March, 1959.

At a news conference, the Cardinal-designate said one of his first phone calls earlier today was from Archbishop Dearden, with whom he served on Vatican Council II.

He said Archbishop Dearden and he were happy to be teaming up again.

Bishop Wright said his schedule is so tight in the next month that it will be difficult to prepare for his new assignment.

Always quick with a quip, he added, "I might go Downtown to see the 'Shoes of the Fisherman' to learn how to behave."

Bishop Wright, the eighth bishop of the diocese, became a dominant figure in this City's life as prelate, educator, ecumenist, civic leader and civil rights protagonist.

Erudite, witty, a top scholar and an intellectual, he was regarded as a conservative theologian, and a political and sociological liberal. But he dislikes labels.

He has been active in virtually every phase of the poverty war and equal opportunity struggle here. He was not averse to appointing black militants to assist the church in its participation in this struggle.

Among the early congratulations was a message from Mayor Joseph M. Barr, who said the Pope had selected "a man of remarkable talents . . . a man of great warmth, understanding and passion."

"Those of us in public life who have been privileged to be closely associated with this distinguished church leader are well aware of the exceptional qualities which obviously prompted this pronouncement from the Vatican."

Bishop Wright's elevation to the College of Cardinals had long been forecast in church circles.

His rise to the top of the church's hierarchy has been relatively rapid.

BISHOP AT 37

The Pittsburgh prelate became a bishop at the age of 37, which is young for that rank in the church.

Bishop Wright, born July 18, 1909, in Lawrence, Mass., was named the first bishop of the Diocese of Worcester, Mass., when it was formed in 1950.

He was installed as head of the Pittsburgh diocese nine years later.

An Irishman who dispenses wit and wisdom in balanced proportion, he is equally at ease before a football banquet or divinity

class, a firemen's parade or a solemn liturgical procession.

His associates recall the time he flouted tradition and arrived at an interfaith breakfast wearing a green skullcap along with the normal black-and-scarlet trappings of his office as bishop.

"It's St. Patrick's Day," he told the crowd while doffing the green skullcap.

In Boston, where he attended St. John's Seminary at the start of his career, he quickly was recognized as "a bright young Catholic priest headed for bigger and better things" in church affairs.

Studious, eschewing athletic Latin School as a boy, was graduated from Boston College, then entered the seminary. In 1932, he was sent to the North American College in Rome and attended classes at nearby Gregorian University.

In 1935, he became a priest in ceremonies at the North American College, then spent four more years in the Eternal City, except for summers as a parish curate in England, Scotland and France.

EARNED DOCTORATE

He earned a doctorate in theology during this time.

Returning to the U.S. in 1939, he taught philosophy at St. John's Seminary.

He became assistant to William Cardinal O'Connell of Boston the same year.

Cardinal O'Connell recognized the young priest's talents. The youthful churchman became the cardinal's personal secretary.

Following Cardinal O'Connell's death a year later, the priest became secretary to Richard Cardinal Cushing, O'Connell's successor.

In the following years, promotions came rapidly—papal chamberlain in 1944, auxiliary bishop in 1947, and full bishop by 1950.

RIGHTS LEADER

His Pittsburgh career is notable for achievements in the civil rights field.

One of his oft-quoted comments was made at a discussion of interracial community problems in Hazelwood. He said:

"All persons are members of the single, human race. I cannot understand a discussion of race except as it concerns the human race."

An eloquent speaker with a Boston accent, his schedule of personal appearances is rigorous.

Commenting recently on his 10-year tenure here, he observed that the tuggings for his time, either as a speaker, a traveler for peace, or in connection with his duties as a prelate, create a "tension" within him.

He noted that one of his biggest problems is budgeting the use of his time, then added wistfully that every person has only "so much energy" and that this "precious commodity" must be dispensed with great care.

He was one of the leading figures at the church's Second Vatican Council, a group which debated Catholicism's basic philosophical concepts during the early 1960s.

He recalls that he made 41 round trips to the Rome sessions in 1963 and 1964, a distance of about 415,000 miles.

Reflecting on this activity, he recently commented:

"Shortly after I came to Pittsburgh, beginning in 1960, I had to spend weeks on end in Rome and elsewhere working on affairs of the Ecumenical Council.

"This was a very great worry to me, particularly in view of the fact that I was still new to Pittsburgh. But the worry was greatly diminished . . . by the way the priests of the diocese and members of the staff kept things going."

He said he quickly discovered that the Pittsburgh Diocese is a tight-knit, strong, cohesive unit.

"Then I began to worry that perhaps a diocese as strong and cohesive as this one would not be responsive to things coming out of Vatican Council," he said.

"It's one of the major consolations of my 10 years here that stability in this diocese is not synonymous with immobility.

"I feel comfortable about the way things have worked out."

This is an apparent reference to the fact that Pittsburgh Catholics refrained from joining in protests which swept through many cities on the heels of pronouncements stemming from Ecumenical Council's deliberations.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 30, 1969]

CARDINAL WRIGHT

Pittsburghers of all creeds will take special pride in the elevation of Bishop John J. Wright to the College of Cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church has been here since Colonial times, and Bishop Wright is the eighth head of the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese.

Now he becomes the first bishop of the six-county diocese to rise to cardinal. And the first American to advance directly from bishop to cardinal without first becoming an archbishop—which many will interpret as a sign of special recognition by the Vatican.

To add to Pittsburgh's honor, Bishop Wright's immediate predecessor here—Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, who served this diocese for nine years—also has been named a cardinal.

Both of these churchmen have been active in the ecumenical movement initiated by Pope John XXIII and advanced by Pope Paul VI. In recent years, both have been active in Vatican deliberations and both have played key roles in the affairs of the American bishops.

Bishop Wright is well-known among leaders of all denominations for his all-embracing interest in humanity.

He recognizes only one race—the human race—and he views his diocese here, as he said on the occasion of his elevation, as "America on a small scale," embracing every culture, nationality and ethnic group and reflecting an infinite variety of God's children.

These are times that generate problems and issues for the Catholic church and for religion generally, no less than for government and secular organizations.

It should be reassuring to Catholics and inspiring to others that a man of Bishop Wright's caliber has been elevated to a position where his learning, wisdom and love of humanity will find even wider application.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Mar. 29, 1969]

PRINCE OF THE CHURCH

Friends of Bishop John J. Wright will rejoice in his elevation to the College of Cardinals. In the Roman Catholic hierarchy, a cardinal ranks just below the Supreme Pontiff and participates in the election of a new pope. As advisers to the pope, members of the cardinalate have a powerful influence on ecclesiastical policy. Bishop Wright's immersion in community affairs has qualified him as a persuasive force for progressive change.

Bishop Wright combines political liberalism with theological conservatism. He is not the aloof prelate who chooses to stand above the battle. His courageous espousal of civil rights has drawn the fire of those who believe a clergyman should confine himself to broad general endorsements of an abstract virtue. The democratic ruler of the Pittsburgh Diocese has not merely given lip service to the cause of social justice. He has allowed latitude to activist Roman Catholic priests who have chosen to plunge into the dust of the political arena.

Admiration of the personable Bishop Wright is not denominational. He has striven to serve all sectors of the community—especially the barely visible poor. Assumption of the scarlet hat and robes of

the cardinal confirms an eminence which Bishop Wright owns by nature. His scholarship, sagacity, courage and humor should prove priceless assets for the guidance of his church in a disoriented time.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Mar. 28, 1969]

"A LOT OF PEOPLE BETTER DO A LOT OF PRAYING," TEXT SAYS

Here is the text of a statement by Cardinal-designate John J. Wright:

"This news is bewildering. As of this minute, I am not sure what it means except that a lot of people better do a lot of praying. As a priest I can already do everything that I could possibly do as a cardinal. In the way of that which chiefly matters, like the sacramental service of souls and the preaching of the glory of God.

"HELP EVEN MORE

"As a bishop I can do special works for peace, for the defense of the faith, for social justice, for the intellectual life, for the reconciliation of God's people.

"I hope that as a cardinal I can help even more. Certainly not less.

"Knowing Pope Paul on the basis of all the things he says and does, I am sure he intends that his cardinals do more, not less. He will always get a ready response from me.

"A cardinal has special ties with the Holy Roman Church. But no scarlet cords could possibly tie me more closely to Rome and the Church universal over which the Bishop of Rome holds the presidency of charity, and to all the loves I have shared all my life with the parents, family, brother priests, devout nuns, lay associates and friends whom God has given me so generously.

"Many of the dearest among these friends and co-workers are not at full communion with Rome, but as much as any, they have shared the intellectual and spiritual pieties which have made me glad through the years of my priesthood, to echo Christ with a Roman heart.

"PROTESTANT TRIBUTE

"One of my most cherished Protestant teachers introduced me to the Latin poem from which I took my motto as a bishop.

"I particularly hope that people in the area served by the Diocese of Pittsburgh—and all of them without exception—my own people and their neighbors of every color, ethnic culture and creed, who have been so generous, so good to me—are grateful that the Holy Father thought of this corner of the world when he was choosing members of his College of Cardinals.

"Pittsburgh deserves a salute implicit in this news. Our diocese is the church in miniature. Our six counties are America in small scale. Every culture is here, every nationality, every ethnic group, every kind and condition of Adam's breed, of God's children, of Christ's brethren.

"And the plain fact is that, despite occasional family tensions, we all love one another.

"Moreover, we all know it.

"Now we must pray for one another, all of us in the whole community, with greater love and more than ever.

"Ten years have taught me the strength that comes from the prayers of Pittsburgh priests, Pittsburgh's sisters, Pittsburgh's lay people—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and kindly skeptics, all included."

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened at the

passing of the late President Eisenhower. His death leaves a great void in the minds and hearts of the American people. He was a courageous man, one who I believe, truly reached heroic stature.

He will always stand in my mind as one of our greatest Americans. His record and accomplishments are all a matter of public knowledge and history. In a time of national disaster, Ike was there, leading his country with a moral force and courage unparalleled in our country's history. His decisiveness and brilliant leadership swept our Nation to victory during World War II, banishing the deplorable tide of nazism, and giving freedom-loving people, both at home and abroad, new hope for a better life.

It was fitting that a deeply grateful country would bestow its highest honor on this man. Following the mandate of his people, he restored his beloved country to a period of new calm and confidence.

The late President Eisenhower was all that was virtuous and fine in a human being. From a humble beginning, a glorious career ensued, one filled with faith in his fellow man, a great love of country, hard work and determination. This was the measure of the man. I cherish my memories of him. We shall not forget him soon.

LAWRENCE LESSER, CELLIST, NATIVE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as many of my distinguished colleagues know, I represent a district which includes Beverly Hills, West Hollywood and West Los Angeles, the home of some of the most gifted and creative people in our entire Nation.

On April 23, 1969, one such gifted musician, Lawrence Lesser, will play cello in an important concert at town hall in Los Angeles. Mr. Lesser, although young in years, already has distinguished himself in a very difficult field and will bring great honor to all Americans who appreciate fine music.

Lawrence Lesser has been hailed by music critics throughout Europe and the United States for his compelling artistry and extraordinary virtuosity. He has been the recipient of outstanding honors, including a prize at the prestigious Tchaikovsky Competition in Moscow.

A native of Los Angeles, a 1956 graduate of Beverly Hills High School, Lawrence Lesser exhibited talent at an early age. He graduated with honors from Harvard University in 1961 and then went to Europe under a Fulbright Fellowship. Mr. Lesser won the cello prize in Siena in 1962 and concluded his year with an enormously successful concert tour in Germany, Italy, and Spain.

He was a guest performer in the 1966 Heifetz-Piatigorsky concerts at Carnegie Hall, and again in the 1968 Los Angeles series. While in Russia in 1966 he recorded for "Melodiya", and his recording

of the Schoenberg Cello Concerto for Columbia Records has recently appeared.

Lawrence Lesser is a protege of Gregor Piatigorsky, and Pablo Casals has hailed his artistry. His repertoire is extensive, ranging from standard classical and romantic music to most of the important contemporary works. He plays a Stainer cello of rare beauty, made in 1670.

I know that the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives join me in praising this fine young American who shows great promise in the field of music.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

### HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker:

Soldiers, rest! Thy warfare o'er,  
Sleep the sleep that knows not breaking;  
Dream of battled fields no more,  
Days of danger, nights of waking.

Soldiers, rest! Thy warfare o'er,  
Dream of fighting fields no more;  
Sleep the sleep that knows not breaking,  
Morn of toil, nor night of waking.

—SIR WALTER SCOTT.

Destiny reaches out her hand and with unerring accuracy places her finger on the man equipped by character and training to carry out her purposes. As the war clouds gathered over Europe in the late 1930's there was dire need for a man of uncommon virtues. In the armies of the United States there was an inconspicuous colonel. Who could have predicted that this colonel would be selected to lead the armed might of the free world against the violence of a military machine in the hands of a mad man? We must say that destiny—or shall we say, Divine Providence—interposed to save the world from slavery.

The record of General Eisenhower's achievements is placed clearly before the scrutinizing gaze of history. His judgment in military action, his skill in manipulating men and materials, his statesmanship in dealing with the complex problems arising from diverse personalities and independent governments, all have been analyzed in detail. Today they stand approved, without a dissenting voice. No such universal acclaim has ever been attached previously to any military figure in all history.

More than two centuries before the Christian era, Asia was the arena in which ambitious kings struggled for dominance. Out of the confusion of the times came an astonishing figure, little known to the Western World. His name was Asoka, and it is written of him that—

He is the only military monarch on record who abandoned warfare after victory.

After uniting what is now India into a stable society, he put his genius to work in promoting the arts of peace. His accomplishments in economic advancement, in education, and in social welfare seem almost modern in scope and in application to the needs of the day.

Somehow the career of General Eisenhower seems curiously to rehearse that of this ancient and benign monarch. For with the general, after war came peace, and the reestablishment of stable societies in Europe, and the restoration of economic strength, and education, and political leadership.

Supported by the adulation of the millions, at home and abroad, he might indeed have been a monarch. The ego of a lesser man, fed on the approval of his countrymen, must surely have responded to the promptings of ambition. But he was not that lesser man. He chose not "pomp nor show, nor lofty place, not boast above the least." Clothed in the "majesty of humility, his scepter was his kindness, his grandeur was his grace."

At this hour, a caravan of trains carries his mortal remains toward a little country town in the Midwest. There, in a shrine as unpretentious as his life has been, the general will be laid to rest. But it is not the all-conquering general, but the wise and gentle and simple "father-figure" who will live in the hearts of his countrymen.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

### HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the whole world mourns the passing of Dwight D. Eisenhower. We are fortunate to have had him as one of our country's foremost military and political leaders. We are all the richer to have been able to share him with his family.

Ike's boyhood ideals, supplemented by his strict family training and West Point's 4 years of emphasis on devotion to duty, all stood him in good stead for the rest of his life.

The puritan ethic was constantly an important factor in his life which resulted in his chief motivation: "to do good." His driving dedication pushed him forward into higher and higher responsibilities, so that he could implement the ideals which he held—to improve the welfare of his fellow man.

This ambition came into prominent focus at the height of World War II when the greatest military forces of the world were placed under his command, and he led them to ultimate victory.

It is no small wonder that this position of successful leadership led logically to a call from a grateful people, to pull this country together from the ravages of a war and to become President. He likewise served ably in the White House. Ike always remembered the strict precepts of his youthful upbringing. He was a God-fearing man, religious to the core, and motivated by only the highest ideals.

Despite his militaristic background, General Eisenhower was a patient, kindly, and humble man. His personality was warm and friendly. To know him, was to admire and love him. He was a special American and an exceptional

world leader. Not only has he earned the respect and admiration of our citizenry, but citizens from all ends of the earth.

His fighting spirit was evident to the end. He fought valiantly despite countless odds, so that he could continue with his pursuit to "do good." We shall miss him.

Mrs. Schneebeli joins me in extending prayers and heartfelt sympathy to his grieving family.

### ENDANGERED SPECIES LEGISLATION

### HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, legislation to protect species of animals which are in danger of extinction is an important matter on which this session of Congress must act. We must protect and preserve the species not only during our generation but during ones to come.

Hearings on the legislation were recently held by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. An important statement on the legislation was delivered to our subcommittee by a spokesman for the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO. The statement was applauded by subcommittee members from both parties.

The significance of the testimony is that this labor union, which represents leather tannery and fur workers, as well as food industry employees, greatly feared the endangered species legislation last year. It was afraid the legislation, as written last year, would threaten its members with further job losses in two already declining industries. At the same time, the union felt that the objectives of the legislation should be achieved.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, set about trying to find a common ground with conservation groups and the sponsors of the legislation. It not only succeeded, but it also bridged much of the gap between the fur and leather industry managements and the conservation groups. The amendments which the union proposed not only would ease its fears, but also further the goals of the conservation groups.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, and its two executive officers, President Thomas J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman, for their imaginative, considerate, and statesmanlike approach to this problem. They certainly deserve congratulations.

The testimony presented to the subcommittee gives a forthright and frank account of the union's position in the past and today, the actions it took and the recommendations it made to our subcommittee. Under unanimous consent I include the statement in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ARNOLD MAYER, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN, AFL-CIO, CONCERNING ENDANGERED SPECIES LEGISLATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, FEBRUARY 20, 1969

My name is Arnold Mayer. I am the Legislative Representative of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO).

The Amalgamated is a labor union with 500,000 members organized in about 700 Local Unions throughout the United States and Canada. The Amalgamated and its Local Unions have contracts with thousands of employers in the meat, retail, poultry, egg, canning, leather, fish processing and fur industries.

About 35,000 of our members work in the fur and leather tanning industries. Some of these members are involved with the endangered species legislation.

Appearing with me is Henry Foner, President of the Joint Board, Fur, Leather and Machine Workers Union in New York. The Joint Board combines some of our fur processing and leather tanning Local Unions.

#### REASONS FOR PAST CONCERN

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, we appear today to offer strong support for legislation to conserve endangered species. As you know, our Union was quite concerned about this legislation last year. We should like to explain what our concern was and what has happened to ease our anxieties about the legislation.

When the endangered species legislation was moving through Congress last year, some of our fur and leather Local Unions greatly feared that the bill's ban on the importation of certain animal skins may cause job losses. Three background factors made that fear very real and very pressing. They are:

(1) Both the fur and the leather tanning industries are declining in employment. Virtually every year, additional companies close plants and shops. Men and women who have worked in these industries for decades are without jobs. Because of the nature of the work these employees have done most of their adult lives, it generally is not easy for them or the Union to find substitute employment offering them an equal standard of living.

Therefore in these two industries, any possible threat to present employment is looked upon with special fear and special anxiety.

(2) Because of past Congressional actions, the fur industry has suffered the export of some of its work and business to other countries. The most notable of these experiences is the result of a provision in the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 which bans the importation into the U.S. of seven Russian and Chinese furs.

The stated reason for this action—taken during the height of the Cold War—was to deny the Soviet Union and Red China an American market for their furs. But manufactured garments made of these furs continued and still continue to come into the U.S. freely. The skins are processed and the garments made in Western Europe. The finished product is then imported into the U.S. and sold here. The only result of the legislation is that perhaps thousands of U.S. jobs have been lost by an already declining industry.

Because of this and some other experiences, the Local Unions are especially sensitive to new legislation concerning fur importation bans.

(3) The provisions of H.R. 11618, the legislation which passed the House of Representatives last year, actually heightened these fears. For example, that bill did not specifically provide any hearing procedures on the listing of endangered or banned

species. It did not provide for action to assure that other nations will pass similar legislation. The bill could have made illegal those skins which were already on hand and on which work might be done. And so on.

We know there was no intention by the legislation's drafters or sponsors to do any harm to the jobs of our members. That is obvious. But our Local Unions fully realize that laws are written to be enforced for a very long time. The determinant of what the legislation will do in the distant future lies entirely in its provisions and its legislative history. The existing provisions of H.R. 11618 provide no protection against job losses and exportation and therefore contributed to the already existing anxiety.

#### UNION'S DILEMMA

Obviously, our Union has an obligation to deal with any job loss danger which our members face. On the other hand, we also found the objectives of the endangered species legislation to be desirable and action to implement these goals to be necessary.

We faced a dilemma. We felt quite uncomfortable.

We decided that we must find a solution to the dilemma. We decided to work with the conservation groups, the industry groups, Interior Department officials, members of Congress and their staffs to discover ways in which the objectives of the legislation could be achieved, but at the same time, possible job losses would be curtailed.

We realized then and we realize today that this legislation will cause some job losses under any circumstances. Some may argue that these losses may be comparatively few and that the jobs would disappear anyway when the animals become extinct. That point may be quite true. But even a few jobs held only for a year or two are important in a declining industry.

The point is we will undoubtedly lose some jobs. But we want to limit that loss. And that is what we set out to do.

#### DISCUSSIONS AND MEETINGS

We have held several dozen meetings with various individuals and groups involved with all or different aspects of this legislation. We have frankly discussed our problems with them and we have sought solutions.

These discussions began during the Congressional session last year. They got underway when we joined fur and leather management representatives in a conference with Interior Department officials. As a result of this conversation, some subsequent talks and various discussions held only between the management representatives and Interior officials, the Department proposed very important changes in the legislation.

Although these amendments did not provide the solution, they were a great step forward. They came at the end of the Congressional session when time was running out for more conversations and further action could not be assured.

We continued the talks with conversation groups after the Congressional adjournment. In mid-December, we invited as many of the interested conservationists as we could reach, representatives of the two Congressional Committees, Interior Department officials, fur industry representatives and leather industry representatives to a January 6 meeting to discuss the legislation fully. It was the first time that management representatives from the affected industries and conservation leaders had ever met.

That meeting and a subsequent one held on February 7 were very successful. I do not mean that everyone agreed with everyone else. But fears were fully aired and efforts made to deal with them. Anger was expressed and cleared up. And most important of all, differences were narrowed.

In these meetings, our Union found itself in the middle between the industries and con-

servationists. This is true literally, because we had called the meeting, chaired it and tried to serve as a bridge in them. This is true figuratively because we found that our views were somewhere between the two sides.

Our own position—the way out of our dilemma—jelled during the meetings and the conversations. It is to support H.R. 4812, to propose one major amendment, two minor ones and to suggest a provision for the Committee's report.

Our position and our proposed amendments do not come as a surprise to any of the groups. We made our proposals clear during the February 7 meeting and other conversations. We found much support for our position and—as far as I know—no opposition.

#### SUPPORT OF H.R. 4812

We strongly support H.R. 4812. This measure was proposed by the Johnson Administration before it left office and was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee, Rep. Edward A. Garmatz. It reflects some of the changes sought by our Union and other organizations last year when we complained about provisions of H.R. 11618.

Some of the improvements of H.R. 4812 over previous House bills are:

1. It provides interested groups and persons opportunities to comment on the actual determination to list specific endangered species. Organizations and individuals can make their views officially known to the Secretary both before he compiles the list and when it is published.

2. It encourages agreements between the United States and other nations to conserve and protect the endangered species. Such action is absolutely essential to prevent the export of fur and leather jobs and business to other nations as a result of this legislation.

Frankly, we believe this provision needs some strengthening and will suggest an additional section later in this statement.

3. It makes clear that the threat of total extinction must apply to the entire species or subspecies wherever found and not merely a species or subspecies in a particular country.

4. It provides for hardship cases in which a firm contracted for skins before a particular species was banned. The firm must prove its case to the Secretary before it is permitted to import the skins.

This provision may be important to some firms which are poorly capitalized and cannot afford the loss of the money paid in the contracts. In these industries, where many firms are shaky, such a hardship provision could avoid a job jeopardy.

5. It provides for delisting if a species is found by the Secretary to have increased in numbers to a point where it is no longer threatened with extinction. If this were to occur with some species commercially useful in the fur and leather industry, work could begin again and jobs would increase.

#### FOREIGN ACTION ON ENDANGERED SPECIES

During the meetings with the various interested groups, the two points discussed most were: (a) the need to get other nations—particularly other fur processing and leather tanning nations—to join in the conservation effort on endangered species and (b) the need for standards on how a species is determined to be endangered. We have some recommendations in both areas.

Concerning other nations, we believe some stronger language is needed than now exists in Section 5 of H.R. 4812. Obviously, the goal of conserving the species will not be met if the U.S. bans the importation, but other nations do not. Also, we greatly fear that unless other nations provide a similar ban, fur and leather jobs may be exported, as occurred in the previously mentioned cases of the Soviet and Chinese furs.

Another important factor is that the State Department—involved with a series of world crises—may not give a high priority to the negotiation of a worldwide convention, bilateral or multi-lateral agreements concerning endangered species. It will need some prodding by Congress.

One approach to the problem could be to make the effective date of the bill dependent upon similar actions by the major fur processing and leather tanning nations. This move would assure the protection of American jobs from export. But it might also greatly delay the effort to conserve the endangered species. We do not want to hold back that work and we shall therefore not ask for or support such an amendment.

We understand, however, that the Department and various conservation groups have sought and are seeking an early international conference concerning wildlife and fish. Such a governmental meeting could include the signing of a convention which would be binding on the signatory nations. It would provide an early solution to the problems posed by other nations.

We therefore urge that the Committee amend H.R. 4812 by adding a subsection (b) to Sec. 5. This subsection should instruct the Secretary of the Interior, working through the Secretary of State, to seek an international meeting of governments in 1970 on the problems of wildlife and fish and this meeting should specifically include the signing of a convention concerning endangered species.

Our discussions with various persons knowledgeable in the field of international conservation indicate that such a meeting could be held in 1970. The advance work apparently can be done in the intervening time.

#### STANDARDS FOR THE LISTING OF SPECIES

Great fear has been expressed by some parts of the fur and leather industries and by some of our Local Unions concerning the absence of specific standards for determining what species are endangered. In our various discussions, we have tried to arrive at some standards which would both conserve rare animals and also provide a guarantee against any arbitrary action by a Secretary sometime in the future.

Very frankly, we have been unable to come up with any such provision. Existing species are so varied that a standard to fit all has escaped us.

We do have several suggestions to make for decreasing the fear which still exists concerning the relative absence of standards. These suggestions do not limit the power of the Secretary in listing endangered species, but they would provide some recourse against possible arbitrary actions.

We urge that:

1. The Committee report accompanying the endangered species bill specifically instruct the Department that in the case of any species which is used in U.S. manufacturing, the Department must be especially careful that the evidence concerning the danger of its extinction fully justifies its listing.

2. The bill again specifically mentions the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources in Sec. 3 of H.R. 4812 as an organization to be consulted.

Other bills specifically named this very prestigious and knowledgeable organization. For some reason, its mention was dropped from H.R. 4812. Since this international group has the greatest amount of data and compiles the Red Data Books, it should again be named in the legislation.

3. Either the bill or the Committee report should provide that no species or subspecies will be listed that is not considered rare and endangered in the Red Data Books of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

During the February 7th meeting of the various organizations, Interior Department officials were asked whether any species which was not in the Red Data Books would be listed. They answered, "No."

These volumes are the main worldwide source of information in this area. The Committee can thereby ease fears about the possible listings in the future without sacrificing any authority of the Secretary by writing the Red Data Books into the legislation or report.

#### SPEEDY ENACTMENT

In closing we again want to voice our support of H.R. 4812. We urge your approval of this bill with the suggested amendments. We hope Congress will enact this legislation shortly.

Thank you very much for giving us this opportunity to present our views.

### THE MAGNITUDE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT OF GENERAL AVIATION

#### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 1, 1969, the Utility Airplane Council of Aerospace Industries Association released the results of an important study on the impact of general aviation, now and in the future. General aviation is making sizable and significant contributions to our way of life and to the national economy. The findings of the study were discussed at a briefing in Washington yesterday and followed by a summarization by Joseph T. Geuting, Jr., manager of the Utility Airplane Council entitled "The Magnitude and Economic Impact of General Aviation."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Geuting's address made on occasion of the public release of the research study commissioned with R. Dixon Speas Associates by the Utility Airplane Council:

Aviation has changed the face of business in the United States—in truth, in the world—in little more than a generation. Air travel is no longer an adventure, it is a necessity.

The airlines have made great strides, as they have developed the finest system of scheduled air transportation in the entire world. America's commercial airlines provide service for millions of people and tons of cargo between major metropolitan centers in the United States and around the globe. General aviation strengthens and completes the nation's air transportation system. Whereas the airlines provide service to about 600 places, general aircraft fly to and from all of the nation's civil airports—numbering about 10,000—located in many places in all of the fifty States.

The most expensive camera will produce a clear picture only if the subject is in focus. The varying views expressed about today's air transportation problems often result in a fuzzy image. Due to the urgency of the problems, it is time to trade in our distorted lenses and look at the subject with high resolution, wide angle equipment.

To better focus in on what the real problems are, let's acknowledge that our viewfinder sees that the basic subject, our nation's great air transportation system, is composed of the scheduled airlines and gen-

eral aviation. While on the one hand they are two distinct elements of the nation's total air transportation system they are identical in one very fundamental respect, their objective is satisfying the total requirements of the air traveler.

Their combined strength, however, is the sum of their different functions. While the airlines operate over specified routes at specific times, general aircraft move when and where they must in order to conform to times set by the air traveler. Thus, the needs of the public are served through two separate systems each interdependent upon the other and together forming one complete system.

This is the true picture of the air transportation system which exists today. It is the same successful system which will exist ten years from now—although it will then be greatly expanded. Its continued success, and its concurrent ability to greatly contribute to the national economy, depends on understanding and cooperative efforts by the public, public officials, and aviation industry leaders.

Since general aviation provides 98 percent of the aircraft in the total air transportation system, has 91 percent of the licensed pilots, flies 79 percent of all airplane hours and 71 percent of all air miles, carries 50 percent of all passengers and is making a continually growing impact on the national economy, there should be no doubts that general aviation is a full partner in America's National Aviation System.

And, in realizing that by 1980 the present fleet of more than 122,200 general aviation aircraft will have more than doubled, that there will be 1,400,000 pilots as opposed to 600,000 today will fly 63 million hours (nearly three times the total hours in 1967) and further realizing that the direct contribution of general aviation to the national economy will have increased from \$2.2 billion in 1967 to \$7.1 billion, it is vitally important that the planners of the National Aviation System have adequate information on which to base their plans.

Certainly some of the information set forth in the study prepared for the Utility Airplane Council by R. Dixon Speas Associates is startling—startling, that is, in the light of previous proprietary industry and other studies which past experience shows have on the whole been conservative. Frankly, we have a nagging feeling today that these new projections—though soundly based—may well prove conservative. The past performance of the general aviation industry has caused us to so think.

There have been several great strides made by general aviation in the past two decades:

The introduction of the light twin-engined aircraft greatly broadened the utility of light aircraft for business and corporate use;

Modern low cost aircraft particularly suitable for training has broadened the base and opened the field for a whole new generation of private pilots to learn to fly in aircraft essentially identical to those they will use as they increase their flying skills and put aircraft to work in their day to day activities;

The advent of the small turbined powered aircraft, pure and prop jet, with pressurized cabins, has further increased utility for corporate and business use;

Air taxi and commuter type service to supplement and feed airline service is now accelerating rapidly using typical general aviation aircraft; and

Not the least of the strides, in fact, a giant stride, is the availability of a wide variety of highly reliable, low cost, electronic navigation and communication equipments which places general aviation on a par with the airlines in the ability to fully use the National Aviation System. In fact it was a general aviation aircraft which was first certificated for CAT II Operations.

Growth is evident in other ways. In 1954 the general aviation industry produced 3,071 aircraft with a manufacturers' net billing value of \$43.4 million; in 1956 the industry produced 6,738 aircraft valued at \$103.7 million; and in 1968—13,698 aircraft were shipped with a value of \$425,682,000. 1980 domestic sales alone are projected to have a value of 1.6 billion dollars. When it is pointed out that more than 20 percent of today's production is exported and export sales have also shown a strong and continuing growth trend, the 1980 sales outlook becomes even more significant.

The trend-line shows strong and continuing growth which has been greatly accelerated within the most recent past. Faced with the facts of past growth and the future potential, it becomes increasingly important that planners have adequate information. The members of the Utility Airplane Council, as well as other elements of the aviation industry and government, have long been concerned about the evolving problems. We have known for many years that the complexities facing a National Aviation System were increasing by quantum leaps as the expansion and improvement of the nation's airports and airways was lagging behind—at an increasing rate—the introduction and use of more and better equipped aircraft in both the airline and the general aircraft fleets.

The UAC study not only indicates an already significant contribution to the nation's air transportation economy by general aviation but a future of much greater significance and national impact.

Unfortunately some of the ways that the problems of the National Aviation System were brought to the general public's attention tended to cloud the basic issues and needs and caused some to cry out for constraints. The solution to air transportation problems will not serve the public interest through constraints on any portion of civil aviation. There has to be a better way.

We believe the information contained in the Utility Airplane Council-R. Dixon Speas Associates study adds substantially to the knowledge of general aviation and its overall importance as an integral part of the nation's transportation economy. In recent months there has been an emergence of a broader public understanding that air transportation is an essential national asset. If the general public is to benefit from air transportation it must understand it in its total sense, commercial airline plus general aviation operations.

Planners particularly must have detailed knowledge of this totality. A principal objective of the study was to provide new information to assist responsible planning bodies at national and local levels in assessing the requirements of the airport/airways system, and for planning related facilities adequate to match growth patterns.

These factors influenced the Utility Airplane Council in its assignment to R. Dixon Speas Associates. In preparing the study, Speas Associates were given freedom as to methodology and reporting techniques. They were also to assume that no unusual constraints would be placed on any segment of civil aviation.

It is our belief that "The Magnitude and Economic Impact of General Aviation" presents a new spectrum in the study of general aviation. It provides information of a nature and in a form not previously available from any source, exclusive of proprietary studies conducted by members of the industry for specialized segments of various markets. It should also be clearly stated that the study was not made with any thought of either discounting or displacing previous industry or government studies. The sole objective was to provide new and additional information so vitally needed by government and industry planners for an adequate airways/airports system.

The study provides factual support to the strong belief long held by the general aviation community that general aviation is making sizeable and significant contributions to the national economy; and a high positive relationship was found between Gross National Product and the changing levels of general aviation activity permitting more accurate forecasting based on highly developed available forecasts of GNP.

Overall, the fleet is forecast to grow from 122,200 units in 1967 to 260,000 in 1980, an increase of 112.8 percent.

Whereas growth will occur in all forms of general aircraft, the highest growth rate will occur in turbine powered units—both turbo-prop and pure jets. Please note, I said rate. The piston powered aircraft, in great variety; will dominate the general aircraft fleet for many years to come.

In the same vein, the UAC study places general aviation hours flown at 24.4 million. The forecast of hours flown projects a 7.6 percent annual compound growth rate through 1980 going from 24.4 million in 1967 to 63.4 million in 1980.

This is carried over into aircraft movements estimated to be 98 million in 1967 and projected to 242 million in 1980.

Flight hours and aircraft movements are based on counts at some 300 airports where the FAA has control towers. This then can only be an approximation of the total number of general aviation flights and flight hours since there are nearly 10,000 airports in the United States.

One might add that of the top ten airports in the nation in the number of movements, three are general aviation airports with no airline service at all. Of these, Opa-Locka, Florida has as many or more operations as O'Hare which is considered the busiest airport in the world.

Movements are indicative of the number of people carried. Studies suggest that general aviation now carries 50 percent as many passengers in inter-city travel as do the nation's certificated airlines. This can also be expected to grow as can the use of general aviation aircraft for cargo and mail. The Utility Airplane Council-R. Dixon Speas Associates study indicates that where 100 million people were carried in 1967, this number will increase to 317 million by 1980. Cargo will increase from 250,000 tons in 1967 to one million tons and, as we mentioned earlier, the number of pilots will more than double from 617,000 today to more than 1.4 million by 1980.

While the growth of the fleet, numbers of pilots, flying hours, people and cargo carried are themselves demonstrative of explosive growth, the economic impact is also very great.

Utilizing the statistics supplied by the R. Dixon Speas Associates report, the Utility Airplane Council prepared a somewhat more comprehensive analysis of the economic impact both in a direct and in an indirect sense. Utilizing standard procedures and an input-output matrix of a type which is readily available to economists, it has been determined that in the time period 1967 to 1980 general aviation direct and indirect economic impact will grow to approximately 15 billion dollars. This growth will also be at a more rapid rate than the total Gross National Product. GNP is expected to increase by 143.1 percent, while general aviation increase will be on the order of 220.4 percent. General aviation's contribution to Gross National Product as a proportion of total GNP should increase from .62% to .82%.

The rapid growth of both airline and general aviation is outstripping and out-pacing the capacities of many of the nation's airports and portions of its air traffic control system. This growing lack of adequate capacity, which the government has publicly stated is not a safety problem, could have a serious effect, unless corrected and corrected

quickly, on realizing the maximum economic potential of this industry.

It is an economic problem because if the airport and air traffic control system is not continuously improved and expanded it will constrain the growth potential of all forms of air transportation and the nation will suffer economic penalties.

But, with proper national attention to adequately support and improve the nation's airports and airways—or the National Aviation System as it is now called—the beneficial growth projected will easily be attained. The performance of the general aviation industry in the past decade is ample proof of this.

Unlike transportation conducted on the surface with rivers, oceans, and mountain ranges imposing natural barriers, air transportation moves in a mighty ocean of air which encompasses the entire world. This air ocean connects every place with every other place. It touches all people from the most primitive to those living in advanced centers of civilization. How this ocean of air is used will mark man's progress in the next year, the next decade, the next century.

Progress is man's distinctive mark. But progress is not accidental. It must be planned for and paid for. The members of the Utility Airplane Council believe that air transportation today—all air transportation—is the distinct mark of progress, and is vitally necessary to the economic well-being of the United States.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, a man whose dedicated service to his Nation in the military, as a civilian leader, and finally as President of the United States, offers to all of us in public life an outstanding example for each of us to follow to the full extent of our capabilities.

Dwight David Eisenhower was born on the Texas frontier and reared in the midst of a pioneer environment in the Middle West. He was a member of a family of limited financial means but of unlimited ideals and family spirit. This background and the strength of his family, provided the foundation on which he grew to become one of the greatest men the world has known this century.

Eisenhower, the general, earned a unique place in the history of this Nation because of his tremendous ability to mobilize not only the forces of our own country but the forces of our Allies for the greatest amphibious assault the world has ever known, crossing the English Channel on June 6, 1944, to commence the long march which he led to return freedom to Europe.

Eisenhower, the statesman, after World War II, served the free world as organizer and Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Through his wisdom and guidance, General Eisenhower in this capacity contributed to the rebirth of free Europe. The healthy societies and economies

these liberated nations enjoy today, especially as they are compared to their counterparts still behind the Iron Curtain, stand as a monument to the job which he undertook after achieving victory in World War II.

Eisenhower, the President, served all the people of this Nation, putting aside any thought of partisan differences. I can say personally that I felt it a privilege and a pleasure to work with this man who sat in the White House during the first 2 years that I was a Member of the House of Representatives. President Eisenhower, a soldier by education and profession, was truly a man of peace. His honesty, his open, warm personality, generated trust and faith in him as a leader not only on the part of the people of this Nation but on the part of the military and political leaders and individual citizens throughout the world. This confidence in his personal ability and integrity, I believe, were in large measure responsible for the fact that the Eisenhower years represent the longest period of peace this Nation has known for many decades.

Mrs. Johnson and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the members of the family.

#### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, 1969 is the 51st anniversary of Byelorussian independence and I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave and freedom-loving people of Byelorussia.

During the 19th and early 20th centuries a distinct Byelorussian culture asserted itself within czarist Russia. Despite strong opposition and constant harassment by the central government, books and newspapers were published in the Byelorussian language, a Byelorussian theater was established, and Byelorussian political parties took shape.

World War I provided the Byelorussians with the opportunity to establish their national independence. Shortly after the Russian March revolution of 1917 a Congress of the Byelorussian Socialist Hromada was called in Minsk, Byelorussia's major city. The Congress called for the reorganization of the Russian empire as a federative state with Byelorussia enjoying autonomous status. On December 5, 1917, an all-Byelorussian Congress met in Minsk. It was attended by 1,872 democratically chosen delegates representing all Byelorussian organizations and political parties. This Congress took another step toward complete independence from Russia when it adopted a resolution endorsing the right of self-determination for all peoples.

Before the Congress adjourned, however, the Bolsheviks, who had seized power in Russia in November, 1917, surrounded the building where the meeting

was being held and disbanded the Congress with a display of armed power. By this action Byelorussia became one of the very first victims of Communist aggression.

More favorable conditions prevailed when the Germans occupied Byelorussia after February 1918. On March 25, 1918, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic solemnly proclaimed their independence and published an official decree of independence.

Despite great difficulties imposed by the war and its consequences, the Byelorussian Government made significant advances in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare. The new Government was also active in the international sphere, and sought and received recognition from numerous countries.

Byelorussian independence, sadly, was short-lived. With the dissolution of the German Armed Forces after the armistice of November 1918, and the advance of the Red Army into Byelorussian territory, the small and ill-equipped military forces of Byelorussia were unable to protect their beloved homeland. On December 10, 1918, the Communists seized Minsk and established a puppet government. With the Treaty of Riga in 1921, Byelorussia was divided between Poland and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, to this day the Byelorussian people have not been subdued by their Communist overlords. Tactics of deportation, executions, purges, and terrorism have failed to dampen their belief in freedom and self-determination. I salute the brave Byelorussian people and pray that their goal of national liberation will not be long in coming.

#### GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to a great leader—a man whose life and devotion to our Nation will continue to inspire people throughout the world for all times.

The people of the Ninth District and the State of Missouri share this period of mourning with all Americans and with all friends of freedom in every corner of the world.

As Commander of the Allied forces in Europe, General Eisenhower liberated millions from Nazi oppression and as the 34th President, he gave strength and courage to millions who recognized his smile and upraised arms as symbols of freedom.

Words are inadequate either to describe our loss or to retrace his contributions to mankind. History will have to record the full scope and significance of Eisenhower's deeds.

We can take comfort in knowing that the principles for which Ike stood have become more permanent as a result of his life and the future generations will not forget this great leader.

#### SOUTH-WEST AFRICA RESOLUTION PASSES U.N.

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in 1966, soon after the assassination of South African Prime Minister Verwoerd, I joined with six of my Republican colleagues in calling strong American leadership "toward nondiscriminatory development and nonviolent transition" in Africa. In a letter to President Johnson, we pointed out that the assassination was testimony to the extraordinary tensions which exist throughout southern Africa, and called the administration to task for failing to exercise the effective leadership that the United States is in a position to provide "to channel the energies of the African people in non-violent policies dedicated to the ultimate growth of a peaceful and integrated society in southern Africa."

The letter also urged constructive initiatives by the United States in the United Nations to deal with the problem of South Africa's refusal to terminate its mandate over South-West Africa, and I am pleased to note that the Nixon administration has taken a step in this direction. Over 2 years ago, the U.N. General Assembly called an end to this mandate, the unjust and discriminatory nature of which has led to a dangerous degree of tension throughout the African continent, and on March 20, 1969, the Security Council took its first action to put the declaration into effect. With strong U.S. support, the Council adopted a resolution, 13 to 0, calling on South Africa to withdraw immediately from the neighboring territory of South-West Africa.

By thus going on record in support of the cause of self-determination in southern Africa, the new administration has taken an important step in our commitment to the achievement of a just, stable, and progressive peace throughout Africa. Although two members of the Security Council abstained from the vote on the grounds that the U.N. could not insure the implementation of the resolution, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Charles Yost, stated that the resolution "wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions." There are, indeed, a number of alternative actions open to the United Nations which do not involve direct physical or economic confrontation, and which are due careful study in our search for effective means to deal with the problem. I am presenting here for the consideration of my colleagues an article from the Washington Post which briefly describes the recent U.N. action, and a policy statement from the American Committee on Africa which suggests a number of possible steps which the U.N. could take. Although I question the value of some of the recommendations offered by this paper, I think it is, in general, a useful demonstration of the creative thinking and constructive approach from which we may develop the diplomatic efforts

that can be effectively implemented and that will allow progress in this complex and difficult situation.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post]

**SOUTH-WEST AFRICA RESOLUTION PASSES U.N.**

UNITED NATIONS, March 20.—With U.S. support, the U.N. Security Council called on South Africa today to withdraw immediately from the neighboring territory of South-West Africa.

The 15-nation Council adopted a resolution to that effect 13-0, with two abstentions. Britain and France abstained because they believed the United Nations cannot insure its implementation and it would only encourage false hopes.

It was the first Council action to put into effect the General Assembly's 2½-year-old declaration that South Africa's League of Nations mandate to govern South-West Africa, a former German colony, was terminated.

Before the vote, U.S. Ambassador Charles W. Yost said the United States was able to support the resolution "because it wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions."

Many black African nations have been demanding at least economic sanctions against South Africa for defying the U.N. declaration. Zambian Ambassador Vernon Johnson Mwaanga, who introduced the resolution, contended it was broad enough to encompass mandatory sanctions.

**IS THERE NOTHING WE CAN DO ABOUT SOUTH WEST AFRICA?**

(By Elizabeth S. Landis, American Committee on Africa)

Re: Action which could be taken by the United Nations General Assembly and Council for South West Africa to assert international jurisdiction over South West Africa without direct physical confrontation with the Republic of South Africa.

First, the UN General Assembly should declare the South African government to be an illegal "occupying power" in South West Africa and so refer to it in all official documents and speeches. (Since South Africa "occupies" South West Africa to the exclusion of the UN itself, its occupation can be distinguished from other occupations—e.g., Tibet, the Middle East, etc.—which the UN might not want to stigmatize in that way.) The United States should also employ this terminology.

The UN Council for South West Africa should:

(1) (a) Issue passports for South West African citizens and visas permitting the entry of aliens into South West Africa.

(b) Request all UN member states not to acknowledge passports issued by the occupying power to South West Africans and to mark the passports of their own citizens "not valid for travel in South West Africa unless this passport bears visa issued by the United Nations Council for South West Africa."

(2) (a) Direct all persons (natural or corporate) subject to general taxation (primarily income, sales, and excise taxes) to pay such taxes to the Council. The Council could request all UN member states to collect such taxes from their own nationals subject thereto, on behalf of the Council; and it could grant such states a collection fee for the service.

(b) Request all UN member states to deny foreign tax credits or otherwise to penalize their nationals if they pay such taxes to the occupying power; foreign tax credits should be granted for taxes paid to the Council.

(3) (a) Record all existing land titles (including mineral rights, etc.) and keep an official register of all future transfers of title. It should investigate all transfers made

under the Odendaal Plan, the "Development of Self-Government for the Native Nations on South West Africa" law, and related legislation; any such transfer should be deemed presumptively invalid in the absence of a showing that it was in the interest of the indigenous nonwhite inhabitants of South West Africa.

Request all UN member states to accept the Council register as the valid register of land titles, and to act accordingly. The United States, for example, should require all securities registration statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by companies having interests in South West Africa to indicate whether they have valid land title according to the Council register.

(4) (a) Issue South West African postage stamps.<sup>1</sup>

(b) Call on the International Postal Union and its members to treat as if it were unstamped mail, all mail originating in South West Africa, which does not bear a stamp issued by the Council.

The UN might issue one or more of its own stamps commemorating its assumption of the South West African Mandate.

**THE WORLD'S SEABED: PREVENT ITS MILITARIZATION**

**HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored a resolution dealing with the prevention of militarization of the world's seabed. We have reached a point of saturation as far as armaments are concerned. As I gaze about the world today, I am struck by the marked resemblance between it and Europe before World War I struck. There is the same proliferation of armaments, built in the name of peace. There are the same vast armies, assembled in the name of peace. There are the same beplumed, helmeted, and glittering assemblages of generals and admirals, all atwiltch with an urge to find out how good their armed forces, schedules, and weapons really are. Further, they are rapidly seeing to it that geographical areas technology opened up to man are first reached and strategically overseen by the Military Establishment. This today is true of the oceans and seabeds of the world.

As science allows us to penetrate further into the depths of the planet's waters, it is already easy to discern another trend of military thought. Oceans are merely another sphere of influence and military operations in the eyes of the general staffs of the world's great powers. I believe it is essential to prevent swift militarization of the seabeds of the world.

Ample precedent exists for such an agreement. We have previously entered into treaties providing for demilitarization of outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies. We have done the same as far as Antarctica is concerned, and scientific cooperation flowering there is a monument to the spirit of that agreement.

<sup>1</sup> This would have the additional advantage of raising substantial revenue for the Council through the sale of such stamps to philatelists.

We can and should move immediately to keep the world's seabeds free of militarization. By so doing we would eliminate a potential source of conflict among nations of the world.

As of today there is no major militarization of the seabed because technology has not become fully sophisticated enough to allow it. There is travel through the depths on a military basis, though, and we must act now.

**JACK JOUETT'S GAMY RIDE**

**HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1781, Capt. Jack Jouett, of Virginia, outwitted the British and saved the lives of Thomas Jefferson and his family, and of members of the legislative assembly who had moved for safety from Richmond to Charlottesville, Va.

Captain Jouett observed the move of the Red Coats from the window of the Cuckoo Tavern in Louisa Court House Town, Va., and guessed they were going after "big game." He immediately mounted his horse to make a fast ride by moonlight at midnight taking a short cut through the wilds to give warning to Jefferson and the others before the enemy could arrive.

His mission was successful. Jefferson sent his family by carriage over the mountain to the Carter Place, and he later followed on horseback. The legislators, after Jouett's warning, adjourned to assemble down the valley at Staunton Hall.

A constituent of mine, who is also an accomplished poet, Lena G. Doll, has composed an account of Captain Jouett's ride, which I commend to all who read this RECORD for careful attention. Captain Jouett was an authentic, and largely unsung, American hero. His feat should prove an inspiration to Americans, young and old.

