EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE INFLICTION OF TORTURE AT CHILOCCO INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was shocked when I read a report on the Chilocco Indian Boarding School in Oklahoma, operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The report is a recitation of physical and mental torture administered to teenage children.

It is significant that the report was prepared by the Bureau of Indian Affairs officials. It is not a report by an outside organization or by a group of militants; rather, it is a report by responsible agency officials on an institution operated by their own agency.

There are accounts here of children with wrists scarred for life by handcuffs. There are indications of beatings administered to children for alcoholism, a treatment for this disease that has been notoriously unsuccessful because it merely reinforces the self-punitive attitudes that are a major cause of alcoholism. There are accounts here of the "failure expectancy syndrome" in teachers and administrators, the attitude that Indian children are hopeless and that punitive custody is thus the only possible expedient for dealing with them.

In short, this is a recitation of one of the most terrible failures of our society in dealing with human problems; specifically, the failure creatively and compassionately to bring our Indian people into the mainstream of American culture.

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

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

CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

(By Charles N. Zellers, Assistant Commissioner, Education)

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

From November 22–26, 1968, a program review team visited Chilocco Indian School, Chilocco, Oklahoma. The team members were Dr. Desmond Phillips, Deputy Assistant Commissioner (Education); Mr. James Freelon, Education Specialist (School Management), who also served as Chairman of the group; Mr. Ray Sorensen, Assistant Chief, Division of Curriculum; Mr. Heinz Meyer, Education Specialist, Division of Instructional Services; Mr. Lloyd Watkins, Chief, Equipment and Training Section, Division of School Facilities; Mr. Floyd E. Stayton former Assistant Area Director (Education) for the Anadarko Area; and Mr. Frank Quiring, Education Specialist, Anadarko Area Office.

Chilocco Indian School is responsible for providing an educational program for 1050 Indian students. At present the student body is composed of youngsters from 93 different tribes coming from 23 States. The majority of the students at Chilocco have previously attended mission or public schools and are enrolled at Chilocco due to lack of school space in their home area or because of academic or social reasons.

According to Dr. Wall, Superintendent, the average student enrolled at Chilocco school is 3 years underachieving according to results from the California Achievement Test that was administered last year. The following is a breakdown of the average achievement level of students enrolled in the high school program: 12th grade 9.7; 11th grade 9.4; 10th grade 8.6; and 9th grade 7.8. This clearly indicates that the students at Chilocco school are in need of an educational program that will enable them to function at their present ability level and progress as rapidly as possible.

ADMINISTRATION

The school was allotted $1,640,000 for the 1968–69 school year. Of this amount $161,577 went to Plant Management for common services, leaving $1,478,423 to operate the school. Personal services required $1,232,714 so that $245,709 remained for textbooks and supplies, etc.

There is definitely a leadership problem in the administration at Chilocco. The Plant Management representative from the Area Office met with the review team one day and it appeared that he gives direction to the Superintendent that is not in his province. The fact that he is from the Area Office may cause school officials to accept his views.

There is a lack of program direction from the Principal to the department heads and teachers. They by-pass him and apparently he has little to say about the operation of the school. Each department appears to be operating as a separate school with little coordination of effort. The Principal does not decide which departments' requisitions are honored; the requisitions are submitted directly to the administrative manager who makes such decisions—and according to some staff members, his determinations are based on who are his friends and who has "pull." It is not clear whether the Principal is being by-passed because he has not exerted the necessary leadership or whether the Superintendent has covertly discouraged any initiative on his part. However, the Principal stated he would like to have the opportunity to make decisions affecting the program.

The administration has also failed to assure that students have a voice in the operation of the school and that the staff is involved in planning the school program, as will be discussed later in this report.

Another administrative problem concerns the school's goal and purpose. The Assistant Area Director for Education and the school Superintendent both request a policy statement as to what educational philosophy Chilocco school should follow. There seems to be a question as to whether Chilocco should provide a vocational, comprehensive, or academic program. Dr. Wall said that the present offerings in the business education field are very limited because a central office directive of several years past stated that the business education course offerings should be cut back and he did not have knowledge of this directive ever being rescinded.

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

The review team's strongest impression of Chilocco Indian School was the overwhelming aura of institutionalism that permeates this school. That the youngsters are relegated to a secondary position, with the highest priority going to administrative easement, is immediately obvious. While there are some things especially in the instructional program that are worthy of mention, the fact is that teachers and young people are both frustrated in their presence there.

The chasm separating the totality of guidance and instruction is reiterated constantly both by the students and the demoralized staff.

A negativistic attitude reflecting the "failure expectancy syndrome" permeates as seen in the statement, "Well, what can you expect, these are Indian kids."

Attitudinally, the youngsters of this school are viewed as socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed, as problem youngsters, chronic alcoholics, etc. In short, staff perceptions border on the reformatory concept of reaction rather than progression or even the minimal concept of rehabilitation. The lines of demarcation are steeply drawn between the antagonists (the students) and the staff. This is felt by all.

In addition, there is evidence of criminal malpractice, not to mention both physical and mental perversion on the part of certain staff members. Portraying ignorance of fact, the administration of the school implicitly has condoned these conditions, perhaps, as was stated, because of "the system." This is reflected in such comments as, "Well, we have alway done it this way."

Student involvement, nominal at best, was seen by the review team as a facade coverup, portraying pseudo-professionalism and a lack of interest in youth.

The following observations substantiate this account and illustrate the absence of a sound pupil personnel service philosophy or program at Chilocco:

1. While some psychometric data is evident, and this is fallacious, the entire testing program is extremely weak. Intelligent testing is non-existent, yet achievement scores are available. The latter result from the use of the California Achievement test which is notorious for highly spurious results. In short, any attempt to correlate, as is normal educational practice, achievement and intelligence is lacking.

2. Counseling is minimal at best; this involves little personal counseling and practically nothing in vocational and career advisement. Even though the staff is most loquacious in expressing their conviction that these students are "problem youngsters," less than even minimal psychological counseling is evident. What assistance there is of this type is given sporadically by a social worker and by a psychologist who visits the staff once or twice a month (sickness and other things have even minimized these attempts).

3. Introverted inappropriate behavior is overlooked completedy.

Extroverted inappropriate behavior is generally solved by physical punishment, placement in the Newkirk jail without guidance or any visitation, or expulsion to oblivion.

Students reported that the counseling room in the dormitory was used as a place "to work them over when they wised off." As can be seen in the attached student statements, many physical abuses resulted due to a session or two in the counseling room. In addition to this, youngsters are restrained by the use of handcuffs if they have been drinking regardless of their being violent or not.

Youngsters reported they were handcuffed for as long as 18 hours in the dormitory, handcuffed behind their back from above or around a basement pillar or from a suspended pipe. One team member was shown the restraining procedures by the personnel in the boys' dormitory and therefore verified the youngster's expressions. However, the permanent wrist scars on one youngster's arms, the deformed hand of another boy, and an obviously broken and misshaped rib on another tended to reveal the veracity of student statements.

These practices were not limited to the male students alone, but were also purported to be practiced on the female students. However, it seemed more common to jail any girl that appeared to have been drinking. For example, the evening while the team was on campus three girls were handcuffed (behind their backs) and placed in the Newkirk jail. Only one girl was reported as being violent and she did not want to leave her room. With the "help" of the male counselors, the same who were reported as using excessive force on the boys, these girls were bodily taken from the dorms and driven to jail in Newkirk.

Commonly expressed was the ruling that *any* drinking would result in loss of home visitation and town rights and possible expulsion.

The responsibility for these actions rests not only with the school administration, but also with the Area Office. For example, the Assistant Area Director for Education related that these conditions (e.g., lack of interest, poor administration and supervision, student punishment, etc.) were known to the Area Office and that they "have been trying to get rid of the Superintendent for years." One cannot help but wonder at the efficiency and sincerity of these remarks and efforts. For example, a social work report was turned into the Area Office several weeks prior to the site visit and for the most part, reiterated what was found by the review team. Yet no action had been initiated regarding excessive physical punishment.

4. While health services are not at this time a function of the school, these practices were reviewed. The nurse assigned by DIH to the infirmary was very concerned and actively seeking better ways to improve health practices. For example, she had initiated her own screening process in an attempt to identify various physical anomalies. The clinic operates from 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Ergo, any sick child must return several hundred yards back to the dormitory. On weekends the clinic closes completely. Both physical and dental care seem adequate with the exception of sick children having to return to their dorms nightly.

Mental health services by this clinic are limited to a rare psychiatric consultation or examination, the burden of this responsibility falling primarily on a visiting PHS social worker. Her caseload was minimal and limited to severe cases.

The hospital staff has little to do with the school, the program, the expulsion of students, etc.

5. With the exception of several classes designated for slow learners, no special education program is in existence. Yet some 61 children have been identified as exceptional by a very cursory record screening procedure.

6. With regard to food service, an acceptable master menu was posted and was being followed. The preparation and serving facilities were well-kept and appeared adequate. However, since the youngsters received prepared trays (to expedite feeding and administration) and had no choice as to item selection, much food was being rejected and therefore dumped. For most part, the female youngsters were throwing away the high caloric food such as bread, potatoes, etc. Concomitant with this, the Alaskan children's expressed dislike of Southwest regional food also accounted for excessive food waste.

Male and female youngsters are served from three lines having to wait outside the buildling regardless of weather. No mixing of the sexes is permitted during mealtimes. Guidance personnel supervise these lines and the feeding times. When questioned about this, one person stated they were on duty in case of a riot.

It was reported that the Boys' Guidance Director had presented a more appropriate feeding and serving plan allowing selection of food and mixing of students. This was rejected by the food service personnel and the Superintendent on the basis that it did not move the children through the cafeteria fast enough.

7. As for the dormitory situation, some dormitory personnel expressed attitudes of sincere intent and concern for the youngsters, while others expressed perverted behavior as explained previously.

In regard to facilities, the male dorm, now two years old, had several construction defects even when new. These have already been reported to the Central Office Engineering Division for their consideration. These items included such things as poor construction practices, inadequate drainage, misplaced outlets and utilities, etc.

The girls' dormitories, on the other hand, are antiquated. Modern shower and bathroom facilities had been added to these dorms, but these facilities leaked from one floor to another resulting in plaster falling and paint peeling. It was also noted that many of the utilities were broken.

The rooms were overcrowded in the girls' dorm, yet the boys were not. In several instances, it was noted that beds were not separated and this results in a youngster's having to stay in bed until her partner gets up. Also, walls had holes in them. In one bathroom the innards of one wall were exposed showing inner lathing, pipes, etc. One room contained exposed heavy duty electrical wiring at the head of one youngster's bed. The possibility of that girl being electrocuted in her sleep was evident.

However, it should be noted that much reading material (Title I Project) was evident in the dormitories and that the youngsters, while overcrowded, were allowed to hang their own pictures and decorate their rooms.

8. The guidance personnel/student ratio is one to 89. This reflects a minimal shortage of 11 people (includes recreational leaders, aides, supervisor). Combining this with the absence of other specialists (e.g., special education teachers, psychologist, social workers, etc.) makes apparent a great lack of pupil personnel specialists.

9. Student activities were minimal. The students claimed they had no voice in school affairs, that activities were dictated for them not by them. The student council was only a nominal facade and held no serious voice in school activities. For example, many students claimed to have requested a chance to sleep later on weekends, to establish their own dances, to have some say so with regard to expulsions, to voice their opinions on the educational program and their future adult needs, etc. (Student expulsion takes place after a secret ballot is taken by a committee comprised of the school Principal and the guidance staff. Teachers, school health personnel, and students do not take part in this process.) These responsibilities they felt were disallowed them. Because of such denials and the resultant attitude that no one on campus really cared and that they must really be bad, they drink, fornicate and act up. Students readily admitted to the review team (interesting, since the team members were all strangers) where and how these illicit activities took place.

It should also be noted that the student council was functioning without a president and a vice president because they had been removed from their elected offices for disciplinary reasons. Interviews with the two deposed officers revealed that a matron (instructional aide) had told them they were kicked off the student council. Impeachment proceedings had not taken place by the governing body of the student council and the staff adviser to the student council, and neither the Principal nor the Superintendent of the school had talked with them.

Student morale is poor; their attitude is that no one cares for them, never listens to them, never comes to their affairs, etc. With regard to the latter, it was voiced that the Superintendent had attended his first student party only because the review team was invited. However, the Principal did try to attend many functions.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The problem of low morale seemed to prevail not just among the students but throughout the school staff. All the guidance personnel appeared demoralized or disinterested and the same condition was expressed by the teachers. The atmosphere of the majority of classrooms visited by the review team reflected poor teacher and student morale, disorganization, lack of supervision and lack of purposeful and meaningful direction. Many teachers do not have lesson plans or evidence that preplanning has taken place in relation to scope and sequence of classes being taught.

In most classes visited by the team members, students were doing written work at their desks. No interchange was taking place between teachers and students or among the students in most instances. In one classroom students were busy attempting to write the answers to questions at the end of a chapter. One student remarked to a team member that it was pretty hard because the class had not read the chapter yet. It was very evident that the staff and students had been prepared for the review team's visit and a very "canned" educational environment was reflected as the result.

Among the causes of the staff morale problem are the obvious lack of staff involvement in program planning, the poor communications within the school, and the absence of effective leadership.

Although much lip service is given to the fact that the students at Chilocco are in need of a strong, innovative educational program due to their underachievement, little evidence can be found indicating strong instructional leadership or involvement in curriculum development that will provide an instructional program to meet the needs of the students. The curriculum offerings and approach to teaching are very traditional in nature.

The lack of communication between administration and department heads, between departments and between staff members working in the same discipline area is very evident. Each discipline is an "Island unto itself" in relation to contributing to and being involved in the total educational program. Both the instructional staff and the guidance staff stated that they rarely communicate to each other. Problems in the dorm only get reported to the teachers via the grapevine and vice versa. No system of common reporting has been established. Staff members related at a meeting called by the review team that this was the first time members of each subject matter area had been able to get together to discuss their disciplines and exchange ideas with coworkers. These people were very positive in stating "we need more meetings like this."

Further comments concerning the instructional program at Chilocco school are as follows:

1. The buildings utilized by the instructional department are old and outdated; however, this is no excuse for the lack of adequate maintenance that is readily apparent. Classrooms are in need of paint, chalkboards are in need of refinishing and repainting, and in general, the housekeeping and repair of most classrooms leaves much to be desired in terms of a pleasant classroom environment.

2. The developmental reading program being taught by Mrs. Clark is innovative and is meeting the needs of 85 students. The utilization of several different kinds of read-

ing materials and devices plus the availability of a paperback library makes this classroom interesting and a challenge to the students. It is unfortunate that this program is not available to more students as low reading achievement was identified by the staff as being the basic academic problem of the students.

3. Mr. Paul Sward has visited Chilocco school and arrangements have been made to implement BSCS Patterns and Processes (Special Materials) by providing all books, manuals, supplies, materials, and equipment which are necessary for this program. This will upgrade the science curriculum.

4. Workshop classrooms (grades 9 and 10) reflect much more teacher and student involvement in this instructional area.

5. The fine arts curriculum should be integrated into the regular class schedule. At present teachers have to meet with students before and after the regular school hours. A situation of this kind creates too much outside competition for the fine arts program to cope with and puts undue demands on the fine arts teachers.

6. The basic textbooks in many of the discipline areas are outdated and short in supply. Supplementary materials for teachers and students use are practically non-existent and lack of teaching supplies and materials create hardships on teachers who are responsible for classroom instructional programs.

7. The present requisition system being utilized provides that requisitions go directly from the department heads to the Administrative Officer. The Principal, who is the director of instruction and curriculum development, is circumvented and has no knowledge as to what is being ordered to carry out the instructional program.

8. An excessive amount of equipment that is obsolete and inoperable is on campus (Example: 23 16mm projectors). It is most difficult to justify new equipment when property inventory shows an overabundance. Survey action is necessary to dispose of equipment that is not supporting the program.

9. Business education classes are in desperate need of calculators and adding machines for student use in bookkeeping.

10. The policy concerning department heads and teachers utilizing student cumulative folders is not clearly defined by the administration or understood by the staff. In any event, at a meeting with department heads, it was obvious that availability of and use of cumulative folders was not clear.

11. Students at Chilocco school are not involved in an extensive program of field trips to provide educational and cultural enrichment. Two 44 passenger GSA pool buses are available at 11.5 cents a mile with a minimum charge of $92.50 per month. Administration states that pool buses and funds available are not enough to meet the needs of the student enrollment.

Another significant observation was that 90 percent of the approved Title I Project was not in operation. There was little or no activity in getting any of the Title I components underway. For example, the swimming pool, the enclosing of which had been provided for by previous Title I funding, was not in operation, nor was the campus beautification program; the recreation program was at a standstill because there was no student activities coordinator; some materials for the science program, reading program, etc., were ordered but had not yet arrived. The personnel freeze was given as one reason for the inactivity, but another perhaps more significant comment was that there had been little or no input from teachers in Title I planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In total agreement with the Assistant Area Director for Education's recommendation, the Superintendent should be removed immediately. His successor should seriously consider the immediate replacement of the top echelon people if need be so that he can revitalize the entire school program.

2. An intensive investigation into the physical and mental abuse of the youngsters of this school should be initiated immediately and appropriate action taken against those guilty of such malpractices.

3. While financial deprivation appears to be a common characteristic, every effort should be made to stir the creative imagination of the entire staff in the utilization of the facilities they have. This could easily be done with the proper leadership and the involvement of both teachers and students. In conjunction with this, lines of communication must be established between all departments and staff members and with the students.

4. Intensive effort should be undertaken to rid the staff concept of the "failure-expectancy syndrome"—the concept that Indian students are stupid at best, troublemakers, and inferior to others.

5. Psychological services should be initiated immediately to attempt to rectify the serious damage done to these youth. A comprehensive testing program should be started, to identify the intelligence of youth, the correlated achievement status, the vocational and career potential, and any serious emotional upsetment, either present or potential.

6. As a result of the above, a worthy qualitative counseling program should be initiated, both on an individual and group basis. This program should be innovative and creative rather than operating only as a reactionary program.

7. A closer relationship should be established between the school (instruction and guidance) and the community. The latter should be viewed as including the DIH health center, the business community, mental and physical health specialists, recreational and other community activities.

8. DIH, in conjunction with the school personnel, should make arrangements for adequate staffing of the health center. It just does not make sense for a sick child to get up from bed rest at closing time, return to the dorm for the night, and come back to the health center in the morning.

9. The aforementioned testing program should coordinate with an intensive physical screening attempt in order to identify those youth in need of special education provision.

10. Special education programs should be established for the handicapped and exceptional child. In certain cases this would necessitate the transfer of youngsters back to communities providing services (e.g., deaf children to schools for the deaf, etc.).

11. The staff and students should study and resolve a more appropriate student feeding plan and student activity program which will permit student involvement in school affairs. The student council should function in accordance with established and approved constitution.

12. Campus security is a problem needing attention, in that county roads go through the school property and it is difficult to control speeding autos or unwanted visitors who pick up students or make alcoholic beverages available to them.

13. The staff at Chilocco should re-evaluate the Title I Program components through determining the needs of students in priority order and reprogramming apparent savings resulting from the late starting of the project to meet those needs. Future Title I proposals should have more input by teachers and students and should be more innovative.

14. It is advised that the area office investigate and survey the problems of the Chilocco school program and attempt to rectify them, while concomitantly initiating innovative programs.

CONGRESS MUST REFORM ITSELF OR CEASE BEING RELEVANT

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall join in sponsoring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969.

America today has changed full circle from the American of even 30 years ago. We are an urban society, and the coming census and reapportionment in 1970 will sound the political knell of rural power. Vestiges of such power will linger on in various forms for some years, but the handwriting is on the wall. Those who refuse to adapt to change are destined to be left behind by it.

A nation is only as strong as its institutions of the most basic sort, of which Congress is certainly one. Those institutions endure only so long as a majority of our people maintain their faith in them. If an institution refuses to change in light of new realities, it ceases being able to cope with those realities, becoming irrelevant to the society in which it operates. This is the choice confronting the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

Already power has flowed from the legislative branch to the executive branch in an almost unbroken stream. The stronger the President, the faster and greater is the flow of power to his branch. This was amply illustrated during the last few years. In previous eras, the pendulum has swung back the other way in the fullness of time, but this has been the case because our legislative branch has remained relevant. Now this is no longer the case in large measure, and there exists a danger of power remaining permanently on the executive side. Therefore, the legislative branch of Government must revamp itself to reflect new realities and to anticipate change that even now flows about, around, and over Congress in an unbroken stream.

Congress is bogged down in meaningless tradition which enshrines mediocrity and rewards only length of service. Individual Members are relatively helpless, particularly in earlier years of their service. Everywhere, committee meetings are closed—a trend that is growing. In the House of the people, the people are not allowed to see what is transpiring in their name. Committee reports are often delayed to an unconscionable extent. Proxy voting procedures in committees are often abused. Minority committee members are given minimal leeway in terms of staff and the right to call witnesses.

Faults of this branch of Government can be listed ad infinitum, ad nauseum. I know these remarks and the bill I am joining in sponsoring which accompanies them will be greeted by some with disagreement. It will make no difference. Vast conglomerations of people and resources in our society require relevant and flexible institutions. No major institution can long survive or function if it worships methods found wanting several generations ago.

Our cities grow. Our ghettos fester.

Our skies fill with planes, pollution, and noise. Our suburbs creep over the land, gobbling up green expanses. Megalopolis exists. Our population explodes and explodes and explodes. Sewage piles up. Taxes mount. Waters grow foul. Life becomes more of a struggle.

Do the powers that be imagine for one moment that we who represent these cities will suffer to be held in political bondage in this House for much longer? Do they actually think they can hold us back from power which holds a key to answers our constituents demand of us with ever louder cities? Do they imagine we shall sit humbly and be patronized for much longer? If they will not listen to us, then they shall have to listen to other sounds.

Congress can answer questions, solve problems, and help our Government remain relevant to our society—if it is willing to perform major institutional surgery upon itself. This bill embodies the reforms that are a minimum.

It may be this effort will fail. But we shall come again—and again—and again—and again—until we are heard—until we prevail. The realities of life are on our side.

EDITORIAL EXPLAINS ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS—ASKS UNDERSTANDING

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, too often people misunderstand the operations of government and mistake the absence of open, visible activity for no activity at all.

Consequently, it is gratifying when the news media explains to the public some of the workings of government and calls for reason in viewing government.

For example, although the Senate will begin its Easter recess at the conclusion of business today, the Committee on Public Works, of which I am chairman, will conduct hearings on waste disposal and economic development during the recess.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial by Robert Earle on this subject in the Weston, W. Va., Democrat printed in the RECORD.

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

ON GETTING THINGS DONE

The other evening national education television carried an hour program featuring former Vice President Hubert Humphrey conducting his first class in his new job as professor at MacAllester University.

It was a lively session and the students were sharp with the loaded questions they flung at him. But most of what they had going for them was knowledge newly-acquired, mainly through reading, little through living. They were attempting to confound a bright man who has been a liberal since his days as mayor of Minneapolis, who has served many years in the Congress and a term as Vice-president of the United States, a man who has sat down with the great men of the times.

It was easy to find fault with his part in the civil rights program but they overlooked the fact that much of what has been accomplished for civil rights was through his efforts and the same goes for the poverty programs. It is a tendency of the young to look at the peaks and to ignore the arduous ascent that is needed to reach them.

We once knew a young man who was terribly disillusioned upon his first visit to Congress. He watched a Senator speak to a virtually empty chamber, saw lawmakers sauntering in and out, and finally he left in disgust.

This week, Senator Jennings Randolph in answering allegations of inactivity in the 91st Congress had this to say: "The mechanics of making the laws under which we live is a complex and time-consuming process, and it is one which demands a large amount of unglamorous work," the senior West Virginia Senator declared.

This work, Randolph noted, is now going on in the committees and elsewhere. The 16 Senate standing committees have already spent some 550 hours in meetings and hearings, considering new laws, Presidential nominees and other matters, he added.

Randolph said this background work is like the large part of an iceberg that doesn't show above the water.

"Those occasions when there are not many Senators on the floor engaged in debate and voting may give the impression that the lawmaking process has ground to a standstill and the Senators are away from their jobs," Randolph said.

"Those familiar with the mechanics of government know, however, that action on the floor is only the very important end product of long hours, days and weeks of preparation," he emphasized.

The Public Works Committee, which Randolph heads, has spent 60 hours considering a wide variety of matters, and the Subcommittee on Labor, of which he is the ranking majority member, has devoted 22¼ hours of public hearings to coal mine health and safety proposals.

"The efforts in the Senate in which we are now engaged and in the House of Representatives as well, will flower in profusion in the weeks ahead but only because Congress is hard at work now," said Senator Randolph.

A NEW LOOK AT RELEVANCE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the subject of relevance in our high schools has been made controversial by a recent film produced by Frederick Wiseman. The film, "High School U.S.A.," deals with the modern, white, middle-class high school, and its subject is Philadelphia's Northeast High School located in the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I represent. Most of the parties concerned have not been given an opportunity to see this film, but have had to content themselves with reading its many reviews which appeared in the news media of several major cities. It is obvious to all concerned that an injustice has been committed by the producers of the film.

"High School U.S.A." purports to show the lack of relevance in Northeast High School. It ridicules certain minor idiosyncrasies, and questions the importance of other major endeavors. The school has a space research project, for example, which is the only one of its kind in the country, and has received official recognition. The unique learning experience which it provides for budding scientists is given little attention. Other facets of the school are misunderstood. A program of cooking instruction for boys, which has helped many previously maladjusted youngsters to find useful occupations, is shown as the height of irrelevance.

What is even more distressing is what the producers of the film chose not to include. Having photographed almost everything at Northeast for several weeks, they edited the film down to a 1 hour and 15 minute version. The many worthwhile and "relevant" aspects of the school seem to have been pushed aside. The school offers a variety of curriculums, for all types of students. Some study commercial subjects, while others prepare for college. There are even several college-level courses for the more gifted students. Virtually every extracurricular interest can be pursued at Northeast. Students participate in musical and athletic groups, and in debating and world affairs clubs. They publish a newspaper and a literary magazine. They even operate an amateur radio station. These are just a few of the many activities which satisfy the varied interests of a large student body. But the greatest test for "relevance" might well be the achievements of Northeast's alumni. About 70 percent of Northeast's graduates continue their education in some institution of higher learning. A large number of its students win scholarships by competitive examination. When one views the complete picture of Northeast High School, he may develop new ideas as to the true meaning of "relevance" in modern education.

I would like to include in the RECORD a review of the film written by Fred M. Hechinger, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 23, 1969. I would also like to include two letters written to Dr. Mark H. Shedd, superintendent of Philadelphia's schools by an ad hoc committee of Northeast High School faculty members:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1969]

A LOOK AT IRRELEVANT VALUES

Who would want to see a documentary film on a modern big city high school with an almost entirely white middle-class enrollment? What could such a film possibly tell about the real urban probelm of the slums and of underprivileged youth?

Yet, this is exactly the kind of school chosen by Frederick Wiseman, the documentary film producer who uses the camera as a means of social reform and received widespread publicity for his controversial Titicut Follies, a film of a Massachusetts State Hospital for the criminally insane and whose documentary on the police was shown on the Public Broadcasting Laboratory earlier this month.

Although not yet released publicly, the Wiseman school film was shown recently to an audience in a course at the Center for New York City Affairs of the New School for Social Research. Last week it was evident that

the film was raising questions in educational circles about the relevancy of some school programs.

Within minutes after the opening of the one-hour and fifteen minute film, it becomes clear that Philadelphia's Northeast High, the subject of "High School," is not intended as nostalgic escapism. When Edgar Z. Friedenberg, the social psychologist, saw the film recently, he said his first reaction was that high school personnel have not yet absorbed the basic lesson taught to the staff of every decent hotel: "Don't insult the clientele."

This may not be entirely fair; none of the teachers and administrators mean to insult the children—it is just that they do by virtue of a frightening gap between the two worlds. The intended—and effective—message is clearly that, if this gap is so wide in the placid, all-white middle-class setting, what must it be in the more volatile ghetto?

What are the values taught in the school? A bedraggled boy, who maintains that he is being punished for an offense he did not commit and that the teacher refused to hear his side of the story, is told by the dean of discipline to prove that he is a man by taking the punishment, especially since it is only an hour's detention.

When the boy, closer to tears than anger, finally agrees to "take it" under protest, he is told. "It's time you showed a little character."

"Thoughts for the day" are presented like remnants of Victorian primers. "The dictionary is the only place where success comes before worry," is a typical example.

ATMOSPHERE IS IRRELEVANT

In a dreary counseling session, a bright young thing is endlessly lectured for having "insulted" the school by wearing a short dress to a formal dance.

From folksy fashion and deportment demonstrations to cooking instruction for boys, the atmosphere is, in the purest sense of the current idiom, irrelevant. While there are sparks of life in the foreign language instruction, one wonders at the gap between affluent students and teacher when the latter, in French, explains that in France one dines in the dining room, while Americans usually eat in the kitchen.

There is a strange mixture of authoritarianism ("Don't you talk, you just listen," says the dean), blanket suspicion (in the manner students are asked to show their program cards in the hallway) and pseudo-psychology ("Don't you feel guilty for disappointing your father by not going to college," asks the guidance counselor in front of an overpowering father.)

Ironically, the only activities in the film that arouse the youngsters are a drum-majorette rifle drill and an eight-day simulated space flight in a capsule provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Agency for an expensive space biology project. Yet, both of these activities have little, if any concrete educational value.

The camera is perhaps too brutally selective. It might be argued that some more inspiring lessons could have been sought out to relieve the gloom. But Mr. Wiseman denies that he filmed anything that seemed extraordinarily bad, adding that he cut out much that was worse. Nor does the reaction to the film by many educators and parents indicate that they disapprove of the school.

After the showing at the New School, one teacher said that while the typical high schools in New York are not anywhere as placid and teacher-dominated, she wished at times that they were. But most in the audience disapproved of the teachers' dominant role.

After a Boston showing, Mr. Wiseman said, many parents and teachers praised the school's effort at inculcating values and respect.

Yet, the nagging question remains—what kind of values and respect for what? One of the school's few Negro students, chosen because of his interest in the space project, said that while some of the science teaching was competent, "morally and socially this school is a garbage can."

That, too, is probably excessively rough, but it would be difficult not to come away, at least, with the feeling of having seen an obsolete container for modern youth.

F. M. H.

OPEN LETTER TO DR. SHEDD

NORTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR DR. SHEDD: The faculty of Northeast High School is distressed that you have shown the film "High School USA" to your university class as "a fair reflection of what is happening" in middle-class schools, and by implication that this film is a "fair reflection of what is happening" at Northeast High School.

We would like your reactions to the following:

Since you have never observed Northeast High in action; since you have never talked with our students, sat with our counsellors, or observed our teachers in class, how can you presume to say that this film or any film is a "fair reflection"?

We think that it is your responsibility as Superintendent of Schools to establish the conditions under which a film is to be made in a public school and under which it is to be released. It is not Mr. Wiseman who "should have been clearer with the faculty of Northeast as to what he had in mind." It is your responsibility to have informed the principal and faculty of what you permitted Mr. Wiseman to do. You negotiate for the school district, not we.

You are quoted as saying that this film shows the weakness of urban high schools and their "lack of relevance". By implication Northeast's program of studies is not "relevant". We think we are relevant, relevant to the needs and goals of our students and our community. Between 60% and 70% of our graduates go on to schools of higher learning. Year after year Northeast students are merit scholarship semi-finalists and with some frequency, finalists. An extremely high proportion of our students win *competitive* scholarships. Would you have us change?

AD HOC COMMITTEE:
MARGERY BRAUNSTEIN.
HELEN K. O'BOYLE.
PHILOMENA G. O'HANLON.
IRENE M. REITER.
FRANK SEIDLER.

NORTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 27, 1969.

Dr. MARK R. SHEDD,
Superintendent of Schools,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR DR. SHEDD: We look forward to viewing *High School, U.S.A.* "as soon as possible after the spring vacation" as you arranged in a telephone conversation with Dr. Haller yesterday. Let us remember that "as soon as possible after the spring vacation" should not be extended indefinitely.

Your telegram to our building representatives December 16 informed us that the single copy of the film would be shown to us "upon its delivery" in this city. We were chagrined to learn that you showed the film at the University of Pennsylvania while we waited patiently for the showing you promised us.

We would also like the answers to some relevant questions concerning the film:

1. Who authorized the film making?

2. Who negotiated with the film makers? What conditions were agreed upon governing the film making? What were the conditions agreed upon controlling the release of the film for national viewing? Were negotiations formalized in a written contract? If so, we would like to see a copy.

3. When Mr. De Lone instructed Dr. Haller to permit the film making. Was the principal informed of the restrictions or other conditions to govern the film making? Who was to inform teachers of their legal rights if the film shots were "candid"?

4. Was the Board of Education's legal department consulted? What was the opinion of that department concerning legal redress on the part of teacher, parent or student if presented in an unflattering or unprofessional posture?

5. Who are the film makers? Did they represent a *bona fide* educational organization? Were they a commercial organization making a film for profit?

We would appreciate receiving your reply as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

AD HOC COMMITTEE:
FRANK SEIDLER.
PHILOMENA G. O'HANLON.
IRENE M. REITER.
HELEN K. O'BOYLE.
MARGERY BRAUNSTEIN.

AMERICAN BASES IN SPAIN

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "American Bases in Spain," recently published.

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

AMERICAN BASES IN SPAIN

With the deadline near for renewal of the agreement covering American military bases in Spain, the Pentagon has yet to produce convincing evidence that these bases will be crucial to American and Western security in the nineteen-seventies.

In the absence of such evidence, the Nixon Administration's consideration of what price to pay for an extension requires weighing the utility of three Air Force bases and a Polaris submarine station against the growing political liability of a major American military presence in Spain.

Even the Franco Government has become increasingly wary of having American nuclear weapons on Spanish territory since the "loss" of a hydrogen bomb off Palomares in 1966. The bases would almost certainly become a focus for anti-American sentiment if Spanish students and workers gained greater freedom of action after the death or retirement of Generalissimo Franco.

It is embarrassing enough to have the question of a five-year extension of base rights come to a head only weeks after the Franco regime has reverted to type with a "state of exception" that suspends even the limited freedom Spaniards have been able to exercise in recent years.

When the original agreement was signed with Spain in 1953, the Air Force stations were crucial as forward bases for strategic bombers of limited range. Their importance fell off sharply with the coming into service of B–52 bombers and intercontinental missiles based in the United States. The naval base at Rota facilitates deployment of the present Polaris fleet in the Atlantic and Mediterranean, but the submarines could be based on America's east coast at only slightly greater cost.

In the light of all these factors, it is dismaying that the Johnson Administration turned over renewal negotiations to an Air Force general last December. It is more dis-

maying that Gen. David Burchinal evidently went well beyond the present agreement in accepting expanded United States responsibilities for the defense of Spain.

Fortunately, these were not binding commitments. The new Administration has every right and responsibility to take an objective look at the whole question, including Spain's demand for $700 million in military aid as the price for renewal.

Unless the Pentagon can produce compeling arguments involving American and Atlantic security, the Administration should inform Madrid politely on the March 26 deadline that the United States no longer requires the bases and will evacuate them within the specified year. The political cost of renewal is likely to be greater than the military benefit.

PROFESSIONAL PAY FOR LEGAL OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4296, which has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable ALEXANDER PIRNIE. In short, this bill would authorize professional pay and a continuation bonus for judge advocates in the uniformed services. The object of the bill is to provide retention incentives for service legal officers similar to those now being received by doctors, dentists, and veterinarians in the Armed Forces.

The need for such legislation is reflected in the distressingly high dropout rate of legal officers in our armed services coupled with the growing need for qualified lawyers. The burden on legal officers has increased even more with the passage of the Military Justice Act of 1968 which extends to military personnel the right-to-counsel privilege currently enjoyed by criminal defendants in civilian courts. The figures indicate that the retention rate of legal officers in all four services is dangerously low as it is, but it is estimated that they will need an additional 700 military lawyers to meet the needs created by the Military Justice Act.

H.R. 4296 is aimed at increasing the retention rate of legal officers by making it more lucrative for qualified lawyers to remain with the Armed Forces. In addition to providing attractive monthly pay scales, the bill provides for a continuation bonus payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year for which a judge advocate agrees to remain in active service beyond any then outstanding active duty service obligation or service commitment.

This bill is not without precedent since similar privileges are already enjoyed by doctors, dentists and veterinarians in the armed services. The bill is receiving the active and vigorous support of the American Bar Association and the Judge Advocates' Association. I wish to add my full support for H.R. 4296 because I am convinced the retention incentives it provides will go a long way in overcoming the crisis situation which now exists.

WILD HORSE ANNIE

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, there is in the Western United States today a spiritual kinswoman to the hero of Romain Gary's moving novel, "The Roots of Heaven." She is Mrs. Charles C. Johnston, a respected citizen of Reno, Nev., and the president of the International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros.

Westerners know her by an affectionate pseudonym. To us, she is simply Wild Horse Annie, and her chief estate is the high wilderness of creation where man seldom ventures.

Where Mr. Gary's protagonist waged a lonely battle to save from extinction the great elephant herds of the African savannas, Velma Johnston has crusaded with equal vigor on this continent to secure permanent sanctuary for America's wild horses and burros. Her tireless efforts, in concert with those of her organization, have rescued hundreds upon hundreds of animals from the savageries of man and nature over a period of nearly two decades.

This year alone, Mrs. Johnston already has organized and directed two separate "Operation Mustang Haylifts" to save herds of wild horses trapped without food in the deep snows of remote mountain ranges. Successful air drops were made in the Pine Nut Range east of Lake Tahoe and, more recently, in the Kawich Range of central Nevada.

Mrs. Johnston is a remarkable woman, renowned as much for her imagination and inventiveness as for her considerable warmth and charm. Lacking the substantial resources required for her ambitious works, she has marshaled an impressive volunteer auxiliary from government agencies and private enterprise. The Kawich haydrop, for example, was a joint venture involving men and equipment from the Bureau of Land Management, Nellis Air Force Base, and the Atomic Energy Commission. And for the earlier Pine Nut drop, helicopters and a special airplane were provided by Mr. Ed Court, of Lake Tahoe Helicopter, Inc.

While preferring direct action, Mrs. Johnston has carried her campaign to the high councils of Government. In 1959, she testified vigorously before a Senate committee on legislation to prohibit the airborne and mechanized pursuit of wild unbranded horses and burros. I was a cosponsor of that proposal, and took great satisfaction in its enactment.

Earlier this year, Mrs. Johnston was back in Washington to present a paper before the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. The subject, of course, concerned the latest developments in her efforts to protect these wild creatures of the West.

Mr. President, America today is a complex, urban-oriented society and there is a tendency to overlook or lightly dismiss the labors of those committed to the preservation of our natural environment and its precious resources. To some, perhaps, Mrs. Charles C. Johnston is a quaint figure tilting 20th-century windmills of progress. But to Nevadans and other westerners, she is Wild Horse Annie, and we hold her in the highest affection and esteem. We see her as a fierce champion and protector of nature's kingdom. We salute her remarkable achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD significant portions of a report recently prepared by Mrs. Johnston.

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

REPORT OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ON WILD HORSES

(By Mrs. Charles C. Johnston—Wild Horse Annie)

On March 4, 1969, I presented a paper, "Public Pressure and a New Dimension of Quality—Horses and Burros," at the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington, D.C. The paper was co-authored by Dr. Michael Pontrelli of the Biology Department of the University of Nevada, and was aimed toward proving that the opinion of the public must be considered in the determination of wildlife values.

The case history of the fight that has gone on for nearly two decades to obtain a permanent protection program for the wild horses and burros of the west was the subject of the paper, with the development of public interest through newspaper and magazine publicity, and the resulting step by step progress toward the ultimate goal highlighting the presentation.

A letter just received from Dr. Bruce Wilkin of the Department of Conservation of Cornell University, who was Chairman of the Program Committee, and at whose invitation the paper was submitted, contained these comments, "Just a brief note to express my deep appreciation and the thanks of those in attendance for your presentation at the 1969 North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. I particularly appreciated your willingness to meet the various deadlines involved. Our session was the best attended of the technical sessions, reflecting the interest in your presentation and the comments of the other panel members. I know you were somewhat concerned over your presentation. Many commented to me on the value of hearing some facts on an issue that has been rather heated at times."

There was no lack of current and dramatic proof of the interest of the public in the wild horses, for "Operation Mustang Haylift" was in progress in the Pine Nut Range at the time of our departure for the nation's capital. Dr. Pontrelli accompanied me to Washington. The trapped and starving horses were the subject of nationwide news coverage, when the residents in the area of the Pine Nut Range, working on a volunteer basis, came to their rescue. Helicopters, and a special airplane, with pilots, were furnished by Ed Court, of Lake Tahoe Helicopter, Inc., with the only charge being for the gasoline consumed. Hay was donated by ranchers and cash donations were made for fuel.

Hardly had we removed our coats on our return from Washington on March 6th, when I received a telephone call from the District Manager of the Bureau of Land Management at Battle Mountain, Nevada, informing me that his field men had reported several bands of wild horses in the Kawich Range, that were trapped in the deep snow and without food. The Bureau of Land Management had made arrangements with Nellis Air Force Base to conduct a Haylift from the Las Vegas area, and a plane was standing by. Bureau of Land Management's District Manager in

Las Vegas had located 17 tons of hay, at $35 per ton, but there was no money available to purchase it. Since time was of the essence, I borrowed the necessary money from a fund of the International Society for the Protection of Mustangs and Burros, of which I am President, thus enabling the Haylift to get under way.

On Sunday, March 9th, a plane was sent in from Battle Mountain by the Bureau of Land Management, to pick up Dr. Pontrelli and me, for the purpose of a survey to determine the effectiveness of the Haydrop, and to assess the future requirements. It was gratifying to us to see that of the approximately 200 head that was discovered to be trapped, about 125 were already running free and able to get to feed; about 75 were still trapped, but every effort humanly possible was being made to reach them. With the mild weather on March 11, all but 4 or 5 had gotten into the open and were in good condition. Concentrated efforts are being made to get feed to those few remaining trapped, and it is expected that all will be saved.

The money I borrowed has already been repaid to the fund. On the evening of March 10th, Judy Lynn, whose Country and Western Band was being featured at Harrah's Club in Reno, handed me a check in the amount of $600 as a contribution for her and her husband, John Kelly. It is my hope now that a permanent emergency fund can be set up to meet other similar crises in the future, and an appeal has been launched in various parts of the country for that kind of help.

I have just received a call from the mother of a member of the Trailblazers 4–H Horsemanship Club, who invited me to be the guest of her and her husband at the Circus Room of the Sparks Nuggest on the occasion of the Sierra Nevada Sportswriters and Broadcasters Association's Annual Dinner, at which Horseman of the Year awards are made, and where a representative of the 4–H Clubs will give Wild Horse Annie a check for $200 to "take care of the horses in the future." It is this kind of interest by the children in our country that gives me goose bumps when I think about it.

* * * * *

About the crisis with the horses in Central Nevada in the Kawich Range: I have the highest praise for the cooperation of the Bureau of Land Management, of Nellis Air Force Base, of the Atomic Energy Commission that loaned the Sno-cat for the land crew to go in to see what could be done; for private enterprise, and for individuals far and near. It is a first in the history of our country that the wild horses have been given help. In years before they have been left to starve. I would like to label this little tale, "Haylift and Heartlift," but I want to save that title, because some day when I get through living this saga I can write a book about it and that is what I would like to title one of the chapters.

There are a few little human interest items I would like to add to this. The check that I made out was by the request of the Bureau of Land Management, made to the National Mustang Association, that has a branch in Las Vegas, and upon receipt of the check, or a guarantee, rather, that was telephoned to them by the local Bureau of Land Management officer, the hay was purchased from the ranch and it is gratifying to know that within five hours of the notification of the emergency, the hay was loaded on the flying boxcar and was on its way. In a report I had from an officer of the organization that evening, his people had sent out the word that help was needed and ranchers from far and near were bringing in bales of hay. Contributions of cash were being made, the Air Force men had passed the hat, gathered up all their coffee money, and a retarded children's school had collected $44. It's that kind of participation that gives you a warm, glowing feeling all over.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower is dead. His passing, of course, was not unexpected, although the old soldier had fought with death and won so many times before that it was hard to believe he would not also win what proved to be his final battle. He died at age 78, his life full of both deeds and honors. And so his death was not tragic, not in the sense that his passing came before the essential part of his life's work was finished. General Eisenhower's was, indeed, a life fulfilled. As did Paul, he fought a good fight, finished the course, and kept the faith. Surely the supplication of Reverend Sayre, "remember Thy servant Dwight David, O Lord," will be heeded on high.

But the death of a man of the stature of Dwight David Eisenhower cannot occur without an accompanying sadness, whether he has completed his work or not. And truly we are sad, not only here in America, but throughout the world. He is gone, and we shall greatly miss him. His place cannot be taken by another. The famous Eisenhower grin, his strength of character, the easy charm, the essential goodness of the man are now but memories. But they are good memories and will, I am sure, cause the spirits of men everywhere to be uplifted for generations to come.

My generation remembers him as the peacemaker, a man trained for war who brought and maintained the peace. He led the most powerful military force in history to victory over a strong and evil aggressor enemy. It is doubtful that any man will ever again lead such a great army. General Eisenhower was already a hero, although the war was not yet over, when I became old enough to enlist in the Armed Forces in January 1945. I did not happen to serve under his command, but I have always been proud of the fact that I wore the uniform at the same time General Eisenhower did. All veterans of World War II, I am sure, share that same feeling of pride.

Having led our forces to victory in battle, General Eisenhower then fought to preserve the peace. After the war, he served as Army Chief of Staff, then later returned to Europe as Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As President he again served in the role of peacemaker, bringing an end to the hostilities in Korea. And during his 8 years in the White House, Dwight Eisenhower, the man of war, took the necessary steps that preserved the peace.

My generation, of course, participated in the Eisenhower years. We fought in battle with him, served under him during his terms as President, revered him as elder statesman. He was such a part of our lives and time—the hopeful, essentially happy, good period of years to which he contributed so much—that my generation cannot forget him.

My children and their friends of a younger generation have a less sure remembrance of him. Laurence Shupe, my youngest child, who was born in the last few months of the Eisenhower administration, is too young yet to understand fully why so much has been made of the Eisenhower passing. He will, of course, come to understand better as he grows older.

But to him and to those of his time I would say that what General Eisenhower did, important as it was, is not as important as what he was. And he was, in my judgment, one of the most genuine, honest, and deeply concerned men who ever served in public life. There was nothing hypocritical about Eisenhower, no phoniness, no posturing. He was as incapable of hiding behind an unreal facade as the Kansas countryside from which he came is incapable of hiding behind a mountain. Where some politicians are suspected of being devious, General Eisenhower was never suspect. Where some have been accused of being less than truthful, nobody ever seriously questioned "Ike's" honesty. When Dwight Eisenhower told you something, you could believe it. He was the diplomat, the conciliator, the leader who brought diverse personalities together and effected a working union. And, though mild in demeanor, he could be tough. It was Eisenhower who first moved in the direction of civil rights; it was Eisenhower who sent troops into Little Rock. When the situation became explosive in the Middle East, President Eisenhower didn't hesitate to send American troops there to restore order and prevent a Communist takeover. The deeds are many, and there is no need to recount them here. History will certainly note them.

I cannot say what place historians will assign General Eisenhower as a President, but I suspect that it will be high. There has been much speculation in this regard in recent days. I like what Newsweek Columnist Kenneth Crawford said the other day:

> He was the right President for a particular time.

Perhaps that is as fitting a judgment as any, at least until time allows for a better perspective.

Ike was the archetypical American hero, the poor boy who learned correct principles at home, practiced them in life and went on to accomplish deeds and win honors beyond the wildest of dreams. It is unlikely that my son will lead armies or be President. But though he may not emulate Dwight Eisenhower in deeds or vocation, I would hope that he would take him as an example, a model of the kind of man he wants to be. He could make no better choice.

DR. EDWARD HUGHES PRUDEN, A SERVANT OF MANKIND

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today marks the last service that a remarkable clergyman will conduct at a remarkable and historic church here in the Nation's Capital.

Dr. Edward Hughes Pruden will retire from the pastorate of the First Baptist Church at 16th and O Streets NW. He has served the congregation there for 32 years.

But Dr. Pruden has served a far wider congregation, too. He truly has ministered to men. He has reached far out from his own denomination, and sought to bridge the differences not only within Christian denominations but among religions and races. Dr. Pruden has been an important link between the Southern and Northern Baptist Conventions. He has been president of the American Baptist Conventions. He has been active in the religious and social community of the District of Columbia.

Dr. Pruden was born in Chase City, Va., and graduated from the University of Richmond. He took a master's degree at the Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Ky., and a Ph. D. from the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. He held a pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Petersburg, Va., for 5 years, and then came to Washington First Baptist Church, where he has remained.

His pastorate has been eminently worthy of one of the oldest churches in Washington, D.C. The First Baptist Church at 16th and O Streets was founded in 1802. It has been the mother church of many others founded in Washington, and across the country. Its founders also established George Washington University in the District of Columbia. This church has provided a spiritual haven and inspiration for many of the Nation's leaders throughout the life of the Republic. In recent years, it was to 16th and O Streets that President Harry Truman often walked from the White House for Sunday worship.

In the stained glass windows of this church are portrayed religious leaders of the ages, St. Augustine, Martin Luther, Albert Schweitzer, among them. Other windows remind us of the outstanding Baptists of history—John Bunyan, Roger Williams, and Edgar Goodspeed. There are included three Texans in this group. They are Sam Houston, B. H. Carroll, of Fort Worth, and Dr. George Truitt, of Dallas.

These windows serve to link this mother church with Texas, and with Baptist congregations throughout the country.

They also serve to link this church with the other religions of the world and of history.

They remind us, as did Dr. Pruden, that the word of God and the message of Christ know no language, nor race, nor nation, nor denomination.

I salute Dr. Pruden for the contribution he has made to this great church.

I welcome his successor, Dr. John Howell, of Atlanta, Ga. I know he will continue to serve this church in keeping with its tradition and that of Dr. Pruden.

JIM WRIGHT TELLS F–111 STORY LIKE IT IS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we all receive a lot of unsolicited mail, most of it not very helpful. An outstanding exception to this rule was the letter dated March 21, 1969, that I received, and I gather all Members of the House received, from JIM WRIGHT. The letter tells, what I am willing to bet for the first time, the true story of the F–111. Never in my experience have I seen such a deliberate and determined and unending effort to demolish the reputation of an American combat aircraft as there has been in the case of the F–111.

Virtually without any shadow of a doubt, it is one of the greatest design successes in the history of combat aircraft. It has capabilities well beyond any aircraft in the inventory of any nation in the world, but to read about it and hear about it over the past 2 or 3 years you could hardly think of it as anything other than a complete failure. I do not expect to ever know why this campaign started and where it got the push to continue it, but I do know that it has been almost successful.

The F–111 is made in JIM WRIGHT'S district, and he, therefore, has a parochial interest in it, but what he also has, and gives us in his letter, is all of the information, in this case correct information, about this great airplane.

I thank him for his letter, which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., ———, 1969.

DEAR ———: You will be enormously pleased, I know, with the truly magnificent record which the F–111 aircraft has achieved in two years of actual flying. This record is a thorough vindication of the confidence and judgment of the Congress in authorizing this program and subsequently appropriating monies for its development and production.

Even previously critical news media—as evidence the enclosures—finally are recognizing that Congress was eminently right in authorizing the plane!

In view of the sensational news treatment which has accompanied every single accident suffered by an F–111—treatment never accorded to any other aircraft—it no doubt will come as a very pleasant surprise to many that *the F–111 actually has the very best flight safety record of any military aircraft of the Century Series.*

Here is the comparative record, in number of accidents, based in each case upon 5,000 hours, 10,000 hours, and 20,000 hours of actual flying.

NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS—ALL CENTURY SERIES AIRCRAFT

Aircraft	5,000 hours	10,000 hours	20,000 hours
F–100	7	14	29
F–101	9	16	18
F–102	9	12	22
F–104	14	17	28
F–105	8	12	14
F–106	7	8	11
F–111	[1]3	[1]6	[1]10
F–4	6	8	11

[1] F–111 in each case has produced fewer accidents per hours flown.

In this connection, the following facts are extremely pertinent.

1. The *escape module* in the F–111, designed to throw the pilots free in event of a crash, is probably the best and most effective yet built. In most of the highly celebrated F–111 accidents, the pilots actually escaped injury. Unlike many escape systems, the F–111's is effective at the lowest altitude—and even over water.

2. The *short takeoff and landing* characteristic of the F–111 is in one sense a safety factor for emergency operations of various sorts. This aircraft will take off and land on shorter airstrips than any other Air Force model capable of such advanced speeds.

3. No other aircraft has such a *complete redundancy of systems*—in other words, a series of spare electric and mechanical systems designed to actuate and take over automatically if the primary systems should fail. So far as possible, these have been designed to protect even against pilot errors.

4. Undoubtedly the most significant—and most revolutionary—safety development of the F–111 is its *Terrain Avoidance system* which operates by radar. I've tested this system personally at very, very low levels over extremely mountainous country. It works! With this system actuated, it is just almost impossible for a pilot to fly the plane into a mountain or building even on the darkest night and in the worst of weather.

COMBAT TESTS IN VIETNAM

These particular innovations were given an extremely thorough testing in most adverse conditions in Southeast Asia, where the Air Force flew *854 missions* including training missions. *Fifty-five of them were actual combat strike missions.* The planes flew in at such low altitudes that *the enemy radar could not pick them up* and enemy antiaircraft weapons could not focus on them. They came back *without a single hole,* and Lt. Colonel Dean Salmeier, who flew some of these missions, has said:

"There is no question in my mind that on most missions the enemy did not even know we were there until we were gone . . . The aircraft is definitely capable of making strikes at night, in all weather, and with extreme accuracy."

The F–111 is the only aircraft in the arsenal which will do these particular things.

COMBAT RADIUS AND PAYLOAD

The F–111, in spite of its relatively small size, will carry a bigger bomb load over a longer distance than any interdiction aircraft in our arsenal. The next best is the A–7 and the third best is the F–4.

Compared with the A–7, the F–111 will carry 50% more 2,000 pound bombs for more than twice the distance. Or, it will carry 30% more bomb load for almost three times the distance.

Compared with the F–4, the F–111 can carry three times the bomb load for almost five times the distance, or 30% more bombs for better than three times the distance.

NAVIGATION PRECISION

The F–111 has the most accurate navigation system of any aircraft ever built. The

figures below represent the error in nautical miles for each hour of flight when the Navy system is not updated to a correct position enroute.

(Miles) Error per hour	
F-105	8.0
F-4	2.3
F-111A	1.2
F-111D	0.5

It is particularly notable that, in the past several weeks, objective news stories in some of America's most responsible journals are now recognizing the undeniable positive and favorable facts demonstrated in the F-111 record, so long obscured by the earlier spat of sensationalist and negative comment.

You will be pleased indeed with the enclosed factual and objective stories which have appeared recently in *U.S. News and World Report* and *Aviation Week.*

Thought you would like to have these facts which so thoroughly and effectively vindicate the Congress.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely,

JIM WRIGHT.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Roll Call, Capitol Hill's own newspaper, contains an interesting and significant article on the tax exemption of foundations and organizations in the issue of March 13, 1969. Representative PATMAN's inquiry into the activities of foundations has revealed scores of inequities and discriminatory practices. Perhaps the worst case of discrimination was the abrupt withdrawal of the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club immediately after the publication of an ad in the New York Times and Washington Post protesting construction of a dam or dams that would flood a part of the Grand Canyon.

As pointed out in the Roll Call article, all but four of the 26 biggest spenders in 1965 were tax-exempt organizations spending money for ads and literature trying to get Congress to enact the type of legislation that the Sierra Club was protesting. They were not successful in their legislative objective, the Grand Canyon proposal was not adopted, but they kept their tax-exempt status. The Sierra Club lost its tax exemption but won the war.

In view of the investigation currently underway and the inquiry into legislation, general in nature, clarifying the tax laws and the regulations, it would seem that the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service should recognize that an error was made in the case of the Sierra Club and restore its tax exemption. Then all the organizations would be equally bound by the new legislation, if any, that is enacted. The continuation of a bureaucratic blunder made by the previous administration should not be permitted by the new administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS PROBES TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The first comprehensive Congressional examination of tax-exempt organizations in nearly 20 years started last month as the House Ways and Means Committee, which writes the bills that specify who gets tax exemptions, began a series of hearings.

"Private tax-exempt foundations are frauds," snaps Rep. Wright Patman, the Texas Democrat. "They don't do much for the nation except serve as tax evasion devices for the very rich. But they're so loaded with money that no one dares touch them—except me."

The concept of maintaining foundations as tax-free enterprises relates to the public view that private philanthropy plays an important role in our society. They are able to provide financial aid to areas which government cannot or should not advance. They are uniquely qualified to initiate thought and action, and to experiment with new and untried concepts, often dissenting from prevailing attitudes.

Because we have viewed private foundations in this manner, we have established generous provisions for their tax exemptions and tax deductions for contributions to such foundations have been provided for in our laws. This treatment diverts large amounts from the public treasury to private foundations. It is, therefore, essential that the tax laws insure that these private foundations and organizations put these funds to philanthropic purposes that benefit the public, not to purposes which provide personal advantage to the donor, or which advance partisan political activities and causes.

An important example of an organization which was once granted such tax exemption but which later saw its exemption revoked is the Sierra Club.

The Sierra Club has for many years been a leader in the cause of conservation. It had more than a passing interest in legislation affecting the preservation of forests, parks and other natural resources. On June 9, 1966 the Sierra Club ran full page advertisements in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post,* headlined: "Now Only You Can Save Grand Canyon From Being Flooded . . . For Profit." The ads opposed federal legislation to build two dams at the Grand Canyon.

The following day, the District Director of Internal Revenue in San Francisco wrote to the Sierra Club advising them that the Internal Revenue Service was no longer prepared to extend advance assurance of deductibility of contributions to the Club. In a letter dated December 16, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service held that the club was no longer exempt from federal income tax and that contributions to the organization were not deductible.

Many observers claimed at that time that the Sierra Club was being singled out as a scapegoat because it had opposed a favorite project of the Administration. But the point is much broader: is there a systematic method of legislative oversight to see to it that the tax exempt foundations do not engage in partisan political activity, or is there not?

Consider the expenditures of other organizations during the same period when the Sierra Club lost its tax exempt status. The American Medical Association spent by its own accounting $1,155,035.30 in an effort to defeat the Medicare Bill. Newspapers, magazines, and television screens were saturated with its anti-medicare ads. The money for all of this came from two sources, the tax-free advertising revenues of the *A.M.A. Journal* and other A.M.A. publications, amounting to about $10 million a year, and from the membership dues of doctors, deductible items on their tax returns.

Compared with the A.M.A.'s 1965 outlay for political propaganda, the Sierra Club's investment of $10,000 for ads in the *Post* and the *Times* was miniscule. It was minor in comparison with what other tax exempt lobbies spend in Washington every year to win political battles.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, to cite another example, supported the Grand Canyon dams. It had a $300,000 national advertising budget in 1966 to buy space in such magazines as Look, Harpers, and the Atlantic. Many of its ads were "institutional," aimed at arousing public support for the co-ops as a necessary element in the American power system. Others were open appeals for Congressional votes. Two months to the day after the Sierra Club ad appeared in Washington, the Internal Revenue Service could have read in the Washington Star or Post a three quarter page ad calling on Congress to create a Federal bank for rural electric systems.

During the year in which the Sierra Club lost its tax exemption, the *Congressional Quarterly,* in its annual report on spending by Washington lobbies, found that all but four of the 26 biggest spenders in 1965 were tax-exempt organizations, including the Central Arizona Project Association, which spent $74,065.02 in 1965 solely to get Congress to do what the Sierra Club was trying to prevent—build dams in the Grand Canyon.

Neither the Central Arizona Project nor any of the other 23 biggest spending lobbies on the *Congressional Quarterly* list had at that time had their tax-exemptions questioned by the Internal Revenue Service.

When asked why it had revoked the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club but had not seen fit to investigate any of the others, I.R.S. Commissioner Sheldon Cohen said that the I.R.S. is limited in what it can do. It checks, he noted, only about 15,000 of the 500,000 returns filed by "charitable" groups each year and spends little time observing the political operations of such groups.

A brief look at the largest of the foundations, the Ford Foundation, shows how a foundation, under the guise of education and research, can consistently subsidize one political view over another.

In 1968 the net worth of the Ford Foundation was $3.1 billion and its gift commitments stood at $203.2 million. Were its activities educational and non-partisan, or were they often political and partisan, and did they sometimes have the result of stirring disorder and turmoil?

In 1967, the Foundation approved a $175,000 grant primarily to help a voter registration drive in Cleveland sponsored by the Congress of Racial Equality. Supporters of Republican mayoralty candidate Seth Taft criticized the Foundation for assisting the campaign of Democrat Carl Stokes, who subsequently won.

Last Fall the Ford Foundation helped to finance New York City's school decentralization experiments, including one in Ocean Hill-Brownsville that later became the focus of three city-wide teachers' strikes. Albert Shanker, who as president of the United Federation of Teachers led the walkouts, accused the foundation of undermining his union, tampering with the city's public schools, and exerting influence over key Board of Education members holding Foundation grants.

What the Ford Foundation was supporting in the New York schools, many observers believed, was the opposite of the policy of integration which the Courts have called for. In fact, the New York Board of Rabbis criticized the Foundation's school decentralization plan as "a potential breeder of local apartheid."

In 1962, Dyke Brown, then a vice president of Ford, wrote that the Foundation's interest had "shifted from management and public administration to policy and the political process." Only last month, Ford awarded

eight former aides of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy travel and study grants totaling more than $131,000.

It is essential that we have a clarification and tightening of existing tax laws. Foundations, it must be remembered, are creatures of the Congress. Thus, the Congress has a special obligation to oversee their activities. The inequities in the current law are clear, and the time for change is now.

U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE SPEAKS AT GEORGIA B'NAI B'RITH BANQUET ON MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, Georgia Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE spoke on March 15, 1969, to the Georgia State Association of B'nai B'rith Lodges on the Middle East situation.

My good friend, Maurice Steinberg, attorney at law, Augusta, Ga., sent me a copy of the speech with the following remarks:

I had the pleasure last Saturday night to attend a banquet held in Decatur, Georgia, at which our friend Herman Talmadge was the guest speaker. The banquet was part of the convention of the Georgia State Association of B'nai B'rith Lodges. There were more than 200 people present and they were tremendously impressed by Herman's remarks. The subject matter of his talk is of extreme importance on the world scene, and it is my impression that good, sound thinking concerning the unrest in the Middle East is of great importance, particularly among members of Congress.

I think this speech will be of interest to all of the Members of Congress. I submit it, therefore, for insertion in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE

I am honored and privileged to appear before this distinguished gathering. I salute your new president.

I know all of you are proud of Ben Hyman for what he has done for your organization, for his community, and for our great State. I am proud to call Ben my friend, and I want to wish him: *Mazzel Tov.*

You have my heartfelt congratulations.

It is also my distinct pleasure to commend B'nai B'rith for a job well done. I am aware of your humanitarian work and of the splendid contributions all of you have made—through this fine organization—to promote a better understanding of the complex world in which we live.

B'nai B'rith has a long record of distinguished service and meritorious accomplishment.

You have come through some very hard times. And, even yet, the people of this troubled world are still a long way from the promised land. Judging from the present state of national and world affairs, you still have your work cut out for you.

Strife and discontent seem almost to be constant companions, both at home and abroad.

All around us, we see manifestations of immorality and dissension . . . between regions of our country, between the races, between the religions, and between nations throughout the world.

Perhaps at no other time in history have we had more of a need for men of good will, and for leaders of unwavering devotion to God and country.

I am sad to say that there probably is more disorder and internal hatred within our country today than at any time since the War Between the States.

In many parts of the world, there is political strife that at any moment can erupt into armed conflict.

People in foreign lands are ravaged by poverty and disease that is beyond our comprehension here in America.

In short, the present domestic and world situation is not one to bring cheer to the minds and hearts of peace-loving men and women.

Even now, there is terrible tension in the Middle East and even continued bloodshed. I know this is a source of deep personal concern to you.

As the second year since the June 1967 war draws to a close, Israel and her Arab neighbors are still locked in the extremely dangerous stalemate of an armed cease-fire.

Despite efforts of the United Nations mediator, and the good offices of many other interested parties, not the least of which is the United States, there is still no substantial progress to report.

The Middle East, which has been a tinderbox for these last twenty years, still totters on the brink of disaster.

If anything, the situation in the area may have become even more fraught with danger than it was. In the interim, both sides have resorted to armed force on several occasions. The reasons for the reprisals and attacks may differ between the Arabs and the Israelis. But the result has been one of keeping the Arab-Israeli conflict simmering.

Border incidents and skirmishes have become more frequent. Arab guerrilla fighters, more organized than ever before, apparently have decided to intensify their aggressive action against Israel.

As the terrorists cross the borders into Israel or the occupied regions, the Israelis have been meeting them with a fierce resistance. This denotes an increasing determination to protect their homes and farms from bombs, mines, and attacks. This is as it should be. Self-protection of Israel is, of course, beyond reproach.

The Israelis must defend their nation from bandits that raid their land in the night. But last summer, the Arab terrorist attacks against Israel took on international consequences.

In July, a group of Arab guerrillas hijacked an Israeli commercial airliner on its way from Rome to Tel Aviv. They forced the pilot to fly the plane and its 45 passengers and crew to Algeria.

The ramifications of this act were immediately apparent to all. The Arab-Israeli war had now moved into neutral ground. The hijacking in Rome, except for the inconvenience and the consternation of the captives and their families, was not harmful. The people and the plane were returned to Israel in due time.

The next international incident in the Arab guerrilla war was the attack against the El Al plane in Athens, resulting in the death of one man, and injuries to a few others.

Israel retaliated by destroying 13 planes in the Beirut airport. This drew some criticism of Israel and a United Nations condemnation.

The world was faced with a rather difficult legal problem concerning the Beirut raid, as it had been faced with the same question on many of the other reprisal raids of the Israelis.

When the Arab terrorists conduct an attack, such as the Athens raid, they do so as men without a national status. That is, they are supposedly not acting as agents of an Arab government, at least so far as it can be determined.

When the Israelis launch their retaliatory attacks, they do so as Israelis.

On the one hand, the United Nations cannot officially condemn the Arab terrorists since they are not representatives per se of a recognized government.

On the other hand, the Israelis are a government, and the United Nations passed a resolution which condemned the Israeli action.

International lawyers and diplomats may find consolation in the fact that the law, in the strictest sense of the word, has been judiciously applied. But there is obviously much to be desired in their judgments.

No one can quarrel with Israel's right to protect its citizens and its property.

No one, with the exception of the Arabs, denies that Israel's retaliation against the terrorist attacks is a fitting payment for the barbaric behavior of Arabs who pursue a policy of terror.

In one sense, the UN condemnation of Israel is an acknowledgment of Israel's honesty, in that Israel admits that the raid was carried out by the Defense Forces of the country.

The absence of a similar condemnation of the Arab nations who give sanctuary to the terrorists is a recognition of their basic dishonesty for not admitting that they, the Arab nations, are responsible for the Arab terrorists.

Another aspect of the problem in the United Nations is that any attempt to offer an appropriate condemnation of the Arab states results in either a Soviet filibuster or a Soviet veto.

The record, taken at face value, shows the Israelis as the villains since the condemnations are approved by the Security Council and the General Assembly. At the same time, the Arab nations appear innocent since there are no condemning resolutions on record against them.

For whatever consolation it may be to the Israelis, most reasonable people recognize that the deck is stacked against the Israelis in the matter of United Nations resolutions.

As for other terrorism perpetrated against the State of Israel and her citizens, such as the bomb explosion in the Jerusalem market, or the bomb in the Tel Aviv bus depot, these acts are regarded with universal contempt.

They are only meant to harm, maim and kill. They are despicable. It is one of the great tragedies of the Middle Eastern situation that Israel must suffer these daily threats to life and limb.

There have been reports of several different peace plans offered by the Soviet Union, France, Egypt, Israel, the United States, and others. But the primary obstacle to a permanent peace still remains the Arab refusal to negotiate directly with the State of Israel.

If any of the proposals for peace will prove to be fruitful is a question that only time will answer.

But it is clear that the first stumbling block to any settlement is the Arab rejection of a peace conference. As President Johnson said before B'nai B'rith in Washington on September 10, 1968:

"The process of peace-making will not begin until the leaders of the Middle East begin exchanging views . . ."

The President also said at that same meeting that the United States has ". . . no intention of allowing the balance of forces in the area to ever become an incentive for war."

Since then the United States and Israel have concluded an agreement for the sale of Phantom jet aircraft to the state of Israel. It is hoped that these planes will preserve the current arms balance between the two sides, and therefore keep the Arab states from assuming that Israel is unable to defend herself.

Such an assumption could provoke new attacks and new aggressions in the Middle East.

And, judging from the heroic behavior of the Israeli armed forces in the June, 1967 war, it could well be another disastrous assumption on the part of the Arab nations.

By honoring the Israeli request for these planes and other armaments, it is hoped that the Soviet Union will realize that its policy of arming the Arab nations in the hope that they will be able to gain an arms advantage will be proven not only foolhardy but also unfeasible.

I fully support the United States' policy of assisting Israel in the acquisition of arms to keep the balance and thereby prevent another war. The strength of Israel acts as a deterrent until such time as real peace negotiations can be implemented.

The outcome of the peace negotiations, when negotiations finally do begin, will depend on the ability of both sides to compromise. In the end, both the Arabs and the Israelis will have to compromise if there is to be any meaningful agreements.

The current positions of both sides are apparently unreconcilable. Both sides must understand that they cannot possibly realize all their hopes and desires. New approaches may find ways around some of the present disagreements, and new tactics may be needed to break current deadlocks.

There are two examples of deadlocked questions that could be solved by accepting less than the full measure: so-called "Israeli expansionism," and the state of war.

According to the newspapers, President Nasser has offered to issue a declaration of peace instead of declaring an end of the state of war. Israel wants an end to the war, but perhaps the Israelis will have to settle for the compromise.

The Arabs have, for many years, been claiming that Israel has designs on Arab territory, that the state of Israel is going to expand until it reaches from the Nile River to the Euphrates. If the claim is true or not really doesn't matter so long as the Arab people believe that it is true.

We know that Israel is not going to push its borders to Iraq. But as long as the Arab leaders are able to convince the Arab masses that Israel intends to take more Arab territory, then there must be some way to try and tell the Arab people otherwise.

Israel could issue a declaration of nonexpansion and put it on file at the United Nations along with the Arab declaration of peace.

These concessions may appear petty and insignificant, but if the long-range goal is to be achieved, then maybe we will have to make such concessions.

The goal is peace. Israel wants only to be left alone, to have peace, to end the madness that has seized the Middle East for two decades.

We know what Israel can do if all the resources of the country were turned toward the full development of the Israeli nation.

I do not mean the natural resources of Israel. They are meager at best.

I mean the human resources of Israel. They are immense.

I submit that not since the founding of our own nation and the unprecedented development of the United States has a nation of people been possessed of such a wealth of human initiative, determination and inventiveness, as the nation of Israel.

Israel is given credit for "turning the desert into gardens." This is true. It is a miracle of the modern world that the nation of Israel has registered the amazing development that it has, in spite of the adverse conditions of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In a peaceful Middle East, Israel would surpass any other example of achievement. Moreover, the Israeli leaders have said many times that they would share their wealth of knowledge with their neighbors.

One of the most impressive of the Israeli programs has been the international cooperation between Israel and the other developing nations of the world.

A Burmese government official was quoted as saying, in praise of the Israeli technicians who had come to his nation to assist in farming projects, that Israel "gives us what we want."

What he was saying was this: There were no "strings" attached to Israeli assistance. There were no political implications involved in Israeli help. The Israelis were showing his people, the Burmese people, how to help themselves.

Israel does not have a give-away program. They have a "show-how" program. They show how to build a nation.

In the four corners of the earth, Israelis have been demonstrating a new kind of international cooperation that reminds me of something I learned a long time ago by another name. It was called hard work.

In a day when it appears that half of the world is looking for something for nothing, how refreshing it is to see someone working.

In Israel they work now, for their own future and for the good of all mankind. Even in the dark hours, when Israel was threatened with destruction, they had time to offer a helping hand.

The most momentous and self-sacrificing gesture of this war-torn area of the Middle East is that Israel has offered to help the Arab states with their own development as soon as peace can be achieved.

For any who would doubt the good intentions of the Israelis, I think that their offer of help to their own enemies is sufficient proof that there is nothing devious in the Israeli program for the future.

The nation of Israel is truly a nation of peace. She wants only to live and grow in peace and freedom and help her neighbors do the same.

HOW RELIABLE THE ABM?

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial, entitled "How Reliable the ABM?" recently published.

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

HOW RELIABLE THE ABM?

A report from North Dakota, where President Nixon wants to start installing his ABM missile defense system, raises a new question about the whole fantastically expensive program on which United States security is built. That question involves the reliability of the intricate rocketry that powers the Minuteman missile and its projected ABM defenders.

Farmers who plow around the Minuteman are skeptical that it will ever fire when needed. That skepticism stems from repeated failures in test launches at the North Dakota base—the most embarrassing last Aug. 14 when high-ranking Pentagon officials and Congressmen waited in vain. Something always seems to go awry: a resistor proves faulty; a capacitor doesn't work; a pin misfunctions.

Such experiences with the Minuteman point up the more serious problems of dependability presented by the incredibly intricate ABM complex of radars, computers and Spartan and Sprint missiles. These problems apply not merely to the hardware but to the programing of the computers, a make-or-break element in the Safeguard system.

Many will argue that the flawless performance of Apollo spacecraft in the exacting flights they have made in preparation for the first landing on the moon erases any valid basis for doubt that the ABM system can fulfill its assigned mission. But quite apart from the fact that an Apollo rocket is simpler than the Safeguard complex, the project to put men on the moon benefits from a degree of care and checking that no long-lived ABM can expect to have.

An army of inspectors and testers keeps the Apollo units under microscopic watch at every step of the long road from manufacture through assembly and blast-off. And the mooncraft do not stand in silos year after year while generations of bored military nursemaids give increasingly routine attention to the myriad electronic components, every one of which must operate perfectly if the rocket is to work.

The whole intertwined program for building deterrents around the present grid of nuclear deterrents provides plentiful opportunity for the operation of what engineers call Murphy's Second Law: If anything can go wrong with a complex system, it will go wrong. An ABM system would be fired only once—on twenty minutes notice at the outbreak of nuclear war. The possibility of substantial, even catastrophic, failure requires close examination by Congress before it decides on a project for which there is little discernible justification in any event.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, mere words are always inadequate to express the deep feelings that flood over one in the loss of so great a man and so noble a leader as we have lost in the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. And my words are more than inadequate to add anything to the stirring tribute delivered by President Nixon in his eulogy in the rotunda on Sunday.

The world has lost its most beloved and respected citizen. It is symbolic of the stature he attained that the world mourns the loss of this son of America's heartland and mourns him as deeply and sincerely as any in his native land.

Near the end of his eulogy, President Nixon expressed what to me is the most significant thing about the life of this late, great American hero. Each of us has been diminished by his passing, but as the President pointed out:

> Each of us here will have a special memory of Dwight Eisenhower.

That is true. And it is powerful.

It is true because no man who ever met him or saw him or heard him speak could forget him. Could anyone forget that smile, so full of kindliness and good humor? Could anyone forget his voice, so firm, resolute and assured, yet so rich in goodness and sincerity. There was strength in his manhood—boundless energy and enthusiasm—and such gentleness in his eyes and in his manner.

It is true and it is powerful. Powerful because it is a memory etched in the

mind forever of a man who personified as no other of our era has all the noble qualities of America. Dwight Eisenhower was a man of great accomplishments who never lost his deep sense of humility. He was a man of great power whose first concern, whether as general or President, was always for the good of those he led. He was a target for thoughtless criticism who never learned to hate. He was schooled in the military, yet constantly devoted to the cause of peace and one of our most effective peacemakers. He was subjected to the greatest pressures, yet he never deserted the principles and ideals instilled in him as a youth by a devout mother, a firm but kindly father, and a community imbued with love of country. He is the kind of man every parent hopes his child will grow to be, and the challenge to emulate his example will be a powerful influence for good wherever it is taken up.

Yes, each of us will have a special memory of Dwight Eisenhower. My special memory is of playing golf with him at Burning Tree when he was President. He was a strong competitor, a great sport, a man it was tremendous fun to be with.

He was the most interesting man I have ever known; warm, friendly, and good-humored, with a deep compassion for all mankind; an American through and through. A great general, a great statesman, a great President. Yes. But more than that, he was a "great guy." That is my memory of Dwight Eisenhower. And in his passing I have lost a sincere friend. But my life has been specially blessed by having known him, and for as long as I live nothing can diminish that privilege, that honor, that great reward.

To his gallant and gracious widow, to his wonderful family, I extend my deepest sympathy and pray the blessing of God's peace upon them.

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT McKELDIN BEFORE CONGREGATION OF CHRIST CHURCH, RALEIGH, N.C.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on March 26, 1969, Maryland's distinguished former Governor and mayor of Baltimore, Hon. Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, who now serves as a member of the Indian Claims Commission, addressed the congregation of Christ Church in the capital city of Raleigh, N.C. The occasion was the noon Lenten service in this historic church, whose rector is the Reverend Bruce Daniel Sapp; associate rector, the Reverend Edward Cook LeCarpentier, Jr.; and lay leader, a prominent citizen of Raleigh, Mr. Ben F. Park.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor McKeldin's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, CHRIST CHURCH LENTEN SERVICE, RALEIGH, N.C., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1969

It has been suggested to me that this audience is particularly interested in two aspects of the problem that confronts the American who honestly strives to square his conduct with his conscience in discharging his duty as a citizen. Those two are, first, the responsibility of our governmental institutions, and, second, of government officials "for the reconciliation and maintenance of the community life in a changing world."

Of course, I know that you do not expect me to cover that subject in detail in a single address. The theory is available to you in a whole library of books, so I assume that what you require of me is such hints as I may have picked up, not from the study of books but from practical experience as Mayor of a large city and Governor of a small state. That I can do, for I have not learned so much that I can't give you the gist of it in a speech of reasonable length.

To begin with, all our institutions of government are designed to operate within a framework of political principles so extremely simple that the rest of the world has never been able to understand them, and we ourselves have frequently misunderstood some. You may think that I am offering you a paradox calling them too simple to understand, but it is a fact that often the simplest statement is the hardest to understand. I offer you an example: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"—twelve words, each of one syllable, all perfectly familiar, but if you can tell what they mean, not part, but *all* of what they mean, you are wise beyond the wisdom of this generation, for the whole world today is committed to the theory that only by secrecy, deception, and devious strategems can any nation hope to preserve its freedom.

So the fact that the framework is simple doesn't mean that it is easy to handle. On the contrary, we have devised the most difficult form of government the world has ever seen, and the difficulty begins with the six reasons that we have advanced as the only legitimate reasons for having any government at all. They are stated in the preamble to the Constitution, as follows:

1. To form a more perfect Union.
2. To establish justice.
3. To insure domestic tranquility.
4. To provide for the common defense.
5. To promote the general welfare.
6. To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Consider those six statements. They are all as simple as A-B-C—and harder to grasp in all their implications than the 24 volumes of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* of the Emperor Justinian. Take Number Two, "to establish justice"—every famous writer on the law, from Tribonian, through Coke and Blackstone, down to our own Justice Holmes, has struggled in vain to explain what that means. The reason is simple—it hasn't meant exactly the same thing in any two different periods of time, or in any two different countries in the same period. It is a changing world.

Number Five, "to promote the general welfare," is even more difficult, and Number Three, "to insure domestic tranquility," is almost as obscure. Nevertheless, to these six objects the fundamental law commits the government of the United States, and to no others. There are three, in particular, to which most of the nations known to history have been committed, but to which ours is in no way pledged. They are:

1. To increase our wealth.
2. To extend our dominion over the earth.
3. To correct the manners and morals of foreign nations.

Yet there are Americans in large numbers who believe with all their hearts that the government should direct its attention first to these three, and attend to the others later, if at all. Furthermore, they would amend Number Six. Where it reads "to secure the blessings of liberty," they would make it read "to secure the blessings of prosperity."

I am no Marxist. I see nothing intrinsically evil in wealth, or in power, or in missionary zeal, but I see great wisdom in their exclusion from the list of our nation's reasons for being. Certainly the nation must acquire enough national wealth and national power to provide for the common defense, and it should proclaim to all the world its adherence to the ideals of justice and liberty. But that is the limit of its commitment under its organic law.

That, I believe, defines the full responsibility of our governmental institutions.

Now consider the responsibility of the men to whom is entrusted the operation of our institutions, which is to say, the responsibility of our government officials.

The first I shall mention is a responsibility that the official owes, not to the public, but to himself. It is the cultivation of a certain modesty as he goes about his task, a realization of its difficulty, and a firm rejection of the temptation to believe that he alone is the people and that wisdom shall die with him. I assert this without hesitation or reservation, because I have the highest possible authority for it. You know who said, "Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, that is, God." Any man who thinks he can rule this country perfectly thinks he is wiser than Jesus of Nazareth, who knew that God alone can do it perfectly. A man who forgets that—and I think I have seen some—is disqualified for public office.

But that is, I repeat, the official's responsibility to himself. What he owes to the people who elected him, or to the higher official who appointed him, is an honest effort to make the government, within his sphere of influence, serve the six objects that it was established to serve. He may be a minor official, with a small sphere of influence, but to the limit of his authority the same obligation rests upon him that rests upon the President of the United States.

I think it fair to say that the primary obligation rests upon the minor official, for it is he who has the first and most frequent contact with the public. Relatively few of us ever exchange a word with the President, and not a great many with the Governor of the States. But everybody has spoken to the letter-carrier and the policeman on the beat, while most of us have at some time had dealings with the tax-collector, all of whom in their various ways represent the government.

It may not be fair, but it is human nature for us to base our opinion of any institution on our personal contacts with its representatives. Hence it is possible for even a minor official to do something to defeat every one of the six objects for which the nation was formed. If his conduct is such as needlessly to enrage people, then by just so much he impairs the Union, aborts justice, disturbs tranquility, weakens defense, retards welfare and makes people doubt that they have any liberty.