The poem follows:

JACK JOUETT'S GAMY RIDE

(By Lena G. Doll)

Jack Jouett's momentous midnight ride  
Through the wild Virginia country side  
From Cuckoo Tavern through Albemarle  
To Monticello and Charlottesville

Saved Thomas Jefferson and other great men  
By the British invaders from being taken.  
June third, seventeen hundred eighty one,  
Jack Jouett rode hard through the woods  
alone.

The Virginian law-makers had already signed  
The Declaration of Freedom of Albemarle  
From authority of England's King George III  
And were hard at work to write their own  
laws,

The vanguard of thinking in Freedom's just  
cause,

"We'll take the heart and the very life pulse  
Of Virginia; we will thus quench the source  
Of rebellion in these colonies", the British  
agreed,  
Germaine and Cornwallis, to do so was prime  
need.

Cornwallis then said to Banastre Tarleton, His most active and resourceful partisan, "Get Jefferson and his men at Charlottesville, The advance thinkers of Freedom's will. That will scotch the idea, put an end to the war.

These Colonies are well worth fighting for. Now what will you need to accomplish the task?

Yours for the taking, whatever you ask."

"A hundred dragoons from your veteran staff And seventy-five Welsh Fusiliers is all I ask."

"Choose from the Legion the dragoons you deem able,

For Welsh mounts, pillaged horses from Virginia's best stables.

Be hard at it now, there is no time to lose Lafayette's now in Virginia with a token of troops

And Wayne is approaching with a thousand fresh men,

'Tis reported he is on this side of the Rapidan. Now, even now, is the propitious time—Go, get the Legislators and Tom Jefferson.

Both men were pleased with this bold novel strategy

Both felt assured of a quick easy victory.

Tarleton's wild thinking gave him a sense of delight,

King George himself would dub him a knight When the chained captives were stood in his sight.

Tarleton was an egoist with a one-channel mind.

He thought not of failure, to that he was blind,

He had not full reason, he was of that kind. He had just failed at Cowpens, but that was behind,

Here and now was his chance to pick the prize plum,

He would surely be a General when that feat was done,

He thought not at all of his superiors three, Of British Colonial Secretary, Germaine, Of Cornwallis in charge of the Virginia Campaign,

Of Sir Henry Clinton, Commander, of Forces of the King.

'Twas only himself and the self-glory he'd win

On which his thoughts dwelt, that he kept well within.

He made a salute and a most gracious bow, "Yes, Sir, General, I will do that right now. Hanover to Charlottesville is near seventy miles

My men can ride it in the span of a day, Surprise, and seize the captives, and return without delay."

Then Tarleton made plans for his daring exploit,

To take Jefferson and the Legislators at one fell swoop.

The Legislators had withdrawn from Richmond to Charlottesville,

Not to be deterred from high purpose, or will, At stake was their freedom from an arrogant King

Their death, if it please him, their capture could bring.

In Tarleton's mind they were already his take,

From his trained and equipped cavalry, how could they escape!

About ten o'clock in the evening of the third day of June,

Tarleton's uniformed equipage rode into Louisa Court House Town,

Under the charm and splendor of a brilliant moon; the townspeople only guessed—

Was this another rapid raid, or was it a big game quest?

Providentially, Jack Jouett's sharp eyes and alert mind descried their bold intent

As he spied from a small rear window the Cuckoo Tavern lent,

They took the road to Charlottesville, forty miles to the west,

Instantly, Jack Jouett knew they were out on a big game quest.

They would be there by early morn to sack Freedom's seed and sprout,

To get his good friend Jefferson, and the Legislators, too, no doubt.

They hadn't seen Jack Jouett, but Jack Jouett had seen them.

They did not know Jack Jouett was an unusual dare-devil horseman,

Of Virginian militia, a Captain, with his own horse at his call,

Or that he would get there ahead of them, their big game quest to foil,

That he would have given warning to his fellow country-men

That the British were fast coming, and to leave before they came.

Not waiting to settle his account for his Cuckoo Tavern food

He rushed to the stable and saddled his horse to take a cut-off ride

To get ahead of Tarleton and his splendid equipage

Making their trip to Charlottesville by way of the common road.

Jack Jouett, on Prince Charley, plunged into the wilderness,

Goaded by the need to save good lives for Freedom's sake, no less.

More or less familiar with terrain of Albermarle

Where he had been on fox hunts o'er many a rugged mile

Of mud holes, of gullies, of small and unbridged streams,

Of thick undergrowth, of thorny bush, of long lush twining vine

But here and now was a different ride, significant through-out all time.

Jack sensed the situation, heeded not his wounds from thorn,

But pressed with spur his superior steed into the early morn.

And just as grey dawn was breaking over Albermarle's rounded hills

Jack forded the Rivanna, and galloped with a will

Up the wind of "Little Mountain" while everything was still.

Before Monticello's stately portico, he reined his panting steed

And called out through the quietude "Red Coats are coming; take heed."

Like a shot Jack was off again for another two-mile pace

When he would be in Charlottesville, the end of this hard race.

There he would warn the Legislators who were sleeping at the Swan,

Since his father was its keeper, Jack knew well every room,

"Up, up, my friends!" he called to them; "Up, up, my friends, and away!

The Red Coats on horse are coming, they'll be here by early day!"

At Monticello Jefferson was in meeting with Legislators as his guests,

After a hurried breakfast, for Charlottesville they left.

He put his family in his coach under trusted servant care

To go over the mountain to the Carter place; they would be safe and secluded there.

He then ordered his favorite horse to be shod, and concealed on a mountain trail

In readiness to follow them when advantage should avail.

While his servants were concealing his valued treasures there,

He was bundling his documents to be transported elsewhere.

After he saw them off the place, he went up on a near-by hill

To his favorite look-out where he trained his telescope direct on Charlottesville.

The streets there were deserted, that was one good sign,

His friend Legislators had made it there, all in one good time.

He thought the Red Coats would be in Charlottesville before they came to "Little Mountain",

But in that the sly Tarleton out-witted him, and divided his forces at Rivanna.

The dragoons he started to Charlottesville, then when that was done,

The Fusiliers to Monticello for the great prize, Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson had remembered an important paper he had overlooked in his haste,

And started to the library to get it when he made a right about face.

For all of a sudden he noticed that he had dropped his sword,

And to be without that in any event, no gentleman could afford.

He made a search and recovered it up on his favorite hill,

Then he turned to look through his telescope at the Square in Charlottesville.

The streets were swarming with Red Coats, it was now nearly mid-forenoon,

Jack Jouett had been there three hours before, and that was none too soon,

For the Legislators had assembled in the Courthouse for roll call

And adjourned on fresh mounts for an undisturbed flight.

Down the valley to Staunton hall.

At Staunton, both Houses voted that to Jack Jouett

The Governor should present, two pistols and an elegant sword,

As memorial to the high sense they entertained

For his enterprise in watchfulness, and for the aid he lent.

As Jefferson saw the Red Coats swarm the streets of Charlottesville,

He was amazed at a glance to see Red Coats, also, riding up "Little Mountain" hill.

Through the quivering aspens he saw them approaching for their take;

By a margin of minutes, on his readied horse, Jefferson made narrow escape.

After the Red Coats had made certain that the big prize bird had flown

They toasted the health of George the Third with Monticello's wine.

For eighteen hours they delayed to leave, milling thereabout,

At midnight they took their departure, dispirited, no doubt.

The dragoons, after they had crossed the Rivanna, on way to Charlottesville,

Had taken a "delayed" breakfast with Doctor Walker "for good will".

When they finally reached Charlottesville, and learned that their game was gone

They tarried to harry a day and a night before their march to join

Cornwallis, anxiously waiting, at his camp far north of his Portsmouth base.

The General would be disappointed at the facts that he would face.

What of Tarleton, with his troops, burning with chagrin

At the non-attainment of his task, he had caught none of his big game—

With one hundred, and seventy-five mounted men

The very best of the British best corps—

To return to base with empty hands, this would not end the war.  
 The idea of Freedom had not been killed, not even scotched, in fact,  
 It had new impetus to thrive, and be clarified, intact.  
 And what of Jack Jouett in Charlottesville, he had a task to perform  
 To have the townspeople conceal for safe keep needed stores and some small arms.  
 He with General Stevens, invalidated home with wounds from the war,  
 Hadn't fully completed the task when spied by the British corps.  
 The General was not recognized in his garb of one from the farm,  
 But strapping Jack in uniform, red feather in cap, had instant need of alarm.  
 He sprang into his saddle, dashed away in the woods on a trail  
 Pursued by the eager Red Coats, but to no avail;  
 They were soon out-distanced, eluded, and lost on that difficult devious trail.  
 History tells us what later happened to each, but we will leave them all here, alack,  
 For Jack Jouett's ride is finished, and recorded on a plaque  
 Set on the site where the Swan Tavern stood, as memorial to Captain Jack.  
 The very fact that Jack Jouett's grave can not be found today  
 Is witness to the circumstance that his work will live always.  
 His noteworthy ride made history; it occurred in seemliest time  
 To help raise the light of Freedom aloft, that it could forever shine.  
 The greatest luxury we have today, as we well know,  
 Is the Freedom for which Jack Jouett rode one hundred eighty years ago.  
 In all the annals of history no other by night or day  
 Like the memorable ride by moonlight through the wilds by Jack Jouett.

**SUITLAND GI DIES OF WAR INJURIES**

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. James R. Taylor, an outstanding young man from Maryland, died recently of wounds he received in Vietnam. I should like to commend the courage of this fine soldier and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

**SUITLAND GI DIES OF WAR INJURIES—PFC. JAMES R. TAYLOR WAS IN WALTER REED HOSPITAL**

A Suitland (Md.) soldier who would have celebrated his 19th birthday yesterday, has died from injuries received in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Pfc. James R. Taylor died March 2 in Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, from wounds he received during an enemy mortar attack February 5 near the Cambodian border.

Private Taylor had enlisted in the Army in January, 1968, while in his senior year at Suitland Senior High School. He received his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and then completed paratroop training at Fort Benning, Ga., and Fort McClellan, Ala.

He was originally attached to the 173d Air-

borne Division but was transferred to the 4th Infantry Division when he arrived in Vietnam in August, 1968.

While in high school he was active in many sports and was on the varsity track and football teams. He completed high school while in the Army and planned to go to college when he left military service.

**LEAVES WIFE, SON**

His wife, Mrs. Brenda L. Taylor, said that her husband felt that he should "fight for freedom" or if necessary "died for it."

"He wanted those people to be free," she said, referring to the South Vietnamese.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a son, James R. Taylor, Jr.; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. O. T. Taylor; and three brothers, Robert A. Taylor, of Norfolk, John R. Taylor, of Annapolis, and Guy W. Taylor, of Washington.

**INCREDIBLE ARMY EDICT FORBIDS CHAPLAINS FROM MENTIONING GOD IN LECTURES TO TROOPS**

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a most incredible order has been issued by the Department of the Army to its chaplains forbidding them to mention God in their lectures to the troops.

I was shocked to learn of this order—a reaction which I find is widely shared, particularly in my home city.

I have urged Secretary of Defense Laird to initiate an immediate investigation of this unprecedented directive resulting from a complaint made by the American Civil Liberties Union.

If the chaplains cannot mention God, how can they be expected to accomplish the work which they have been assigned? Indeed, if the order is allowed to stand, what is the justification for having chaplains on duty at all?

This action is of great concern to the people of my congressional district in western New York State.

Following is the text of a telegram sent to Secretary Laird by the commander of the Erie County, N.Y., Council of AMVETS:

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
 Pentagon,  
 Washington, D.C.:

Recent action of ACLU to prevent chaplains' reference to God is felt by this organization to be ridiculous, if not appalling. We are shocked to note Army order in compliance thereto. Erie County AMVETS respectfully urges Department of Defense to countermand this. We firmly believe America to be—One nation under God.

ERIE COUNTY COUNCIL OF AMVETS,  
 CHARLES D. McCLURE, *Commander*.

Rev. Raymond J. Kozlowski, chaplain of Adam Plewacki Post No. 799 in Buffalo, one of the largest American Legion posts in the country, has written to President Nixon as follows:

MARCH 29, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
 President of the United States

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great concern that I write to you about the order issued by the Army to their chaplains to eliminate all reference to God and philosophy in lectures aimed at instilling moral responsibility in its soldiers.

I ask you, Mr. President to consider this apparent contradiction. How can any chaplain, whose sole responsibility is to bring soldiers closer to God, not use the name of God? Suppose you, as our President were ordered by the Senate and Congress never to use the words United States, ever. It certainly does stagger the imagination. Yet, this in fact, is what the American Civil Liberties Union has succeeded in doing "because of the objection of one soldier!"

It is the same American Civil Liberties Union which sponsored the abolition of Bible reading in the Public Schools. The nation has indeed suffered because of this.

I feel that the minority groups of this nation have infringed on our rights and the rights of all God fearing men in our country, which represents the majority. This great country of ours was established with the recognition of God. Has fought and built, and constantly sought His intercession.

As chaplain of the American Legion Adam Plewacki Post #799, which represents the largest Post in the State of New York, feel that it is my duty to appeal to you in this cause. Please be informed that this matter will be pursued to the National level within the next four months, and that the majority of our voices will be heard throughout the land which we have fought for.

I appeal to you, Mr. President, to please reconsider and rescind this order issued by the Dept. of the Army. It does great disservice to our country.

Presently, the American Legion is celebrating its 50th Anniversary. Its motto is Fifty years for God and Country. It is with heavy heart that all of us in the Legion should learn, that on our anniversary, orders are issued by the Armed Forces to eliminate any possible mention of the word God.

Sincerely Yours in the American Legion,  
 Rev. RAYMOND J. KOZLOWSKI,  
 Post Chaplain.

A newspaper editor's view on the issue is given in the following editorial:

[From the Buffalo, (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 29, 1969]

**"IN G-D WE TRUST"**

Just when several public school districts in Pennsylvania have boldly defied the U.S. Supreme Court by reinstating daily prayers and Bible readings, comes now the Army with a weird and wondrous directive to its chaplains to make no mention of God or religious philosophy in lectures aimed at instilling moral responsibility in its soldiers.

The Army order was prompted by an American Civil Liberties Union complaint to the effect that lectures intended to instill moral responsibility were used for religious indoctrination. And so, no doubt, some of them were in the hands of overzealous chaplains. But to go so far as to forbid an ordained man of God to mention God—in a country whose very credo of nationhood invokes divine Providence—is carrying the banning of religious indoctrination to a pretty silly extreme.

Especially absurd, it seems to us, is the attack on such references as that in the foreword of the Army's long-used character guidance manuals, which says that the philosophy of American freedom "regards man as a creature of God" and "as such, every soldier is . . . accountable to his Creator for the way he performs. . . ."

If this be religious indoctrination, then so would be a Fourth of July reading of the Declaration of Independence, for that great document starts right off invoking "the laws of nature and of Nature's God" and goes on to shamelessly declare that "all men are created equal" and "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." If that in itself is not justification for the assertion, as a plain statement of historical fact, that this nation's philosophy of freedom "regards

man as a creature of God," then those Founding Fathers who asserted their firm reliance on "divine Providence" just before mutually pledging their lives, fortunes and sacred honor, must be whirling in their graves.

After all, we don't really have to make ourselves ridiculous in order to maintain the hallowed wall of separation between church and state. No court has told us yet that we have to remove "In God We Trust" from our coins or "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. Nor is any court ever likely to forbid the Army to assert in any guidance manual the simple historical truth that this nation's philosophy of freedom "regards man as a creature of God."

The kind of flat defiance of law which those Pennsylvania school districts have indulged in, however, is an offense of a very different color. Here these adult leaders of their communities, in the name of indoctrinating their children in religious values, are actually deliberately indoctrinating them in disrespect for the U.S. Constitution as interpreted by the nation's highest court.

Whatever they may think of the Supreme Court's decision banning prayers in public schools, their open defiance of that edict is no different in spirit or effect from the earlier defiance by many Dixie communities of the school desegregation decision, or the more recent defiance by many college students of the draft laws. A school board more than most public agencies, after all, has a duty to exemplify respect for law, not teach contempt for it by indulging in flagrant acts of defiance.

THE EMERGENCY SMALL LOAN PROGRAM: ITS BENEFITS IN ST. LOUIS

**HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history, the demands of justice and equity have moved us, as a nation, to embark upon projects which truly serve to fulfill the American dream to those who have been denied participation in it for one reason or another. We have responded in the decade of the 1960's with energy and determination to fulfill this goal with greater Federal direction and involvement than ever before. The 1960's have been an extremely prosperous decade and our affluence alone could have easily blinded us to the urgent needs of so many of our citizens. The sincerity of our efforts can easily be seen in the vehicle of our war on poverty; namely, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The results of the Economic Opportunity Act are too numerous for me to detail on this occasion, but I would like to point out the successes of that part of the act with which I have been most intimately connected. I am speaking, of course, of the emergency small loan program which was added to the act as an amendment in 1966. The purpose of the program has been quite simple: to make available small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. It sounds simple, but in my judgment, exemplifies, as well as any other facet of the Economic Opportunity Act, the basic spirit of the act; the emergency loan

program sets itself to the task of maintaining the dignity of the poor man by enabling him to extricate himself from those emergency financial problems which all of us are beset by from time to time; by preserving his dignity and thereby enhancing it; by encouraging the use and development of his own initiative. In this way the emergency small loan program provides the spark to impel the poverty-stricken person above the threshold of poverty and toward the achievement of self-sustaining citizenship. We would be remiss in our duty toward the poor if we merely alleviated their condition without offering them the hope and the means to effect a qualitative change in their lives.

In recent weeks I have been surveying local establishments, all over the country and in all kinds of poverty situations, in order to assess the accomplishments of this emergency small loan program to date. Some responses have come in and without exception attest to the great need which the program meets, the single-minded attention to those needs by the administrators involved, and the gratitude of the recipients for the services no one else would provide.

As a case in point, let me briefly describe the efforts of the Human Development Corp. of St. Louis, Mo. The Human Development Corp. located in the Third Congressional District of Missouri, which is represented so ably by that champion of the consumer, Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN. As of January 31, 1969, the basic statistics are as follows: With an original loan fund of \$103,405, the Human Development Corp. was able to make 2,725 loans for a total of \$109,987.42. At present 1,011 loans, accounting for \$28,672.35 are outstanding. Collections have been good, amounting to \$42,025.60; in this respect it should be kept in mind that all of these loans repaid represent small loans, not exceeding \$300, so that the number of people helped and the number of people strengthened and encouraged by the sense of accomplishment is quite significant. Seven hundred fourteen loans are overdue, totaling \$26,335.95. This amount would be lower were this a normal loan program. But it is not; borrowers are not unduly pressured, nor is legal coercion brought to bear to enforce collection.

What purposes have these loans served? We should not be surprised at how basic the needs of the poor are. The loans have prevented evictions, enabled evicted families to come off the street and to find housing, provided food, medicine, job tools, funds for a new job, training expenses, and provided funds for fuel and light in homes.

The report of the Human Development Corp. from St. Louis further analyzes the type of loans according to frequency. Rent requests have been the most frequent, followed by loans for food, most of which have been used in the food stamp program. Next are loans for job maintenance, either for new jobs or for interim funds until a new payday. Utility bills are a constant concern of the poor; they have needed loans to prevent disconnection of essential services and to restore services discontinued because

of delinquent bills. Other types of loans have been made for school clothing, furniture, job clothing, funeral expenses, tuition for training courses, and funds for college dormitory fees, and the prevention of foreclosures, garnishment, and repossession of furniture.

This list alone demonstrates that there are a multitude of basic needs which the poor are forced to go without because of emergencies and dislocations of their meager incomes. These needs, generally for either subsistence or self-improvement, could not be more worthy of our attention.

The manager of the St. Louis program has indicated his willingness to continue the program as long as funds last and has wholeheartedly endorsed the proposal to supplement the project with new funds.

There is ample evidence of poverty in St. Louis to make the continuing need for this loan program self-evident. I am pleased that St. Louis was selected as a participating area in the emergency loan program and I am convinced that our efforts there are showing progress and must continue.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the great men of American history, Dwight David Eisenhower.

How proud we citizens of Pennsylvania were when Dwight Eisenhower decided to spend his days of retirement in Pennsylvania. He chose the area of the historic Battle of Gettysburg. The American people literally plowed a furrow to his new door in our State. They not only visited his farm in large numbers, but also called on him at his office on the campus of Gettysburg College. How fitting that a great man like Dwight David Eisenhower would choose the area where Lincoln delivered his now immortal Gettysburg Address. Lincoln fought to free the body of man from slavery. Dwight Eisenhower, the hero of World War II, fought to preserve for free men that freedom won not only on the field at Gettysburg but also at Runnymede and at Belleau Wood.

I was one of those thousands who called on "Ike" at his office in Gettysburg. I was then a candidate for my first term in Congress. I had called for an appointment and was told to be there at 7:30 a.m. The General was always at his office in the early morning hours. He was most cordial and was especially nice to Mrs. Johnson. He said the only advice he could give me was to always campaign with my wife at my side. He said that Mamie was his constant companion and one of his greatest political assets.

In these last years of the life of our great President he was a tremendous force for good in this country. He had known happiness and love. He had suf-

ferred great sorrow, when he lost his 3½-year-old son through scarlet fever. He had known great anguish and uncertainty as he planned the great invasion on "D" Day. He had experienced the joy of having been elected President of the United States by the biggest majority in history up to that time. And he had the great satisfaction to know that he had a warm place in the hearts of his countrymen.

Dwight David Eisenhower has departed from this earth, but the principles for which he stood will be long remembered.

Dwight Eisenhower gave both strength and dignity to our Nation in both war and peace. He was a courageous man who deeply loved our country.

Eisenhower was the Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, and later Supreme Commander of NATO. In both capacities he proved himself to be a great administrator and leader.

As our country longed for peace in the early 1950's Dwight Eisenhower again accepted a call to duty. He was elected the 34th President of the United States. During his two terms in office America experienced 8 years of peace, progress, and prosperity.

With a deep sense of loss we mourn his passing.

THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROTUNDA

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot is fortunate to have on its editorial staff Mr. Guy Friddell. The genius of Mr. Friddell is his ability to express life in a gentle satirical way. Few men are so endowed with this gift.

On March 30, Mr. Friddell wrote an editorial in the Virginian-Pilot entitled "The Elephant in the Rotunda." It is a marvelous and poignant essay on man's destruction of the wildlife around him. This editorial ought to be read by millions of Americans. I take pride in offering it for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROTUNDA

(By Guy Friddell)

Bill Cox once wrote that all he ever wanted was an elephant.

Little enough to ask of life, you'd think. I gave away my last one, a year or so ago. But I can pass along a couple of new books on the vast subject.

"Elephants Across Border," by C. Burke (Simon and Schuster, \$4.95), is about a rich sportsman's safari after a magnificent ancient elephant, a moving monument to time, that has strayed out of the sanctuary of an African park and is fair game as long as he's across the border. It is an adventure yarn, the kind to be read at one sitting, not because it's brief but for the suspense that holds until the last page. I was pulling for the elephant.

The elephant also occupies a sizable segment in "Animals of East Africa," by Louis B. Leakey (National Geographic Society, \$4.25). It has an array of fine pictures, including one of a herd of zebra, splashing and churning around in a rain-pool, a swirling duplication in the wild of Rosa Bonheur's famous picture, "Horse Fair," as if though,

all the horses had put on striped summer seersuckers.

But the most impressive photograph is an airview of a herd of 500 or so elephants moseying across a green plain while a flock of white cattle egrets wheel over them. It catches, as well as any picture could, untrammelled might, and life. Dr. Leakey writes that elephants tend to be very destructive in their feeding. They push over a small tree and then eat only a few of its leaves. They break off branches and rip so much bark from a larger tree that it will die. They amble on and repeat the process, again and again. An area devastated by elephants may not recover for several years. This problem affects many East African parks, and specialists are carrying out intensive studies of the numbers and activities of these great creatures."

I wish them well, teaching elephants manners.

I know one old rogue that no one could have schooled. Ten years ago I came upon him unexpectedly. (That, unexpectedly, is the most dramatic way to meet an elephant. One minute the path is clear, the next he is towering over you, tornadic.)

We had started out to drive to the zoo in Washington, but, what with a blowout and breakdown, our time was short, and we had to settle for a quick run through the Smithsonian Institution, that national attic of oddities. I wished the three boys might see at least one compelling object that could lift its head above history's detritus.

I steered them to the natural history museum housing the skeleton of a great dinosaur, but when we walked into the rotunda, a new exhibit stopped us, the biggest elephant I ever saw, dominating the center of that great round room, his trunk curled high in a trumpet call, his triangular ears spread broad as sails, his eyes red with hate, caught in just the moment of his swinging stride through the brush.

I was accustomed to see placid elephants sweeping the ground with languid trunks for peanuts. The boy was wild. His trunk was gnarled as an oak, crusted as a barnacled timber, and his tail had a great brush on the end of it. Nothing sagged in his bulk. The taxidermist had restored the streamlined might of him. Like a massive mountain, he offered a new aspect at every turn. He was at once, both compact of wonder and huge.

The placard said simply he was the largest elephant on earth, standing 13 feet 2 inches at the shoulder, a foot higher than any other ever captured or shot. He approached the dimensions of the legendary mammoth.

He was killed in the Cuando River District (an area, by the way, that I know like the back of my hand, was there in '32 with Frank Buck) of Southeast Angola on November 13, 1955, by a hunter from Madrid, J. J. Fenykovi. He weighed 12 tons and took two years to stuff.

I read statistics to the others, pointing out this and that stupendous detail of the great beast, and, at last, the youngest, then 4, had a question.

"If it was so big," he asked, "why did they kill it?"

THE SUSPENSION OF THE INVESTMENT CREDIT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the unrestrained continuation of the inflationary spiral makes it absolutely mandatory to suspend the 7-percent investment credit which continues to fuel inflation.

Latest figures indicate that capital improvements are soaring at a rate of 14 percent ahead of last year. This is in every respect a business expansion inflation.

The consumer has not overindulged. In fact consumer sales are leveling off because of higher prices. It is difficult for the consumer to adjust his affairs to weekly price increases on everything. Our senior citizens and those on fixed income are cruelly assaulted by soaring prices.

This tide must be reversed. Suspension of the investment credit is the only prescription for immediate relief. Time is running out.

The 7-percent investment credit is the most troublesome tax loophole in existence today. There is no better way to "modify the inflationary psychology" of which the President complains. The closing of this tax loophole will save the Treasury over \$3 billion annually. Along with one or two other simple tax reforms, the need for the harsh 10-percent tax surcharge will be eliminated.

OHIO AND KENTUCKY'S 83D U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMMAND CELEBRATES FIRST ANNIVERSARY

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress, one of the largest U.S. Army Reserve Commands in the Nation is celebrating its first anniversary. The 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command, headquartered at Fort Hayes in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio, assumed active command of approximately 144 units and 12,000 men April 1, 1968, after the reorganization of the Reserve Forces.

All of Ohio is proud of the men who serve both their country and their community as citizen-soldiers. Many of them served during World War II, Korea, and the Berlin crisis as well as in the Vietnam conflict.

The hundreds of years of valuable experience the officers and enlisted men have accumulated, together with their strong dedication to the Army and their love for their country have resulted in a superior and economical force, and has brought great credit to every facet of the Army Reserve program.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. Robert C. Tyler of Columbus, the ARCom commands and supervises the U.S. Army Reserve units in the western two-thirds of Ohio and all of Kentucky, except for the 100th Training Division. It was one of the first of the new ARCom's to become operational after the reorganization of the U.S. Army Reserve in early 1968.

A primary mission of the 83d ARCom is to insure the mobilization readiness of all its assigned or attached units. Despite the difficulty of taking over the administration of units from a large area, the reservists attained that level in a short time. Previously, the administration of Reserve troops was borne by full-

time active Army personnel in the 20th U.S. Army Corps with approximately 400 service and civilian personnel.

Members of the 83d ARCom, both in the field and in the headquarters itself, wear the shoulder patch formerly worn by members of the 83d Infantry Division. The division, which had a proud history since it was organized at Camp Sherman, Ohio—near Chillicothe—in 1917, served in France during World War I and was known as the Ghost Division because of its great mobility. During World War II, the 83d Infantry Division saw action in the European Theater of Operations and was known as the Thunderbolt Division due to its great striking power.

The officers and enlisted men assigned to the 83d Arcom headquarters have spent hundreds of extra hours on the job in addition to their regularly scheduled 4-hour weekly drill in order to successfully accomplish their mission and in a very professional manner. They continue to meet their obligations and have received congratulations from their superiors after learning of their full and never ending accomplishments.

General Tyler, the last commander of the 83d Infantry Division before its inactivation, now serves as the commanding general of the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command. He together with the members of his command have forged a strong link in the proud history of the U.S. Army Reserve. The members of the 83d, and like others in the program, will never allow this important program to die so long as we have free Americans to willingly serve and die if necessary for our country.

I am, including, Mr. Speaker, proclamations from the Governor of Ohio, James A. Rhodes, and the mayor of Columbus, M. E. Sensenbrenner, together with the personnel roster:

PROCLAMATION, 83d ARCOM ANNIVERSARY,  
APRIL 1, 1969

Whereas, citizens of this state have selflessly served as members of the U.S. Army Reserve for many years, answering the call to active duty during World War I and II, the Korean conflict, the Berlin crisis and the Vietnam action; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers continue to give up weekends, vacations and evenings to maintain a high state of combat readiness so that they will be prepared when called upon to defend our beloved nation from external threats to its security; and

Whereas, the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command overseeing about 12,000 troops approximately 145 units in Ohio and Kentucky is headquartered at Fort Hayes in Ohio's capital City; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers of the U.S. Army Reserve are observing their first anniversary as members of the new 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command and the people of this state owe so much to these patriotic fellow citizens:

Now therefore, I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate April 1, 1969, as 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command Day and the month of April as U.S. Army Reserve Community Month and call upon all citizens of Ohio to join in a tribute to the U.S. Army Reserve citizen-soldiers of this state who have given so much of themselves so that this country could remain the greatest democratic society in the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus,

this 25th day of March, in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Nine.

PROCLAMATION, 83d U.S. ARMY RESERVE  
COMMAND, APRIL 1, 1969

Whereas, many residents of Columbus have selflessly served as members of the U.S. Army Reserve for many years, answering the call to active duty during World War I and II, the Korean conflict, the Berlin crisis and the Vietnam action; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers continue to give up weekends, vacations and evenings to maintain a high state of combat readiness so that they will be prepared when called upon to defend our beloved nation from external threats to its security; and

Whereas, the 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command overseeing about 12,000 troops approximately 145 units in Ohio and Kentucky is headquartered at Fort Hayes in Ohio's capital City; and

Whereas, these citizen-soldiers of the U.S. Army Reserve are observing their first anniversary as members of the new 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command and the people of this city owe so much to these patriotic fellow citizens;

Now, Therefore, I, M. E. Sensenbrenner, Mayor of the City of Columbus, do hereby designate April 1, 1969, as 83d U.S. Army Reserve Command Day and the month of April as U.S. Army Reserve Community Month and call upon all citizens of Ohio to join in a tribute to the U.S. Army Reserve citizen-soldiers of this city who have given so much of themselves so that this country could remain the greatest democratic society in the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the Great Seal of Columbus to be affixed at Columbus, this day of March, in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-Nine.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, HEAD-  
QUARTERS, 83d U.S. ARMY RE-  
SERVE COMMAND,  
Fort Hayes, Columbus, Ohio.

Tyler, Robert C., MG.  
Cree, Edward I., Col.  
Lane, Robert C., Col.  
Lawrence, Lee, Col.  
Russell, Robert C., Col.  
Fisher, Charles E., Lt.  
Groseclose, Jack W., Lt.  
McConnell, Clyde, Lt.  
Heldman, Richard L., Lt.  
Nelson, William, Lt.  
Haynie, Harold C., Col.  
Nicol, Gerald E., Lt.  
Pfeifer, Robert B., Lt.  
Stilson, Jerry, Lt.  
Wilkins, Stanley V., Lt.  
Boden, Richard N., Maj.  
Brant, Charles E., Maj.  
Brause, Paul R., Maj.  
De Long, Paul W., Maj.  
Doyle, Lawrence, Lt.  
Gerhardstein, Leo H., Maj.  
Grimm, Robert R., Maj.  
Leister, Robert W., Maj.  
Leslie, Henry A. Jr., Maj.  
Martell, Norman W., Maj.  
Paoletti, Karl P., Maj.  
Porter, William E., Maj.  
Walters, Jack D., Maj.  
Walters, Jack D., Maj.  
Chapman, Ted M., Maj.  
Balogh, Jack C., Cpt.  
Harvey, Samuel J., Cpt.  
Healy, Francis A. C., Cpt.  
Losekamp, Bernard F., Cpt.  
Roberts, Donald J., Cpt.  
Sensenbrenner, Edward W., Maj.  
Spradling, Georm, Cpt.  
White, Norman R., Cpt.  
Brown, Carter N., 1Lt.  
Severson, Layton C., Cpt.  
Uhl, Robert W., 1Lt.

Chieffo, Dominic J., 2Lt.  
Mackey, William G., CW4.  
DeLorme, Thomas A., CW3.  
Logan, James F., CW3.  
Scott, Madison H., Sgm.  
White, Alexander, Sgm.  
Cobb, James M., 1Sg.  
Cole, James G. Jr., Sfc.  
Fannin, Ronald L., Sfc.  
Goodrich, James R., Msg.  
Zrubb, Robert A., Sfc.  
Kotlarchik, Robert A., Sfc.  
Kramer, John, Sfc.  
Logan, Richard A., Sfc.  
Mansfield, Donald M., Sfc.  
McFee, Raymond A., Sfc.  
Trump, Harold E., Sfc.  
Williams, Ronald E., Sfc.  
Althoff, Davis G., Ssg.  
Dollmatsch, John D., Ssg.  
Drum, Kenneth L., Ssg.  
Goodin, Larry L., Ssg.  
Karshner, Glenn A., Ssg.  
Moots, Phillip R., Ssg.  
Oleksa, Thomas M., Ssg.  
Scott, Gene D., Ssg.  
Vellani, Albert J., Ssg.  
Wolfe, James F., Jr., Ssg.  
Buckingham, Melvin P., SP5.  
Creagon, Thomas E., SP5.  
Geese, Ronald L.Q., SP5.  
Kerlee, Ronnie L., SP5.  
Levering, Rex R., Sgt.  
Markstrom, Richard L., SP5.  
Ricci, Robert A., SP5.  
Sollie, Robert C., SP5.  
Stoffel, Stephen W., SP5.  
Thayer, Richard D., Sgt.  
Almond, Bernard L., SP4.  
Clutter, Vaughn D., SP4.  
Bennett, John M., SP4.  
Gantner, Joseph, SP4.  
Green, Jon M., SP4.  
Husse, August, SP4.  
Kramer, Joseph, SP4.  
Lynn, David A., SP4.  
McClain, Otis M., SP4.  
Smith, Thomas C., SP4.  
Ongaro, Ronald M., SP4.  
Starn, Michael W., SP4.  
Trott, Paul D., SP4.  
Wells, Joseph L., SP4.  
Wilson, Robert N., SP4.  
Witzel, James A., SP4.  
Armstrong, Craig S., Pfc.  
Cassady, Michael H., Pfc.  
Henning, Daniel J., Pfc.  
Henwood, Thomas L., Pfc.  
Herman, Mark P., Pfc.  
Lane, Terry L., Pfc.  
Lehring, Larry L., Pfc.  
Manecke, Jeffrey, Pfc.  
Merz, Ronald A., Pfc.  
Przybiski, Careth R., Pfc.  
Weiskopf, Thomas D., Pfc.  
Williams, Richard L., Pfc.  
Nootesting, James, Pvt.  
Porterfield, Ralph, Pvt.  
Wirthman, Thomas, Pvt.

POVERTY IN THE SPACE AGE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Dan Vichorek, editor of the Montana Kaim'n, is one of Montana's most gifted student newspapermen and, in today's jargon, he's not afraid "to tell it like it is." Mr. Vichorek recently pointed out to his readers that, although some refuse to recognize it, poverty abounds in the United States. He further revealed that more than 10

million Americans are unable to provide an adequate diet for their children. Ten million is not a small figure in any circumstance and, when more than 10 million of our fellow citizens are unable to subsist decently or adequately because they are too poor, then poverty does indeed abound in this country.

Mr. Vichorek questions our priorities. While this country was spending \$500,000 to postpone the last Apollo space mission the Senate was allocating but \$250,000 to investigate the existence of poverty. Of course there are many Federal programs that deal with poverty but it seems, so far, that they have not been able to make a significant impact on the hard core of poverty. And, lest we forget, these are the first programs to suffer appropriation cutbacks.

Mr. Speaker, this country is blessed with a plethora of natural resources but the greatest natural resource of any civilization is its young. Because of poverty and war a not unsubstantial portion of that resource is lost yearly because of death and injury or, as is the case of many of poverty's children, because of brain damage caused by lack of protein in the diet. Our society cannot continue to absorb these losses in our young people. Are we so hung up on our technological accomplishments that we would rather have a man on the moon than healthy children in our society?

I insert Mr. Vichorek's editorial at this point in the RECORD:

**MORE POOR SPACE TRASH**  
(By Dan Vichorek)

In the twelfth year of the space age the United States Senate discovered poverty in America.

At least it admitted there might be such a thing, and allocated a whole \$250,000 last week to finance an investigation to find out for sure.

Meanwhile, three Americans orbited overhead, and it had only taken \$5 billion a year for the past few years to get them there. In fact, when the three caught cold prior to the launch it took only \$500,000 to delay the shot until they recovered.

Meanwhile, observers on earth speculated what the Senate investigators might discover about poverty in America. Will they manage to discover, for example, the well-known fact that at least 10 million Americans are unable to provide an adequate diet for their children? Will they learn that the inadequate diet leaves thousands of children, particularly black, Indian, and Mexican-American children, with permanent brain damage from protein deficiency?

Is it possible the Senate will discover that the surplus foods so generously distributed by the government consist almost entirely of heavy starches, which don't do anything for protein deficiencies? Is there any chance that even Strom Thurmond will be convinced that poverty does not always result directly from laziness? May he even concede that the laziness of the fathers should not necessarily result in the unavoidable mental retardation and hopeless situation of the sons?

From past performances, we know that few if any of these things will come to pass. We also may continue to assume that Congress will continue to vote its multi-billion dollar allocations for our space program.

Those who support the space program the most vociferously speak mainly of enhancing the national prestige and ennobling men's minds.

Strangely enough, the folks in Watts don't seem to feel much of an upsurge when they see Apollo 9 pass over.

Then when astronaut Wally Schirra is asked in Europe about the inequity of poverty and the space program, Navy Captain Schirra says the poverty problem has been "greatly exaggerated," which seems something of an exaggeration.

What do we get for the billions we put into the space program? We are assured we are getting a plethora of highly trained technical and presumably necessary, hardware. For example, worldwide communications are supposed to be greatly improved.

We're in favor of communications, but we think short range communications should be improved first. For example, we would like to see the poor and starving of South Carolina communicate directly with Strom Thurmond when he says "We'll always have some people who are not willing to work."

It is quite obvious why we must continue to finance the space program. After all, the Vietnam war can't last forever, and after it's over, the government will need a new means of pumping funds into the faltering economy.

And obviously, as Mr. Thurmond notes, the poor are a bad investment.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. JOHN KYL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Nation there have been many individuals who have gained respect and admiration by virtue of their moving to high office. The admiration and respect sometimes goes with the important job. And there have been cases in which a good public servant has been overshadowed by the office. Dwight Eisenhower offers a different example.

In the typical mind's-eye picture, conjured by people here and abroad, Eisenhower the man stood before the uniform of Eisenhower the general. He was Eisenhower the general. He was not a general named Eisenhower. Similarly, they saw Dwight Eisenhower the President, standing before the White House. Conversely, Dwight Eisenhower considered himself to the end not a general, but a soldier; not President, but servant.

The President of the United States is always a symbol of America. And this is good, because he is the elected leader of our people. He was chosen to lead free men, by those who are served. But when the people can see in the President a man of integrity and honesty and strong moral convictions, they can identify with the man. They can take him for an example. They can draw confidence for themselves. They do not expect such a man to be infallible, yet they know that the decisions made, right or wrong, are made with the right processes, the right considerations.

Dwight Eisenhower showed us a lesson which we do well to recognize in these times. As General of the Army, as President of the United States, he demonstrated that there is but one moral code for all men at all times—for work and play, for government and those outside government, for those who serve and those who are served. No matter how spectacular are our accomplishments, or how great our affluence, we are reminded

that it is the integrity of individual citizens which counts. There can be no truly worthwhile goals or movement to those goals without a deep spiritual strength. Any government which does not know this, which thinks there is a special code for itself, will perish in weakness. Dwight Eisenhower knew this truth. He lived this truth.

It is our belief that writers in some future age will echo Macaulay's prose in reference to Dwight Eisenhower:

What a singular destiny has been that of this remarkable man! To be regarded in his own age as a classic, and in ours as a companion! To receive from his contemporaries that full homage which men of genius have in general received only from posterity; to be more intimately known to posterity than other men are known to their contemporaries!

FCC BAN ON CIGARETTE  
ADVERTISING

**HON. ALTON LENNON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings on cigarette advertising scheduled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to bring to attention the following editorials from North Carolina papers, the Wilmington Star News and the Fayetteville Observer. These editorials correctly point out that the FCC ban is discriminatory, unjustified, and usurps legislative authority.

The editorials entitled "A Dangerous Proposal" and "Ad Ban Unjustified" follow:

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) News, Feb. 7, 1969]

A DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

The Federal Communication Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television is one of the most dangerous suggestions to come out of a Washington bureau in years.

This absurd move is based on the FCC's assertion that smoking is "a most serious, unique danger to public health." Obviously, six of the seven members of the Commission have accepted as a fact a highly controversial report. The Commission points to statistics of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare which blame smoking for the deaths of many Americans. These statistics have been challenged since the time they were issued. But this is not the major aspect of the deplorable proposal by the FCC. What it wants is to compromise the principle of free speech, as represented by advertising and, in doing so, encourage the restraint of legitimate trade.

The point we wish to emphasize is simply this: Commodities or articles which are legal in the eyes of the laws of our Republic—and cigarettes certainly are legal—should not be subjected to any restraint as to their advertising in any form their makers wish.

After all, the principle the FCC is following as to cigarettes could be applied to many other products. And if and when it is applied, then advertising—one of the major assets of the free enterprise system—would be entirely under the control of bureaucrats and politicians.

Thus, when one looks ahead, the danger of the FCC proposal is magnified greatly.

Chairman Hyde has said he is confident

his agency will have the legal authority to enforce a cigarette advertising ban when the 1965 Cigarette Labeling and Advertising act expires on July 1. Under this law, both the FCC and the Federal Trade Commission are prohibited from taking any action to regulate cigarette advertising.

Expecting a full congressional review of the smoking controversy after July 1, Mr. Hyde said "it is a matter in which Congress will be the final arbiter."

When the time comes for Congress to make its decision, its answer would be a whole-hearted and emphatic "No!" to the latest FCC proposal. Otherwise American freedom of speech and free enterprise will suffer one of the most serious setbacks in modern times.

[From the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer  
Feb. 7, 1969]

#### AD BAN UNJUSTIFIED

The Federal Communications Commission's proposed ban on cigarette advertising on radio and television seems an extreme step at this point in the continuing smoking and health controversy.

One reason, of course, is that public health authorities obviously haven't proved to the satisfaction of the great majority of Americans that smoking does indeed cause all the lung cancer and emphysema deaths being attributed to it.

At least it seems safe to assume that if the overwhelming majority of Americans did take the "statistical evidence" against smoking as hard proof, the tobacco industry might well be tottering on the brink of disaster.

At the same time, though, some of the outcries against the FCC's proposal seem a little bit extreme and hysterical to. "A supreme example of bureaucratic tyranny," said Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina.

No tyranny, bureaucratic or otherwise, has been exercised in this matter. The FCC may be wrong but it is moving within its jurisdiction and, as required by law, has given official notice in ample time for Congress to override it in this matter of great importance to the tobacco-growing and tobacco-manufacturing state of North Carolina.

Cigarette advertising is, of course, big business to the television and radio networks. Tobacco firms now spend almost \$227 million or about 75 per cent of their advertising budgets on TV and radio commercials. This is about 10 per cent of the broadcasters' revenues. And the industry has not only a large stake in this proposal but a legitimate argument that there should be no outright ban on the advertisement of products that can be legally sold.

If there is any justification for the FCC's new proposal, it hasn't yet been advanced. And the present health warning on cigarette packages, which in effect stresses the need for moderation in cigarette smoking as in other things, is strong enough medicine at this time.

Meanwhile, in its own self-interest, the tobacco industry might be well-advised to look to the content of some of its TV advertising, which at least some parents find objectionable because of its clear pitch to young people.

#### DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other colleagues in paying tribute to Dwight David Eisenhower, a true patriot, a great hero, a natural leader of men.

As General of the Army and as President, he served with distinction and honor—but with humility and compassion. It is said that as he bade farewell to a contingent of young paratroopers boarding planes for a landing behind the Normandy beachhead in World War II, tears trickled down his cheeks as he turned away.

"I knew some of those boys would never return," he said later.

It was General Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, who welded together from allied nations a fighting force that spelled defeat for the aggressor.

His generalship of this multination force marked the first time that an American general had headed an army that included troops from many nations.

It was my good fortune as a soldier to serve in General Eisenhower's command in Europe—and later as a Congressman to serve in President Eisenhower's "command" in Washington. I served in the Congress while he was President.

I met General Eisenhower in southern France in World War II while I was a major in the U.S. Army. Again, in Washington I had occasion to meet him on several occasions during his Presidency.

Dwight D. Eisenhower—as general and as President—was always a warm, genial person. He was loved by the people, and he loved the people.

As general this great leader fought the fight for freedom in his generation and won. Later as he stood near the fields of white crosses marking the battlefields in France he said that nations of the world simply must discover a way to reconcile their differences without resorting to war and bloodshed.

He deplored the tragic waste of young men who gave their lives in the battles of World War II and in other wars.

As President he stood firm and yet he maintained the peace—he "waged" peace. His Presidency was noted for its tranquility—the quieting of the frustrations and fears of our people. Among his domestic achievements as President was the initiation of the great interstate highway program which is continuing. This great limited access system of highways is comparable to the autobahn highway system in Europe.

Dwight David Eisenhower was a giant among giants, a man among men. The fact that both major political parties sought him as their presidential nominee testifies and attests to his greatness as a natural leader.

We do not yet have the full historical perspective on the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower—time will write this story.

However, we do know that his warm personality drew people to him. We do know that the American people felt comfortable and safe with Dwight Eisenhower in the White House. He will be greatly missed.

I want to extend to Mrs. Eisenhower, Col. John Eisenhower, and other members of the family this expression of our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

#### DEEDS, NOT WORDS

#### HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the battle cry for the revitalization of our sinking merchant marine which has been sounded through the years by those of us on the Committee for Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been taken up by still another able advocate. On March 19, 1969, before the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Washington, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, our esteemed colleague, L. MENDEL RIVERS, warned most eloquently that the time has come for deeds rather than words in the building of not only a new Navy but a new merchant marine.

I consider Chairman RIVERS' remarks most pertinent in that he addressed himself to the need for total seapower. I applaud him for his forthright stand, and I commend his text to all who desire to see our great Nation survive:

#### DEEDS, NOT WORDS

(Remarks of L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman, House Armed Services Committee)

Speaking earlier this month, the President of the United States said that our policy in Vietnam would be judged by deeds and not words. We can all applaud that approach—to Vietnam or any other problem. And I hope the President is prepared to have his Administration judged by deeds and not words in its response to the problems of our maritime industry.

If he is going to do that, he is going to have to depart from the pattern of inaction of his predecessors. Up to now what Mark Twain said about the weather has been true about our maritime problems—"Everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it." The problems of our commercial fleet today parallel the problems of our combatant Navy fleet. Fifty-eight percent of the ships in the U.S. Navy are 20 years old or older. Likewise, the ships of our commercial fleet are on the average over 20 years old.

By contrast, the Soviet Navy, which is growing by leaps and bounds, has only 2 ships which are more than 20 years old—less than 1% of the Russian navy. Likewise, in the Soviet commercial fleet 50% of the ships are less than 5 years old. In a few short years the size of the Soviet commercial fleet has increased many times, while the U.S. commercial fleet has been steadily dwindling. Today the two fleets are just about the same, but the Russian fleet is growing steadily and ours continues to decline.

The parallel between the serious obsolescence in our Navy fleet and the steady decline of our merchant fleet is not just coincidence. They both derive from the same source. And that source is the failure to have a total, integrated, national program of sea power and the failure to give sea power its proper place in the ordering of national priorities. This total national program should cover all aspects—naval combatant power, commercial shipping, fishing fleets, oceanography, and a revived ship-building industry.

It should not be necessary at this late date to have to convince people of the importance of sea power—but it still seems to be necessary. I know I do not have to explain it to an audience such as this. But let me give just one example: Today 95 to 98% of the logistics support for all of our forces in Vietnam is delivered by sea—the largest and

longest sealfit operation in history. (This operation, incidentally, represents only one-half of the world-wide business of the Military Sea Transportation Service.) Some 533 ships are operated by the MSTs, most of them old cargo ships, Victory and other such ships built during World War II. In addition, the MSTs ships almost as many measurement tons monthly of cargo, in less than full shiploads, in ships providing scheduled berth service.

The head of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Vice Admiral Lawson P. Ramage, told a subcommittee of our Committee that our old transport ships, at the point where they reach 30 years of age, will be of questionable usefulness in supporting future military operations. He said, "I would say generally ships built 30 years ago, although not in active service throughout, have come to the end of their useful life."

The American merchant ships on which we send additional measurement tons to Vietnam each month are, of course, largely in the same old-age category.

In other words, while the present Merchant Marine of the U.S. has been able to support the military campaign in Vietnam, there is still a question as to whether it will be able to do as much 5 years from now.

Just a moment's reflection will indicate to you what a profound effect this could have on our foreign policy.