To attribute such terrific results to one surly cop, or postman, or tax-collector you may say is nonsense, for the worst he can do is trivial. True—but multiply a triviality by a million, and it is no longer trivial. And there are more than two million government employes, not counting men in the armed forces.

At the same time, it must never be forgotten that there are times when the cop

or the tax-collector, and perhaps even the postman, has to get tough if he is to do his duty. In such a case the resentment he arouses is all to his credit.

In short, the responsibility of the public official in dealing with the public is a two-way street. If he owes courtesy to the public, the public owes fairness to him. A failure in either direction results in damage to the whole political structure.

I do not believe, however, that such failures are primarily, or even largely responsible for the uneasiness that wisest men among us feel when they consider the temper of the times. It is stupid, as well as cowardly not to face the fact that there is widespread disaffection in this country. It is merely attested, it is not created by rioting in the black ghetto, rioting on the university campus, clergymen and scholars courting pains and penalties by exhibiting not merely contempt, but hatred for the law, eminent scientists giving each other the lie over the question of whether a projected defense system will defend or further imperil us. I cannot too strongly condemn the senseless violence that has not merely disturbed, but very nearly wrecked domestic tranquility; but neither am I able to lay the flattering unction to my soul that it is all the work of a personal devil, walking to and fro in the earth, seeking whom he may devour.

I know that the situation is perilous and I think the peril rises, not from the ranting of the lunatic fringe, but from a profound exasperation among people who would scorn to take part in any rioting, or draft-card burning, or parading with idiotic signs. The silent people nevertheless begin to suspect that the government that once was theirs has somehow escaped from their hands and is now running wild. They hope that the newly-elected President is still in control, and that hope has brightened appreciably within recent weeks. Nevertheless they are considering—and they are right in considering—whether it may be that this nation for many years has been giving too much attention to wealth and power and self-righteousness, to the neglect of the six aims that it was established and ordained to seek.

I yield to none in my adherence to the principle of complete separation of Church and State, and I am adamant in my opposition to the injection of any theological concept into organic or statute law. But in this house and in this presence, I venture to remind you that every one of the six objects of government named in the preamble to the Constitution is squarely in line with the Christian ethic propounded by the Founder of our Faith.

Therefore I see nothing inconsistent with the old Americanism, in which our fathers believed, if their sons in this hour when distrust is rife, distrust of government, distrust of law, distrust of leadership and, worst of all, distrust of ourselves—in this hour of perplexity and peril, it is pure Americanism for us to resolve to act as the Psalmist did in his great defiance of the Powers of Darkness, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth."

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce legislation to establish the already-existing Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs as a permanent statutory agency of the Federal Government. The Committee is now scheduled to expire in June 1969.

I feel we must not ignore the many problems of our Mexican-American citizens. A concentrated effort must be made to provide this minority group with the advantages and protection that full American citizenship accords. It is for this reason that the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs must be established on a permanent basis.

The Interagency Committee is responsible for focusing attention on the many problems of the approximately 10,000,000 Spanish-surnamed Americans, which represents about 5 percent of our total population.

Since its creation as a Cabinet committee on June 9, 1967, the Interagency Committee has sought to identify the needs of the Mexican-Americans, provide advice on assistance and benefits available from the Federal Government, and to recommend new programs to meet the unique needs of the Spanish-speaking people in our country.

While the Committee title refers to "Mexican-Americans," its concern is with all Americans with Spanish surnames, whether from Puerto Rico, Spain, Central America, or Latin America. These persons share a common language and traditions, and they face similar problems.

The Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs is active in many areas, including education, health, welfare and poverty, housing, migrant labor, civil rights, immigration, employment, and economic development. During its brief history, the Committee has made numerous program contacts with all levels of government as well as with private industry and organizations. Progress has been made in attaining economic dependency for Mexican-Americans, but more needs to be accomplished.

The economic plight of the Mexican-American community is their most basic and serious problem, and it is largely a result of a lack of educational opportunity. From this has stemmed the chronic problems of the Mexican-Americans.

The legislation I am introducing will make available on a permanent basis the machinery necessary to improve the social and economic conditions of the Mexican-Americans. The proposed Committee will expand upon the functions of the present Interagency Committee by involving all Americans of similar ethnic and cultural backgrounds in this necessary task.

Much has already been accomplished by the Interagency Committee. The ground has been broken and the task begun on behalf of the Mexican-Americans. We must not stop in this effort until all Mexican-Americans have the advantages and protection of full citizenship and are able to participate fully in our society.

I therefore urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to establishing on a permanent basis the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

ABM—ADMINISTRATION'S BIGGEST MISTAKE?

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "ABM—Administration's Biggest Mistake?" by James Reston, published in the New York Times of March 12, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ABM—ADMINISTRATION'S BIGGEST MISTAKE?

(By James Reston)

There are really two crises over the ABM. One is over what the initials mean: do they stand for an essential Anti-Ballistic Missile, or for the Administration's Biggest Mistake? It depends on who is talking. But the second, and maybe even more important crisis, is not so much over what to do about the ABM, but how to decide what to do.

Very few people in this country, or even in the world, have the scientific and technical competence to pass judgment on whether this missile would be effective in knocking down multiple-entry warheads with their decoys and other radar scramblers; or even whether deploying such a system, whatever its cost, would add to or subtract from the security of the Republic.

DECISION PUZZLE

In this situation, about all the rest of us can demand is not a specific decision but a sense of confidence in the *process of decision*, and this sense of confidence is precisely what is lacking.

President Nixon will make a "decision" on this five- or fifty-billion-dollar ABM question, but he won't decide it, for it is so tangled in subjective questions of politics, Government contracts, cost-effectiveness disputes and arguments on the need for spending the money elsewhere, that his "decision" will leave the controversy unresolved no matter what he says.

Accordingly, there is considerable merit in the proposal made to the Congress this week by Dr. James R. Killian Jr., the chairman of the board of M.I.T., a multiple intellectual trust located in Cambridge, Mass. The defense of the nation, Dr. Killian suggested, is too serious and complicated to be left to soldiers and politicians alone.

OUTSIDE JUDGMENTS

He was more polite than that, as usual, but he argued for the creation of an independent commission of qualified men who could make a "comprehensive study in depth of our weapons technology and of the factors which bear upon the decisions the nation must make regarding on-going strategic forces and policies."

Dr. Killian recalled that such a commission had been established during the Eisenhower Administration and proved to be useful to both the President and the Congress. He did not argue that its findings should carry more weight than studies conducted within the Government, but he noted that the competition between the services for roles and missions, and the subjective interests of military and industrial minds, often led to suspicion of narrow and selfish decisions, which an outside group of experts might avoid.

THE COMMITTED CHAIRMAN

He might have added that there are now powerful men in the armed services committees of the Congress whose disinterestedness in voting funds for missiles and other ex-

pensive explosives is not unbounded. What he did say was that even the Congress could use some special help from outside the Government from time to time in reaching decisions on the great strategic questions of the day.

The comments out of Capitol Hill on the ABM question this week illustrate the point. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers of the House Armed Services Committee said he was for deploying the ABM's. "I want protection, and like everybody else, I want the latest in technology," he said.

Representative Gerald Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, made an equally profound remark. "If you have to gamble and err," he said, "it is better to gamble and err on the side of strength and not weakness."

THE BIG QUESTION

This is the kind of thing that passes all too often for analysis in the Congress, and it sounds fine only until you begin to think about it. For the argument over the ABM is not whether we want "protection" but whether the ABM will provide it; not whether we want strength or weakness, but which of the two we will get from deploying these missiles.

Dr. Killian's proposal could help us out of this dilemma, or at least give us a little more time to decide how to decide. The ABM is being debated as one defensive weapons system without much relation to the other critical aspects of a strategic plan as a whole. For the moment, it has got lost in politics and opinions and past commitments, and is not likely to be accepted either at home or abroad until there is a great deal more trust in the way evidence is gathered and decisions are taken.

WASHINGTON REVISITED

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the following is a sermon preached in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C., on Palm Sunday—March 30, 1969—by Dr. Arnold F. Keller, Jr., pastor:

WASHINGTON REVISITED

Today the Christian Church observes one of its significant festivals. It is the door into the observance of Holy Week. It ushers us in to those events which have forever altered the meaning of history and destiny of man. Each Palm Sunday our minds picture again that procession of Passover pilgrims winding its way along the road that leads from Bethany to Jerusalem.

Strange as the scene appears to the modern eye, how much more strange the story that it tells. For the meaning of Palm Sunday lies in a paradox, an apparent contradiction. This paradox is summed up strikingly in the poet's two lines—

"Ride on, ride on, in majesty,
In lowly pomp ride on to die . . ."[1]

On this day Jesus was greeted with the acclamation due a conquering hero. There must have been a gaiety about it all, an excitement, an enthusiasm. People waved palm branches; they laid their garments in the road to afford Him protection from the dust and grime. Was this not the prophet from Galilee who, but a few days before, had raised Lazarus from the dead? They sang and they chanted, "Hosanna! Blessed is He who comes in God's name."

Triumphal, men have called it. But not the sort of triumph that we are accustomed to expect! It did not lead to the honoring of a national hero. It did not culminate in the coronation of a king. It did not climax with the inauguration of a chief executive. Instead, in the brief span of five days the "Hosannas" had choked in their throats. In five short days the cry became the savage howl of a mob, "Crucify Him! Release Barabbas; but crucify Him!" So, in this paradox of event which wasn't at all what it seemed to be, God's purpose was unfolded, as Jesus entered the city.

I never read this story, I never come to a Palm Sunday without appreciating how completely contemporary it is. It translates so directly into the text and context of the modern world. And so, there is always the accompanying question . . . what would happen today? What would be the case were Jesus to revisit His world today? If He were, for instance, to revisit mankind in this capital city as He revisited His own in that never-to-be-forgotten Passover Week, what would be in His heart and mind? And what would be our response?

Nothing escapes His glance. Surely the eye of God is not so limited as the eye of man; the eye of God is not so easily deceived by superficial appearances, not so easily fooled by facades, as is the eye of man. Katherine Mansfield, writer of many fine short stories, is said to have cried out once, "But there isn't one of them that I would show to God." You see, it is with such thorough scrutiny, such complete perception, Jesus entered the city.

And the record of Scripture has it that as He looked at the city He wept, saying, "If only you understood on what your peace depends . . . but you didn't understand, you didn't understand, when God Himself was visiting you."

Would it be so different today? Would not our Lord weep were He to look out upon this city, or any of our great cities, today? Were He to view the tragedies of hunger (not only in the world's refugee camps, but also in the cities of America)? The richest nation in history, the most advanced in the sciences and technologies! If such a nation does not gird itself to mount a thorough attack upon the noisy, ugly, unclean environments of its cities, upon the problems of hunger and undernourishments in its midst, and to reverse its dismal failures to educate and to train its young for useful living . . . if we continue to score so low here . . . if we do not allocate our resources and direct our skills to solve these human problems, then we are faced not only with a social tragedy, but also with a sin against God. For having failed the least of these our human brothers, we have offended God Himself.

Jesus looked at the city and wept.

And would not our Lord weep at what we are doing to His world? Not to our world, but to His world! The Apollo 8 men looked out at the earth from the rare perspective of a spatial orbit. They saw the good earth as "a grand oasis in the vast desert of space." But what are we doing to the oasis? Ecologists tell us that we are making of the world a place that is increasingly unsuitable for human life. In greed and in carelessness our industry belches poison into the air we are trying to breathe and spews out waste into the water we are supposed to drink. So vile is the situation that in one of our largest cities each glass of water has been described as a mass of inert bacteria suspended in a chlorine solution.

The problem of good air, pure water, unspoiled land is so huge, the vested interests who take of the resources given us without returning are so strong, the controls upon it all are so inadequate that one feels helpless to change the relentless course. But we can and do shout out the sin of it. For it is another outrage against God; it is a religious issue as well as a matter of human survival. The wise man who stated the great concepts found in the Book of Genesis speaks of man and of the world in this fashion. "The Lord planted a garden in Eden, in the east; there he put man (2.8) . . . put him in the garden to till it and to keep it (2.15)" You see, the concern is man's stewardship of God's good earth.

Jesus looked at the city and wept.

And would our Lord not weep to see man so helpless to act creatively before the insanity of modern warfare? Ballistic missiles and anti-ballistic missiles; the potential for a man-developed and loosed plague (euphemistically spoken of as bacteriological warfare); nuclear warheads; rockets and fire; all of these make an exceedingly dubious record of human achievement. A distinguished Harvard biology professor has recently told us that "There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war—nothing material or ideological—no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating . . . nuclear weapons offer us nothing but a balance of terror."[2]

This is all the more lunatic when we begin to look at the total of our governmental expenditures, comparing what we spend for destructive potential with what we spend for schools, for cities, for the hungry, for children, for preserving and protecting natural resources. Some people say, give me a look at a man's checkbook and I'll tell you about that man. Well, what does a look at our nation's checkbook disclose about us? It might reveal us to be a nation of armorers and warriors, which is the very last thing that we think ourselves to be.

Jesus looked at the city, and he wept. He wept.

There is, you see, for every person, for every city and for every society the question of priorities, the choice for what really matters, the issue of the allocation of skills and resources. There is also the fact of God's judgment and of His expectation. Perhaps never before have the options been so crucial and the pressures of God's judgment as well as His hope been as clear as they are today. A break with past patterns which have not succeeded is essential. Great allocations of money and skill must be made in behalf of God's world and God's creatures.

What will we do? The record has it further that when Jesus entered the city. He was taken and crucified. Would it be any other today? Perhaps the historic response to Palm Sunday is equally a contemporary response. Or, it is more like Studdert-Kennedy's poem of how the Lord might have been received in Birmingham, England?

"When Jesus came to Golgotha, they hanged
Him on a tree
They drove great nails thru hands and
feet, and made a Calvary
They crowned Him with a crown of thorns,
red were His wounds and deep
For those were crude and cruel days, and
human flesh was cheap.

When Jesus came to Birmingham, they
simply passed Him by
They never hurt a hair of Him, they only
let Him die
For men had grown more tender, and they
would not give Him pain
They only just passed down the Street,
and left Him in the rain.

Still Jesus cried, "Forgive them, for they
know not what they do"
And still it rained the winter rain that
drenched Him thru and thru.
The crowds went home and left the streets
without a soul to see
And Jesus crouched against a wall and
cried for Calvary."[3]

[1] Henry Hart Milman, 1791–1868.

[2] The New Yorker; March 22, 1969; page 31, column 3.

[3] G. A. Studdert-Kennedy, *"The Crucifixion."*

Jesus looked at the city and wept. He weeps still . . . "if only you understood on what your peace depends."

JUDGE ROBERT MAXWELL WARNS AGAINST VIOLENCE OF THE FEW

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are those among our young people who today believe that change and growth can be achieved only through disruption and destruction. The history of our Nation proves that this is not the case.

U.S. District Court Judge Robert E. Maxwell, of Elkins, W. Va., recently reminded a group of young people that there is room for dissent and constructive paths to change in our country. Judge Maxwell, a relatively young man himself, is well qualified to speak on this subject, and what he has to say is worthy of attention.

I request unanimous consent to have a report of Judge Maxwell's talk, as reported in the Clarksburg Sunday Exponent-Telegram, printed in the RECORD.

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

JUDGE MAXWELL WARNS GROUP AGAINST "VIOLENCE OF THE FEW"

CHARLESTON.—Calling them members of the most socially conscious younger generation in history, Judge Robert E. Maxwell asked the young Saturday to develop a posture of excellence in seeking solutions to the problems they will face in the years ahead.

Addressing a luncheon meeting of the Key Clubs of West Virginia at their state convention here, the U.S. District Court judge said:

"Social change is a learning process for all who are concerned, and in today's world we have no alternative but to be concerned. Your choice is to train yourself excellently for the task which is ahead."

The Elkins jurist said society cannot achieve greatness, and new answers for old problems, unless individuals at many levels of ability accept the needs for high standards of performance and strive to achieve those standards within the limits made possible to them.

Maxwell said it is doubtful that any society on earth has been confronted with as many challenges as the present one, "or needed more desperately to draw on the deepest sources of understanding and responsibility."

He touched on the unrest welling up from college campuses all across America, saying, "All too many of those among the rebellious groups at Berkeley, Columbia, San Francisco State and elsewhere have confused the free with the free and easy. If freedom had been the happy, simple, relaxed state of ordinary humanity, as some in these groups view it, many would have been everywhere free.

"But such is not the case, and those misguided young people are giving a bad name and a disgraceful reputation to the younger generation, when in fact it should be the other way around."

Campus protest follows illegal and legal lines, he said, and went on:

"Peaceful protest is as American as the Bill of Rights . . . Peaceful protest, when linked with a righteous cause, is awesome in its appeal and overpowering in its force . . .

"There is absolutely no place in our political system for violence of the few. Violent protests of the type that has invaded the academic world forms the cutting edge of unrest, upheaval, and, ultimately, anarchy."

Maxwell urged the Key Clubbers to pursue such constructive outlets as an education "to the limits of their resources," a meaningful family life, the role of an intelligent voter, and participation in other areas of government as "alert and concerned citizens."

In conclusion he said, "Excellence, competence and good deeds of a superior quality are the only sure traits that can preserve and protect us. Even the best is not enough. We must try harder.

"With my generation already far down the road, it is in your generation that we must place our trust—to preserve and enhance our country's institutions, our system, our way of life."

REPORT ON LUMBER PRICES

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently both the executive and legislative branches were moved to begin examination of the increased prices of lumber and plywood which have affected the home-buying public as well as the wood producers.

This problem has attracted nationwide attention because suddenly those not familiar with the timber shortage—the real cause of increased prices—have realized that the Nation may not fulfill the goals of the Housing Act of 1968. Under that law 26 million housing units are to be built during the next 10 years. It is now estimated that the Nation will be short new housing for 200,000 families during this first year under the new law.

The Congress has shown its concern during the recent hearings in the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope this concern and the consequent discussion continue, and for this reason I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three discussions of the causes of the present crisis in lumber and plywood prices.

The Huntley-Brinkley report, on March 19, carried the following interview with the manager of a lumber yard who explained that wood prices have skyrocketed and that better management of our forests could reverse those upward trends:

REPORT OF LUMBER PRICES

DAVID BRINKLEY. The prices of lumber and plywood have risen far higher and faster than anything else affecting the cost of living. In some cases, price increases are up to a hundred percent. That, plus the highest interest rate in history on home mortgages, is raising the cost of housing.

President Nixon has asked to have it looked into, and will have the Federal Government do whatever it can to help bring lumber prices down.

From NBC News Correspondent, Jack Perkins, a report on why lumber prices have risen so high.

PERKINS. Anyone who's been to the lumber yard lately has noticed, he couldn't help but notice, prices have about doubled. It's the same with most everything in the yard, a bother for the homeowner, a major problem for the home builder.

Forty percent of the wood used in this country today, is used to build homes.

MAN. The price of lumber has gone up approximately a hundred percent on most of the items that we use in construction of our homes.

PERKINS. In the last year?

MAN. In the last year. Yes, sir.

PERKINS. Well, what does it do to you?

MAN. This raises the price of a typical house, let's say about a $22,000 home by about 13 to 14 hundred dollars.

PERKINS. The problem is, the men at the lumber companies will tell you, is that there is today a shortage of timber.

SECOND MAN. Now, when a little shortage develops, and then obviously the price goes up as, Lord knows, the prices on plywood and lumber have been way too low for at least the last ten years. That's what makes this thing look precipitous at the moment, because they have been too low, and now maybe they're a little too high.

PERKINS. The Federal Government is investigating and finding that higher lumber prices are caused by lumber shortage, and the shortage is caused by the Federal Government.

Two-thirds of the Forests of this country are owned by the Federal Government. The government sells the timber to private industry, but it doesn't sell as much as it should each year, because it doesn't run its forests very efficiently.

The Forestry Service is not given enough money properly to clear the forests, reseed them, survey them, build access roads. The government could probably get two-thirds more timber out of its forests each year if they were properly managed.

It is so the Federal Forests may be more efficiently managed that President Nixon is asking for greater appropriations for the Forestry Service.

Home builders consider this a matter of vital importance.

THIRD MAN. Wood is the basic material of the home building industry, and if we don't have if, at prices that we can live with, our industry is in trouble, and it's in trouble now.

An article in the March 28 issue of Time magazine outlines both the background of the price boosts and some of the stopgap measures designed to meet the immediate crisis. This article also covers long-range solutions such as better access to forests to facilitate harvesting ripe timber and to cut down on the waste of this valued resource, further limits on the exports of logs and a "need to revamp the Nation's timber management policies."

The article follows:

PRICES

THE COST OF NEGLECT

Anxious to escape abrasive confrontations of the kind that embroiled his two immediate predecessors, Richard Nixon had hoped to avoid direct federal intervention against price increases by private industry. Yet last week the President took strong steps to arrest soaring lumber prices—and there was little grumbling. His tactics much resembled those of the Johnson Administration, which in 1965 fought off aluminum and copper price rises by threatening to release supplies of the metals from Government stockpiles. Nixon ordered the Interior and Agriculture departments to step up the sale of lumber from publicly owned forests, which contain more than half of the nation's sawtimber supply. To reduce demand, he directed the Defense Department to limit its purchases to "essential requirements."

Wood prices have been highly volatile during the past year. The cost of plywood has risen by 77%. Douglas fir lumber, used mostly in housing, has doubled in price in many localities. Housing's surprising winter strength has only heightened the price pressure. Last week the Commerce Department reported that new housing starts reached an annual rate of 1,700,000 in February, well above last year's total of 1,500,000.

Limiting Exports: Builders blame the price problem not only on heavy domestic demand, but on rising exports to Japan, whose timber purchases in the U.S. have increased twentyfold since 1960. Last year the Japanese bought enough lumber to erect 40% of the U.S. output of one-family homes. In response to complaints that numerous small lumber mills as well as price stability have been imperiled, Congress last fall sharply limited exports of lumber harvested from federal forests. But prices have continued to rise, partly because of severe winter weather in the Pacific Northwest and the recent East Coast longshoremen's strike, which cut down the supply of timber from Canada.

At the urging of George Romney, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Nixon three weeks ago appointed a task force to recommend remedies. Last week's action is aimed at increasing timber output from federal lands by about 10%, but the Administration clearly regards that as only a stopgap. Testifying at a Senate hearing, Romney last week warned that spiraling lumber prices jeopardize the goal of raising residential construction to 2,600,000 units a year under the Housing Act of 1968. The former auto executive and Michigan Governor criticized Democrat Robert Weaver, his predecessor at HUD, for failing to develop programs to meet that objective. Complained Romney: "I have inherited a department that is essentially in the same condition as American Motors when I took over. It was losing money. Our department is losing ground."

Lack of Access: The U.S. faces no shortage of timber. National forests alone occupy an area twice the size of California. Because of federal limitations on logging operations and poor forest management techniques, the Government's holdings yield only a quarter as much timber per acre as private timberland. The Agriculture Department has long complained that Congress allows it too little money to manage better, even though the sale of timber to private lumber producers nets the Treasury substantial revenue. A lack of access roads causes as much sawtimber to be lost to storms and insect infestation as is harvested from national forests. Meanwhile, heavy opposition from conservationists makes any expansion of logging politically difficult.

For the time being, Congress will probably content itself with imposing further limitations on lumber exports to Japan. Such restrictions should help to relieve the shortage and ease prices. On the other hand, they would undercut Washington's goals of fostering free world trade and improving the U.S.'s balance of trade. In any case, Congress can scarcely overlook the need to revamp the nation's timber management policies. That is something that Washington has not done for 30 years.

Another explanation of the many facets of the timber problem is the article, "No Lid on Wood Prices," in the March 29 issue of Business Week magazine. The article points to recent action taken by the Executive to make greater quantities of lumber available to the homebuilding industry:

NO LID ON WOOD PRICES

The rocket-like ascent of lumber and plywood prices has eased off a bit in recent weeks, but hardly anyone believes the trip is over. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney warned this week in testimony before the House Banking & Currency Committee: "We may not have seen the end of the rapid climb, even if it is interrupted."

Further, the state of the market is such that President Nixon's intervention last week—his first attempt to influence prices—offers only short-term relief to a serious long-term problem.

Acting on advice of a Cabinet-level task force, appointed only three weeks ago, the President ordered:

An increase of 1.1-billion board feet in timber to be offered from public lands by the U.S. Forest Service over the next 15 months.

Reduction in the government's own purchases of softwood lumber.

High priorities for boxcars to move wood.

Faster action on new softwood lumber standards in moisture and size specifications. The changes, proposed by the industry but subject to government approval, should bring more efficient use of the lumber supply.

ON THE FENCE

In a single proclamation, the President appeared to respond to demands of the lumber industry for more logs and to the pleas of home builders and buyers for federal action to slow soaring price increases; at the same time he avoided any real crackdown on prices. The only objections came from conservationists who decried additional cutting of federal forests.

The President's action cannot be credited with the recent softening in prices. This occurred when heavy snow and rough weather in large consuming areas of the East, Midwest, and Texas made it impossible to move building materials to job sites.

The frantic buying eased off. One leading producer in Oregon cut prices; others followed. The price of index-grade sanded plywood dropped from $144 per thousand ft. at the end of February to as low as $110.

But the slump appears temporary, Young's Forecast of Softwood Lumber & Plywood Prices last week advised readers, "The . . . market appears to have reached its low point, and we are changing our recommendation to 'buy heavily.'" A resumption of heavy buying is bound to send prices skyward once more. Also looming large is a possible strike threat when industrywide labor contracts expire June 1.

BACKGROUND

Extraordinary increases in mill prices began late last summer and have accelerated at a rate not seen in lumber in modern times. Roots of the problem trace back to the homebuilding slump of 1966–67, which clobbered the lumber industry and drove many marginal mills out of business.

The comeback in homebuilding coincided with severe shortages in log-producing regions. The extremely dry late summer of 1967 closed large areas of Western woodland at what should have been the peak season for logging. Added to raw material shortages were strong demands from military and export markets, a severe winter that prevented cutting and hauling of logs, low inventories, and a shortage of boxcars.

Underlying all these conditions, however, is one simple fact: U.S. requirements for plywood and lumber have begun to outrun the available raw material.

Almost two-thirds of the nation's total softwood sawtimber (standing timber large enough for lumber and plywood manufacture) is in public ownership. Thus, as Lowry Wyatt, vice-president of Weyerhaeuser Co. and spokesman for the National Forest Products Assn., told the Senate housing subcommittee last week, "The federal government holds the key to the log supply and to domestic wood prices in the way it chooses to manage this timber."

HINT OF PRESSURE

Romney suggests several actions for government, including a boost in imports, increasing the efficiency of harvesting public timber, encouraging use of softwood substitutes, and reconsidering the Jones Act, which prohibits shipments from one U.S. port to another in foreign ships. The latter has resulted in shipment of most Alaskan timber to Japan.

In this week's House testimony, Romney omitted a recommendation he made to the Senate last week—one that hinted strongly of government pressure on the industry itself: "The lumber industry needs to be encouraged and induced—and depending upon what happens here, more than that—to restrain price increases beyond those levels that are reasonable in relationship to the over-all picture, their interests, their future interests, and the interests of the nation as a whole."

HOW PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. FLOUTS THE LAW

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, illegal acts by large corporations seldom receive the attention paid to illegal acts by small individuals. The relatively tender treatment accorded corporate misbehavior has not gone unnoticed on a younger, more candid generation than ours.

A major story of corporate misbehavior involves Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the TVA-sized utility on the west coast, which has successfully defied Congress, the courts, and the city of San Francisco.

As a result of its disregard of the Raker Act, P.G. & E. received some $30 million which, as the San Francisco Bay Guardian pointed out, could otherwise have been used for a variety of other worthwhile purposes, among them "to develop job and training programs for the disadvantaged, to turn the city's resources toward the grinding problems of race and poverty and unemployment."

In 1967, after payment of all its operating expenses, including taxes, P.G. & E. had an operating income of $163,429,000. The average interest rate on its long-term debt was only 3.93 percent. Thus, after paying the interest and dividends on preferred stock, the company was able to earn 12.4 percent on its common stock, an increase of seven-tenths of 1 percent from the year before.

The outlook for P.G. & E. is the same as that for the rest of the energy industry, glowing, because it has a monopoly on an essential product.

The rosy picture was painted a few weeks ago by Robert H. Gerdes, president of P.G. & E. and also president of Edison Electric Institute, trade association of the investor-owned utilities. In a canned editorial dated March 10, 1968, and distributed for P.G. & E. to 11,000 newspaper editors by Industrial News Review, President Gerdes is quoted as saying:

The electric power industry should properly be classified as a growth industry . . . For decades, the production of electric power has grown at more than twice the rate of

the economy as a whole, as measured by the gross national product.

Mr. Gerdes goes on to say, according to his canned editorial service, for which he pays $2,299.92 a year, that:

Opportunities to improve the efficiency of our operations are by no means exhausted. We are looking forward to further economies of scale, to the use of better and more sophisticated equipment, to further mechanization, to greater computerization, and to benefits flowing from modern information technology. Also, we are just beginning to realize the benefits from the great new technology of nuclear power.

Mr. President, having read P.G. & E.'s own accounts of its financial successes, as reported by the company to the Federal Power Commission, and having read the glowing account just quoted by the company president, I was taken aback to read a conflicting account of P.G. & E. finances issued last month by another one of its canned editorial services, the California Feature Service, issued weekly by the well-known public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter, 870 Market Street, San Francisco. According to its March 31, 1969, P.G. & E. editorial, the poor utility may not be able to meet the payroll this spring. It says:

At this tax deadline time, P. G. & E. will be about $45 million short on ready cash to make partial income tax payment of about $15 million, plus a $52.7 million due in property taxes.

So it is off to the bank for P.G. & E.'s treasurer, to see if he can wangle a loan to meet those taxes, and the State corporation tax, and more Federal income tax and interest on the bonds.

Mr. President, I submit that these two conflicting P.G. & E. editorials, both issued last month, constitute an argument for the Moss-Kennedy reliability bill, which would provide for greater coordination within the electric power industry. If the canned editorial division, public relations department, of one utility, is pushing the company forward to greater heights and backward to the brink of disaster at the same time, consider the potential for confusion in the company's and the industry's principal business, the production and distribution of energy.

Communications are in no better repair. Admittedly it is a long distance from Foggy Bottom to smoggy California. Yet 47 years have elapsed since the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, in the Galveston case, that all taxes, including income taxes, property taxes, and corporation taxes, are a part of a utility's operating expenses, collected via rates, paid for in toto by the customer. Had that message gotten to San Francisco, California Feature Service would have known how ludicrous it is to picture a utility treasurer out trying to raise some money to meet the tax bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD P.G. & E.'s Industrial News Review editorial, entitled "Confounding the Aborigines"; P.G. & E.'s California Feature Service editorial, entitled "Off to the Bank We Go"; the San Francisco Bay Guardian editorial, "A Little Law and Order, Please!" to which I have referred; and an excellent account by J. B. Neilands, in the same issue of the Guardian, of P.G. & E.'s evasion of the Raker Act, entitled "How P.G. & E. Robs San Francisco of Cheap Power."

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

[From Industrial News Review, Mar. 10, 1969]

CONFOUNDING THE ABORIGINES

The annals of human endeavor contain few success stories to match that of the investor-owned electric industry in the United States. It is with good reason that Mr. Robert H. Gerdes, president of the Edison Electric Institute, believes, "The electric power industry should properly be classified as a growth industry. . . . For decades, the production of electric power has grown at more than twice the rate of the economy as a whole, as measured by the Gross National Product."

Since energy is the basis of our present high level of material well-being, the growth record of the electric industry is far more than a localized success story of an industry. It is an index of national growth, which goes far to explain long-term rises in living standards and the ability of the American people to move ahead without breaking stride under unprecedented burdens of inflation, wars and soaring taxes. The record of the electric industry is also a fitting answer to those who dance like aborigines around the periphery of its achievements, whooping it up for government take-over of the power business at taxpayers' expense.

What of the plans of the electric industry for the future? On this, Mr. Gerdes says, "opportunities to improve the efficiency of our operations are by no means exhausted. We are looking forward to further economies of scale, to the use of better and more sophisticated equipment, to further mechanization, to greater computerization, and to benefits flowing from modern information technology. Also, we are just beginning to realize the benefits from the great new technology of nuclear power. . . ." Measured by that surest of all barometers—energy consumption—the U.S. has a bright future. And no small measure of the credit for that future must go to the investor-owned, taxpaying electric light and power industry.

[From California Feature Service, Mar. 31, 1969]

OFF TO THE BANK WE GO

The average taxpayer who is crying all the way to the bank to borrow money to pay his April 15 income tax levy can take some comfort in the fact that he has company. Big company . . . like Pacific Gas and Electric Company, for an example.

Of course, the utility's problem isn't quite as poignant as the little fellow's, but it's a problem just the same. At this tax deadline time, PG&E will be about $45 million short on ready cash to make a partial income tax payment of about $15 million, plus a $52.7 million due in property taxes.

Because revenues totalling $80 million from a scheduled sale of bonds won't come through until April 17, the bank is the destination of Donald Bell, PG&E's treasurer. It'll be a short loan, and he won't have to carry too much identification to get it, of course, but especially at the new high interest rates it'll be expensive. And he'll have to do it again in June when such items as $3.9 million in partial payment of the state corporation tax, another $15 million on federal income tax, and some $36.5 million in interest payments to bond holders come due.

Unfortunately, this doesn't make our own little borrowings any the less painful, but it does point up the major contribution our utilities and industries and businesses are making along with us to the national, state and local treasuries.

[From the San Francisco Bay (Calif.) Guardian]

A LITTLE LAW AND ORDER, PLEASE!

San Francisco is the only city in the U.S. required by federal law to build a municipal power system. But it doesn't have one.

As Joe Neilands, George Norris, Harold Ickes and Sen. Lee Metcalf make clear in this Guardian, this is because the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. has defied the City of San Francisco, the federal courts, the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Congress and has prevented the city from getting the millions of dollars in annual benefits (some $30 million, as computed by Neilands in his story) from the public power it produces in its own system in the Sierra.

It's a complicated story, which Neilands and the Guardian have researched for months, but the major points are simple. San Francisco was granted an unprecedented concession, the power to dam a beautiful valley in a beautiful national park, by the federal government. The condition: that the city produce cheap public power, that it build a municipal power system and that it allow absolutely no resale or transfer of power to private utilities such as PG&E.

It produces public power, but it's been PG&E—not the city—who receives the gargantuan but illegal benefits.

This is not an academic argument over public vs. private power.

It is of enormous and strategic importance for one simple reason: there's a lot of money at stake for San Francisco. Money to build swimming pools in Hunters Point, to develop McClaren Park, to save the view on Mount Olympus, to keep the Muni bus payment at 15¢ or lower it, to keep zoo admission free, to bring back the ferry boats, to build mini parks, to plant trees somewhere besides Alioto's North Beach, to develop job and training programs for the disadvantaged, to turn the city's resources toward the grinding problems of race and poverty and unemployment. Thirty million a year can go a long way.

San Francisco ought to have cheap public power for its residences and businesses, just like Palo Alto, Los Angeles, Sacramento and a dozen other California cities, but most of all it ought to get the massive tax subsidies that come from publicly owned power.

Even the most fiscally conservative among us should have few reservations. Why go to Washington for federal handouts when the money is here in San Francisco? Why not extend law and order to the City of San Francisco and to PG&E? Isn't our lack of law enforcement causing disrespect for government and alienating our youth? Why do we coddle PG&E? Let's have no more of it.

Things aren't this simple, of course, but it's time to make the City face up to its public responsibilities under the Raker Act and get about the business of establishing a municipal power system.

First: The Guardian recommends a congressional investigation to determine whether, how much and for how long SF's Hetch Hetchy power has been sold or transferred illegally to PG&E. Second: That the matter be placed squarely before the electorate in this fall's supervisorial election. In short: that every major candidate for election be forced to state unequivocally his public position on law enforcement and the Raker Act.

[From the San Francisco Bay (Calif.) Guardian, Mar. 27, 1969]

HOW P.G. & E. ROBS SAN FRANCISCO OF CHEAP POWER

(By J. B. Neilands)

(NOTE.—Sen. Lee Metcalf of Montana, a nationally recognized authority on utilities, writes the Guardian: "Political manipulation by power companies is commonplace. Too few accounts of it are published. J. B. Neilands

here tells well how Pacific Gas & Electric Co. defied national and local governments and denied Bay Area residents the low cost electric power to which they are entitled by law—and which they can get if they will insist on law enforcement. Metcalf is co-author with Vic Reinemer of "Overcharge," an exhaustive 1967 study of utilities. (Metcalf has invited Neilands, a professor of biochemistry at the University of California, Berkeley, to testify at current congressional hearings on public power.)

A few months before he died last year, Franck Havenner sat up in his bed in a nursing home in San Francisco and told me of how the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. swindled San Francisco out of hundreds of millions of dollars of cheap hydroelectric power.

The story was incredible: PG&E and its political allies had defeated eight successive bond issues to establish a municipal electric system in San Francisco and grant city residents and businesses the benefit of low cost power produced by the city's Hetch Hetchy water system in the Sierras.

The result: San Francisco has paid through the nose to PG&E for its power and the city loses about $30 million a year in profits it would get from a public system.

Havanner, longtime SF supervisor and later a U.S. representative, said: "In the beginning, we had the support of some newspapers, but in the end the PG&E was able to buy them all out with their newspaper ads."

The PG&E/newspaper/political combination got stronger with each bond issue. Today, you never hear about the city's sacred pledges to build a public power system.

How could this happen? How could Sacramento, Los Angeles, Palo Alto and a dozen other California cities get their own lucrative electric distribution systems when SF couldn't even get one when it had its own power? More: How could this happen when it is a specific condition of federal law for San Francisco, unlike any other American city to build its own municipal electric distribution system?

Abe Ruef's graft in 1906 was peanuts, birdseed, compared to this.

The story goes back to the turn of the century when San Francisco desperately needed an adequate water supply. Fifteen alternate sites were crossed off before Mayor Phelan filed for water rights on the Tuolumne River with money from his own pocket.

Unfortunately, however, the site lay inside Yosemite National Park and the proposed dam would flood exquisite Hetch Hetchy Valley.

Conservationists were furious and John Muir raged: "Dam Hetch Hetchy! As well dam for water tanks the people's cathedrals and churches; for no holier temple has ever been consecrated to the heart of man." Understandably, Congress was reluctant to grant the brutal intrusion into Yosemite.

The impasse was resolved by Rep. John Edward Raker, from the state's second (Mountain) district. He proposed to let San Francisco take the water from Yosemite, but in the process generate and distribute low-cost hydroelectric power.

It was the only federal grant of its kind ever made by Congress and it is certain, as Interior Secretary Harold Ickes later emphasized, that it would never have been made without crucial conditions: that both water and power go directly to consumers and that no profits whatsoever from this unprecedented public grant go to private utilities.

The act's language was explicit (see chronology, 1912) and there was no doubt, among supporters or opponents, about the public power intent of Congress. Thus, on the floor debate:

"Mr. Sumners: Is it the purpose of this bill to have San Francisco supply electric power and water to its own people?

"Mr. Raker: Yes.

"Mr. Sumners: Or to supply these corporations, which will in turn supply the people?

"Mr. Raker: Under this bill, it is to supply its own inhabitants first . . ."

Muir and other militant conservationists were bitterly disappointed by the Raker Act and the loss of Hetch Hetchy, but other conservationists, like Sen. George Norris of Nebraska, considered it a reasonable compromise.

The Raker Act was the Magna Carta for cheap public power. It was thought to be tightly drawn in the public interest and virtually impervious to subversion by private power trusts. Its basic intent was to establish a municipal power distribution system in San Francisco, but it also allowed the sale of power to public agencies and recognized the prior claims of the nearby Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts.

However, the Act stipulated, in strict terms especially irritating to the private power lobby, that any attempt to transfer the water or power to a "person, corporation or association" for resale could result in revocation of the federal grant.

WATER, NOT POWER

In developing water, San Francisco has observed reasonable compliance with the Raker Act on the record. It has had little trouble passing expensive water bond issues to construct the enormous Hetch Hetchy system of pipes and tunnels that delivers the water across the Central Valley, under San Francisco Bay and into the Peninsula's Crystal Springs Reservoir. There's been no reluctance to "go into the water business" in San Francisco.

In developing power, however, San Francisco has gone up against fortress PG&E and has failed miserably in complying with the Raker Act. Ickes was here on Oct. 24, 1934, for the celebration of the first flow of Hetch Hetchy water to reach Crystal Springs. He mused in his diary:

"San Francisco also develops power from this water. . . . Unfortunately, private utilities have such a grip on San Francisco that it cannot actually sell its own power to users in San Francisco. I held there was a violation of the Act . . . the newspapers and most of the politicians have seen to it, by propaganda and other devious methods, that a method of complying with the Act has been defeated."

Norris lamented in his biography that, as a supporter of the Raker Act, he had "underestimated the resourcefulness" of PG&E. "When I spoke so hopefully and so confidently (not only I but many others) it was incredible that a great utility could control the policies of city government in San Francisco . . . to defeat the original spirit and purpose of Hetch Hetchy. But it has done all this."