The hazards of shipping in foreign-flag lines, particularly for shipping in support of military operations in line with our national policy, does not have to be spelled out for this group. Our policy could be at the mercy not only of those who own the foreign-flag ships, but of those who might have some influence with the crews. A few years ago, for example, the MSTs chartered a certain ship and the crew flatly refused to sail when they were informed they were going to Vietnam. There are other instances of foreign-flag ships chartered by American operators on which the crews refused to sail or delayed the ship when they found it was going to Vietnam.

Let me repeat once more—sea power in all of its manifestations is an integral part of our national security power and our commercial shipping capability is an integral part of American sea power.

It is because our Committee recognized the serious nature of our sea power problem that I appointed a Subcommittee on Sea Power last September. And because I recognized the totality of the involvement of all forms of sea power in our national security, I gave that Subcommittee the broadest charter. In addition to Naval power, I asked them to ascertain the steps necessary to overcome the glaring deficiencies in the cargo and troop carrying capabilities of ships owned by the United States Government or by U.S. industries. And I asked them to study the capacity of the privately-owned shipyards to meet the need of both combatant and noncombatant ships crucial to our national security.

The Subcommittee has just released its first report on the Status of Naval Ships. I would commend it to you for careful study. It can be best described in one word: "Shocking."

The discussion in this report of the advances made by Soviet sea power will chill your blood. The advances are no accident. While we have been throwing words at each other about sea power, the Soviets have taken the lessons of Admiral Mahan to heart and have pursued sea power in all of its aspects. They have simultaneously improved their naval, commercial, and fishing fleets to exert more and more power over the oceans and to use the seas to have a greater influence around the world. They are exerting power further and further away from their homeland. They have expanded their shipbuilding industry. They have 7 major shipbuilding

yards capable of constructing a total of 20 nuclear submarines each year, as well as meeting their growing program of new surface ships. They have the largest shipbuilding yard in the world. They have 7,000 students enrolled in schools for naval architects and marine engineers—23 times as many as we do. They graduate almost twice as many engineers and scientists a year as the colleges in the United States. They can build ships with greater horsepower and higher sustained speed capabilities than current U.S. ships. They have begun to make their new sea power felt in the oceans of the world, with a large group in the Mediterranean and more ships than the U.S. in the Indian Ocean. Their fishing fleets dot the horizon.

The U.S. Navy has 106 ships 4 years old or younger. The Soviets have 431. We have 96 ships between 5 to 9 years old. The Soviets have 486.

In commercial shipping, the Soviets are establishing trade routes to African nations and have opened up routes between Australia and New Zealand and Europe for wool. They have opened a trade route between Western Canada and Japan.

This report of the Subcommittee also makes clear in shocking detail the terrible ravages of age upon American naval ships, the unstoppable corrosion, the great limits on habitability for crews, the great difficulties in getting needed repair parts because some ships are so old the original parts manufacturers have gone out of business.

Now, what can be done?

How can we get American sea power back on course?

The first ingredient—we might as well admit it plainly to ourselves—is money. We have provided inadequate funds for new naval ship construction and for ship maintenance and repair for years. We are going to have to increase the annual rate of spending markedly to get results. I don't mean a crash program. I mean in increased level of funding sustained over a period of years. I have introduced legislation to provide a shipbuilding program in the coming fiscal year of \$3.8 billion. In my view that would be a beginning step. By contrast, the program in the last fiscal year was only \$1 billion, and the program submitted in the final Johnson Administration budget was \$2.6 billion.

In one of his campaign speeches, President Nixon suggested that we should ship at least 30% of our commerce in our own ships. The goal is a good one. It would not seem to be extraordinarily high. But the simple fact is that at present we carry only 6% of our foreign commerce in our own ships. Now, I realize that we cannot jump to the President's goal of 30% all at once and that even on a gradual basis some difficult adjustments might be necessary. I don't like any more than you do the idea of a Washington bureaucrat dictating to shippers when they can use foreign ships. But we might take a leaf from the pages of those who run our air carriers. This might require some fundamental changes in maritime thinking, and I know it would create some difficulties. But I think it is something at least worth debating and studying. The U.S. carries a far higher percentage of its own cargo in its own planes because it has a series of bilateral agreements with other nations that all commerce of those nations will be carried on flag lines of the two nations. If this principle has worked so well in the air, might it not help turn the tide on the oceans?

Naturally the conversion would have to be on a gradual basis so as not to upset our allies who are presently carrying a large portion of our commerce. Various offsetting arrangements might be necessary. And the cost implications would have to be studied closely. But I do suggest that those in the maritime industry at least examine the possibility of such an approach.

Another step we should take is to devote

funds to new technology applicable to shipping. In the years between 1963 and 1969, the Department of Defense has spent about \$1 billion on research and development for airlift. In that same time it has spent only \$46 million for sealfit—and the major portion of that was for the ill-fated FDL's. And my attitude toward the FDL program has not changed since last year. I am opposed to including any FDL's in a Navy ship construction program. There are so many other ships we need so much more than a government constructed experiment which could only end up competing with what is left of our privately-owned merchant marine.

Certainly, the DOD has a major interest in seeing that our shipping is carried on as efficiently and effectively as possible. But it has not done much for research and development in the area of sealfit. It just keeps going back to the FDL program, somewhat like a broken record.

At the same time, I cannot help but believe that many of the things designed for the Navy would be of value to our commercial shipping. And I cannot help but believe that there is a more effective way of turning these ideas loose to our free enterprise system than has been done in the past. This is what gave us the development of diesel power. The Navy brought it over here for submarine use and the contractor then continued on his own until the diesel was available for all sorts of other uses, including trains and trucks. Many of our commercial airlines have benefitted from engine and air frame work done for the Air Force, and I keep thinking the same should be true for merchant ships in relation to the Navy.

I am aware, of course, that many great developments have been achieved by the private shipping industry on its own without Federal funding or interference. The great container revolution is just one example. It is progressing with such momentum that it is almost completely changing our commercial shipping industry. Without blunting any of the initiative on the part of industry, I do think much more help and encouragement could be given to our merchant ship development by the Maritime Administration.

Commercial shipping as it relates to the Nation's defense requirements is the next item on the agenda for our Sea Power Subcommittee. I hope those of you here who have worthwhile suggestions will not hesitate to communicate them to this Subcommittee. After that, the Subcommittee will make a study of U.S. shipbuilding capacity, both for naval ships and for commercial ships which contribute to national defense requirements. But we do not have to wait for that study to tell you that our shipyards need to accelerate their modernization at a faster rate. A determination to increase our naval and our commercial fleets will make available new financial support to give our shipyards the new tools of expansion they need.

We need to have above all a determination to work together—Congress, the Administration, industry, and the unions. But needed as much as anything else is leadership from the Administration—leadership backed by an awareness that we must have the total package—covering our naval forces, our commercial ships, our fishing fleet, and our shipyards. We will get this leadership only if this Administration—and the President—are willing to give sea power a high national priority. We have had promises from the Administration and past administrations that we would get a new Navy and a new Merchant Marine. The time has come for more than words. As President Nixon said, "I believe that it is far more effective to use deeds rather than words . . . in order to accomplish objectives."

Words have been used up till now. Mr. President, we are waiting for some deeds.

COAL MINERS COMPENSATION  
ACT OF 1969

**HON. JAMES KEE**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives a bill, entitled the "Coal Miners' Compensation Act of 1969."

The purpose of this bill is to authorize Federal assistance to provide adequate workmen's compensation benefits for disability and death resulting from coal miner's pneumoconiosis.

It is the intent of this bill to provide workmen's compensation protection to coal miners in the event of disability or death from pneumoconiosis resulting from exposure to coal dust during their employment. Eligibility depends on exposure in the course of coal mine employment, irrespective of the time when the disability or death occurs. A cutoff date for assistance is provided because it is assumed that with increasing knowledge of the incidence of pneumoconiosis among coal miners and methods of prevention, that workmen's compensation insurance actuarial factors will be worked out on a more realistic basis than has been possible in the past and that the hazards will be materially reduced. The concurrence of these two contingencies will tend to obviate the need for Federal assistance in behalf of coal miners.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to pay benefits to miners or their survivors for disability or death from pneumoconiosis arising from exposure to coal dust, supplementary to benefits they are receiving under State workmen's compensation law. The amount of the supplement shall be the difference between the benefits payable under the State law and compensation as measured by the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act.

Benefits are to be paid retroactively to the date of disability or death.

When benefits under a State workmen's compensation or occupational disease law cease because of time or monetary limitation in such law, payments of the compensation formerly paid by the State will also be assumed by the Secretary.

No supplementary payments may be made in a State which diminishes programs or benefits related to occupational injuries and diseases.

COMPENSATION AND DEATH BENEFITS

The Secretary is also authorized to pay benefits to coal miners or their survivors if benefits for disability or death from pneumoconiosis have been denied, there is no coverage under State workmen's compensation law, or indemnity has not been received from any person liable for damages. Benefits may be paid retroactively from the date of disability or death.

Benefits shall be paid in accordance with those of the Longshoremen's and

Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which the Department of Labor administers. Insofar as retroactive benefits for surviving dependents are concerned, except as to widows during widowhood, payments may be made only to those persons who qualify as dependents at the time the claim is filed.

GRANTS TO STATES

Under plans approved by the Secretary, subject to certain specified standards, the Secretary may make grants to the States in which coal mining is carried on to conduct studies and to carry out other programs to improve workmen's compensation benefit programs as they relate to coal dust exposure in employment.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Secretary is given power to make rules for the administration of the Act including the specifying of the degree of proof necessary to establish compensability of claims for benefits when State workmen's compensation benefits are not available.

Benefits authorized under this proposal will be paid from the Employees' Compensation Fund established by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. B. F. SISK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that can be said about Dwight David Eisenhower that can in any way add luster to his name. It has all been said. It has been said on the battlefields of World War II and in the councils of peace during his years as President of the United States.

And it has been said in a thousand different ways by millions of people around the world who have looked upon him as the dignified, much-loved former leader of the free world living out the twilight of his life as the world's elder statesman and fighter for freedom.

It is in periods of national grief such as this that our Nation's better qualities become evident. We seem once again to be willing to acknowledge some of the eternal verities that in this age are all too often shoved aside for cynical vulgarities. And the measure of our love and affection for General Eisenhower can be measured, I believe, by the fact that no assassin's bullet was needed to elevate him or to trigger our response. He is of heroic proportions because of what he was and not because of the manner in which he died.

It was my pleasure to serve in the Congress for 6 years while Dwight Eisenhower was President of the United States. Though he was not of my party, he was my President, as he was President of all Americans. I am truly saddened at his passing and extend to Mrs. Eisenhower and all of their family my most sincere sympathy. We have all lost a great leader and true friend of peace.

PROJECT TEKTITE

**HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, the four aquanauts working on Project Tektite completed one-third of their planned 60-day mission beneath the surface of Lameshur Bay early in March. The multi-agency scientist-in-the-sea project began February 15 and is scheduled to end April 17.

The aquanauts, Rick Waller, John Van Derwalker and Connie Mahnken are with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Department of the Interior, and Ed Clifton is with Interior's Geological Survey.

In addition to Interior; the Navy, NASA, and General Electric are the sponsors of Project Tektite. GE constructed the habitat at its Missile and Space Division Headquarters in Valley Forge, Pa.

Tektite's primary objectives are to conduct an extensive marine science program, and to study the physiological and psychological reactions of a group of men working and living under stress for an extended period of isolated condition.

As of March 9, the aquanauts have logged collectively more than 150 hours of work outside the habitat. During the past week, their activities included tagging a number of spiny lobsters, sonar and fauna studies, fish population studies and geological mapping.

Among the many behind-the-scenes workers on Project Tektite are three alternate aquanauts, Ian Koblock, an aquatic biologist with the College of Virgin Islands; Gary Davis, an aquatic ecologist with the National Park Service; and Larry Phillips, a geologist with the U.S. Geological Survey. The alternate aquanauts perform scientific work on the surface and under water in support of the primary team.

Lt. Comdr. Thomas Markham, Tektite chief medical officer from the Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Conn., says the aquanauts have been in excellent health since the project began except for a minor ear infection incurred a few days ago by Aquanaut Mahnken. Mahnken was limited to work inside the habitat until the infection cleared.

When the aquanauts are in the habitat, a team of scientists headed by Dr. James Miller, of the Office of Naval Research, monitor all their activities from the command barge on the surface. Closed-circuit television and open microphones enable the topside scientists to monitor every move and sound in the four-chamber habitat—from the amount of food consumed to the subtle changes in mood of the aquanauts at different times. All activities are coded on IBM cards and officials said that to date more than 120,000 bits of information have been recorded. The behavioral data, according to NASA and Navy spokesmen, will be applied to selection, training and composition of crews for future long-term space missions and underseas projects. The data should also be valuable to future marine biological and oceanographic studies.

One of the highlights of a recent week of Tektite was the observance of the 27th anniversary of the Seabees. A detachment of the construction organization had built the base camp, and emplaced the habitat on the ocean floor. The Tektite detachment sponsored a barbecue featuring beef, pork, and native goat. Portions were sent to the aquanauts who in turn sent best wishes to the Seabees.

Another message went from the habitat on the ocean floor March 7 when Chief Aquanaut Waller sent a greeting to his wife on their 12th wedding anniversary. The message said, in part, "Wish you were here." The greeting was relayed by Comdr. Frank Looney, operations commander for Tektite.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LAIRD  
INTERVIEWED BY U.S. NEWS &  
WORLD REPORT

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration was presented with many far-reaching and serious problems affecting our national security when it assumed the duties of office.

Some of the most serious problems such as the Vietnam war, the Soviet military threat, and the need for the anti-ballistic missile were discussed in depth by Secretary of Defense Laird in an interview which appeared in the April 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

The information and comment which Secretary Laird presents will be of interest to all Americans concerned about the welfare and security of our Nation. I am therefore including the text of the interview as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT'S THE ANSWER TO ABM AND WAR?

Q. Mr. Secretary, what do you regard as the No. 1 problem of the Defense Department today?

A. The No. 1 problem is ending the war in Southeast Asia.

Q. How much time do you have?

A. We're hopeful that we will meet with success in the peace talks in Paris. This has to be our objective for a period of time.

This Administration has had only two months to negotiate in Paris. For another two months prior to that, I believe, the other side wasn't too anxious to get down to real negotiations because they felt that a new Administration was coming in on January 20, and they would wait for that.

Q. These peace talks have been going on now for almost a year, and they don't even have an agenda yet, do they?

A. The Administration would be severely criticized if it did not give a reasonable amount of time to negotiations, hoping for success and trying to work out a settlement.

But we should be prepared and will be prepared, in event that the Paris talks are not successful, to have an alternative plan to follow as far as the conduct of the war is concerned, and in bringing that war in Vietnam to an end.

Q. Has the other side been escalating the war in this two-month period?

A. There is no question about that. I think that is what part of the bargaining is all about in Paris. Since I have been Secretary of Defense, the only escalation of the war in

South Vietnam has been on the part of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

Q. How much more time should be allowed for talking?

A. I would not want to set a timetable on the Paris talks. That is something that should be determined by the Secretary of State, and he can make his recommendation to the National Security Council. Then the President will make the decision as to how much time we are going to give to the talks in Paris.

Q. During this interval, do we have to go on taking casualties of 300 to 350 Americans a week in Vietnam?

A. I would hope not. I would hope that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese would realize that this offensive of theirs—where they've taken tremendous casualties—has not been a successful operation.

Q. We heard the same thing after the Tet offensive a year ago—

A. Yes.

Q. And war still has gone on for another year—

A. I know. We get this argument that we should break off in Paris now. I really feel this is not the time to break off the Paris talks. I am concerned about those casualties in South Vietnam, but I do feel we have to give some more time to negotiations before we move forward on an alternate course.

I want you to know, however, that we are preparing alternative courses of action to follow, in the event that our efforts for mutual troop withdrawal, for re-establishing the Demilitarized Zone and for the release of prisoners are not successful in the not-too-distant future, as far as the Paris talks are concerned.

At that time, if Paris fails, we will announce the alternative course of action that we plan to follow. We are not going to follow the same course of action as the previous Administration if we do not meet with success in Paris.

Q. How long do you think the public will allow before people decide that "Johnson's war" has become "Nixon's war"?

A. I think the people of this country will understand that the new Administration should have adequate time in Paris. The last Administration had about eight months in Paris, and not much happened. I do not want to be in the position of setting a timetable.

Q. Could you indicate what alternative war plans might be possible?

A. No. I do not think it would be prudent to do this.

Q. There are a million and a half troops in South Vietnam—540,000 Americans and nearly a million South Vietnamese. Why can't a force that size do more than it is doing?

A. It is an unrealistic situation when you stop and realize that the enemy—the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese—can move in and out of that country at will. They have privileged sanctuaries in Cambodia, in Laos and in North Vietnam.

Also, the level of violence is controlled by the other side. They have a safe haven any time they want it. Some of their retreats and bases are within 26 or 30 miles of Saigon. They're across the border in Cambodia or Laos or North Vietnam.

It is a most difficult war to fight under the terms and conditions, the understandings and arrangements that have been set forth in the past.

Alternatives certainly have to be considered. I think we have to go forward with the phase 2 modernization program for Vietnam which I outlined in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. We should go forward with a program to "Vietnamize" the war. In the past, we have not carried out a very successful program in this area.

SHIFTING BURDEN OF WAR

Q. What needs to be done now?

A. We have to change the emphasis so that American forces in Vietnam can move forward to train and modernize the South

Vietnamese forces, rather than fighting so much of the war themselves.

Q. Wasn't that supposed to be the program?

A. I am concerned because most of the past planning has been based on having a South Vietnamese force capable only of handling guerrilla-type operations in case the North Vietnamese pulled their regular forces back to the North. Past policy was not based on turning over full combat duty to the armed forces of Vietnam—"Vietnamizing" the war.

Q. What do you mean by "Vietnamizing" the war? Is that the same thing as "de-Americanization" of the war?

A. It is the same thing, only I think it has a little different impact. To many people, "de-Americanizing" the war means that we would give up our objective, which is self-determination for the people of Vietnam. I would like to see that objective achieved by the Vietnamese people. That is why I think this military-modernization program for the forces of South Vietnam is so important.

Q. What is involved?

A. It involves immediately an additional 156 million dollars, so far as equipment is concerned, for the South Vietnamese forces. It would shift the emphasis for our forces toward becoming training forces, rather than combat forces.

Q. Is that a long-range program?

A. It is a long-range program, but it's one that I think we can do much more about than we have in the past.

Q. What is your position on the possibility of any American troop withdrawal from South Vietnam now?

A. My position is very clear: We are faced with an offensive in South Vietnam that is being conducted by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. Secondly, we're engaged in very important peace talks in Paris. A key item on the American agenda for those talks is mutual troop withdrawal of U.S. and North Vietnamese forces. This is not the time for us to talk about unilateral troop withdrawal.

Q. Do you believe the South Vietnamese forces can be trained and equipped to take over most of the ground combat duty in Vietnam?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. In what period of time?

A. Well, I would say within a reasonable period of time. I would rather not get into the timetable now.

Q. Are we giving them some kind of navy?

A. They will have a naval capability in the Mekong Delta and elsewhere, including small monitor gunboats and patrol boats.

Q. Are we giving an air force to the South Vietnamese?

A. Yes, we are.

Q. Why can't they do something against the North if they have these things?

A. The North Vietnamese have one of the most sophisticated air-defense systems in today's world. The SAM missiles and the anti-aircraft equipment they have are very sophisticated. Without the most modern equipment, the South Vietnamese Air Force would not last very long in that environment.

Q. With no bombs falling on the North, what pressures are there on the Communists to come to terms in Paris?

A. It is difficult to believe that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong can consider taking for a long period the kind of casualties they have been taking. We also are taking heavy casualties. They have been replacing their casualties by infiltration from North Vietnam and limited recruitment in South Vietnam.

The purpose of my trip to Vietnam was to look at the situation from our country's point of view: first, to assess the safety of American forces; second, to see that they had all the equipment and support that they needed.

Where the South Vietnamese forces are concerned, the purpose was to see if they

could, through their own efforts, achieve the objective of self-determination and self-defense.

Third, it was to see how soon we could reduce our commitment from the standpoint not only of reducing casualties by reducing dollars, matériel and manpower.

#### TERMS OF BOMBING HALT

Q. Was there any real agreement that accompanied the halting of bombing of the North?

A. When I became Secretary of Defense on January 21, I was informed that there was no written agreement, but there were understandings.

Q. Was it understood on both sides?

A. It was understood, I was told, on both sides.

Q. Is it possible to state what were those understandings?

A. The understandings, as related to me, were that the U.S. would halt the bombing, and the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong would not use the Demilitarized Zone. Furthermore, they would not indiscriminately shell the major population centers in South Vietnam, and they would permit the South Vietnamese to take part in the talks in Paris.

Q. Has the Communist shelling that has gone on for the last four weeks violated that agreement?

A. In my opinion, it has violated the understandings.

Q. Are the Communist forces in South Vietnam stronger now than before the bombing halt?

A. There is no question that they are stronger. There has been increased infiltration from North Vietnam into Laos, Cambodia and into South Vietnam. That infiltration has increased to a very great extent since October 31, when the bombing halt went into effect. There has been an increase in the number of people, the amount of matériel, supplies, ammunition that has been brought down from the North.

Q. Are the Communist forces more capable of fighting the war now than they were before?

A. Any army is more capable when it has more supplies and more men, but perhaps less capable when it suffers heavy losses of trained people.

Q. Has there been any slackening whatsoever in the Soviet supply of matériel to North Vietnam?

A. No.

Q. Or of China's supply?

A. No—but the Chinese have not been the major suppliers. The Soviet Union is continuing to supply the forces of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong. Almost 80 per cent comes from the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. Red China makes up approximately 15 per cent.

Q. How much do our allies provide—the additional 5 per cent?

A. Indirectly, you could say that some of our allies do some trading with North Vietnam.

Q. Does most of that arrive by sea?

A. As far as the military equipment is concerned, most of it is arriving by land.

Q. Across China?

A. Across China. But, as far as tonnage is concerned—if you limit it to tonnage—with the petroleum and the other supplies that come in through the ports of the North, you'd probably have a greater tonnage coming by sea.

Q. You said that in the eight months the Johnson Administration was talking in Paris, there was no progress. Does that still hold true at this date?

A. I would be less than frank with you if I said that there had been substantial progress made in the two months since the Nixon Administration took office. As far as substance is concerned, these talks merely dealt with procedures, up until the first of November or shortly thereafter.

Q. Are the Russians helping in these talks?

A. Well, there has been some evidence, we have been told, that when it came to settling the question of the table and some other items, they were helpful.

Q. But not on substantive matters—

A. We would certainly hope that they would be helpful, but—

Q. Why do you think that the Communists are staging a new offensive in South Vietnam at this particular time?

A. It seems to be tied in with the Paris negotiations. It is probably an effort on their part to influence public opinion in the U.S., hoping for an effect on negotiations in Paris. They feel this is important from a psychological standpoint in the U.S. I think it has a greater effect on American opinion, really, than it does in South Vietnam from a military standpoint.

The enemy has learned from their last three offensives how to use their sanctuaries to hit and run, and not to stand and fight. They used their resources to better effect than they did in the last three offensives.

#### TESTING SOUTH VIETNAM

Q. Does it seem as if this whole thing is hopeless?

A. I don't think that it is hopeless to maintain our objective of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, if the people of South Vietnam want self-determination and the right of self-defense. But the time has come when we had better test that and make sure that this is what they do want, and not just some objective we've set for them.

Q. How do you determine that?

A. That's what this modernization program is all about. I think the time has come to see whether they will accept this responsibility—whether, if given the opportunity for training and given the equipment, they are in a position to carry forward on their own to maintain the objective of self-determination.

Q. Are they in a position to do that?

A. I believe they are. I believe they will. But if they are not, it shouldn't be up to us to do it for them.

The No. 1 objective of this Administration is to stop the war in Vietnam and to see that the American involvement in that war is brought to a halt. This is our main objective, and that is what we're working toward right now.

Q. Have the South Vietnamese ever been told precisely and exactly what we expect them to do?

A. I think they knew what was expected of them in the event that the North Vietnamese withdrew and the Americans withdrew, say, under the terms of the Manila communiqué [signed Oct. 25, 1966, by the U.S. and its allies]. The past planning has all been based on that kind of a limited responsibility for the forces of South Vietnam in the context of a Manila-type withdrawal. In other words, the North Vietnamese will not be present and the Americans will not be present in any substantial number. The planning for that kind of a situation, I would tell you very frankly, has gone forward in a rather effective manner.

But the planning for the other kind of responsibility for the forces of South Vietnam, as I outlined them before the Senate and House committees, has not gone forward as effectively as it should. My testimony as far as the modernization program is concerned was not based on a complete withdrawal of the armed forces of North Vietnam. That's the difference.

Q. Would we accept a coalition government in the South including the Viet Cong's National Liberation Front?

A. If it were up to me, I would certainly accept a coalition government if it was elected in a regular election and if it was a free and independent election. We have always talked about the right of self-deter-

mination. If they go that route, and they take Communists into the government, and they are elected in a free election, I do not think that is an area where we should prescribe the standards.

I am not one who believes that it is necessarily like putting a fox in a chicken coop, as long as we do not force the South to put Communists in their government. I do not believe that should be our responsibility—to force them to put Communists there. But if they elect them, that is a different matter.

Q. Could a coalition be agreed upon in the Paris negotiations?

A. In negotiations, a free and open election would be, perhaps, the extent of our moving toward any kind of coalition. A coalition would have to be the result of free elections. I do not believe we would be a party to force a coalition.

Q. Would you expect to see all American troops out of South Vietnam in the next 10 years?

A. I would hope that we could see all of them out of there in the next 10 years. I hate to make a broad statement like that. I mean, we still have troops in Korea. We still have troops in Europe, and World War II has been over since 1945. Here it is 24 years later, and we still have troops in Europe. I wish it wasn't necessary to have troops in Korea.

This is one of the important things that we are going over in the National Security Council at this time—a review of all of our commitments around the world. This is something in which we are very interested in the Department of Defense, because I think we may be overcommitted worldwide. We should review our commitments very carefully to make sure that we do not commit ourselves to more than we can deliver.

Q. How do you go about pulling back without someone else moving into the vacuum?

A. This is what we're going into in these National Security Council studies. These are the most important studies that have been conducted by the Government since World War II. Not only are we studying our total strategic-force commitment, but our conventional commitments. This kind of study has not been performed in this depth for some time, as far as our country is concerned.

Q. Have any conclusions been drawn?

A. No, we will not have our strategic study completed until about May 15. Our conventional study, based on the commitments we have, will be completed sometime in October. So I don't want to give you the impression that the studies have been completed.

#### WHY THE ABM IS NEEDED

Q. Mr. Secretary, why did you decide that it was necessary to go ahead with deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system?

A. Because this is necessary for the safety and security of our country. Originally it had been felt necessary to give this country the protection of the Sentinel system of missile defense, primarily against the possible development of a Chinese missile threat to the U.S. in the decade of the 1970s.

The plan in the budget submitted to Congress by the previous Administration provided for an authorization of 1.8 billion dollars for ABM development for fiscal year 1970. We have decided to cut that total back to 800 million dollars—a reduction of a billion dollars in the budget requests to Congress for the year to start next July 1. This modified system gives the same protection, as far as a small Chinese threat is concerned, as the original Sentinel system.

However, as we assessed our intelligence information on what the Soviets are doing with their missile deployment and the increased Soviet missile deployment that has been going on over the last 24 months, we became increasingly concerned. We found that as recently as December they were still going forward with the deployment of the SS-9.

Q. What is this SS-9?

A. The SS-9 is the largest intercontinental ballistic missile that the Soviet Union has in its inventory. It has a capability of carrying a warhead of up to 25 megatons. I felt that the American people should know that the Soviet Union was going forward with deployment of this weapon. Two years ago, and again a year ago, our best intelligence was that the Soviet Union would probably not go forward with further deployment of the SS-9. Deployment of offensive missiles was expected to level off.

#### POWER OF RUSSIAN MISSILE

Q. Is this Russian missile more powerful than our intercontinental ballistic missiles?

A. It is much more powerful than anything we have. You do not need this kind of megatonnage in those numbers to destroy cities. For a retaliatory strike, you would not need the large nuclear capability of the SS-9. If we were developing a missile like this, I am sure the Soviet Union would assume that we were developing it to take out underground missile sites and to destroy the deterrent force of the Soviet Union.

As Secretary of Defense, I must try to assess why the Soviets are deploying this very powerful weapon. One of the conclusions that a defense planner must come to—if he is looking out for the security of the United States and wants to deter a nuclear war—is that this particular Soviet system has the capability to knock out our hardened missile sites. Now, it is possible for us to save many of our missiles—but not our cities—from a massive Soviet attack.

Q. Why defend missile sites and not population centers?

A. The way to save our cities is to protect the credibility of our deterrent nuclear power, so that we have a balanced deterrent, a protected deterrent—assuring that no nation will ever choose to strike the U.S. in a nuclear attack.

Q. But you are proposing to defend only two of our missile launch areas.

A. We're going forward with deployment at two missile sites in phase 1 in the 1970 budget. The over-all program has 12 sites in the continental U.S., with an option to add two more at a later date in Hawaii and Alaska.

But in the 1970 funding, there only is construction proposed on two sites—the two missile bases in the northern part of U.S. These two ABM sites when fully deployed will provide a relatively "thin" cover over all of our Minuteman capability and a heavier cover over approximately 30 per cent of our Minutemen. It will also give some protection for our bombers in that area.

Q. Will this Safeguard program be an effective system?

A. Yes. We have had successful tests of the Spartan, which is a long-range interceptor missile. We have had successful tests with the Sprint short-range missile. We have had successful tests of the missile-site radar. We've had successful tests of all components of the PAR radar.

Q. What is PAR radar?

A. PAR is the perimeter acquisition radar that goes out and searches for missiles on the horizon. It is a long-range radar. We are going to put two of these PAR installations in phase 1. These are costly radar installations. Now, we haven't installed a PAR radar anywhere, but I have been assured by the most competent people in the scientific community that this radar will work.

Q. Can PAR be tested when put in place?

A. That is what we propose to do. This radar will be an effective instrument as far as our defense establishment is concerned, even if research and development lead us to believe at a later date that we can use some type of new developments to destroy incoming missiles.

If our work with advanced radar tech-

niques and lasers, and some of the other things we're working on, should prove to be successful at a later time, there is no reason why parts of this Safeguard system cannot be used. We have to go forward with an acquisition type radar for the detection, not only of submarine-launched missiles, but also of missiles that might be launched from China or from Russia, and to keep a close watch on the FOBS [fractional-orbit bombardment system]. These are fractional-orbiting space vehicles which have a capability of firing nuclear weapons against the U.S.

Q. Can ABM weapons be used to destroy space platforms armed with nuclear weapons?

A. Yes, we will have that capability with the Safeguard system.

Q. Some scientists now contend that the entire system could be knocked out easily by striking at the radar heart of the system with a very small nuclear explosion. Is this true?

A. No. The system will intercept the incoming nuclear weapons whether they are high or low yield. In addition, we have designed the system so that there is no advantage to the attacker to concentrate on the Safeguard radar.

Q. Some Congressmen claim that a strong offense by the U.S. is the best defense—

A. The President of the United States should have the option of using this defensive-weapons system before he used all of our offensive capability.

It is going to be very difficult for any President to be sure that a missile attack coming over the horizon is a full-scale assault. He would have to make this determination within a very few minutes, giving the order to unload our silos, and to fire our offensive-missile force, and to have all our bombers on the way, in a very short period of time.

Q. About how long a period?

A. This would depend on the type of enemy attack, whether ICBM, SLBM [submarine-launched ballistic missile] or FOBS. We could have less than 15 minutes in which to make a full evaluation—and to react. I want to be in a position where our deterrent force can survive a first strike, if necessary, and still deliver a devastating blow to any potential enemy. That is what will keep this country from getting into a nuclear war. That is what is going to protect our people, and that is what is going to keep the peace. That is why it is so important to protect our second-strike capability.

Q. Do you consider this an investment in peace?

A. That is what this all about. I hope that the ABM system is never used. But if it is never used, the money will not have been wasted. It will be a small price to pay if we keep the peace by preventing a nuclear exchange between the U.S. and any other country.

We have to prevent that nuclear exchange. The way to prevent it is not only with a balanced deterrent force, but a credible deterrent insofar as our second-strike capability is concerned.

Q. Are we committed to accept the first strike in a nuclear war?

A. We could accept the blow now.

Q. But are we committed to that as a matter of policy?

A. No, we're not committed to that—but I think it is important that we be in a position so that, if a surprise attack comes and we do not fire our missiles, we still have the capability to deliver a second strike. Any potential enemy must know that we can deliver that second strike. The timing of our retaliatory strike must, however, be a command decision of the President, based on the situation as he sees it.

I do not worry about this eventuality in the time period of 1969, 1970, 1971. But when

we get into the period of 1972 and later—then, as Secretary of Defense, I do have some concern. I know we could take the first strike today and retaliate with devastating strength.

We have our Polaris fleet of nuclear submarines. I've been very active in the Polaris program. I cosponsored the amendments in Congress which provided for accelerating the Polaris program. Some members of the scientific community were telling us that the Polaris system would not work.

I was convinced by Admiral Raborn [head of the initial Polaris program] and Admiral Rickover [pioneer in the development of nuclear submarines] that the system would work. Their scientific advisers were convinced it would, and I was willing to take the chance that it would. This system is today virtually invulnerable. It cannot be attacked successfully by the Soviet Union, and it increases the credibility of our deterrent tremendously, as far as our second-strike capability is concerned.

Q. But will the Polaris fleet remain an invulnerable system?

A. I cannot give that assurance for the long-range future. I know what can be done scientifically. I know some of the things we are working on. And I do not downgrade the scientific capability of the Soviet Union to the extent of saying that our Polaris submarine fleet would always be invulnerable.

#### REDS' SUBMARINE BUILDUP

Q. Are the Soviets now developing their own Polaris-type submarine fleet?

A. Yes, they have the capacity to produce one Polaris-type submarine a month. Last year they produced seven.

Q. With 16 nuclear missiles each?

A. With 16 missiles.

Q. So they could catch up with us, then, in about 3½ years in numbers of Polaris submarines—

A. Yes. But we're talking here about the credibility of our Polaris as a deterrent force. I don't want to give the impression that the Polaris-type fleet being turned out by the Soviet Union is an attack fleet against our own Polaris submarines. That is not correct. But the Soviets are going forward with other developments in the attack area which do raise questions.

Q. So they have seven Polaris-type submarines with 16 missiles each that could approach our coast—

A. There's no question about that. The number that they have deployed at the present time, however, is not a significant figure.

Q. But in the next few years—

A. In the time period 1974-75, they could equal or surpass the number of Polaris-type submarines which we presently have. That number is 41.

Q. Could our land-based missile sites survive an attack from those submarine-based Soviet missiles?

A. I would think that they might use their Polaris-type submarines with their missiles primarily against other targets, including our bomber force. I think that their Polaris submarine would, however, be more of a second-strike weapon. The major missile-site weapon, as I see it, is the one they are deploying at the present time—the powerful SS-9.

Q. You testified in Congress that the Russians have about 200 of these—

A. More than 200.

Q. And these 200 Soviet ICBMs could destroy 55 per cent of the population of this country—

A. We do not have 200 cities which are large enough to be a good target for the SS-9. The Soviets have large numbers of a smaller ICBM, the SS-11, which is clearly suited for city destruction. It could destroy half of the population of our country.

Q. Some people seem to feel that there is no possibility of any country challenging us—

A. Well, I hope that we can go forward with meaningful arms-control talks, and that we will be successful in working out an arms-control agreement. But this may take months or years. In the meantime, we have to protect the credibility of our deterrent force.

When you talk about the sufficiency of the U.S. nuclear forces, you must take into consideration the fact that we in the U.S. live in an open society, and the Soviet Union is a closed society. You must also recognize that we are preparing a retaliatory-type force, which could survive any first strike, and still deliver a devastating blow to any potential aggressor. It is this second-strike capability that is going to keep the peace. This deterrent capability is going to prevent nuclear war with the Soviet Union in the decade of the 1970s. One of my primary responsibilities is to see that such a capability exists. The ABM is only part of the program to insure the credibility of our deterrent power.

Q. What is the total cost of this ABM investment?

A. The total cost in dollars is between 6 and 7 billion, plus about 2 billion more in projected ABM-component research and development.

Q. So you know something about effectiveness of an ABM system already—

A. We know quite a bit about it. We've been firing these missiles on a regular basis. We know exactly whether we have made an intercept, by the manner in which we work this into our computers with the firing of the missiles—and we are firing the missiles.

Q. With no warheads, though—

A. No, we are not testing warheads in the atmosphere.

Q. What about underground?

A. We are going forward with tests of the warheads underground. We have the capability of carrying out these tests underground without any violation of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

Q. How far out can this intercept be made in your tests?

A. With the Spartan missile, at a distance of several hundred miles. That's the long-range missile. The Sprint missile is of much shorter range—a few tens of miles. You use the Sprint for close-in defense as a back-up to Spartan.

Q. Can you tell us anything about the Russian system?

A. The Russians have deployed an ABM system around Moscow.

They slowed deployment of this system about a year ago, and have been going forward with tests of a more sophisticated ABM system in their test grounds. We think for that reason they probably will not deploy many more of the Galosh missiles which they have around Moscow at this time.

Q. Don't the present Russian ABM's concern you much?

A. I wouldn't say that they do not concern me, because we have to assume that they have a capability. I think you would have to take that system into consideration, and you would have to target a certain number of your second-strike weapons against the Russian ABM system, particularly if it were expanded to cover more cities. Otherwise you would not be able to penetrate as you should. You would not have the kind of credibility that the second strike force must have.

Q. If the Soviets were willing to freeze their development of ABM's is our Safeguard system negotiable, too?

A. ———  
Q. Has there been any indication that the Soviet Union wants to move ahead with arms-control talks?

A. I can only say that it is most important if we get into arms-control talks, that we discuss defensive as well as offensive weapons. The system that President Nixon has

outlined is an added incentive for effective arms-control talks. It is not provocative in any way, because it is truly a defensive system to protect our second-strike capability.

Q. Why should the Russians want to place their ABM missile sites around Moscow and other cities, while we now want to put our defensive weapons around missile bases and defense installations?

A. I believe it is rather provocative to put your ABM sites around your cities. In that way, under the program outlined by the previous Administration, it could be said that we were trying to protect our cities from Soviet missile attack and thus be in a position to launch a first strike. What we're trying to do with the Safeguard system, as it relates to the Soviet Union, is to insure the reliability of our second-strike capability. We believe that we can protect our people better in that way.

Q. Did some of the uproar—Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and other places—have something to do with the shift from defense of cities?

A. It did not have anything to do with the recommendation that the Deputy Secretary of Defense, David Packard, and I made to the President and the National Security Council. I can assure you of that. It did demonstrate, however, how a system deployed at cities can be misinterpreted. Many of those protesters thought the previous Administration was attempting a heavy city protection against a massive, Soviet-type attack.

The biggest factor influencing us in our decision—and the American people should know why we made the decision that we did—is the fact that the Soviet Union is going forward with deployment of the SS-9, which has the capability of carrying a huge warhead, and has the capability of carrying multiple warheads of large capacity that could be targeted on our retaliatory-missile sites.

Q. When did this become known to you?

A. The key information was gathered by our intelligence sources during the month of December. It became known to me after I became Secretary of Defense in January. But this December deployment was not known to the previous Administration—I want that made very clear—at the time they prepared their defense budget.

Q. Was that intelligence information the reason the Nixon Administration called a halt to the Sentinel system?

A. The only thing we could call a halt to was one site that was going forward near Boston. I ordered a review of the entire ABM program—a review which was headed up by Deputy Secretary Packard.

Q. How much protection will this revised ABM system provide against the Chinese threat?

A. As far as complete area protection against a Chinese threat is concerned, it would not be completed until late 1975. We do not anticipate, as of today, that the Chinese Communists will have a significant ICBM capability before that time.

However, should the Chinese test-fire an ICBM—and I think they might within the next 18 months—the program can be accelerated, and we could have an effective system completed at an earlier date. I think we can have sufficient protection against a Chinese threat through the 1970s, if the measured Safeguard system is completed through all of the phases as outlined by President Nixon.

Q. And after that?

A. It could be modified at a later time in the period of the 1980s. We may be into some other sophisticated types of antimissile defenses by that time. We are not stopping research and development in other areas, such as lasers and sea-based ABM's.

We are hopeful that we can have successful arms-control negotiations and an agree-

ment. But we want to be in the position—if we do not have an effective agreement—that we will be able to maintain the credibility and effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent, our second-strike capability.

Q. Do you feel that Congress will give you the money and authority to proceed with this ABM in fiscal 1970?

A. I am confident that the Congress—with the full facts in hand—will approve this modified program. In view of the activities of the Soviet Union in the strategic-arms field during the last 24 months, particularly the accelerated deployment of the SS-9 missiles, Congress will want to protect our deterrent forces so that we can prevent nuclear war in the decade of the 1970s.

Q. We do not want to be in a position where the Soviet Union could pull a Cuban missile crisis on us in reverse—

A. That is correct. It is important for everyone to understand that at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, the U.S. was in a position of vast strategic nuclear superiority. We are not in that same position today. The Soviet Union is now in a position where it has more ICBM's on launch pads and under construction than the U.S. does. It has the capability in the next few years of going ahead of us in submarine-launched missiles. It has a tremendous capability in intermediate-range missiles, which are targeted against our allies in Europe.

We must have a credible deterrent so that the Soviet Union knows that if they use these weapons, if they make that kind of mistake—and I don't think they will—then they will surely suffer the consequences. We want to maintain that kind of deterrent until we can be assured that we have an arms-control agreement that will work—one that will protect our people.

#### SOVIET VERSUS UNITED STATES OUTLAYS

Q. We've spent 50 billion dollars on anti-aircraft defenses in the U.S. since the end of World War II. Why all the opposition now to spending 6 or 7 billion on ABM defenses?

A. It is difficult for me to understand except that this attitude is connected somehow with the frustrations that people have over the war in Vietnam. Understandably, our people are concerned not only about our casualty tolls but also the amount of money we have been forced to spend in recent years. This year—the current fiscal year which ends June 30—our total expenditures on Vietnam will be almost 30 billion dollars. This is a massive amount of spending.

The Soviets, with their policy, have been successful in getting by with an annual expenditure, I say, of about 4 billion dollars in Vietnam. The previous Administration and our intelligence community say the cost to the Soviet Union is lower than that—that the Russians have been able to supply about 80 per cent of the war materials used by the Communists in Vietnam at a cost of around 2 billion dollars.

Q. A year?

A. A year. So here is a 2-billion-dollar investment, according to our intelligence community. And that is a tradeoff against 30 billion dollars being spent by the U.S. The Soviet Union has been able to use this period to go forward with a massive strategic-arms build-up of offensive and defensive weapons inside the U.S.S.R.

Q. While we couldn't—

A. We could not because of our vast commitment in Southeast Asia.

So, really, when you ask me why the opposition to the ABM, I think it has become more or less a symbol of some of the frustration we all feel over the tremendous tie-down of our assets in Southeast Asia.

The ABM is a very insignificant issue as compared with the war in Southeast Asia.

THE CALL FOR A NEW GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association held its annual congressional luncheon in the Rayburn Building. The Members of Congress who attended were privileged to hear a very excellent address entitled "The Urban Crisis Calls for a New Government-Industry Partnership," by Mr. Richard A. Campbell, president of Western Electronic Manufacturers Association.

The subject matter of this address is so important that I recommend it as "must" reading to every Member of the House of Representatives. The address follows:

THE URBAN CRISIS CALLS FOR A NEW GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP

(Remarks of Richard A. Campbell, president of Western Electronic Manufacturers Association, at WEMA's annual Congressional Luncheon, Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969)

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I am Richard Campbell, President of the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association. In behalf of the 96 industry executives who have crossed the country to be here today, I want to welcome you to our Congressional Luncheon.

This is our eighth annual reunion, and this year we decided it was time to use the occasion to learn from you as well as to talk to you. This morning we were privileged to hear from Senator Bennett, Chairman Hollifield, Congressman Gubser and Chairman Miller. I'd like to express our deep appreciation to these gentlemen for giving so generously of their time. We are especially indebted to Chairman Miller since he arranged for us to meet here in the halls of Congress today.

We spent considerable time at our morning conference discussing "The Government-Industry Partnership." Since many of our companies have long served the needs of the country's defense and space efforts, we have a substantial interest in the ground rules and operating policies that have evolved over the years to govern the relationship of buyer and supplier.

That is a special relationship, born of the nation's decision to mobilize its resources for such top-priority objectives as defeating the Axis in World II or beating the Russians in the race to the moon.

Those undertakings had the support of the American public because of the great stakes involved and the clear case for plunging into those efforts. We in Western electronics have been deeply involved in providing the wherewithal—both the "hardware" and the technological capability that lies behind it—to carry out those commitments. Only the Government could embark on such undertakings in behalf of the people of this country, and only industry could quickly and abundantly meet the need for increasingly more sophisticated and precise equipment.

The United States has other challenges to meet, however, and I want to shift focus to these because it casts our traditional relationship in quite a different light.

The nation today faces an urban crisis so complex and so urgent that no one would assert that it will resolve itself if left alone to subside with the passage of time.

One of the things that distinguishes this crisis from those we have met before is the fact that the issue is so complex. The response is not at all clear. When Pearl Harbor was bombed and when Sputnik was thrust into orbit, we had no difficulty identifying the challenge. The urban crisis is not so readily characterized. Racial strife is only one aspect of the urban crisis. It is tightly interlocked with other elements such as structural unemployment, inadequate housing, widespread lawlessness, deficient schools, pollution of our air and water and congestion of highways and airways.

One does not have to be a systems analyst to recognize that these problems all interact—that solutions for one or a few of the problems are bound to fail if allowance is not made for the way they will affect the other elements of the problem.

Because of the complexity of the crisis, responsibility cannot be readily fixed. We are accustomed to looking to the Federal Government for direction in responding to external threats, but the snarl of domestic problems has left us uncertain of how we should proceed. Often we hear it said, for example, that "if we can put men into outer space, why can't we find a way to bring people to work in our cities?" Denver, Seattle, Portland, Los Angeles, San Francisco—really, every major city—is confronted each morning with a tide of slow-moving, exhaust-producing automobiles on highways and freeways that reached their capacity twenty years too soon. The system isn't working. It's getting worse. The complaint, however, neatly sidesteps the question of *who* is supposed to take charge of the problem.

In many cases we find that a cobweb of various governmental jurisdictions is itself the chief barrier to problem solving. The engineering challenge of designing an effective, low-cost rapid transit system for the Los Angeles Basin is minor, for example, when compared to the tangle of rivalries posed by 1,056 cities and special districts in that area which may assert their special interests in the choice of alternatives, financing, rights-of-way or other factors.

There is clear need for leadership in all these areas, but the urban crisis is not just the government's problem. It is not just industry's problem, nor is it the problem of any given element of society. It is everybody's problem.

Government and industry must work in partnership to cope with it, sometimes with government as the buyer and industry as the supplier, but often as two independent partners working simultaneously toward a common goal.

Our Western electronics industry, with the technological capacity it has developed and its systems approach to solving problems, has increasingly turned its attention toward applications in the domestic, civilian market. Wherever there are needs to be filled and money available to pay for them, the intelligently-run company is going to find the investment money and manpower necessary to produce the wares required. That is a marvelous way to meet the needs, and I submit that it has the staying power needed for the long pull.

*Certainly, as a first order of business, we must achieve a turnaround in the lives of the people in the ghetto. The overriding single need is to reverse—not merely ameliorate—the generation-to-generation inheritance of defeatism and poverty.*

While putting people to work clearly will go far to diminish the crisis, the crisis is not unemployment itself. Giving jobs to men and women may alleviate discontent and improve morale, but it will not end the crisis. The Kerner and McCone Commissions found that many of the looters and rioters in Watts and Detroit, for example, were people who had jobs.

In and of itself, employment does not bring the ghetto person into the mainstream of society. To be sure, the efforts made to date in training and employing the unskilled are impressive.

In cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen and the Urban Coalition, our companies have made substantial contributions to the national crash effort. We estimate that, since January of 1966, western electronic firms have trained and hired 7,000 unskilled men and women. In most cases, the cost of training and low productivity of new workers has been borne by the companies themselves. The added special training required was carried on in the plants, for the most part. In the remainder of the cases, skills have been taught in a variety of community training centers, like the Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center, or vocational schools with curricula tailored to meet specific needs of industry today. Often, equipment for teaching has been donated by companies. Federal programs—notably those under the Labor Department's Manpower Administration—have helped mightily toward shouldering costs, but the case is rare that a company is spared risk and expense of its own.

We think it would be a very unfortunate mistake to conclude that realization of the goal of putting 500,000 people to work will end the crisis. In their press to meet NAB quotas, a few companies have hired ghetto people without regard to whether there was work for them to do. As heart-warming as that may be, it is difficult for us to see how such actions make any real contribution to ending the crisis. Yet, it would seem from much of the pressure exerted on our companies by various governmental agencies that this is what is expected of us. We submit that gauging progress by the single standard of quantity is very risky indeed.

Those of us who have been involved in defense and space contracting vividly recall how, at various junctures, thousands of people—regardless of their skills—have suddenly been needed to meet the government's wartime needs. Between 1940 and 1965, for example, Los Angeles' Negro population soared from 75,000 to 650,000, chiefly in response to the promise of jobs. But as contracts were filled or cancelled, many of these people—the least skilled and the least senior—were laid off. Without a doubt, the disillusionment that these people suffered contributed to the Watts insurrection of 1965. I don't think any of us cares to see that cycle repeated, and yet we must recognize that over-hiring without economic need is bound to lead to layoffs again in a short while. The fact is, it's already happening.

One of the most hopeful signs we see of the qualitative change in economic opportunity is the emergence of Black Capitalism. Admittedly, it is not "the answer," for there is no single answer, but it is a movement that deserves all the encouragement and help we can give it. The phenomenon is important not merely for its symbolic value for the black community; Negro-owned and Negro-managed business simply makes sense. We are familiar with a number of these new ventures. Indeed, western electronics executives have played key roles in capitalizing a number of these companies and there are now several company presidents from the ranks of our own engineers. Some of our companies are forming teams of volunteer management consultants to help these firms through their "shakedown" periods and, I might add, one bit of advice they usually give is "avoid reliance on government business."

It is three-and-a-half years now since the Watts riots and one year since the Kerner Commission rendered its report. That is not a long time, but it is long enough for us to form some conclusions on the basis of

our own experience with the urban crisis generally, and the problem of expanding economic opportunity specifically.

First, we have found that, despite flaws in their education and years of forced idleness, the people of the ghetto can be trained to do exacting, precision work in our plants. Further, with thoughtful attention to the special problems they must contend with during the early period of their employment, they do in time perform very well indeed.

Second, although we must train and absorb all the people we can now, we must be wary of repeating the "one step forward, two steps backward" routine of the past. As we look into 1969, we find that sales projections for western electronics indicate very little growth, and we don't expect to have as many new jobs as we did in 1968 when our employment grew by only 1%. It would be disastrous to buoy the hopes of people by training them for jobs that don't exist.

Finally, we believe that new approaches to urban problems must take precedence—creative, imaginative ideas must be put forward and tested by the standard of what they will do to bring about fundamental change.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, who is well known for his research into the black ghetto, has said:

"Business and industry are our last hope. They are the most realistic elements of our society. Other areas in our society—government, education, churches, labor—have defaulted in dealing with the Negro problem. It is now up to business."

I am not sure but what Professor Clark gives us more credit than we deserve. While it is true that industry provides more than two-thirds of the jobs in this country, it does not follow that dependence on the business community's ability to solve urban problems, to the exclusion of other sectors of society, is realistic or sensible. In truth, we do look to government to provide leadership, mobilize public opinion and marshal resources to deal with this crisis as it has with others.

No useful purpose is served by asserting that industry, infused with evangelical fervor, can single-handedly cope with America's greatest crisis since the Civil War. But industry, in partnership with government, can help mightily to find the solid, economic approaches that will bring about solutions in all areas of the nation's unfinished business.

#### THE AMERICAN LEGION

### HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, quite recently, on March 11 to be exact, this body adopted House Resolution 302 commending the American Legion on its 50th anniversary. Because of my close association with the American Legion, I was gratified by this display of affection for a great American institution.

We all know that the Legion earned its reputation as a result of the dedicated efforts of millions of loyal, patriotic citizens organized in local community posts throughout the Nation. As an example of this dedication to God and country, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this body an editorial from the Delaware Republican-Express, Delhi, N.Y., concerning the Donald W. Gleason Post of the Legion in Delhi:

#### AMERICAN LEGION—GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

"Fifty years of 100 per cent Americanism—a Commitment to Freedom," is the theme adopted by the 2,600,000 members of the American Legion as they observe the 50th year of organization.

American Legion national commander, William C. Doyle, explains the meaning of the theme as "a reasoned approach and concern with major problems which confront America; an earnest effort to seek sound solutions within the framework of the law; a love of country and respect for its institutions; respect for the rights of others; concern for the freedoms of men, as God-given rights, but a recognition that every right carries its own responsibilities."

These are basic generalities which the American Legion in every community is charged to translate into service within local boundaries. Whatever needs doing to improve social and economic life, provide better schools, and local government are opportunities for legion concern.

Donald W. Gleason Post of the American Legion, Delhi, is a leader in projects for community improvement. The pavilion which it plans to erect at Legion Park this spring, is a recent example of its concern for community well-being.

To legion members and their commander, Richard E. Wickham, we, as a community and small segment of the America we love and revere, express appreciation for the sacrifices and devotion extended in our behalf.

#### ESPERANTO: INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

### HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, a new worldwide language is being developed called Esperanto. Actually the language was first created by a Polish physician in 1887. Recently an article on the subject appeared in the Gallup Independent. Mrs. James Stone, of Gallup, N. Mex., informed me that the national office of the Esperanto League for North America was so impressed with the news story by Mrs. Martha Zollinger that they requested I bring this story to your attention.

The story follows:

#### JET-AGE LANGUAGE SHOWN IN VIP WINDOW AT PAPER

A language for the jet age, Esperanto, will celebrate its formation during International friendship week, Feb. 16-22. In connection with this, the VIP window at the Gallup Independent will feature Esperanto articles belonging to Mrs. James Stone, 504 N. Fifth. "Breakfast in New York, lunch in London, dinner in Rome" has become commonplace to many travelers. European television comes to us live via satellite. The crust of isolation that used to shield Americans from overseas contacts has been broken. Esperanto, the international language, is becoming a necessity.

Mr. and Mrs. James Stone and Mr. and Mrs. Richard Feeney have started an Esperanto Club in Gallup. Anyone who is interested in becoming a member may contact them at 863-5023 or 863-9235.

The time-worn cliché that "wherever you go, people speak English" just is not true. Less than 10 per cent of the world's people speak it. Esperanto, an international language, was created by Dr. Ludwig Samenhof, a Polish physician, in 1887. It has been found easy to learn, is politically neutral and is a great practical value in everyday use.

The spelling is based on the phoenic principle of one letter, one sound. Consequently, the pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary are easy. There are only 16 rules with no exceptions or irregular verbs.

Esperanto is not the property of any one nation, it has no historical or political implications to hinder its acceptance. As one of the new countries to join the United Nations stated regarding the use of English as the international language, "It is humiliating for the small nations to be obliged to learn the language of the larger ones. Only a neutral language like Esperanto can eliminate that cultural dependency."

One of the most important reasons for the success of Esperanto is that it offers exceptional practical advantages:

The Universal Esperanto Association, with headquarters in Rotterdam, maintains a network of over 3,000 representatives in 65 countries, sponsors many international activities, and issues a Yearbook which gives the addresses of its representatives and information on current international activities. There are more than a dozen international professional associations of, for example, teachers, scientists, journalists, doctors, lawyers, etc., which sponsor meetings, publish journals, and otherwise promote the technical use of Esperanto. Other international organizations serve the interests of esperantists who share the same religious affiliations—Catholics, Protestants, Quakers, Buddhists, etc.—or the same hobbies, such as stamp collecting or chess.

The traveller who knows Esperanto is not confined to talking with hotel clerks, cab drivers, waiters, guides and travel agents. By writing to the Esperanto representative in each place he visits, he can be sure of being met and helped. Wherever he goes, he knows he will find friends who speak the same language and share his interests. He will meet and talk to the people of the country, instead of merely looking at its monuments. At international meetings where Esperanto is used, he can be sure of clear and animated discussions, free of earphones and interpreters, as well as much friendly conversation in corridors, lobbies, and nearby cafes.

Many esperantists get to know other countries and their peoples without ever leaving home. Books and magazines in Esperanto bring the news and culture of other countries to your door.

The value of Esperanto for international relations and the rapprochement of peoples was recognized by the General Conference of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) in a resolution passed in 1954. This came as a result of a world-wide petition, with signatures representing more than 16 million people, asking the UN to encourage the spread of Esperanto throughout the world. UNESCO has maintained a consultative relationship with the Universal Esperanto Association ever since 1954.

Mrs. Stone's parents were immigrants who spoke Yiddish and lived in the French section of a city in Vermont. When they wanted to communicate, with townspeople, translator speaking French, English and Yiddish was needed. It was frustrating, states Mrs. Stone, so she eagerly contacted a group in Boston when she was 15 years old and read about the Esperanto activities in a local newspaper. She became a member of that group and has been speaking Esperanto ever since.

Mrs. Stone has been asked to translate literature for several thousand delegates to use at the Universal Esperanto Congress when it meets in Portland, Oregon, in 1972. She is also helping update the multivolume Esperanto encyclopedia and has been instrumental in disseminating information about the southwest Indian culture to European peoples.

Among Mrs. Stone's personal advantages coming from the use of Esperanto are the following: Giving hospitality to visiting Esperanto members (she is listed in a universal address book as the Gallup representative); a Hungarian doll as a wedding gift from a couple in Budapest that she met through correspondence; a tapestry purse from Yukiko Isobe, who lives in Japan, and visited in Gallup about three years ago; meeting a prophet of the Bahai religion when he came to Gallup; being a cultural link around the world when traveling and using Esperanto; and similar experiences.

A baby's life is also credited to Esperanto. Mrs. Stone was corresponding with the baby's father who lives in an isolated section of Brazil. The man told of his daughter's sickness and stated he did not know what to do. Mrs. Stone translated the Esperanto into English and told her physician about the circumstances. It was a routine matter for the American doctor who prescribed medicine which eventually saved the child's life.

Among articles displayed in the window will be literature concerning the religion, science, travel and people living in many of the countries where Esperanto is spoken. Also included is a copy of "The Prophet" by Gibran which was translated by Mrs. Stone from English into Esperanto. The book is now a best seller in language circles.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today with much sadness, I join the rest of my very distinguished colleagues in eulogizing our very beloved late President, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. Like many in this House of Representatives, I well recall the grim days of June 1944 when he led our allied forces through D-Day to victory. He became a symbol then of courage, tenacity, and a symbol of our freedom and our desire for the freedom of man in a world that had been too long held under the Fascist and Nazi heel. I know others here today remember those days while free nations of the world held their breath—and I may add these were not "simpler, easier times."

General Eisenhower later served with great distinction under President Truman as Director of SHAPE to keep the peace in Europe where it had been so painfully won. Those of us who recognize the inherent difficulties of working not only with people but with crowned heads, generals, and sovereign nations, give a special salute to General Eisenhower for his ability to deftly weave together from rather frayed threads a fabric that has become enduring. From some newspaper accounts, one might get the impression that courage, duty and honor today have become old-fashioned. I am glad that Dwight David Eisenhower never felt this way.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I am proud to salute a courageous soldier, a calm politician, and a President of all Americans. To his wife and family, my deepest sympathy.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER,  
1890-1969

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower, general of the Army, President of the United States, is gone, and with him goes a small part of each of us. His career as one of this country's great leaders spanned both the tragedies of war and the challenges of peace. The continuing pageant of history calls upon few men to bear the awesome responsibilities for the fortunes of both men and nations. General Eisenhower was among these few, not only as a defender of his country at war but, ultimately, of the free world at peace. His experience in battle—the violence, the destruction, above all the intimacy with the pain and suffering of death—led him not to the belligerency of a warlord but, rather, to a deep and lasting commitment to peace. For this, above all, he will be remembered.

An origin of simple but strongly principled beginnings propelled Dwight Eisenhower to the highest levels of military and civilian leadership. Often he described his boyhood home as a place of quiet tranquillity where the realities of an increasingly complex world seemed vague and distant. The values he held were not the compromising, coldly reasoned values of the intellectually cynical or the easily rationalized, unthinking values of the morally expedient. They were, instead, the basic human values which touch the heart of man's continuing effort to learn to live with his fellows in peace and security. It was his firm belief in and knowledge of what life could be and ought to be which sustained him through the infinitely complex and pressured trials that marked so much of his public career.

It can truly be said of General Eisenhower that he loved, above all, this country and his fellow man. In a world increasingly marked by cynicism and mistrust of established values, he maintained a remarkable example of principle, understanding, and warm humor. He cautioned his countrymen against indulging in self-satisfaction because of our successes during and since World War II. The demanding responsibilities of world leadership, he warned, and, especially, the maintenance of peace and freedom must summon the best that is in us.

He recognized also the serious implications of the intricate, new partnership between our vast military establishment and the modern industries which sustain it, saying that this situation was new to the American experience and warrants our attentive concern. His overriding desire for peace once led him to remark that, as a military man, he would like nothing better than to see the necessity for his own job eliminated. He viewed war not as the expedient tool of politics, but as the tragic social phenomenon of mankind.

So we bid farewell to this good and decent man who served us both as a great leader and a warm friend. May he find now the enduring peace and brotherhood which eluded his countrymen and himself for so many of his years; let us hope that the qualities he exemplified and the virtues he defended will guide our efforts to live together in peace and freedom throughout this troubled world which General Eisenhower has now departed.

CHEAP IMPORTS CLOSE ANOTHER  
SHOE FACTORY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to bring to the attention of the membership of this body the continuing threat which faces the domestic footwear industry in the United States because of the influx of cheaply produced foreign footwear which somehow enjoys an unfair edge over domestic production because of imbalance in import quotas.

A few days ago, I pointed out the necessity for immediate action to counterbalance this deteriorating situation. It is questionable how long our footwear industry can stand up to these imports. Today I read an answer, in part, to that question.

The following article from the March 29, 1969, edition of Foster's Daily Democrat, a newspaper in Dover, N.H., points out vividly the destructive course we are allowing by inaction to continue. The paper reports that the Newmarket branch of the Pittsfield Shoe Co. has been closed—shut down without any indication that it will ever reopen. As a result, 250 persons have been displaced in their livelihood. This in a community of only some 3,200 to 3,500 persons is a sad situation.

The company, a manufacturer of lady's dress shoes, has found that their customers are filling almost 40 percent of requirements in Europe where the end product is cheaper because labor costs are much less than in New Hampshire. And, Mr. Speaker, the cost of labor in New Hampshire is well down on the national scale of wage rate averages. The effect of this is obvious, and the reason is explicit.

This Congress has an obligation to effect relief to the shoe industry in this situation. We should take action before remedial action cannot be taken. We should protect the industry before there is no industry left to protect.

I again urge consideration of H.R. 7696 as a constructive step toward the promotion of equitable competition in this field.

The article mentioned above follows:  
PITTSFIELD SHOE CO. CLOSES IN NEWMARKET  
NEWMARKET.—Pittsfield Shoe Company of Pittsfield, N.H., closed the firm's Newmarket branch today, but will maintain its warehouse and office in this town.  
The firm was operating one shift in the Newmarket plant and had about 250 persons employed here.

Arthur Hirschberg, executive vice president, reports that the reason for the closing is the competition from imported shoes. The firm makes a lady's dress shoe and according to Hirschberg, their customers for this type of shoe are "filling 30 to 40 per cent of their requirements in Europe."

Hirschberg says that as far as can be foreseen the closing is permanent, that no further operation in Newmarket can be anticipated at this time. He states that the firm will absorb as many of its Newmarket workers as possible in the main plant in Pittsfield.

#### THE NEED FOR REGIONAL WATER PLANNING BETWEEN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND THE PACIFIC SOUTHWEST

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, within the past 10 days I have called to the attention of my colleagues a significant article in the U.S. News & World Report and an important economic study of the 11 conterminous Western States.

It will be seen upon reading both that the story in the March 31 issue of U.S. News & World Report—"As Floods Threaten in the United States, the Colorado Runs Low"—and the so-called McCann Report—"Economic Interdependence of the Western States"—have some very definite interconnection.

While the magazine story expertly describes the water supply problem of the seven Colorado River Basin States, the McCann report furnishes extensive evidence why the 11 Western States, the water-rich Pacific Northwest and the water-short Pacific Southwest, should approach their problems with a common viewpoint.

The reason why the Southwest States are facing such a serious water supply dilemma is underscored in a companion article in the same issue of U.S. News & World Report. Citing the latest census estimates on the Nation's "Fastest Growing Cities," the article shows that five of the first 13 areas experiencing the most rapid growth are in California.

In introducing the McCann report to fellow Members I dwelt in the main on its general conclusions and findings, detailing the overall economic interdependence of the two principal western regions. Today, I would like to show the relationship enjoyed by just one Northwest State, Washington, with the Colorado River Basin States. I draw my remarks from a press release issued in connection with the public disclosure of the study:

Washington's economic ties with the seven-State Colorado River Basin region are perhaps greater than any of the other three Pacific Northwest States.

Apples, beer, butter, and insurance are just a few of the commodities and services which Washington-based firms market in the Pacific Southwest and Rocky Mountain area.

Conducted by an independent Los Angeles economic consultant, Wilbur McCann, the report was published by the

Colorado River Association of California. Details were discussed at a luncheon meeting of the Portland Chamber of Commerce by Philip F. Walsh, vice president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Drawn from official Federal and State agencies, the report reveals that:

The latest available figures from the Interstate Commerce Commission—1962—shows that 27 percent of the 82 million tons of commodities shipped out of Washington that year went to the Colorado River Basin States. In toto, about 39 million tons went to other Western States.

During 1966, Washington apple shipments to just California totaled some 4.8 million bushels. In fact, Los Angeles consumes more Washington apples than Chicago, New York, and Detroit combined.

The second favorite beer in the 3 million household Los Angeles-Orange County region is that sold by the Olympia Brewing Co., of Tumwater, Wash.

Washington provided 1,825,000 pounds of butter for Los Angeles housewives in 1966.

Twelve Washington-domiciled insurance companies sold or earned premiums in California alone, in 1965, of some \$84.5 million; that figure represented 30.7 percent of those companies' total business.

California depends almost entirely on the West for its supplies of sheep and lambs and Washington shipped 13,000 head in 1966. Total livestock shipments, including beef and dairy cattle, from Washington total about 21,000 head in that year.

In 1966, the Seattle-Tacoma airport reported more than 2 million non-Washington air passengers and 998,400—or 49 percent—of these were going or coming from points within the Colorado River States.

And then there is the outstanding current example of interregional exchange—the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie, which allows for the interchange of surplus electrical energy between the two areas. The Bonneville Power Administration estimates that its net revenues will increase by as much as \$20 million a year through its intertie arrangement with the Southwest.

#### AN APPEAL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that I and five of my New York congressional colleagues have asked the President to press the Soviet Union immediately to fulfill its commitment and allow Russian Jews to be reunited with their families in other nations.

I ask all of you to join us on this mission of mercy to free the 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union who are being deprived of the basic legal right of repatriation. It is a right that has been affirmed

and reaffirmed under international law, by the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the World Court.

The Declaration of Human Rights incorporated into the charter of the United Nations guarantees the free choice of national domicile and the unrestricted freedom of movement to all people. The Soviet Union is a signatory to that document and is legally and morally obligated to honor it.

The International League for Repatriation of Russian Jews has provided me with a copy of a letter that was smuggled out of the Soviet Union by the Jewish Youth Committee of Russia, an underground group. The letter is a shocking exhibit which states that the aim of the Soviet government is to "liquidate" Jews in Russia.

The letter states that "the Soviet Government's entire attitude toward Jews is built from beginning to end upon the aim to liquidate our people, to dissolve it in the huge mass, to destroy it."

The letter emphasizes that "only due to our instinctive national resistance to the brutal anti-Semitism of the Bolshevik powers were we saved from national annihilation up to this day."

This letter—dated March 1969—expresses the strong desire of Russian Jewry to leave the Soviet Union and contains a fervent appeal to the free world for help.

The letter offers conclusive proof that Russian Jews are living in virtual slavery and fear cultural extinction.

On December 3, 1966, Soviet Premier Kosygin made this statement:

For those who want to leave the Soviet Union the door is open. If there are some families divided by war, who want to meet their relatives outside the U.S.S.R. or even to leave the U.S.S.R., we shall do all in our power to help them.

The Soviet Government, however, has failed to keep this pledge and has taken no action to expedite the many requests for visas. Justice and decency demand that the Soviet Union open the door to the emigration of those many thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to be reunited with families living in the United States, Israel, and elsewhere—families that were shattered in the ghettos and extermination camps of the Nazi era.

In the past, as president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, an organization of 80,000 Americans of Italian origin, I have spoken out about the plight of Soviet Jews, and I will continue to do everything within my power to alleviate the terrible burden that these people are enduring.

It is my hope that everyone in responsible positions—both in and out of Government—join in this mission of mercy for the repatriation of Soviet Jews.

#### EMERGENCY IN THE COURTS

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, recently we were reminded by the Honorable Earl

Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, of the distress experienced by the Federal courts because of a shortage of judges, prosecuting attorneys, probation officers, legal clerks, and administrative operating funds and even messengers. The Chief Justice, who, incidentally, is one of my most distinguished constituents, made his evaluation in a speech to the District Bar Association, and stressed how seriously the delay in court action undermines justice and the confidence of the public in their courts.

Congress must face the responsibility it shares in contributing to this distressing situation. Appropriations for the entire judiciary lag behind even those of the FBI and the CIA. The time between indictment and trial can be shortened only if the courts are adequately funded. This is our job in the Congress. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I pledge my support to this endeavor. For those of my colleagues who are in doubt on the necessity of this effort, I commend a review of several recent articles in the popular press.

The distinguished jurist, the Honorable J. Skelly Wright, Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in a stirring reminder of how unfairly justice is meted to the poor of our own Capitol City, underscores Chief Justice Warren's complaint.

And the able young columnist, Mr. William Raspberry, bears further witness to our courts' inadequacies in a recent column in the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial comment on Chief Justice Warren's speech—which was delivered extemporaneously so is not available in its entirety—Judge Wright's article, and Mr. Raspberry's column, with an earnest request that my colleagues in Congress give them the careful attention they so richly deserve:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Mar. 18, 1969]

#### EMERGENCY IN THE COURTS

We are glad that Chief Justice Warren spoke candidly about congressional neglect of the courts even though he is not yet in retirement, as he thought he would be when he consented to address the District Bar Association. In a very direct sense the Federal courts are at the mercy of Congress. Unless Congress appropriates ample funds to keep them functioning efficiently, the quality of justice is unavoidably impaired, and the courts can do little about it.

The Chief Justice noted that the caseload of the Supreme Court has increased 2½ times in the last 16 years, but not more than five or ten employees have been added to the Court's staff during those years. Many specific requests for additional personnel in the courts have been ignored, while numerous executive agencies have proliferated.

The relationship between this lag in supplying judicial needs and the rising crime rates is unmistakable. A shortage of judges, prosecuting attorneys, legal clerks, probation officers and so forth creates a backlog of stale cases and undermines the confidence of people in the law. Congress seldom authorizes the creation of new judgeships until a desperate situation has developed, and then it takes months to get the law passed and more months to get qualified judges appointed and confirmed.

Last January the President sent a message to Congress asking for the creation of 10 more judgeships in the courts of the District of Columbia as an integral part of the war on crime here. Fortunately, bills for relief of

the local courts have been introduced in both houses, and hearings are anticipated soon. But it would be surprising indeed, if any judges are ready to sit under this legislation before October.

Congress cannot, of course, act on the spur of the moment. But the present delay of 12 months between indictments and jury trials in the District Court here should never have been permitted to develop before remedial action was initiated. Chief Justice Warren has merely brought to public attention a critical deficiency in our judicial system that has been the subject of many complaints in the past. In Washington as in many other cities the problem has now assumed emergency proportions.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Mar. 21, 1969]

#### STUDY OF CIVIL COURTS SHOWS THEY ALSO REQUIRE REFORM

(By William Raspberry)

There has been a good deal of discussion in recent months over the ways to strengthen reform and speed up the court system.

That most of the talk has been about criminal courts is not very surprising in light of what may be the first genuine "crime wave" in recent memory. But the emphasis on criminal court problems has all but eclipsed the need for reform of our civil courts, particularly as they involve the poor.

Two things, primarily, are wrong with the civil courts. The first is how they function. Landlord and tenants courts, for example, too often act as agents for the landlords. Small Claims courts are frequently little more than collection agencies for businesses.

Sit through a few hours at one of these courts; the impression is of speed, but hardly of justice. Lawyers representing businessmen regularly win judgments against the bewildered, intimidated "little people" who account for a good deal of the court's business.

The "little people" who believe the landlord to be in the right, or the alleged debt to be just, usually don't bother to show up. Those who do come to court often think they have a good case. Too often they leave the courtroom as losers but without any feeling that justice has been done.

This is the first target of reform. A second is discussed by Thomas E. Willging, law professor at the University of Toledo, in the current issue of the Georgetown Law Journal. Willging deals with the "heavy financial barriers" between poor litigants and justice.

He notes the constitutional guarantee of free access to civil courts for all citizens but charges that for poor people, justice may be "sold at a prohibitive price."

For not only are poor people frightened of the court system, which they view as rigged against them; the unsuccessful litigant, as the poor man is likely to be, faces loss of time and money as well, since judgments often include court costs.

Willging goes so far as to say that the summer riots of the past few years "can be construed as violent petitions for redress of grievances" made necessary by society's failure to provide the machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes.

He suggested a number of ways to encourage poor people to make wider use of the civil courts.

He would eliminate "court costs" entirely, letting the government pay for clerical and judicial personnel the same way it pays for police or garbage-collection service.

The services of Landlord-Tenant and Domestic Relations courts would be free.

He would end payments by litigants for services provided by marshals, sheriffs, court reporters and stenographers by bringing these services within the court system. "These are necessary services," he said, and "should in no way depend on a personal or economic relationship with the litigant."

Willging would also provide, without cost to the litigant, such things as expert witnesses, property appraisals and blood tests (in paternity cases).

He is less conclusive, however, with what is perhaps the major barrier between poor people and justice: expert legal counsel. He notes that while adequate counsel is a necessity for successful litigation, our efforts to provide good counsel for poor people have not worked very well.

Willging proposes the establishment of a national commission to study this problem, considering such alternatives as a "judicare" system, based on the British Legal Aid plan, or simply imposing the costs of litigation on the losing party, with the government paying if the loser cannot.

Solutions, however, may turn out to be the easy part. The more difficult task is to get across to the public just how unjust our system of justice can be for ordinary folk and to sell our leaders on the importance of doing something about it.

If they thought court reform would prevent riots, they'd reform them tomorrow.

[From the New York Times Magazine]

#### THE COURTS HAVE FAILED THE POOR

(By J. Skelly Wright)

The twin problems of racism and poverty have converged in our society to become the problem of the inner city itself. Where once our cities were cultural meccas, they are now miserable slums. Where once the immigrants to our cities came from abroad with hopes for a better, happier life, now they come from the South, despairing if not desperate. And after they arrive they find no escape from the cycle of poor health, substandard housing, disoriented family relationships, interrupted schooling and joblessness. There are 35 million hard-core poor who, in the richest nation the world has ever known, earn less than \$3,000 a year, the income level defined by the Federal Government as constituting poverty by American standards. And, particularly in the inner city, a vastly disproportionate number of the poor are Negroes; in addition to the misery of poverty, they must bear the psychic brunt of the white racism that is eating away our society.

Ignorance, discrimination, slums, poverty, disease and unemployment—these are the conditions that breed despair and violence. Is it any wonder that our cities, once melting pots, are now powder kegs? The causes of these conditions are too many and varied for condensation here. I shall discuss only one aspect of the general problem: how the law and the courts have failed the inner-city poor.

The words inscribed over the entrance of the Supreme Court Building in Washington are "Equal Justice Under Law." And surely one of the proudest boasts of American lawyers is that all men stand equal before the law. But too much of that equality turns out, upon analysis, to be of the sort that prompted Anatole France's sarcastic remark: "The law, in all its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges on rainy nights, to beg on the streets and to steal bread."

The point is simply that a law may be consistently and evenly applied, yet systematically work a hardship on a particular class. In our society, the law has worked a hardship on those least able to withstand it. Rather than helping the poor surmount their poverty, the law has all too frequently served to perpetuate and even exacerbate their despair and helplessness. And now we are reaping as we have sown. The civil disorders which have racked our cities demonstrate an alarmingly widespread disrespect for law among those ghettoized in the inner city.

But if the law is to gain respect, it like everything else, must earn respect. This it has not done. While to us, in the words of former Attorney General Nicholas deB.

Katzenbach, "laws and regulations are protections and guides, established for our benefit and for us to use," to the poor they are "a hostile maze, established as harassment, at all costs to be avoided." As Senator Robert Kennedy put it, the "poor man looks upon the law as an enemy . . . For him the law is always taking something away."

At first glance this may seem strange or even mistaken. Has not our Supreme Court made great strides in equalizing the rights of rich and poor? After all, in the landmark case *Gideon v. Wainwright* it announced that in all felony trials the indigent defendant has the right to free legal counsel. And more recently, in *Miranda v. Arizona*, the Court has tried to assure equal justice at the station house as well as in the courtroom by requiring the police to warn a suspect of his right to free counsel before interrogating him.

Though these decisions are certainly legal milestones, they bear on only an infinitesimal percentage of those instances in which the inner-city slum dweller confronts the police and the criminal law process. *Gideon* assures the right to assigned counsel only in felony cases—those that may result in a sentence of more than one year in prison. And *Miranda* cannot stop abusive treatment by the police. All the Court can do is overturn convictions if proper and humane procedures have not been followed. It cannot assure that these procedures will be followed in the thousands of investigations of innocent people that never reach court. Ironically, then, those subject to the indignity of illegal search, harassing arrest or police brutality gain nothing from the Supreme Court's decisions unless they are found guilty.

Nor can the Court do very much about the inner-city residents' other major complaint about the police—that they do not provide adequate protection. The Court cannot undertake to assign policemen to different sections of a city. This is the function of the city government and of the police department itself. But the evidence bears out the observation that frequently more policemen than necessary are assigned to the wealthy parts of a city, where the crime rate is low, while relatively fewer are assigned to the ghetto areas, where the crime rate is much higher. Could it be that we regard an assault as more serious when it is perpetrated on one of "us" than on one of "them"?

There are other areas where the local criminal courts can play a positive role but have failed miserably. I am referring to the magistrate and police courts, which, as their names imply, frequently serve as virtual arms of the police department, dispensing their own brand of justice wholesale. For example, a study of the magistrate's court in a large Eastern city said that, in 13 minutes on the morning after a local newspaper ran an editorial under the title "Get Bums Off Street and Into Prison Cells," 60 persons were tried and convicted of vagrancy by a single magistrate. In several cases, a defendant was committed after the magistrate simply called his name, looked at him and pronounced sentence—usually three months in the city jail.

Despite the presumption of innocence, the defendant in these police and magistrate courts is, *prima facie*, guilty. The burden is placed upon him to give a satisfactory answer to the question, "What have you got to say for yourself?" He is almost always uncounseled and sometimes he is not even informed of the charges against him until after the so-called trial. Often no records are kept of the proceedings, and in the overwhelming majority of cases these courts are, in practice, courts of last resort. The careful provisions for appeal, certiorari and habeas corpus, which look so fair in the statute books, are almost a dead letter as far as indigent misdemeanor defendants are concerned. Thus, according to Prof. Caleb Foote of the University of California at Berkeley,

the "magistrate is given an almost unchecked opportunity for arbitrary oppression or careless cruelty."

And of course these police courts—not the Federal or state courts—are those with which the poor are most likely to come into contact. Consequently, it is these courts that form the image the poor will have of our system of criminal justice. This is why the criminal law is perceived by the poor not as protection for life and property, but as the establishment's tool of oppression, designed to keep them shackled to their poverty and imprisoned in the inner city. The vagrancy and public-drunkenness laws serve primarily the aesthetic function of removing from the sight of the establishment the wretchedly poor, whose condition we do nothing about but cannot bear to see. As one study points out, the only reason for many vagrancy arrests is apparently that "the appearance of the victims was not attractive."

It is in these police courts that those accused of the crimes most often associated with poverty—vagrancy, disorderly conduct and public drunkenness, the modern counterparts of sleeping under bridges or begging on the streets—are tried. In essence, these laws and the courts that administer them have made it virtually a crime to be poor in public; and to make the condition of poverty criminal is not simply uncivilized, it is also futile and self-defeating. Instead of trying to find the vagrant a means of support, we brand him a criminal, throw him in jail, then release him. His criminal record makes it even more difficult for him to find a job, and he soon winds up in jail again. The cycle of oppression continues.

Moreover, it is not only on the criminal side that the law as it bears on the poor man is foolish and self-defeating. If anything, the cards are even more formidably stacked against him in our petty civil courts. To begin with, where property rather than liberty is at stake, the indigent, under prevailing legal doctrine, has no right to a lawyer and consequently is likely to go unrepresented. Even the indigent fortunate enough to have a lawyer and win his lawsuit will be the loser in many cases because his legal fees will swallow up his modest recovery.

The concerns of the poor do not reflect this sharp distinction between civil and criminal litigation on the right to counsel. Poverty only magnifies the importance of protecting one's meager property from seizure by legal process.

A case that the Supreme Court recently declined to review provides an example of the indigent's problem. Matias and Teresa Sandoval, a poor and illiterate Mexican-American couple in Texas, were sued by a mortgage holder and lost the two-room house in which they and their nine children had lived since 1945. Two weeks before the trial, their lawyer withdrew because they could not pay his fee. They sought help from the county legal aid attorney, who apparently did not attempt to confer with them because he spoke only English and they spoke only Spanish. The lawyer never discovered that the so-called deed on which the plaintiff had based his claim to the Sandovals' land was in fact only a mortgage, which could not confer title under Texas law. If they had had a conscientious lawyer, the Sandovals might not have lost their home.

To ameliorate the indigent's lack of counsel, many states have established special tribunals, commonly termed small-claims courts, to enable the poor to prosecute and defend minor claims—generally for not more than \$200 or \$300—without counsel and at minimal cost. Rules of evidence and procedure are informal and filing fees are nominal. But the promise of the small-claims courts has not been fulfilled, for in actual operation there is little correspondence between the professed aims of these courts and the ends they serve. Those who have studied them have observed that they are primarily

used, not by the poor, but by business organizations seeking to collect debts. A number of these organizations handle such a large volume of claims that they have established collection departments which make routine use of the courts. Thus it is primarily the businessman, not the poor man, who reaps the advantage of the inexpensive and speedy small-claims courts.

Why has the initial purpose of these tribunals been subverted? Primarily because business concerns are aware of their rights and the poor are not. Consequently, the poor are usually the defendants, rather than the plaintiffs, in small-claims courts. The poor lack the security and capacity to assert their rights, even when they recognize the rights. Indeed, most low-income consumers are unaware of the existence of the small-claims court. They simply do not think in terms of invoking legal processes on their side. They have no confidence in courts. Where the low-income consumer is irate enough to take action, he is likely to stop payment as a form of retaliation and thereby worsen his position. Finally, the poor are essentially unorganized and therefore lack the unity required to exert the sort of political pressure that would force these courts to remain true to their principles.

A recent Federal Trade Commission report concerning the practices of District of Columbia retailers bears out the observation that small-claims courts have become virtual collection agencies. The report noted the frequency with which the small group of retailers catering to the poor utilized the courts to enforce their claims under installment contracts. In 1966, 11 ghetto retailers reported 2,690 court judgments, one for every \$2,200 of sales. The report concluded that, while retailers generally may take legal action against delinquent customers only as a last resort, many of those who cater to the poor depend on such action as a normal order of business. And in many instances sales are made pursuant to unconscionable installment contracts with the expectation and hope that the goods sold will be repossessed so they can be resold.

Even where the small-claims courts have not been captured by business interests, the poor person is likely to be victimized by prevailing legal doctrines, which our judges have been unduly reluctant to overhaul.

Consider, for instance, the facts of *Williams v. Walker-Thomas Furniture Company*. Beginning in 1957, Walker-Thomas, a store in Washington, D.C., sold to Mrs. Ora Lee Williams, an indigent mother on relief with seven children, about \$1,800 worth of appliances and furniture. These had been purchased from time to time on installment contracts, and Mrs. Williams had been paying the debts as they became due. Then, in 1962, Mrs. Williams purchased from Walker-Thomas a stereo set with a stated value of \$515. At this time she had paid back all but about \$170 on the \$1,800 owed for goods already purchased. When Walker-Thomas sold her the stereo, they were aware of Mrs. Williams's financial straits, for on the reverse side of the contract of sale the store's manager had noted the name of Mrs. Williams's social worker and the amount of her monthly welfare stipend—\$218—as her credit references. Nevertheless, with full knowledge that Mrs. Williams had to feed, house, clothe and support herself and her seven children on this amount, the store sold her the \$515 stereo set.

But this is not all; when Mrs. Williams failed to make her payments on the stereo, the store did not seek simply to repossess it. It sought to take back all the other appliances it had sold her, most of which she had already paid for! The contracts under which Mrs. Williams had bought all her goods from Walker-Thomas provided, in an obscure, almost unintelligible fine-print provision, that until the balance due on every item had been paid in full, the unpaid balance on a

single item would be distributed among all the previous purchases. In other words, the debt incurred for each item was secured by the right to repossess all the items previously bought by the same purchaser.

Perhaps it was more than coincidence that Walker-Thomas sold Mrs. Williams a stereo just when she was nearing the final payment on all her previous purchases and would then own the goods outright. But even if the sale was no more than happenstance, contracts such as Walker-Thomas's, when foisted on ignorant and helpless customers, are grossly unfair and one-sided and should not be enforced by the courts. Yet both the trial and lower-appellate courts enforced the contract and ordered Mrs. Williams to return all that she had purchased since 1957. The lower courts condemned Walker-Thomas's conduct but felt that they lacked the power to refuse enforcement of the contracts because the legislature had done nothing to protect the unwary public from such one-sided bargains.

Our court reversed. We pointed out that ordinarily one who signs an agreement without full knowledge of its terms might be held to them. But we felt that when a party of little bargaining power, and hence little real choice, signs a grossly unfair and commercially unreasonable contract with little or no knowledge of its terms his consent has not even been implied and the contract should not be enforced. The failure of the legislature to live up to its responsibility was no reason for the courts not to live up to theirs. Yet our opinion in *Williams v. Walker-Thomas* was, shockingly, one of the first to hold that the courts had the power to refuse to enforce such unconscionable contracts.

And Mrs. Williams's path to judicial relief would have been even more difficult if, rather than holding her contract, Walker-Thomas had sold its rights under the agreement to a finance company. For if the finance company, rather than Walker-Thomas, had filed suit, it might have been shielded under the legal doctrine of holder in due course. One judge has termed the doctrine "the mask behind which fraud hides," and this can be an apt description. In most jurisdictions, a financial agency can purchase installment contracts free from responsibility for fraudulent or unconscionable practices perpetrated by dealers; even if the dealer skips town and never delivers the purchased goods, the consumer may be required to pay. To prevail against the finance company, the defendant who has signed a contract waiving defenses against assignees must prove that the company knew that the underlying transaction was fraudulent—a requirement almost impossible to meet.

While the holder-in-due-course doctrine may thwart the defrauded rich man as well as the poor, its effects hit the indigent much harder in many ways. When the working poor man falls behind on his installment payments, the legal machinery, which one commentator has remarked is "geared for, and used for the benefit of, the manufacturer-seller-financier complex," is likely to put him out of work and back on the relief rolls. The recurring pattern has been outlined this way:

Mr. Smith, who can barely afford to feed, house and clothe his family, is persuaded to buy a second-hand car with \$500 down and three years to pay. But because Smith does not have the \$500, the dealer arranges for a loan of that amount from a finance company, which takes Smith's furniture as security. After making payments for several months, Smith finds that he cannot keep them up. Besides, the car may not be running all that well. So he stops making payments. After the dealer writes Smith a few letters, Smith is likely to find one morning that his car is gone. It has not been stolen; the dealer or his agent has legally repossessed it.

But Smith is not off the hook. The dealer,

after the car is resold for less than the balance due, can secure what is known as a deficiency judgment against him. In addition, Smith may still owe the finance company, which may take his furniture and when that is sold, secure a second deficiency judgment.

The lawsuits in which people lose their cars, their furniture and their money and have deficiency judgments taken against them are not likely to come to trial. The overwhelming majority of merchant-initiated suits—97 per cent in the case of Harlem merchants—end in a default judgment for the plaintiff because the defendant never appears or answers the summons or complaint. In many cases, this is because he never receives the summons. A common procedure of process serving has come to be called "sewer service" because, rather than serving the defendant with notice of the action against him, the merchant's process server deposits it in the nearest sewer. Of course, if the defendant is sufficiently wary, informed and resourceful, he will be able to set aside the default judgment because he has not been given adequate notice and the court has not acquired jurisdiction over him. But in the real world, where an indigent defendant is involved, the default judgment is likely to stand. In fact, the purchaser may not even be entitled to notice before judgment, for when making his purchase he may have signed a card authorizing what is known as a "confession of judgment." This card provides that as soon as he misses a monthly payment the unpaid balance becomes immediately due and any attorney or court is empowered to obtain a lien and execution on his property without even notifying him.

Once the creditor has secured his deficiency judgment, he will proceed as quickly as possible to garnishee the debtor's salary. Garnishment, of course, means that the court orders the employer to withhold a certain amount from an employee's earnings—as much as one-half in many states—and turn it over to the creditor to satisfy the judgment. The employee often learns about the judgment when he receives his first diminished paycheck.

The process of wage garnishment has been termed "a modern parallel to debtors' prison." And it is, in many ways, not only as iniquitous, but also as ridiculous and self-defeating as the debtors' prisons were. The employee whose salary is being garnished is not simply going to be taking home less money; he is also likely to find himself without a job. This is because employers find the procedure of withholding employees' wages such a bother that many simply fire the employees. Just as the debtor in prison is not going to be able to pay his debts, neither will the unemployed indigent subject to garnishment be able to get and hold a job. Unless he can discharge his debts in bankruptcy—and for a number of reasons this may be impossible—his salary will again be garnished if he finds other employment. Again the oppressive pattern of joblessness and relief.

There are several things that could be done to break this debtor spiral, but I will mention just one: eliminate wage garnishments altogether. Three states—Florida, Texas and Pennsylvania—have already done just this, and experience shows it has helped not only debt collections but business in general. Moreover, as one commentator concludes, the elimination of wage garnishments would provide "a new kind of security to millions of Americans who live in dread of being fired. They would know that their job was safe from creditors and that the money needed to feed their families [would] be there. The welfare rolls would be reduced by the number of families forced into unemployment because their bosses wanted to eliminate [bookkeeping] expense."

It is not only in his role as consumer that the poor man finds the courts oppressive rather than redemptive. Consider the plight of the indigent tenant. To begin with, his apartment, even though it will probably be rundown, dirty and lacking in adequate services, will not be cheap. The inner-city Negro who is forced by segregation to live in the overcrowded slums may pay as much as middle-class white tenants pay for garden-type apartments in the suburbs. And public housing is not nearly adequate to meet current needs.

Yet there is no effective mechanism for change. In view of the appalling housing shortage in our major cities, slumlords feel little economic pressure to keep their low-income housing repaired and habitable or to rehabilitate badly deteriorated buildings. They are able to make enormous profits, even on unfit and dilapidated units.

And the housing codes have not proved a spur to reform. Where housing inspectors discover violations, the landlord is notified and given a grace period to remedy defects. In a report commissioned by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mrs. Patricia Wald, a former member of the District Crime Commission in Washington, said that in New York "the average wait for cases examined by the building department was almost five months." In the District of Columbia grace periods and extensions may postpone repairs up to a year and a half. If the problem ever reaches the prosecuting authorities, they try what Mrs. Wald calls "friendly collaboration and gentle persuasion," which may delay matters three months more. The ultimate coercive weapon in the District is a sentence of 10 days in jail or a \$300 fine. But in no case has a landlord spent even one day in jail. Though the landlord's crime is far more detrimental to society than a poor man's vagrancy, as a "white collar" criminal he is handled with kid gloves by our courts. The indigent does not fare so well.

Poor tenants, even if they are somehow able to find out where and to whom they should complain, hesitate to do so, for if the landlord finds the source of the complaints "retaliatory evictions" may follow. Slum tenants are usually not protected by a lease, and their tenancies can be terminated in a summary procedure on 30 days' notice without cause. Here, then, is another area where the courts have failed the poor; they have in effect become parties to persecution by aiding the landlord in his retaliatory and antisocial purpose.

A case decided by our court is illustrative. In March, 1965, Mrs. Yvonne Edwards rented an apartment in the District of Columbia. Shortly thereafter she complained to the Department of Licenses and Inspections of sanitary-code violations which her landlord had failed to remedy. The ensuing investigation uncovered more than 40 such violations, which the department ordered the landlord to correct. Instead of fixing them, the landlord told the department to forget about the violations because he was going to evict Mrs. Edwards for making her complaint.

The landlord then gave Mrs. Edwards who did not have a lease, 30 days' notice to vacate the premises. Mrs. Edwards fought the eviction on the ground that the notice to vacate had been in retaliation for her complaints to the housing authorities. The court ruled that evidence of retaliatory motive was irrelevant. It ordered Mrs. Edwards to vacate. The lower appellate court affirmed. As in the Walker-Thomas Furniture Store case, it deplored the plaintiff's actions but felt that the task of protecting indigent tenants seeking to exercise their First Amendment right to speak freely and to petition the government for redress of grievances belonged to the legislature, not the courts.

Our court reversed the judgment of the lower court and for the first time denied a

landlord's right to evict a tenant for invoking the help of housing authorities in having her premises repaired. The fact that this is a landmark case shows that the courts have preyed on the poor. Until now the courts in every jurisdiction have not merely refused to intercede to halt retaliatory evictions, but have actually placed their imprimaturs on such evictions by enforcing them.

And not only when he is evicted will the indigent tenant find the courts of no avail. He will meet with little or no judicial success when he is displaced by the burgeoning urban-renewal programs prevalent in most of our major cities. Here displacement is likely to be on a grand scale. For example, the Detroit Housing Commission Quarterly reported in 1964 that 5,530 families had been uprooted by Detroit's 10 redevelopment projects.

Relocation typically brings no amelioration of the overcrowded living conditions common among the urban poor; in many cases the situation is made worse. Instead of replacing the slums with low-cost public housing which the poor can afford, the projects often lead to the construction of luxury-apartment buildings for the benefit of the affluent. Even worse, the slums may not be replaced with housing units at all; the sites may be used for highways, parking lots or office buildings, again for the benefit of affluent suburban commuters. As a consequence, there is likely to result a substantial rent hike in the remaining slums as low-income housing is bulldozed away.

Yet when, contrary to the promise of the Housing Act of 1949, the slum dweller is threatened with permanent displacement and turns to the courts for help, he is likely to be rejected without even a hearing. His remedies in the state courts are agreed to be inadequate and, to date, the Federal courts have denied the private citizen the right to enforce the relocation requirements of the Housing Act. It is now past time for the courts to begin to hear these cases. Newark and New Haven—two cities which have large urban-renewal programs—were among those hit by ghetto riots last summer. In both, urban-renewal projects have been cited as factors contributing to the frustration and outrage which finally exploded.

Under these circumstances, judicial review could serve a valuable and creative function. Today most cities have the resources to continue redevelopment and honor our national promise of relocation. Judicial review would assure that the resources were in fact used for rehousing to the fullest extent possible. Where such resources are not available, judicial review would force into the open the contradictions within the program. "By enjoining displacement where adequate rehousing was not available," said a recent article in the Yale Law Journal, "the courts not only would be supporting a sound public policy, but also would be generating pressures that could lead to a legislative solution."

The last area I shall discuss in which the courts have failed the poor is welfare. For too long our welfare programs have embodied the degrading theory that welfare is a form of charity and that dependency is the fault of the individual. Welfare recipients are watched with suspicion and their use of welfare money is hedged with limitations. There are frequent investigations to prevent the misuse of public funds. "In their zeal," says Prof. Charles Reich of Yale, "public agencies have claimed and exercised the privilege of entering recipients' homes at any hour of the day or night—the law literally pursues recipients into the bedroom." There is an insistence that, because a man is on welfare, the authorities have a right to concern themselves with his family's affairs and morality. But as Professor Reich has pointed out, "such invidious laws and the general pattern of bureaucratic supervision, investi-

gation and control conspire to increase dependency by preventing those who need welfare from leading normal lives or achieving independence and self-esteem." The program is self-defeating in that its effect is too often to destroy rather than restore the dignity of the recipient.

Now a new philosophy of social welfare is struggling for acceptance in this country. This modern school of thought considers dependency a condition ordinarily beyond the control of the individual and seeks to establish the status of welfare benefits as rights, based on the notion that everyone is entitled to a share of the common wealth. This conception of welfare seems justified in view of all the others in our society who receive government subsidies and largess, not as a matter of privilege or charity but as a matter of entitlement. For example, the transportation industry is dependent on public assistance; airlines are subsidized on short hauls; shipping is directly subsidized and indirectly aided by laws favoring American-flag vessels; trucking is aided by public roads. Second-class mail rates are essentially a subsidy to the magazine industry. Homeowners are given many types of financial guarantees and assistance, while farmers have been beneficiaries of public-assistance programs for many years. Other subsidies are less obvious. Docks and airports are supplied to the shipping and airline industries at public expense; channels of the radio and television spectrum are given without charge to the broadcast industry. Intellectual activity, especially scientific research, is also subsidized. Perhaps the biggest subsidies of all are some of our tax exemptions.

Despite the pervasiveness of public assistance throughout our economy, only the welfare recipient is singled out for special, degrading supervision and control. When a farmer receives Government subsidies, the payments are not presented as relief but as an attempt to restore an imaginary balance in the economy, thrown out of kilter by large anonymous forces depressing agricultural prices. In some instances the payments are made to appear as "transactions" in which the Government has purchased commodities from the farmer. Once payments pass to the farmer, they cease to be public funds whose use the Government is entitled to investigate and supervise. The farmer's private life remains his own. Thus in broad outline the payments are designed to preserve the farmer's self-esteem and independence. Throughout our economy, business subsidies follow this general pattern.

It is absolutely essential that we cease treating the welfare recipient as society's child and, instead, bring him back into the mainstream so that he and society can be relieved of the burdens of welfare. Legal recognition and sanction of this emerging philosophy could be one of the most significant advances of our time. But it has not happened. And the courts are again partly to blame. For they, like society in general, have adopted a double standard, one for aid to business and the farmer and a very different one for welfare. Says Reich: "It is a double standard from the moral point of view and a double standard from the legal point of view. There is a law for the poor and a law for the rest of us. Receipt of government aid by the poor carries a stigma, whereas receipt of government aid by the rest of the economy has been made into a virtue."