PG&E moved in early and has prevented the full public development of Hetch Hetchy power to this day. Hetch Hetchy's first small hydroelectric generator, Early Intake Powerhouse, went on the line in 1918. It was immediately connected to the Sierra and San Francisco Power Co. (later merged into PG&E). Interior declared the accord illegal on June 8, 1923, but nothing was pressed since only a small amount of power was involved.

With the completion of Moccasin Powerhouse in 1925, a substantial block of hydroelectric power became available; to bring the energy to San Francisco as required by the Raker Act, the city began laying a steel tower transmission circuit in the direction of San Francisco.

It was strung all the way to Newark, some 99 miles, but was stopped abruptly at Newark on the east shore of San Francisco Bay. Here, conveniently, PG&E had a substation and here, conveniently and in obvious anticipation of a new energy load, PG&E had just laid a trans-Bay, high voltage cable to span the remaining 35 miles to San Francisco.

Although the city had purchased enough copper wire to complete the Hetch Hetchy line, word suddenly rocketed from city hall that further construction funds were exhausted. San Francisco's two power companies, Great Western and PG&E, refused to sell their systems to the city, and the board instead of using eminent domain to acquire them, approved a contract on July 1, 1925 to hand over Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E at Newark. The copper wire was stored quietly in a SF warehouse and 10 years later sold for scrap.

THE BIG SELLOUT

It was a sellout worthy of chronicling by Lincoln Steffens and Frank Norris. The city produces the power, but PG&S grabs it for wholesale, then wheels it into the city at exorbitant retail rates. As the San Francisco Examiner then observed:

"It is a wrongful and shameful policy for a grant of water and power privilege in the Yosemite National Park Area to be developed at the expenditure of $50 million by the taxpayers of San Francisco, only to have its greatest financial and economic asset, the hydroelectric power, diverted to private corporation hands at the instant of completion; to the great benefit of said private corporation, and at an annual deficit to the city of San Francisco."

In the 1925 city election, every incumbent supervisor was defeated who voted for the 1925 contract and presided over the establishment of PG&E's tollgate at Newark. The people wanted public power and the new board determined the city should bond itself in whatever amount necessary to buy out PG&E and get it.

The first $2 million bond issue in 1925 fell before a powerful PG&E onslaught, but it still got 52,216 for, 50,727 against (two-thirds needed for passage). In all from 1925 to 1941, PG&E's enormous political influence defeated eight bond propositions to buy all or part of PG&E distribution properties.

To defeat the bonds, Havenner told a congressional committee in 1942, that PG&E had spent at least $200,000 in the previous 10 years; Ickes broke the amount down further: $11,876 in 1935; $25,330 in 1937; $59,755 in 1939 and much, much more in 1941. It now spends hundreds of thousands each year in political and charitable donations.

PG&E's strategy, Ickes testified, was to "spread throughout the city the word that the Raker Act could be easily amended" and to confuse the issue by saying the city "had been discriminated against" by the act (see Ickes box).

PG&E laid it on thick in an expensive series of seven ads in the daily press; the press responded by repeating and embellishing the PG&E line. The Chronicle, for example, ran nasty cartoons and editorial comments implying this was all a city hall power grab: "If the city hall were not so busy trying to aggrandize itself by clutching more business to muddle with . . ."

PG&E'S VOICE

(PG&E maintained close connections with most newspaper managements, but Chronicle/PG&E connections have for decades been intimate through family relationships, notably the Tobin and de Young dynasties. Joseph O. Tobin, who became a Chronicle owner by marrying Mike de Young's daughter, Constance, is a nephew of Joseph S. Tobin, a onetime PG&E director. The Tobins live in Hillsborough and have long been associated with the Hibernia Bank. Mike de Young and his brother founded the Chronicle.)

(Recently a Chronicle story described PG&E president Robert Gerdes as "exceedingly dignified" in the utility's whopping rate hike case before the Public Utilities Commission. His opponent, the distinguished former PUC commissioner, William Bennett, was described as "something" of a representative for consumers.)

His patiences exhausted, Ickes meanwhile filed suit in federal court to throw out the PG&E's phony 1927 contract. The case ultimately went to the U.S. Supreme Court which ruled, on April 22, 1940, that San Francisco had been illegally disposing Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E for the past 15 years.

More: that the act required a "publicly owned and operated power system" in San Francisco.

It is difficult, almost impossible I found, to determine how long this illegal sale continued, how much city users were overcharged and what is the city's current legal status. It appears to me, after months of research, that the city is still under a federal court injunction.

A significant sidelight is then Rep. Clair Engle's investigation in 1955 into another diversion of Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E. Engle's biting cross examination of public officials and his ability to disentangle complicated issues proved conclusively that San Francisco was allowing irrigation districts to serve as a conduit to transfer Hetch Hetchy power to PG&E.

Engle quoted figures compiled by the Federal Power Commission showing that 24.7 per cent of the power purchased by Modesto and Turlock "is currently and for a period from 1945 to 1953" was sold to PG&E. Forty-eight per cent of this total was Hetch Hetchy power, the FPC said.

Engle asked the American Law Division of the Library of Congress to research this point. It advised him on May 22, 1956, that SF had sold dump power to PG&E since 1945 and by letter agreement had extended the arrangement into 1962. It also said that SF had been selling power to Modesto and Turlock, which at the same time were furnishing to PG&E about the same amount they were buying from the city. M and T have plenty of power through their own generating plants at Don Pedro and La Grange.

To determine if this unlawful transfer of power continues, the following data is required: (1) hourly production by district generating plants; (2) simultaneous receipt by the districts from Hetch Hetchy; (3) simultaneous delivery from the districts to PG&E. The Interior Department has refused my repeated requests for this public information.

We are left with a significant remark in the Modesto District's 1967–68 annual report: "These once bitter enemies, the irrigation districts and San Francisco, work in close harmony toward the full economic development of the water and power resources of the Tuolumne River watershed."

And, I might ask, in supplying power to PG&E in violation of the Raker Act? Because of the power, the money and the chicanery involved, only something on the order of a congressional investigation will turn up the facts.

As a result of PG&E's influence, Hetch Hetchy's formidable power output is dribbled away in a fragmented pattern that brings relatively little revenue to the city. Besides the irrigation districts, power is sold to several low-paying San Francisco industrial consumers, which are served by PG&E lines from its Newark and Warnerville substations. The city pays for transmission charges, including losses.

City power is wheeled into San Francisco on PG&E toll lines and the company until recently levied an outrageous toll. (PG&E buys Hetch Hetchy power at Newark for $2 million, then resells it to SF consumers for $9 million, congressional testimony showed in 1941. Total overcharge: $6,600,000. Multiply these totals year by year and you begin to get the dimensions of this steal from the city treasury.)

Hetch Hetchy power goes to the airport, Muni and street light. Everything else, notably the lucrative, tightly packed retail market that forms the base of PG&E's empire, is served by PG&E.

THE BIG STEAL

What does San Francisco lose without its own system to distribute its own power? Three key points: (1) a lower use rate for business and residences, (2) a new source of city income (much, much more than PG&E taxes bring and (3) a substantially lower city tax rate because of this massive tax subsidy.

Let us compare SF with Palo Alto, a city with a municipal system since 1898, and see how these benefits accrue.

(1) Lower user rate: Palo Alto's municipal rate for KWH is $5.65, PG&E's in San Francisco is $6.20. This means that power per user is about $20 cheaper a year in Palo Alto and owners of Palo Alto's 20,000 meters would save some $400,000. (PG&E charges much higher rates around Palo Alto—in Menlo Park, for example, 250 KW costs $7.41 from PG&E.)

(2) New city income: Palo Alto put $1,327,000 in surplus power profits into the general fund in 1967. This does not include the exact in-lieu-of-tax payment PG&E would have made had it operated the utility. Palo Alto credits this as a separate item to answer PG&E charges that "public agencies do not pay taxes."

(3) Lower tax rate: income from public power is the reason, and the only reason, that Palo Alto's tax rate is just 78¢ per $100 assessed valuation. In Berkeley, a city of comparable size, the city tax rate by contrast is almost $3 because it does not have public power. Clearly Palo Alto uses power revenue as a big tax subsidy.

If we add the $400,000 in user savings to the $1,327,000 in utility revenue, the total annual benefit of public power approaches $2 million. Palo Alto also has an $8 million investment in a modern and efficient electric utility system which, at the rate of undergrounding, will be entirely subsurface by 1980.

San Francisco's profits from public power would total about $30 million a year by scaling up these figures from Palo Alto. It would more than double the city's current Hetch Hetchy power revenues.

This sum would undoubtedly rise much higher because San Francisco has an extremely high meter density, with its packed in housing, and because the city of course generates it own power. Palo Alto buys federal power wheeled over PG&E lines.

Politically, it would be difficult to establish a municipal power system in San Francisco. A ninth bond issue, even a modest one to complete the line from Newark, would surely be defeated by the PG&E/Ex/Chron combine. Sacramento is the most recent California city to buy out PG&E; even with the forthright support of the Sacramento Bee, it took a terrific battle to defeat PG&E's well-heeled campaign.

In Berkeley, where the Berkeley Coalition has made public power an issue in the April council election, PG&E agents call on the Berkeley Gazette almost daily to keep the newspaper in line.

The best course in San Francisco is to illuminate the issues as this article has done, then dramatize them in this fall's supervisorial campaign (see editorial, p. 8). There are several ways San Francisco can proceed: one is to gradually acquire its own system by putting in its own lines during redevelopment construction; another is to get acquisition capital through the non-profit corporation method of financing used with Candlestick Park and parking garages.

Since Ickes two decades ago, the Interior Department has been notoriously lax in pushing San Francisco to enforce the Raker Act. James Carr stepped out of this don't-ruffle-PG&E-atmosphere in Interior to become San Francisco's general utilities manager. He has kept PG&E's monopoly intact, untroubled and unquestioned in San Francisco.

I asked Carr, shortly after he took office in 1964, when the city would enforce the Raker Act. Carr replied in a letter, 51 years after the Raker passed as the Magna Carta of public power, that it was "premature to discuss municipal distribution of power in San Francisco." In March, 1969, it still is.

[From the San Francisco Bay (Calif.) Guardian, Mar. 27, 1969]

HOW TO "HETCH HETCHY"—A CHRONOLOGY

1902: SF City Engineer Grunsky develops a plan to pump Hetch Hetchy water in Yosemite National Park to a thirsty San Francisco.

1912: The Freeman Plan calls for a gravity-flow system with hydro electric plants on the Tuolumne River. The Board of Supervisors publishes a book, large and glossy, showing that the proposed work would beautify Hetch Hetchy and make cheap water and power available to SF.

1913: Congress passes the Raker Act (HR 7207) granting, with strict provisions, water and power rights to the City & County of San Francisco.

The two key sections: Section 6:

"That the grantee is prohibited from ever selling or letting to any corporation or individual, except a municipality or municipal water district or irrigation district, the right to sell or sublet the water or the electric energy sold or given to it or him by the said grantee: Provided, that the rights hereby granted shall not be sold, assigned, or transferred to any private person, corporation, or association, and in case of any attempt to so sell, assign, transfer, or convey, this grant shall revert to the Government of the United States."

Section 9 outlines enforcement procedures:

". . . the grantee shall at all times comply with and observe on its part all the conditions specified in this Act, and in the event that the same are not reasonably complied with and carried out by the grantee, upon written request of the Secretary of the Interior, it is made the duty of the Attorney General in the name of the United States to commence all necessary suits or proceedings in the proper court having jurisdcition thereof . . ."

1923: The City purchases enough copper transmission cable to reach from Hetch Hetchy to San Francisco.

1925: San Francisco builds a great powerhouse on Moccasin Creek in the low Sierra and the transmission line was started to the city. Suddenly, word comes from city hall that further construction funds were exhausted: just as the line conveniently reaches PG&E's substation in Newark, just after PG&E conveniently completes a high voltage line from SF to Newark. PG&E refuses to sell its SF system to the city, then inveigles SF to put up a PG&E tollgate in Newark. PG&E got the city's power cheap, then jacks up the rate for wheeling it the remaining 40 miles to SF consumers. (See 1941.) Every supervisor for this contract was defeated handily in the 1925 supervisorial election.

1927: First of eight bond issues to create an SF municipal power system as required by Raker Act. PG&E, its powerful political allies and the newspapers only manage to narrowly defeat the bonds: 52,215 for, 50,-727 against on a ⅔s vote. PG&E's alliance gets stronger as the press in later years more and more shuts off the truth about San Francisco's pledges under the Raker Act. Now, you see hardly a word.

1933: Interior Secretary Ickes takes office. Begins study of 1925 contract.

1935: Ickes grumbles about PG&E and Hetch Hetchy. City sells the unused cable for scrap.

1937: Ickes files suit in Federal District Court charging San Francisco with violation of Sec. 6.

1938: Federal District Court rules in favor of the government; the city appeals.

1939: Circuit Court of Appeals reverses

the District Court; government appeals to the US Supreme Court.

1940: Supreme Court upholds the Government, remands the case to the District Court. The Supreme Court made liberal reference to the original debate on the Raker Act and said in part.

"From the Congressional debates on the passage of the Raker Act can be read a common understanding both on the part of sponsors of the Bill and its opponents that the grant was to be so conditioned as to require municipal performance of the function of supplying Hetch Hetchy water and electric power directly to the ultimate consumers . . ."

Again: "Before final passage in the Senate opposition had practically narrowed down to the power provisions of the measure, and these provisions contemplated a publicly owned and operated power system". San Francisco readied its eighth and last bond issue.

1941: Ickes comes to SF and gives a speech at the Civic Auditorium urging passage of the bond issues on Nov. 4. Chronicle runs front page editorials and nasty, misleading cartoons against the power bonds. Citizens committee is formed to fight the power bonds and amend the Raker Act. Chairman is J. W. Mailliard of the politically prominent family, a member is Walter Haas of Levi Strauss.

Committee states "We are not committed to private ownership nor to public ownership." The bonds were defeated and Rep. Tom Rolph (brother of Mayor James Rolph) introduced a bill to amend the Raker Act. Hearings were held in Washington and San Francisco. Bill died in committee.

1941: A quick glimpse of PG&E's surcharge on SF public power (unreported here) emerges in the House Public Lands Committee hearing in Washington. PG&E buys Hetch Hetchy power at Newark for $2,400,000 a year, then resells it to SF consumers for $9,000,000, testimony showed. The total overcharge: $6,600,000. It is difficult, almost impossible The Guardian found, to determine how long this illegal sale continued and how much city users were overcharged.

1944: Ickes coins the phrase "to Hetch Hetchy" in a Commonwealth Club speech. Means "to confuse and confound the public by adroit acts and deceptive word in order to turn to private corporate profit a trust set up for the people."

1949: Walter Haas elected to the board of PG&E.

1955: Rep. Engle introduces a bill to create a new irrigation district on the Tuolumne River. In the hearings, Engle proves that Hetch Hetchy power sold to Turlock & Modesto Irrigation districts was resold to PG&E in violation of a 1945 proviso by Ickes. City Atty. Dion Holm agrees Raker Act requires a municipal system and says ". . . we are minus that for the time being, which one day we will have."

1964: James Carr assumes post as manager of SF utilities. Comes from an interior department notoriously lax, since Ickes, in trying to enforce the Raker Act. His brother, Francis Carr, was until 1966 manager of PG&E's tax department. Neilands asks Carr when the city will enforce the Raker act and Carr replies, 51 years after Raker Act passes, that ". . . it is premature to discuss municipal distribution of power in San Francisco . . ."

1965: Neilands writes similarly to Frank Barry, solicitor of the Interior, Says Barry; ". . . we know of no means by which the US can require the city to acquire the municipal distribution system . . ."

1969: Oral Moore, manager of Hetch Hetchy, tells the Guardian that the city has no plans to enforce the Raker Act.

"The disgraceful history of the handling of Hetch Hetchy power should place a new ugly verb in the lexion of political chicanery. 'To Hetch Hetchy' means 'to confuse and confound the public by adroit acts and deceptive words in order to turn to private corporate profit a trust set up for the people'.

"I need not repeat the scandalous story that has given birth to this new verb, but I would remind you that the last chapter of it has not been written. The pledge that the people of San Francisco, with full knowledge, made to their government has not yet been redeemed". Interior Secretary Harold Ickes to the Commonwealth Club in 1944

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report carries a timely reminder for those who so bitterly oppose development of an ABM system in America that they could be wrong.

There have been similar fights in our recent past and the RECORD shows that had the opponents been successful, the course of history might have been changed and America might not be the great haven of freedom it is today.

I hope those who oppose the ABM will read carefully to possible consequence of their action in the light of recent history.

It would be my hope they would reconsider their opposition and let us get on with the job of defending America at a time when our opponents are making vast gains in nuclear development to destroy us.

The article follows:

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

When the chips are down on the ABM, anything can happen. Past shows that. Key defense decisions have been voted by the narrowest of margins—and sometimes with surprising results.

This nation, once again, is facing a crucial decision involving defense.

The decision this time is whether to build an anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM) proposed by President Nixon.

In the battle that is developing, many Americans are being reminded of other battles over defense proposals that proved fateful in the past. To those with long memories, some of the arguments now being heard sound familiar.

They recall the decision against fortifying the Pacific island of Guam in the face of rising Japanese belligerence in 1939.

Then came a 1941 cliff-hanger, when Congress by a single vote agreed to extend the military draft only months before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor.

In the late 1940s, the issue was whether to build the hydrogen bomb. That fateful decision, after long delay, came barely in time to win the H-bomb race against Soviet Russia.

Now the issue is how to defend the nation against the H-bomb menace.

President Nixon himself has drawn a historic parallel. He predicted that the congressional vote on his ABM proposal might be as close as the 1941 vote on extending the draft.

LOOK BACK TO '41

Americans still shudder at thoughts of what might have happened if that 1941 vote had gone the other way.

In 1940, Congress had passed a military-draft law. For the first time in history, Americans were being drafted into the armed services at a time when this nation was not at war.

But the 1940 law called for only one year of military service. This meant, in 1941, that nearly 1 million men would soon be mustered out of service—at a time when World War II was intensifying and likelihood of U.S. involvement appeared to be growing.

So Congress was asked to lengthen the draftees' period of service.

The war in Europe then had been going on for two years. But there was strong sentiment for keeping the U.S. out of that war. There were "hawks" and "doves" in those days, too. The "doves," then, were called "isolationists."

A bitter debate was stirred by the draft issue. The Roosevelt Administration was challenged to show how the nation was in peril that justified a big "peacetime" Army.

On Aug. 7, 1941, after seven days of debate, the Senate voted 45 to 30 to extend the draftees' period of service by 18 months.

On August 12 came the vote in the House of Representatives. There the extension squeaked through by the thinnest of margins. The vote was 203 to 202.

Result: When Japan attacked on December 7, the Army built up by the draft was still intact.

THE H-BOMB BATTLE

The battle over the hydrogen bomb was waged in secret councils of the Government rather than in Congress.

Ever since the U.S. exploded the world's first atom bomb over Japan in 1945, scientists had conjectured that a superbomb was theoretically possible.

However, with the world then at peace and the U.S. still holding a monopoly on the A-bomb, research on the superbomb was not pushed.

Some scientists—still feeling guilty about the destruction at Hiroshima caused by the first A-bomb—opposed the superbomb on moral grounds.

A key figure in the opposition was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who called the hydrogen bomb "an expensive, uncertain gamble" and "morally wrong."

Then, on Sept. 23, 1949, Russia exploded an A-bomb. The U.S. monopoly had ended. Interest in the H-bomb suddenly soared.

On Jan. 31, 1950, President Truman decided the issue in favor of the bomb.

On Nov. 1, 1952, the U.S. exploded the world's first H-bomb. Russia came up with its own in 1953. It was another close call for U.S. defense.

UNFRIENDLY GESTURE

The 1939 decision on Guam went the other way and, in the light of history, appeared costly.

Guam, strategically located between Hawaii and the Philippines, was a potentially valuable base for airplanes and submarines. Military experts viewed it as important in case of a war with Japan. In 1938, a board appointed by President Roosevelt recommended that Guam be developed and fortified.

In 1939, Congress was asked for 5 million dollars to improve Guam's harbor. Although this bill did not call for fortifying Guam, it would have been a start and would have permitted its use as an advanced scouting base.

While the bill was before the House, the U.S. was warned that Japan would regard Guam's fortification as "an unfriendly gesture."

The bill was defeated, 205 to 168—and Guam lay unfortified when Japan attacked two years later. It was the first American possession to fall to Japan and later became an important war base for the Japanese.

Now, 30 years and three wars later, this nation faces another decision involving national defense—and Americans are wondering if it will prove to be a fateful decision.

HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, the members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs were recently privileged to hear the testimony of a great woman from the mountains of eastern Kentucky who has been actively engaged in efforts to alleviate conditions of hunger and malnutrition in that part of our State. Mary Jane Dunn of Jackson, Ky., is as Senators were soon to learn, an intelligent and articulate person whose suggestions as to how we might alter Federal regulations to improve our food distribution programs were detailed and practical.

I highly commend Mrs. Dunn for her remarks and strongly endorse her recommendations. For these reasons, I ask unanimous consent that her statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY JANE DUNN BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS, MARCH 28, 1969

There is none more generous than the American heart. He gives daily to the Red Cross, Community Chest, Salvation Army and scores of other worthy causes. And yet, in his own back yard, children are going to bed hungry. Each time I see a plea made for Care packages, I wonder how I can appeal to our people to do something about our own problems. We have arrived at a time in history when the story of a heart transplant no longer amazes us, and yet, as recent as March, 1969, I saw written on a child's record, Scurvy—malnutrition. What an indictment of a nation that speaks of conquering the moon! Each time we become inflamed about a particular problem in our society, we rush to build another program and fill it so full of red tape and regulations, that by the time it gets to the little man for whom it was intended we have to shake our heads and say to a 56 year old mother trying to put her 17 year old boy through high school with a husband not old enough to draw Social Security but too ill to work, I'm sorry lady but because you are too proud to accept welfare and want to break your back making beds and scrubbing floors you can't have food stamps. You see, by our rules, you make $5 per month too much money. When are we going to stop penalizing those people who wish to remain in the mainstream of life?

Hunger is one of the more dramatic problems facing us at this time, but you cannot zero in on one small fraction of a family's needs and hope to solve the problems that plague our people. Why do people go to bed hungry? No food! Why no food? No money! Why no money? No jobs! Why no jobs—poor health, poor education—or no jobs in the area! Why poor health? Poor nutrition—poor sanitation. It's a vicious cycle. We *must* look at the entire problem.

I would be the first to say to you malnutrition is not exclusive to the poor man. Just providing free food stamps does not assure an adequate diet. Consumer education, preparation of meals, storage, all these are a must. But you can't do it passing out printed pamphlets. General educational programs geared to the masses are good, but they do not always reach or apply to those who need them most. The media of radio and newspaper can be effective only where it is available. What good is a comparative price list to a mother who cannot read?

We voice a lot of concern about intestinal parasites in children, and yet, merely providing an adequate diet will not eradicate the problem, just as providing the basic four will not assure healthy children. We must not overlook environmental health education. Would it shock you to know there are families who for 19 years have lived in the same place and raised a family with absolutely no means of disposal for human waste?

We still have outdoor toilets over streams, or more commonly, built without a pit, garbage is still thrown into streams or out the back door where cans collect rain water and breed flies and mosquitoes which carry disease.

In spite of advances made in the fight on Tuberculosis, it will not be eradicated until conditions are improved which aid and abet the germ carriers. If you have any doubt of how intestinal parasites can wreck the health of not only children, but their parents, I call to your attention the very excellent case histories prepared by Mrs. Regina M. Roberts, which will be made available to this Committee, taken from her experiences as a Public Health nurse during the Ligon Project sponsored in Floyd County by OEO in 1965 at which time 65% of the population were found to have intestinal parasites. I myself have seen children so infested, they would vomit worms and have seen them crawl not only from the nose but the ears of children. Perhaps you are thinking there is no excuse for this type of thing. Laziness you say? Ignorance? I am sure many of you have rural backgrounds, but I wonder, if one of your children was required as of today to go to a rural area with no instructions as to how to live, would he have enough knowledge of the basic requirements of good environmental health to dig a pit and bury his garbage when all he's ever known is daily garbage pick-up. Would he know enough not to locate the water supply below the toilet, where all he's ever known is to turn on the tap. Would he dig a pit in the earth and make his outdoor toilet fly-proof? Ignorance? Yes, but only because he has not been taught better. So it is with my people. They are simply following the same pattern as your children, doing what their parents did before them. It is not a hopeless situation and it does not need to continue to exist. It can be remedied with education.

Hunger cannot be wiped out by feeding a few people a few meals. Writing a new program, appropriating new funds will not solve the problems as long as we concentrate only on a fraction of the need. It is like putting a band-aid on a wound that requires four stitches. The wound will eventually heal with a lot of good luck, but in the meantime, infection sets in, granulation takes place, and the end result is an ugly scar. If we go about this haphazardly with band-aid measures, our children after us will be looking for the solution to the same problems, only multiplied many times. Hungry people are sick people, not only in body but often in mind. Hungry people are depressed, angry, and often give up in hopeless despair. Maybe Mr. Average Taxpayer is saying "I didn't put him there. I pulled myself up by the bootstraps, let him do the same". Mr. Average Taxpayer, I wonder who provided your bootstrap! How would you go about pulling yourself up, with a third grade education, no job skills, eight children in school, the roof on the rented house leaks, there's not enough money for beans and bread for the month, much less shoes for the kids who are walking two miles out of a holler, and riding the bus 25 miles to school. The mother is ill and needs medical attention but there's no medical card, and even if they had one, there's no way to get to the doctor. It's hard to keep the kids and their clothes spic and span when the drinking water is carried a mile. You wouldn't live there you say? Where would you go? How would you pull yourself up?

If you are convinced there are resources available geared to the needs of the people, try to meet some of those basic needs. You will soon find yourself ensnarled in red tape, restricted by bureaucratic rules and regulations, and frustrated to the point of forgetting what the rules are, rather than risking impairment of the welfare of human life. It appears to those of us in the mountains that the majority of programs are written for urban areas. When we attempt to apply them to a rural area, they are just not practical or applicable. Fourteen dollar value received on food stamps can be quite a bonus if you have only to go a block or so to the Issuance office, but if you have to leave Breathitt County, go into Perry County and back into Breathitt to get to your home community and pay someone $7 to take you to town, is it any wonder the Food Stamp Office is concerned about eligible people who are not taking advantage of the programs.

Although the net income basis of coupon issuance has been revised as of February, 1969, the cost of stamps is still too high in comparison to the income of the people.

(A) A grandmother receiving $137 monthly, pays $48 for food stamps, $6 transportation fee, leaving $83 for utilities, clothing, school supplies, and other necessities. She doesn't buy food stamps because she just cannot afford $48 the first of every month.

(B) An elderly man living alone drawing $90 monthly would pay $18 and receive $24 in stamps. When I suggested the food stamp program to him, he replied it would cost him $6 for transportation. Stamps should be issued on basis of existing need.

(C) People moving back from another state to Kentucky can be certified on a no income basis but the farmer who is trying to exist on a small tobacco crop is certified on last year's income. The profits at best are small and obligated before the check is received.

Transportation is a major problem, not only in the food stamp program, but in every program. If we really intend to find a solution, let's do not leave out the basic ingredient to make it work.

Much has been said about stamps lasting only the first part of the month, and the family eating gravy and bread the rest of the month. Issuance can be arranged on a bi-monthly basis, but what about the case of the elderly man paying $18 and receiving a $6 bonus. If he gets stamps at the beginning of the month, pays $9, gets $12 and pays $6 transportation fee, then it becomes apparent merely issuing bi-monthly is not the total answer. Why not supplement with commodities? I have long wondered why commodities cannot be used in conjunction with the food stamp program, especially for emergencies such as floods and fires.

Consideration must be given to purchases allowed in order for families to receive the most benefit from their food stamps. Pop and candy can be bought while soap and detergents are forbidden. Just as important as the food served on the plate, is the care of the plates on which it is served and the pans in which it is prepared. Garden seeds and canning jars make far more sense than a carton of pop which costs $.93 for eight bottles. Although the law forbids using food stamps to pay debts it still happens. Stamps, where lost, can be used by the finder without too much difficulty. Suggestions have been made by Outreach fieldworkers that each stamp be endorsed by the recipient and the client.

Consumer education is vital to a workable food stamp program. But classes held with recipients while they wait to purchase their stamps often reach only the man of the household. Preparation and storage must be taught along with buying, but demonstration

cooking classes held in gleaming white kitchens with hot and cold running water, measuring cups, saucepans, herbs and spices are not very effective for a mother cooking on a coal and wood stove, carrying water from the spring, and who has never measured anything in her life.

If the large food producers are really concerned about the plight of their customers, let them lend the resources they have available to the local people who are trying to combat the problems.

Concern has been voiced about the growing number of people who no longer garden or can. Everyone seems to be of the opinion it is due to laziness and shiftlessness on the part of the people. Perhaps in some cases. But where do you get $12 to pay for plowing one tenth of an acre of land? How do you coax food to grow in soil that has long been depleted? Fertilizer you say? Rotate crops? Wonderful! Where do I get the fertilizer? How do I plow the land? The cost-share farm programs are beautiful in theory but how can a tractor stay on our steep hillsides? Why pay for fencing the garden when there's no money to buy lime and seed?

The Emergency Food and Medical Program has been a salvation to three counties of our area, but Lee County was excluded and it has been most difficult to explain to hungry people, "I'm sorry, you're hungry in the wrong county." Even in the Food and Medical Program we were told not to supplement income by buying food stamps for people already on federal programs.

In the medical phase of the program children were taken to their family doctor for much needed hemoglobin tests. In cases where anemia and malnutrition were diagnosed, iron and vitamin therapy along with proper diet were prescribed, and after two months teachers reported weight gain, improved general appearance of hair and skin, and increased alertness in the classroom. One child, at least, was not so fortunate. Deprived of proper food since its birth, it could not sit alone at fourteen months. The child is now being hospitalized for extensive tests, but the doctors have already diagnosed mental retardation. We know the incidence of mental retardation is high and even though statistics are not readily available, we are confident that a direct correlation exists between malnutrition and mental retardation.

I am very much aware of the arguments against the food stamp program. I have heard more than one citizen expound on mothers who misuse stamps to buy pop, candy and cakes, on grocery stores who raise their prices at the beginning of the month to take full advantage of food stamps, of merchants who allow stamps to be taken in payment for debts, of fathers who use stamps to buy booze. But surely in a nation generous enough to fight every cause from Multiple Sclerosis to shelters for stray animals, and a nation wealthy enough in intelligence to produce the lunar satellite, surely, we can find solutions to these problems. There are many dedicated workers in every program who are on the firing line daily. They know the need and many of them have good down-to-earth suggestions. Why not draw from their knowledge rather than leave all the decisionmaking up to people removed from the scene.

I beg of you, don't waste time and money making more surveys on a people already surveyed to death. Don't waste more money looking at a problem that any agency worth its salt can give you barrels of statistics proving it exists. Don't allow malnutrition to continue to develop while more studies are being made. It is very difficult to explain to a mother concerned for her children that if she will just be patient, there are some very thorough studies being made, and when they are computed we'll feed you.

There is, in my opinion, too much duplication of services in federal programs. Have you stopped to consider how many people we are now sending into the homes of our low-income people? There are Outreach fieldworkers, Public Health personnel, social workers from the Department of Economic Security, nurses and social workers from Title I programs, Extension Service personnel, Pupil Personnel Directors, Emergency Food and Medical Services workers—the list is long and confusing. Is it any wonder the people cannot relate the person to the service? Some effort must be made to communicate and coordinate. In our own county we have recently formed an inter-agency commission and are in the process of publishing a looseleaf booklet listing all available resources and how to take advantage of them.

I also feel programs are tied up in too much red tape. I realize every program must have rules and regulations and I strongly urge that supervisory control be built into all programs, especially in cases of A.D.F.C. where fathers drink up the pay check and the children still remain hungry. But I also would invite for your consideration, changes where proof exists that the same rule or regulation time upon time, is detrimental to the effect of the program.

In the department of Economic Security the Division of Public Assistance, there is a great need for some provision for immediate certification for assistance. It is my firm belief that the majority of people come to the P.A. office as a last resort! Help should be given and then if it is found that a person has falsified statements, cut them off just as quickly. However, I see no large problem in verification of need since a phone call to any agency should provide information concerning the family until a home visit could be made.

Disabled persons have too much difficulty in proving their disability. The word of the local physician is rarely accepted. Central office in Frankfort nearly always requires additional information which involves transportation to other medical facilities and money for extensive tests. In one case an elderly lady trying to obtain a medical card, was told to wait three months and she would be eligible anyway under Social Security. With her bad heart, let's hope she makes it. It would be interesting to know how many people have died waiting to become eligible.

There remains a group of people I call the "forgotten ones". They have reared their families and many times have produced educators and other professional people by their sheer determination and the sweat of their brows and yet, now because they are no longer physically able for the labor market, have no job skills, are not old enough for Social Security, and unable to qualify for ADTD are just having to sit and wait until they reach 62.

I realize the government cannot care for every single individual and meet all their needs and I am a firm believer in a man working his way, but I cannot condone a society that pays a man thousands of dollars to hit a ball with a stick while people scream "kill the umpire" and at the same time allows people to go hungry and to die from lack of adequate medical care.

Although the Division of Public Assistance has a transportation clause, I am told by the social workers it just never seems to fit the situation. For instance, a woman whose husband had a chronic illness had to make three to five trips per month to the University of Kentucky Medical Center. She had a car but could not afford that much gasoline. There was no provision in the transportation clause for gasoline but there was money set aside to pay the ambulance fee of $30 per trip. I am not the best student of mathematics, but even I know the government could have saved money buying the gasoline. Again, I urge you not to build more and bigger programs. Take a good long look at what is happening with the ones already funded.

Headlines have been made recently concerning all the money being paid doctors and pharmacists and yet the doctor is handed a printed sheet telling him what drugs he can give a patient. If he is limited to the amount and kind he can prescribe what can we expect but repeated visits to both doctor and pharmacy. If Thorazine is prescribed only 50 tablets are allowed. If the patient takes 4 tablets daily, every 12 days he returns for a refill. If he cannot get someone to take him to town after walking two miles, he returns home to brood. Over a period of time this could lead to suicide, or at best reconfinement in a state hospital. Which is cheaper? This is only one example, but the result is costly in terms of doctor visits, refills, transportation and overcrowded waiting rooms filled with chronically ill patients. All this adds to our growing problem of medical care for the nation.

And finally, although rules and regulations governing P.A. all come from the same manual, each local office seems to have its own interpretation.

As a Committee concerned not only with nutrition but human needs as well, I ask you please to take a complete look at the whole picture. Transportation, substandard housing, poor health, lack of education, malnutrition, the elderly poor, inadequate water supply, and of course in capital letters, LACK OF JOBS. The list is long, but each component is part of the whole problem. And it is my most humble belief that "He who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything", and hope must be provided first in bringing about practical solutions. Why not explore the idea of a homemaker service? It is being done on a limited basis in Day-Care Centers in the Kentucky Department of Child Welfare.

There are many women from among the low income groups who could be taught practical courses in home nursing, nutrition, consumer education and birth control. Assign them to a number of families and let them concentrate their efforts on the problems within those homes.

If we must provide assistance for household heads, let them do some of the jobs that so desperately need to be done. Clean-out streams, cutting the growth that inhibits the flow of water, dispose of unhealthy and unsightly garbage, make homes safe and attractive, in short, see what really could be done in a community to make it a safer and better place to live.

Explore the idea of adult basic education for mothers, teaching practical home management and environmental health in the home, taught by someone who speaks the language.

Consider the idea of self-help type projects such as sponsored by the Save the Children Federation. Mr. Leet who is Extension Director would have a wealth of knowledge. He has worked with the U.N. on these type things. Maybe it will become necessary to stake a small farmer to a cow, a sow, and a few chickens and some garden seed.

I think we must also look into the future and make some plans for preventive measures. History is being made almost faster than it can be recorded and yet we continue to require our children to learn every explorer that ever explored a bayou. So Ponce de Leon looked for the Fountain of Youth. He didn't find it! Of what benefit is that to a 17-year-old high school senior who has no intention of going to college but every intention of rearing a family. Would it not be more profitable to teach a good practical course in home management?

I do not assume to know all the answers, gentlemen, but I offer you for what it's worth, any assistance I can provide. The knowledge I have gained concerning the people and their needs are at your disposal. May God guide you in seeking the answers.

NEW FACILITIES FOR MONTPELIER CO-OP

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative located at Montpelier, Iowa, does an outstanding job of serving its customers, most of whom are in my district. A recent article in the Muscatine Journal tells of the wonderful success story of this organization as it prepares to put its newest facilities into operation. I insert the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EASTERN IOWA LIGHT AND POWER COOPERATIVE PLANS "OPEN HOUSE" AT MONTPELIER POWER UNIT

Members of Eastern Iowa Light and Power Cooperative and the public are being invited to inspect the rural electric's "Second Miracle on the Mississippi," Unit No. 2 of Montpelier generating station, on Saturday and Sunday, March 29-30. The cooperative will hold Open House from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. both days at the generating station on Highway 22, between Davenport and Muscatine.

Eastern Iowa Light and Power serves nearly 13,000 members in 12 counties, and the cooperative is planning to host large crowds during the two-day event. Guided tours through the plant will be conducted by employees of the cooperative.

Open House guests will receive two booklets to aid in understanding the generating plant equipment and the operations of the rural electric. Several appropriate displays will be placed in the lobby and along the tour route. Refreshments will be served. All guests may register for the 14-inch portable color television door prize.

Montpelier's Unit No. 2 and the building addition that houses the new generation equipment more than doubled the cooperative's generating capacity and the physical size of the plant. In peak operation, Unit No. 2 produces 40,000 kilowatts of power. It has a rated capacity of 33,000 kilowatts.

PLAN THIRD UNIT

Generation capacity of both units at Montpelier station is 65,000 kilowatts. This production of power is more than ample at present to serve the peak demand of the cooperative's members and available surplus power is being sold to neighboring utilities. However, with power consumption of the members doubling every 10 years, planning for Montpelier Unit No. 3 is already underway.

Total cost of building and equipment for the new unit is $5 million. Cost of some of the larger contracts for Unit No. 2 were $1,501,680 for the steam generating unit, $898,302 for the turbine-generator unit, $241,211 for the substructure, and about $155,000 each for structural steel and for condensing equipment.

The boiler for Unit No. 2 is capable of generating 385,000 pounds of steam per hour, under 875 pounds of pressure, at 900 degrees Fahrenheit. It is fueled by 20 tons of pulverized coal per hour. Unit No. 2 requires 264 tons of air per hour for combustion and 30,000 gallons of river water per hour for steam condensing.

In announcing the Open House, General Manager F. E. Fair said, "Through good engineering and careful contracting, Eastern Iowa's consumer-owners have secured a 33,000 kilowatt generating unit at the normal cost of a 22,000 kilowatt unit. Availability of this dependable, low-cost electricity will stimulate agricultural, industrial, residential, and recreational growth in the large area we serve."

The Open House at Montpelier also marks the 25th year of service to the cooperative by F. E. Fair, who has been general manager of Iowa's largest rural electric cooperative since February of 1944.

J. Kermit Eland of Mediapolis, president of the cooperative's board of directors, said during a dinner at Montpelier to honor Mr. Fair, "The dream of rural America for light and power is still alive. The dedication of rural Americans to their own electric cooperatives is still vigorous. Montpelier generating station represents our pride in the past, our power for the present, and our faith for the future."

RUSTIN SPEAKS WITH REASON ON SEPARATISM

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Bayard Rustin has long been one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the Negro in America. His counsel is wise and worthy of careful attention.

I request unanimous consent to have a report of recent remarks by Mr. Rustin which appeared in the Washington Post printed in the RECORD.

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

RUSTIN DENOUNCES BLACK SEPARATISM

(By Harry Bernstein)

LOS ANGELES.—"Who the hell appointed you spokesman for the Negro people?" AFL-CIO President George Meany once shouted at A. Philip Randolph, the famed Negro civil rights leader.

Randolph, the only AFL-CIO Negro vice president and head of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, drew the Meany remark when he was challenging the labor federation to accept as fact that some unions were guilty of racial discrimination.

In those days, Randolph was among the most militant spokesmen for the Negro people. But today his approach would be in strong contrast to that of black separatists—and this difference was emphasized at one of a series of 80th-birthday celebrations for him here and in other American cities.

Bayard Rustin, Negro author, lecturer and executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute in Washington, led the tribute to Randolph here last weekend by the United Negro Labor Community Council.

Rustin noted that the black separatists of today defy one of the basic principles by which Randolph lived: integration.

Many young blacks at first sang out, "black is beautiful," Rustin said, but now they are changing this to "only black is beautiful."

"I can tell you this is the biggest lie ever perpetrated.

"There is nothing more beautiful about black than about white.

"I know a black family in the ghetto in New York which pays $100 a month for one rat-infested room, and they pay it to a black landlord.

"That is what a black man is doing to a black man and that ain't beautiful."

Rustin also ridiculed current pleas by some students for separate dormitories and separate classes for blacks in college.

"The Ku Klux Klan said for years that only white teachers could teach white children. Some black students must be having nervous breakdowns when they now echo the KKK and say only blacks can teach blacks.

"These people must know nothing can be learned effectively in a segregated school system, black or white," he said.

Rustin then denounced black capitalism, an idea designed to give Negroes ownership of businesses.