The effect of this double standard has been to deny welfare recipients the values and protection that the rest of the publicly supported private economy enjoys. The courts could provide some of that protection but, for the most part, have not. Because they continue to view welfare as a gratuity rather than a right, courts have refused to enjoin governmental invasion of privacy, which would not be tolerated except for our degrading conception of the poor as second-

class citizens. In disputes involving welfare recipients, the courts have refused to enforce the procedural safeguards long established in connection with many other types of public benefits. A free television license can be revoked only after the most scrupulous observance of due process in a hearing and review procedure, but a poor man's welfare payments can be cut off without any hearing whatever.

While the courts have not created the problems of the inner city, they have not acted to alleviate them and, in many instances, have actually exacerbated the plight of the poor. They have had a hand in what Richard Nixon has called white America's attempt to buy off the Negro and keep him out of sight in the ghetto. As the consensus report of the Assembly on Law and the Changing Society concludes, the cluster of problems known as the urban crisis "arises partly from basic weakness in social, economic and political institutions and partly from weakness in the machinery of justice itself." Even if the courts cannot solve the problems that beset the inner city, they and the legal system as a whole can and should play a significant part in that endeavor. Professor Reich of Yale has put it this way: "All too often, law is used as an excuse for maintaining an unjust status quo. . . . But no form of law is ever necessary or inevitable. Law is the servant of social policy, not a determinant of it. It is our policy that must change." The courts can and must participate in bringing about that change by changing the law, at least in the areas where judges made the offending law in the first place.

As Roscoe Pound said, law is social engineering, "and it must be judged by the results it achieves . . . not by the beauty of its logical processes." I have suggested a number of areas in which, by this criterion, the law must be judged a failure. Though our most pressing social, moral and political imperative is to liberate the urban poor from their degradation, the courts continue to apply ancient legal doctrines which merely compound the plight of the poverty-stricken. These doctrines may once have served a purpose, but their time has passed. They must be modified or abandoned.

HIS COUNTRY WILL ALWAYS LOVE HIM

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Dwight David Eisenhower is gone, but as long as men love freedom he will live.

He began as a soldier of war and completed his life as a crusader for peace. Perhaps only a man who has seen the terror and destruction which General Eisenhower saw could fully understand the ravages of war.

There is much to be said about the man that he requested to be interred in the simple metal coffin provided for a soldier. Perhaps this act of humility and devotion speaks much of the man.

He wore the five stars which only nine other men in the history of our Nation, which includes Pershing of World War I, have been entitled to wear. Who can know the agony he suffered as the final decision had to be made to invade Europe. He knew that thousands of lives rested in his hands.

One statement by a friend said that General Eisenhower was always the calmest when the tempest was at its height.

He served as the President of the United States. Twice the American people bestowed upon him the highest trust in the land. He served in a critical period of American history.

He followed the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman when this Nation was engaged in the greatest struggle for survival in the history of the world. At home, the Nation had undergone a peaceful revolution during the 20 years of these administrations.

Eisenhower brought a calm to the Nation. It was a period of reflection as we consolidated the programs of a hectic period. There was no looking back, only looking forward. I will have to leave to history to judge his Presidency. My feeling is that he was a man of the times—that he gave to the American people a sense of stability after such a hectic period in our history.

It has been 8 years since he has held any office, yet the heart of America went out to the general at his passing. There have been few men in the history of our Nation where the American people gave the affection they felt for Ike.

He was laid to rest in his "Eisenhower jacket" with his campaign hat at his side. He fought the good fight. His had been a rich and full life. While a Nation mourned his passing, there was also a sense of fulfillment and a deep note of gratitude.

As President Nixon intoned so eloquently, it was not so much the honors that came in such abundance that endeared him to the American people, it was his character.

Whatever historians may say in the future about the life and work of Dwight David Eisenhower, there is one thing for certain today. We liked Ike.

And his final words to Mrs. Eisenhower speak so much of the man.

"I have always loved my country."  
His country will always love him.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT  
EISENHOWER

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. NELSEN, Mr. Speaker, the Nation this week mourns the death of a great American patriot, Dwight David Eisenhower. I would like to reminisce a bit about this warm and sunny personality, who made so many contributions to our country.

I came to know President Eisenhower rather well during the period I served as Administrator of the REA. He was always most gracious, very kind, and easy to talk to. He was pretty much the kind of a guy that people naturally like. He was surrounded by capable people and relied on them for the background and

facts he needed to arrive at decisions. He seemed to decide questions easily.

My most delightful meeting with Ike occurred after I had decided to leave the REA and return to our farm near Hutchinson. It was necessary to visit the White House to submit a formal resignation, so I took along our daughter, Miriam, who was 10 or 11 at the time. The President could not have been nicer to our little girl. He was attentive to her conversation, jovial and fun to be with. He dug into one of his desk drawers, rummaged around for a little paperweight and presented it to her. He also gave her a silver dollar, minted in the year of his birth, and framed so that she could wear it as a locket.

I had brought along a camera, and asked the President if it would be alright to take a picture. He said, "Oh, yes, go right ahead." The photos we took that pleasant day are among the prized possessions in the Nelsen family scrapbook.

The incident tends to illustrate what were among the President's finest qualities—his genuine goodness and humility. These are among the qualities that define the very great among leaders in history.

I recall another incident that is somewhat revealing about Mr. Eisenhower. We had been having great difficulty settling an electric power controversy that had arisen between the Interior Department and some REA interests. Things had reached an impossible point. Finally, I suggested that the southern unit send up some new faces to Washington for discussions, feeling that the disposition of those arguing so stubbornly would never permit any kind of agreement. The new people came, and we went to the White House for some meetings with advisers. In short order, these lifetime Democrats from the Deep South—who held some pretty stout convictions about Republicans in general—were ushered right into the President's office. They seemed flabbergasted. When they found this Republican President to be reasonable and just, of course, the problem was quickly worked out amicably.

This story illustrates another of Eisenhower's great strengths. He was not a mean political partisan and he would not, for the sake of politics, do something cheap or wrong. His first and overwhelming concern was always for his country.

Few Americans in history can match Ike's many and varied accomplishments. He was a popular President, and his two terms were stable years of quiet peace and harmony. He was an outstanding wartime general. As Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe, he launched the biggest invasion in history and played a leading role in Hitler's defeat. He was an educator of note, serving for a time as president of a leading university. He was also a farmer and took a keen interest in his Gettysburg land and stock. He will be remembered for all such reasons. But he will be remembered, too, for his friendly ways, his infectious grin and his splendid spirit. These attributes of character will remain among Ike's greatest legacies to all of us.

I include at this point a further tribute to the late President, an editorial which

appeared March 29 in the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn.:

AMERICANS LIKED IKE

It can be said with considerable justice that Dwight Eisenhower was the most universally loved of all American presidents.

Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt, perhaps, were revered in a more emotional way by their adherents—and, most certainly, were "greater" presidents—but they were also heartily despised by fairly substantial numbers. John Kennedy was achieving something of a love affair with Americans, particularly the young and the intellectuals, but the affair never really had to stand the test of election and time.

Ike was unique in generating the affection of all classes and parties. There was no shading. Americans just "liked Ike." And so did so many others, all over the world.

Eisenhower will not, in history's view, appear as a great man. He wasn't spectacular or political or responsible for great change.

He did his job.

He won World War II as Supreme Commander and he held the Alliance that fought that war together. He won election to the presidency on a plea for a "return to normalcy" and the ending of the Korean war and he accomplished both his objectives. He felt it was not a time for a political administration and he was, perhaps, the most unpolitical of our presidents.

It might be because of this, or because he embodied almost all the old, honorable American virtues, that the people followed him and respected him so very much. In an age of fetish for charisma in leadership, he was calm and really quite colorless.

Maybe this is why the people trusted him and believed in him.

They heeded his advice with consideration and it is, indeed, a mark of the man that his last official statement to his nation, his farewell warning about the dangers of a military-industrial complex, is becoming, nine years later, the catchword of an increasing national debate. The old soldier's syntax was involved but his thinking was clear and direct.

He is gone now, almost the last of the great figures of the 20 years that saw such a great upheaval of war and reconstruction. Only Charles de Gaulle and Chiang Kai-shek remain of those who fought and led in the war and only Harry Truman, who had so much to do with the peace and the rebuilding, are left.

However, history records his immense career, most people will mourn his passing not as a great figure but as a friend in high places and this may, indeed, be the finest epitaph of all.

DEACON ROBERT WILLIAMS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the selfless efforts of a "good Samaritan" and a good citizen of his city, his State, and his Nation, Mr. Robert Williams, of Alexandria, Va.

I have known Mr. Williams, who is a deacon of the Beulah Baptist Church in Alexandria, for as long as I have been a Member of Congress. I first met him when he brought men and women to me for assistance with some problems they may have had concerning their em-

ployment, their social security, or some other area in which I could assist them as their Representative in Congress. There are few men anywhere for whom I have greater respect than Deacon Williams, and I believe our colleagues should know of his most recent efforts to promote better understanding between the races, not only in his home city, Alexandria, but elsewhere in the Nation, by designating the first week in each year as "Black Citizenship Week"; and to help the needy, regardless of race, creed, or color, through his newly established black citizen's action program.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of two articles concerning Mr. Williams and these programs, from the Alexandria Gazette of January 4, 1969, and the Washington Star of March 16, 1969. I know our colleagues will agree that men like Deacon Williams deserve the thanks and admiration of their fellow Americans.

The articles follow:

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette, Jan. 4, 1969]

#### MAYOR BEATLEY PROCLAIMS BLACK CITIZENSHIP WEEK

An effort by members of the Negro community to unite further those of the black and white races came to a climax Thursday morning when Mayor Charles E. Beatley Jr., proclaimed the week of Jan. 5 as Black Citizenship Week.

Present for the signing was Deacon Robert Williams who spearheaded the effort. The date was set as the first week following January 1, 105th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. The event is expected to be marked annually in the City of Alexandria.

A special service of worship conceived by Deacon Williams and led by the Rev. R. B. Strong of the host Community United Presbyterian Church honored the forthcoming week. A special collection of more than \$300 will be used to assist the needy, regardless of color or creed, Deacon Williams said. Mayor Beatley was among those attending the service.

Assisting Deacon Williams were Mrs. Pearl May Lynch, Mrs. Mary Abraham, Dawson Earl, Mrs. Jimmie May Earl and Mrs. Williams, who also assisted her husband in research on the project.

The official text of the proclamation follows:

Whereas, the contribution of each individual and each group in his community is vital to the progress and growth of this nation; and

Whereas, the black citizens of this community and nation have made many contributions in various fields in sharing the responsibility of securing the rights of all men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas, the black citizens of this community have been highly active in serving with their neighbors on City boards, committees, commissions, and authorities, as well as on civic groups, educational endeavors, and social activities to the benefit of this City;

Now, therefore, I, Charles E. Beatley, Jr., Mayor of the City of Alexandria, Virginia, and on behalf of the City Council, do hereby proclaim the week of January 5 as Black Citizenship Week in Alexandria and call upon all persons and groups in this community to consider the significance of this week and the need for further enlightened citizen action to preserve and extend the goals of liberty and justice through the pursuit of individual and collective responsibility and brotherhood.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of

Alexandria, Virginia, to be affixed this 2nd day of January in the year of our Lord, 1969.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 16, 1969]

#### SO MANY NEED HELP: A SAMARITAN BRANCHES OUT

(By Thomas Crosby)

A 66-year-old furniture mover who has been a good samaritan to the poor in Alexandria for almost 30 years has set up a local organization to help the needy.

Robert Williams, energetic, and youthful looking has formed the Black Citizen's Action Program with the help of his wife, Ethel, who is 60, and several friends. In spite of its militant-sounding name, the group is applying ideas of help for other people which Williams has served since 1940.

Although admitting there are many organizations already in existence to fight poverty, Williams said he still sees "so many people that need help."

#### WILL SOLICIT HELP

The group, which helps both Negroes and whites, started collecting funds in late December and in January distributed small amounts of cash to about 20 persons. Since then it has raised \$75 and hopes people will continue their donations. Williams said he plans to visit several Alexandria churches soon seeking contributions.

Williams, whose program will operate from his apartment at 1532 Princess St., already is a familiar figure to city officials, patients at Alexandria Hospital and Rep. Joel T. Broyhill, R-Va., who represents the city.

Williams began giving his time to people after he was a patient at the hospital in 1940. He said at that time he saw patients that needed haircuts, shaves or were "just plain lonely."

Now every day when he finishes his work of moving furniture at the Main Navy Yard, Williams takes a bus to the Duke Street branch of the hospital. There he makes his daily rounds, saying hello to the patients and reading the Bible and praying with them.

"He really boosts the patients' morale," said a nurse.

#### HAD OWN BLOOD BANK

Back in 1956 he set up his own blood bank at the hospital with the help of Miss Jean Morse, a blood bank technician.

Called the Beulah Baptist Church Blood Bank after his church, it allows a patient to borrow blood on a one-for-one basis. The hospital's regular blood bank charges two pints for every one given a patient.

Williams also is a frequent visitor to Broyhill's office. The two have been friends since Broyhill was elected 16 years ago and Williams started to bring people with employment and Social Security problems to see "their congressman."

Mrs. Elizabeth McCann, Broyhill's research assistant, said it is "amazing how many people he helps. He is always trying to straighten someone's problems out."

Broyhill intends to read into the Congressional Record a tribute to Williams for his efforts in getting Alexandria to hold a "Black Citizenship Week" Jan. 4-11 this year.

#### AIDED CITY OFFICIAL

Williams also aided Harry Walmer, a city housing official, when Walmer visited Negro churches to talk about the voluntary open housing law the City Council passed last year.

"He went to all the meetings with me to help me gain some rapport and communication," Walmer said.

The son of a South Carolina sharecropper, Williams only has a fourth grade education and has always had to work at jobs requiring physical labor. He says he is happy.

"God has been good to us," he said. The Williams' apartment in Jefferson Village is neat and filled with religious pictures.

Devoutly religious, he has been a deacon at Beulah Baptist Church since 1957.

He was honored by the city in 1967 when he received a recognition award for his work as a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee for Community Improvement and he still serves as a member of the Economic Opportunity Commission.

Also a member of the Elks and Masons, Williams said the friendships he has formed in these clubs have often helped him get lawyers and professional advice for people in trouble.

Williams has a philosophy that differs from most charitable organizations which he said will apply to his new program.

"Some people say a person doesn't need because he led a bad life in the past but if you don't have it, you need it," he said.

Helping in the program are his wife, Mrs. Pearl May Lynch, Mrs. Mary Abraham, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Dawson and Mrs. Dorothy Boggins.

His wife said, "Pray for him to be successful. There are a lot of poor people who need help."

#### THE CASE FOR THE REPATRIATION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, knowing that the following will be of deep interest to my colleagues in the House, I take pleasure in submitting it for your consideration:

#### THE CASE FOR THE REPATRIATION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

The Jew is history's exile—not its expatriate. His dispersion began with the Babylonian conquest of Judah in 586 B.C. It was completed six centuries later when Hadrian erected Aelia Capitolina on the shattered hulk of Jerusalem and forbade the Jew from reentering the city on punishment of death. For 1,878 years thereafter, he sat as an uninvited guest at the table of others—despised, driven, decimated . . . occasionally tolerated.

The 13 million Jews now living are the descendants of these exiles. In every legal and historic sense they were themselves exiles until the reestablishment of a Jewish State in 1948.

The State of Israel was the first to recognize this fact. Virtually the first order of business of the first Jewish parliamentary body to convene in 19 centuries was the enactment of the "Law of Return." It granted to all Jews everywhere the unqualified right to enter Israel as free and equal citizens. The very name "Law of Return" was implicit recognition of the involuntary nature of the dispersion that had scattered these Jews and their ancestors to the far corners of the globe. They did not have to become citizens because they had never ceased to be citizens of the Jewish State. They might choose to continue their domicile outside the confines of that state; they might prefer the citizenship of other states; but surely they could no longer consider themselves exiles.

Of the 13 million Jews given the choice of repatriation to Israel, only 10 million have thus far been free to exercise that option. Three million have been denied that freedom. These are the three million Jews of Soviet Russia.

#### I. JEWISH NATION

There is no need to create a "case" for the repatriation of Russian Jewry. The "case" already exists within the context of Soviet policy and precedent. Its documentation can

be found in any Soviet library from Moscow to Vladivostok.

To begin with, any Jewish claim to repatriation must be based on the existence of a definable "Jewish nationality." The concept of Jewish nationality is not in dispute today even in anti-Semitic Poland. In the midst of the worst paroxysm of anti-Semitism since the end of the Second World War, Warsaw keeps the door to Jewish emigration ajar because—as Wladyslaw Gomulka put it last spring—Jewish nationality is a fact of life even in Communist Poland and Jews who feel a national allegiance to Israel should be permitted to go there. The Russians, whose expertise in this area derives from the presence of over 130 nationalities and subnationalities within their borders, have formally recognized Jews as a nationality since the Bolshevik Revolution. Jews were never Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians or Uzbeksians. They were always Jews, no matter where they lived, or what language they spoke.

This fact is totally exclusive to the peripheral issue of anti-Semitism. Rather, it has to do with the political and cultural nature of the Soviet system. The *modus vivendi* of that system is the very corollary of the "melting pot" theory popular in the United States and other Western countries. Lenin accused Czarist Russia of being a "prison of nations." It is noteworthy that after 50 years of socialism, they boast not of having transformed it into a melting pot, but into a place "where all nationalities thrive."

If Marxism-Leninism is the philosophical blood and bone of Soviet life, nationality is its outer covering. It determines the language one speaks, the literature one reads, the history one is proud of and the identification one carries in his internal passport. It is indelible and intransmutable.

As an officially recognized nationality, Soviet Jews for a period of 20 years after the revolution were accorded virtually every cultural, religious, educational and communal right guaranteed other nationalities in the U.S.S.R. It is true that Hebrew was suppressed as a vestige of "reactionary clericalism," but Yiddish flourished.

Until the purges of 1936-1938, Russia could boast of scores of Yiddish language newspapers, periodicals and magazines. Yiddish books rolled off the government presses in the hundreds of thousands. There were nearly 20 professional and amateur Jewish repertory theatres. Hundreds of Jewish primary and secondary schools taught everything from mathematics to Marxism in the Yiddish language. There were several distinguished academies for the training of Jewish teachers and a number of outstanding Jewish university departments, as well as graduate research institutes for the study of Jewish history, social sciences, literature and language.

It is no accident that 50 years after the Revolution, a half million of Russia's three million Jews still designate Yiddish as their mother tongue. They learned it in Russian schools.

## II. JEWISH AUTONOMOUS PROVINCE: BIROBIZHAN

The Soviets didn't stop at a mere legal definition of Jewish nationality. They attempted to expand it into a concept of Jewish nationhood. Out of the whole sorry history of the abortive Soviet attempt to create a Jewish autonomous province in the Asian reaches of Birobizhan, one fact stands forth clearly: the U.S.S.R. was the only sovereign state outside of England to recognize that the Jews represented a special cultural and historical problem that could only be solved through the legitimization of Jewish nationhood and territorial integrity.

Moscow's current attacks against Israel ring rather hollow when contrasted with the glowing accounts of Jewish national fulfillment presumably being achieved in Birobizhan during the 1930's. An August 29, 1936 report on the Jewish Autonomous Province

by the Central Committee of the Presidium proudly declares that "for the first time in the history of the Jewish people, its burning desire for the creation of a homeland of its own and for the achievement of its national statehood has found fulfillment . . ."

"The Presidium of the Central Committee of the U.S.S.R.," the report goes on, "is firmly convinced that workers and kolkhoz farmers of the Jewish Autonomous Province, all Jewish toilers of the Soviet Union, and the organizations of the Soviet Union, and the organizations of the Soviet public, will bend every effort for the speediest accomplishment of the tasks connected with the further development and strengthening of national Jewish statehood in the U.S.S.R."

Birobizhan was in its death throes by August 1936 and the leadership that was to bring Jewish statehood to the U.S.S.R. was already marked for liquidation by Stalin's secret police. But this does not obscure the fact that a Sovietized version of Zionism figured most prominently in Moscow's plans to dispose of its Jewish problem.

The idea of Soviet-Jewish statehood was being discussed in official circles as early as 1925. In October of that year, Aleksandr Cherneriskii, first secretary of the Central Board of Jewish Sections and a reliable government sounding board, told a White Russian Conference of Jewish Sections in Minsk that "the idea of a Jewish Soviet State has never been denied." A year later in a respected book entitled "The Communist Party and the Jewish Masses," Cherneriskii amplified his remarks with unusual clarity:

"In large measure the national problem in the U.S.S.R. is solved by means of national territorial autonomy, the establishment of autonomous national provinces, national republics, etc. The question is whether the possibility of national territorial autonomy is closed to the Jewish masses of the U.S.S.R. By no means. Politically it is possible in our Soviet country to establish Jewish territorial autonomy whenever a considerable Jewish majority is established in some continuous territory."

"The question then is whether such an opportunity can materialize, whether such a territory with a Jewish majority can emerge in our country. Most certainly, yes. The rural placement of the Jewish masses now under way can provide this opportunity, for if we succeed in settling on continuous territory not even all of the 100,000 families but only half that number, it would already mark the beginning of a Jewish autonomous province."

Birobizhan failed—but not because it was impossible to ruralize the Jewish masses or to organize them into a politically autonomous unit—Israel proved it was. Birobizhan founded in the Jewish soul. That soul rejected a blatant attempt to substitute a contrived panacea for a 2,000 year-old dream. No amount of dialectical arguments could turn Birobizhan into the Promised Land and not even the most ignorant Jewish peasant in Soviet Russia was likely to mistake the Ar-mur River for the River Jordan. . . .

Characteristically it was another Jew, Commissar for Jewish Affairs Mr. Semen Dimanshtein, who inadvertently sounded the death knell for Birobizhan back in October, 1918, when the Revolution still had most of its ideals intact and Josef Stalin had more important things to conjure with than a Jewish Autonomous Province.

"Why dream of tilling the land far off in Palestine," Dimanshtein declared, "when you can have a Palestine in Moscow? Why remember Zion, the vassal of British imperialism, when Jewish farm labor communes can be set up right here in socialist Russia to the immediate advantage of the destitute and the unemployed?"

Mr. Dimanshtein should have known better, artificial Palestines have been attempted in other places than Soviet Russia and they haven't worked.

## III. REPATRIATION

If the concept of Jewish nationhood is firmly rooted in the Soviet past, even more so is the concept of repatriation. Following the Second World War, the U.S.S.R. voluntarily repatriated thousands of nationals from Spain, Poland, Hungary and Rumania. By the time they got around to Armenians, the Russians had transformed repatriation into an article of Marxist faith.

For almost 20 years following World War II, Moscow waged a tireless campaign to persuade one million overseas Armenians that their rightful place was not in the lands of their birth, but in the Autonomous Soviet Republic of Armenia. In promulgating that campaign, the Russians employed what can only be termed a form of "Armenian Zionism." The Soviet propaganda tracts and radio broadcasts directed at the Armenian overseas communities during those years would have been thoroughly familiar to Herzl and Nordau. They wrote them. One had but to substitute "Jewish" for "Armenian" and "Israel" for "Armenia" to compile a complete primer on the four W's of Zionism—What, Where, Why and When.

Nothing it has ever said or done so damningly exposes Moscow's standard as its attitudes toward Jewish and Armenian nationalism. One has literally to turn language and semantics upside down to appreciate it. Yet, the history of no two peoples has ever been more strikingly analogous.

Jews and Armenians have both been the objects of centuries of persecution. Their ancient homelands were repeatedly overrun. As a result, they became dispersed throughout the world. Some have undergone assimilation. Some have clung tenaciously to their language, culture and historic traditions. Many have a profound religious attachment to the soil of a country they have never seen. In both instances, the majority have lived outside their national homelands for generations.

Despite these historic parallels, when Moscow speaks of Jews and Armenians, it speaks in two different tongues. The return of dispersed Jewry to Israel is "treason." The return of overseas Armenians to Armenia is the height of patriotic virtue. Consider the following statement in the March 31, 1964 issue of *Komosolskaya Pravda*:

"The Armenian People endured much suffering throughout its centuries-old history. Hunger and despair compelled many to leave the land of their fathers and seek salvation in foreign lands. These were later paths of suffering and humiliation. Only in the years of the Soviet regime has the cherished word "return" crossed the Wandering Armenian's lips . . ."

*Izvestia* put the case in even stronger terms in an article on April 1, 1964:

"Tens of thousands of Armenians abroad who live under an alien and not always hospitable sky still strive to return to their Motherland, to Soviet Armenia. . . It is well known that love for the Motherland, the constant craving for unity, for life in the land of their ancestors have upheld the Armenian nation."

Have the Soviets ever considered what force upheld the Jewish nation through centuries of even greater travail?

The Soviet quality of mind becomes even more apparent in discussing the question of assimilation. For Russian Jews it is a "normal, desirable process" to be hastened by the denial of cultural rights. For Armenians the same prospect is nothing less than "a white massacre." The U.S.S.R.'s Erevan Radio puts it in the most chilling perspective:

"It is difficult to overestimate the political and historical significance of the newly organized repatriation of overseas Armenians. It is a matter of eliminating the consequences of the Turkish barbarian atrocities against the Armenian people and of saving our brothers and sisters in the diaspora from

the brutal reality of capitalism and the danger of assimilation that hangs over them like the sword of Damocles. The new repatriation has caused a wave of enthusiasm and joy in the diaspora."

The use of the word "diaspora" is grimly amusing. It is a Zionist slogan that has been denounced from every propaganda pulpit in the U.S.S.R. In employing it, Moscow apparently takes no cognizance of the fact that one man's "Motherland" might be another man's "diaspora." The Kremlin's schizophrenic approach to Jewish and Armenian repatriation raises an intriguing paradox. By the fate of history, Armenia is situated within the present borders of the U.S.S.R. while Israel is in the Middle East. One is tempted to ask what Moscow's policies on the repatriation of the two peoples would be if the geographical locations of the two countries were reversed. Would Jewish repatriation then become a categorical imperative? Would Armenian repatriation become a crime?

The Russians did more than borrow the phraseology of Zionism. They even copied its administrative machinery. Beginning in 1961, Soviet embassies in Turkey, Greece, Cyprus, Lebanon, Egypt, France, and the United States included Armenian emigration departments that were nothing less than replicas of Jewish Agency offices. Through these departments, the Russians organized the repatriation of some 150,000 overseas Armenians.

Nor did Moscow hesitate to pressure foreign governments for aid in facilitating its Armenian repatriation scheme. In a note to the U.S. State Department dated April 21, 1947, (the text of which was carried by the New York Times of December 5, 1947) the Soviet ambassador declared:

"The government of the U.S.S.R. with a view to satisfying numerous requests of Armenians residing abroad has given permission for the Government of Soviet Armenia to arrange for the return of Armenians who desire to go back to their Motherland, Soviet Armenia, from a number of countries, including the United States of America.

"In this connection the embassy requests the Department of State to render assistance to those Armenians who desire to return to their Motherland by permitting them to take export property which belongs to them, relinquish their foreign citizenship, etc."

The State Department, of course, informed the embassy that American citizens and alien residents of the U.S. were free to emigrate anywhere they chose and to take their personal property with them.

Moscow's language was somewhat less polite in dealing with French recalcitrance on the Armenian issue. The New York Times of December 23, 1947 reports of a note sent to Paris by the U.S.S.R. bluntly telling the French government to stop putting "obstacles in the way of the repatriation of Armenians wishing to go back to the Soviet Union."

The French Foreign Ministry denied it was doing any such thing. But informed sources in Paris admitted that the government was withholding visa applications from such prospective Armenian emigrants in the hope of negotiating an agreement for the return of a number of French nationals still in the Soviet Union.

The Armenian campaign was duplicated on a somewhat smaller scale in Moscow's drive to repatriate a colony of Cossacks that had been living in Turkey for 250 years. Again, fear of assimilation and a return to the Motherland were the principle propaganda lures. In short, as far as Moscow was concerned, Zionism had everything to recommend it, so long as it wasn't applied to Jews.

#### IV. THE JEWISH STATE

The Soviets had no compunctions about deviating from this hard-line when it suited their political purposes. Moscow's chief political purpose in the Middle East during the

early fateful months of 1947 was to weaken British influence in that area. If it took the creation of a Jewish State to bring an end to the British Mandate in Palestine, the Russians were more than willing to turn Zionism back to its original authors, the Jews. Contrast present Soviet policy toward Israel, the Jewish people and Jewish nationhood with the moving words uttered by Andrei Gromyko in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on May 14, 1947:

"In considering the question of the tasks of the Committee which is to prepare proposals on Palestine, our attention is inevitably drawn to another important aspect of this problem. As is well known, the aspirations of an important part of the Jewish people are bound up with the question of Palestine, and with the future structure of that country. It is not surprising therefore, that both in the General Assembly and in the meetings of the Political Committee of the Assembly a great deal of attention was given to this aspect of the matter. This interest is comprehensible and completely justified.

"The Jewish people suffered extreme misery and deprivation during the last war. It can be said, without exaggeration, that the sufferings and miseries of the Jewish people are beyond description. It would be difficult to express by mere dry figures the losses and sacrifices of the Jewish people at the hands of the Fascist occupiers. In the territories where the Hitlerites were in control, the Jew suffered almost complete extinction. The total number of the Jews who fell at the hands of the Fascist hangmen is something in the neighborhood of six million. Only about one and a half million Jews survived the war in Western Europe. But these figures, which give an idea of the losses suffered by the Jewish people at the hands of the Fascist aggressors, give no idea of the situation in which the great mass of the Jewish people find themselves after the war.

"A great many of the Jews who survived the war in Europe have found themselves deprived of their countries, of their shelter, and of means of earning their livelihood. Hundreds of thousands of Jews are wandering about the various countries of Europe, seeking means of livelihood and seeking shelter. A great many of these are in the camps for displaced persons, where they are continuing to suffer great privations.

"This was all clearly stated in the discussions of the Assembly's Committee by the representative of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

"It may be asked whether the United Nations, considering the very serious situation of hundreds of thousands of Jews who have survived the war, should not show an interest in the situation of these people who have been uprooted from their countries and from their homes. The Organization of the United Nations cannot, and should not, remain indifferent to this situation, because such an attitude would be incompatible with the high principles which are proclaimed in our Charter—principles which envisage the defense of the rights of men, irrespective of race, religious convictions and sex. This is a time to give help, not in words, but in deeds.

"It is necessary that we concern ourselves with the urgent needs of a people who have suffered such great hardships as a result of the war, in connection with Hitlerite Germany; it is a duty of the United Nations.

"Regarding the necessity of concerning ourselves with the situation of the Jewish population, which is without shelter and without means of livelihood, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the following circumstances. The experience of the past, particularly during the time of the Second World War, has shown that not one state of Western Europe has been in a position to give proper help to the Jewish people

and to defend its interests, or even its existence, against the violence that was directed against it from the Hitlerites and their allies. This is a very serious fact, but unfortunately, like all facts, it must be recognized.

"The fact that not a single Western European state has been in a position to guarantee the defense of the elementary rights of the Jewish people or compensate them for the violence they have suffered at the hands of the Fascist hangmen explains the aspiration of the Jews for the creation of a state of their own. It would be unjust not to take this into account and to deny the right of the Jewish people to the realization of such an aspiration."

Gromyko was more persuasive than he intended to be. His sudden passion for Zionism caused Syrian Ambassador Faris Bey El-Khoury to remark that "if Jews are to start coming to Palestine they might also want to leave Russia, where they have been persecuted since the Seventh Century." The General Assembly proceedings carry no record of a reply by the Soviet ambassador.

V. 1948-1968

When the Jewish Agency attempted to match Gromyko's words with deeds two and a half years later, it found that Moscow's passion for persecuted Jewry had cooled considerably. The Agency reported on November 10, 1949 that the Kremlin had totally ignored a request that repatriation bars be lifted for 1,000,000 Russian Jews and 600,000 Rumanian and Hungarian Jews who wanted to come to Israel.

The events in Soviet Russia during the 20 years that followed Gromyko's historic speech are well known to every student of Jewish history. They include the destruction of the last vestiges of Jewish cultural and educational life; the imprisonment and execution of Jewish writers, poets and journalists; the infamous Stalinist "doctors' plot;" the vicious denigration of Jewish history, religion, language in the Soviet communications media; the Jewish "economic trials" of the early 1960's; the unremitting campaign of hatred and slander against Israel, and, finally, the unabashed attempt to obliterate the identity of three million Soviet Jews through enforced cultural assimilation.

The only significant break in this chain of events came on December 3, 1966. Premier Alexei Kosygin, then in Paris, was asked by a correspondent for United Press International whether there was any possibility of reuniting Soviet Jews with families from which they had become separated during World War II.

Kosygin's reply went well beyond the terms of reference of the question. He declared, in part:

"We on our side shall do all that is possible for us if some families want to meet, or even if some among them would like to leave us, to open for them the road. And this does not raise here, naturally, any problem of principles and will not raise any."

The Kosygin statement had an electrifying effect on Jews and non-Jews alike. Here, indeed, was concrete evidence of the flexibility of Russia's new leadership and its ability to put humanitarian principles above politics. Israel National Radio termed the statement "a marked departure from the policies of Mr. Khrushchev." The London Jewish Chronicle called it "a pledge" and the New York Times said it would "give encouragement to many thousands of Russians, Ukrainians, Soviet Jews and others, whose families were broken up by the dislocation of World War II."

Seven months later, the dream of Jewish family reunion was ground under the boots of an Egyptian army advancing up the Sinai Peninsula. Since then an ominous silence has fallen over Soviet-Jewish affairs. A world waiting to hear the joyous sounds of families reuniting has awakened instead to the ugly clatter of a renascent anti-Semitism in Poland.

## VI. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

It is the view of an increasing body of learned opinion—both Jewish and non-Jewish—that the three million Jews of the U.S.S.R. are being deprived of the basic legal right of repatriation. It is a right that has been affirmed and reaffirmed under international law, by the League of Nations, the United Nations and the World Court. The Declaration of Human Rights incorporated into the charter of the United Nations guarantees the free choice of national domicile and the unrestricted freedom of movement to all people. The Soviet Union is a signatory to that document and is legally and morally obligated to honor it. To this end, an ad hoc committee has summoned leading jurists, legislators, scientists, economists, writers and industrialists from many countries to attend an International Conference on the Repatriation of Soviet Jewry to be held in Geneva, Switzerland.

It will be the purpose of this conference to establish itself as a permanent world body with headquarters in Geneva to strive for the implementation of the right of Soviet Jews to repatriate to their national homeland.

We believe the single greatest challenge facing contemporary World Jewry is the rescue of three million Soviet Jews.

There is a fundamental relationship between the return of these Jews to their homeland and their continued existence as Jews. Soviet Jewry is a people in search of nationhood. Israel alone offers them the chance—perhaps the last chance—to replant their cultural and religious roots in hospitable soil. Unless they are permitted to grasp this opportunity for national self-realization, Jewish history will have taken a tragic and perhaps irrevocable step backward.

It will be the major task of the Geneva Conference to assemble and present to the Russian Government documentary evidence of the existing desire of Russian Jews to repatriate. We wish to provide a forum from which a silent and exiled people may be heard.

We are witnessing the climax of a human drama that began 2,000 years ago with the enforced exile of the Jewish people. The circle of Jewish history is now being closed. The Jewish State has been reestablished. Its children are being called home. Destiny has given us no time-table. We do not know when the Call to Zion will be heard in the free Western Jewish communities, except that it will be heard. We do know that it has found an echo in the hearts of three million Russian Jews.

Since the 1967 War in the Middle East, repatriation has become a moving force among Soviet Jews. It is particularly strong among the younger generation, but its appeal cuts across all economic, social, religious and age distinctions.

This fact is confirmed almost daily from independent sources throughout the globe. It has been echoed by virtually every Western visitor to the Soviet Union during the past two years. Those who have had even the most peripheral contact with the Soviet Jewish community testify that repatriation is the only subject Russian Jews deem worthy of serious discussion. All other subjects have become irrelevant.

During a recent fact-finding tour, members of the committee had ample opportunities of interviewing a group of young Russian Jews who repatriated to Israel during the past years. These young people reject any contention that Judaism is languishing in the Soviet Union. It is more vibrant and alive than ever. They reject any contention that repatriation sentiment is limited to any one group of Russian Jews. They insist that no Soviet Jew be written off . . . that virtually the entire Russian Jewish population, including many of those still occupying positions of authority, would be prepared to come to Israel if the bars to repatriation were lifted.

These young people, born, schooled and indoctrinated under the Soviet system, have no quarrel with that system. Most of them remain staunch socialists. They want neither prayer books nor matzoths nor sympathy. They want to come home. They tell us that tens of thousands of other Jews study Hebrew and Yiddish and immerse themselves in Jewish history and literature. They have rejected assimilation. They see their destinies outside the borders of the Soviet Union. Their eyes are turned to the Promised Land.

It will be the function of the Geneva Conference to spell out the legal and humanitarian rights of these people in terms the entire civilized world, including the Soviet Union, can understand and accept. It is not our purpose to engage in a debate with the Kremlin over its treatment of the national Jewish minority or to demand of it an easing of restrictions on Jewish life. Such debates belong to the past. We doubt that any liberalization of Soviet Jewry policy can solve the ultimate dilemma confronting Russian Jewry.

The only long-term solution for Soviet Jewry is repatriation. At the same time repatriation represents for the Russian Government and people a truly genuine solution of the Jewish problem in a just and humane form. The International Committee for the Repatriation of Russian Jews will undertake the burden of that solution. In that spirit of humility, purpose, and faith, we ask God's help for its success.

## ONE-SIDED U.N. RESOLUTION ON MIDDLE EAST

## HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep concern with the resolution passed by the U.N. Security Council yesterday condemning Israel for its attack on Jordan last week. This resolution, which passed the Council by an 11 to 0 vote, with the United States and Britain abstaining in opposition, virtually ignores the guerrilla actions that endanger the lives of Israel civilians and provoke Israel's retaliation. It is a one-sided measure and is in every respect counterproductive to our efforts for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli strife.

French and Soviet support for this resolution splits the major powers at the very time when plans for beginning the big four talks on the Middle East are being completed. These talks were originally proposed by Paris and Moscow some months ago, and have involved arduous efforts to reach the delicate stage we are at now, and all four of the powers have a responsibility to maintain the atmosphere in which progress can continue.

The censure resolution adds weight to Israel's charges of bias by France and the U.S.S.R., and will make any of the proposals for settlement or promises of guarantees that may come out of the impending talks even more suspect in Israel's eyes. It is of even more immediate concern, furthermore, that the resolution will encourage the Arab terrorist groups that are openly determined to renew the conflict and bring us closer to the conflagration we have been working to prevent.

All violations of the cease-fire are

counterproductive to peace and must be deplored if we are not to further polarize hostilities and make any progress in solving this potentially explosive situation.

I am presenting here an article and editorial comment from today's New York Times on this urgent problem for the consideration of my colleagues:

ISRAEL CENSURED BY U.N. COUNCIL—RAID ON JORDAN CONDEMNED BY A VOTE OF 11 TO 0—UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN ABSTAIN

(By Juan de Onis)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., April 1.—The major powers split in the Security Council today on a resolution condemning Israel for an air attack against Jordan, but plans to open Big Four talks on the Middle East this week remained unaltered.

The Soviet Union and France indicated they would vote for the draft resolution sponsored by Pakistan, Senegal and Zambia, which condemned the Israeli air attack on the town of Salt on March 26 in which 18 civilians were killed.

Charles W. Yost, the United States delegate, said that the attack was "in the highest degree counter-productive" for peace talks, but that the United States could not vote for a resolution that took no heed of Arab terrorist attacks on Israel.

Despite the split among the Big Four, there was no change in their plan to open talks on the Middle East this week.

"Death is just as final and as shocking if it comes from a bomb in a supermarket or from a bomb from the air," Mr. Yost said.

## BRITAIN VOICES OBJECTION

Sir Leslie Glass, the deputy representative, said that his country could also not support a resolution that condemned Israel without encompassing all violations of the Middle East cease-fire of June 10, 1967.

"The outside world as a whole would surely scratch its head as to why the Council cannot at this delicate and important stage, in the most general terms and without any specific reference to either side, recognize the general state of violence, which undeniably exists, and deplore all violations of the cease-fire," Sir Leslie said.

Jordan, pressing her complaint against Israel, and the supporters of the Arab cause on the 15-member Security Council, contended that they had the necessary nine votes to carry the resolution. Since all Arab-Israeli war of 1967, all Security Council decisions on cease-fire resolutions have been adopted unanimously, with some reference to violence on both sides.

The split between the major powers, which are scheduled to open talks on the Middle East here Thursday, came despite arduous consultations during the day in which Max Jakobsson of Finland succeeded in winning minor modifications in the three-nation draft.

But the Arab refusal to accept any language that would label actions against Israel by Arab commando organizations as cease-fire violations thwarted any accommodations.

Agha Shahi, the Pakistani delegate, said in introducing the resolution that the three sponsors had "gone a long way in diluting the resolution" to prevent a "division among the permanent members of the Security Council on the eve of the projected four-power talks."

"While anxious to prevent any division, we could not possibly disregard the fact that the situation, which is at present being considered by the Council, has deteriorated," he said.

The key operative paragraph of the three-nation resolution said that the Security Council:

"Condemns the recent premeditated air attacks launched by Israel on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the

cease-fire resolutions and warns once again that if such attacks were to be repeated the Council would have to meet to consider further more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to insure against repetition of such attacks."

#### BLOW TO MIDEAST PEACE

The Soviet Union and France undercut their own initiative for Middle East peace yesterday when they voted for a United Nations Security Council resolution which condemns Israel for its attack on Jordan last week but virtually ignores the guerrilla actions that provoke Israeli retaliation.

French-Soviet support for the one-sided resolution—one the United States and Britain rightly refused to go along with—compromises their position just when arrangements are being completed for starting the Big Power peace meetings, originally proposed by Moscow and Paris months ago. It adds weight to Israeli charges of bias by the two powers, and tends to encourage truce violations by Arab groups blatantly bent on renewed conflict.

Despite this new handicap, the Big Four search for a new path to peace must not be abandoned. The primary responsibility for forging a final settlement remains with the contending Mideast nations, as Israeli and Arab leaders have taken pains to point out. But the Arabs and Israelis thus far have made no progress toward peace on their own. The Jarring mission is at a dead end.

In the face of rising violence that could envelop them all, the major powers have an obligation to themselves and to the world to make a new effort to promote a settlement through the U.N. The Russian and French have a special obligation now to undo the effect their vote by demonstrating that they recognize the rights and security requirements of the Israelis as well as those of the Arabs.

#### A LEGACY OF DECENCY

### HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on this day of burial for Dwight David Eisenhower, we pay our final respects.

In the passing of General Eisenhower, Pennsylvanian and American, we have lost a great leader and a beloved President.

His death, as his life, reflected courage and determination, calm and cheer.

Just as the Eisenhower years were a time of strength and peace, prosperity and good will, so they reflected the man for whom they were so warmly named.

Few men will soon forget the hearty smile, the outstretched hand, and "We like Ike." May many long remember the man, the strength, and the love that gave the world those peaceful, prosperous years.

While our 34th President leaves so much for us to remember him by, perhaps one of the finest legacies was his elemental decency as a human being.

This thought is expressed in the lead editorial of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on Monday, March 31, 1969, and I insert it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### A LEGACY OF DECENCY

Most men who make their mark upon the world and who die in greatness leave behind

as their legacy some specific deed or thing, or some words expressing inspiring or profound thoughts.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has given more. He has left behind, for all who will accept it, a legacy of decency.

As 34th President of the United States, as most respected citizen in retirement, as General of the Army, Mr. Eisenhower held to a strong and basic faith in his country and its people.

There was, he was certain, a strength, a resolve and a basic goodness in the land and in its people. To him the qualities of honesty, tolerance, self-reliance and patriotism were not to be described as old fashioned. They were part of each day.

When Mr. Eisenhower saw these qualities held up to ridicule he became concerned. He saw the young people of today as perhaps the finest the nation has ever produced. But he expressed fear that so many of them have been taught nothing of responsibility and self-discipline or the real meaning of life.

"You accepted hard work and a concern for others as a way of life," Mr. Eisenhower once said in describing his formative years. "We would have sneered at anyone who said we were underprivileged or anything like that."

Mr. Eisenhower was indeed, as President Nixon said yesterday, a product of America's soil and America's ideals. Mr. Eisenhower was, as he said in his London Guild Hall speech in 1945, from the "heart of America."

There is a tendency today to brush aside the qualities that were so much a part of Mr. Eisenhower as something of value only in a past, unsophisticated and simplistic era. But in truth they are as relevant and more needed today than ever before in the nation's history.

And, despite the cynicism and the skepticism that is part of America today, the vast majority of the nation holds to the same beliefs that Mr. Eisenhower held—a faith in themselves and in their country and a respect for their fellow man.

The difficulty today, as it has been in other periods of this country's history, is that it is difficult to hear the voice of this majority above the shrill shouts of those who seek confrontation rather than conference and conciliation.

President Nixon, in the eulogy delivered yesterday in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol said that these days of national mourning should also be days of gratitude for the inspiration and the strength which Mr. Eisenhower has given his countrymen.

These days can be something more. They can be days of rededication to the basic beliefs and the truths that were Mr. Eisenhower's. They can be the time of acceptance of Mr. Eisenhower's legacy of decency.

Nothing, in a nation so divided and torn by dissent, could be a finer tribute to a man who believed that his nation's future rested upon its moral strength.

#### THE MONEY TREE: NEW JERSEY GETS SMALL SLICE OF U.S. PIE—I

### Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Passaic Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., recently carried a series of eight articles by Staff Writer Mike Stoddard, entitled "The Money Tree."

In these articles, Mr. Stoddard casts a critical eye at the Federal grant-in-aid

programs, pointing up the difficulties encountered by local governments in applying for the various forms of Federal aid.

While the series deals primarily with Morris County, N.J., in my congressional district, the problems described are common to many areas.

I insert these articles in the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

#### THE MONEY TREE: NEW JERSEY GETS SMALL SLICE OF U.S. PIE—I

(By Mike Stoddard)

Graftsmanship—The art of eliciting funds for specified uses from federal, state, foundation or private sources.

The foregoing definition, however, is not to be found in any of the current dictionaries since it has only become a recognized practice in the last few years, and even its practitioners are ready to argue that it may be science rather than art.

Historically, the roots of grantsmanship may be traced back to 1862 when the federal government, under the Morrill Act, established the first grant-in-aid program to states by giving them aid to education in the form of land grants.

The land grant colleges, as the primary national effort to utilize this country's resources to effect the nation's goals, set the pattern for today and unwittingly, perhaps, hardened for all time the uses to which grants of any type may be put.

From the land grants, national policy extended itself to aid to agriculture and as the nation became industrialized, a slow shift took place as the farmers' need for roads brought about the first major shift in policy in the 1920s when the federal aid programs for highway construction became a reality.

The roads and highways were not all the farmers received, for as industrialization forced the smaller farmers to bankruptcy, new skills were needed to cope with a world that could no longer afford to support the marginal farms and farmers.

The next step of vocational training funded by federal grants was only a short distance from the massive welfare and public works programs of the 1930s where the Great Depression shattered the economy of the United States.

The clock spun faster after the 1940s and the aid programs grew in scope, until today the spectrum of grant-in-aid encompasses, by one count, 1,271 programs which cost almost \$21 billion a year.

A federal government reluctantly admits having slightly more than 400 grant-in-aid programs citing the "bible" of grantsmen, "The Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs" as the authority.

The catalog compiled by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for the President lists a bewildering array of programs in its 700 pages, which in addition to a brief description of the programs, tells who may apply and to whom.

Testimony to the confusion rising from the catalog may be deduced from a second book published under the seal of the vice president of the United States entitled, "Handbook for Local Officials" which in 300 pages explains how to use the first catalog.

To the experienced grantsman, however, the catalogs are so much window dressing, for a specific program and its funds are the target and that information is not easily available.

A new breed of public official, the grantsman, has been born to cope with the multiplicity of programs for local government up to and including state level civil servants lack the expertise and sophistication needed to stick their thumb into the federal pie and come up with plum.

In most cases, local officials, aware of an available supply of money, have no difficulty

in dropping their system of priorities to run after a grant-in-aid, simply because "the money is there."

To the professional grantsman, the bumbling approach is painful and to the sophisticated federal official administering a grant program, the rush of an outstretched hand is a sure guarantee of a turndown.

FOURTEEN CATEGORIES

The key to the grant-in-aid programs is not in their diversity but in their limited applications for while there are more than 1,300 "money pots" they each fall into one of 14 categories.

The major criticism of the grant-in-aid programs is their "categorical" nature which is a severe drawback to those communities which may want something not specified in the federal guidelines.

The 14 over-all categories supply the clue to the national goals which shape the type and amount of assistance available.

New Jersey's inability to reflect the national goals is shown in its participation in the federal grant-in-aid programs where the over-all system of priorities is rearranged to put state highway spending ahead of all the other categories.

The New Jersey numbers, in addition to restructuring the national goals, show the state is paying a high penalty for refusing to comply, since it receives the least amount of money from the federal government of all the 50 states.

For the fiscal year ending July 31, 1968 New Jersey received only 1.95 per cent of all federal grant-in-aid funds, \$416,105,000, and tracing that amount to Morris County shows practically none of it ever gets home.