Black capitalism has won some favorable remarks from both President Nixon and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant civil rights group.

"When Nixon and CORE start agreeing on something, the rest of us had better start worrying about it," Rustin said.

LEWIS HILL BUILDS A NEW CHICAGO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Chicago Tribune carried an excellent profile on Lewis Hill, Chicago's urban renewal and planning director, who is spearheading the drive to make Chicago the first city in the Nation free of slums.

Mr. Hill has brought a new activity to Mayor Daley's profound hope of making Chicago the most progressive city in the world.

The Chicago Tribune profile, by Miss Joy Darrow, captures Mr. Hill's dynamic spirit and I am pleased to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Lew Hill exemplifies the spirit of which Chicago's administration is made.

The article follows:

THIS IS LEWIS HILL: SEE HIM PLAN

(By Joy Darrow)

At age 42, Lewis Hill, the head of Chicago's urban renewal and planning departments, has torn down and built up about as much of the city as did the combined efforts of Mrs. O'Leary's cow, Daniel Burnham, and Arthur Rubloff. And it's not too hard to see why. Or how.

Hill's attitude toward the prompt and well-organized uplift of Chicago could perhaps most accurately be likened to an army officer telling the medics who are clearing the battlefield: "Let's get on with this, men, there are 1,000 more waiting in the foxholes to get a piece of the action."

Despite his concern for action, however, "the individual" always has to be part of "the big picture," says Hill, an early transplant from Fort Worth. Chicago was the city to which his family came so that "they could search for better opportunities," which for him eventually meant degrees in both engineering and architecture and 18 years in various city departments.

The dark-haired, quietly-tailored city official now lays groundwork and prepares the preliminary "ayes" for more local projects than does any other department head. He started working for the city in the land clearance division, was appointed to head the urban renewal department in 1965, and two years later became the over-worked landlord of many of the city's most tired neighborhoods when he accumulated the additional title—and duties—of the city's planning and development department.

The dimensions of his job are delicate. He has the responsibility of a job that not only includes planning for the persons he meets daily in the line of duty, but preserving the city as well. He must keep close tabs on vari-

ous neighborhoods' strengths and weaknesses, and consider everything from its number of garbage cans and rats to its unemployment and riot-potential factors.

Alternating an air of humility, ["I'm just the mayor's right arm now, remember . . ."] with that of a professional fund raiser for a worthy cause, Hill comes off as one who will have no truck with an obdurate world that does not want to better itself. His efficiency at getting this done has resulted in a win versus loss record of about 98 per cent wins, and has shown the many sides of the man.

He can be cruel: At one recent planning committee meeting he verbally lambasted the executive director of an influential business group in front of a crowd.

He can be businesslike: When a west side resident asked if she should continue remodeling her kitchen now that she lived in an urban renewal area. Hill briskly advised her that it would be in her best economic interests to stop.

But he also can be gentle. When one elderly lady, dressed in tweeds and sensible walking shoes, asked for a moment's time so that she could describe—and plug for—the renovation rather than the demolition of her lifetime Chicago neighborhood, Hill slowed the pace of an almost frenetic meeting. [Four enormous urban renewal and conservation projects were on the agenda.] City officials listened while the proud little woman fought for preserving the near north area, west of La Salle street, for residents now living there.

"There is room for all of us there, black and white, young and old," she said. And she was a much more graphic picture than could have been presented by any of Hill's charts, maps, and statistics. Hill thanked her graciously, and when he turned to the next item on the agenda, his tone was quite a bit less brisk.

Part of this gentleness comes because Hill is smart enough to know that no matter how smoothly projects hum along, the words "urban renewal" are a frightening combination to many residents. And part of it comes because he understands "that everybody wants something uniquely and exclusively his own for his neighborhood."

He speaks of a community's chauvinism these days almost solely with nostalgia because of his increasingly long distance touch, and he chafes more from irritants such as underinformed reporters or aldermen than he does from uninformed residents or bureaucratic binds.

He personally stays ahead of the game by keeping current on the contents of about 50 pounds of paperwork that each week arrives at—and departs from—his desk. A considerable portion of the work is treated to a round trip to his northwest side home in a Texas-sized briefcase he totes home each night.

His secretary spends the mornings dispatching her boss's homework to the necessary next stops and her spare time preparing memoranda to hand him when he stops in the office on his way to, or from, one of the many daily meetings he attends.

His stamina is becoming legend around city hall, but his race for time is easy to understand. The father of six children, a home owner, and a member of more than a dozen professional, civic, and social organizations, he has been known to commandeer a day full of meetings and then hurry home to cook dinner because his wife was sick that day.

If he has any fun at his largely friction-free city hall meetings, it is not noticeable. It's never amateur afternoon when he is at the conference table. His smiles are infrequent, but resilient, and his patience seemingly endless. He appears most comfortable with a pencil and some papers spread before him.

With few exceptions, Hill's hands and feet do not fidget. At one recent meeting, however, which was more verbally colorful and crowded with audience participation than usual these days, Hill's pencil tip, pressed to the breaking point, snapped.

Perhaps this is one of the few visible indications that the city's biggest planner, who says "We Will" a dozen times a day, might for once have been thinking more along the lines of "We Hope."

But, because Hill is Hill, there was no break in the meeting's continuity. He had another pencil—and 1,000 more facts—waiting in the wings to get a piece of the action.

DOVES SILENT, HAWKS SOUND FAMILIAR

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Doves Silent, Hawks Sound Familiar," written by Mary McGrory, and published in a recent edition of the Washington Star.

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

DOVES SILENT, HAWKS SOUND FAMILIAR

(By Mary McGrory)

The New Democratic Coalition, an organization of McCarthy-Kennedy-McGovern veterans of 1968, making an eloquent protest against the war, included one declaration that derived more from hope than reality.

"We intend to make it clear that the voice you hear today will be the voice of the new Democratic party, speaking not from the divisions of the past but with unity against any continuation of the war in Vietnam," it said.

The fact of the matter is that Democratic dissenters, who won a glorious victory in New Hampshire a year ago tomorrow, have fallen silent, while the President ponders the "appropriate response" to the new enemy onslaught in Vietnam.

Eugene McCarthy, the hero of New Hampshire, is busy writing a book about the campaign.

BATTLING FOR TREATY

Sen. J. William Fulbright is fighting for the nuclear nonproliferation treaty in the Senate.

Sen. George S. McGovern is fighting hunger in the South.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy is fighting against the antiballistic missile system.

Allard K. Lovenstein, firebrand of the "Dump Johnson" movement, is now a member of Congress, bemused by Biafra.

The war, which was reversed in its course a year ago March 31 by Lyndon Johnson, goes on, and with increasing fury and mounting casualties.

The rhetoric is the same.

A FAMILIAR SOUND

President Nixon sounds like President Johnson when he says (as he did in his last press conference) that "The American people will support a President if they are told by the President why we are there, what our objectives are, what the cost will be and what the alternatives would be if we took another course of action."

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird says, as his predecessor, Robert S. McNamara said a year ago, that the Tet offensive is "a failure."

Chairman John Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee, says "we are chewing up the enemy in some places."

The military, who a year ago reportedly said they needed 200,000 more men to finish the job, are saying now that they can do it with the present troop level. They promise, as before, that the enemy is weaker, that the South Vietnamese are stronger, that the war is going better.

On the campuses, where dissent was born, the rumblings of disruption and all-out resistance are being heard. If the answer *is* escalation, the students will march. Enrollments in the radical Students for a Democratic Society are up, because, said one troubled Harvard sophomore, "We're going crazy over the war, and the SDS are the only ones who are doing anything."

The President has not scheduled his decision on the war. The ABM comes first, and there is some thought that he feels if he halts deployment, he will prove his independence of the military-industrial complex and buy more time on Vietnam.

Some dissenters, like Fulbright, feel he will, being intelligent, face the facts about the war, and proceed with whatever settlement he can get. Others, like McCarthy, wonder if he has to go through the course of previous presidents, beguiled by military optimism and repelled by the prospect of presiding over America's first defeat. Still others think the President may do nothing immediately.

The President has shown a lively response on minor matters. Encountering resistance on Willie Mae Rogers as consumer guide and Murray Chotiner as a Republican party official, he dropped them both.

But the war is the first matter of total consequence which he has faced. The only clue he gave was a laughing reference to the "domino theory," beloved of hawks, in reference to South America. He had to be forced in his Pacific press conference to warn of retaliation on the Viet Cong offensive.

The New Democratic Coalition said that the primaries seemed to them "a direct manifestation of the American conscience and will, expressing a profound distaste for the war and its consequences."

If Nixon agrees with that, his course will be clear. He will instruct the negotiators in Paris to make concessions, and instruct the field commanders to scale down the fighting. Otherwise, as he full well knows, "Johnson's war" becomes "Nixon's war" very quickly. The political opposition which turned it around once is not possible for another two years.

As he sits in the gloaming, as he likes to do when pondering grave questions, he must really make up his mind about what the people of New Hampshire were saying last March 12.

STEINER-LIFF IRON AND METAL CO. OF NASHVILLE, TENN., ENTERS AN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a pioneer project has been underway in my home district of Nashville-Davidson County.

I have been so impressed with the ideals behind this project, and its results, that I would like to briefly outline this program, how it began, was carried, and the success it achieved, for the consideration of my fellow Members of the Congress.

For some time we have asked our business community to accept a greater

responsibility and involvement in seeking solutions to our urban problems.

Steiner-Liff Iron and Metal Co., of Nashville, Tenn., has accepted its role in seeking these solutions.

The company had entered into an on-the-job training program, through a subcontract through the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, their national trade association. The institute had a contract with the Labor Department for 1,000 jobs throughout the United States. Seventeen of these jobs were assigned to Tennessee, and Steiner-Liff obtained all 17 openings. Contracts were signed for these training openings whereby the firm was to be reimbursed by the Federal Government, through the institute, at the rate of $20 per employee for a period of from 4 to 20 weeks, depending on what the job for which the individual was to be trained.

Mr. Noah Liff, president of Steiner-Liff Industries, stated that his firm was not interested in the $20 per week, but were interested in the employee pool from which they might be able to find employees. Mr. Liff indicated that they would, in turn, take the money received and turn it over to some school or neighborhood activity program. It was then Mr. Liff learned of the complementary program, a basic education program which is done on the job.

Under this program, Steiner-Liff received $15 per student, per week, with $5 going toward paying a nonprofit organization called the Board for Fundamental Education, to set up classrooms right in the plant to teach the most basic rudiments of education, specifically, reading and writing.

In addition to the 17 on-the-job training positions, Steiner-Liff contracted directly with the Board for Fundamental Education for any and all existing employees who wanted to go to school because they had to drop out of school for some time and wanted to take a refresher course. This was done at a cost of $20 per student for the entire 25-week course.

The Board for Fundamental Education agreed to:

First. Interview all employees.

Second. Test on a Stanford Standard Achievement Test all employees who are agreeable and interested.

Third. Grade and classify, confidentially, those employees who are rated from 00 to fourth grade and those employees who are from fifth grade to eighth grade.

Fourth. Hire and assign teachers who are experienced in adult education—using the board room technique rather than the teacher-up-front, students-at-the-desk method.

Fifth. Guarantee that on graduation day at the end of the 25 weeks those students who are in the double zero to fourth-grade category will have a reading and arithmetic level of at least the fourth grade and those in the fifth to eighth grade level will have at least the eighth-grade level. When graduation comes, if there are some who have not reached this level of accomplishment, the board teachers will stay on for those few stragglers until they do reach this level of accomplishment at no additional cost.

At these prices, it was obvious that this could not be accomplished without contributions to the board by charitable foundations. Steiner-Liff Foundation, although not obligated to do so, intends to reimburse the board at the end of the sessions for any actual out-of-pocket cost they have for the program.

One hundred and one people were interviewed. Eighty-nine of them signed up to go to school. Only four of them tested out at the high school level; the balance were lower. And, of those, only about 10 or 12 were as high as fourth to eighth grade, and this included many who had actually attended high school.

The board had stated that Steiner-Liff could expect about a 50-percent-dropout rate for those who were eligible to take the course. This held true, and many of those who first enrolled dropped out of the program for a number of reasons, including transportation problems, overtime, and termination of employment with the company, among the reasons.

Yet of those who began the program, 15 graduated.

This effort on the part of a private business concern has been of benefit to the community, has helped build morale within the organization, and has improved the lives—and earning power—of those who completed the program.

Mr. Noah Liff, and his company, Tennessee Steel & Supply Co., deserve recognition, support, and encouragement for seeking immediate and meaningful solutions by those who are best capable of finding these solutions—the American businessman.

CHAMPIONS OF ALL

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, perfection is the goal of all of us, but attained by only a precious few. One who has reached that magic circle with the appropriate nickname, the "Titans," is the basketball team of Saginaw's St. Stephen's High School. This past weekend, the Titans climaxed a perfect season by winning the Michigan class C high school basketball crown. It completed a perfect season with 24 victories and not a single loss.

I extend to these young athletes my heartiest congratulations and a special commendation to their head coach, Sam Franz, and his young assistant, Hubert Lynch.

To the team, coaches, parents, and loyal followers, congratulations. I would like to insert at this time a fine editorial on the champions which appeared in the March 24, 1969, edition of the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich.:

OUR TITAN CHAMPIONS

Winning it uphill against the odds, against the clock and when everything seems to say it can't be done is what it's all about. That's the mark of a champion which Saginaw St. Stephen's bears today.

Champion—truly, uncontestably champion of Michigan Class C high school basketball.

Coach Sam Franz' Titans answered any lingering doubts about this team's perfection late Saturday afternoon in MSU's Jenison Fieldhouse to the satisfaction of all of the experts. A 24-victory, no-defeat season now goes into the school's collection of happy memories along with that silver trophy.

It may be a time before we see anything quite like this again. A 24–0 record requires more than luck. It is not an every-day achievement. If one doubts that, ask any man who has ever been associated with the coaching of the young. Saginaw High was last to turn that trick in 1962.

Loyal St. Stephen's fans, justifiably bursting with pride, know very well what it took beyond "luck" to reach this pinnacle. It is a triumph, of course, that stands on much broader base even than mere athletic skill—which this team has.

It is a testimony to things like desire, affection, respect, devotion and plain old-fashioned belief. For this, a coach, a team, parents and loyal followers can take a bow.

We hope they'll not object if an entire All-America City reflects in some of the glory earned by its newest champion of Michigan. Somehow it seems very appropriate today.

COTTAGE GROVE, OREG., NAMED ALL AMERICA CITY

HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, Cottage Grove, a progressive community in Oregon's Willamette Valley, has just been named an "All America City."

In selecting Cottage Grove as one of 11 cities in the Nation to receive this coveted award, the editors of Look magazine said:

A new sense of purpose reaches down through a 40-member Metropolitan Committee to grass-roots citizen discussion groups.

The magazine, which cosponsors the contest with the National Municipal League, described the city's economic situation:

Dependent upon a fluctuating lumber market, populated by transient loggers, a full hour's drive from the city of Eugene, Cottage Grove had a civic base as narrow as an axe handle.

The writers go on to cite the efforts of concerned and involved citizens to secure a swimming pool for the high school—thanks to a generous lumberman—housing for the elderly, and renewal of slum areas.

Said Look:

A town of 5,700 has a hard time competing in the progress game. But in one vital area, Cottage Grove is way out in front. Across the United States, cities are spewing raw or inadequately treated sewage into lakes, streams, and rivers. Cottage Grove purifies its sewage once, twice, three times, and what goes in unmentionable comes out potable.

Last year the city dedicated the second known tertiary sewage treatment facility in the Nation.

Cottage Grove also is winning in the battle against crime. A special program has policemen talking with students about social problems that affect them and about a policeman's role in the com-

munity. The result: an 11-percent drop in juvenile crime.

Those of us who know and love Cottage Grove realize that this small city has a special feeling about it. The citizens really care about their city. They have worked hard to make Cottage Grove a better place in which to live and a nicer place to visit.

As the Congressman who represents this fine city, I join its citizens in their pride in that well-deserved title, "All America City."

A BILL TO HELP MAKE LIFE EASIER FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will extend medicare to cover those drugs which are prescribed for the treatment of diabetes and those chronic cardiovascular, respiratory, and kidney diseases that commonly afflict the aged.

Medicare, in its short existence, has done much to alleviate the financial burden of health care which is felt by so many of our older citizens. It has not only improved their quality of life, but it has brought to the aged a peace of mind which comes with the knowledge their finances will not be drained due to the heavy expenses of a serious illness.

I feel it is vital that we now extend this very successful program to include diabetic treatment for the aged among its provisions. Nearly 1 out of every 20 persons in this country today is an actual or a potential diabetic, and these figures are constantly increasing. The American Diabetes Association has found that since 1950 the prevalence of diabetes has increased nearly 95 percent.

As we all know, diabetes is a chronic condition which develops when the body is unable to make use of certain foods, especially sugars and starches. The most likely targets are: persons who are related to diabetics; women; persons who are overweight; and those who are at least 45 years of age. According to a study made by the American Diabetes Association, nearly seven out of 10 known diabetics did not discover their diabetes until they were 45 years of age or older. In one out of five cases, diabetes was discovered when the patient was 65 years or older.

Diabetes now ranks eighth among the causes of death by disease. Approximately 32,000 deaths per year are attributed directly to diabetes. Neglect of diabetes may also lead to an increased risk of coronary disease, hardening of the arteries, cerebral hemorrhage, kidney disease, failing eyesight, gangrene, and diabetic coma.

But diabetes can be controlled by diet, exercise, and insulin, or one of the oral compounds that reduce blood sugar. Without the availability of these prescribed drugs, however, a diabetic has little chance of living a normal life. This treatment must be made available to our older citizens who cannot otherwise afford it.

I feel that this legislation is necessary to help make life easier for our senior citizens. Its adoption would mean that a more comprehensive health package would be made available to millions of Americans.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIMPSON COUNTY, KY.

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year is the sesquicentennial year of Simpson County, Ky.

This is the year when a century and a half of history will be brought to light. One hundred and fifty years of earlier dreams and hopes, of honest toil and dedication, of personal and civic pride, will be recalled, retold, and relived. And in this year, as it was in 1819, the good people of Simpson County will continue to dream and hope, to toil, and to dedicate themselves toward making the future of their county ever one of growth and progress.

The stature of Simpson County and its county seat, Franklin, did not come about by chance. Its advances are by no means typical. Statistics show us that in some areas throughout our country, towns and counties have diminished in their influence and importance. This is not true in Kentucky and it has not happened in Franklin or Simpson County. Simpson Countians simply would not tolerate such a situation. I have known these people for a long time. I know them to be strong and good people—proud people who, like their forebears, love their part of Kentucky and want it to prosper. The word "decline" is not acceptable, the thought—intolerable.

Simpson County was established in February 1819 and is the nameplace of an illustrious Kentuckian, Capt. John Simpson. A distinguished lawyer and legislator, Captain Simpson, at the onset of the War of 1812 rallied his friends and neighbors to raise a company of riflemen. Together they went forth to join the first Kentucky troops to serve in that war. Captain Simpson was killed in the Battle of the River Raisin and as a tribute to his courage and bravery his name was given to the 63d county to be formed in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. One year later a town, named for Benjamin Franklin, was founded. Simpson County retains its original boundaries and Franklin remains its county seat.

Simpson County's roots were bedded in this rich and welcoming land. The soil was productive—ideal for the cultivation of wheat, corn, oats, and tobacco. Grazing lands were abundant and two great rivers, the Barren and the Red, drained the area. Though not without hardships, life was good. More and more the word of Simpson County spread and settlers came with their families to make it their home. Here they were welcomed as neighbors by friendly and hospitable folk. This same welcoming spirit exists today and perhaps could well be called the county's trademark.

The years passed and while agriculture is still vital to the county's social and economic life, civic leaders realized some years ago that if their young were to enjoy Simpson County as they themselves had been privileged to do, opportunities for their employment must be found. Industry had first to be attracted and then brought in. With intelligent planning and cooperation from all sources such projects as school improvement and recreational facilities were begun. An industrial development association was formed. Companies were invited to look over its possibilities. They came, liked what they saw, and stayed to become a part of the Franklin-Simpson community.

The community has been recognized throughout the State of Kentucky for its program of self-betterment and today is regarded as an outstanding example of what can be done when interested and concerned citizens work together. Its remarkable progress and notable history will be commemorated during the summer of 1969 with a full week of festivities. The success of Simpson County Sesquicentennial Week is assured just as the future of Simpson County is assured. Its people determined long ago—150 years ago, in fact—that Simpson County was their county and as such, in all things, it deserved their best efforts.

I know I speak for all Kentuckians in my praise of Simpson County. It has won recognition in the past and I have no doubt that more honor will come in the years ahead.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON CONCERNING THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the 28 years the Honorable Frances P. Bolton served as a Member of the Congress from the 22d Congressional District of Ohio, she was privileged to work with the administration of five Presidents of the United States. One of our Presidents with whom she worked most closely for 8 years was Dwight D. Eisenhower. Her friendship and admiration for General Eisenhower dated back many years. In 1951 Mrs. Bolton was one of a small group of prominent persons who visited General Eisenhower when he was Supreme Allied Commander in Europe to urge him to become a Republican candidate for President.

Mrs. Bolton was appointed by President Eisenhower as the first woman Member of Congress to serve as a Representative of the United States of America to the Eighth General Assembly of the United Nations. Upon learning of President Eisenhower's death, Mrs. Bolton issued the following statement:

To the many who have been privileged to work with him General Eisenhower's death is a grievous thing. Even in the last many months which he had to spend at Walter Reed Hospital, there was a courage emanating from him that gave each of us a steadiness and a strength that carried us over many stony places. For this we are deeply, deeply grateful—for we shall miss him more than words can possibly express.

To him this country was indeed "one nation under God" and he served her selflessly and well. What light there was in his eyes! What strength and calm tenderness in his voice—what force when force was needed!

One cannot grieve now that he has gone on to broader living, for has he not given us a rare legacy of patriotism? Surely it has been a wonderful experience to have known him—to have worked for and with him—to have watched his clear, open, honest ways. It will be many moons before another such as he comes into our midst.

May Heaven grant his devoted wife and family a deep and abiding comfort and peace.

CONGRESS ASSAILED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House and a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have been distressed to note the low level at which Congress funds the Federal court system. This inadequate funding was recently the subject of some unprecedented criticism of Congress by Chief Justice Earl Warren. It is my own belief that one of the major problems with administration of criminal justice in the United States is the inordinate delay between a crime and punishment for that crime. The psychological relationship between the crime and the punishment—on which the deterrent theory of criminal punishment is largely based—is destroyed by the long wait between commission of the crime and imposition of punishment. To me a speedy trial with a decision following soon after the crime would have far more deterrent effect than the harsher sentences which have been suggested by some.

But if the long delays in criminal proceedings are detrimental of society's purposes in imposing punishment, they are even less defensible where the defendant is found innocent. Sometimes a man may have been under the cloud of an indictment for years before he is finally cleared of wrongdoing. Not only is this unfair, but it seems to me violates the sixth amendment's guarantee of a speedy trial for all citizens.

To the extent that we in Congress are responsible for the inability of the Federal courts to dispense justice expeditiously, we must bear part of the responsibility for the breakdown in administration of criminal justice in the United States. I believe that the attached editorial from the Chicago Daily Defender points out the problem which we face. The Chief Justice's words are worth pondering. So is the discrepancy between what we are willing to devote to detecting and capturing criminals, and what we devote to trying them after they are caught.

The editorial referred to follows:

CONGRESS ASSAILED

Breaking his traditional reticence about open fault-finding with the legislative branch on non-judicial matters. Chief Justice Earl Warren assailed Congress for failing to meet the needs of the nation's federal courts.

He advanced the view that part of the increasing crime problem is attributable to "the fact that we do not move along to get cases tried." To keep cases current, the Chief Justice said, "we must get a response from Congress to do our job in a proper way.

Addressing the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, Warren asked: "Do you think we can get any help from Congress? The answer has clearly been no." The Chief Justice described Congressional expenditures for the judiciary as just a drop in the bucket. And he added that the "FBI budget is infinitely higher than the whole federal court system."

LURLEEN B. WALLACE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the illness and death of the one may sometimes result in the cure and life for the many. The tragic illness and death in 1968 of Alabama's beloved late Governor, Lurleen B. Wallace, may very well be such a case. A group of dedicated Alabamians have proposed the construction of the Lurleen B. Wallace Memorial Cancer Hospital and Tumor Institute. Our present Governor, Albert P. Brewer, an author of this dream and initiator of the work which will turn it into a reality is serving as honorary chairman of a "Courage Crusade" dedicated to the task of raising $15 mililon to build and equip one of the Nation's finest cancer hospitals in Alabama.

The hospital is designed to become the South's most modern facility in the treatment of cancer and will engage in research for the cure of this dread disease.

In Alabama it is estimated that one out of every four persons will have some form of cancer during his lifetime. Such a fact greatly underscores the need for such a hospital.

Governor Brewer and those working with him have dedicated themselves to a meritorious but difficult task. The building of the hospital depends on the generous response of all Alabamians. The cost of the hospital must be underwritten from private and individual contributions in the amount of $5 million with another $10 million coming from other sources. The probable location of this great new facility will be adjacent to the Medical Center in Birmingham, since location elsewhere would cause the cost of the hospital to more than double. Originally planned for 200 beds, the hospital is so designed that it may be increased to a capacity of 500.

It is significant that this project has been endorsed by the Alabama Medical Association, the dean of the University of Alabama Medical School, the National Cancer Institute, and the State of Alabama Department of Health.

Supporting Governor Brewer in this significant task are two other distinguished Alabamians—Earl Mallick and Donald Comer, Jr.—campaign chairman and cochairman, respectively.

There could be no more fitting tribute to Lurleen B. Wallace, a courageous fighter against cancer in life, than to dedicate to her memory this proposed hospital, the purpose of which is cancer's cure and extinction.

PRESIDENT NIXON PREPARES FOR RETURN TO VOLUNTARY ARMY

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to learn that the new administration is taking all necessary steps to prepare for the return to a voluntary military manpower system in the historic pattern and tradition of this Nation.

An all-volunteer Army has been part of our national heritage, abandoned only in periods of major war. As a free society, we must turn away from as inherently inequitable a system as conscription and return to that heritage just as soon as circumstances permit.

President Nixon announced his intention to move in a careful and responsible way toward an all-volunteer military so that our national security is never in doubt. Accordingly, he has named a distinguished 15-member Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force to develop a comprehensive plan of action for accomplishing that goal.

The members of the Commission, under the chairmanship of former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, have a broad base of qualifications that should give weight to their final conclusions.

There have been previous Presidential commissions to study the military manpower requirements of the country. But there has been no rigorous study made of how to return to the voluntary system. Thus, this Commission will be breaking new ground.

The President has made it clear that the Commission will consider carefully the need to keep reformed selective service machinery available for national emergencies and also the requirements for adequate reserve forces.

The Commission's studies will dovetail with the study already ordered by the President within the Department of Defense, taking into account both the costs and the savings that would result from voluntary military manpower recruitment.

The text of the President's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCING A COMMISSION ON AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

To achieve the goal of an all-volunteer force we will require the best efforts of our military establishment and the best advice

we can obtain from eminent citizens and experts in many related fields of national endeavor. For this purpose, I have today appointed an Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force under the Chairmanship of the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., former Secretary of Defense.

I have directed the Commission to develop a comprehensive plan for eliminating conscription and moving toward an all-volunteer armed force. The Commission will study a broad range of possibilities for increasing the supply of volunteers for service, including increased pay, benefits, recruitment incentives and other practicable measures to make military careers more attractive to young men. It will consider possible changes in selection standards and in utilization policies which may assist in eliminating the need for inductions. It will study the estimated costs and savings resulting from an all-volunteer force, as well as the broader social and economic implications of this program.

The transition to an all-volunteer armed force must, of course, be handled cautiously and responsibly so that our national security is fully maintained. The Commission will determine what standby machinery for the draft will be required in the event of a national emergency and will give serious consideration to our requirements for an adequate reserve forces program.

I have instructed the Department of Defense and other agencies of the Executive Branch to support this study and provide needed information and assistance as a matter of high priority.

The Commission will submit its report to me in early November, 1969.

MARCH WAS NATIONAL DECA MONTH

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, National DECA Month—Distributive Education Clubs of America—was observed throughout the Nation during March. The purpose is to call public attention to distributive education which identifies a program of instruction in marketing, merchandising, and management. DE is offered in all 50 States and the territories of the United States.

DECA identifies the program of youth activities related to DE and is designed to develop future leaders for marketing and distribution. It is the only youth organization operating in the Nation's schools to attract young people to the careers in commerce. Its purposes are: First, to develop a respect for education in marketing and distribution which will contribute to occupational competence; and second, to promote understanding and appreciation for the responsibilities of citizenship in our free competitive enterprise system.

These young people are not content to wait for tomorrow to learn the ways of the business world—they are learning today. By their actions, they are assuring the economy of trained, efficient business leaders in the next generation. The training they are receiving now is invaluable and I want to thank the dedicated work of DE teachers and students across the Nation for their efforts.

THE NEED FOR WATER QUALITY MONITORING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., Administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, presented a most significant statement at the Water Supply and Waste Water Seminar sponsored by the American Water Works Association and the Water Pollution Control Federation, March 4, 1969.

Dr. Johnson's statement warns of the critical dangers which now threaten our water resources. As a Representative from the Lake Erie water basin, I share with Dr. Johnson a desire for more meaningful Federal action and have introduced a bill to provide for the creation of a national water pollution disaster fund to meet critical problems which are either interstate or beyond the capacity of any single State to solve.

The immediate danger of ecological disaster is apparent from data I have presented in past statements. In addition, Dr. Johnson points out the need for increased monitoring of our water supplies. Although Ohioans easily know when the taste and odor of Lake Erie water have made it undrinkable, scientific monitoring of taste, color, and odor as well as bacteriological and chemical pollutants will increase the scientific understanding of our water resources. This knowledge will make it possible for us someday to offer our citizens not only the minimally acceptable water we are now seeking, but actually to provide them with quality drinking water.

Careful scientific monitoring of the water our citizens drink is an absolute necessity, and it is my hope that we will act soon to provide our water treatment plants with something more than sewer water to distribute to our citizens.

Dr. Johnson's satement follows:

THE NEED FOR WATER QUALITY MONITORING

You have asked me to direct my remarks especially to the current situation with regard to legislation affecting your area of interest. I will tell you what I can about legislative matters, but I think it would be useful first for me to review, very briefly, the principal problems which confront us today in maintaining safe, potable water and to discuss with you the direction in the new Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service believe Federal, State, and local water hygiene programs should take.

As you know, the Public Health Service's water quality program is now a part of the Environmental Control Administration, whose Commissioner is Assistant Surgeon General Chris A. Hansen.

The Environmental Control Administration is one of three agencies which comprise the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, of which I am the Administrator. The other two units are the Food and Drug Administration and the National Air Pollution Control Administration. Let me tell you just a little about the philosophy and operations of the new Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service because we feel that the present organizational structure will strengthen all of our programs including our water hygiene activities.

Most observers would agree that, at this particular time in history, we have reached, or at the very least are rapidly approaching a critical point with regard to adverse change in the physical environment. Every year, pollution gets worse, rather than better; the threat from unsafe food, drugs, water, and even consumer products is increasing; and the complex relationship of these diverse environmental threats is little understood.

Certainly, our Nation's progress in meeting human needs has been great, but it has been uneven. And our failure to come to grips with the complex problems—physical and psychological—generated by environmental change has created threats to human health—some subtle and some not so subtle—that the passage of time can only compound and complicate.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service has been established to make possible a more effective and systematic approach to this complex of interrelated problems. Its primary goals are to achieve a deeper insight into the relationship of man to his environment, to assess the total impact on the human organism of many separate environmental stresses which impinge on man simultaneously, and to implement necessary action programs to help the Nation achieve needed environmental improvement.

I do not need to explain to you who are concerned with water hygiene that the human body does not always differentiate as to the method of entry or origin of chemical or bacteriological insults. The effect on the living organism may be the same whether the insult gains entry through the water man drinks, the air he breathes, the food he eats, the therapeutic drug he ingests, or some other product he consumes or uses.

You who are primarily concerned with water quality, are constantly made aware of the close interrelationship and interdependence of all parts of the environment. Significant change or deterioration in any part of the environment all too soon becomes a water problem. Soil erosion, deforestation, the use of agricultural chemicals, industrialization, urban sprawl, freeway construction, waste disposal, air pollution—each of these is the subject of grave concern in its own right, but ultimately each contributes to even more serious concern for water quality.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service is initiating a vigorous new effort to try to advance our understanding of these complex, multiple threats to human health and to assure that we have a coordinated, concerted action program to maintain environmental quality. We want to consolidate all that we know today, and all the knowledge that we can develop in the future, into a sensible, revealing picture of what is happening to man in the contemporary environment. We want to assure that no important line of research is neglected. And we want to make sure that vitally needed programs are not slighted simply because they lack visibility or popular appeal.

We believe that our water quality program—and indeed the total national effort to maintain safe, wholesome drinking water—needs to be stepped up substantially. Our mission in water hygiene—and we are not alone in this responsibility—is to make certain that the quality of the Nation's water used for drinking, recreation, and other human contact is maintained at the highest possible levels. The total effort, as indicated by budget at all levels of government, seems to indicate a dangerous national complacency about the safety of our water supplies. Today, in the face of soaring populations, increasing environmental pollution, and the sometimes questioned adequacy of present treatment and distribu-

tion systems, we must not be apathetic about the safety and purity of the water we use for drinking and other human contact.

The Public Health Service, with its broad responsibility for the health of the whole population, certainly must not be guilty of such apathy. We have a clear obligation to work with State and local governments and industry, in a spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance, to achieve our national water quality goals. Working together, I am convinced we can achieve these goals, but I am equally convinced that it will require a major effort on the part of all.

In our opinion there is reason for serious concern about community water supplies in the United States. A 1967 report to the Secretary of HEW by the Task Force on Environmental Health (the Linton Report) extrapolated the statistics gathered as a result of the Public Health Service interstate carrier program and concluded that 33 percent of all public water supplies, serving some 50 million persons, do not meet the requirements of the Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards. Moreover, as I know you are all aware, the present PHS standards do not reflect the best and latest knowledge of real or potential threats to human health and fall far short of the drinking water quality goals promulgated by the AWWA last year.

Confirmation can be found simply by looking at the record. Most community water supply systems in this Nation were constructed over 30 years ago. Since then urban populations have increased from 20 to 40 percent. Many community systems are plagued by insufficient supply, inadequate transmission or pumping capacity, or other known deficiencies in their treatment and distribution systems.

Moreover, when these systems were built, there was insufficient information to design a facility for the removal of certain toxic chemical or virus contaminants. They were designed to treat a high quality of raw water for removal of bacteria. Today, both ground and surface water supplies have markedly deteriorated.

In addition, we know that water surveillance programs of State and local health agencies have deteriorated in recent years along with the treatment and distribution systems. Recurring major epidemics of water-borne disease were a primary concern of environmental health programs 40 years ago, and a major effort was sustained to curb such outbreaks. Today, however, concern has diminished, and water surveillance programs have declined in favor of other surveillance activities or pollution control programs, particularly in those fields in which Federal grants are available.

Yet today, we have problems—and they are growing every year—which point to a need for greater, not less, attention to water quality:

First of all, there is the ever increasing need for water for domestic and industrial use, caused by growth and concentration of the population and burgeoning technological development. We have already noted the obsolescence and inadequacy of many community water systems. If we have failed to keep pace with current needs, what does the future hold? It is estimated that the population of the United States will reach at least 230 million by 1980. Today, demand is running about 24 billion gallons of water each day, or 9 trillion gallons per year. By 1980, we can expect that demand to rise to 34 billion gallons per day, or more than 12 trillion gallons per year.

This means that additional water supplies must be developed, distribution facilities strengthened and extended, and more surveillance maintained in order to assure the continuous safety of water supply to the consumer's tap.

Second, there is the continued occurrence of communicable disease outbreaks resulting from contamination of water supply systems. It is true, of course, that the classical communicable water-borne diseases, such as typhoid fever, amoebic dysentery, and bacillary dysentery, have been brought under control. Nevertheless, during 1946–1960, there were 228 reported outbreaks of water-borne disease, resulting in 26,000 cases of illness. Those that are unreported are probably many times more—perhaps 100 times more than the reported cases.

In the last 5 years, reported outbreaks have averaged one per month. Two substantial outbreaks, involving 2,500 and 18,000 cases of salmonellosis respectively, and several instances of hepatitis attributed to contaminated water supplies have occurred in this period. In view of these continuing outbreaks, questions can logically be raised as to the reliability of time-honored safeguards against contamination. The adequacy of coliform organisms as a measure of water quality needs to be critically examined and better microbiological indicators of contamination sought.

Third, we know that there is a continual stream of new, and in some cases unidentifiable, contaminants originating from new industrial products. Wastes from synthetics, adhesives, surface coatings, solvents, and pesticides have reached surface waters in increasing quantities during the past 20 years. Many of these are extremely complex and are unaffected by present water and waste water treatment procedures. Some, such as pesticides and oil refinery wastes, have been shown to be toxic or carcinogenic. We know little about the identification and measurement of these compounds in drinking water, and we have little knowledge of their long-range health effects.

A fourth matter of concern is the potential needs for, and the current experimentation with, use of reclaimed waste waters for water supply purposes. During the past decade much has been learned about the treatment of waste waters for removal of some organic substances and bacteria, and processes for renovating waste waters have proceeded to the pilot plant stage. However, not enough effort has been devoted to the development of methods to remove such harmful contaminants as trace elements, pesticides, and some unidentified viruses. Little is known about the concentrations of carcinogens, antibiotics, or hormones present in waste waters, and the problem of establishing fail-safe operating and control criteria is an extremely complex one. So far as the Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards are concerned, these are based on the premise that the water source is relatively unpolluted; little work has been done to establish a basis for criteria that could be applied to the use of reclaimed municipal wastes for all purposes. Our people in the Bureau of Water Hygiene are mindful of their responsibility in this area of present and future concern.

These then are the principal problems, as we see them. It seems to me that they present to all of us, at every level of government and in industry, a serious responsibility and challenge. As I said earlier, I believe that working together we can meet the challenge, but I don't for one moment believe that it will be anything but a complicated and difficult task.

There are a host of unanswered questions which must be answered, and answered soon, if we are to maintain the safety of our water supplies. And I feel that the Bureau of Water Hygiene should mount a major research effort to find those answers. Clearly too we need to expand, far beyond the limitations of our present resources our operations, our technical services, and our training activities to strengthen State and local capabilities to deal with their water problems.

In view of the known and unknown contaminants which are increasingly present in source water, there is a critical need for more meaningful standards for drinking water, particularly with regard to chemicals. Total body burden exposure is becoming increasingly important in establishing limits for such contaminants in air, water, or food, and this is a matter of special concern in all of the CPEHS programs.

We need to determine the health of effects of trace minerals and biologicals in water supplies, both singly and in combinations in order to develop sensible standards. There is certainly a need to revise the present sampling regimen to reflect the quality of the source water, the treatment provided, and the control techniques used. We need information about what happens to various carcinogens in water treatment and we need to know more about viral contamination of water supplies. It is important that we evaluate new concentrating techniques so that we can develop studies of organics and viruses, and certain inorganics and specific bacterial pathogens.

We need to determine what happens to various carcinogens in water treatment, demonstrate the existence (or absence) of a water-borne viral gastroenteritis, and make virus challenges of the several tertiary treatment processes such as reverse osmosis membranes, electrodialysis, and carbon adsorption. We need to step up our research on infectious hepatitis. Certainly we need to initiate public health studies of waste water reuse.

We need to study quality deterioration in distribution systems and expand reservoir studies to include chemistry of destratification and the relation of hypolimnion oxidation reduction control as a means of algae control.

We need to develop a "water quality criteria for health" program that will provide updated and evaluated information to the profession.

In addition, we need a greater research effort to develop methods for rapid identification and measurement of both microbiological and chemical contaminants. New instrumentation in allied fields, and automated monitoring systems using bacteriological parameters for potable water quality should be investigated to provide more sensitive and accurate detection of harmful contaminants.

We feel that an essential preliminary to our progress in the water quality field is the development of better information on which to evaluate the status of community water supplies. So far, our only uniform information relates solely to interstate carrier supplies. If our experience with these supplies is any criteria—and we believe these supplies receive the best surveillance available—there are deficiencies in the construction, treatment, and surveillance of most community water supplies that require serious evaluation and correction.

It is the intention of the Bureau of Water Hygiene—an intention that is fully supported by its parent agency, the Environmental Control Administration, and by the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service—to move ahead as rapidly as possible to find answers to the questions I have raised about the content of our water supplies, to upgrade our water quality standards, and to intensify our technical assistance and training activities.

As one step in this direction, the Bureau of Water Hygiene is beginning this week a special community water supply study. The first surveys have begun in greater Cincinnati, Ohio; Charleston, West Virginia; and Charleston, South Carolina. During the next six months, survey teams will move on to six additional metropolitan areas, until nine cities—one in each Public Health Service region—have been surveyed. This survey was planned with the advice and guidance of a

highly qualified advisory panel drawn from the American Water Works Association, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, universities, the consulting engineering field, and others with professional interests in water quality. The staff of our Bureau of Water Hygiene has met with the States, municipalities, utilities, and others concerned, and they are giving their full cooperation. In each of the survey areas, State and Public Health Service teams will conduct water supply inventories and collect distribution samples, measure these for various parameters, and conduct joint system surveys during the summer months. Later, in the fall, while stream flows and ground water tables are at lower levels, they will collect a second round of distribution samples and make further observations.

We feel that this nine-city survey will help to narrow the information gap which, as I indicated earlier, needs to be closed before we can make sensible, orderly progress in our Federal program.

The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1968, which the American Water Works Association supported last year, did not reach a vote in the Congress, as you know. The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service has proposed that the Administration support a similar bill this year. In brief, the legislation would give specific authorization for the Public Health Service to broaden its standards for water quality in supplies used by interstate carriers, to include "any matter which by reason of its nature or quantity may constitute a hazard to health." In addition, it calls for a nationwide study of community water supplies.

I have no way of knowing what the fate of these proposals will be. However, I believe that passage of such legislation would give new vigor to the Federal program and make a significant contribution to State and local efforts to maintain high water quality.

As I have indicated, we are going ahead under our general authorities and with the resources available to us at the present time to begin at least a preliminary study of community water supplies because we feel this is of the utmost importance as a means of getting base line data.

This, then, is the direction I feel the Federal water program should take—a broadened program of research and development, upgrading of water quality standards, and an intensified program of operations, technical assistance, and training. Our progress may not be in "giant steps", but in this time of rapid growth and change, we in the Public Health Service cannot be content with the status quo if we are to discharge our responsibility for protecting the health of the American people.

If you who have the direct and immediate responsibility of providing safe drinking water to the American people are to discharge that responsibility, there are certain urgent and pressing needs which you must meet. These are, in my opinion, at the very least, improved surveillance of water supplies and constant vigilance against unforeseen waterborne health hazards; expanded training and licensing of water treatment plant operating staff; and a substantial, continuing program to expand, modernize, and replace deficient treatment and distribution systems.

I have mentioned several times that our program for certification of water supplies used by interstate carriers points to serious deficiencies in these systems. Let me be just a little more specific:

As of January 15, 1969, 707 of these supplies were under Public Health Service surveillance. 567, or 80 percent, of these were classified as approved for use on interstate carriers. The remaining 140 systems were classified as provisionally approved because of important defects in their supplies or their operations.

Some of these fail to meet the bacteriological standards, or do not meet the sampling frequency required.

A great many have no record of chemical analysis for trace metals such as arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, cyanide, lead, or selenium—elements that have limits which if exceeded, can constitute grounds for rejection of the source. A very high percentage have no records on turbidity, color, or threshold odor. A great many have no data available on radiochemical properties of their water. Others have inadequate or questionable cross-connection control programs or report major physical defects in the system or its operation.

I know that you who are working so hard to maintain safe and wholesome community water supplies are aware of these things, and I know very well the serious problems—budgetary as well as technical—that you face every year, and every day, in trying to do your jobs. Moreover, I want to say, with all sincerity, that you are doing an exceptional job under very trying circumstances. The trouble is that we are rapidly approaching a point at which you will no longer be able to assure the people of your communities of safe water unless you move, and move fast, to correct the kind of deficiencies I have cited.

I realize that the November article in *McCall's Magazine* caused consternation on the part of many conscientous professionals who are doing the most effective job they know how with the resources available to them. By its method of presentation, which certainly verged on sensationalism, it no doubt generated unjustified public alarm in some localities. However, it seems to me that, whatever the imperfections of its presentation and in spite of some errors in its factual content, it certainly pointed up the fact that the people of this country have a right to expect that the water that comes out of their taps is safe and pure, and that anything less than a "fully approved" water supply has no place in America today.

A year ago in January, the Board of Directors of the American Water Works Association approved a statement of policy supporting firmly "the position that the quality of the Nation's water resources must be upgraded and maintained at levels that are as high as are technically and economically possible." The Association recognized the engineering and fiscal difficulties involved in providing the high degree of treatment required. We all recognize the difficulties. I am confident that we all recognize, as well, that the time has come for action—whatever the difficulties—to make this goal a reality. If we don't do so we are flirting with disaster.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the world mourn the loss of Dwight David Eisenhower, a dedicated leader who was beloved to friend and foe alike.

On the battlefront, in the White House, or in Gettysburg, Pa., this fine American inspired confidence and understanding in all with whom he associated. General Eisenhower was particularly devoted to the cause of better understanding among Americans, and among peoples of the world. I think it entirely fitting and proper that in his memory, each of us strive a little harder toward achieving this marvelous attribute.

His passing leaves a great void on the American scene, and the memories of his brilliant service shall long remain.

AQUANAUT CANNON IS FALLEN HERO

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, exploration of the unknown has been filled with tragedies in the loss of brave men who dared to brave new frontiers. America's eyes have been particularly turned to outer space in recent months and the names of Grissom, White, and Chaffee come to the mind each time we see an Apollo rocket burst into the heavens.

The seas have often been called inner space and America has a hero who braved the unknown as we seek to learn more about our own planet. It has been said that we know more about outer space than we do about our own environment.

It was in this quest for knowledge that a brave young man, Berry Cannon, gave his life.

His passing was keenly felt all over the Nation and particularly in my district. He was a graduate of Williston High School, in Levy County, and the University of Florida.

Two moving tributes which express what this Nation feels more eloquently than I could hope to do came from the Panama City News-Herald and the Ocala Star-Banner, which I submit as a tribute to another pioneer whose bravery and courage should serve as a lesson to us all:

[From the Ocala (Fla.) Star-Banner, Mar. 2, 1969]

A HEROIC CASUALTY

While most Americans, especially those of us in Florida, are far more familiar with space expeditions than with underwater experiments, Berry L. Cannon's death was no less a heroic casualty than any of the tragedies that have occurred in the space program.

The glamor and excitement of astronauts' adventures thus far have overshadowed aquanauts' activities in their deep sea projects. But as more underwater projects are carried out and the public becomes more aware of their value and importance, we have an idea the accomplishments of these men who work underwater will be appreciated to a greater extent.

Just as space flights are sent out into the unknown in quest of valuable information, those who probe deep under the surface of our oceans also are probing an unknown part of the universe.

Berry Cannon was a graduate of Williston High School, from there he went on to the University of Florida, before eventually becoming a member of a scientific team dedicated to learning more about the resources of vast ocean depths.

There is much to be learned and gained from underwater projects. Those who possess vast knowledge about the subject are certain there is a potential of great and incalculable value.

Just as those who are in the space program face danger, their counterparts in underwater study are engaged in a highly hazardous activity.

Berry Cannon was willing to risk his life in quest of knowledge. Despite all the skill and courage that he possessed death came to him in his pioneering effort.

The supreme sacrifices that have been paid by such men as Berry Cannon and Virgil Grissom in underwater and space ac-

tivity ultimately will prove to be of immense value to all mankind.

[From the Panama City (Fla.) News-Herald, Feb. 23, 1969]

AQUANAUT CANNON A HERO—DESERVING OF HIGH AWARD

Man's pathways of progress have invariably been marked along the way by the grave stones of uncommon men.

These intrepid explorers and pioneers have shared certain identifying denominators: courage, humility, dynamic drive, and an abiding love for their God, their fellow men, their families, and the goal for which they sought.

Over the seas and across the lands, they pursued a better life and more abundance for those who remained behind; all too often to be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice attended only by the hovering Valkyrie.

The latter day quest of limitless space has already added three astronauts to the select society of Valhalla.

And now, the depths of the seas—which hold out the golden promise of wealth and plenty to a burgeoning humanity—have claimed their first heroic explorer, Aquanaut Berry L. Cannon.

He could decry this praise. In fact, Berry Cannot might shed a tear at having been taken away from the task before its completion. He might even smile quietly, and find a sad amusement at being cast as a member of the exclusive club of explorers and pioneers who have died for daring to blaze new trailways.

He was doing his job. He was doing it well. Berry Cannon was a master at his trade and profession, and he asked nothing more than this; to do his job and do it well.

But those of us who remain to benefit from his courageous work owe him something. We owe him due recognition as a hero, for that he was.

Berry L. Cannon knew hardship and heartache in his personal life. He knew the personal sacrifice of loneliness at being called away from his beloved family—Mary Louise, Patrick, Kevin and Neal—for—what must have seemed endless weeks and months in the saga of Sealab.

His dedication took him away from his beloved Florida in pursuit of education and preparation to participate in the enormous Sealab undertaking. He worked and studied and grew in proficiency and expertise, and finally achieved his berth as one of the select few to earn the title, "Aquanaut."

Then it happened. With a moment of achievement at hand, and inches away, in the black silence of a distant sea, death denied Berry L. Cannon the satisfaction of seeing the most adventurous Sealab experiment, yet, begin.

His massive contribution to the project remains. His memory is with his family and friends to be cherished and recalled for all time.

His assignment will be taken over by another, and the project will go ahead, for this is a fact of life, and the way Berry Cannon would have willed it.

He has been memorialized by his Church, by his Panama City station, the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory, and by the Navy at large with the final salute at the brink of the grave.

We strongly feel that certain things remain to be done:

That the citizenry of Panama City (perhaps under the auspices of the Bay County Ministerial Association) conduct a fitting memorial to this man for his achievement and sacrifice that appear to extend far beyond his brief 33 years;

That the Congress of the United States consider a fitting award or medal in posthumous recognition of his bequest to the nation and its people;

That consideration be given and action taken to rename "Princeton Circle" where he lived as "Berry L. Cannon Circle;"

That the Sealab III Experiment be permitted to continue without undue delay and pursued to the achievement of the glorious promises it holds;

And that each of us bow a moment and say a prayer of thanksgiving for having been privileged to be served by such a man, and for the family which remains, that they may find comfort at this hour of tragic loss.

Though we're certain a Benevolent Creator has already said them to Berry L. Cannon, may we too say with deep sincerity, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

FINNISH DEVALUATION

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, in October 1967, Finland made a decision to devaluate its currency and to impose a 3¼-percent tax on exports in order to reverse its balance-of-trade deficit and, generally, to improve its domestic economy. Financial authorities in this country were openly skeptical of the wisdom of this move. I am happy to report, however, that the "experts" have now admitted that they were mistaken and that the Finns, owing to their imagination and willingness to practice national austerity, have succeeded in overcoming their balance-of-trade deficit, and in turning down their long-term debt and cost-of-loving indices.

In this country, we have long been aware of the courage and initiative of the Finnish people. Indeed, one of the first national groups to migrate to this country was the Finns, who settled along the Delaware River around 1634. And it was the Finns, together with other national groups, who opened up Minnesota's timber stands and developed the iron ore deposits, forging a necessary link in the Nation's economic progress.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the following article from the Journal of Commerce, which clearly illustrates Finnish imagination, initiative, and spunk:

THE HELSINKI RECORD

Way back in October, 1967, this newspaper published an editorial dealing with the decision of Finnish authorities to devalue their currency by 31¼ per cent and to accompany this with a 14 per cent tax on exports and other measures designed, in our words, to "allow them to have their cake and eat it too."

Although not a matter of earth-shaking importance by itself (as currency devaluations go) the Finnish move gave evidence of long planning and study. The tax on exports was to be paid into an equalization fund and its proceeds made available to new industries. Friendly neighbors—chiefly in Scandinavia—got some protection in the assurance that the lowering of the price of competitive Finnish exports wouldn't come all at once. Helsinki, in the meantime, promised to go ahead with the abolition of certain duties on imports from the European Free Trade Association scheduled for the following Jan. 1, and did so.

Our comment at the time was that the Finns were trying to kill a lot of birds with one stone. Their conviction that they could help themselves without hurting their neighbors we termed "a good trick if it works."

In retrospect, it is only fair to say that Helsinki's imaginative move, combined with some rigorous austerity measures at home, did work.

Finland's balance of trade showed a surplus of about $43 million last year (the first full year since devaluation) after a decade of unbroken deficits, some of which had run as high as a quarter of a billion dollars.

Long-term debt turned down during the year. And in the fourth quarter the cost of living index turned down for the first time in the memory of most living men.

It is true that a number of factors account for these impressive results. One was the willingness of the government and of the general public to abolish a long-standing system of index-tied accounts in labor, contracts, government borrowings and the like which, if maintained, would simply have produced more inflation.

An effective wage-policy was one result, and it helped mightily.

We are not citing the Finnish experience as an argument that the United States or, for that matter, any other country ought now to set about devaluing its currency. Finland's devaluation in 1967 was not an aftermath of sterling devaluation. In fact, it preceded London's action and was ordered for reasons peculiar to Finland itself.

What the Finnish experience does teach, however, is that a good many of the economic ills besetting many governments today are not beyond solution and are, in fact, manageable, provided the government and all classes of society are not only willing but determined to make them work.

Last winter at this time many businessmen and union leaders in Finland were much concerned over economic prospects for the coming year. The former feared the export tax would rob them of the increased sales they would ordinarily expect as a result of devaluation. The unions feared unemployment and restiveness among the rank and file.

But the results speak for themselves and to those in the United States, Great Britain and other countries who are wondering how to solve their own immediate problems, they ought to make instructive reading.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying final respects to a great American, former President, and general of the Army, Dwight David Eisenhower.

Not only was Dwight Eisenhower the embodiment of the ancient and honorable ideal of the soldier-statesman but he was a man blessed with an abundance of personal warmth and compassion. A devoted family man, a man of religion, and a stanch patriot, he was most of all a man possessed of deep feelings for his fellow beings.

I feel greatly honored to have had the privilege of serving in the Congress during the last years of the Presidency of Dwight David Eisenhower. He served his Nation and the cause of freedom well.

I join in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Eisenhower and the family.

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in the period ahead a decision will be made on the proposed Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. This will be a momentous decision because of the significance of the Safeguard defense system to our entire national security.

Everyone, of course, wants to take what he or she believes is the right position on this vital issue. In this connection, the April 7 issue of the U.S. News & World Report contains an item which reviews various instances in recent history when far-reaching decisions had to be made involving our national defense and discusses some of the results of the decisions that were made.

I believe the article, entitled "Lessons of History for the ABM Vote," will be of interest to the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD:

LESSONS OF HISTORY FOR THE ABM VOTE

This nation, once again, is facing a crucial decision involving defense.

The decision this time is whether to build an anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM) proposed by President Nixon.

In the battle that is developing, many Americans are being reminded of other battles over defense proposals that proved fateful in the past. To those with long memories, some of the arguments now being heard sound familiar.

They recall the decision against fortifying the Pacific island of Guam in the face of rising Japanese belligerence in 1939.

Then came a 1941 cliff-hanger, when Congress by a single vote agreed to extend the military draft only months before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor.

In the late 1940s, the issue was whether to build the hydrogen bomb. That fateful decision, after long delay, came barely in time to win the H-bomb race against Soviet Russia.

Now the issue is how to defend the nation against the H-bomb menace.

President Nixon himself has drawn a historic parallel. He predicted that the congressional vote on his ABM proposal might be as close as the 1941 vote on extending the draft.

LOOK BACK TO 1941

Americans still shudder at thoughts of what might have happened if that 1941 vote had gone the other way.

In 1940, Congress had passed a military-draft law. For the first time in history, Americans were being drafted into the armed services at a time when this nation was not at war.

But the 1940 law called for only one year of military service. This meant, in 1941, that nearly 1 million men would soon be mustered out of the service—at a time when World War II was intensifying and likelihood of U.S. involvement appeared to be growing.

So Congress was asked to lengthen the draftees' period of service.

The war in Europe then had been going on for two years. But there was strong sentiment for keeping the U.S. out of that war. There were "hawks" and "doves" in those days, too. The "doves," then, were called "isolationists."

A bitter debate was stirred by the draft issue. The Roosevelt Administration was challenged to show how the nation was in peril that justified a big "peacetime" Army.

On Aug. 7, 1941, after seven days of debate, the Senate voted 45 to 30 to extend the draftees' period of service by 18 months.

On August 12 came the vote in the House of Representatives. There the extension squeaked through by the thinnest of margins. The vote was 203 to 202.

Result: When Japan attacked on December 7, the Army built up by the draft was still intact.

THE H-BOMB BATTLE

The battle over the hydrogen bomb was waged in secret councils of the Government, rather than in Congress.

Ever since the U.S. exploded the world's first atom bomb over Japan in 1945, scientists had conjectured that a superbomb was theoretically possible.

However, with the world then at peace and the U.S. still holding a monopoly on the A-bomb, research on the superbomb was not pushed.

Some scientists—still feeling guilty about the destruction at Hiroshima caused by the first A-bomb—opposed the superbomb on moral grounds.

A key figure in the opposition was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who called the hydrogen bomb "an expensive, uncertain gamble" and "morally wrong."

Then, on Sept. 23, 1949, Russia exploded an A-bomb. The U.S. monopoly had ended. Interest in the H-bomb suddenly soared.

On Jan. 31, 1950, President Truman decided the issue in favor of the bomb.

On Nov. 1, 1952, the U.S. exploded the world's first H-bomb. Russia came up with its own in 1953. It was another close call for U. S. defense.

UNFRIENDLY GESTURE

The 1939 decision on Guam went the other way and, in the light of history, appeared costly.

Guam, strategically located between Hawaii and the Philippines, was a potentially valuable base for airplanes and submarines. Military experts viewed it as important in case of a war with Japan. In 1938, a board appointed by President Roosevelt recommended that Guam be developed and fortified.

In 1939, Congress was asked for 5 million dollars to improve Guam's harbor. Although this bill did not call for fortifying Guam, it would have been a start and would have permitted its use as an advanced scouting base.

While the bill was before the House, the U.S. was warned that Japan would regard Guam's fortification as "an unfriendly gesture"

The bill was defeated, 205 to 168—and Guam lay unfortified when Japan attacked two years later. It was the first American possession to fall to Japan and later became an important war base for the Japanese.

Now, 30 years and three wars later, this nation faces another decision involving national defense—and Americans are wondering if it will prove to be a fateful decision.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues, our fellow Americans, and men of good will throughout the world in mourning the death of a great patriot, soldier, and statesman, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower has now returned to the fertile plains of the Midwest of which he was so proud and which he loved. However, he will never be forgotten by the men and women of the world who loved him. He has left a rich legacy in which we can all take solace and encouragement. While his cheerfulness, energy, and great spirit will be deeply missed by us all, we will always remember his many contributions to his country and to the free world.

I am proud to join in paying tribute to General Eisenhower. His life, his moral courage, and his fine personal qualities serve as his best eulogy.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Eisenhower and her family my deep personal regrets and sorrow over their loss. We are all most grateful to them for having shared Ike with us.

A GREEK POET-DIPLOMAT CRIES OUT AGAINST OPPRESSION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 28 a Nobel Prize-winning Greek poet and former diplomat issued a short, passionate statement of protest against the dictatorial regime that took over the Greek Government in April 1967.

The author of the statement is Georgos S. Seferiades, former ambassador to Britain and, writing under the pen name George Seferis, winner of the 1963 Nobel Prize for literature.

As Mr. Seferiades explained in his statement, he has published nothing since the military takeover, as a protest against the regime. But it became imperative for him to speak out, he said, and so he issued the following eloquent words to the press:

I long since resolved to remain out of our country's internal politics. This did not mean—and on another occasion I tried to make the point clear—that I was indifferent to our political life. For years now I have in principle abstained from such matters. But what I said in print early in 1967 and the stand that I have since taken (for since freedom was muzzled I have published nothing in Greece) showed clearly enough what my attitude was. Now for some months, however, I have felt, within me and around me, that more and more it is becoming imperative for me to speak out on our present situation. To put it as briefly as possible, this is what I would say.

It is almost two years since a regime was imposed upon us utterly contrary to the ideals for which our world—and so magnificently our people—fought in the last world war. It is a state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values that we have succeeded, with toil and effort, in keeping alive are being submerged in a swamp, in stagnant waters. I can well imagine that for some people these losses do not matter. Unfortunately this is not the only danger that threatens.

We have all learned, we all know, that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end, inescapable. It is this tragic ending that consciously

or unconsciously sounded as in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus.

The longer the abnormal situation lasts, the greater the evil.

I am a man completely without political ties and I speak without fear and without passion. I see before us the precipice towards which the oppression that covers the land is leading us.

This abnormality must come to an end. It is the nation's command.

Now I return to silence. I pray God that never again may I find myself under such compulsion to speak.

TEMPLE'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, my hometown, Philadelphia, is one of the great basketball cities in America. One of the great universities in Philadelphia and in America is Temple. It has been long distinguished as an outstanding academic institution committed to the needs of the community it serves.

It also boasts an enviable record on the basketball court.

This year Temple University's Owls defeated Boston College 89 to 76 to win the National Invitation Tournament in New York City. In deference to our distinguished Speaker, I must add that the Boston boys were valiant in defeat.

Temple's victory adds a curious footnote to the history of the tournament founded in 1938. Temple won that inaugural tournament, defeating Colorado.

Going into this year's tourney, with a season record of 22 wins and 8 losses Temple was not the favorite. The Owls proceeded to defeat the University of Florida, 82 to 66; St. Peter's College of Jersey City, N.J., 94 to 78; University of Tennessee, 63 to 58, before going into the finals against Boston.

I would like to pay tribute to the members of this great team; Capt. John Baum, Joe Cromer, Eddie Mast, Bill Strunk, Tony Brocchi, Tom Wieczerak, Jim Snook, Pat Cassidy, Carl Brooks, Gordon Mulava and John Richardson.

I would like to pay special tribute to Temple's "Mr. Basketball," head coach Harry Litwack. He has been part of Temple and an architect of its court fortunes longer than anyone can remember.

He has been head coach at Temple since the 1952–53 season, compiling a remarkable won-loss record of 305–150. Eleven of the past 14 seasons Coach Litwack has led his Temple Owls into a postseason tournament.

From 1931–51, he was an assistant coach and head coach of the Temple freshman team. During his tenure, the freshman team never had a losing season. An undergraduate, he played for Temple from 1926 to 1929, being captain of the team in both his junior and senior years.

When you talk about Temple basketball, you are talking about Harry Litwack. Congratulations, coach.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and the world have lost a man of unique qualities in the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. For he was that rare military captain who genuinely renounced the very calling which put him among the historic great.

General Eisenhower first became known to the American people as Supreme Allied Commander in the European theater in World War II. What he did in those years made him a hero to all Americans and a liberator to many of the nations of the world.

He was a career soldier of a unique mold, for he embodied the best qualities of the American military even as those qualities went beyond the narrow confines of the military profession itself. In the words of the motto of the West Point Military Academy, he followed the principle of "Duty, Honor, Country." General Eisenhower carried this principle into the Presidency with him. Although a military man by background, he believed—and he made it very clear in his actions and statements as President—that the Armed Forces, just as the executive and legislative branches of the Government, are servants of the people and that their activities must stay within the confines of public policy, even if policy later turns out to be wrong. This is their duty to their country and it is what distinguishes a nation directed by its people from a people directed by their state.

As President of the United States, General Eisenhower translated this principle into action. He was the American President who negotiated an end to a war without insisting on capitulation. He made the first approaches toward a reduction of tension between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. through his atoms-for-peace proposal. He created the first program for economic aid to Latin America. But most symbolic of his personal philosophy were the actions he did not take—the wholesome restraint he exercised on our use of power on major foreign policy decisions. In reacting to the French defeat in Indochina, he stood firm against involvement in the face of strong counsel by many of his top advisers to intervene militarily. And he refused to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system which was so vehemently urged upon him by his former colleagues in the military.

General Eisenhower revealed his unique quality as a military hero able to step back from his background in his farewell address to the American public, warning that—

> While a vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment, we must recognize the immense influence that it has in every city, every State House, and in every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.
>
> 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.

General Eisenhower expressed so eloquently the principle that guided him as soldier, President, and private citizen in that farewell speech as well:

> Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.
>
> But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

With the Nation today so involved in the question of the antiballistic missile and the broader issue of how to channel our post-Vietnam economy, the greatest tribute we can pay Dwight David Eisenhower is not in our words a eulogy to his life, but by heeding the principle which governed his life and following the example he set as President by rejecting the antiballistic missile and the desire to channel our economy into bigger and better systems of mass destruction.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM WELL RECEIVED IN NUECES COUNTY, TEX.

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dana Williams, superintendent of schools, Corpus Christi Independent School District, Corpus Christi, Tex., responding to a questionnaire of the House Committee on Education and Labor gave an overwhelming endorsement to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program based upon its high degree of effectiveness there.

Dr. Williams, a highly professional educator took the initiative to request the comments of students participating in the NYC program, and they responded with resoundingly favorable, perceptive and revealing letters chronicling the

benefits of the program. These letters, as well as the questionnaire have been filed with the committee for reference in their current deliberations on this important subject, and should be of inestimable value to them in assessing the program from the viewpoint of its participants.

REAPING THE WHIRLWIND

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Washington Evening Star and Washington Daily News both carried articles describing the disruption of a meeting of the City Council of the District of Columbia by a group of approximately 150 people demanding that this coming Friday be set aside as a holiday to mark the anniversary of the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. According to the Star:

> The mood of the crowd was ugly as the Negro militants delayed the start of the council meeting by about two hours.
>
> The crowd repeatedly screamed demands for the holiday while beating drums and waving a large flag.

The disruption of City Council in the Nation's Capital was ironic indeed. While one can certainly have grief and sorrow at the manner in which Dr. King lost his life, still his doctrine of civil disobedience was opposed by many citizens who viewed this doctrine as a sophisticated justification to flout all laws with which he might disagree. One cannot deny that Dr. King played a major role in bringing to public attention the necessity for change in the area of civil rights for minority groups. As long as he used legal and acceptable means to pursue his ends, he rendered a valuable service. But even Negro leaders parted company with him when policies of civil disobedience and disruption were brought into play. In Chicago, for instance, Dr. J. H. Jackson, Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention opposed this aspect of Dr. King's crusade and stated that civil disobedience and nonviolence would not carry the civil rights movement any higher and might even lead to disrespect for law and order and to possible violence.

According to the Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1967, the Chicago chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which had long been critical of the civil rights tactics of Dr. King, formally split with Dr. King's group.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer carried an article in late 1967 entitled "King Warns of Riots if Aid Meets Delay," in which Dr. King outlined a program to engage in massive nonviolence which would probably include acts of civil disobedience. To implement this program, Dr. King planned to train a cadre of 200 hard-core disrupters in the tactics of massive nonviolence, who would then return to their cities and train other units. The object of the program was to hold, according to Dr. King, "a nationwide city-paralyzing demonstration" centered in Washington but including simultaneous demonstrations in 10 other cities. The principle of the common good and the welfare of the community was conveniently forgotten by Dr. King in his attempt to gain his ends. Is it surprising then that some misguided followers of Dr. King sought to paralyze the functioning of the City Council of the Nation's Capital by disruptive tactics to gain their own ends? Should city councils in other cities be subject to disruption as they try to perform their duly authorized functions? Or should the cities themselves be vulnerable to paralyzation by massive nonviolent programs using civil disobedience tactics? Is there no defense against the nonviolent takeover of college administration offices? Or the locking in—or out—of college officials? If we have the moral obligation to disobey unjust laws as Dr. King proclaimed, and each person is left to decide which laws are just and which are unjust, how long will our Government based on law exist? Why is not lawlessness to break a law and accept willingly the penalty, as Dr. King taught?

The tragic nature of Dr. King's death was both shocking and revolting to the people of our Nation, still one should not be mesmerized into not looking objectively at the whole record. His lawful pursuit of civil rights is to be lauded; his espousal of civil disobedience in a society where lawful remedies are available must be opposed.

In addition to legal remedies available, positive efforts are being made on other fronts to help Negroes fulfill their rightful aspirations. Just a small sampling of newspaper headlines indicate that Negroes, with the help of other citizens and organizations, are making progress in a constructive, peaceful way: "Big Companies Venture Their Talent and Money in Civil Rights Effort"; "Negroes Dedicate Major Shopping Center"; "Business, Government Open Doors in Harlem"; "Cash Register Rings Harmoniously in a Biracial Store"; "Eight Banks Agree to Offer Loans in Ghetto Area"; and "Negro-Backed Building Planned."

The Federal Government, the business and labor fields, along with the participation of private individuals, are making efforts to correct inequities in this area. Admittedly, there is much remaining to be done, but most importantly, these efforts are being expended within the framework of civil obedience and mutual harmony. What a contrast between this approach and that of the disrupters of the District of Columbia Council where the order of the day was—demand, do not request; propagandize, do not reason; attack the system rather than working within it for corrective action.

I place the two articles, "King Holiday Is Demanded of Council" from the Washington Star and "Council Decrees King District of Columbia Memorial Friday," appearing in the Washington Daily News, both dated April 1, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

KING HOLIDAY IS DEMANDED OF COUNCIL

(By William Basham)

The District City Council, under siege for two hours this morning by angry black militants demanding that Friday be set aside as a holiday to mark the anniversary of the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., finally resolved to ask Mayor Walter E. Washington to grant leave for that day to District employes.

The vice chairman of the Council, Sterling Tucker, told the angry group that the council was uncertain of its authority to specifically declare a holiday.

The mood of the crowd was ugly as the Negro militants delayed the start of the council meeting by about two hours.

The crowd repeatedly screamed demands for the holiday while beating drums and waving a large flag.

ABOUT 100 IN CROWD

Led by the Rev. Douglas Moore, the crowd of about 100 assembled quietly at 10 a.m. when the council was scheduled to begin its session.

When the council members failed to appear and one of the demonstrators refused to remove a large black and red flag (symbolizing their ideas of the District's colors as proposed 51st state), members of the audience began to shout.

Several speakers stepped forward to address the council members after they entered the chamber, all demanding the holiday.

"We are demanding it, not asking for it," one man said. Moore challenged the council's plan to issue a proclamation honoring the anniversary of Dr. King's death. He shouted, "The council acted within a matter of minutes to declare a holiday for our late president (Eisenhower)."

Another angry speaker, who was unidentified, said of Eisenhower: "While black people were being rolled and tarred and feathered, he was on the golf course."

ENTIRE WASHINGTON

The same man turned to Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr. and said, "We are hip to you . . . Dr. King died for us and I want you to remember every April 4 until never."

A man who had been standing near the large flag stepped to the microphone, waved his hand back toward the seated audience, and said, "This is not one section, this isn't just Northeast or Southeast, this is entire Washington, from one end to the other. These are the people holding things in check."

The same man continued, "The word is out." He alluded to threats by some of the group who promised trouble on Friday if the holiday were not declared. "You've got people here who can stop that."

The status of possible store closings on Friday has remained in doubt.

Meanwhile, other groups also noted the assassination anniversary and called for businesses to close.

Spokesmen for the Center for Emergency Support said that letters were distributed to Connecticut Avenue stores last night requesting that the stores be closed Friday. As of this afternoon, the spokesmen said, they did not know how successful their campaign has been.

A group called Jews for Urban Justice also said that it has wired the heads of various large business concerns, asking them to close. So far, the response has been slight, a group spokesman said.

A spokesman for the Metropolitan Community Air Council, a Northeast action group which is coordinating four rallies around the city Friday afternoon, said stores along 14th Street NW and U Street from 7th to 18th Street NW were expected to be closed.

UP TO MERCHANTS

The council, whose phone number is on posters being distributed, has received calls reporting that store owners have received demands about closing Friday.

"We are telling our people to tell merchants that 'it is up to you whether you

close or not.' We're not demanding, but requesting the stores be closed," the council spokesman said.

The Council of Churches of Greater Washington has requested businesses to allow employes time to participate in "memorial services and other appropriate observances."

But the Board of Trade has taken an officially neutral stand on the issue.

COUNCIL DECREES KING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEMORIAL FRIDAY

(By Sidney Lippman)

The District City Council voted unanimously today to declare Friday, April 4, a holiday for most city employes in commemoration of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., a year ago.

The action came after about 150 members of the D.C. Statehood Committee repeatedly disrupted the council meeting, demanding that the step be taken.

After the vote, Rev. Douglas Moore, chairman of the committee, demanded a clarification of the vote. Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn said the city government would take whatever steps it could to let employes off, although he said he wasn't certain of the extent of the City Council's powers.

The Civil Service Commission said no decision has been reached on whether to declare Friday a holiday for Federal employes here, but a meeting was scheduled for later today on the matter.

The Board of Trade said it would wait to hear if the downtown department stores will close before deciding whether to urge all its members to close. But major department stores have not yet made decisions about closing by noon.

Mr. Hahn said the council has the authority to grant administrative leave to city employes, but he didn't know if the council could influence private employers to close.

The chaotic meeting began an hour and 15 minutes late after the Statehood Committee members repeatedly interrupted with chants, bongo drum playing and rhythmic clapping.

The council finally entered its chambers at 11:15 and agreed to hear spokesmen of the group. After representatives had spoken, the council went on to other matters.

After 15 minutes of other business, the drums, applause and chants started up again.

"You're rapping (talking) on things that are going to happen in 1970, or next May. I'm telling you there isn't going to be any May after April 4. We're going to move. You're going to deal with us right now; right now," said a young man who seized the microphone.

When Chairman Hahn tried to proceed with other business, the noise started up once again.

"The only thing white people understand is violence," said a young black girl who stepped to the microphone.

"You are going to stand up and say 'that's the only way you know how to act.' But that's the only way you listen.

"You will listen after April 4," she said.

The Council had called the police Civil Disturbance Unit to tell protestors to remove their red and black flag. When they didn't, CDU members backed off and stood at the door.

"We refuse to remove the symbol of black humanity and the blood we have shed," said the Rev. Douglas Moore.

"We're going to stay here until Tarzan (Chairman Gilbert Hahn) and that City Council come out," Rev. Moore shouted at 10:30 a.m. when the City Council had failed to appear for its 10 a.m. meeting.

He said he called Mr. Hahn "Tarzan" because "all those white folks think they're going to lead us out of the jungle."

Councilman Joseph Yeldell talked briefly with the Rev. Mr. Moore but was shouted down. "Henceforth, we say nothing to Joe Yeldell," the Rev. Mr. Moore declared.

When asked if the Council would come out to meet with the people, Councilman Yeldell shrugged.

Meanwhile, the demonstrators, many of them wearing Afro haircuts, chanted "freedom" and danced in the Council chambers. Several carried signs saying: "The Man Gave You Monday. Are You Man Enough to Take Friday, April 4, in Memory of Martin?"

"This Council acted in minutes when our beloved President died and declared a holiday," Rev. Moore said. "We want a holiday April 4. We want no more and no less."

Many of the group wore red and black sashes symbolizing D.C. Statehood Committee.

The Rev. Moore said that the Council allowed Alexandria residents in its chambers last year carrying signs that said "Shoot Looters." He said the Statehood Committee flag had just as much right in the Council chambers as such signs.

However, the City Council entered the chambers at 11:15 a.m., an hour and 15 minutes late, and agreed to hear the people before taking up regular Council business.

After Councilman Rev. Jerry Moore Jr. said an opening prayer, the Rev. Douglas Moore (no relation) of the D.C. Statehood Committee said another, to the cheers of blacks in the audience. He eulogized Dr. King, who, he said, died so that garbage men might be free and blacks might "get off the plantations."

He warned the Council: "Don't misread the signs of the time."

When Chairman Hahn Jr. next said Corporation Counsel Charles Duncan had indicated the Council's powers "are unclear" over proclaiming Friday a holiday, the audience hooted in response, and an unidentified speaker read a section of the revised city ordinance, which he said gives the Council that authority.

Sammy Abbott, of the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis, told Mr. Hahn and fellow whites on the council that "how white men can sit up here surrounded by 75 per cent black population and say the majority don't have the right, then you should hide your head under your arms and sneak off."

Mr. Abbott, who is white, said "when the trouble comes the black population in D.C. once again in motion is not going to distinguish between me and you, Mr. Hahn."

He warned that the council "is going to have to respond to institutional racism," and assailed three city officials—Thomas Airis, director of the Highways and Traffic Department; Lt. Col. Sam Starobin, city liaison from the Army Corps of Engineers, and Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher for allegedly selling out the city to the suburbs—and said the Emergency Committee was joining "in this and every other movement to get responsive action from the council and we're throwing the gauntlet down."

Rev. Walter Fauntroy, former city councilman and member of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said the SCLC will recommend that individual store owners make up their minds about closing.

"The closing was not our idea and is not significant enough for us to take a stand," he said.

But Rev. Channing E. Phillips, president of Housing Development Corp. and District Democratic National Committeeman, said, "Closing would be a wise thing to do in understanding the sentiment of the community."

Asked about the importance of lost pre-Easter sales, he replied, "It depends on where your values are."

The Metropolitan Community Aid Council is organizing Friday rallies in Meridian Hill Park, Dupont Circle and a park at 48th-st and Deane-av ne. District schools will hold special events on April 3, the day before spring vacation.

Washington churches will be asked to hold services at 6:04 p.m. Friday, a SCLC spokesman said, and a morning memorial service is being planned by the D.C. Council of Churches and the Baptist Ministers' Conference.

A Jewish "freedom Seder" will be celebrated at the Rev. Mr. Phillips' Lincoln Memorial Temple on Friday evening.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the great honor of my life is to have personally known Dwight David Eisenhower.

Honesty, integrity, devotion to God and country, decency, courage—all describe our 34th President. He was the personification of all that is good and moral in America, and his countrymen responded manifold. He was a hero, a friend, a leader of the highest order.

Few men in our history have been so highly honored or so dearly loved by his people. Few in our history have so richly deserved it.

When America was provoked into war, he led the way to the swiftest victory possible, commanding the largest military machine the world has ever seen or may ever see again. But he remained a man of peace. General Eisenhower's words, spoken 14 years ago in Vermont, not only reflect his deep conviction and dedication to peace, but are particularly relevant to the world today. He said:

> We merely want to live in peace with all the world, to trade with them, to commune with them, to learn from their culture as they may learn from ours, so that our sons may stay at home, the products of our toil may be used for our schools, and our roads and our churches, and not for the guns and planes and tanks and ships of war.

A military man himself, he warned upon leaving the Presidency against "the acquisition of unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex."

We cannot and, as he would have quickly affirmed, should not turn to the past except to learn from it. But one cannot help harboring the wistful desire for a world less fraught with tensions and turmoil, as represented by the Eisenhower years of the Presidency.

Dwight David Eisenhower will live on as an inspiration to future generations of Americans. The ideals for which he stood seem, in these days of national unrest, to reflect a simpler and more serene America. But these are the ideals that have always taken America through her most trying moments in history. They will be needed again and again in the future.

To the Eisenhower family, we express our heartfelt sympathy. To Dwight David Eisenhower, our eternal thanks and gratitude. Now committed to the ages, he can now take his rightful place in history as one of our greatest sons.

INCARNATE WORD SISTERS PLAN 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert into the RECORD some of the history of one of the greatest colleges in the United States, Incarnate Word College of San Antonio, Tex., on the occasion of the college's 100th anniversary: This college has contributed talent and consequently wealth and progress to our community and Nation.

The material referred to follows:

INCARNATE WORD SISTERS PLAN 100TH ANNIVERSARY

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—One hundred years ago today three determined French Roman Catholic Sisters, Srs. Madeleine, St. Pierre, and Agnes alighted from a stagecoach in frontier San Antonio, the last stop in a dusty, three-week trip from the Gulf coast town of Galveston.

San Antonio in 1869 must have been slightly overpowering to the three Frenchwomen. Not only was it remote from their idyllic French convent of the Incarnate Word in Lyons, founded in the 17th century, but they spoke little English, the building which was to have been their convent-hospital had burned to the ground three days before their arrival, and the city was suffering from the most serious cholera epidemic in years.

But Sisters Madeleine, St. Pierre, and Agnes did not leave their homeland, cross a continent for missionary nursing work because, as a poet said, 'they were made of sugar candy.' In fact, these three were selected by Claude M. Dubuis, then Catholic Bishop of Texas, to leave their hospital work in Galveston to build a similar institution in San Antonio, the city's first civilian hospital.

The Sisters were short of food, money, and a working English vocabulary—everything, that is, except the courage and stubborn determination to do, with faith, what could never have been done without it.

The challenges of that first day were to become old friends for the next two decades, and even with success challenges continued through the first century.

Those three nuns, without proper convent or hospital building, rolled up their flowing sleeves and prepared to build a hospital, and a legacy. They founded a congregation now called the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word which, in 1969, consists of over 1100 nuns in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Missouri, Illinois, Mexico, Peru, and Ireland.

By December 3, 1869 the three foundresses, thanks to the generous support of Texans drawn to their magnetic dedication "to serve, not to be served," had completed their first goal. Santa Rosa Infirmary was opened.

Today that same hospital, the Santa Rosa Medical Center, continues to grow with San Antonio, having become one of the largest in Texas and the third largest Catholic hospital complex in the United States. And that was only the beginning.

The Sisters' today have three provinces (San Antonio, St. Louis, and Mexico) and operate 82 institutions or "houses," including fifteen hospitals, fifty-four schools, five homes, and eight community and Christian doctrine centers. The Congregation also owns and operates one college, Incarnate Word College, founded in 1881 and now fully accredited by fourteen agencies to grant the bachelor's degree in 29 fields and the master's degree in five.

In San Antonio the superior general of the order, Sister Calixta Garvey, recently announced plans for the Congregation's centennial celebration, July 20 through 26. Once the major celebration is held at the San Antonio Motherhouse, institutions in other cities will follow suit.

By happy accident, the official opening of the Centennial Week coincides with the day and time the first American astronaut is scheduled to step out of the LEM and onto the surface of the moon—1:00 p.m., July 20, 1969.