The national order of priorities established by the amounts of money appropriated for various categories according to latest information compiled by the state Department of Community Affairs is:

FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS FOR 1967-68

Program category	Total, all States	Total, New Jersey
Public assistance.....	\$4,201,019,000	\$70,169,000
Highways.....	4,021,980,000	103,756,000
Agriculture.....	3,501,239,000	6,278,000
Education.....	3,086,528,000	72,845,000
Public health.....	1,406,221,000	20,165,000
Antipoverty.....	1,377,264,000	51,808,000
National Guard.....	842,802,000	14,860,000
Food distribution.....	686,554,000	10,020,000
Unemployment insurance.....	614,797,000	24,884,000
Urban development and public housing.....	538,077,000	25,041,000
Veterans' benefits.....	306,916,000	7,141,000
Conservation practices.....	289,223,000	1,239,000
Vocational rehabilitation.....	266,821,000	4,578,000
Child care.....	233,172,000	3,313,000
Miscellaneous programs.....	491,865,000	1,053,000

THE MONEY TREE: \$12 WILL GET YOU \$1 IN FEDERAL FUNDS—II

(By Mike Stoddard)

Out of the more than \$20 billion in federal grant-in-aid funds spent last year, New Jersey ranked last in the amount given all the 50 states plus Puerto Rico. Morris County, without any firm statistics, ranks among those which got the smallest slice of the federal melon.

In the jungle of federal statistics, the Office of Economic Opportunity in its annual survey of federal outlays states Morris County received \$146,494,071 during the last fiscal year.

The information derived from the new federal information exchange service, however, is preceded with the caution that the numbers shown are "obligations of government administered funds" and then proceeds to lump every penny spent in or outside the county on programs which may be pro-rated on national programs which have no effect upon the county.

The federal government with a broad brush includes the money spent on defense programs, including the Picatinny Arsenal payroll as one of its major expenditures in Morris County.

That the federal government is not above coloring its largesse is indicated by the inclusion of \$218,920 from Coast Guard, marine, harbor and shore services and \$49,608 as the county's share of participating in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Morris County also gets \$39,114 for feed grain direct payments to the owners of its nonexistent farms and receives \$1,536 in wheat direct payments for those same farms.

The Department of State, the report indicates, spent \$51,316 in Morris County for salaries and expenses of what must be assumed are foreign service officers, while the U.S. Information Agency put another \$18,988 in the local economy possibly for broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain.

The meat of the issue of how much Morris County gets from the federal government to aid local programs is carefully obscured behind the overwhelming numbers but it breaks down to very little.

The clue to Morris County's participation is found again in the state statistics using the per capita return to the state.

With New Jersey's getting the lowest per capita return of all the states, \$59.60 each, against the national average of \$105.81, the population of the county at 350,000 could only net about \$20 million.

The announcements of grants over the past year from the office of Rep. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, R-5th, show that less than \$6 million was allocated to Morris County including the expenditure of more than \$1 million for additions to Picatinny Arsenal.

One argued statistic released earlier this year by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association said it cost New Jersey \$1.70 for every dollar it received from the federal government.

SPEND \$12 FOR \$1

The truth is that for every dollar New Jersey received in grant funds, it paid more than \$12. Morris County with a larger than average per capita income, effectively paid its \$12 and got nothing.

That the county showing is so bad is not because the system of national priorities has no room for fitting the county's needs into the federal system of priorities for national goals but a local view that ignores those goals.

Freeholder Norman Griffiths, acknowledged to be Morris County's student of government, reaches back into as a county official to summarily dismiss the entire federal grant program as "a waste of time and effort."

Griffiths, who is quick to point out he has no political bias against having the county get federal, grant-in-aid funds, remembered his years of activity as a local official, a state legislator and of trudging to Washington, New York and Philadelphia looking for the elusive dollars so sorely needed by the growing county.

Now in his 80s, Griffiths' voice shakes with indignation as he tells of the countless trips and snarls of red tape which frustrated his efforts to do something for his home county.

His indictment of the federal grant-in-aid program is encompassing for he could find no hope that something could be done for his constituents.

WASTE OF TIME

"It is a waste of time," Griffiths said. "The bureaucrats only use that money to make their empires bigger and give more jobs to their friends."

County participation in some programs, Griffiths quickly pointed out, was more onerous than "doing it ourselves."

He said the federal regulations on strings attached to the grant programs made them

unworkable from their inception. The federal government handbook to local officials in language more tempered, warns, "In a sense, a 'no strings attached' program does not exist."

The federal government also warns officials to be prepared to face "red tape, which may cause frustrations and delays for local officials."

Griffiths disgustedly said the major drawback to the federal grants was that "they cost you more in the long run than if you had done it without federal help."

Last year the Morris County freeholders defended their refusal to ask for federal funds to help build the new county library. The money made available to the state through a block grant was not requested by the freeholders because the library design would have had to be changed to meet a floor space requirement exceeding those planned.

Griffiths agrees that the county should be eligible for additional federal funds. But he once more pointed at the requirements which make the funds a small part of any problem.

He recalled one example of a federal program where the grant, after being used in one year, left the county with the same amount to budgeted yearly.

The project, Griffiths said, was the desnagging of the Pompton River, where the U.S. Corps of Engineers gave the county a grant of \$50,000 the first year, then carefully wrote into the contract a provision that Morris County would maintain the river bed after the initial work was completed.

He said the maintenance item was estimated to cost as much each year as the original grant since the river bed changed course with each new rainfall.

Griffiths was especially bitter at the cost to the county of carrying on programs after the "feds and state pull the rug out from under us."

He and the other freeholders have publicly taken the state to task for failing to fund a program aimed at improved dental health in school age children which is being phased out, but not by the county which has assumed the cost with only a token payment from the state pot.

THE MONEY TREE: OFFICIALS INDIFFERENT TO U.S. GOALS—III

(By Mike Stoddard)

Morris County officials, while aware of the federal grant-in-aid programs, have at best reluctantly partaken in the fiscal feast. In their now indifference to the national goals spelled out by the grant-in-aid programs, the officials led by the Morris County Board of Freeholders may have jeopardized the future of every one of the county's 39 municipalities.

In 1967 Congress passed legislation which stated that no municipality in a given section, such as a county, will be given any federal financial aid unless a comprehensive plan for the entire county was completed.

The cutoff date for federal aid was set at last October but it was recently amended to October 1969, giving those municipalities engaged in federal programs a year's breather.

This year the Morris County Planning Board began working on a three-year comprehensive plan, funded in part by a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The county's reluctant involvement in the future of its municipalities stems again from the federal requirements which place a large measure of influence on statistics.

The federal government uses what it terms the "PEN" formula as determining its criteria for assistance. "PEN" stands for population, financial ability and need for any program. As the least meaningful number to assess a program, the county population is used as the base.

The financial ability of the county to pay for its share of any program is usually derived from the per capita income of the residents, which in turn leads to a slanted view of the county's ability to pay for its needs.

An unwritten criterion on federal aid programs on which all the experts agree is to measure the degree of poverty affecting the area. Morris County's poor, mainly blacks and Puerto Ricans, can attest to the minimal antipoverty funds which have been channeled into their lives because of the literal application of the "PEN" formula.

The municipalities, like the county, have lost their impetus to develop their own body of experts and fall further behind in their ability to solve the problems forced by the explosive population growth they are all experiencing.

In New Jersey, James Alloway, director of the Division of Local Finance of the Department of Community Affairs, oversees the financial health of the state's 567 municipalities and 21 counties.

Alloway is both sympathetic to the municipalities and highly critical of their performance.

"We're still running our towns from the hip pocket," Alloway said. "The feds are sophisticated and the towns are not. With the federal government staffed by skilled technicians, they expect the towns to come up with equally sophisticated approaches to their problems."

He compared the federal categorical grants to "laser beams" which cut through the many layers of government to focus on one aspect of one problem, ignoring all the other factors and problems affecting the municipality.

"The most grossly overignored aspects of the federal programs are the strings attached to them," he said. "Often the grants interfere with the orderly development of a municipality because of the strings."

Alloway pointed out that the allocation of local funds to complete a federal grant-in-aid contract could, in some instances, leave the municipalities short of funds for its local needs and lead to the creation of "artificial priorities."

As a first step to establishing a system of priorities for municipalities, Alloway called for greater state participation in the federal grant process to assure the attainment of common goals.

"The state has to assume its proper responsibility so it will have a say in how it develops, instead of allowing the municipalities to keep going in directions dictated by Washington," he said.

The state's contribution to directing the efforts of municipalities, Alloway said, may lie in new legislation, with one effort made to insist upon the regular submission of realistic capital budgets.

He said of the 588 five-year capital improvement budgets supposed to be submitted each year by every municipality and county, only 60 appeared to have any realistic basis. The others are either not submitted, he said, since the law allows their omission, or are submitted as "pie in the sky" dreams without any hope of realization.

#### CONGRESSMAN KEY TO FEDERAL GRANTS—IV

(By Mike Stoddard)

Grantsmen, the experts on tapping the U.S. grant-in-aid programs for local uses, all agree that a district's congressman is the key man to the Washington hierarchy.

Morris County shares with Somerset County the services of Rep. Peter B. Frelinghuysen, R-15th Dist., who has allied himself with Rep. William Roth of Delaware on the new legislation which would catalog every one of the existing federal grant-in-aid programs on a regular basis.

Roth, a relative newcomer to Congress, spent eight months last year compiling an

up-to-the minute listing of all federal aid programs and, in comparison to the announced 400 or so programs supposed to be active, found 1,271.

Roth also discovered that the federal government was spending \$21 billion instead of \$17 billion on those programs.

The monumental detective job performed by Roth and his staff has been recorded in the June 25, 1968 issue of the Congressional Record, which overnight became a new "bible" for the grantsman.

The Roth Catalog, as it has become known, sliced away the governmental verbiage hiding the programs and clearly defined who may apply for aid, to whom and how much money each program sheltered. The task was complicated by the fact that the aid programs are given in a variety of ways which include loans, advances, shared revenues, technical assistance and outright grants. Most of them require cost sharing and contributions from the affected municipalities of the states in which they are located.

Frelinghuysen calls the overlapping programs and lack of information from any one source "incredible."

He cites the existence of more than 470 educational programs spread among 20 different agencies and departments as areas of "possible waste and duplication."

Under the "program information act," Roth, Frelinghuysen, and 23 other congressmen are asking for a monthly catalog.

The bill, according to Frelinghuysen, would require that each assistance program listed in the catalog submitted to Congress would include a description of the program, the restrictions, level of funding, the costs and actual mechanics of applying for aid.

"As more and more programs of federal assistance are established, the amounts of bureaucratic red tape and paper work increase proportionately," he said. "It is therefore, not surprising to hear of incidents in which local officials have given up in frustration attempts to obtain federal assistance for local projects," Frelinghuysen added.

Another aspect of the federal programs which annoy him was noted in the OEO catalog of federal programs. He said the feds list a program under which consultants will be provided by the government to municipalities seeking federal aid. Ironically, Frelinghuysen noted, the consultant program was never funded.

Morris County's failure to take part in the federal aid programs has not gone unnoticed by Frelinghuysen, who said he has received "very few requests for help, either on a county or local level."

The machinery of his office, he said, has always been available to help steer passage through the Washington shoals, but there have been almost no takers.

Part of the reluctance he ascribed to the multiplicity of programs offered by the government and the lack of grantsmen on the county or local levels who have some familiarity with the programs offered.

He also blamed the paucity of the amounts granted as deterring factors in the never-ending search for funds. "The money is distributed in such small packages," Frelinghuysen said, "that it loses whatever effectiveness it may have had."

One answer he conjectured may be the reassessment of all federal grant-in-aid programs to channel large amounts to the states instead of through the present categorical approach.

Terming the present system "chaos" the congressman said the re-evaluation would be "an enormous job" but added it had to be done.

The county's failure to get more money, Frelinghuysen noted candidly, in addition to the reluctance of the local officials to get involved, was based upon purely political considerations.

Frelinghuysen said the county, as a Republican stronghold, often received a deaf ear in a capital that was run by a strong Democratic organization.

He said the change of political climate would undoubtedly be reflected in the future dealings of the county with the federal establishment, since it had registered a strong pro-Nixon vote.

#### THE MONEY TREE: SOME FEAR AID BYPASSES STATES—V

(By Mike Stoddard)

There is a growing suspicion among government experts that the federal grant-in-aid programs have been distorting the face of America by fostering an unnatural relationship between the federal establishment and municipalities which completely bypasses the state.

Among those students of intergovernmental relationships is Rep. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, R-5th Dist., who predicts a new role for state government under the incoming Republican administration.

He said the state would probably be given a larger part to play in the decision-making process, especially on how to make more effective use of federal funds for local programs.

On the state cabinet level, Treasurer John Kervick's interest in new state-local relationships may be the harbinger of the new direction.

As the custodian of all federal funds which are distributed to local governments through his office, Kervick and his accounting staff serve somewhat as historians for the grant-in-aid programs of the past.

Kervick's office in its yearly preparation of the budget and its fiscal report which accounts for those funds allocated to the towns, counties and cities is as sorely pressed as the local governments for exact information on who got how much and for what.

He said his office is now exploring methods of keeping the accounts which would reflect federal funds spent in the state, information he admits the state does not now have.

The formula funds given states are noted in the yearly fiscal reports, Kervick said, but individual grants to local jurisdictions in some cases never pass through the state coffers.

"We would like to know what each program is when an application is made by anyone," Kervick said. "Right now the first time we know of many applications is when the federal government sends us the money."

Kervick's understanding of the reluctance of many jurisdictions to participate in the federal assistance programs is based upon a longtime exposure to the realities of home rule and the political complexities of grants and aid.

He admits the state of New Jersey as a whole has not taken full advantage of federal funds and said he did not advocate "tapping the federal government" for a larger share of the available funds.

His reluctance to urge in-depth grantsmanship is based upon his evaluation of the state as a "prosperous, growing, industrial and commercial state," as opposed to those which have none of New Jersey's resources or wealth.

In contrast to others who would hit the federal government for any aid over normal expenditures, Kervick expects New Jersey to keep getting a very small per capita return because of its relative affluence and finds no fault with the concept of helping the less fortunate states.

That local governments have not taken part in the programs, Kervick said, was understandable.

"Many municipalities never wanted to participate," Kervick said. "They did not want to for political reasons in some instances and

many just did not want to subject themselves to the prying audits required by the federal government as part of the contract."

**BLOCK GRANTS SEEN**

The future of federal grants, Kervick said, will rest with the new federal administration. He echoed the predictions of Rep. Frelinghuysen that some form of block grants issued to the states would probably replace the existing categorical grants.

He predicted a tightening of funds, although pointing out that no tightening of federal money was being experienced by New Jersey at the moment.

The concept of federal income sharing, Kervick said, has been advanced by the incoming administration but details on what is involved have been lacking.

"We definitely would be interested in how the federal government would handle income sharing," Kervick said, "but we would want to know the details and that means everything."

"Most important," he said, "we would want to know how it affects the state and its people. Once we know we would be able to consider it and its application to our problems."

The one point on which Kervick was certain was that no matter what method the federal government employs to distribute its aid funds, the taxpayer "will not be relieved of his federal taxes."

His view of federal aid is limited to greater efficiencies in distribution of existing funds since income sharing and block grants are still limited to theoretical applications and methods.

The most pressing need for federal relief, Kervick said, is in the field of welfare costs which have an impact on every state and municipal government.

He said the federal assumption of all welfare programs would probably save many local governments now reeling under the costs. Part of the saving would be realized, he said, from the elimination of substructures to administer the funds which are apportioned to the states and then to its governmental subdivisions.

Other than priority on welfare programs, Kervick opined there were not other areas which were in dire need of immediate change.

For those municipalities still out in the cold and wanting to obtain federal funds for local projects, Kervick said the state wanted to help.

"The door is open," Kervick said, "all the machinery is there. We have all the programs, all they have to do is ask."

He said the establishment of the Department of Community Affairs was the single most important step taken to give the state a larger part to play in the development of the municipalities.

John Gleeson, head of the Office of Community Services, simply states his function saying: When this department was set up March 1, 1967, "grantsmanship was to be our major function."

**THE MONEY TREE: GRANTSMEN HURDLE ROADBLOCKS—VI**  
(By Mike Stoddard)

In marked contrast to many officials, the staff members of the Office of Community Services of the Department of Community Affairs have no reservations about the rights of municipalities to seat themselves at the federal table and partake of the fund feast.

John Gleeson, head of the division, notes the founding of the new state Department of Community Affairs in March 1967 was a clear mandate from the legislature to make grantsmanship work for the benefit of the state and its political subdivisions.

The Office of Community Services is staffed by the new breed of official, the grantsman, and every roadblock erected by the federal

agencies to protect their limited funds is viewed as a challenge to their ingenuity.

The staff is composed primarily of people who have been on both sides of the grantsmanship game and now work for the state. Road blocks which would discourage local officials are hurdled almost without effort.

Since the department was established a year and a half ago, the office has obtained grants worth more than \$100 million—money, Gleeson and his assistant Herbert Rosen are quick to point out, which has been used by New Jersey municipalities to further their programs.

The bulk of the money received to date is earmarked for the construction of the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry now being built in Newark. The school will take about \$75 million while another \$30 million is allocated to other projects spread across the state.

Even though the new department's success is startling in view of what has been accomplished before its birth, Gleeson and his staff view their efforts as "marginal" because of federal funds locked up by the war in Vietnam.

At a roundtable conference a few weeks ago, Gleeson, Rosen and William Bamka, a community service officer of the division, analyzed the federal grant-in-aid programs, their successes and their failures.

The financial condition of New Jersey obviously pained them for their future is closely tied to the state's fiscal health.

Under the existing tax structure of the state, local property taxes take the biggest bite, leaving only 29 per cent of all money collected to finance the entire state and its programs.

The paucity of state funds for needed programs, Gleeson said, was the final factor in directing their grant efforts to the federal programs.

The outward directed effort at Gleeson's "one-stop shopping service," however, is a state counterpart which also works out of the same office.

**THIRTY-ONE PROGRAMS**

In its most recent catalog the Department of Community Affairs lists 31 assistance programs funded by the state either solely or in co-operation with the federal government.

Many of the programs, while not paying off in money grants, are designed to give municipalities services which would otherwise act as a drain on their limited treasuries.

In contrast to the federal catalogs of assistance which only sketch the highlight of a given program, the community affairs catalog tells what the program is, its purpose, the nature of the program, who may apply and whom to contact.

Many of the state programs are aimed at upgrading the professional status of municipal employees and some funding is involved in others which pay the salaries of municipal employees loaned by one town to another for specific professional tasks.

The bureau of training and recruitment has just embarked on a series of courses in co-operation with state institutions of higher learning, all aimed at upgrading the municipal employees.

As another contribution to local governments, Michael Herbert, director of the bureau, conducts far ranging employe searches for municipalities at no cost.

**STATE PROGRAMS**

Gleeson said the state plans programs to aid the municipalities. How far the services can go will depend on the generosity of the Legislature and its view of how state money should be spent.

For the present the Office of Community Services has a clear-headed view of how to tap the federal fund pot, even listing guidelines on how. To the municipalities wishing to get federal aid, Gleeson and his staff say,

"Call us. Just pick up the phone and call us."

Under the federal capital program review, the department will help steer any applicants for federal aid through the proper channels after making certain the application is in proper form for submission.

Beyond the application, Gleeson and his staff have a hard view of what is needed for successful grantsmanship.

The first requirement, they say, is "a good staff, well paid and able to keep abreast of what's happening."

Keeping abreast is the gathering of intimate knowledge of what is taking place in Washington as new grant programs are passed into law and old ones are updated.

Next in importance, Gleeson said, is the reading of the law and building a case to present to the feds.

"What you have to do," he said, "is make the law work for you."

Successful grantsmen, Gleeson recalled, almost as soon as a law is passed which authorized a new grant-in-aid program, would be on the doorstep of the administering agency with their own programs and would help write the guidelines which would govern the future programs of other applicants.

In some instances, Gleeson said, demonstration projects could be coaxed out of the federal government simply because someone was inventive enough to think of a new approach to solving an old problem.

The faults of the federal programs, according to Gleeson, Rosen and Bamka are echoes of every complaint voiced by other officials, but the Trenton group is more keenly aware of the national goals shaping the federal programs.

The interest in the future direction of federal aid is masked by their overwhelming concern to do what can be done under existing restrictions.

Rosen, voicing their concern said, "every year it is costing the municipalities more and more to stay where they are. They have to be helped now."

That other means of aiding municipalities and other levels of government exist are not overlooked but there the approaches are more unusual.

**STATE SKILLED AS GRANTSMAN—VII**

(By Mike Stoddard)

The Department of Community Affairs, interpreting its formation as mandate to show its skills in grantsmanship, has returned more than \$100 million to the state in less than two years.

Part of its success is attributable to its aggressive enthusiasm and another part to its up-to-the minute flow of information.

Elmer Reinthaler, deputy to Assistant Commissioner Gregory Garrell, surrounded by masses of statistical information, waves most of it into oblivion calling it, "propaganda."

Reinthaler, although endorsing the state's enlarged role in aiding the communities, is doubtful of its future success unless the entire tax structure of the state is changed.

He cited the state's small income as 29.7 per cent of all local collections and said the money compounded the difficulties of administering any large scale programs since New Jersey, in addition to receiving the smallest amount of federal aid of all the states, also had the fewest number of employes per capita of any of the states.

He said the municipalities in their search for outside financial assistance usually overlooked private sources, such as foundations and voluntary agency funds accumulated by United Fund and Red Feather drives.

He noted that the entire public health budget for the United States was about \$1 billion, while thousands of voluntary fundraising organizations collected more than that every year.

In Morris County alone the current United Fund drive to support in part some 34 agencies is over the \$1 million mark.

The nonprofit foundations, Reinthaler said, have been overlooked by most governmental units as possible sources for funds. "The money is there, it's simply that no one goes after it," he said.

Reinthaler's assessment of the situation is a reflection of the current interest in foundations which, according to the Foundation Center of New York, have assets of more than \$20 billion spread among more than 20,000 foundations.

The largest of them all, the Ford Foundation, has drawn a great deal of attention in recent headlines because of its financial contributions to New York City's educational system.

Grants to New Jersey for studies and programs aimed at education from Ford are to be found in the pages of the annual fiscal report and a key to foundation grants can be found in the words of one spokesman who said it must fill two conditions, "experimentation first and visibility second."

Robert Seaver of the Ford Foundation disclaims any ability to speak for his foundation but years of grantsmanship practiced on both sides of the fence give him some authority on foundation thinking.

#### STRESSED DIVERSITY

Seaver initially stresses the diversity of the foundations, noting that by underwritten agreement many limit their grants to prevent competition for any one program from a variety of sources.

On the use of foundations by local governments, Seaver smiled as he recalled, "local people don't appear to take advantage of all the opportunities available to them."

Part of their reluctance, Seaver said, may be traced to corporate structures of the governmental unit, but recalled again that most proposals emanating from governments were "not" experimental or could serve as pilot projects which could have widespread applications in other areas.

Another key to foundation grants, Seaver pointed out, was the prospect of it being successfully duplicated by others without additional foundation funds.

"A foundation is not able to fund all worthy causes," he said, "so it looks for maximum leverage on minimum resources and is interested in those programs which will avoid permanent dependency."

One of his recommendations for obtaining funds for local projects, Seaver said, was for the municipalities to broaden their partnerships with local universities.

The universities, Seaver explained, have years of experience in grantsmanship, deriving almost all their funds from private and government sources.

They also have the ability to utilize the services of their faculties with high levels of expertise on most pressing social problems, and finally view problems in their area-wide context, he said.

The financial structure of the university, Seaver noted, in sharp contrast to most governmental units, is set up to spend money for specific programs.

The plus factor of municipal-university programs, Seaver \* \* \* municipalities which make it difficult for them to take grants for specific uses, since their finances must all come through their general funds.

#### THE MONEY TREE: LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MISS HARVEST—VIII

(By Mike Stoddard)

The consensus at practically every source of funds for aid to local governments is that the local governments themselves have not utilized the resources available to them.

Their inability to cope with their growing problems, the experts agree, again is due pri-

marily to the local governments' failure to attract and pay well-trained, enthusiastic staff members.

In Morris County, the local governing bodies have been carrying the added burden of a county government which has turned its back on outside help, preferring to pay for all its needs out of the tax moneys collected from the resident property owners.

On the state level, the past years of inactivity in fiscal matters left the state understaffed, unable to pay civil servant salaries out of the small percentage of money which reaches the state treasury.

The federal government, now writhing in the coils of serpentine grant-in-aid programs which overlap to the point where they are unresponsive to local needs, is about to make a dismaying survey of its own inability to help the states which pay the taxes to support those programs.

The last untapped resource, private capital, is slowly being brought into the vortex of government, for those confronted with the problems of urban living believe the business community of the country has helped create many of the problems and at the same time has disclaimed any responsibility for them.

As the population has moved to be close to its jobs, the problems of every community have grown in direct ratio to the number of people clustering inside the communities.

Functional disbanding of arbitrary municipal boundary lines has been advanced by some as one method of achieving better performance for a given tax dollar, while others have called for more regionalization of all facilities affecting the health, welfare and safety of the residents.

Commissioner Paul Yivisaker of the Department of Community Affairs has been on both sides of the fence in the field of grantsmanship, as an officer of the Ford Foundation and as a public official.

His opinion of local governments' failure to obtain funds from the federal grant-in-aid programs or other sources is that the local governments have not failed but rather have been failed by higher echelons of government which possess the expertise local officials lack.

Yivisaker, pointing at the tax structure of New Jersey, calls for a complete overhaul which would give the state a tax base capable of growing with the economy so the rate paid by the taxpayer would remain stable.

The federal grant structure, Yivisaker said, will have to be changed to allow the states to have a larger voice in how it will develop.

The method of grants would increase the state aid allocations and make the state a more equal partner in the never ending battle to solve the growing problems of population pressures.

#### SOME ELIMINATED

States which have not taken any substantial positions to improve their own tax efforts and insure performance would be eliminated from any further participation, he said.

"The state would have to demonstrate its competence to stay in the partnership," he said. "There would be no point to giving more money to states which do not make any effort to increase their own effectiveness."

He, like many others, was critical of the existing grant-in-aid programs of the federal government which sent "bureaucrats to talk to bureaucrats."

Ranging across the wide spectrum of programs, Yivisaker said a major effort will have to be made to "flush out the inaccuracies" of federal statistics and discover the "arbitrary allotments," hidden in the federal programs.

#### MORAL OBLIGATION

The new partnership with private industry is based, Yivisaker said, upon industries' "moral obligation," to help solve some of the problems.

Its most important obligation, he said, was

for industry to take action to add to the housing stock of the state.

He pointed out that many of the suburban housing units could only be afforded by high-paid employes and the lower paid employes were forced to live in the already short supply of low and middle income housing, most of it clustered in the state's decaying cities.

The new housing would give new life to the suburbs, Yivisaker opined, and coupled with a new tax structure for the state, make the coming years good ones in which to be alive.

#### TRANSATLANTIC DIALOG

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the eminent Senator of the French Republic, Georges Portmann, also distinguished as one of Europe's eminent physicians and presently serving as President of the French Association for the Atlantic Community, recently wrote in the March 8 issue of *Le Figaro* the following comment about President Nixon's relationship to Western Europe.

Coming as it does from a longstanding delegate to the North Atlantic Assembly and one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the spirit of liberty, Senator Portmann's remarks have special meaning for the United States.

Here is the text of his comments:

[From *Le Figaro*, Mar. 8, 1969]

NIXON REOPENS TRANSATLANTIC DIALOG

(By Georges Portmann, Senator from the Gironde, President of the French Association for the Atlantic Community)

At the height of a serious controversy in Europe on the Common Market and the Atlantic Alliance, President Nixon came to tell the old Continent that "the United States is determined to listen to its NATO partners with a new attentiveness." This is, no doubt, one of the most positive results of Mr. Nixon's trip to the principal European capitals and should encourage the allied countries of Western Europe to unite and to open a dialog with the United States profitable to all of them.

The speech delivered by Mr. Nixon to the Permanent NATO Council at Brussels deserves to be studied and analyzed. It gives the Europeans the guarantees they had a right to request, and it implies that the United States no longer wants to lay itself open to certain types of criticism on the part of its allies. So the President of the United States said he was convinced that his country should—in his own words—lecture its European partners less and give greater attention to what they think.

Continuous political consultation among fifteen allied countries has been, and is, one of the essential features of NATO. President Nixon did not hesitate to allude to the feeling which exists in some European quarters that too often the United States informs its partners only of what it has decided to do, instead of consulting them before hand. The new "master" of the White House stated that genuine consultation consisted in cooperating before acting, and not in securing the approval of a unilateral action. He added that this consultation should take place in both directions.

To concretize his words, Mr. Nixon undertook the pledge that he would consult the NATO countries thoroughly before and during any negotiation directly affecting their

interests. That is enough to reassure those who are afraid of direct negotiations between Washington and Moscow. Some will say that these are only words, but nobody can deny that the United States is seeking to reestablish an atmosphere of trust. It is up to the Europeans to take up the dialog and to make use of it for the future of the Western World.

President Nixon's trip to Europe is an act of faith in transatlantic cooperation. The distinguished visitor summed up his thinking as follows:

"As NATO is entering into its third decade, I see for it a possibility of being, even more than before, a rampart of peace, the maker of new ways of association and a dynamic forum for new ideas and new technologies appropriate to enriching the life of our people."

No peace-loving European can remain indifferent to this appeal for intensification of the bonds among countries defending the same freedoms. The President of the United States emphasized that the Atlantic Alliance must pool not only its weapons but also its brains. Though the French Government decided no longer to have its armed forces form an integral part of NATO, we can hope that he will appreciate the need for stepped-up political consultation among allies. As President Nixon said: "No nation has a monopoly of wisdom."

ROTARY CLUB BULLETIN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Rotary Club of South Knoxville, Tenn., produces a club bulletin for its members to keep them informed of club activities; and featured in the bulletin for this week is an excellent statement which I would like to share with my colleagues:

Those of you who read your newspapers probably saw where the film "I Am Curious (Yellow)" has just completed a smash-run off Broadway and is now scheduled to be shown in Washington, D.C. This film, apparently sanctioned by the sick minds of the Supreme Court, which shows a young couple in various acts of sexual relations, is being sponsored and promoted by Grove Press. Grove Press, one of the world's greatest purveyors of pornography, has been flooding the newstands in the past several years with pornographic publications. They are apparently immune to prosecution due to decisions rendered by said Supreme Court.

Without viewing the film, one needs only to examine their publications, such as, Evergreen Magazine, the paperback entitled "The Pearl", etc., to know that they would not sponsor anything unless it were pornographic. If I were a dedicated Communist, I would channel every dollar I could get my hands on to support these people in their magnificent efforts to destroy morality and therewith, religion.

The permissiveness and apathy of the American public is permitting this scum to promote the Kremlin's planned takeover from within by destroying the moral fiber of our society and with it the will to resist. At this point in history, the greatest service that Rotary International could render would be a vigorous program aimed at exposing this degenerate philosophy, eliminating its purveyors, and strengthening the moral fiber of our youth through the God and Country concept. Otherwise, there will soon be no Rotary International, Kiwanis, et al.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES H. SILVER AT THE 1968 ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the 23d annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation occurred on October 16, 1968, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Charles H. Silver. This annual non-political event, always held shortly before election day, has become a tradition in offering a unique opportunity for major candidates to be seen and heard. Last fall's dinner was attended by Presidential candidates, Hubert H. Humphrey and Richard M. Nixon—now our President. The then President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, made an unannounced appearance at the dinner.

It was indeed appropriate that in a Presidential election year the guest of honor was former Postmaster General James A. Farley whose own career spans the period from the days of the "Happy Warrior" to the present.

The Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner, which raises funds to aid the poor, sick and underprivileged, was organized originally at the urging of the late Francis Cardinal Spellman who, in the manner of Governor Smith, was deeply concerned about human suffering. The tradition was carried on last fall by the Most Reverend Terence J. Cooke, Archbishop of New York, who has recently been designated as Cardinal by Pope Paul VI.

I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address which the Honorable Charles H. Silver, the chairman, delivered at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner on October 16, 1968:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, CHAIRMAN, AT THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER, OCTOBER 16, 1968

His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, has entrusted to us a magnificent heritage and a sacred mission which we carry on tonight.

At this time, my friends, I ask that you please rise in silent prayer and tribute to His Eminence. Thank you.

It was His Eminence who initiated this annual convocation of minds and hearts to recall, from the perspective of our times, the "Happy Warrior" whose bright memory inspires us to continue his crusades of hope and courage against ignorance and hate—the dream he cherished—impossible in his time—still unreached in ours—of brotherhood and peace among men.

The years have dimmed none of the lustre of his love for those he called the common people—the victories against bigotry he won, even in defeat—the covenant he made, without compromise, to lift the heads and hearts of men higher than the orbit of the ordinary . . . so that they might walk tall—equal with all—and humbly—and justly—in the sight of God.

Today, many decades beyond, we look back with admiration and wonder—we "Look at the record" of that great American in whose name this foundation was born—and in

whose deeds we can take pride—yes—more than pride—example—and inspiration.

Ideals—as lofty as those for which he lived—will never die as long as we gather to honor the name of Alfred E. Smith.

This is our twenty-third annual dinner. Time has turned many a momentous page in the last quarter century. The world has rolled through blood and flame, tragedy and triumph. We have smelled the stench of genocide. We have heard the screams of the innocent. We have seen rockets rise to nudge the moon.

And even as our world totters on the brink of destruction, we witness the struggle of civilization to redeem itself in areas of social justice, health, education and intellectual emancipation.

What years they have been! And what men have emerged from them! Such leaders of thought and action as grace our dais tonight—President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, Vice President Nixon, Senator Javits, Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Lindsay—and, most particularly, our guest of honor, that noble humanitarian and notable citizen of the world, the Honorable James A. Farley.

They are leaders in the human parish that fuses men of all faiths in search for a way of life to ease the tensions of today and to meet the trials of tomorrow.

They are leaders—and followers, too, of those who minister to the human spirit—those men of God who give us the strength to carry on despite seemingly overwhelming odds—despite the rage and riot in our streets and the bitterness and bloodshed between men and nations.

If there is hope at all, it is the shining symbol of our beloved host who stands in the place of a departed prince and wears well the mantle of his office—that man of untiring strength and exalted vision—guide and friend and guardian of the faith—His Excellency, Archbishop Terence J. Cooke.

We can look to the wisdom and integrity of such men to draw a firm, clean line between the frontiers of freedom and the borders of bigotry and say to the fear-makers, the war-mongers, the rabble-rousers and the demagogues . . . "So far shall you go—but no farther."

Yes, whether it be a distant outpost in Saigon—or the smoldering barricades of Prague—or the bloodstained pavements of our cities—let us not shirk our duty. Let us peer into the gathering darkness to discover the causes and motives, the good and the evil—and to take our stand and say: "So far shall you go—but no farther."

The time has come for us to choose between progress and extinction. The time must not pass without our making that choice.

The atomic age has produced a deadly power which our faith can convert into the salvation of mankind. If we fall now, we condemn the future to chaos and fear.

We have seen the fruits of violence on every hand. We have lived with terror, created by weapons of unimaginable consequences for which no adequate defense exists.

And yet, this fearful force can be made a stepping-stone to the ultimate exaltation of humanity.

Be not deceived. The days ahead will damn the world to destruction or deliver it to peace.

And when peace comes again, let us be sure that the billions which went for planes and guns will go into medical research and housing and schools and every worthwhile project to keep men at work and replace poverty with health, opportunity and prosperity for all.

Our first obligation is to create a universal merging of minds and hearts.

Brotherhood must become something more sincere than mere words—and politics.

Education must become something more than the helpless victim of violent men and constant strikes—and politics.

Foreign policy must become something more than wasteful subsidies—and politics.

Against the degradation of crime and war—the dissolution of morality—we must erect barriers of reason, intelligence and understanding—so that a day may come when each of us in every land carries his own mirror of conscience reflecting hope rather than despair—courage—rather than fear—decision rather than doubt.

There is a famine in the world today more serious than lack of food. Men's bodies are starved in many places, yes; but the greatest hunger is in the soul of man.

And there is a hunger in the soul of America.

Our nation was conceived by men of vision to be an example of the better life that liberty and democracy can offer.

Today's frustrations and anger—today's injustice and insecurity—should remind us that America is what we make it—for ourselves—and for our children.

It must again mean the better life. It's a big job—and not an easy one—but it is time we got busy making this country what it was meant to be . . .

We have strayed far from our ideals.

It is time to revive the impossible dream of America.

It is time to protect the pride and reverence that nourished this nation's birth of freedom . . . to fight, if need be again, to beat back the unbeatable foe . . . to right the unrightable wrong . . . to strive with our last ounce of courage to reach the unreachable stars.

**QUICK MARCH TO THE REAR BY  
NIXON ADMINISTRATION ON  
CIVIL RIGHTS**

**HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, of late a highly disturbing trend has surfaced in the manner in which the Nixon administration is enforcing existing legislation in the area of human rights. These advances were so dearly bought, so painfully gained. So many good men and women gave their substance, efforts, and even their lives for laws now on the books. Their names are enshrined in the hearts of millions now enjoying these freedoms. Generations yet unborn will have cause to bless their names.

For these reasons I am much disquieted at what seems to be a deliberate policy of erosion being carried forth by the Nixon administration in the area of full enforcement of these laws.

It began with awarding Army textile contracts to companies in the South with highly questionable records of fair employment and promotion practices. These corporations also had severe antilabor records as well. Protests from many quarters brought murmurings of compliance and promises of activity but no performance. So much for Department of Defense contributions to this policy.

Next came a series of slowdowns in the pace of school desegregation in the South, as civil rights compliance sections of laws were not pushed with ac-

customed vigor by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Encouragement was lent to other school districts to delay cooperation or submission of their plans to desegregate. That has been HEW's share.

A third chapter has been written by the Department of Transportation. Working with major construction companies and construction trade unions which have often barred certain elements of American society from participation, major highway contracts were used to force compliance with the laws. Before acquiring such contracts, major firms had to show compliance with these laws. This restriction has recently been removed.

Now the Chairman of the Equal Opportunity Commission is grilled and threatened because he seeks to hold open the door to economic opportunity to those most in need of a chance.

So many have huffed and puffed for so long about jobs and regular income bringing new dignity, that I find these recent acts puzzling in the extreme. If we slam the door to employment shut in the faces of these citizens, then we are truly blighting their hopes and denying them their share in our American dream.

**THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
PEARY EXPEDITION**

**HON. HASTINGS KEITH**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, April 6 marks an anniversary which is deserving of special recognition. Easter Sunday is the 60th anniversary of Adm. Robert E. Peary's successful expedition to the North Pole.

The last surviving member of that expedition is Rear Adm. Donald B. MacMillan, who at 95 years is enjoying his retirement by the waters of Cape Cod Bay in Provincetown, Mass. In his own right a remarkable man, Admiral MacMillan has filled his life with the challenge of exploration—the lure of the unknown that brought him to join Peary's expedition. It spurred him to lead polar expeditions on an almost annual basis until he was 84 years old.

There is something we can all learn from the triumph that was the Peary expedition's when they became the first men to set foot on the North Pole.

Many men had set out before them but had faltered when the going became too difficult. Some paid for their efforts with their lives. Peary, who had attempted the feat twice before, had failed, but persevered and was the first to reach the Pole.

Peary and his men set out to do what other men had been unable to achieve. The elements were harsh, men suffered the agonies of severe frostbite. At times it seemed that they, too, were to be turned back. Of the 24 men who started out from the S.S. *Roosevelt* at the Arctic

staging point on March 1, 1909, only six reached the North Pole on April 6, 1909. They included Peary, four Eskimos and a Negro, Matthew A. Henson.

Each was inspired by his own motives and by their common bond of courage and perseverance. They had to overcome adversities and achieved what many others could not.

Each American should take notice of the bravery, courage, determination, perseverance, and strength of spirit displayed by Admiral MacMillan and other members of the expedition. We must apply them to the challenges of today.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the legacy and the challenge that Admiral MacMillan and the Peary expedition have given to us all.

**EULOGY TO DWIGHT DAVID  
EISENHOWER**

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we mourn the passing of a great and beloved American, a victorious general and a President who strove for peace. We honor Dwight David Eisenhower for a lifetime of devotion to the ideals of "duty, honor, and country."

President Eisenhower, a son of America's heartland, touched the hearts of the people of the world with the American vision of tolerance, freedom, and compassion.

His memory will be honored as much for his character as for his deeds. The qualities which made him a great man were those that have made America a great Nation: Courage, integrity, vision, compassion, and loyalty.

He was a President above partisan politics; a general whose main concern was peace; a man at once kind, gentle, and stern in his pursuit of the right. He was calm, judicious, determined, hopeful, idealistic. Americans trusted and loved him, not because he was a great man, but because he was a good man. Thoroughly American, he elicited pride in America.

He enjoyed more widespread popular support than any public figure in modern American history.

His simple nobility never left him. His humor and humility were constant. First and foremost he was a down-to-earth American who treated everyone alike, whatever their station in life. This unique humility graced his enduring warmth and friendliness. It was as if everyone of us were a member of his closest family for whom he had a fatherly concern.

We will cherish his memory for as long as the qualities he possessed are valued by men of goodwill.

We citizens of Hawaii have even more reason to honor his memory, for it was President Dwight D. Eisenhower who signed into law that bill which made Hawaii the 50th State of this great Union.

To his grieving widow, our former First Lady, Mrs. Eisenhower and to members of his family, I extend deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences for the people of Hawaii and for myself personally.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent observed the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. For over two decades after independence, in 1918, the Lithuanians made tremendous strides toward improving their nation; but, their freedom was short lived. Since 1940, 3 million Lithuanians have lived under the oppressive rule of communism and while these people cannot celebrate their own day of independence it is for us to remember and commemorate their cherished day of freedom.

I have as a part of my constituency many fine American-Lithuanians who enjoy the freedom of our country. They are faithful to publicly mark their homeland's day of independence. In this connection I am pleased to share with my colleagues a letter to the editor of the Schenectady Gazette titled "Lithuania's Tragedies Recalled."

It is also my pleasure this year to have nominated two fine young men of Lithuanian descent to the U.S. Military Academy. I am honored to include a resolution concerning those nominations presented at this year's Lithuanian Independence Day celebration in Albany, N.Y. which was signed by 89 American-Lithuanians.

The letter and resolution follow:

LITHUANIA'S TRAGEDIES RECALLED

EDITOR, GAZETTE:

As one looks over the pages of history of Russia, it becomes quite obvious that the rulers of that country have always prevented the people of eastern Europe from enjoying peace, freedom, and a better way of life. As an example, let's see how they treated the people of Lithuania.

From the time the Lithuanians were forcefully put under Russian rule in the late 18th century, until a few years before the outbreak of war in 1914, the Czars did nothing but take repressive measures against them. The Roman Catholic Church was persecuted, the Lithuanian language was forbidden to be taught in public schools, and all publication of newspapers and books in the Lithuanian language was forbidden. Despite the risks involved, Lithuanian books and periodicals were printed in East Prussia and the United States, and then smuggled into Lithuania. Homes became hidden schools where parents taught their children how to read and write their native language.

Two uprisings against the Czars ended in failure, but it was not until the end of the First World War, that their hopes and dreams became a reality.

On Feb. 16, 1918, with their homeland occupied by the German Imperial Army and Russia torn apart by political turmoil, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. They were not alone in their fight for

freedom as the people of Poland, Finland, Latvia, and Estonia joined in the struggle to break away from Russian rule.

Despite all treaties made to respect the integrity and independence of Lithuania, the masters of the "new" Russia, the Soviet Union, launched a massive invasion on June 15, 1940, and quickly occupied the country. The expression, "man inhumanity to man," would be the best way to describe the attempts of the Soviets to convert the Lithuanians to communism and the Soviet way of life.

The Communist Party became the only political party permitted to function. To strengthen their grip on the population, mass arrests of those who opposed the "new order" quickly followed. Since the Communists do not recognize the existence of God, a ruthless attack on religion was initiated in order to convert the people to atheism.

The German invasion of Russia on June 22, 1941, temporarily halted the Soviet plans for Lithuania. Captured documents of the Soviet Secret Police revealed that 34,260 people were arrested and deported to Siberia, during the two-week period just prior to the German attack.

The Russians also perpetrated atrocities before fleeing Lithuania. In a forest near the city of Kaunas, for example, piles of unburied corpses numbering 5,740 were found. Among them were 15 priests.

As the Nazi Army began their retreat to Germany in 1944, the Red Army once again occupied Lithuania. The 10 year period from 1944 to 1954 must be considered as the most horrifying in the entire 1,000-year history of Lithuania. During this time, about 300,000 people were either executed or deported to Siberia. The drive against the Roman Catholic Church and its clergy was renewed with greater fury than ever before. As a result of these terror tactics, 100 priests were imprisoned, and another 180 were sent to Siberia, including three bishops. One bishop was shot to death after being convicted as "an enemy of the state."

Have the Russian rulers mended their ways since the death of Stalin? Have they learned to treat people of other nations with compassion, respect, and dignity? I find no evidence of this. The events that took place in Hungary in October of 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in August of 1968 certainly offer positive proof.

What does the future hold in store for the people of Lithuania? Nothing encouraging, I'm afraid. In 1964, orders came from Moscow, that the campaign against religion was to be so intensified that the Roman Catholic Church would be wiped out by 1980. In 1966, the Kremlin sent its special emissary, a man named Pomeransev, to survey the progress of its anti-religious war.

May the millions of innocent victims, their blood, and their suffering serve as a warning to the United States to be vigilant and to resist the hypocrisy and the lies of communism. Let us always be on guard to protect our freedom, so that we may guarantee its blessing, not only for ourselves, but for all mankind.

EDWARD W. BARANAUSKAS.

SCHENECTADY.

RESOLUTION PRESENTED AT THE 1969 LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION, ALBANY, N.Y.

Whereas, on this 16th day of February, 1969, at Albany, New York, the Lithuanian community in said city, together with its friends, is celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day; and

Whereas, even though Lithuania may no longer be free, her fine and honorable heritage lives on in the hearts of her countrymen, descendants and friends in the United States; and

Whereas, the Lithuanian community in Al-

bany is very pleased that Hon. Daniel Button, our Congressman, through his Selection Board, has been kind enough to nominate, among others, as candidates to the United States Military Academy at West Point, two fine young men, brothers, of Lithuanian (and Scottish) descent, namely, James Russell Mackay and David Bruce Mackay, sons of Mr. and Mrs. David S. Mackay, respected members of our community; and

Whereas, said young men, James Russell Mackay and David Bruce Mackay, long known to us, do honor to their Lithuanian (and Scottish) heritage, by their exemplary conduct and achievements;

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

1. We thank Hon. Daniel Button, our Congressman, and his Selection Board, for their interest in our Lithuanian youth and for giving them the utmost opportunities; and

2. We thank Hon. Daniel Button, for his interest in our Lithuanian community, our people, our young people and all the problems that pertain to us; and

3. As a token of appreciation for his past, present and future interest in the Lithuanian cause, we sign this petition which will be sent him, as a friend of Lithuania and matters Lithuanian.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower prompts people the world over to contemplate the outstanding career of a distinguished American, affectionately known as "Ike."

This great leader whose death we mourn today was in life the personification of all that is so dearly cherished by free people everywhere. As a soldier, he was a brilliant military strategist and inspirational leader during a period of great crisis. As a statesman, he was a cohesive influence at a time when certain forces were placing in jeopardy the democratic institutions we prize. As a general and then as our President, he earned our respect, confidence, and even love but it will be as a true patriot that he will be long remembered.

The personal struggle for survival against illness so valiantly waged by General Eisenhower was characteristic of his conduct through life. He was not one to back away from a challenge or to lose heart when the going got rough. It was this spirit that sustained him and permitted him to cling to life despite great physical attacks, attacks which would have long ago claimed men of less determination.

It was John Donne who said "any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind." Today, I have that feeling. As one who proudly served in the Army under General Eisenhower in time of war and as one who was privileged to serve in the Congress during the final years of the Eisenhower Presidency, I prize the honor of having been personally so identified with this soldier, statesman, and patriot.

It is difficult to realize that Dwight David Eisenhower is no more. The loss is not ours alone, it is that of all mankind.

ADDRESS BY C. FRED KLEINKNECHT, JR., 33D DEGREE, GRAND SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL, ANCIENT AND ACCEPTED SCOTTISH RITE OF FREEMASONRY

### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. Fred Kleinknecht, 33d degree, grand secretary-general of the supreme council, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, recently delivered an important address before the Topeka, Kans., Scottish Rite bodies, marking the conclusion of their spring reunion. Mr. Kleinknecht discussed the problems of unrest and violence which have plagued many of our Nation's colleges and universities. In view of current interest regarding these problems in the Congress and throughout the country, I want to bring Mr. Kleinknecht's remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of his speech before the Topeka Scottish Rite bodies:

During the past year, college campuses across the United States from Columbia to San Francisco State erupted with violence, bloodshed, and arson. Although various groups and individuals participated in the campus upheavals, an organization of self-proclaimed radicals ironically called the Student for a Democratic Society was in the thick of this disruption. The irony of this organization is that, in spite of the promise of its label, its members are doing everything they can to destroy both democracy and society. For example, 70 persons were injured at the University of Wisconsin after the SDS organized a riot against Dow Chemical Company recruiters. At the University of Georgia, SDS-led demonstrators occupied the administration building, demanding that women students be allowed to drink and stay out all night. At that hot-bed of dissent, the University of California at Berkeley, the SDS deployed walkie-talkie-directed students as shock troops, erected barricades, and fought pitched battles with police in an assault on the Oakland Induction center. In light of this very disturbing situation on our campuses, I think it would be of interest to you to dwell on the background and causes of today's campus disorders and the evils produced by the likes of the Students for a Democratic Society. After having shown you the depth of the problem facing us, I will make some proposals which I feel must be enacted if we are to preserve academic integrity and higher learning in this country.

The past two decades have witnessed a transformation in the makeup and attitudes of America's collegiate student body. The courageous young men who survived the Second World War and the Korean conflict took advantage of the G.I. bill to further their education. They were a serious lot who already had, in many cases, a wife and family. They were anxious to learn and study in the classical tradition in order to attain a degree or more and go out into the competitive society to carve a career. Due, in part, to the efforts of these graduates our economy grew by leaps and bounds and our technology entered the space age.