The week opens with a vast, three-hour open house at the Motherhouse with tours, exhibits depicting the history of the Congregation, and progress made in the three provinces. In the late afternoon a Mass of Thanksgiving will be concelebrated at San Antonio's new Theatre of the Performing Arts in the Convention Center by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey of San Antonio and bishops from dioceses where members of the order are serving.

Sister Clare Eileen Craddock, born and raised in New Orleans and professor of French at Incarnate Word College, serves as chairwoman of the Centennial Committee.

"Much of the week," Sister Clare Eileen said, "will be devoted to the Sisters. This is their week."

In addition to the opening Mass, three other Masses will be held during the week for friends and benefactors, deceased members of the congregation, and for the order's jubilarians. There will also be cook-outs, picnics, movies, talent shows, and other entertainment for the large gathering of Sisters.

A major highlight of the week will be three evening performances by the Lutheran New World Sacred Chorus of St. Louis, directed by Professor Robert Bergt of Concordia Lutheran Seminary. Two of the concerts will be for the guests of the congregation and the third is open to the general public.

Looking back on the first century of her order, the superior general, Sister Calixta, said that she "stands in wonder at the success of our Congregation which has grown from three to over 1100."

"This could not have happened," she continued, "without Divine help . . . and the glorious faith and courage of the founding women."

Sister Calixta stressed once again that the Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word is "here to serve, not to be served."

She also indicated that her order, like the Church and Society, was in the midst of a transitional period. It is a new challenge, not unlike the challenges of the previous century, and "we get great courage from looking back on those who went before us."

As she begins to lead her order into its second century, the superior general affirmed her belief in the permanency of the religious life, saying that the future will see an expansion of the congregation's work in education, hospital and health services, and social work in the inner city apostolate.

"We have an open attitude," Sister Calixta concluded, "(which is) to try to serve as best we can the needs of the day. We are not afraid!"

GENERAL STATISTICS OF THE SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD

The Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word consists of 1,121 Roman Catholic sisters with its Motherhouse and General Administration here in San Antonio. Mother Calixta Garvey is presently the Mother General of the entire Congregation.

The Congregation is divided into three main provinces, each with a provincial house or provincialate governing that area. They are: San Antonio, St. Louis, and Mexico.

Under the San Antonio province is the Congregation's first foreign mission (October, 1964) located in Chimbote, Peru. There are six sisters working there. In 1966 another six began hospital work under the Peruvian government at a hospital for the police and their dependents. Another member of the Congregation, Sister Charles Marie Frank, is project administrator for project HOPE in Lima.

There are 82 houses in the Congregation. A "house," in our terms, is any institution operated by the sisters. It may be a school, hospital, orphanage, or community center. The following tabulation shows the diversity of work carried on by the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word:

Province	Total houses	Schools	Hospitals	Homes	Others
San Antonio (Texas and Louisiana)	34	24	4	1	4
St. Louis (part of Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Illinois)	27	18	4	3	2
Mexico	21	11	7	1	2
Total	82	54	15	5	8

Note: These figures include the Santa Rosa Medical Center in San Antonio, the 3d largest Catholic hospital complex in the United States. The Santa Rosa was San Antonio's 1st hospital and was the prime goal of the sisters when they arrived in San Antonio in April of 1869.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS—SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD CENTENNIAL WEEK, JULY 20–26, 1969

SUNDAY, JULY 20

1:00–4:00 p.m.: Open House, Reception, and Exhibit of Campus.

5:00 p.m.: Mass of Thanksgiving—Theater, Convention Center.

7:00 p.m.: Social Hour and Dinner for Special Guests—Marian Hall.

MONDAY, JULY 21—SISTERS' DAY

Special Community celebration honoring all our Sisters.

TUESDAY, JULY 22

10:00 a.m.: Mass for friends and benefactors—Motherhouse Chapel.

8:00 p.m.: New World Sacred Chorus of St. Louis—College Auditorium.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23

10:00 a.m.: Mass for deceased members of the Congregation—Motherhouse Chapel.

6:00 p.m.: "Cook-Out" at the Pool.

8:00 p.m.: New World Sacred Chorus of St. Louis.

THURSDAY, JULY 24

10:00 a.m.: Demonstration of Liturgical Singing—College Auditorium.

12:00: Box lunch.

FRIDAY, JULY 25

4:00 p.m.: Greeting and Program for Jubilarians—Marian Hall.

7:30 p.m.: Movie—College Auditorium.

SATURDAY, JULY 26

8:30 a.m.: Mass for Jubilarians.

11:30 a.m.: Jubilee Dinner.

5:00 p.m.: Picnic Supper at the Pool

7:30 p.m.: Sisters' Program—College Auditorium.

CENTENNIAL SYMBOL: SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD

Important: A modern fleur-de-lis, the centennial symbol depicts the French origin of the Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word. The three-pronged stem which cradles the flame symbolizes the three provinces of which the congregation is composed. The darting tongue of fire issuing upward bears testimony to the spiritual and intellectual illumination imparted by its edu-

cational institutions, as well as the warmth and care extended in the hospitals, the homes for children, and the social welfare centers of the congregation. The flame also symbolizes the vitality and inspiration which have guided the work of the congregation during its one hundred years of service and which hopefully will continue to distinguish its service to God and man.

INSTITUTIONS OPERATED BY SISTERS OF CHARITY OF THE INCARNATE WORD

TEXAS

Amarillo

St. Mary's Academy, 1112 Washington Street; Sr. Mary Wilbert Boul, Superior.

St. Anthony's Hospital, Sr. Lucy Glass, Superior.

Corpus Christi

Spohn Hospital, 1436 Third Street; Sr. Mary Digna, Superior.

Our Lady of Perpetual Help School, 5805 S. Padre Is. Dr.; Sr. Mary Joseph Smyth, Superior.

Dallas

St. Joseph Home for Girls, 901 S. Madison; Sr. Mary Achille Bugnitz, Superior.

Dunne Memorial Home for Boys, 1825 W. Davis Street; Sr. Nadine Luebbert, Superior.

Our Lady of Perpetual Help School, 7625 Cortland; Sr. Albeus Hartigan, Superior.

Del Rio

Our Lady of Guadalupe School, 603 Cuellar Street; Sr. Clara O'Driscoll, Superior.

Sacred Heart Academy, 209 East Greenwood; Sr. Honoria Keenaghan, Superior.

Eagle Pass

Our Lady of Refuge School, 577 Washington Street; Sr. Baptista Doyle, Superior.

El Paso

St. Margaret Home, 491 St. Matthew St.; Sr. Amabilis O'Byrne, Superior.

Our Lady of Mt. Carmel School, 9070 Alamede Ave.; Sr. Josette Eveler, Superior.

Our Lady of the Valley School, 8620 Winchester Place; Sr. Mary Leonard McGuire, Superior.

Fort Worth

St. Joseph's Hospital, 1401 S. Main; Sr. Mary James Whelan, Superior.

All Saints School, 2022 N. Houston; Sr. Florita Lee, Superior.

Holy Family School, 5617 Locke; Sr. Denise Smith, Superior.

Kerrville

Notre Dame School, 925 Main Street; Sr. Anna Teresa Hussey, Superior.

Lubbock

St. Elizabeth School, 2312 Broadway; Sr. Joseph Francis Geever, Superior.

Marfa

St. Mary's School, Box 1028; Sr. Bernadette Forck, Superior.

Pampa

St. Vincent de Paul School, 2320 N. Hobart St.; Sr. Alice Marie Holden, Superior.

Paris

St. Joseph's Hospital; Sr. Mary Cornelia O'Leary, Superior.

Pharr

(Parish work) Sisters Ma. Felisa Cardona and Julia Villegas, 215 North Aster Street.

San Angelo

Sacred Heart School, Box 5287; St. Frances Therese Philippus, Superior.

Holy Angels School, 2315 A&M Avenue; Sr. Mary Imelda Moriarity, Superior.

St. John's Hospital, Box 1191; Sr. Monika Schonberger, Superior.

San Antonio

St. John's Convent (Santa Rosa Medical Center); Sr. Margaret Mary Curry, Superior.

Incarnate Word Convent, 4515 Broadway; Sr. Clare Eileen Craddock, Superior.

Incarnate Word High School, 727 E. Hildebrand; Sr. Teresa Connors, Superior.

St. Joseph's Convent (senior Sisters) 847 E. Hildebrand; Sr. Clementia Carey, Superior.

Incarnate Word College, 4301 Broadway; Sr. Alacoque Power, Superior.

Our Lady of Guadalupe School, 1401 El Paso St.; Sr. Brigid Conlon, Superior.

St. Ann's School, 1334 W. Ashby; Sr. Marian Jordan, Superior.

St. Cecilia's School, 118 Lowell; Sr. Philomena Birmingham, Superior.

St. Mary Magdalen School, 1701 Alametos St., Sr. Mary Regis Byrne, Superior.

St. Patrick's School, 518 Mason St.; Sr. Ernestine Lalor, Superior.

St. Peter-St. Joseph Home, 919 Mission Rd., Sr. Margaret Mary Mannion, Superior.

St. Philip's School, 134 E. Lambert St., Sr. Timothy Muldowney, Superior.

Espada Mission, Rt. 12, Box 178; Srs. Pacifica Scallan and Mariana Gutierrez.

St. Peter's School, 112 Marcia Place; Sr. Annette Smiley, Superior.

Seguin

St. Joseph's School, 510 S. Austin St.; Sr. Bernardine Coyne, Superior.

Our Lady of Guadalupe School, 402 E. College St., Sr. Janet Marie Monsalvo, Superior.

Stockdale

St. Ann's School—Kosciusko, Box 77, Rt. 2; Sr. Edith Louise Pastore, Superior.

Windthorst

St. Mary's School; Sr. Alpheus Murphy, Superior.

LOUISIANA

Metairie

Archbishop Chapelle High School, 2651 Montana; Sr. Mary Mercy Fitzpatrick, Superior.

St. Catherine of Siena School, 400 Codifer; Sr. Brigid Marie Clarke, Superior.

OKLAHOMA

McAlester

St. Mary's Hospital, 628 East Creek Ave., Sr. Mary Alyce Odneal, Superior.

ILLINOIS

Cahokia

St. Catherine Laboure School, 1820 Jerone Lane; Sr. Mary Gerard Forck, Superior.

Cicero

St. Frances of Rome School, 1400 S. Austin Blvd.; Sr. Mary Pezold, Superior.

MISSOURI

Cadet

St. Joachim's School, Rt. 1, Box 253; Sr. Rosita Hyland, Superior.

Chesterfield

Incarnate Word Convent, 13416 Olive Blvd., Srs. Theodore Holden and Jane Frances McGrail.

Florissant

S. Dismas School, 2585 Steeplechase Lane; Sr. Rose Mary Politte, Superior.

Jefferson City

St. Francis Xavier School, Rt. 3, Box 98; Sr. Edna Marie Green, Superior.

Immaculate Conception School, 429 Clark Avenue; Sr. Joan Cecilia Moran, Superior.

Potosi

St. James School, 101 Hickory Street; Sr. Laura McGowan, Superior.

St. Louis

St. Anselm Convent, 12828 Oakstone Lane; Srs. Helen Ann Collier and Alice Marie Rothernick.

St. Sebastian School, 9920 Glen Owen Drive; Sr. Janette Fuchs, Superior.

Incarnate Word Hospital, 1640 South Grand Blvd., Sr. Juliann Murphy, Superior.

Incarnate Word Convent, 2800 Normandy Drive; Sr. Stephen Marie Glennon, Provincial Superior.

Blessed Sacrament School, 5021 Northland Avenue; Sr. Eileen Friel, Superior.

Incarnate Word Academy, 2800 Normandy Drive; Sr. Agnes Ditenhafer, Superior.

(Ireland, Peru, and Mexico not included on this list.)

WEAPONS AND ANTIWEAPONS

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is now confronted by the tragic decision of President Nixon to proceed with the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system—a project of spurious military, political, and economic value. The misguided nature of this decision to continue to proliferate weapons and antiweapons is well exposed in an article by I. F. Stone in the March 27, 1969, issue of the New York Review of Books. The article is as follows:

NIXON AND THE ARMS RACE: HOW MUCH IS "SUFFICIENCY"?

(By I. F. Stone)

The annals of the Nixon Administration, in so far as arms are concerned, must begin, like the Gospel of John, with The Word. But Nixon has changed The Word at the very outset.

In the campaign it was "superiority." At his first press conference this was changed to "sufficiency." The two words seem to move in different directions. One implies an endless arms race. The other seems to promise that at some point we will have enough.

The real meaning of the shift is difficult to evaluate because it came, not in any formal and considered pronouncement, but in an offhand reply to an unexpected question. The correspondent, Edward P. Morgan of the Public Broadcasting Laboratory, long one of the few liberal voices on the air, is not the man the Nixon team would have chosen for a planted question. The meaning of the exchange is further obscured because it involved a double error, on Morgan's part and on Nixon's. Morgan wrongly attributed the idea of "sufficiency" to Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Nixon's chief assistant on foreign policy and national security. Nixon not only assumed that Morgan was correct but briskly and cheerfully accepted the idea. The result seemed to be a reversal of all Nixon had said in the campaign.

The question was framed, like so many reportorial questions, in such a way as to indicate the desired answer and clearly disclosed Morgan's own bias against the arms race. One would think the very wording would have put Nixon on guard. This is the full text of Morgan's question, from the official transcript:

"Q. Back to nuclear weapons, Mr. President. Both you and Secretary Laird have stressed, quite hard, the need for superiority over the Soviet Union. But what is the real meaning of that in view of the fact that both sides have more than enough already to destroy each other, and how do you distinguish the validity of that stance and the argument of Dr. Kissinger for what he calls 'sufficiency?' "

Nobody can say that was not a leading question. In a courtroom Nixon's counsel would have objected to it at once as loaded and the objection would have been sustained. But Nixon waded right in. The answer, too, merits examination in full text:

"A. Here, again, I think the semantics may offer an inappropriate approach to the problem. I would say that with regard to Dr. Kissinger's suggestion of sufficiency, that that

would meet, certainly, my guideline, and I think Secretary Laird's guideline, with regard to superiority.

"Let me put it this way: when we talk about parity, I think we should recognize that wars occur, usually, when each side believes it has a chance to win. Therefore, parity does not necessarily assure that a war may not occur. By the same token, when we talk about superiority, that may have a detrimental effect on the other side in giving great impetus to its own arms race."

Nixon then went on to define what he considers sufficiency.

"Our objective in this Administration, and this is a matter which we are going to discuss at the Pentagon this afternoon, and that will be the subject of a major discussion in the National Security Council within the month—our objective is to be sure that the United States has sufficient military power to defend our interests and to maintain the commitments which this Administration determines are in the interest of the United States around the world.

"I think 'sufficiency' is a better term, actually, than either 'superiority' or 'parity.'"

This is the same Nixon who, only three months earlier, had said America's defenses were "close to peril point" and that we were in "a security gap" which by 1970 or 1971 could become a "survival gap." "I intend," Nixon said at that time [1] "to restore our objective of clear-cut military superiority."

The organ of the Air Force Association, the most powerful component of the military-industrial complex, in a pre-inaugural editorial had noted with satisfaction Nixon's commitment to superiority and to "the role of technology in maintaining such superiority." If the new Administration," it said,[2] "is willing to put its money where its mouth is in national defense, some welcome changes are in the offing." Could it be that an entirely new gap was opening—a Nixon gap, between the campaigner and the President?

II

Where did Morgan pick up the term "sufficiency" and how is it that the new President was so ready to adopt it? We know the answer to neither question. Morgan later admitted he was in error in attributing it to Dr. Kissinger. It is true that in a symposium by the Brookings Institution, Dr. Kissinger—writing before his White House appointment—rebutted the "superiority" concept on which Mr. Nixon campaigned. He wrote: [3]

"Throughout history, military power was considered the ultimate recourse. Statesmen treated the acquisition of additional power as an obvious and paramount objective. . . . The nuclear age has destroyed this traditional measure. . . . No foreseeable force-level—*not even full-scale ballistic missile defenses* [italics added]—can prevent levels of damage eclipsing those of the two world wars. . . . The paradox of contemporary military strength is that a gargantuan increase in power has eroded its relationship to policy. . . . The capacity to destroy is difficult to translate into a plausible threat even against countries with no capacity for retaliation. . . . Slogans like 'superiority,' 'parity,' 'assured destruction,' compete unencumbered by clear definition of their operational military significance, much less a consensus on their political implications.

Similar views were expressed by Nixon's new science adviser, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, in an interview with *The New York Times*, last December 17, when he said:

"If it is a contest in which we have 1,000 hydrogen warheads and the Russians have 900, is that good or bad? Or should we have 1500 to their 900? Or are they going to get 1500 and we only have 1,000? It is an impossible race to see the end of, or to see the validity of, and it is terribly important to find a way of getting out of the rat race of nuclear build-ups *and nuclear defense build-ups* [italics added]."

Neither Dr. Kissinger nor Dr. DuBridge actually used the term "sufficiency." The President may possibly have seen it in an advance copy, perhaps even a special private draft, of a new report prepared by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This was "cleared" before its release with a prestigious panel which included former Secretary of Defense McNamara, General Matthew B. Ridgway, USA ret., and Major General James McCormack, USAF, ret., all of whom allowed their names to appear in connection with it.[4]

This report was prepared by Dr. George W. Rathjens of MIT, formerly with the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and before that, with the Institute for Defense Analyses. In it Dr. Rathjens said, with no dissent from this panel, "The strategic forces of both sides are too large. Thus, as far as deterrence is concerned, the point has certainly been passed by now where both sides have 'sufficiency'—probably a more useful concept for describing the present strategic balance than either 'superiority' or 'parity.'"

Actually the term "sufficiency" was first used in the context of the nuclear arms race thirteen years ago. There is irony in its origin. It was first used by Eisenhower's Air Force Secretary, Donald A. Quarles, during the 1956 presidential campaign. In a speech on August 4 of that year, Mr. Quarles, though he was talking to the Air Force Association, had the courage to say, "There comes a time in the course of increasing our airpower when we must make a determination of sufficiency. . . . There is no occasion in this audience to labor the point that the buildup of atomic power in the hands of two opposed alliances of nations makes total war an unthinkable catastrophe for both sides."

What he then said of planes applies equally today to missiles and antimissiles. "Neither side," he said, "can hope by a mere margin of superiority in airplanes or other means of delivery of atomic weapons to escape catastrophe . . . even if there is a wide disparity between the offensive *or* defensive [italics added] strengths of the opposing forces." The irony is that the Quarles speech was delivered to counter the "bomber gap" campaign then being waged against the Republicans by the Air Force lobby with the enthusiastic support of the Democrats, like the "security gap" campaign waged by Nixon last year.[5]

"Sufficiency" was the Eisenhower Administration theme in fighting off the demands for higher defense spending from the military and its industrial allies. Is Nixon, faced with budgetary problems and an unstable dollar, coming back to it now? That is the question which will soon be answered by his decision on the anti-ballistic missile and by the results of the review he has ordered of the military budget, which is due the latter part of March.

The shift from "superiority" to "sufficiency" may prove to mean little or nothing. But the shift, even if only semantic, offers new leverage to the peace movement. For it raises the question of how much armaments is enough, and it raises it on the highest level and in the broadest forum. When the new President himself adopts the term "sufficiency," he invites public discussion of the military budget in the simplest and most graphic terms. How much is enough? If Secretary Laird has his way, the budget review will find present military appropriations insufficient. Perhaps the peace movement ought to set up a public hearing board of its own to take testimony from experts on this problem of "sufficiency" and publish both the testimony and the final report. In what follows we will try to give a preliminary sketch of the military monster.

III

The real word for America's nuclear arsenal is not sufficiency but lunacy. When the Rathjens report says "the strategic forces of both sides are too large," that is the understatement of the millennium. Briefly, we have 3½ times as many nuclear warheads as the Soviet Union, and ten times as many as we need—not just to "deter" but to destroy it. The first figure is from Clark Clifford's final posture statement on the fiscal 1970 budget (p. 42) last January 15, This says we can launch 4200 warheads with our ICBMs, Polaris submarines, and bombers, while the Soviet Union can launch 1200. The second figure is from a table (at p. 57) of McNamara's final posture statement for the fiscal 1969 budget dated January 22 of last year. This for the first time gave figures on the number of 1-megaton warheads (one Megaton=1,000,000 tons of TNT) needed to wreck the Soviet Union. The *maximum* is 400.

As McNamara explains, "further increments would not meaningfully change the amount of damage because we would be bringing smaller and smaller cities under attack." McNamara figures this would kill 74 million people, or more than three times the total Soviet losses in World War II, and destroy 76 percent of Soviet industry. Give or take any reasonable number for error, this is no longer war as man has ever known it before but instant cremation. Seventy-four million people will be "only" 30 percent of the Soviet population in 1972, the year to which this table is projected. But a footnote (at p. 52) of an earlier McNamara posture statement in January 1967 still applies to these estimates of lethality. The footnote explains that they cover only "prompt" deaths from blast and fallout—"they do not include deaths resulting from fire, storms, disease, and general disruption of everyday life." So add to the immediate deaths any number for the slow, and then ask yourself again how much is enough? What is sufficiency?

The assumption behind these computations is as distant from human realities as the numbers. Never has so much precision been attached to so much spurious rationality. The assumption is that war is a kind of game on which nations embark after consulting a computer to see who would come out ahead. Not the least dangerous aspect of our war machine is that it is based on so fallacious a theory as to why and how wars occur. Starting from so abstract and mechanistic an axiom, the planners have developed a series of corollaries which seem designed to confuse not only us but even our computers.

The first corollary is that if it looks to the attacker as if the damage to himself in any war would be "unacceptable," he will be "deterred." The second corollary is that the way to confront your enemy with "unacceptable" damage is to have an "assured destruction capability" which you can impose on him in a "second strike" of retaliation if he attacks first. The third is that to do this you need a nuclear arsenal which is so large and so invulnerable that the enemy cannot destroy it—or enough of it—in a first strike to save himself from destruction in return. The fourth and final corollary is that you have to keep building more and better weapons to be sure of maintaining that second-strike capacity. This is what keeps the nuclear rat race going. Those who work within the military bureaucracy are doomed to serve its purposes. The proliferation of doctrine furthers the proliferation of armaments. The finely spun concepts of deterrence and second strike give a rational appearance to an essentially irrational process, the mindless multiplication of weaponry.

The arms race is based on an optimistic view of technology and a pessimistic view of man. It assumes there is no limit to the ingenuity of science and no limit to the deviltry of human beings. Thus so-called "conservative" military planning assumes the best of the enemy's laboratories and the worst of his intentions. It seeks to ensure

Footnotes at end of article.

against all possible contingencies, like an insurance salesman selling protection against the possibility of blizzards in the tropics.

The proliferating corollaries of deterrence having conditioned us to mega-weapons and mega-deaths, the sheer numbers of nuclear weaponry no longer surprise us. They numb and comfort. When Clifford reports that we have 4200 deliverable warheads as compared with the Soviets' 1200, we are instinctively cheered to hear that we are so far "ahead." No one any longer asks where they would be "delivered" or how many times we might find ourselves killing the same peasant woman and her cow. Such talk is "old hat." It is hard to realize that less than a decade has passed since a one-time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff like General Maxwell Taylor could argue that 200 missiles would be a sufficient minimum deterrent. It is odd to be reminded by General LeMay himself in his new book [6] that "as few as 17 large-yield Soviet ICBMs could severely damage the 17 densely populated urban complexes in the United States that contain over one-third of our population."

By the same calculation, three large-yield US ICBMs could destroy Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev while thirty much smaller ones could wreck the Soviet Union's thirty other cities with a population of 500,000 or more. Surely this should be enough deterrence. LeMay himself proceeds by a series of splendid non sequiturs to prove that this means we need more missiles! He goes on to say, "The Soviets have 40 ICBMs for each US urban complex. The US, on the other hand, to cover some 175 dispersed Soviet cities, would need 7,000 missiles to provide the same ratio of 40 per target. Yet we plan to have only 1,054 from now on." If one large-yield Soviet ICBM is enough to damage severely a whole US urban complex, why do they need 40? And why do we need 40 each for every one of 175 Soviet cities, though 175 gets us down to places like Kirovsk, half the size of Hiroshima (about 100,000) which we destroyed with a "primitive" A-bomb so small (less than 20 kilotons) we no longer consider that size a strategic weapon?

IV

Our 4200 warheads average out to adopt LeMay's standard—to twenty-four each for those 175 Soviet cities. But apparently this is insufficient. We are on the verge of expanding the number of warheads eightfold, and soon after, ten- or twelvefold. A table appended to McNamara's last posture statement (p. 214) shows that during the eight years in which he presided over the Defense Department we spent over $68 billion on our strategic forces.[7] And now we are told, in effect, by McNamara himself that it is not enough![8] Our weapons have to be MIRVed.

The acronym stands for Multiple Independently Targeted Reentry Vehicle. The subject has long been a deep secret. It was first described publicly by Secretary McNamara when he said in his final posture statement on January 22 of last year, "Now, in the late 1960s, because the Soviet Union *might* [the italics were McNamara's] deploy extensive ABM defenses, we are making some very important changes in our strategic missile forces. Instead of a single large warhead, our missiles are now being designed to carry several small warheads and penetration aids, because it is the number of warheads, or objects which appear to be warheads [i.e., the so-called "penetration aids"—IFS] to the defender's radars, that will determine the outcome in a contest with an ABM defense."

Last August, sixteen MIRVs were tested successfully for the first time in an ICBM, the Minuteman, and in an underwater ballistic missile, the Poseidon, which will replace Polaris. A vast expansion in the number of our warheads is now under way. McNamara's final budget set in motion the conversion of 31 of our present 41 Polaris-carrying submarines into carriers of Poseidon. The remaining 10 are of a type it would be too expensive to convert; it would be cheaper to replace them with new Poseidon submarines. The number of warheads the Poseidons can carry is still classified. The number generally given is 10 warheads per missile, though I have been told by one informed source that the Poseidon can carry as many as 14.

Each Polaris sub now carries 16 Polaris missiles, or a total for the fleet of 656 missiles, each with one warhead. But as Poseidons replace the Polaris on 31 ships—with a total of 496 missiles—and if each Poseidon missile can carry 10 warheads, that is a total of 4,960 wardheads. In addition we are replacing Minuteman I and Minuteman II, our main intercontinental ballistic missiles, with Minuteman III, which will also be MIRVed. Again the figures are classified but it is generally believed that each Minuteman III will carry three warheads.

In his final posture statement McNamara projected for the period 1969–73 a nuclear missile force made up of:

Minutemen	1,000
Poseidons	496
Polaris	160
Titans	54
Total	1,710

This was the same size as our nuclear missile force last September when we estimated our own nuclear long-range missile force at 1,710 and the Soviet's at 945. But MIRVed up, this would become, in warheads:

	Warheads
Minutemen	3,000
Poseidons	4,960
Polaris	160
Titans	54
Total	8,174

This would change the disparity in nuclear missile warheads from less than 2-to-1 in our favor (1710 to 945) to almost 9-to-1 (8,174 to 945). It would mean we could aim several of our missiles at each one of theirs, threatening a possible first strike. To see how this expansion of nuclear power must look to the other side we need only read a passage in Clark Clifford's final posture statement last January, and substitute US where he said Soviets. "It is quite evident." Clifford wrote, "that if the Soviets achieve greater accuracy with their ICBMs, together with a MIRV capability, our land-based strategic missiles will become increasingly vulnerable to a first strike."

V

The most alarming aspect of this vast expansion of American striking power, as seen from the other side, must be the fact that it is accompanied by a new propaganda campaign designed to make the US feel insecure—to sell the idea that all this still is not enough. A new numbers game is being played similar to the ones which accompanied the bomber- and missile-gap campaigns. Its principal spokesman is the man Nixon picked to be Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird. Through him and its multifarious lesser mouthpieces, the military-industrial complex is trying to make it appear that new "gaps" are developing, one in strategic offensive power, the other in antiballistic missiles, and that these threaten to change the balance of power, and to create what Nixon in the campaign melodramatically called a "survival gap," a phrase he may regret if he should now seek to hold the military budget down.

This new campaign focuses first of all on the sharp increase in the number of Soviet ICBMs in recent years. The latest US intelligence estimates, as given by Clifford in January, credit the Soviet Union with a steep increase in ICBMs in the last two years: from 250 in mid-1966 to 570 in mid-1967 to 900 in September, 1968, as compared with the 1,054 ICBMs we have had since we decided to freeze their numbers at that level in November 1964.

It is possible that by next fall the Soviets will actually have more ICBMs than we do. By focusing simplistically just on these numbers, a new wave of near-hysteria may be whipped up. But ICBMs are not the only component of the strategic forces. And numbers are not the only thing that counts. The cryptic remark with which Clifford followed this revelation is a good starting point for assessing the realities. "We have been anticipating for some time," Clifford reported, "a Soviet deployment of a solid-fuel ICBM. We now believe the deployment of such a missile has started, although at a relatively slow rate." These quiet words light up an extraordinary technological missile gap in our favor. Liquid-fuel missiles are obsolete. They take about fifteen minutes to load, and they are so full of valves and controls, the chances of a misfire are high. The solid-fuel missile can be fired in less than a minute. We have only 54 liquid-fuel ICBMs left in our arsenal, the huge Titans, still useful as big city-killers though vulnerable to a first strike. We began to phase out the liquid-fuel Atlas and to deploy the solid-fuel Minuteman as far back as the autumn of 1962. It is startling to learn that we only now "believe," in Clifford's words, that the Soviets have begun to deploy a solid-fuel missile of their own, though "at a relatively slow rate." "Their new solid-fuel ICBM," Clifford added, "appears to be no better than our earliest Minuteman missiles, first deployed in fiscal 1963." Fiscal 1963 began July 1, 1962. US intelligence estimates of Soviet power are not given to understatement. If that is the best the intelligence men can say, the lag is serious indeed.

The fact is that during the past six years we have not only replaced all our liquid-fuel Atlases with solid-fuel Minutemen but introduced two new and improved models of Minuteman; the missile industry, like the automobile, believes that the way to maintain sales is to get the customer to trade in his old car every few years for a new model. Our present force consists of 600 Minuteman Is and 400 Minuteman IIs, and the Minuteman III—with MIRV, i.e., multiple warheads—is already being phased in.[9]

To go from Minteman I to Minuteman III, as we have seen, is to increase the number of warheads by at least three for the same number of missiles. Even the Senate group closest to the Pentagon in outlook, the Preparedness Subcommittee of Senate Armed Services under the chairmanship of Stennis, said in its report last September 27: [10]

"Instead of an increase in numbers of missile launches, we have planned to meet the greater and still growing Soviet threat by qualitative improvements such as *Poseidon, Minuteman III, MIRVs,* increased accuracy, penetration aids and silo hardening. *The Joint Chiefs themselves have not recommended a quantitative increase in missiles to meet the current threat* [emphasis added]."

The numbers game is discounted on this more sophisticated level of discussion. What the Joint Chiefs ask, says the Stennis report, is not more missiles but "the phasing in of an advanced ICBM, which they believe would provide for the modernization [a lovely word, in two or three years a missile model is already "ancient"—IFS] of the force while increasing our total missile throw weight. Technical improvements which the Joint Chiefs foresee include better warhead design and increased reliability, survivability, penetrability and accuracy." What the Stennis report might have added but doesn't—the Pentagon does not like to mention the subject—is that more "throw weight" would presumably make it possible for the new ICBM to carry more warheads than Minute-

Footnotes at end of article.

man III, further multiplying our striking power.

If we MIRV, the Soviets will eventually MIRV their missiles, too. In the letter submitting his report to the full Armed Services Committee, Senator Stennis says, "of major importance in the strategic nuclear field, are the apparently well documented press reports that the Soviets have flown a multiple re-entry vehicle. This compounds our concern. . . ." But these "press reports" apparently were not "well documented" enough to be confirmed in this year's posture statement. In any case we are several years ahead in this technological breakthrough and have already begun to deploy Poseidon and Minuteman IIIs.

Lest it stupefy the reader, we will touch only in passing on two other components of the nuclear equation in strategic offensive forces which the new numbers game omits—the intercontinental bomber (we have 646, or four times the Soviet fleet of 150) and the underwater missiles carried by nuclear submarine. We have 656 missiles (in process of being MIRVed, as we have seen, into ten times as many warheads) as against the Soviets' 45. When all these numbers and the technological factors are added in, the imbalance is so great that it makes talk of a new missile gap—even if the Soviets pass us in the number of ICBMs—a colossal deception. The gap in our favor is enormous.

Much the same holds true of the strategic defensive. It is true that the Russians have already built some elements of an anti-ballistic missile system around one city, Moscow, while we have yet to deploy our Sentinel at all. But their ABM system is already obsolete, and it would be to America's advantage if the Russians wasted scarce resources in deploying it. "Their Galosh ABM system," Clifford reported in January, "resembles in certain important respects the Nike-Zeus system which we abandoned years ago because of its limited effectiveness." It is the same system Eisenhower wisely vetoed when the Joint Chiefs recommended its deployment in 1959. Even the Stennis report (p. 10) says "the fact that it has not been deployed at other cities probably indicates that Soviet officials have reservations about its effectiveness."

Perhaps they are at last readier to learn from our experience than the present advocates of the Sentinel ABM system in this country. "Had we produced and deployed the Nike-Zeus system [which Galosh resembles] proposed by the Army at an estimated cost of $13 to $14 billion," Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance told a Senate inquiry [11] two years ago, "most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced almost before it became operational, by the new missiles and radars of the Nike–X system. *By the same token, other technological developments in offensive forces over the next . . .* [deleted by Pentagon censor] *years make obsolete or drastically degrade the Nike–X* [Sentinel] *system as presently envisioned* [italics added]."

Even here our planned ABM program is many times the size of the Soviets'. They are wasting money putting an already obsolete system around one city. We are on the verge—if we go ahead with Sentinel—of wasting many times that amount by deploying a soon-to-be-obsolete "thin" ABM system big enough to give a dubious "area defense" to the whole country and "point defense" to more than a dozen cities. Even in folly, we may insist on being "ahead."

VI

Even before the Russians finish deploying Galosh around *one* city, we are preparing a further expansion of striking power big enough to overwhelm a much more extensive and up-to-date Soviet ABM when and if they deploy one. Such is the endless see-saw of the nuclear arms race.

In any discussion of "sufficiency" it is essential to take a close look at what our military think sufficient. To see the dimensions of the expansion projected for the next four years it is necessary to go back to McNamara's final posture statement of last year and read the section entitled "Capability Against the 'Highest Expected Threat' in the NIE." The NIE stands for the National Intelligence Estimates. These are agreed upon by the US Intelligence Board (of twelve separate intelligence agencies, no less!). The Board provides a range of estimates as to Soviet power in the next few years. A McNamara footnote explains (p. 57) that the "highest expected threat" is actually higher than anyone really expects, since this "is actually composed of the upper range of NIE projections for *each* [italics in original] element of the Soviets' strategic forces." That is, strategic missiles, missile-armed submarines, and bombers. "In many cases," the footnote continues, "these represent alternatives and it is highly unlikely that all elements would ever reach the top end of the quantitative range simultaneously. Therefore, the 'highest expected threat' is really a greater threat than that projected in the NIE."

With that in mind, the reader may be prepared more fully to grasp the stupendous multiplication of our retaliatory power sketched by McNamara when he says:

"Even if the Soviet strategic forces by 1972 reach the higher end of the range of estimates [these are classified–IFS] projected in the latest NIEs and even if they were to assign their entire available missile force to attacks on our strategic forces (reserving only refire missiles and bomber-delivered weapons for urban targets), about one-half of our forces programmed for 1972 would survive and remain effective."

Then McNamara says:

"If the Soviets expand the Moscow ABM defense and deploy the same or a similar system around other cities at the highest rate projected [again the figures are classified–IFS] in the latest NIEs, about three-quarters of our surviving weapons would detonate over their targets."

Apparently—though McNamara does not say so explicitly—some 1600 1-Megaton warheads could under those circumstances reach their target. That is four times the 400 1-Megaton warheads we mentioned earlier as enough to wreck the Soviet Union. Here McNamara inserts the table to which we earlier referred. It purports to show Soviet population and industry destroyed in such an attack in 1972, assuming a total Soviet population of 247 million, of whom 116 million would be urban. This is the horrendous table: [12]

Warheads (in megatons)	Fatalities		Industrial capacity destroyed, percent
	Millions	Percent	
100	37	15	59
200	52	21	72
400	74	30	76
800	96	39	77
1,200	109	44	77
1,600	116	47	77

We see in that table that even if only 100 warheads got through it would destroy 59 percent of Soviet industry and kill 50 percent more people in one blow than the Nazis did in the four years of World War II. If the Soviet Union published a table of this kind we would accuse them of trying to terrorize us into giving up the nuclear arms race altogether.[13]

As if to pile horror on horror, McNamara added: "Even if the Soviets deploy a substantial number of [additional] ABM interceptors by 1972 our strategic missile forces alone could still destroy more than two-fifths of their total population (more than 100 million people) and over three-quarters of their industrial capacity." What an arsenal we must be building up!

McNamara goes on to explain that "these results, of course, reflect the decisions we have taken in recent years to enhance the the future capabilities of our 'Assured Destruction' forces." These, he says, include (1) the replacement of Polaris by Poseidon with MIRVs; (2) improved missile penetration aids, i.e., chaff and decoys to confuse the radars which set in motion the other side's ABMs; (3) an increase in the planned number of Minuteman III ICBMs with MIRVs; (4) development of new small re-entry vehicles "to increase substantially the number of warheads or penetration aids which can be carried by a single missile"; and (5) "The development and production of SRAMs for our strategic bombers." This last is an acronym for Short Range Attack Missiles. These would enable our intercontinental bombers to stop short of Soviet bomber defenses and fire nuclear missiles into Soviet territory.

In addition to the SRAM, the Air Force has begun a campaign for a new weapon system called SCAD (see *The New York Times*, February 5). These add a new horror to our alphabetical military nightmares. SCAD stands for Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy. These are small pilotless but nuclear armed aircraft which could be launched from a carrier plane toward enemy targets from beyond the Soviet Union's defense perimeter. One enthusiastic planner was quoted as saying, "SCAD does for bombers what the multiple warhead does for missiles—it makes the enemy's defense problem virtually impossible." It would take a new and larger intercontinental bomber to carry SCADs, and this is what the Air Force hopes for. The cost, of course, will be in the billions.

In the meantime SCAD is one of ten "Advanced Development Projects" for which Clifford asked almost a quarter billion dollars in additional research and development funds in the new fiscal 1970 budget. One of these is a new ABM to succeed Sentinel and a new "Underseas Long-Range Missile System" in case Soviet anti-submarine capability becomes a threat to Polaris and Poseidon. Another is an Ocean Engineering project which may take us one step further toward the new idea of hiding ICBMs under the ocean floor. The armed forces also have not yet given up the idea of using the MOL (the Manned Orbital Laboratory) as a step toward weapons in space, despite an international treaty against it. This, dear reader, only skims the surface of what is on the drawing boards and in the laboratories; we have only touched the highlights of the unclassified material on strategic weapons. We have not even touched the plans in the works for counter-insurgency, which promises new Vietnams, or such goodies as new bacteriological and chemical weapons.

For the military, there will never be "sufficiency."

VII

I would like to make three grave observations in conclusion.

(1) With MIRV, we are entering a new period of darkness. What I mean is this. The U–2 and the SAMOS satellite dissipated the missile gap nonsense because we could actually see and count how many ICBMs the other side had. There is no way to see from afar, or to be sure, just how many MIRVs there are on each missile. This may bring us back to that atmosphere of panicky conjecture and exaggeration so useful to the arms lobby and the military.

(2) The deployment of an ABM will make each side fearful lest the other venture a first strike, calculating that the ABM, if improved sufficiently and buttressed by fallout and blast shelters, may cut down casualties to an "acceptable" level. Each side will become more fearful of adventurism on the other.

(3) MIRVs open a new era in the arms race, and raise the threat of a first-strike capacity. If one side can, by MIRVs, obtain, let us say, a tenfold advantage over the other, it may

Footnotes at end of article.

have enough to destroy the other's missiles—or think it has. This will take the balance out of the "balance of terror."

McNamara implies that the MIRV was developed as an answer-in-advance to a Soviet ABM. But there is evidence that MIRV was first developed to provide capacity for a first or preemptive strike. At last year's Senate hearings on the fiscal 1969 military budget, Senator Mansfield put a series of questions to Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., whom Laird has retained as the Pentagon's Director of Research and Engineering. These have gone almost unnoticed but deserve close attention. Question No. 10 asked, "Is it not true that the US response to the discovery that the Soviets had made an initial deployment of an ABM system around Moscow and possibly elsewhere was to develop the MIRV system for Minuteman and Polaris?" The unexpected answer was: [14]

"Not entirely. The MIRV concept was originally generated to increase our targeting capability rather than to penetrate ABM defenses. In 1961–62 planning for targeting the Minuteman force it was found that total number of aim points exceeded the number of Minuteman missiles. By splitting up the payload of a single missile [deleted] each [deleted] could be programmed [deleted] allowing us to cover these targets with [deleted] fewer missiles. [Deleted.] MIRV was originally born to implement the payload split-up [deleted]. It was found that the previously generated MIRV concept could equally well be used against ABM [deleted]."