However, as a result of the post-war baby boom and our greater affluence, America's college population has skyrocketed from approximately 2 million, six-hundred thousand

in 1955 to over 7 million in 1969. Thus, at our larger universities, freshman and sophomore classes are conducted by inexperienced teaching assistants whose average age is 26. The large state universities often, have lecture classes bloated to 1500 or more. Thousands of our students arrive on a campus expecting a close and intellectually enriching contact with experienced and well qualified professors. Instead, they find themselves facing the increasing impersonality and regimented demands of today's mass universities.

Facing such an obstacle, it is not surprising that some of these students began looking for a scapegoat. From the overwhelming majority, a minority of activists has emerged. The members of this minority have what psychologists call a "protest-prone personality." A former Berkeley professor who quit in disgust after campus totalitarians took over, found this group to be "possessed by a terrible, compulsive irrationality that corrupted their idealism." The famous longshoreman-philosopher, Eric Hoffer, puts it more simply: "They find waging revolution easier and more fun than writing a term paper."

Some among this "protest-prone" minority met in June 1962 in Port Huron, Michigan, to produce the SDS manifesto, which was a Marxist economic critique of America. By 1968, SDS claimed to have 6300 dues-paying members and another 35,000 unregistered participants in 250 chapters, all under the direction of SDS headquarters in Chicago. Although SDS began as an idea group, the activists soon took over. What are some of their tactics?

Using typical Marxist rhetoric to harangue an audience, SDS National Secretary Greg Calvert recently boasted, "We're working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. We're actively organizing sedition." A typical tactic of the SDS is to rally the student body around a flimsy but popular issue such as dorm rules and then politicize the issue into a protest against the university's relations with the nation's defense establishment. Specific tactics to cause a school to be disrupted are:

Starting trash can fires and activating fire alarms;

Making hundreds of appointments with deans and registrars, thus overloading university machinery;

Checking out an excessive number of books to disrupt libraries and study programs.

Having become acquainted with the all-too-familiar tactics of these campus insurrectionists, one wonders just how "pink" the SDS is. After repealing a constitutional stipulation barring Communists from membership, SDS chapters abound with Maoist, Stalinist, and Trotskyite Communist Party representatives. Tom Hayden, an SDS founder, visited Hanoi in 1965 with the top U.S. red strategist, Herbert Aptheker. Other leaders went to Havana recently for Castro's international cultural congress. SDS organizer Bernadine Dohrn, an admirer of Che Guevara, says "I consider myself a revolutionary Communist." Yet, not all activists are Moscow or Peking-oriented Communists. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sees a further menace: "Their common bond is a passionate desire to destroy, to annihilate, to tear down. To put it bluntly, they are a new type of subversive, and their danger is great."

As a result of the tactics of these groups such as SDS, Black Panthers, and the Mobilization to End the War in Viet Nam, our great universities are in danger of being irreparably damaged. In order to combat these dangerous trends on our campuses, the following courses of action are suggested:

Students and faculty must support prompt action to maintain campus peace. Dissident students and faculty are a present day version of Hitler's storm troopers and must be met with strict enforcement of the law.

College administrators must not appease

or temporize with totalitarian minorities using coercion and anti-democratic tactics. If police are needed to quell a campus riot, so be it.

We must all support basic university reforms that are genuinely needed. We must do what is necessary to alleviate the impersonal atmosphere of the school systems and attend to the legitimate orderly expression of student grievances.

We must encourage our press and media to tell the story of the bright and responsible majority of our students as well as the disruptive actions of the minority but with more emphasis on the former.

It is necessary that we revere and love the god of infinite beneficence, labor for the good of the human race, strive to acquire a knowledge of the wonders of nature and the sublime truths of sound philosophy, and practice the virtues taught in freemasonry.

Many of our Masonic brethren helped establish this free country and I am convinced that, if we lack the will to thus defend our academic institutions against illegitimate disruption and takeover our future as a free society is doomed.

LET US KEEP "GENTLE BEN"

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in this modern day of protest against everything, it is refreshing to find a protest for, a protest for a wholesome, positive program on television, and against the powers that be who have arbitrarily decided to cancel the weekly show, "Gentle Ben."

At a time when we are seeing more and more violence on television and at a time when we are investigating violence on television, I think a campaign in south Florida to save a particular TV program is worth bringing to the attention of my colleagues in the House and Senate.

I would like permission to reprint in the RECORD a newspaper editorial written by Mr. George Radosevich, and a column by Mrs. Joan Bucks Hansen, both of which appeared in the North Dade, Fla., Journal. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues with the request that they read the same and assist, to the extent possible, in retaining this worthwhile television program:

"GENTLE BEN" SHOULD BE KEPT

It is a sad commentary on our society when a television show that is gentle, wholesome and moralistic—such as "Gentle Ben," can't stay on the air while countless shows of violence prosper.

"Gentle Ben" is more than a 600-pound black bear, or a television performer. He represents something that too often is left by the wayside in this era of drama and violence, hippies and riots, nudie plays and draft dodgers.

"Wholesome" is a word that in this day is too often sneered at. But that's what "Gentle Ben," is. Maybe that's one reason for his banishment.

And that is why we think his banishment is a mistake.

The majority of television viewers are just as wholesome as "Gentle Ben." They are concerned about the violence, and raw character of much of what is seen on the television screen.

"Gentle Ben" is not a goody-goody and neither is his friend Mark Wedloe, the warden's son. Ben and his family live in a real world with real dangers, and face them in a completely human fashion. Ben teaches the lesson that a 600-pound brute can be gentle and that implies a great deal more.

We hope our readers and television viewers across the country will take up pen or pencil to let CBS know that "Gentle Ben" is the kind of wholesome entertainment that should continue.

It is time for everyone who has been unhappy with the other kind of television entertainment—too frequently seen—to strike a positive blow for wholesome TV by helping to save "Gentle Ben."

Letters on behalf of "Gentle Ben" should be addressed to John Schneider, vice president, CBS, 51 W. 52nd St., New York, N.Y.

And if you belong to a church or civic group it would be a good idea to interest your members on a national level to help keep "Gentle Ben."

**"GENTLE BEN" NEEDS YOUR HELP TO STAY ON**  
(By Joan Bucks Hansen)

"Gentle Ben," that 600-pound modern day version of Winnie the Pooh, will lumber away into the Everglades forever and not be seen again unless something happens to change CBS's corporate mind about dropping the program for the 1969-70 television season.

As children's fare, I don't think anything else on the TV screen can top it. Nine-year-old Mark Wedloe, the Everglades warden's son, lives out all the problems and puzzling situations that confront every child growing up.

Almost every show in the "Gentle Ben" series has represented a worthwhile lesson for both children and parents.

Most little boys don't have a 600-pound pet bear to back them up when the going gets rough. But they have big dogs. They don't have the Everglades to play in, nor alligators to avoid—but the everyday world of our city streets can be every bit as hazardous as the Everglades, and it is often inhabited by hazards that are just as real as the jaws of a gator.

"Gentle Ben," as a children's television show, is wholesome without being saccharine-sweet, and it is real in the sense that its nine-year-old hero is confronted with problems that are identical to those faced by most children.

It is difficult to see why a show of this type should be cancelled. Perhaps competing with Walt Disney, which is on at the same time, is expecting too much of the bear.

The show has all the elements that "Lassie" has—and more. Lassie has left the children's world she once inhabited for the adult world of the forest ranger, and the plots get thinner and thinner all the time. Yet the furry old girl goes on and on, without any real message or appeal to children except her soulful face and furry coat.

I'm fond of Lassie myself. But she doesn't have the kind of special child-appeal that the "Gentle Ben" series has.

I think that "Gentle Ben" is worth saving. Perhaps a deluge of letters to CBS and their local affiliates might keep "Gentle Ben" around for another season.

It would be a good way to strike a blow for wholesome television entertainment. It would be a positive approach.

It seems at times that it is easier to find people who are ready to crusade against something—against obscene literature, TV violence, drugs, and a multitude of other undesirable items—than it is to find people ready to crusade for something.

I think that a crusade to save "Gentle Ben" would be a good, and positive step toward encouraging wholesome television entertainment.

**WASHINGTON OPPORTUNITIES  
FOR WOMEN**

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I recently obtained some information about a voluntary group that is making an effective contribution to the Washington area. The group is Washington Opportunities for Women, Inc., or WOW.

WOW came about because of answers to a vocational questionnaire circulated among local alumnae of 50 women's colleges in 1965. These answers indicated that educated women are eager to work, but most of them are married and unable to work outside their homes full time. The needs expressed repeatedly on the questionnaires were part-time employment, serious volunteer work, and part-time education.

Several points seemed obvious to the women who circulated the questionnaires: trained talent is in perennially short supply everywhere; one of the best sources of manpower is womanpower; because most women are married, they require flexible scheduling in their part-time activities; family life can be enriched, rather than weakened, by a mother who is occupied outside her home part time; employers of part-time workers receive full value for each hour worked, since the employees have other hours for extraneous calls and errands; "pairing" of part-time with full-time teachers and other workers, and building flexibility into standard workweeks, require considerable thought and promotion before being widely accepted.

WOW was incorporated in 1966 as a nonprofit organization "to develop and encourage more flexible and imaginative opportunities for educated women—to enable the community to utilize the skills and talents of its women." Since then WOW has bridged the gap between the unused reservoir of able women and the unmet needs of the Washington community in several striking ways:

First. The WOW Information Center: Since 1964, in cooperation with the Professional Placement Center of the District of Columbia office of the U.S. Employment Service, WOW volunteers have staffed a hitherto nonexistent desk to serve women seeking part-time employment, productive volunteer work, or continuing education. Trained volunteers have interviewed more than 1,300 women, individually or in groups. Simultaneously, efforts have been made to develop more part-time jobs and training programs, particularly in fields with critical personnel shortages.

Second. A book, "Washington Opportunities for Women: A Guide to Part-Time Work and Study for the Educated Woman": This publication was researched and written by more than 100 WOW volunteers and published in 1967. The study is available at local bookstores.

Third. A part-time urban teaching project. WOW is in its second year of this 3-year demonstration project, in cooperation with Washington's Trinity College, to develop new teacher resources for urban schools. About 20 qualified women, unable to work as full-time teachers, are trained each year to meet the needs of inner-city schools. Then they are placed as part-time teachers in those schools. The first year's trainees are giving ample proof of the contribution to be made by part-time teachers. Initially funded by private sources, this project is now being supported by the U.S. Office of Education.

Fourth. Social work project: Since 1968, WOW has been devising methods of augmenting the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare staff by cooperating with the department in a new part-time professional and preprofessional placement program. To alleviate the damaging shortage of social workers, trained workers are now being recruited through WOW for less than the traditional 40-hour week. And competent women who do not have their master of social work degrees are being placed in the Department on a part-time basis and will be given on-the-job orientation, training, and in-service support. For those who wish to work toward their MSW degree, WOW has been exploring arrangements with both the University of Maryland and Catholic University. The part-time workers in the city's Welfare Department may receive field work credit toward their degrees. A pilot program of extended part-time graduate study leading to the MSW is being considered. Scholarship funds may be available at both universities.

In a noteworthy move, the Civil Service Commission has agreed, along with the Public Welfare Department, to count relevant volunteer work as qualifying experience for these social service jobs. WOW volunteers are working now with the CSC to simplify and speed the rating process for applicants for part-time social service jobs. For those women who lack sufficient working experience in the social service field, WOW volunteers are striving to place them at a qualifying level.

Envisioned as WOW's next step is a training and employment program combining the talents of professional and disadvantaged women.

WOW makes no charge for its services. It is an example of what can be accomplished with imagination and volunteer effort. It has recruited qualified workers for Federal agencies desiring to set up model programs demonstrating new and flexible ways to hire and utilize people. WOW's projects in Washington have trained many women who have moved or will move to other parts of the Nation, so that these women can carry their training into other areas.

The women behind WOW, Mr. Speaker, are the type of people who look at the troubled world around them, roll up their sleeves and think up solutions involving their own, not someone else's, hard work.

RESIGN, MR. FARMER, FROM  
SOMETHING

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is with demonstrable difficulty that most straightforward people are able to play, simultaneously, on two opposing teams. For some, on the other hand, it is easy. We can witness such an act of political agility at the present time in the case of James Farmer.

The Nixon administration has hardly fielded a team, and certainly had called few plays, yet one of its members has swapped sides and is playing for the opponents.

Of course, it will hopefully only be for one play. And I am sure he was sincere in not liking the play the coach called, and he did just move to the big leagues, and from the opponents camp anyway. Maybe it is to be expected. But some think the whole ball game could depend on this one play. Some even think that team spirit and a united effort are important. Some do not.

The player in question, Mr. James Farmer, was recruited and signed to be a member of the Nixon administration. Mr. Farmer was not, to the best of my knowledge, under any coercion or compulsion when he joined the administration. Neither, as far as I know, was he forced to join the board of directors of SANE.

Now it is time for Mr. Farmer to resign from one or the other. Personally, I would prefer his choosing to resign from the administration. The two are not compatible but it should be his decision.

One of the few plays called by the administration is the decision to deploy the "safeguard" ABM system. As a member of the administration, it seems only reasonable that Mr. Farmer either say nothing about the decision or support it. Actually, one can only wonder what credentials Mr. Farmer presents to indicate his expertise on the ABM decision. I know of his past pursuits and remember no mention of his being an expert in the fields of national defense, foreign policy, nuclear armament, or rocketry. But by the same token, I can think of little to recommend him for a position in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

He is, however, a member of this Department, and also a member of SANE. His double duty came recently when SANE sponsored a full page ad in the New York Times, an ad which among other things stated that "President Nixon, Secretary Laird and their advisers in the Pentagon seem to have lost touch with reality." "They're mad, they're absolutely mad," the ad starts out. Mr. Farmer was, of course, listed appropriately at the bottom of the page.

Mr. Speaker, I have never taken SANE very seriously. SANE has more than its share of crackpot leftists and I'm sure they have a good time of it all but it does become a bit ridiculous.

But the point is this. Mr. Farmer cannot support both and he should resign from SANE or from the administration—preferably from the administration. Or even both.

I include the text of the advertisement from the March 24, 1969, edition of the New York Times, and the list of directors and staff, in the RECORD at this point:

FROM THE PEOPLE WHO BROUGHT YOU VIETNAM: THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

They're mad.  
They're absolutely mad.  
Everyone can see that things at home are getting worse all the time, and that little or nothing is being done about it.

The last thing in the world we need is to spend six or seven thousand million dollars for the down payment on an anti-ballistic-missile system.

But what can you expect from the type of mind that got us into Vietnam in the first place, and that keeps plunging us back in for one-last-victory-try every time it looks as though we might finally extricate ourselves.

Mr. Nixon and Secretary Laird and their advisers in the Pentagon seem to have lost touch with reality.

*There are bombs going off in our cities, but they're not coming from China or the U.S.S.R. The air we breath is being poisoned, but it's not being done by enemy agents.*

*Many Americans no longer believe what the Government tells them, but it's not because they listen to Radio Moscow.*

*The gold in Fort Knox is, for all practical purposes, no longer our own—but the job wasn't done by Goldfinger or Smersh.*

The war and weapons people have become so obsessed with International Communism, they fail to see that they themselves are laying the groundwork for a state of home-grown anarchy.

*A few observations on the A.B.M.*  
The figure they use is six or seven billion dollars. But this is just the well-known foot in the door.

Experience with Pentagon procurement in the past indicates that actual costs run two or three times the original estimate.

Furthermore, there is every likelihood that the "light" ABM system will get heavier and heavier as it goes along, and would ultimately cost over fifty thousand million dollars.

All this for a "Maginot Line in the Sky" (as the N.Y. Times described it in a recent editorial), that would most likely be obsolete by the time it is operative, and wind up as surplus electronic junk on Canal Street.

Meanwhile, back in the U.S.S.R., do you think "their" hawks would be standing still for this?

*What can we do about it?*

Unfortunately, the Pentagon doesn't seem to be able to learn from experience, but we wouldn't give up hope for the U.S. Senate.

There are a lot of Senators—including conservative Republicans—who feel they were "had" by the infamous Gulf of Tonkin resolution, and this time they don't seem to be buying the Pentagon's big public relations campaign on the A.B.M.

This thing can be stopped in the Senate. But it will take the kind of grass roots' effort that did so much to change the political climate on Vietnam last year.

Our marching song has come again.

LIST OF DIRECTORS AND STAFF

SANE: a citizens' organization for a sane world.

Board of Directors: Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, Chairman; Roy Bennett, Vice-Chairman; Herbert A. Brandon, Treasurer; Robert Al-

pern, Dr. Paul Bechtel, Robert D. Bloom, Prof. Robert Browne, O. Edmond Clubb, David Coplon, Prof. William Davidson, John F. DeLury, Dr. Harold DeWolf, Prof. James Dinsmoor, James Farmer, Jerome Frank, M.D., James B. Frankel, Philip Graff, Michael Harrington, Rabbi Isidor Hoffman, Prof. Irving Howe, Prof. Thomas Hutto, Prof. David R. Inglis, Dr. Homer Jack, Mort Junger, Arnold Kaufman, Betty Goetz Lall, Marilyn Langner, David Livingston, Rep. Allard Lowenstein, Lenore Marshall, Prof. Seymour Melman, Joseph Miller, Dr. Paul Miller, Valerie Mullen, Rev. Richard J. Neuhaus; Dr. Orville Pell, Stanley J. Romaine, Prof. Milton Rosenberg, Doris Salzberg, Marjorie Schell, Robert Schwartz, Prof. Bennet Skewes-Cox, Sarah Smith, Benjamin Spock, M.D., Samuel Tucker, Prof. John Ullmann, Dr. Maurice Visscher, Prof. Michael Walzer, Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, Herman Will, Prof. David Wurfel, Rev. Andrew Young, Prof. Gordon Zahn, Betty Zemel, Isidor Ziferstein, M.D.

Staff: Sanford Gottlieb, Executive Director; Tudja Crowder, Program Director.

Honorary Sponsors: Lord Boyd-Orr, United Kingdom; Martin Buber, (1878-1955) Israel; Pablo Casals, Puerto Rico; Brock Chisholm, Canada; Cannon L. John Collins, United Kingdom; Gunnar Myrdal, Sweden; Martin Niemoller, Germany; Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., United Kingdom; Clarence Pickett (1884-1965); C. Rajagopalachari, India; Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965) Gabon.

SANE, 381 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016. Telephone (212) 889-3442.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

**HON. PETER N. KYROS**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a great American, Dwight David Eisenhower.

A statesman among generals, Dwight Eisenhower's military leadership during World War II brought him the profound gratitude and respect not only of Americans, but of citizens throughout the world. This ability to lead men of diverse nationality and varying viewpoints came naturally to General Eisenhower, as a result of his character and dedication. No graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point has ever better exemplified the creed with which Academy graduates are instilled: duty, honor, and country.

Dwight Eisenhower later sought and attained our Nation's highest leadership not as a war hero, although this he was, but as a man dedicated to true world peace. His ultimate quest was for that day, as envisioned by Tennyson, when "The war drum throbbed no longer, and the battle flags were furled." As our Nation yet continues to search for realistic relationships with allies and adversaries alike, it may be that history will regard as General Eisenhower's greatest accomplishment those steps which he took in furtherance of peace.

General Eisenhower inspired us, not only because of what he did, but because of his personal beliefs. He loved our country by loving its people. He sought to bring out in us those qualities which

are most noble, and those ideals which he himself held dearest. In doing so, he summoned forth a unique affection among us.

Few Americans have served their country as long or as well as did Dwight David Eisenhower. We shall miss Ike.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: RESEARCH TOWARD NATIONAL CODE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a genuine crisis in the forest products industry. Everyone is now aware of the great concern over the high prices of lumber and plywood. There are both short- and long-term solutions to this problem, which is principally one of supply, since nothing really can or should be done about demand.

If we are to achieve our national long-range housing goals, to build 26 million housing units during the next 10 years, and still keep up with demand after that period—which, if anything, will be even greater—we now must adopt a national policy to cope with this demand.

Research is an essential and integral part of any long-range solution. This is spelled out in detail in a letter which I have received from Ernest L. Kolbe, a consulting forester in Oregon.

Mr. Kolbe has long been active in forestry, and is one of the truly outstanding experts in the Nation on timber supply. I commend his letter to anyone interested in the price of lumber and plywood, and in making it possible for us to meet our long-range housing goals:

WILSONVILLE, OREG., March 7, 1969.

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

DEAR WENDELL: With hearings on Federal appropriations for Fiscal Year 1970 rapidly approaching, I am calling to your attention again a forestry research need that I know you regard as critically important—construction of Phase II of the U.S. Forest Service Forest Sciences Laboratory at Corvallis.

You have worked long and hard with us since 1965 to obtain this most important facility. It was in large measure through your efforts that funds were appropriated in July 1966, to plan a \$2.5 million addition to the laboratory. The plans were completed in June 1967, and we were most pleased to review them with you last August in Portland at the meeting sponsored by the Northwest Forest Pest Action Council and the Forestry Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

But architectural plans in themselves obviously do not provide the needed working space for scientists to move ahead on solving critical forestry problems. Almost two years have passed and no construction funds have been appropriated. Because of spiraling building costs, estimated funds needed to complete the laboratory addition, if begun in 1969, are now \$2.7 million. Building costs seem certain to increase even more in the months ahead. Thus, it would seem extremely unwise to further delay appropri-

tions to construct this critically needed investment in the forest economy and well-being of the Northwest.

I would like to review for you again some of the specific kinds of high priority forestry research that are being held up or seriously handicapped by lack of facilities at the Corvallis laboratory:

**Forest Genetics Research**—The ultimate solution to many forest protection problems is to develop genetic resistance in the trees. Some examples include the need for strains of sugar pine and western white pine resistant to blister rust, strains of Sitka spruce resistant to the Sitka spruce weevil, strains of Port Orford cedar resistant to the deadly phytophthora root rot, and true-fir hybrids resistant to attack by the balsam woolly aphid.

**Forest Insect Research**—In the limited facilities now available, strong emphasis is being placed on research to develop biological and other alternatives to chemical control of forest insects, which kill several billion board feet of timber annually in the Pacific Northwest. For example, scientists at the laboratory appear on the verge of developing a practical means of using a virus to control the Douglas fir tussock moth, one of the most destructive insects in the West. To the extent possible, work is also in progress on use of sex attractants for controlling the European pine shoot moth, and methods of manipulating beneficial parasites to control pest insects. But these efforts are all seriously handicapped by lack of space and facilities.

**Pesticides Research**—An important nationwide project was begun at the laboratory in 1964 on the impacts of pesticide residues in forest soil and water. The research of this project has a strong bearing on progress toward reaching national goals of abating water pollution. Some excellent work has been done, but the scientists in this project are scattered in improvised space wherever it can be found on the Oregon State University campus. This detracts seriously from research production.

**Forest Disease Research**—Diseases that kill and damage trees are even more difficult to control than insects, and their impacts on forest production are nearly as great. Working in existing, badly crowded space and temporary trailers, scientists have discovered that certain beneficial organisms in the soil secrete antimicrobial substances that are antagonistic to tree diseases, such as highly destructive root rots. These leads have most promising practical value, but cannot be pursued aggressively with the limited facilities now at hand.

I could cite many more examples of high priority research that is being hampered by lack of adequate laboratory space and facilities. But when we need so urgently to move ahead in our timber management in Oregon and other parts of the West, I do not think we can afford any longer to have the outstanding forestry research units at Corvallis operating at half speed. In all our timber growing efforts we are working to save time. We have already lost two years on the Corvallis laboratory and will lose a third unless the budget is revised to get things moving again.

I want to thank you again for the important and extremely effective assistance you have given the Northwest Forest Pest Action Council and many others in improving the benefits from our great forests. I am hoping you can help further in the upcoming Congressional Appropriation Hearings by requesting the needed funds for construction of Phase II of the Corvallis Forestry Sciences Laboratory. This is a key investment in the future well-being of Pacific Northwest forests and the millions of people who depend upon them, daily use their essential products, and many other opportunities they provide.

I am sending copy of this letter to various members of the Northwest Pest Action Council because of their long-standing support of the Corvallis Laboratory.

Sincerely,

ERNEST L. KOLBE,  
Consulting Forester.

WHAT IS "NEUTRALITY"?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the article which I hereby place into the RECORD from the March 7, Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News, by Dumitru Danielopol of the Copley News Service, is certainly a stimulating commentary on the Communist propaganda activities in Sweden:

WHAT IS "NEUTRALITY"?  
(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"Neutrality" is a word the Communists don't understand, not even in Sweden.

For more than 150 years Sweden has been a country that has tried to stay aloof from disputes. It has avoided wars and in turn its neutrality has been faithfully respected. But the cold war is a different matter.

Today Sweden has become a hotbed of Communist propaganda and a most important platform for Moscow, Peking and Hanoi in carrying out their attacks against the West, against Saigon and against the United States.

The choice of Sweden was natural. Her geography, her neutrality, her democratic and liberal policies carried on for generations made her a perfect spot to give respectability and credence to Communist vilifications.

Besides Sweden has a modern communication system which permits rapid and widespread distribution of the propaganda.

The social structure of the country also played a part in this choice.

The older generation of this richest of all Scandinavian countries tends to be disinterested in world affairs. It is fundamentally anti-Communist and therefore immune to leftist propaganda.

It is not the same with the younger generation, especially the students.

Natural idealism, enthusiasm and a desire for adventure has made them a fertile soil for Communist infiltrators.

They are "manipulated by foreign and Swedish Communists who impregnate the innocent minds with beautiful visions of theoretical Marxism, Maoism and Castroism," says Lars Eric Nyman, the youth secretary of the Swedish chapter of the World Anti-Communist League and vice president of the Democratic Alliance, an anti-Communist youth and student organization.

The mathematics student of the University of Stockholm, now visiting this country, is a tough and efficient organizer.

In Saigon, where he visited recently, he convinced the government to establish a South Vietnam Information Center in Stockholm.

"Whereas the Communists spare no money and effort to flood Sweden with propaganda, the West, South Vietnam and especially the United States do very little, if anything at all," he says.

The Communists he says, work openly and stage frequent "peace conferences."

"Young delegates from African and Asian

countries are being invited in large numbers to listen to 'the views of neutral progressive' Sweden," he says.

"The well-known Moscow-financed 'World Peace Council' is the main organizer and agent behind these conferences."

Nyman says four Communist front organizations work full time in Sweden through the so-called Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society. They also have organized the "Vietnamese NFL Information Bureau in Sweden" which specializes in anti-American propaganda.

"They have convinced a majority of Swedish students and young people that the Viet Cong are a coalition of democratic groups in Vietnam, who would organize a democratic society if they were left alone—by the 'Fascist' Saigon regime and the American 'imperialist,'" he says.

"The great majority of Swedes are still staunchly democratic, but when pro-Communist Swedish activists prevent the American ambassador from making a public speech, our democracy is in danger, too. Democracy cannot survive without the freedom of speech."

Nyman's 1,500-youth organization needs all the help it can get.

"We get from the Peking Embassy in Stockholm more literature in perfect Swedish than the American Embassy distributes in English," he says.

"We need more, much more accurate information from the United States—to explain your position in Vietnam."

Nyman's words are more evidence that the U.S. Information Agency has sorely neglected Western Europe.

#### EULOGY—DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

#### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as I ponder the life and passing of Dwight David Eisenhower, I am drawn to our great seal of the Presidency and the American eagle with its claws clenched on the sharpened arrows and a fragile olive branch.

It reminds me as I am sure it has served to remind the men who have held that office of the conflict of power and peace.

Dwight David Eisenhower dealt with power and peace as few other men ever have. He was first a military man whose career was culminated on the 6th day of June in 1944 when he led with daring and skill the most devastating army in the history of mankind. Our Nation had given the arrows of the eagle to Dwight Eisenhower. Use them, we said, so that we may have peace, and he did.

Can the fist that once clenched the arrows ever hold the delicate flower of peace without crushing it? I suspect not often.

Yet the United States found in Dwight Eisenhower a man who in war had learned to cherish peace and the 8 years of his Presidency and the remaining years of his life found him an untiring missionary for that cause.

The enormity of having held both

the arrows and the olive branch of the American eagle in his lifetime left its mark on Dwight Eisenhower. So a devoted man of peace, he safeguarded his country with the most powerful military force in the world. A devoted soldier, still he warned his country of the great dangers he recognized in that force.

In fact, his warning against the power of the military-industrial complex is more timely at his passing than it was even at its uttering.

Dwight Eisenhower struck the balance of the American eagle and his passing must sorrow us all.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER: 1890-1969 — CONGRESSMAN WYDLER PRAISES IKE—CALLS FOR APPROPRIATE MEMORIAL IN NASSAU COUNTY

#### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his freedom-loving fellow men—was the perfect description used by President Nixon to characterize the greatest American of our generation, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The passing of "Ike" was expected, and yet his presence is still with us and his spirit lives on in our Nation.

More than any other man, he typified what is best in the American dream. His basic decency as a person and his great moral character overshadowed his exploits as the Supreme Commander in the greatest war in history and also the fact that he was President of the most powerful nation in the world. He will be remembered as a person who was all man.

It is altogether fitting that we in Nassau County should pay a special tribute to this great man. I have recommended that the Nassau County Park, called Salisbury Park, be renamed "The Dwight David Eisenhower County Park" as an appropriate memorial. It lies in the fabulous Fourth Congressional District, in the heart of Nassau County. It is filled year round with people who loved "Ike" and whom "Ike" loved. Appropriately, it has four golf courses, "Ike's" favorite form of recreation.

I am pleased this recommendation has received the support of the Nassau County Board of Supervisors. It can quickly be made a reality.

No tribute, of course, can repay the debt of our Nation to this humble and honest man. His final measure will be God's judgment, but here on earth his warm personality and character will be remembered longest.

History may call him General Eisenhower and President Eisenhower; but to this generation of Americans he will be "Ike."

#### RACE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

#### HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the least noted but most important repercussions of America's racial problems is the negative impact which they have had upon our country's international relations. When we consider that the non-white peoples constitute two-thirds of the world's present population, we should not be surprised when discrimination against nonwhites in the United States seriously damages our national posture in foreign countries.

In a speech at Stetson University on March 10 of this year, Franklin H. Williams addressed himself to the issue of "Race and American Foreign Affairs." Mr. Williams is one of the most distinguished and articulate spokesmen for the cause of equal opportunity in America today. He served as U.S. Ambassador to Ghana from 1966 to 1968, and is currently the director of the Urban Center at Columbia University. His thoughtful remarks are worth the consideration of all who are concerned with the conduct of American foreign policy.

I insert the text of his speech at this point in the RECORD:

RACE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Franklin H. Williams)

Despite the paramount importance of race in our domestic life very little has been written of its role in American foreign affairs. But every now and then something appears that gives some insight into this important subject.

A small news story in the center pages of the February 23rd issue of the New York Times graphically demonstrates Africa's place as a continent of concern in shaping American foreign policy. The article reads:

"Chelsea House Publishers announced last week that Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the historian, will be general editor of a five-volume 'Documentary History of American Foreign Affairs, 1945-1970'."

Few events have more influenced the form and character of international relations during this period than the emergence into independence of more than 30 African states. Yet note the titles of the volumes to be included in the history:

"East Europe and Soviet Union . . . Asia . . . Western Europe . . . United Nations . . . and Latin America."

Africa? Apparently, as far as American foreign affairs is concerned, the second largest continent in the world, with millions of people, has not existed from 1945 to the present. This to me is especially upsetting since for almost three years I represented our nation as Ambassador to a Black African country. It seems that in the view of Chelsea House and Professor Schlesinger, it either wasn't there or somehow did not count.

THE INVISIBLE CONTINENT

Ralph Ellison has characterized the plight of the Black man in America as that of the "invisible man". He is simply ignored as a living, breathing, sentient person. This tendency to treat Black people as if they weren't there also seems to apply to Africa, and to the problems of race in international affairs

generally. If you look at practically any textbook on international relations published in recent years, there is virtually no discussion of racial factors. In eleven texts published in America since 1960, the entry "race", or its equivalent, can be found in only five of their indexes, and in three of the five the index refers the reader to less than three paragraphs of text. Yet with the possible exception of the Western European colonial empires, no nation's foreign affairs have been more influenced by racial considerations—positive and negative—than America's.

Domestically, race is a matter of deep national concern and divisiveness, and inevitably, our resolution of this national problem will directly effect our role in world affairs and our influence as a world power. Though we often refer to our country as an ethnic melting pot, America is invariably seen and sees itself—as a white Anglo-Saxon Christian nation. As a result, our policies towards non-white peoples have been marked by what can fairly be called "white imperialism", on a political level, and "benevolent racism", on an ethnic level.

Domestically, our immigration laws, from the early Oriental Exclusion Acts to our present statutes, have established national immigration quotas in direct proportion to the whiteness of the country of origin. Further, the internment of the Nisei—but not citizens of German descent—during World War II reflected a national uneasiness with citizens of darker hue.

#### DOUBLE STANDARD IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

It should be noted that these are matters of contemporary history: Asians were barred from naturalized citizenship until 1946. Finally, the long continued almost total absence of Black, brown or yellow Americans from our foreign policy-making councils not only supports this uneasiness but invariably influences our policy-making decisions relative to the world's majority.

Externally, the Boxer rebellion; our economic support of racist South Africa; our military alliance with colonial Portugal, and our apparent readiness to resist colored in contrast to white communist aggression suggest the existence of a double standard in our international relations. It appears, indeed, that we have a bi-partisan ethnic foreign policy: one operating favorable for countries most similar to our own—predominantly white—and the other taking a more negative posture toward those countries whose inhabitants are predominantly non-white.

Over a hundred years ago, in 1854, Martin R. Delaney, a physician, author and Negro leader, spoke these prophetic words:

"The white races are but one-third of the population of the globe—or one of them to two of us—and it cannot much longer continue that two-thirds will passively submit to the universal domination of this one-third."

By 1900, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, a distinguished Black scholar and intellectual, was no longer predicting. He stated unequivocally that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line."

Contemporary history validates this prediction. The two great white nuclear powers, locked in a battle for world supremacy, are attempting to win the allegiance of the uncommitted nations. But the uncommitted—with few exceptions—are colored—and China's entry into the nuclear fraternity, with its unabashed effort to speak for the non-white peoples of the world, has complicated the struggle. Russia's advantage flows from its revolutionary and supposedly non-colonial history. Ours comes also from our revolutionary history, as reflected in the language of our basic documents and the rhetoric of our founding fathers. But this advantage has been eroded if not totally offset by past practices of slavery and segre-

gation and the fact that America is still dominated by essentially racist institutional structures.

Black Americans, who suffered and still suffer from this condition, have always known that American life was permeated with racism; but it took the Kerner Report to drive this point home. At one point the report states: "... White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II... What white Americans have never fully understood—but what the Negro can never forget—is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it."

Today we run the risk that our immersion in day-to-day crises may blur our memory of the past, and that the press emphasis on Black demands may gloss over the systematic and cruel exclusion of the non-white American from the mainstream of national political and economic life throughout our history.

#### A WORLD SAFE FOR RACISM

Let me refresh your recollection just a little.

In 1901, President Wilson, the man who was to make the "world safe for democracy", described the colored American as a "homeless class, unpracticed in liberty, unschooled in self-control; never established in any habits of prudence, bewildered and without leaders, and yet insolent and aggressive: sick of work, covetous of pleasure—a host of dusky children untimely put out of school."

The treatment of Black Americans—including 360,000 soldiers—during and after the war to make the world safe for democracy, proved that Wilson did not have them in mind when he talked of defending freedom. The last six months of 1919 saw 25 bloody race riots, and in that year more than 70 black people were lynched, including ten soldiers in uniform.

The despair that gripped the Black ghettos following the war spawned the Garvey Back to Africa movement, which attracted over 2 million dues paying members. His goal was similar to that of some advocates of Black power today: economic and political control by Black people over their own Black communities. But in 1933 it was estimated that two-thirds of the Harlem labor force was unemployed. World War II created jobs, of course, but institutional racism insured, as usual, that they were on the bottom of the ladder of opportunity. The President of the North American Aviation Company, for example, stated in 1941 that "while we are in complete sympathy with Negroes, it is against company policy to employ them as aircraft workers or mechanics, regardless of their training. There will be some jobs as janitors for Negroes".

After the war, returning Black veterans were expected to fall back into their traditional inferior places. The same old conviction, rooted in slavery, was still in general currency: "Black people are inferior, and we're going to keep it that way." In the armed services itself, Black volunteers and draftees had to fight for the right to fight. For example, Black soldiers overseas were assigned to unskilled non-combat duties until the Battle of the Bulge, when they were organized into platoons and assigned to the front, one platoon to a white company. It was not until 1950, when our segregated army landed in South Korea to defend a colored nation, that harsh military necessity forced President Truman to order the elimination of this embarrassing contradiction.

It cannot be denied that there have been major modifications of our domestic racial policies since that time. Some have been fundamental; for example, the judicial rejection of the constitutionality of enforced

racial segregation. In the main however, such changes have affected more the form of our behavior than the content of our racial ideologies. From the day our founding fathers—some of them slave holders—committed the nation to the achievement of a domestic society within which all men shall be free and equal, to the present where Black Americans still live in substantial insular and isolation, it would be fair to say that racism based on color differences has been an incipient, if not indigenous characteristic of our country. As James Conant phrased it, slavery has been the "congenital defect" in the making of the country, for it built self-deception into the very matrix of the American image.

The descendants of the more than 500,000 Black Americans who survived the voyages from Africa still seek the "promised land" of freedom and unrestricted opportunity. Mutiny aboard ship, unremitting slave rebellions, the underground railroad, experiments with resettlement in Africa, sit-ins, riots, and alternative present-day schemes for Black status and Black communities with Black capitalism all mark unrelenting efforts on the part of Black Americans to find some solution to their American condition.

#### MORE BLACK DIPLOMATS NEEDED

Unless we bring the Black American fully into the main-stream of life in our nation, this important body of nationals—12.5% of the population—will be able to contribute little to our international relations. Unfortunately, we seem to be making little progress in this direction. A new administration has recently assumed leadership without a single Black person in a key State Department post. On the international scene, we have dropped from seven Black Ambassadors, including two in Europe, one in the Middle East, three in Africa and one at the United Nations to a total of four: one in Malta and three in Africa. Though there has been a small increase in the number of non-whites in the Foreign Service at the junior level, the number of senior grade Black officers is at a standstill, with less than a dozen based in Washington or abroad.

The mounting domestic racial crisis has emerged, next to Vietnam, as the major inhibiting factor in achieving respect, communication and support for America and its policies not only throughout the non-white world, but in Scandinavia and elsewhere as well. The gravity of race as a United States domestic problem and as an international crisis is summarized in a recent statement of the Institute of Race Relations in London:

"It is no longer necessary to emphasize the importance of race as a domestic issue in the United States. In Britain, too, this has become a national issue; we may still be in time to learn from American experience and prevent the problem reaching the gravity it has in the United States, but only if exchange of ideas is urgently sought and quickly translated into action."

"It is less generally recognized that ideas about race play a part in every major confrontation of the world today. World poverty, world hunger, world population, and the operation of aid programmes, are all affected; efforts for peace, the activities of the United Nations, the working of international agencies are frustrated by the suspicions and resentments which arise from race. Failures to solve the domestic problem in the United States and Britain; failure to enforce the views of the United Nations in South West Africa and in Rhodesia, failure to achieve peace in Vietnam—all increase the sense of frustration among the developing nations. The line between rich nations and poor and the line between white and non-white are dangerously near coinciding and the polarization of the world into camps divided by these lines become increasingly serious. In the power struggle between the United States, Russia and China, political use is

made of this polarization and it is a major contribution to instability. There are influential people who speak of a 'race war' on a world scale as inevitable if not already in progress. But surely more reasonable courses are open if men apply their minds to the possibilities".

Dr. James Moss of the University of the State of New York has found that in spite of the long tradition of African students studying in the United States most African students experience some form of racial discrimination during their stay in the United States. Indeed, he reported that one group of African students studying in the midwest became more disaffected the longer they stayed in the United States. When we consider the history of discrimination towards African diplomats and other distinguished visitors during their stay in this country, coupled with the documented evidence that some of the most damaging effects upon our American-African relations derive from experiences with racially and culturally unsophisticated white Americans on varying assignments in Africa, is it any wonder that we are so disliked in that continent? Dr. Joseph Kennedy's research findings and conclusions five years ago are just as relevant today as then:

"Today, the entire world is caught up in a great twopronged struggle—a struggle for material and human equality. The American Negro quest for civil rights, the independence of nations, world revolutions, are a part of this larger struggle. For most countries the dissolution of old alliances and the formation of new friendships and relations will be determined by the outcome of this great struggle.

"Where this struggle takes on racial overtones, as it must in Africa, (for the African, like the American Negro, has lived with minority status within the concept of white superiority and Black inferiority) the United States finds itself in an extremely sensitive, tenuous position—much more so than the Soviet Union or England, or any other country in the world. The United States is the major force in the 'free world' standing for democracy, individual expression, and human rights. The United States has the largest Black population any place in the world outside Africa itself. Yet, the United States has an extremely negative racial image in Africa and around the world."

If our country therefore is to alter its image as one of the most hated nations in the world by non-white peoples, nothing short of a major transformation in our racial posture and priorities domestically and internationally will suffice.

The United States and our Western allies must begin to deal with the reality of an international community of non-white peoples, bound together in a common struggle against white racism and imperialism, in which our country is one of the major protagonists. I must here confess my own doubts on this score. Far too many of our policymakers seem to consider that, in the context of world wide priorities, non-white peoples are of too little consequence to merit the kinds of activities on the massive scale that I believe are essential if racial polarization is to be reversed.

#### BLACK MAN'S STRUGGLE IS STRUGGLE OF AMERICA

From our founding this nation and the Black man have been inextricably committed to each other. America's commitment rose out of the contradictions of slavery and democracy—a contradiction which had to be resolved if the republic was to endure. "Indeed, I tremble for my country," Thomas Jefferson told the Virginia House, "when I remember that God is just." Recognizing the contradiction inherent in his plight, and using the Christian ethic and democratic rhetoric as his tools, the Black man hewed his way out of first slavery then enforced

segregation. He looked upon his activity as self-liberation; the deeper truth is that the Black man's struggle is the struggle of America itself seeking its true identity.

It was not by accident that as America came into its own as a world power during and after World War II, the Black man came to represent the conscience of the nation and he advanced in direct proportion to his ability to embarrass America in times of international crises. My point is clear, I hope:—The fate of America and the fate of the Black man are one and the same. The challenge to the one is mirrored in the increasing freedom of the other. I submit that with the advent of national independence abroad and increasing racial opportunity at home the question of color will steadily dissolve into a question of economics. The residual issue then that will have to be faced during the remainder of the 20th century is the struggle between the haves and have-nots.

The danger lies in the fact that the historical events of the past 350 years have doomed the majority of the non-white peoples of the world to the category of the have-nots. Our domestic danger is that we may lack sufficient national concern or commitment to make of our Black minority an asset rather than a liability. It would be a pity if the United States, which held out such hope for the world's needy and oppressed, found itself isolated and alone because of its own inability to root racism out of its national body at a critical point in its own survival. Where then would we turn? How impregnable would our white defense be?

#### TRAFFIC IN PORNOGRAPHY

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a national crisis in the spread of pornographic literature and films to the youth of America.

The inexorable flow of noxious, hardcore pornography continues to fill our newsstands, pours unsolicited into our homes, and threatens to contaminate young and impressionable minds. We must do something about it.

Since the vast majority of traffic in smut is interstate, and since the mail is the prime mover of the material, it is imperative that we pass effective Federal laws to crack down on this.

I have introduced a bill to prohibit the dissemination of books, magazines, movies, and other materials in interstate commerce which are harmful to those under 18 years of age.

It is patterned after a New York State statute which would make it a Federal crime to knowingly sell, offer for sale, loan, deliver, distribute, or provide to a minor in interstate commerce or through the mails material which is defined as "harmful to minors" under the bill.

It would also prohibit the exhibition to a minor of a motion picture, show, or presentation which falls in the "harmful to minors" category.

In April of last year the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of this New York State statute prohibiting sale to persons under 17 years of age of materials defined as obscene to them, even

though the same material might not be obscene to adults.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the Federal Government must follow the lead of New York State and pass a similar law. The health and well-being of our children depends on it.

#### CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES ELIMINATION OF DEPLETION ALLOWANCE ON OIL PRODUCED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK, in cosponsoring H.R. 9896, a bill designed to eliminate the oil depletion allowance on oil produced outside the United States.

I commend my able colleague (Mr. VANIK) for taking the lead in proposing this legislation, and I am delighted to extend my support by cosponsoring this bill.

Rarely if ever in our Nation's history has the importance of reforms to our tax structure been as clear as they are today. We have just learned that the President is requesting an extension of the surcharge on our income taxes for another year. In view of the continuing inflation, this extension may indeed be necessary. But it makes clearer than ever the need to examine the various elements in our tax law that enable hundreds of millions of dollars that should go into the Federal Treasury to escape into the hands and pockets of wealthy individuals and prosperous corporations. Probably none of the loopholes, so called, has received more attention than the oil depletion allowance.

In spite of the wide-scale denunciation of this depletion allowance, however, it would be reckless in the extreme to abandon it altogether. Clearly, as those engaged in the exploration and drilling for oil have rightly pointed out many times, the depletion allowance has served an important role in providing a needed incentive for the finding and exploitation of new sources of oil. In this age of the internal combustion engine and its myriad offspring, we cannot afford to take a chance of a depletion of our oil resources without steps to compensate for what we remove from the ground.

But it is an entirely different matter to allow our giant oil corporations to undertake this oil development anywhere in the world and to be able to take the full percentage depletion allowance, enabling them to pay taxes at a far lower rate than most other major corporations, as the House Ways and Means Committee in its recent hearings on tax reform has so amply demonstrated.

In an era when we still cannot be assured of guaranteed access to other parts of the world on a permanent basis—and this holds particularly true of the vulnerable Middle East, one of the most important sources of petroleum outside the

United States—it is reckless and unwise to encourage our oil companies in their extensive exploration in these areas by means of what amounts to a public tax subsidy.

In other words, while there is an important case to be made for developing our petroleum resources within our own boundaries, so that no matter what the world situation, we will be fully assured of an ample supply of domestically produced petroleum, these arguments should not be applied to petroleum exploration overseas. This is all the more true with the promising developments for oil exploration in Alaska and other parts of the Western United States.

I therefore strongly urge the adoption of my bill, H.R. 9896, which will retain the oil depletion allowance for that portion of oil companies' production that derives from domestic sources, sources which must be developed in the interest of American security and the adequate functioning of our entire economy, but which will put a halt to this percentage depletion allowance on production from foreign sources. This is too urgent a matter to brook delay. I hope that the Congress will respond promptly and positively.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Emerson once wrote that there is in reality no history, only biography. There is a sense in which the lives of great men who move on the stage of world history do constitute the history of our times. This was unquestionably true of the life of Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army, and 34th President of the United States. For almost two decades his commanding presence was felt first in the councils of war and then in the councils of civilian government. For countless generations to come schoolboys will become familiar with the role that he played during the years that the fate of Western civilization literally hung in the balance and Nazi barbarism threatened the world. His contributions in melding together the forces of freedom and marshaling the necessary unity that was necessary to achieve victory were truly enormous. Through it all he maintained the essential humility and nobility of character that is the hallmark of greatness.

His achievements as our 34th President were to further illuminate his already illustrious record. Although schooled in war, his passion was peace, and a grateful Nation will never forget that he ended the bloody and tragic episode known as the Korean war. His open-skies proposal and his atoms-for-peace proposals were further impressive evidence of his complete willingness to subordinate the principle of military supremacy to the far nobler goal of achieving true international amity and understanding.

The record of Dwight David Eisenhower's life will serve as a reminder to coming generations that liberty is something which we must sometimes fight to preserve. Perhaps even more significantly his life of service to his country will serve to asseverate the proposition that the very future of our democratic institutions depends for its maintenance upon men who will also live by the same principles which others die to defend.

These words by Goethe would constitute a fitting epitaph to the life and times of one of America's greatest heroes: Yes, This thought I hold with firm persistence;

The last result of wisdom stamps it true; He only earns his freedom and existence Who dally conquers them anew!"

#### AMERICA'S PAST AT MYSTIC SEAPORT

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very interesting article which appeared in the April issue of Today's Health. The account, written by Alan Rosenthal, dealt with the historic Mystic Seaport on the coast of southeastern Connecticut in my congressional district.

This restored village captures the spirit of a great era in U.S. maritime development, and provides a fascinating history lesson of value to those of all ages. More than 400,000 visitors come to Mystic each year to climb aboard the half dozen old square-riggers and inspect more than 100 smaller craft. In all, the exhibit covers 37 acres and includes cobblestone streets, shops, and homes just as they were when Mystic was a bustling 19th-century port.

Easily reached by all means of transportation, a trip to Mystic is an adventure into America's past, and as one observer noted: "It's a rare visitor who leaves without a touch of sea fever." The article follows:

#### MYSTIC SEAPORT

(By Alan Rosenthal)

A short drive from the bustle of New York or Boston lies an easygoing New England seafaring village of another century. Tall-masted ships rock gently at piers; carpenters repair wooden fishing boats at the shipyard; a smithy fashions harpoons at a fiery forge; youngsters eye penny candy in the general store; musicians tune their instruments on the village bandstand.

This is Mystic Seaport on Connecticut's southeastern shore. Each year, more than 400,000 visitors journey to this living memorial to America's maritime heyday. The tourists clamber around a half-dozen old square-riggers and more than 100 smaller craft. They stroll down cobblestone streets and visit the restored shops and homes of a 19th-century Yankee coastal community. In a single day, a family can examine the 37 acres of exhibits designed to rekindle an appreciation of America's colorful nautical history. (Those especially interested in history and the sea might even want to devote two days to Mystic Seaport.)

The wooden-hulled whaler *Charles W. Morgan* dominates the waterfront, her stately mainmast rising some 110 feet above her main deck. Constructed in 1841, this restored sailing ship carried the U.S. flag to every ocean on the globe as she tracked the wily whale for more than 80 years. Her ship's log contains tales of hair-raising sea chases, battles with South Sea cannibals, an encounter with a giant squid, and the rigors of tropical hurricanes.

Even modern landlubbers—and youngsters, especially—may sense the romance of the sea as they trod the *Morgan's* oak decks, view harpoons and whale-oil casks, and squeeze through the cramped quarters once used by seamen on cruises that lasted as long as four years.

Nestled against another pier is the sleek square-rigger *Joseph Conrad*, a vessel that has borne the flags of three nations. Launched in 1882 in Denmark, this 110-foot-long sailing ship boasts an iron hull, teak-wood decks, and the rigging to carry some 12,000 square feet of canvas. For more than 50 years she sailed the seven seas under the name *Georg Stage*, operating as a training ship for the Danish merchant marine. Next she was rechristened the *Joseph Conrad* and sent to sea under the British flag.

In 1936, the ship was purchased by American sportsman George Huntington Hartford and entered in Atlantic Ocean races flying the Stars and Stripes. During World War II she again operated as a training ship—this time for the U.S. Maritime Commission. In 1947 the *Conrad* was nosed into her final berth in the Mystic River and formally assigned to the Marine Historical Association, operators of Mystic Seaport.

Among the other historic vessels in the harbor is the *L. A. Dunton*, a 124-foot-long Gloucester fishing schooner. This two-masted craft is one of the last descendants of the era when fishing was a leading American industry. Mystic's waterfront also features a flotilla of smaller craft, including cargo vessels, racing schooners, sloops, fishing boats, ice boats, oyster harvesters—even kayaks and outriggers from faraway Alaska, Hawaii, Samoa, and the Philippines.

Near the tip of the Seaport peninsula, just east of the lighthouse, is one the community's busiest enterprises, Greenman Brothers Shipyards. In this working exhibit, visitors can watch skilled craftsmen restore and repair vessels of the Mystic fleet.

In nearby buildings, artisans demonstrate the trades practiced in a typical 19th-century coastal village. In the shipcarver's shop, a carpenter restores old figureheads from wooden ships. His store also contains an impressive display of wood carvings, gilded eagles, fancy nameboards, and other reminders of the age of sail. In the shipsmith's shop, the forges are still used to form miniature harpoons for the tourist trade, as well as shackles, cable, and fittings used in the restoration of Mystic Seaport's navy.

Other buildings around the shipyard recreate the shops where fittings, sails, ropework, barrels, and provisions were supplied for mariners of the 1800's. At most of Mystic Seaport's exhibits, attendants in period costumes are on hand to demonstrate equipment and answer questions.

In the weavers' shop on Seaport Street, hand-operated looms and spinning wheels hum as they did a century ago. Next door is the old firehouse, containing a display of 19th-century firefighting gear that entices boys of all ages.

Just down the street is the village tavern, a vital structure in the old coastal community. Here, visiting seamen and townspeople gathered to eat, drink, play cards or checkers, tell tall tales, and plan new voyages.

The taproom of Schaefer's Spouter Tavern originally stood at Stoddard, New Hampshire. Rebuilt and enlarged at Mystic, the tavern is nautically fitted out with ship models, sea

chests, harpoons, pewter mugs, and paintings of seafaring scenes.

Just off the waterfront are other restored town buildings, including homes, a chapel, schoolhouse, clock shop, and woodcarver's store. In the general store—which formerly performed the functions of a combination social club, supermarket, political soapbox, and department store—tourists may view an old potbellied stove, cracker barrels, hand-operated coffee mill, penny candies, and shelves full of items rarely seen in 20th-century stores.

The doctor's office and apothecary shop provide another fascinating glimpse into New England life a century ago. The store adjoins the physician's quarters, since the 19th-century doctor compounded and dispensed his own prescriptions. The office and reception room contain the medical collection of Dr. Joseph Bringham, who practiced in Wilmington, Delaware, around 1800. The pharmaceutical collection dates back as far as 1793, with such items as alum for dressing wounds, leech jars, and bleeder knives.

Buckingham House, now located on Mystic's Village Street, was first constructed at Saybrook, Connecticut. In 1951, the house was floated by barge to the Seaport. The main portion of the two-story home was built in 1768. The kitchen ell, moved from an older building and attached to the main house, dates back to about 1690. Rooms were expertly restored and furnished in the 18th-century manner. The great kitchen fireplace is flanked by iron cauldrons, fireplace cranes, and pewter dishes. This is just one of the town's residences fitted with antiques and nautical appointments.

In addition to restored village buildings, Mystic Seaport features numerous small museums devoted to America's maritime tradition. The largest of these, the Stillman Building, contains fully rigged ship models, ship figureheads, whaling implements, whale-oil lamps, and scrimshaw—etchings and carvings on whale teeth and bones, made by sailors to relieve the monotony of shipboard routine. Walls of the Stillman Building are decorated with nautical paintings, prints, and murals created by such noted artists as George Wales and Currier and Ives. Other formal display buildings feature additional relics of sea lore.

A worthwhile stop for the tourist family is the Pyncheon Junior Museum, designed with children in mind. Exhibits include diving equipment, artifacts brought back from the Orient, and ship models. In the museum's back yard is a play area resembling a ship's bridge. Youngsters can take turns at the wheel, peer down river through binoculars, even scramble up a miniature mast.

In the planetarium, visitors of all ages get an idea of astronomy's important role in navigation. An expert lectures as a projector recreates the heavens on the dome-shaped ceiling. Sundials and sextants are among the celestial navigation instruments on exhibit.

Other formal displays include the Mystic River Diorama, which provides a bird's-eye view of the area as it appeared 100 years ago, and the Aids to Navigation Building, housing such items as buoys and lightship models.

Service buildings are set well apart from exhibit areas, divorcing commercialism from the 19th-century atmosphere. But hungry tourists can find vittles to fit any mood or pocketbook at the Seamen's Inne. Distinctive dining is available in the Whaler Room or Tap Room; a more informal atmosphere may be found in the Sailor's Room or cafeteria. During the summer, food and beverages may be purchased at the Pantry or Clam Shack near the south parking lot. There's also a pleasant picnic area nearby. The Variety Store and Seaport Store are stocked with gift items and souvenirs.

Among the educational services offered at

Mystic Seaport are college-accredited courses in American maritime history and classes in astronomy and navigation. Basic seamanship and sailing instruction is provided for young people on weekends and throughout the summer. Participants in the Mariner Training Program serve a short tour aboard the *Joseph Conrad*, living in seamen's quarters, learning to swab decks and polish brass between classes. Advanced students may cruise open waters aboard the schooner *Brilliant*.

Special-interest tours are conducted year around for school children, scouts and other groups. These youngsters are admitted to the Seaport at reduced group rates.

Mystic Seaport's facilities are open to tourists every day of the year except Thanksgiving and Christmas. Hours are from nine a.m. to five p.m., except in the winter, when closing time is four in the afternoon.

The Seaport is easy to reach by car, bus, rail, air, even boat. (However, if you are coming by sea and need dock accommodations be sure to make reservations well in advance.)

The village is located about one mile south of Interstate 95—the major highway between New York City and Boston. Road distances are about 135 miles from Manhattan, 95 miles from Boston, roughly 50 miles from Providence, Rhode Island, New London, Connecticut, lies about 10 miles due west. Ample parking lots are adjacent to the grounds, and motels and hotels are nearby.

Spring is an especially inviting time to visit Mystic Seaport. Greenery is beginning to decorate trees and lawns; flowers in gardens throughout the village are adding color to the scene and fragrances to the scent of the sea. According to one observer, "It's a rare visitor who leaves without a touch of sea fever."

#### TRIBUTE TO LEWIS E. TURNER

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, many of us on the Hill have known for years of the sterling qualities and outstanding contributions to America's defense effort by Lewis E. Turner. He has been a tower of strength to the Air Force secretariat throughout his service in that Department. He is presently serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations. It is gratifying to note that Mr. Turner was the recipient recently of two of the highest honors which can be bestowed on a Government employee.

On February 15, then Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown presented Mr. Turner the Air Force's highest decoration for public service, the Exceptional Civilian Service Award, for displaying "an unusual capacity to assume demanding responsibilities" and for exhibiting "rare managerial talent in directing the Air Force installation program." Specifically cited was Mr. Turner's "exemplary leadership in meeting the urgent construction needs engendered by combat operations in Southeast Asia," and recognizing his "substantial contribution to the security of the United States."

The following month, on March 21, Mr. Turner was one of eight Government employees honored by the Air Force Association at its convention in Houston, Tex. He received a special citation recognizing his "exceptionally outstanding service to

the U.S. Air Force, active and reserve, in the timely provisioning of facilities to support mission requirements of a rapidly changing military force."

Prior to appointment in February 1964 to his current position, Mr. Turner was executive vice president of the H. C. Smith Construction Co., Los Angeles, Calif. His Government service, however, dates back to 1940 when he began his civil service career. From 1947, when he joined the Air Force, to 1952 he was that service's budget officer, later serving as Chief of the Military Personnel and Construction Division from 1952 to 1959. He became Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management in 1959, serving in that capacity until he left in 1961 to assume his position with the Smith Co.

As Deputy Assistant Secretary for Installations, he is responsible for policy matters in connection with installations planning and programing, acquisition and disposal of Air Force real estate, construction of bases and facilities, family housing, and maintenance of real property.

Born in Radford, Va., Mr. Turner received his early schooling there. His mother, Mrs. O. B. Turner, is still a Radford resident. He married the former Kate Pettus, daughter of Mrs. Ed Pettus of Hope Hull, Ala. The couple have three children, Michael, Barbara, and Jo Ann. They live at 3539 North Valley Street, Arlington, Va.

I am confident that my colleagues in the House join me in extending warmest congratulations to Mr. Turner on these highly merited awards.

CASSIDY

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in praise of a man who has lent his dignity to the term "bureaucrat" and who through almost 30 years of service has used his humanity to make more human an often impersonal Federal agency.

He is John Joseph "Jack" Cassidy, head of the San Jose office of the Social Security Administration, since the doors were first opened in that office on October 18, 1938.

"Jack" Cassidy will retire this October, a retirement welcomed only by those who have felt his might and just wrath as he fought for the defenseless. For many thousands of the citizens of my district who have been served by "Jack" Cassidy, his retirement, deserved as it is, will be a time of regret, as well as pleasure. "Jack" Cassidy has always fought for the individual, not the system.

A mark of his service is that in the almost 7 years I have served in Congress I have never received a complaint about "Jack" Cassidy or the office he heads—a unique record for any bureaucrat. Instead he has been praised and I would

add my praise and that of my staff for the time, the effort, and incredible effectiveness of "Jack" Cassidy. He has served well.

I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Harry Farrell of the San Jose Mercury on the retirement of this remarkable public servant:

THAT'S "JACK" CASSIDY: A "DIFFERENT" BUREAUCRAT

(By Harry Farrell)

Let's start off today with a little quiz for the old-timers.

What major public administrator in this area has been in office continuously longer than any incumbent member of the San Jose City Council, of the Board of Supervisors, of the entire State Assembly, or the entire State Senate?

What local public official has held his job longer than any Californian now serving in either house of Congress?

What official has a span of service covering the federal administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon?

What official has held his job during the governorships of Frank F. Merriam, Culbert L. Olson, Earl Warren, Goodwin J. Knight, Edmund G. Brown and Ronald Reagan?

REILLY?

If you've been around a long time, you may think we're talking about George Reilly, the perennial 1st District member of the State Board of Equalization.

If so you're wrong, because Reilly, although meeting almost every test encompassed in the foregoing quiz, flunks on one of them. According to our records, his term of office is exactly matched by one state senator, Randy Collier from Yreka. Both Reilly and Collier first took office in January, 1939.

The gentleman we're thinking about was on the job here about three months earlier than that.

He is John Joseph (Jack) Cassidy, who has headed the San Jose office of the Social Security Administration since it opened on Oct. 18, 1938.

This October, after 31 years on the job, Cassidy will retire, on reaching the mandatory quitting age of 70.

DIFFERENT

In the traditional definition of the word, we suppose, Jack Cassidy is a bureaucrat. But from here to Washington, he is recognized as a bureaucrat with a difference.

Too often in dealing with a public official, the citizen feels he is in a losing fight against overpowering forces of government boondoggling. This has been true with the Social Security Administration as well as other agencies.

But here in San Jose, when a genuinely aggrieved citizen is fighting the system, he finds Cassidy fighting on his side—not the bureaucracy's.

We have not been on our job as long as Cassidy has been on his, but over the years we remember him in the newspaper office time after time, always to spread some bit of publicity that would unsnarl red tape, speed up official action, or right a wrong.

Cassidy's superiors know him for the fighter he has always been.

A few years ago we had occasion to deal with Social Security Administration officials all the way up to the headquarters in Baltimore, in connection with a news story. We found that all of them knew Cassidy. Many had felt his wrath.

When Cassidy took over Social Security here in San Jose, he had a staff of three, working out of the Post Office Building at First and St. John streets.

EXPANSION

He originally had a four-county jurisdiction—Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey.

Today, with geographic responsibility that does not even embrace all of Santa Clara County, he has 53 employes working at 500 S. 1st St. The advent of Medicare enormously enlarged his operation.

Just a few days ago, Cassidy gave us permission to divulge his role in tipping off the papers a couple of years ago when Medicare payments were hopelessly snarled. The result was a major publicity blast that shook the Social Security Administration from top to bottom, and achieved at least temporary improvement.

"I don't care who knows it now," Cassidy said. "I only have six months to go, and even if they wanted to fire me, it would take 'em six months to prepare the papers."

There's one great irony in the approaching retirement of Jack Cassidy. He has a government pension, of course, but as a U.S. employe—he isn't eligible for social security.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 13, will be the anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Americans, Thomas Jefferson. I want to say a few words in tribute to the author of the Declaration of Independence.

While Jefferson is chiefly remembered as a statesman, he was also a diplomat, a scientific farmer, a successful lawyer, the foremost American architect of his time, a linguist, an accomplished violinist, the man who devised our decimal system of coinage, the author of a "Manual of Parliamentary Practice," which is still used by Congress, a compiler of Indian vocabularies, the man whose books started what is today the greatest collection in the world—the Library of Congress—and, last, but by no means least, the inventor of the dumbwaiter and the swivel chair.

Thomas Jefferson was an eldest son who inherited a large estate, but he helped to outlaw primogeniture, the system whereby the oldest son got everything when his father passed on. He was an aristocrat, but he promoted democratic government. He was a slaveowner, but he tried to abolish slavery. He was an Anglican, but he introduced legislation that led to the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Virginia.

America has been a great nation for almost two centuries, not only because it has guaranteed its citizens political freedom, but because it has guaranteed them religious freedom as well. When we pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson for the services that he rendered during the long struggle for political independence, let us also remember that he helped to disestablish the State church of Virginia. This was an act that had far-reaching consequences, as Virginia then covered a much greater area than it does today, as it included what are now the States of

Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, as well as part of what is now Minnesota.

Jefferson considered the disestablishment of the State church as one of his greatest accomplishments. This erudite and versatile Virginian served the infant Nation as its third President, but when he penned his epitaph he neglected to mention his 8 years in the White House. These are the words that he did write:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

While the responsibility for drafting the Declaration had been entrusted to a five-man committee, the actual writing was done by Jefferson. It is one of the most amazing coincidences of all time that Jefferson and John Adams, one of his associates on the drafting committee and his predecessor in the Presidency, both died on July 4, 1826, the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. The last words of John Adams were:

Thomas Jefferson still survives.

But he was mistaken, as Jefferson had passed away a few hours earlier, soon after the arrival of the golden jubilee of our freedom. Let us hope, however, that Adams' words were a prophecy and that he spoke truly when he said:

Thomas Jefferson still survives.

"GREECE OF THE FUTURE"—AN ADDRESS BY ORESTIS E. VIDALIS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAMAS. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1969, marks the 149th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

One of the most eloquent addresses I have read to mark this occasion was delivered on March 30, 1969, at the Greek Orthodox Church in Toledo, Ohio, by Gen. Orestis E. Vidalis, who served the Greek Army with very great distinction for many years.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert a biographical sketch of General Vidalis:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ORESTIS E. VIDALIS  
Graduated from Greek Military Academy in March, 1937, with the rank of Second Lieutenant of Artillery.

Participated in World War II as First Lieutenant Battery Commander.

In November, 1942, he escaped from occupied Greece and joined the Greek Forces in Middle East.\*

He fought against the Communists during the Greek Guerrilla War as a Major commanding an Artillery Battalion.

He commanded Artillery units at all levels from Battalion through the Divisional Artillery as a Colonel.

He served in staff position with:  
(a) The Hellenic Army General Staff (Lieutenant Colonel).

(b) The Standing Group NATO (Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel).\*

(c) The Hellenic National Defense General Staff (Colonel).

(d) As Chief of Staff of "C" Army Corps (Brigadier General).

He graduated from all Greek Military Service and Staff Colleges and also served as an Instructor at the three Senior Service Schools of Artillery, Army War College, National Defense College.

He graduated from the U.S. Artillery School (Ft. Sill, Oklahoma) and the Command and General Staff College (Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas).\*

While serving in the Standing Group NATO, he attended Postgraduate studies and received his Master's Degree in Political Science from Georgetown University.\*

In addition to his Greek Decorations which include the Hellenic Medal of Valor (Greece's highest combat military decoration) he holds British, French and a Libyan Decoration.

He was a Brigadier General and Chief of Staff of the "C" Army Corps, one of the major units which supported the King in December, 1967.

He returned to the United States on November 1, 1968, and is a member of the Corporate Planning Division of Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corporation in Toledo, Ohio.\*

Mr. Speaker, I now include General Vidalis' address of March 30, 1969, entitled, "Greece of the Future":

#### GREECE OF THE FUTURE

(By Orestis E. Vidalis)

National celebrations are appropriate occasions for reflection. They assist us in reshaping in our minds and in our hearts the "IMAGE" of the Nation. They might also guide us to ask ourselves the question: "Are we consistent with the 'personality' of the Nation, as it has been developed and shaped by each generation?"

I feel greatly honored and moved for this invitation to join you, in this opportunity for meditation.

We Greeks today celebrate one of the most decisive landmarks of our history. We honor the memory of Greeks whose struggle and sacrifices offered to the Greek Nation the continuity of its historical course.

This is the deeper significance of the revolution of 1821. It joined together the Greece of antiquity with the Greece of the future. It put the nation in command of its destiny, it conveyed to future generations the mission and therefore the responsibility to perpetuate Hellenism.

#### THE GREEK IMAGE AND PERSONALITY

The "image and personality" of the Nation as shaped by our ancestors, enlightened the enslaved Greeks, as it should enlighten and guide today all modern Greeks.

Let us recall the main characteristics of this image and personality of the Greek Nation. Five hundred years before Christ, in a little town on the far western border of the settled and civilized world, a strange new power was at work. Something had awakened in the minds and spirits of the men there, which was so to influence the world, that the slow passage of a long period of time would be powerless to wear away that deep impression. A new civilization has arisen in Athens, unlike all that had gone before.

The civilizations of the ancient Orient were dominated by absolutism, by the denial of mind and by the subjection of the individual to the powerful group. Their political regime was the reign of force.

Hellenism laid the foundations of new ideals. It projected truth and virtue. It glorified the mind. It preached high regard for the dignity and value of the individual man. It conceived freedom as an end. Freedom, in accordance with the Greek definition, is opposed to both blind obedience and anarchy.

\*Service outside Greece.

#### HELLENISM AND DEMOCRACY

Hellenism combined these new ideals together and discovered democracy, which was offered to man as a supreme good. And Hellenism rendered man "Free" and therefore "Responsible."

Our ancestors believed these ideals apply to all men, irrespective of race or gender. And they developed the concept of "Humanity."

This is the substance and the spirit of the Hellenic national "Personality."

This has been a powerful force which constantly incited the enslaved people to attempt the regeneration of the Nation. This people fanatically believed in the enlightening power of Hellenism and they remained optimistic throughout 400 years of oppression. The folk singer kept singing, "Do not cry Despina, they will again be ours," and in 1821 the National Regeneration became a reality.

#### THREE ELEMENTS OF GREEK REGENERATION

Three basic elements cooperated, struggled and won in 1821. First: the spiritual labor of the Church and of the intellectuals of the Nation, who helped keep alive in the Hellenes the consciousness of their obligation for the restoration of their Nation's freedom and sovereignty.

Secondly: the contribution of Philhellenes who believed in "Hellas" as a "spiritual necessity" of mankind. They sacrificed comforts, wealth, and even their lives in order to restore Greece in a free and Hellenic environment.

Thirdly: the determination of the simple people, who dared and won, with no means, no organized hierarchy, without assistance, and with an unfriendly Europe. The Greek Revolution was primarily the result of moral causes which enlarge a nation's intelligence and awaken its feelings. Individual improvement accelerated. The consequence was an increase of moral energy, a desire for action, and a longing for national rebirth. The simple Greek felt he was prepared to climb the rugged paths of virtue and self-sacrifice.

The vast majority of these Greek people were plain men, priests, peasants, shepherds, sailors, etc. They were educated by the secret Greek school, which operated despite Turkish occupation, in a sense of mission and obligation. They were a mature—and a dedicated people. They did not mature under captivity. They were always mature, because they believed they had the right to be free.

As free individuals and as Hellenes, contrary to adversities, and in spite of the toleration by the then Great Powers of the use of force to deprive the Greeks of their freedom, they continually progressed in their struggle for liberty and they were finally successful.

And during the last days of March 1821 Bishop Germanos, incarnating the will of the captive Nation, raised the flag of the revolution, that brought the Cross and the symbol "Freedom or Death."

With these two simple words, the Greek people of the 19th century, reconstituted the continuity of Hellenism.

"Freedom or Death" are indeed two symbolic words meaning in substance that "Greece enslaved, under any form, is not Greece." This is the message of the revolution of 1821 to the Greeks. This was the contribution of the uprising of 1821 in the reconstitution of the image of the Hellenic Nation.

#### GREECE OF THE FUTURE

And now, how can these reflections be connected to the future? What does this message of 1821 imply and what are the obligations of all Greeks for the future?

I will not concern myself with the present image of Greece. I will attempt to visualize Greece in the future, since I feel, we all have a primary duty to contribute to the creation

of the proper environment, for our children and our children's children.

What can and what should Greece of the future be, in a world where "man" conflicts with "force". Force has now, as it had then, when the classical Greek spirit intervened, the form of Totalitarianism. The various shades or colors of Totalitarian regimes do not change their basic similarity. They are carried through by the same techniques and by the same resort to force. All assume that the individual man in comparison with the state has no significance; except as an instrument to be used, with whatever degree of brutality may be necessary, for realizing ends which the ruling minority judges to be good. They all identify right with naked force as an instrument of will. They are all alike, at war with the fundamental values and principles of democracy.

All totalitarian regimes have no relationship whatsoever with the "image and personality" of the Hellenic Nation.

In this world, therefore, where man is facing naked force, in a world where the war of ideas endlessly continues, in this decisive transitional period of humanity, Greece should remain Hellas and offer once again the ideals of Hellenism to mankind.

#### MAN THE SUPREME VALUE

No nation will escape the fate of ultimate disintegration, if it does not believe in itself and in its mission. No nation will avoid this destiny if it continues to disregard "man" as the supreme "value". In order to survive in this competitive world, all nations, irrespective of size, should contribute in a concrete and substantial manner in the successful evolution of this great struggle of man for a better and more humane future.

Greece, of course, is not a big country today. But it is not small either, since none is small in the world of ideas.

Ancient Athens was a small town when her spirit prevailed.

Rome conquered Greece by force, yet eventually she was conquered by the Greek spirit.

The enslaved Greeks of 1821 were powerless to face the massive Ottoman Empire, yet the Greek spirit led them to resurrect the Nation.

The Greeks were few, and practically alone, when they faced Fascism and Nazism.

And last but not least, the Greek people, exhausted from a long enemy occupation during World War II, were again the first to check communist expansion in Europe in 1949 with the assistance of this country.

Therefore, the contribution of each country in the struggle of man against force is not proportional to its size. It is in direct relationship to its devotion, as a "National personality" to this great cause.

The American Professor Gilbertsleeve, in the beginning of our century, comparing Hellenism with Americanism, stated: "Like the Greeks, we are the heirs of the ages . . . The American, like the Greek, has proceeded to realize his inheritance and his inheritance is the democratic form of government . . . We cannot well think of Greece as anything else but a democracy . . . A 'safe slavery' is as abhorrent to us as it was to the Greeks."

This is an excellent description of the "personality of Hellenism". It is a description of a scholar who labored intellectually in this great new land, "The second homeland of all Free Men" as a great Hellene has recently described America.

#### "BIGNESS" YIELDS TO "GREATNESS"

In this image of Greece the meaning of "bigness" yields to the sense of "greatness". Bigness is a measure of material power which was never an element in Greek life. Greatness is an element of spiritual achievement which has always been a part of Hellenism.

The problem of modern Greece is to regain its "National personality," maintain it at all cost and improve it. If Greece solves this

fundamental problem, despite world competition in the field of "bigness," she will be able to contribute her part in bringing mankind closer to the "greatness of the ideals of the Free World."

This will occur only if all decide to respect the Greek people as the only responsible sovereign authority for the preservation of the destiny of the Greece of the future.

This will occur only if we, the Greeks, stop imitating prototypes foreign to Hellenism. Copying examples foreign to Hellenism is a tragic over-simplification in the process of solving very complex problems, connected with our race. And while imitating others does not solve our long range problems, it does serve as an argument of those who maintain that there is no continuity in Hellenism.

**THE GREAT CHALLENGE OF MODERN GREECE**

We certainly cannot survive relying on the achievements of our ancestors while disregarding the "unique Hellenic ideals" created by them.

This is the Great Challenge of modern Greece to transform the Hellenic ideals into reality without forgetting in this process that the idealists should not have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little respect for ideals and idealists.

Then, Greece can become an example of a society of free and responsible men.

Then Greece will recover its own "personality" and will be able to fulfill the mission of Hellenism.

Then the "image" of this democratic society will reflect itself beyond the iron curtain, beyond deserts and seas.

If Greece becomes an example of a successful free society, for the people of new and old countries that are now trying to reach political freedom, then she will have decisively accomplished her mission in the world today. This will be a tremendous contribution in the efforts of our Free World.

It is this Greece of the future, for which all free men dream.

It is this Greece that all mankind loves and respects.

It is this Greece that you should feel proud of, as bearers of the same ideals and traditions in another land.

It is this Greece we should all insist on and strive to recreate.

It is this Greece that the warriors of 1821 had visualized.

And it is this Greece they had in mind, when they wrote on our first flag "Freedom or Death."

**NEGRO NEWSPAPER WEEK**

**HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following proclamation made by the Governor of the State of Indiana and a copy of the letter to Governor Whitcomb for O. L. Tandy, the publisher of the Indiana Herald:

PROCLAMATION OF NEGRO NEWSPAPER WEEK, MARCH 23-29, 1969

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas, slightly over 142 years ago John Russwurm, a Negro, published Volume 1, No. 1 of Freedom's Journal; and

Whereas, this was the first Negro-owned and Negro-published newspaper in the entire American continent; and

Whereas, it was 108 years after a Dutch slave vessel appeared off the coast of Virginia

with its human cargo of black men, women and children; and

Whereas, thirty-eight years hence the Emancipation Proclamation would sound the trumpet of freedom; and

Whereas, from the days of the Journal, throughout the brief life of Fred Douglass' North Star until now the Negro Press has been the tallest and brightest beacon in an era of darkness; and

Whereas, in view of the long and prodigious effort waged and being waged by the Negro Press for increased and full freedom for all mankind irrespective of race, creed, religion or ethnic origin,

Now, therefore, I, Edgar D. Whitcomb, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim March 23 through March 29, 1969, as Negro Newspaper Week in Indiana.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the Capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 27th day of March 1969.

EDGAR D. WHITCOMB,  
Governor of Indiana.  
WILLIAM N. SALIN,  
Secretary of State.

INDIANA HERALD,  
Indianapolis, Ind., March 23, 1969.

HON. EDGAR WHITCOMB,  
Governor, State of Indiana,  
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR GOVERNOR WHITCOMB: Slightly over 142 years ago John Russwurm, a Negro, published Volume 1, No. 1 of Freedom's Journal. This was the first Negro-owned and Negro-published newspaper in the entire American continent. It was 108 years after a Dutch slave vessel appeared off the coast of Virginia with its human cargo of Black men, women and children. Thirty-eight years hence the Emancipation Proclamation would sound the trumpet of freedom. Between these two epochal dates, 1865 and 1969, the Black Man's stock as a commodity has soared. His fertile brain has brought forth magic from the laboratory test tube and his valor on the battlefield has never been questioned.

The names of Black Men are on the scrolls of the Academy of Science and they are listed as recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor. But always in the forefront, fighting for more opportunities for these second-class citizens has been the Negro Press. From the days of the Journal, throughout the brief life of Fred Douglass' North Star until now the Negro Press has been the tallest and brightest beacon in an era of darkness.

Today there are over 300 Negro newspapers scattered from rural Mississippi to metropolitan New York, and the nation's capital. The archives of the Library of Congress contain copies of Negro newspapers blurred with age, but containing gems of historical value. In view of the long and prodigious effort waged and being waged by the Negro Press for increased and full freedom for all mankind irrespective of race, creed, religion or ethnic origin, I respectfully request that you honor and salute the Negro Press of Indiana and the Americus by declaring the period extending from March 23 through March 29, 1969 as official Negro Newspaper Week. I request further that you affix the great seal of the State of Indiana to a proclamation above your signature and that you make this public by instructing your press secretary to forward the original copy to me and carbon, duplicate or photostatic copies to newspapers, TV and radio and other news media within the geographic periphery of the Hoosier State.

This will be the first time to my knowledge that an Indiana Governor has so honored the Negro Press, and I shall dispatch facsimiles of your proclamation to Senators Vance Hartke, and Birch Bayh also all

Indiana Congressmen and beseech them to make permanent records of the same.

With deepest thanks for myself and all members of the fourth estate, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

O. L. TANDY.

**HAWAII IDEAL SITE FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE RESEARCH CENTER**

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution which was recently adopted by both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, urging the U.S. Department of Agriculture to establish a tropical research facility in Hawaii.

For nearly 4 years this matter has been a deep concern of mine. It was my own proposal in the Food for Peace Act of 1966 which provided for the establishment of a Center for Research in Tropical Agriculture. It is my fervent hope that funds will soon be appropriated for the establishment of this Center.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii, in addition to its strategic location in the Pacific Basin, is the only State with a frost-free tropical climate. Its soil has been found to approximate that of many tropical countries which would benefit from this research program.

The Federal Government has already acknowledged the suitability of Hawaii as a research site by establishing facilities which specifically deal with projects relating to the tropics: the Fruit Fly Investigations Laboratory, the Tropical Fruit Laboratory, the Hawaii Research and Development Irradiators, and the Hilo rat study project.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii, in a very real sense is the throbbing heart of the Pacific, where East and West do meet and are the better for it. I am convinced that the island State is the best site in the United States for the establishment of the Tropical Research Center.

For these reasons, I submit the resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

S. CON. RES. 27

Concurrent resolution urging the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America to locate the proposed tropical agriculture research facility in the State of Hawaii

Whereas, the Congress of the United States in the Food for Peace Act of 1966 and the President's Office in the 1970 budget proposed the establishment of a Tropical Agriculture Research Facility to increase our knowledge in this field and to provide this knowledge to friendly developing nations; and

Whereas, Hawaii is strategically located in the center of the Pacific Basin, closer than any other state to many of the world's developing nations; and

Whereas, the International outlook of Hawaii's people as well as their Asian ethnic and cultural background creates rapport be-

tween the people of Asia, the Pacific, and America; and

Whereas, Hawaii is the only state having agricultural land with a frost free, tropical climate; and

Whereas, Hawaii's unique ecology offers a natural laboratory with fully two-thirds of the major soil types found in tropical countries with the associated climate and rainfall features which produced them; and

Whereas, the Federal Government has previously recognized Hawaii's tropical climate by establishing here the following facilities which deal specifically with programs related to the tropics: Fruit Fly Investigations Laboratory, the Tropical Fruit Laboratory, the Hawaii Research and Development Irradiators, and the Hilo rat study project; and

Whereas, Hawaii's agriculture has for over a century been an example of a successful mainstay industry supported by continuing extensive research; Hawaiian agribusiness can build on a decade of experience in successfully applying this agricultural, managerial, and operational knowledge in over fifty foreign countries; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America be urged to locate the proposed Tropical Agriculture Research Facility in the State of Hawaii; and

Be it further resolved, That duly certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Hiram L. Fong, U.S. Senator; the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senator; the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, U.S. Representative; the Honorable Patsy Mink, U.S. Representative; the Honorable John A. Burns, Governor of the State of Hawaii; the Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America; Dean Robert W. Hlatt, Acting President of the University of Hawaii; and Dr. Kenneth K. Otogaki, Chairman of the Board of Agriculture of the State of Hawaii.

DAVID C. McCLUNG,  
President of the Senate.  
SEICHI HIRAI,  
Clerk of the Senate.

TADAO BEPPA,  
Speaker, House of Representatives.  
SHIGETO KANEMOTO,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### THE NOBILITY OF GENERAL EISENHOWER

#### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the significance of a man's life often emerges in clearer and more compelling perspective in the aftermath of his death, in the effect which that life and death are seen to have had in the lives of others.

The distinguished editor of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, has captured one aspect of this truth about the life of our beloved former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his column in this morning's New York Times.

Because it says so much and in so few words both about General Eisenhower and about our country, I want to bring it to the attention of our colleagues by including Mr. Reston's column as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1969]  
"FAITH OF OUR FATHERS, LIVING STILL?"

(By James Reston)

It is hard to believe after the reverent public response to the Eisenhower funeral services that America is quite as indifferent to religion as the modern prophets and publicists say.

You can hardly pick up a paper these days without being told by somebody that God is dead. In fact, the Pentagon is now wondering whether it should banish Him from its instructions to the troops in Vietnam, which is scarcely surprising, considering the Pentagon's expansionist tendencies in all other fields.

Still the substitute gods of the modern age don't seem to be very satisfactory. The trend toward a secular society in America is clear, but when television demonstrates on a great occasion that it has the capacity to bring the whole nation into a common experience—almost to make us all part of a single congregation—then we find that at least the remnants of a common faith still exist.

#### FAITH AND DOUBT

The choir at the National Cathedral in Washington sang the old hymn. The opening line is: "Faith of our Fathers, living still," and despite all the modern denials of the point, it is probably still true. The first line of the chorus, however, is different: "Faith of our Fathers, Holy Faith, we will be true to thee till death"—and that is clearly not true for most Americans.

Nevertheless, for believers and unbelievers alike, some facts are plain. The political life and spirit of this country were based on religious convictions. America's view of the individual was grounded on the principle, clearly expressed by the Founding Fathers, that man was a symbol of his Creator, and therefore possessed certain inalienable rights which no temporal authority had the right to violate.

#### THE RELIGIOUS FOUNDATION

That this conviction helped shape our laws and sustained American men and women in their struggle to discipline themselves and conquer a continent even the most atheistic historian would defend. And this raises a question which cannot be avoided: If religion was so important in the building of the Republic, how could it be irrelevant to the maintenance of the Republic? And if it is irrelevant for the unbelievers, what will they put in its place?

"The liberties we talk about defending today," Walter Lippmann wrote in 1938, "were established by men who took their conception of man from the great central religious tradition of Western civilization, and the liberties we inherit can almost certainly not survive the abandonment of that tradition. . . ."

"The decay of decency in the modern age, the rebellion against law and good faith, the treatment of human beings as things, as mere instruments of power and ambition, is without a doubt the consequence of the decay of the belief in man as something more than an animal animated by highly conditioned reflexes and chemical reactions. For unless man is something more than that, he has no rights that anyone is bound to respect, and there are no limitations upon his conduct which he is bound to obey. This is the forgotten foundation of democracy. . . ."

#### THE COMMON FAITH

What the Eisenhower services suggested, maybe ever so vaguely to some and ever so strongly to others, is that the religious foundation of our common life—no matter how much we divide over creeds and sects and their relation to the state—is not "forgot-

ten." It may be ignored or challenged or defied, but it is not lost. We may not believe, but we believe in believing, and the reaction to the old soldier's death dramatized the point.

It did something else. It demonstrated how national television can bring before the people the things that touch their noblest instincts, and in the process reminded us of how seldom we use their remarkable power for this purpose.

#### THE UNIFYING FORCES

Eisenhower and the church and television were unifying forces of tremendous power for good in America in the last few tragic days. They touched some old and worthy echo in the American spirit which politics, religion, and television usually repel.

These are very old questions but they are still with us. Plato saw man's problem as that of the charioteer driving a pair of winged horses: "One of them is noble and of noble breed and the other is ignoble and of ignoble breed" . . . and "the driving of them of necessity gives a great deal of trouble to the charioteer."

This is as true now as it was in Plato's time, but the old soldier gave us a glimpse of nobility, and through this remarkable instrument of television, the people responded to it with a solemnity and sincerity no cynic could deny.

#### BLOW TO MIDEAST PEACE

#### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed at the one-sided approach which the United Nations has shown toward the sources of the continuing conflict in the Middle East. The Security Council's condemnation of the Israel retaliatory raid on Beirut Airport last December reinforced the Arab governments' belief that they can sponsor terrorist raids and attacks upon the territory and population of Israel without fear of condemnation from the United Nations. As I pointed out in a statement with my colleague from New York (Mr. CELLER) on January 3, this kind of "diplomacy" can only result in an aggravation of tensions in the Middle East and renewed truce violations by Arab groups clearly bent on provoking more violence.

The Security Council's April 1 condemnation of Israel for the raids she has conducted on Jordan-based guerrilla units—raids conducted for the sole purpose of protecting Israel's population and territory from the terrorist violence which these groups have inflicted upon her—is yet another example of this one-sided U.N. diplomacy. While Israel was condemned for her raids on Jordan, no mention was made of the continuing guerrilla raids which provoked the Israel retaliations. The effect of this resolution, supported by France and the Soviet Union and acquiesced to by the United States and Britain, will be to embolden the terrorist groups and their Arab sponsors and prolong the Arab governments' refusal to conduct direct negotiations with the Israelis.

Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed that the U.S. delegation to the Security Council

abstained on the vote to censure Israel. The United States has a long-standing and clear commitment to Israel which must be honored in our policies at the United Nations. Moreover, it is imperative that the United States take the lead in developing a more balanced United Nations policy toward the sources of conflict in the Middle East if a lasting peace in that troubled area is to be secured. So long as the United Nations continues to censure Israel, while ignoring the Arab governments' sponsorship of the terrorist organizations, the Arab states will maintain their fanatical determination to destroy Israel, and the prospects for peace will continue to be thwarted.

I enclose at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the April 2 New York Times which underlines the effect which the Security Council's ill-considered reprobation of Israel will have on the Middle East conflict. I urge my colleagues to make their own views known on this resolution and to demand that our policies at the U.N. fulfill the commitment which the United States has to the State of Israel.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1969]

BLOW TO MIDEAST PEACE

The Soviet Union and France undercut their own initiative for Middle East peace yesterday when they voted for a United Nations Security Council resolution which condemns Israel for its attack on Jordan last week but virtually ignores the guerrilla actions that provoke Israeli retaliation.

French-Soviet support for the one-sided resolution—one the United States and Britain rightly refused to go along with—compromises their position just when arrangements are being completed for starting the Big Power peace meetings, originally proposed by Moscow and Paris months ago. It adds weight to Israeli charges of bias by the two powers, and tends to encourage truce violations by Arab groups blatantly bent on renewed conflict.

Despite this new handicap, the Big Four search for a new path to peace must not be abandoned. The primary responsibility for forging a final settlement remains with the contending Mideast nations, as Israeli and Arab leaders have taken pains to point out. But the Arabs and Israelis thus far have made no progress toward peace on their own. The Jarring mission is at a dead end.

In the face of rising violence that could envelop them all, the major powers have an obligation to themselves and to the world to make a new effort to promote a settlement through the U.N. The Russian and French have a special obligation now to undo the effect their vote by demonstrating that they recognize the rights and security requirements of the Israelis as well as those of the Arabs.

IKE, IDEAL IDOL FOR YOUTH

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the sincere outpourings of affection and esteem from my colleagues regarding Dwight David Eisenhower, but I would like to express my belief that he is uniquely suitable as an idol for our young people.

As President, he unified the Nation. Perhaps the solidarity of those Eisenhower years was due in large measure to the fact that he himself was the synthesis of America, the epitome of what our Nation can produce.

He possessed the qualities we all should nurture: courage, integrity, decency, humility, compassion, sincerity, selflessness, warmth, and patriotism. These qualities permeated his public and private life.

He was a farmer, an athlete, an artist, a soldier, a diplomat, an educator, a politician, a statesman, and a world leader. What an ideal hero to emulate.

He loved peace, but he fought valiantly in war. His brilliant leadership as Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe during World War II contributed tremendously toward our success in that conflict. He ended the war in Korea, a war rivaling Vietnam in unpopularity.

He had a toughness of character, but it was tempered with a human gentleness. He was a strong competitor in sports, but he enjoyed the quiet solitude before a canvas.

He was dedicated to civil rights, but he was equally committed to law and order. Under his leadership, the first civil rights legislation since the Civil War was enacted, and he used the full power of his office to quell the violence of those who opposed the exercise of civil rights.

President Nixon has said that two qualities about Dwight Eisenhower "stood out above all in both his public and his private life: one was his unwavering sense of duty; the other was that whatever he did, he did because he believed it was right."

When his country needed him in military service, he answered and served with distinction, rising to our highest military rank. When his country needed him in civilian service, he again answered the call and served in our highest civilian office, the Presidency.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was not a politician in the stereotype sense of that term. He was a citizen who involved himself in politics because he felt his country needed him in politics. He agreed to run for President on the Republican Party's ticket because he saw that party in such a weakened condition that he feared that the two-party system was in jeopardy. He involved himself in politics because he considered it essential to achieve a competitive balance between the two parties. He believed that, if the greatest form of government ever conceived in the history of the world is to be preserved, we must have two strong political parties to give the voters a meaningful choice at election time and to create a competition which will force both parties to be responsive to the needs and wishes of the people.

We mourn General Eisenhower's passing, but we pray that his spirit, his zest for life, his love of country will endure with us. We will honor his memory best by keeping these qualities alive and bequeath them to oncoming generations. These future generations should know the debt which we of this generation owe to him. They should know what a giant has lived among us.

There are no superlatives which any of us can utter which can add to the stature or deeds of Dwight David Eisenhower. We will miss him, but I hope and pray that we will continue to draw inspiration and guidance from the magnificent example of his life.

TWO MARINES, FOUR GI'S KILLED IN WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Leon Coit, Pfc. Willard A. Wimmer, Sp4c. Thomas G. Turner, Sp4c. George A. Demby, L. Cpl. Michael DiGenno, and Pfc. Thomas C. D. Moffitt, six outstanding young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARINES, FOUR GI'S KILLED IN WAR

The Defense Department reported yesterday that six more Maryland servicemen—two Marines and four Army men—have died as a result of recent combat in Vietnam.

Listed as dead in hostile action were:

Spec. 4 Leon Coit, son of Mr. and Mrs. Willie Coit, of 2716 Baker street, who was killed in a skirmish March 10.

Pfc. Willard A. Wimmer, son of Mrs. Etta J. Wimmer, of 1610 Cereal street, who was killed March 3.

Spec. 4 Thomas G. Turner, son of Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Turner, of 4611 Sleaford road, Bethesda, who was killed March 9 in combat 22 miles west of Kontum, South Vietnam, near the Cambodian border.

Spec. 4 George A. Demby, husband of Mrs. Janice L. Demby, of Abingdon, who was killed in combat March 11.

Lance Cpl. Michael DiGenno (USMC), son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry DiGenno, of Thompson street, Hurlock, who was killed by enemy gunfire March 11.

Pfc. Thomas C. D. Moffitt (USMC), son of Mr. and Mrs. William M. Moffitt, of 12205 Braxfield court, Rockville.

Three of the soldiers, Private Coit, Private Wimmer and Private Turner, had earlier been listed as missing by the Army.

Specialist Coit, 19, the second of four children of Mr. and Mrs. Willie T. Coit, was a native Baltimorean who finished the 11th grade at Carver High School and worked at various factory jobs before enlisting in the Army in February, 1968.

He recently wrote his parents that he had "213 more days" before coming home next September to enroll in a vocational course or, perhaps, prepare for college.

Specialist Coit will have a military burial at Baltimore National Cemetery when his body arrives in Baltimore.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Willie T. Coit, Jr., 22, a truck driver, and Edward Coit, 17, a student at Carver, and a sister, Olivia Coit, 9, a student at School No. 148, Rosedale Elementary School.

LITTLE LEAGUER

Private Wimmer, 20, one of seven children of Mrs. Etta J. Wimmer, was born in Annapolis and once attended Benjamin Franklin Junior High School in Southwest Baltimore, but he spent most of his life in the Curtis Bay area.

He was a Little League ballplayer who later worked at a carpentry job and a steel mill job, and finally enlisted in the Army last June.

"He was a fun-loving person," his mother said yesterday. "He had a lot of friends. They were always coming to the house . . . just loads of them," she said.

#### DETAILS WITHHELD

Private Wimmer was killed near Pleiku. His mother said yesterday that the Army has asked her not to tell the circumstances of his death.

Private Wimmer is survived by five sisters, Mrs. Mildred Jane Graham, Mrs. Carolyn V. Ashworth, Mrs. Cheryl Burdinski, Mrs. Wanda June Pittman and Bonnie Charlene Wimmer, all of Baltimore; a brother, Roger D. Wimmer, of Baltimore, and his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Viola Wimmer, of Olderson, W. Va.

Specialist Turner, 23, was a college senior who aspired to a career as a writer when he was drafted into the Army.

#### "WHAT HE HAD TO DO"

Specialist Turner's father, Marshall S. Turner, who works with the Public Buildings Service of the U.S. General Services Administration, said yesterday his son wrote "profusely" from Vietnam.

"He, like many other Vietnam soldiers, didn't want to be there. He just did what he had to do," Mr. Turner said.

Specialist Turner was killed during a mission to secure an enemy-held arms camp. One of his best friends, Spec. 4 Samuel A. Bond, also of Bethesda, is to serve as escort when Specialist Turner's body is flown to the United States.

Specialist Turner was a ground-fighter with Company B, 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment of the 4th Infantry Division.

#### ATTENDED UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

He attended the University of Maryland and Bellarmine College in Louisville, where he majored in English.

Specialist Turner had already started to learn the publishing trade at Newsweek, Inc., where he once worked for six months as a copy boy.

As a youth, he lived in Cambridge in Dorchester County, and he graduated in 1963 from Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.

Besides his father and mother, Mrs. Myra H. Turner, he is survived by two sisters, Mary Ann Turner and Mrs. Marsha Turner Bonner, all of the Bethesda area.

#### DRAFTED LAST JULY

Specialist Demby was born in Havre de Grace and lived in Harford County all his life, until he was drafted into the Army last July.

In September, after basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., the infantryman was married to the former Janice Harris, of Abingdon, Md. Mrs. Harris is expecting a baby this spring.

Specialist Demby was killed March 11 in Saigon in a skirmish with the enemy.

The son of Mrs. Evelyn Richardson and the stepson of Harold Richardson, he was the idol of his six stepsisters and many cousins, according to an aunt.

Specialist Demby, who turned 20 last August, was a track and basketball star at Bel Air High School, where he was a member of the Class of 1967.

Besides his wife and parents, he is survived by a brother, Alexander Demby, an apprentice electrician; and his stepsisters, Lenore Richardson, Vasessa Richardson, Teresa Richardson, Victoria Richardson, Doreen Richardson, and Donna Richardson, and a number of aunts, uncles and cousins, all in Harford County.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 3, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another.*—John 13: 34.

Our Father God, as we continue our pilgrim way this holy week, entering an upper room, climbing the hill called Calvary, and realizing anew the glory of the Easter morn, we pause in Thy presence to lift our hearts unto Thee in praise and thanksgiving.

We thank Thee for Thy love revealed in the experiences of these days, for Thy forgiving love made known in the way of the cross, and for Thy strengthening power received in our response to Thy love and Thy forgiving mercy.

Bless us and our Nation in these crucial days that we may continue to be crusaders in the cause of human freedom, workers for an enduring peace, and cultivators of good will in the hearts of all people.

Draw Thou my soul, O God, closer to Thine;

Breathe into every wish Thy will divine. Raise my low self above, won by Thy deathless love;

Ever, O God, through mine let Thy life shine.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. DAVID R. OBEY, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with respect to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBER TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 358) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 358

*Resolved*, That the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Schwengel, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### POSTAL REFORM HEARINGS TO BEGIN ON APRIL 22, 1969

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time at the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The gentleman from New York has asked me to announce that public hearings on postal reorganization will begin on Tuesday, April 22, before his full committee.

Several bills are pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service relating to the reorganization of the Post Office Department. The committee has decided, as a matter of policy, that this legislation is of such major importance that it will be considered by the full committee, rather than one or more subcommittees.

The gentleman from New York plans to hold hearings on 1 or 2 days each week, at least at the outset, in order that the

subcommittees of his committee may continue with their own schedules.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 14, 1969

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the week beginning April 14.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader we, of course, have finished the legislative business for the week and will go over for the Easter holidays upon adjournment today, pursuant to the adjournment resolution previously agreed to.

Monday, April 14, is District day. There will be no District bills.

Monday is also Pan American day.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. Also for Tuesday and the balance of the week are the following:

H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, will come up under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order against committee amendment;

H.R. 514, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 4153, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.