In 1961–62 our strategic force was far greater than the Soviet Union's. If we then sought a MIRV in order to cover more aim points, this could only have been for a counterforce or preemptive strategy. That was the time when McNamara, as shown by his famous Ann Arbor speech of June 16, 1962, was moving in that direction. "For a short time," General LeMay says in his new book (p. 269), "I thought we had convinced Mr. McNamara, but I soon learned how wrong we were. To be successful, such a counterforce strategy requires a clear nuclear superiority because it takes more than one missile to destroy another." MIRV, by increasing the number of warheads manyfold (Dr. Foster admitted to Mansfield), might soon give us in the neighborhood of 10,000 warheads, in place of our present 1700 or so single-headed missiles.

At present the US has three strategic forces, each of which is big enough to strike a mortal blow at the Soviet Union even if the other two were destroyed in a first strike. If we add SCADs to our bombers and MIRVs to the Minuteman and to the nuclear submarine (Poseidon), we will have what must begin to look from the other side, with its present level of forces, like three separate strategic forces, *each with a first-strike capacity*. The MIRV is incomparably more unsettling to "the balance of terror" than the ABM. The MIRV is the Great Leap Forward of the nuclear arms race. McNamara put it very quietly in this colloquy before the House Appropriations Committee hearings last year on the 1969 military budget: [15]

"Mr. Mahon [D. Tex., chairman of the committee]: I am concerned lest the Soviet Union make some kind of "quantum jump" in the development of their strategic forces. . . . Is it your view that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union in the next few years will come up with an entirely new weapon which will outmode present weapons?

"Secretary McNamara: I think it extremely unlikely. There will be continued development in such weapons. The true significance of more recent developments are obscured somewhat by the fact that they did not involve as dramatic a *physical* [italics added] change as took place between the bomber and the missile. I, myself, do not agree with your statement that there are not changes going on today as important in terms of strategic capability as those that occurred between the bomber and the missile. *The fact is that the destruction capability between the Atlas and the Poseidon or between the Atlas and Minuteman III, in my opinion, was substantially more than between the B–52* [our last intercontinental bomber] *and the Atlas* [our first intercontinental missile]. [The emphasis is added.]"

Such are the incredible dimensions projected for our military machine. Unless some new agreement puts an end to the endless spiral and proliferation of new weapons and anti-weapons, it will devour an ever increasing share of the material and scientific resources on both sides and make war, should it come, many times more destructive. When Nixon accepted "sufficiency" instead of "superiority," suspended work on the Sentinel ABM and ordered a review of the defense budget, sent the nuclear nonproliferation treaty to the Senate and declared his intention to hold missile talks with the Russians, he began to stir hopes which run counter to everything he said in the campaign. Has he the resolution, even if he should want to, to confront the Pentagon and its formidable allies, including his own Secretary of Defense? Or will all this fizzle out into a tactical and temporary retreat to disarm the strongest wave of opposition the country has yet seen to military spending and the ABM? We should know the answer soon with Nixon's decision on the Sentinel and his review of the defense budget.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Nixon's "Security Gap" speech, CBS, October 24, 1968.

[2] *Air Force and Space Digest,* February 1969, which was prepared before the Inaugural.

[3] *Agenda for the Nation,* Doubleday, 632 pp., $3.50.

[4] *The Future of the Strategic Arms Race: Options for the 1970s* by George W. Rathjens, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, 1969, $.60. This was released two days after the Nixon press conference. The Carnegie Endowment called attention to the fact that its pamphlet had also advocated "sufficiency."

[5] Quarles, now dead, was the object of constant denigration by Joseph Alsop, the main journalistic purveyor of this nightmare and of its successor, the "missile gap." On April 24, 1959, Alsop attacked Quarles as "Mr. Missile Gap," when Alsop feared Quarles might become Secretary of Defense.

[6] *America Is in Danger,* by General Curtis E. LeMay, Funk & Wagnalls, 1968, 352 pp., $5.95, p. 88.

[7] For the morbid, it is worth adding that despite this vast nuclear arsenal we also allocated more than $190 billion to our general purpose forces during the same eight years. The total assigned in those eight years to "defense" (surely it deserves quotation marks in this context) was more than $500 billion or half a trillion dollars!

[8] At the same time McNamara warned, "'superiority' is of little significance. For even with . . . any 'superiority' realistically attainable, the blunt, inescapable fact remains that the Soviet Union could still effectively destroy the United States, even after absorbing the full weight of an American first strike . . . Under these circumstances, surely it makes sense for us both to try to halt the momentum of the arms race which is causing vast expenditures on both sides and promises no increase in security" (pp. 52–53, final posture statement, 1969 budget). In a similar vein Clifford warned in his final posture statement for fiscal 1970 (p. 49), "We stand on the eve of a new round in the armaments race with the Soviet Union, a race which will contribute nothing to the real security of either side while increasing substantially the already great defense burdens of both." No such sentiments have ever been expressed by their successor, whose book, *America's Strategy Gap: A House Divided,* Regnery, 1962, 180 pp., $4.95, is a Goldwaterite "better dead than Red" manifesto.

[9] *Status of US Strategic Power. A Report by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee,* 90th Congress, 2nd Session, September 27, 1968, p. 11.

[10] *Ibid.,* pp. 11–12.

[11] *US Armament and Disarmament Problems. Hearings before the* [Gore] *Subcommittee on Disarmament of Senate Foreign Relations,* February 3 to March 3, 1967, 90th Congress, First Session, p. 58.

[12] Underline in original because, as McNamara explains, "beyond 400 . . . would not meaningfully change the amount of damage."

[13] A more than adequate substitute is provided—with majestic objectivity—by McNamara himself in a table on p. 64 showing the number of fatalities on both sides in the event of an "all-out strategic exchange" in the mid-1970s. This shows that even if the US built up offensive and defensive forces to a maximum so-called Posture B, including an anti-missile defense, which he says would probably end by costing $40 billion, the Soviets, by a maximum program of their own, adding MIRVs and penetration aids, plus 550 mobile ICBMs, could kill 90 million Americans even if we struck first! Mobile ICBMs, constantly moving around on vehicles, would be almost impossible for an enemy to target.

[14] *Senate Appropriations Committee Hearings on the Department of Defense Budget for Fiscal 1969,* 90th Congress, 2nd Session, Part 4, p. 2310. All the deletions are in the original, as made by the Pentagon's censors.

[15] *Op. cit.,* Part 1, pp. 251–2.

See footnotes at end of table.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored, as I am saddened, to share in these farewells to a friend, for it is as a wise and deeply respected friend to his countrymen that General Eisenhower will be remembered.

He was, in the long reach of mankind's years, a unique instrument of international cooperation and a national symbol of unity. But it is not of these achievements in themselves of which I would speak. The quality to which I wish to pay tribute was his active devotion to the moral principles upon which our country was founded, through which he became great, and to which it must return if it is to survive. To the extent that we compromise or abandon those principles on whatever pretext we court destruction, both personal and national, and to the extent that we sustain them, we will achieve the order, the peace, and the liberty we pride above all else.

General Eisenhower knew this and never ceased to live by it; through all the human contacts and experiences and events of his crowded days he was guided by that honesty of purpose.

It is the living example of a richly rewarding life, a life in which the satisfactions far outweighed the disappointments and the life guided by reverence by things we cannot see, for which we shall be eternally grateful.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we allow few "great" men to walk among us. In all but rare instances, that is an adjective we reserve until the finality of death permits us to safely sum up a man's life and decide whether it will be bestowed.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was one of those rare great men permitted to wear that mantle in his lifetime. He did so with grace, humanity, and restraint.

He was a simple man in the best sense of that word who seemed to live a life filled with contradiction.

He was a great soldier, but a President who was a peacemaker. He made momentous decisions, but sometimes appeared to make none. He was a statesman who unified the Nation, but who confessed humbly his ineptitude in politics.

But the contradictions of his life were not to be found in the man. They arose naturally from the great variety of responsibilities he assumed. They were enhanced because the man did not vary with the role.

Whatever his undertaking, he applied the same principles, of duty, dedication, honesty, and humanity.

As a general he led history's most massive assemblage of men and weaponry to free the continent of Europe from tyranny.

As a President he maintained peace on a warlike globe for 8 years and presided over a world which history may credit with renouncing great wars.

He was a soldier who never permitted himself to cease cherishing human values.

He once said:

The only thing I can bring to the White House is the values that a man thinks are important.

No man could bring more.

He left us with a restatement of those simple values in words spoken to his wife on his deathbed.

He said:

I've always loved my wife. I've always loved my children. I've always loved my grandchildren and I've always loved my country.

In a confusing and complicated world people have not always understood the depth of those simple values and all they imply. But they have always recognized intuitively how well Mr. Eisenhower understood them.

People have always responded with affection and trust.

Even after he retired to Gettysburg every American President sought out his advice and counsel whenever a great issue required national unity and bipartisan support. For they knew that with Mr. Eisenhower's approval came the confidence and trust of millions of Americans.

Mr. Eisenhower claimed often that he did not understand politics. Yet, as commander of the Allied forces in Europe during World War II he welded brilliant military men from diverse backgrounds and with diverse ambitions to achieve the most ambitious military undertaking in history.

As President, this man who claimed not to understand politics unified for 8 years a nation weary from war and social change.

It was those same qualities of humanity and tolerance and an outstanding ability to work with others to enlist their trust and cooperation that enabled him to do so.

During those 8 years of peace and stability he worked with quiet strength to maintain the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He gave permanence to a sweeping foreign aid program and offered Americans a new, mature approach to relations with the Communist nations, an attitude whose wisdom and realism we have not yet fully grasped.

He preserved and maintained these institutions for the future often in spite of formidable and determined opposition without bombast or personal recrimination.

He did so with a quiet strength and resolve that often belied the deep inner conflicts which must have enveloped him.

It was his simplicity of motive and purpose that always came through that won him such great rapport with the American people.

And, in turn it was the trust and affection of the American people which provided him with the strength to prevail.

More than any President in modern times, he exemplified the qualities that we like to claim as truly American.

He once said:

I came from the heart of America.

He was referring to the broad expanse of Kansas countryside in which he grew up.

I believe historians will conclude the truth of that statement rests only partially in geography.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Kentucky, which is generally known as the heart of Appalachia, are truly anguished by the departure from the national scene of a great military hero and a great leader in line with the tradition of great leaders of our country.

Dwight David Eisenhower will not be known in eastern Kentucky because of any bricks or mortar erected in his memory, in any bridges or roads constructed during his era of leadership, in any tangible public works or economic development, but Dwight David Eisenhower will be remembered in the hearts of every eastern Kentuckian for what to me is worth far more. Our departed general and great President will be remembered by us for the strength of spirit with which he gave Kentuckians and all Americans, for a renewed faith in our democratic principles, in our Christian heritage and in the noble task which confronts America.

Few Americans have given so unselfishly of their total lives in public service and dedication and I am pleased to rise today with my colleagues—pleased and greatly honored to have this opportunity to speak what I believe to be in the hearts of every one of my constituents.

B'NAI B'RITH HONORS SIMMS

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mr. B. F. Simms, received the B'nai B'rith Humanitarian Award for his work with alcoholics. Those who have been chosen for this distinguished honor have consistently been marked by their significant and selfless service to humanity, and this year's honoree is a distinguished addition to their number.

In tribute to Mr. Simms, I include the account of the award ceremony, as reported in the Birmingham News, in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

SIMMS IS NAMED WINNER OF HUMANITARIAN AWARD

(By Ben Hogan)

Mankind's humanitarians, someone once said, are divided into two groups—those who make headlines and those who work.

For 25 years—until Wednesday night at Fairmont Club when he was named winner of B'nai B'rith's 10th annual Humanitarian Award—B. F. Simms was a member of the latter group.

There is little material for headlines in aiding an alcoholic at Birmingham City Jail in the early hours of the morning.

As district supervisor of Alabama Vocational Rehabilitation Service and an ordained Methodist minister, Simms, 65, has never sought headlines.

What he has sought is a reward few people seem to understand: The self-satisfaction, he says, that comes from aiding a person who's down and out.

Formerly a worker for the blind, Simms of late has devoted his seven-day-a-week efforts to alcoholics. All types of drinkers have received his advice and companionship—the 16-year-old experimenter, the ragged wino, the country club drunkard.

Aided by crutches since a misfortune took one of his legs years ago, Simms understandably is especially sympathetic with physically handicapped persons who have become alcoholics.

According to a spokesman for The Birmingham Parliamentary Law Club, which nominated him for the award, "He speaks of these outcasts . . . as 'some of the very sweetest people I've ever met'."

And Simms doesn't wait for them to meet him. He goes to them, making twice weekly—or more—trips to area courts and jails, often at times such as 3 a.m.

A native of Roanoke and holder of advanced theology degrees from Emory University and Northwestern University, Simms also is active in youth and church work, teaching Sunday School at First Methodist Church of Birmingham.

He was chosen for his award from a list of more than 20 persons active in church, welfare and charity causes.

NO QUARTER TO PRINCES OF POLLUTION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the thought of seeing our rivers and lakes turned into open sewers is a frightening one to all Americans. Oil pollution has been turning our beaches into wildlife graveyards. There must be an end to the wretched ugliness and acid pollution caused by strip mining. A time has come for controls to prevent thermal pollution and the intolerable agony caused by noise pollution. A time is here for an end to unlimited use of pesticides, such as DDT, which are poisoning the air we breathe.

Millions of Americans are apprehensive over the mounting menace posed by a combination of these factors, which are unhinging our world's ecology. A time has arrived for plain speaking, naming of names, and an end to puerile, nonsensical excuses from those responsible. We must take advantage of these cures technologically available. The "princes of pollution," who arrogantly allow these acts to be perpetrated in their name, must be stopped.

Major segments of the American business, commercial, and industrial community are endangering the lives of scores of millions now living and hundreds of millions yet unborn. How? By pouring industrial wastes and raw sewage into streams, lakes, and ponds. By raping natural resources, then moving on, unmindful of damage they have wrought. By building and constructing without considering effects of their efforts.

We are in need of drastic action. Time grows short, for nature will turn on all of us if a balance is not restored.

When auto manufacturers say they cannot control auto pollution, or their products are not major causes of air pollution, we wonder. When metal producers claim they are not really able to control dumping of industrial wastes into major bodies of water, we wonder. When a coal company strip mines on a hillside, leaving it as a raw gash on our land, without attempts at restoration, we wonder. When a community dumps raw sewage into a river, without thought, we wonder.

The list is endless, Mr. Speaker, and we are almost out of time. We possess a finite amount of clean air, water, and usable land area. If we unhinge nature's balance, abusing these gifts, nature will take a terrible revenge on our lives and those of our children in days to come.

Do we not remember the great natural disasters which have been visited upon man whenever he has abused his environment? Is the Dust Bowl forgotten or floods resulting from poor land use and abuse of farmland?

One word of praise is in order here for the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hickel. I was among those who had my doubts when he was nominated. So far, he has done a creditable job, taking several forthright stands.

In my own State of New York we see on all sides the result of this pollution. Lake Erie is, as I have said, an open sewer. So are many parts of the Hudson River. Thermal pollution is emerging in many areas as the rush for atomic power proceeds apace. Noise pollution at our airports is high now and growing intolerable, and we now face the menace of the SST. Our cities are covered by a haze of carbon monoxide, and entire populations are in danger because of this growing menace. A time has come to act, and we must not await natural disaster to make us take preventive action.

Studies have been piled on studies. Technological solutions are available. The "princes of pollution" know who they are and what their companies and municipalities are doing. If there is not civic, municipal, or corporate responsibility, there must be Federal action.

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I urge with all the sincerity at my command that our distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, reverse reported Army plans to delete mention of God in its training and guidance programs.

I was shocked and amazed that the Army was planning to buckle in to a few protestors and eliminate God from the early training of our soldiers. Should this order stand, it would only be a matter of time before our chaplains and chapels throughout all branches of our Armed Forces would be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a nation under God. In our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, we find "One Nation under God." The House of Representatives has here above the Speaker's rostrum in gold letters, "In God We Trust." "In God We Trust" is on our currency. As a nation we grew up with a firm belief in Bible reading, prayer, and a belief in God. This has been the foundation of our strength.

The American Legion is our largest veterans' organization—a great organization of men who served all over the world in four world wars for the cause of freedom. It was chartered by Congress in 1919 and the motto of the Legion is "For God and Country." Mr. Speaker, are we to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Legion by prohibiting God from our military training and manuals? God is synonomous with liberty, individual dignity, morality, truth, purity, and "justice for all." Should we eliminate God from our Armed Forces, our culture, our education, our government, our courts, and our parliamentary system, America would crumble to dust and our great Nation perish forever from the face of the earth. Mr. Speaker, before it is too late, let us rise up and reverse this trend which would leave our Nation helpless and hopeless.

ITALIANS IN BIRMINGHAM

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Theresa Aguglia Beavers, an instructor at Hewitt-Trussville High School, is preparing a master's thesis on the history of the Italians in Birmingham. Included in the March issue of the Chamber of Commerce's magazine, Birmingham, is an excerpt from that thesis entitled, "Success Through Opportunity" in which the author observes that through three generations of hard work, enterprise, and acceptance some 25,000 Italians have a stake in the growth of Birmingham.

The article follows and I commend it to my colleagues.

SUCCESS THROUGH OPPORTUNITY

Italian settlement in Birmingham will always serve as a reminder of the early days when Italian immigrant labor helped to develop the natural resources that made Birmingham a leading industrial city in the South. As time passed, Italians contributed to the development of commerce, and brought in trades such as shoe repairing, barbering, tailoring, and stonemasonry. They have been a responsible, hard working group, property owners, with a stake in the growth of Birmingham. They have added to the spiritual facilities of Birmingham, and in their cultural activities have supplied a diversity to a city population more homogeneous than in other sections of the country. Today, there is no longer an Italian colony, separate from the American community. The descendants of pioneer Italian settlers have successfully incorporated themselves into Birmingham life.

The industrial expansion of the United States in the early years of this century brought an unprecedented number of immigrants from Europe. Over five million came from Italy between 1920 and 1967. The peak years of Italian immigration, 1900 to 1920, saw over three million arrive. Out of this number, few came South. Italian immigrants never numbered more than a few thousand in the Birmingham area at any one time.

Birmingham was a relatively young town in 1900 when Italian immigrants first came in substantial numbers. Most of them were from the sugar and cotton plantations near New Orleans, where they had originally landed. They heard of better jobs available in the coal mines and steel mills of Birmingham, spread the word to friends and relatives in home villages, and soon others arrived to join them.

The majority of Birmingham Italians came from Sicily. Italian immigration did not represent a cross-section of the Italian people, but rather groups of settlers from a particular village. In Birmingham, many settlers came originally from Bisacquino, Sutera, and Castelvetrano, farming towns within the province of Palermo.

Emigration from Sicily was heavy because of extreme conditions of poverty. Italy had only become politically united in 1870, and the problem of improving conditions in the south of Italy continues to the present day. Agriculture was the sole means of livelihood. The mass of people worked as agricultural laborers on the estates of absentee landlords. There was little hope of improving their condition, except through emigration.

Most of the immigrants were illiterate and looked upon as an undesirable type. Several characteristics of the Italian immigrants

helped them win success and respect. These were a reputation for hard work, self-sacrifice, and thriftiness. The early immigrant remained in isolation from the American community. The main contacts with Americans came at places of work, and these contacts were not always friendly ones.

The primary interests of the Italian immigrants remained centered in their families and association with friends from the same village. The close relationship which characterized Sicilian family life helped the immigrants achieve stability in a time of crisis. They settled near their places of work. Thus, the original Italian settlements in Birmingham were located at Thomas, around the Republic Steel Company, in Ensley, near the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company steel mill, and later in East Lake, where a group of immigrants started a truck farming community. Other Italian settlements were in outlying coal mining areas such as Bessemer, Pratt City, and Blocton.

The Italian immigrants soon pushed ahead to better employment by saving money to get enough capital to go into business for themselves and to buy property.

This drive for independence led to fields of work more congenial to Italian talents and experience. They established small grocery stores, and went into truck farming. These eventually led to the predominance of the Italian in the wholesale produce market, and the retail and wholesale grocery business, fields in which the descendants of Italian settlers are still prominent. Many of them helped each other when obstacles were met in establishing businesses due to prejudice and fear of Italian competition.

The Italian societies formed in the early years of settlement acted as representatives of the Italian colony. They organized many parades associated with patriotic celebrations. One such was the celebration of the anniversary of the unification of Italy on September 20, 1870. This later gave way to the celebration of Columbus Day, which continues to the present time. At these occasions, which featured picnics and speeches, civic leaders of Birmingham took part as guest speakers.

Italians had a need for their own church. They could not understand English, and they wanted the celebration of feast days and the veneration of saints as practiced in their home villages. Early in the century, the Catholic Church realized it was losing many Italian immigrants. Some were converted to Protestant faiths, but a greater number were drifting away from any church membership. Priests especially trained to help the Italian immigrant were recruited to counteract this situation.

In 1904, a young Italian priest, Father Canepa, arrived in the Birmingham district to minister to the spiritual needs of the Italian population. Under his direction three Italian churches were built. The first one was St. Mark's, located in Thomas, founded in 1905. This was the first Italian church in the South outside of New Orleans. St. Joseph's was founded in 1913 in Ensley, followed by the establishment of St. John's in East Lake in 1923. In the years before World War I, Presbyterian, Baptists, and Methodists were active in attempting to convert Italians in Birmingham. They met with minor success. The majority of Italian immigrants remained within the Catholic Church.

A particular problem for the Italian immigrant in Birmingham was the presence of the Negro. Italians did not have any historical prejudice against the Negro. They worked with them in the coal mines and steel mills. In some of the company housing quarters, Italians and Negroes were housed together. In others, there was separation into three groups, the native born, Negroes, and Italians, implying the Italians were not a separate nationality, but a separate race. Italians were thus regarded as little better than Negroes in status. When Italians established small grocery stores, they were in Negro neighborhoods. This was a field which the Italians had to themselves. They were not in competition with native storekeepers. They profited from this economic opportunity, although association with the Negro lowered the Italian in the eyes of the native community.

By 1930 the Italians were the most numerous of the foreign born in Birmingham. They numbered 1,418, which together with their children, gave the Italian colony an estimated population of 15,000. Cultural activities played a larger part in their lives, once the initial struggle to make a living had been achieved. The first big cultural event of the Italians in Birmingham was an Italian art exhibit, held in the public library of Birmingham in 1931. This was carried out with the cooperation of the Italian government, which sent valuable paintings and other artistic artifacts. The money needed to stage the exhibit was raised by the Italian colony, and also donated by leading citizens of Birmingham. The exhibit was a great success. One result was the exhibit of the Kress collection, sent down in 1933. Several paintings from this collection were donated to Birmingham, forming the nucleus of a collection which boosted the eventual founding of the Birmingham Art Museum.

During the twenties and thirties, Italian clubs and associations of various kinds were numerous. The Italian immigrant was still a relatively distinct element in the Birmingham community. This separation continued well into the second generation. Social clubs were formed by the younger generation, but the members were predominantly of Italian parentage. During this period, there was an increasing number of second generation graduates in the public schools, and others going to local colleges. Education was important in the immigrants' plans for their children. They had experienced the frustrations and humiliations that went with illiteracy. Many Italians of the second generation moved to better neighborhoods as their conditions improved. There were neighborhoods where Italians were not wanted. Discrimination was practiced through refusals to sell and restrictive clauses in real estate deeds. Ironically, many of the developers of this housing had originally bought the land from Italians.

The twenties and thirties also saw a drive to Americanize the immigrant. There was increased agitation to restrict immigration, particularly from Italy. Immigration legislation, passed in 1921 and 1924, enacted discriminatory quotas against the emigrants from Italy. The continued slurs on the Italian nationality caused the immigrants to organize in self-defense. Political clubs were formed to protect Italian-American interests. The founding of the Alabama branch of the Order of Sons of Italy in 1931 served to unite Italian-Americans still more.

The Italians also suffered discrimination because of their Catholic affiliation. This was the time of the Ku Klux Klan parades through Birmingham. There is no record of overt violence against Italians, but the parades served as a display of implied hostility. To be an Italian Catholic was sufficient reason to be turned down for a job, or being offered the worst of jobs.

Relations between the Italian community and Birmingham appear to have been generally good. Italian crime was negligible. There was some conflict with the law by Italians who violated prohibition regulations, and kept their stores open after hours. The Italians regarded this as an opportunity to make money, rather than as a crime. They had different attitudes toward selling whiskey and the observance of Sunday than the American community. Italians in Birmingham never suffered the notoriety of Mafia activities. Birmingham was not then considered a big enough town for racketeers, but the Italian community also co-operated in policing themselves.

The Italian government maintained a vigilant watch over the welfare of her emigrants in the early years of settlement. It also attempted to maintain close ties with the American colonies through the thirties. Periodic visits were made by the Italian consul from New Orleans to inspect working conditions of Italians. Mussolini's rise to leadership of Italy brought visits from Italian officials, whose mission it was to explain about the improvements taking place in Italy. Mussolini was supported by most of the immigrants at first, because he was regarded as working to improve conditions in Italy. In so doing, he was raising the prestige of the Italian nation, and with it the self-esteem of Italian immigrants everywhere. The local support of Mussolini started to fall off when Ethiopia was invaded in 1935. From this time to the start of World War II, there was some boycotting of Italian businesses. The Italians became more circumspect in their community activities in order not to aggravate a strained situation. During World War II, many Americans of Italian parentage fought in the American army in the very regions their parents had emigrated from earlier.

Many immigrant leaders of the Italian colony did much to help their countrymen. Father Canepa was one of them. Another was the very able and popular vice-consul in Birmingham, G. A. Firpo. He was vice-consul from 1929 until his death in 1954. Another immigrant leader, still living in Bessemer, is Sam Raine Sr., an example of great success as a businessman and one who helped organize the local branch of the Order of Sons of Italy. Another outstanding leader was Elviro Di Laura, editor of the *Columbus Balboa Review*, a magazine devoted to news of the Italian-American community. His death in 1938 brought an editorial of praise in *The Birmingham News* for his fine work as Italian-American. Mrs. Carmela Anselmo-Antonio, who had a college degree when she came from the old country, helped prepare many Italians for naturalization and formerly taught in the Birmingham city schools.

It is probable the second and third generations of Italian stock in Birmingham have lost identity with their Italian heritage more quickly than in larger cities with crowded Italian settlements. The younger generation, educated, has been able to move up to better jobs and enter the professions Social notices in the newspapers show a number of marriages with non-Italians and even with non-Catholics. Enough time has elapsed to see three generations make a successful adjustment from Italian immigrant to American. The Italian settlement in Birmingham is an example of success in overcoming adversity, a tribute to the innate worth of the immigrants, and an affirmation of the American ideal of success through opportunity.

ROBERT D. CHEW

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Board of County Commissioners, Clark County, Ohio, has forwarded to me a resolution adopted April 1, 1969, in memory of Clark County Commissioner Robert D. Chew, who passed away on that date. Commissioner Chew was a highly respected member of the Springfield community and a devoted and hard-

working public servant. His loss will be felt keenly by the citizens of Clark County, Ohio. As a further token of respect, I submit the resolution of the Clark County, Ohio, commissioners for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CLARK COUNTY, OHIO,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Springfield, Ohio, April 1, 1969.

The following resolution was passed by the Board of Clark County Commissioners under date of April 1st, 1969, viz:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas, on April 1st, 1969, this Commission lost a most valuable member by the death of Mr. Robert D. Chew; and

"Whereas, His devotion to public service, his untiring efforts, his friendliness, his integrity and judgment in the performance of the duties of this office will long be remembered and appreciated by members of both political parties, regardless of race, creed or color;

"Whereas, The members of this Commission and his fellow county officials and associates valued his friendship and counsel, and Mr. Chew's passing is a deeply felt personal loss: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we hereby place on the permanent record of the journal of this Commission this resolution as a token of his services to us and the esteem in which he was held by the people of Clark County; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to his sorrowing family, as an expression of our sympathy in their bereavement."

L. G. RONEMUS.
CARL E. MUMMA.

TRIBUTE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been paid to a very fine man, the late Dwight D. Eisenhower.

On March 30, 1969, Rev. Edgar Henshaw Steedle of the United Church of Christ of Glen Rock, Pa., offered a splendid tribute to General Eisenhower at his church's day service. Because this is a particularly meaningful expression on a truly great man, I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The tribute follows:

TRIBUTE

Dwight David Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States.

What does one say about a man who has served his fellow men so well for so many years?

If you list his accomplishments you must be extremely selective or you will run the risk of rambling on into the night.

If you speak of his personal attributes, and love this man as I have, you may be accused of trying to turn a man into a saint.

If you compare him with other great men of the century you will find that his unique contributions place him beyond the bounds of legitimate comparison.

I can say this, for me, Dwight David Eisenhower lived a life dedicated to the people of the nation into which he was born. He governed his life by principles founded upon eternal values, not upon selfish desires or human expediency.

He set the standard for a good life in his day and exemplified, for generations to come, those things which make a person truly human.

We thank God for the life of Dwight David Eisenhower. He answered God's call to service among his fellow men. He has now answered God's call to eternal life.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER: DUTY, HONOR, COUNTRY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1911, a group of plebes gathered at West Point and one of them many years later said of that occasion:

With the American flag floating majestically above us, we were sworn in as cadets of the U.S. Military Academy. It was an impressive ceremony. As I looked up at our national colors and swore my allegiance, I realized humbly that I now belonged to the flag. It is a moment I have never forgotten.

So spoke Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army and 34th President of these United States. We shall not forget him either.

"Duty, honor, country" is the code of the Cadet Corps at West Point and it was Dwight Eisenhower's code all his life. But this was a man who could also say on his deathbed "I have always loved my wife. I have always loved my children. I have always loved my grandchildren. And I have always loved my country." He was a man who could receive every honor that a military career could offer, lead the largest and most victorious army in the history of the world and at the same time call war a "damnable thing" and express the hope that his military colleagues would eventually find themselves unemployed. He was a man who, as 34th President of the United States, could lead the wealthiest, most technically advanced country in the world and also warn her citizens of a threat to "the very structure of our society" by a military-industrial complex and a "scientific-technological elite." He termed these two threats, very real today, "a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method."

President Eisenhower was a very human and trusting person and so at times made mistakes and was betrayed by some of those in whom he put trust. But the basic decency, honesty, and warmth of the man could never be doubted. He was without doubt one of the most popular Presidents this country ever had. Nor was his popularity limited to this country. "We like Ike" was a worldwide chant in an era when "Ami, Go Home" was much more popular.

President Eisenhower was proud to be an American and in 1953 I think he summed it up perfectly when he said:

The things that make us proud to be Americans are of the soul and spirit. They are not the jewels we wear, or the furs we buy, the house we live in, the standard of living, even, that we have. All these things are wonderful to the esthetic and physical senses. But never let us forget that the deep things than are America are the soul and the spirit. The Statue of Liberty is not tired, and not because it is made of bronze. It is because no matter what happens, here the individual is dignified because he is created in the image of his God.

Dwight David Eisenhower, gone from us now, made us all proud to be Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a personal footnote to the foregoing. When I first became a Member of the House of Representatives on June 6, 1944, I was assigned to the House Committee on Military Affairs. As a member of that committee and in the months of November and December 1944, I had the privilege of joining 16 other members in a visit to our military installations and activities in England; France; Liege, Belgium; Maastricht, Holland and the entire western front. Subsequently, we visited such activities in Italy and the icy cold Italian front, which was then up in the Apennines, south of Bologna. It was while we were in France in 1944 that I first met General Eisenhower. Following that time, it was my pleasure and privilege to meet him on innumerable occasions. He became, as you know, president of Columbia University in New York City and subsequently the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, where I visited him a few times. He was my host in the White House on many occasions during his 8 years as President of the United States. So you see, I have lost a valued friend.

PFC. GEORGE M. GORRERA, JR., KILLED IN ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. George M. Gorrera, Jr., a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE GORRERA DIES IN VIETNAM—MARINE VOLUNTEER ATTENDED ROLAND PARK JUNIOR HIGH

An 18-year-old Baltimorean who enlisted in the Marine Corps has been killed on patrol in Vietnam, according to a Defense Department announcement made yesterday.

Pfc. George M. Gorrera, Jr., of 412 East 27th street, died of rocket fragment wounds received March 20 at Quang Tri.

He had been in action in Vietnam since last June and was scheduled to return home soon, his family said. His recent letters indicated that the fighting and dying had begun to depress him very much.

"He'd write that it was terrible, that people were getting killed day in and day out. He'd write and say another buddy of his was killed," said his sister, Miss Patricia A. Gorrera.

Born in Baltimore, he left the Roland Park Junior High School about January, 1967, to work as a finisher for Samuel Kirk & Son, a jewelry manufacturer. He worked

there until his enlistment a year later at the age of 17.

He was sent to Vietnam as a member of the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Division.

Besides his sister Patricia, Private Gorrera is survived by his mother, Mrs. Wilbert Gover; his father, George M. Gorrera, Sr.; a brother, John W. Gorrera; a half brother, Robert L. Gover; two other sisters, Miss Anna M. Gorrera, and Miss Rosemary Gorrera; two half sisters, Miss Brenda L. Gover and Miss Helen L. Gover, and a grandmother, Mrs. Margaret Hagin, all of Baltimore.

RISKING PEACE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Michael Harrington wrote with perception and courage this week in describing President Nixon's dilemma in Vietnam: We must choose between greater military escalation, with dubious prospects for success, and a coalition arrangement with a substantial risk that a Communist government may ultimately follow:

It is interesting that other writers of quite different political views—like William S. White in a recent column—have come to the same conclusion as Harrington. The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 1, 1969]

VIETNAM: RISK THAT MUST BE TAKEN

(By Michael Harrington)

Richard Nixon must negotiate a peace in Vietnam which will risk a Viet Cong victory. That is, American power must insist that the National Liberation Front participate in the government or in organizing any new elections.

I do not suggest the possibility of a Communist takeover which such a policy entails with any enthusiasm or in the mood of those antiwar demonstrators who carry Viet Cong flags (are some of them, I wonder, government provocateurs sent in to embarrass the peace movement?). It would indeed be tragic if, after a quarter of a century of civil war, the South Vietnamese people were to be subjected to totalitarian dictatorship. But that melancholy possibility has to be faced, particularly since American policy has done so much to promote it.

Ever since 1950, when the French convinced Washington to finance its disastrous attempt to maintain the old order in Indochina the United States has been identified in that country with the colonialist past.

There was a brief period in the early days of Diem, who at least had nationalist credentials, when it seemed possible to build a genuinely democratic, socially progressive nation, particularly since Ho Chi Minh was brutally repressing the peasants in the North (they resisted forced collectivization). But Diem quickly became an unpopular minority ruler, and his police measures drove the opposition, Communist and non-Communist, into military struggle.

From that time to the present, the United States has been trying to put together a regime composed of the old friends of colonialism in Vietnam. So it is that "our" men in Saigon are generals who fought for the French against the freedom of their own homeland. That does not make it difficult to understand why they could not even win a majority in an election which they themselves organized.

It is this sad history which explains why Richard Nixon must feel that he is caught on the horns of a dilemma. The United States cannot win a war in which it has driven the nationalist forces into a united front with the Communists or to a bitter neutralism, and it has to be fearful of a peace which would accurately represent the various political tendencies in Vietnam. For the latter alternative would inevitably subvert the present Saigon regime and quite possibly open the way to a Viet Cong seizure of power.

So the issue really gets down to the question: Will the United States guarantee a peace which will recognize the Viet Cong's right to participate in the political life of South Vietnam?

This is not to say that the Viet Cong would inevitably win a popular mandate or carry out a coup after American troops are withdrawn. South Vietnam is a complex, highly political society, and outsiders—particularly four-star generals and secretaries of defense—have a woeful record in predicting what will happen in that country. Nevertheless, I believe that those who oppose this tragic war must accept the possibility that any peace which the Viet Cong will accept will run the risk of a Communist victory.

But what, then, of America's responsibility to the South Vietnamese who believed our promises? For even though I do not believe we ever should have made those promises when we wrongly supported the French and then tried to build our own client state in Saigon, they impose duties upon us. And what of the American dead?

These obligations do exist. But so do obligations to the people of Vietnam who have suffered the greatest casualties; to the people of the world who have seen the hopes of ending the cold war deferred by the conflict in Southeast Asia; and to the poor of America who have borne the greatest burden of a war which vitiated the struggle against poverty and destroyed the Great Society.

In short, there are contradictory rights and duties in Vietnam. Moreover, I can see no real honor to the American dead, or security for the Vietnamese still living, in the continuation of this horrible war. That would mean, the Joint Chiefs of Staff told Lyndon Johnson last spring, an additional 200,000 Americans. In the unlikely event that this grisly gamble won, the United States will have imposed an unpopular government upon a stricken society. And failure would mean one more excuse for further escalation.

In 1956 when the Hungarians rose up, this country rightly and tragically did not give military support to their magnificent cause because that would have threatened World War III. In Vietnam today there is no question of a democratic revolutionary movement, as in Budapest in '56, but of a minority supported by, but arrogant toward, American might.

That is why, even more so than in the Hungarian case, we must chance a Communist victory which we helped make a possibility. All the other alternatives, internationally and domestically, are intolerable.

Nixon must recognize Viet Cong participation in the future government of South Vietnam. He must risk peace.

DIGNITY OF EISENHOWER FUNERAL CAPTURED BY MEDIA

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, since March 28, 1969, the Nation, through the television and radio networks, has been able to share in and be a part of the dignified and solemn ceremonies following the death of our beloved Dwight David Eisenhower.

The general was truly a man of the people, and through the fine efforts of the broadcast media, the people were able to share throughout the days of mourning, the warmth of his personality.

Dignity and taste best describe the manner in which this last tribute was carried out. Dignity and taste also describe the way in which these days of mourning were reported to the Nation. Television did what it does best—capture a mood with fine camera work and a minimum of commentary. The restraint which the newsmen on the scene exercised was laudable, and realistic, since the participants and the observers were not listening to a flow of words describing the scene. The radio commentary I heard was also excellent—low-keyed, restrained and yet complete.

During those parts of the observances I attended, particularly the eulogy in the Rotunda and the state funeral at the Cathedral, the media were not obtrusive, and I am told the coverage was excellent.

I want to commend both television and radio executives and newsmen and technicians for their thoughtful presentation of the events of these sad days. That their excellence allowed the Nation which loved Dwight Eisenhower to participate in his funeral is to their credit. The Nation is grateful.

GEN. DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I join with the people of this Nation and the people of the world in mourning the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower. Men of peace and goodwill have lost a true champion of their cause.

First as a soldier, then as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces during World War II, and finally as the 34th President of the United States, General Eisenhower served his country in war and in peace and he served it well.

Though General Eisenhower rose to fame as the commander of the largest fighting force ever assembled, he will be remembered by the people of the world as a soldier of peace. He knew, more than any man, the havoc war wreaks on both mankind and nations. Because of this awareness of the tragedy of war, he strove diligently during his Presidency to erase this ugly menace from the world.

"Ike" represented America at its best. He was a man of great moral courage, and he possessed an overwhelming sense of duty. But more importantly he believed in the basic goodness of his country and of mankind.

At this time, when many are questioning the fundamental values of our country, we have only to look to this great man for inspiration and strength. We shall always be grateful for

his many outstanding and wonderful contributions toward making this a better world in which to live.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.'S EXCELLENT DOCUMENTARY ON POLLUTION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the National Broadcasting Co. has performed an outstanding public service when it aired over its NBC radio network recently an excellent documentary on the growing problem of pollution in America.

I am pleased to place the script of this production in the RECORD today. It was written and produced by Harry Mantel of Chicago's WMAQ, and I am sure we can all agree Mr. Mantel did an outstanding job of research on this very important subject.

Mr. Mantel and NBC deserve the highest commendation for their timely contribution.

The script follows:

POLLUTION

Dr. GOULD. I do not believe the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or guided missiles. I don't think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care, when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that nineteen of twenty-one civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. There were no bands playing and no flags waving when the old civilizations decayed. It happened slowly, in the quiet and the dark, when no one was aware. (Noise.)

ANNOUNCER. Second Sunday: "Pollution—How Dangerous?"

BILL LINDSAY. Good evening. This is Bill Lindsay, NBC News. Twenty-four years ago American scientists made their first atom bomb, and they expressed their fears for the survival of mankind. Today they have again expressed similar fears, but for a different reason. This was expressed in the eloquent warning by Dr. Lawrence Gould, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The world is rapidly becoming overcrowded, and there are many complex, if not lethal problems created by our manner of living. The word "pollution" is an everyday word now. But there are new forms of pollutions combining with old ones that are threatening our survival. There is a world biological crisis. Nations are disturbed over the question: Pollution: how dangerous?

SVERKER ASTROM. Mr. President, the General Assembly is now beginning a debate on a matter which it seems to the Swedish government in rather direct and critical concern to all peoples on earth. Man has always had to struggle to force a living out of an often hostile natural environment, thereby changing it and undergoing changes himself. Every civilization has indeed been built on and conditioned by the way the natural resources are utilized. We also know that whole civilizations disappeared as a result of mismanagement and misuse of natural resources.

LINDSAY. The Swedish Ambassador, Sverker Astrom, in his hour-long statement last December, carefully explained why the United Nations should adopt his country's resolutions. He had called for a world conference on the environment. It was supported by more than forty underdeveloped or developing nations who were afraid that pollution problems would be exported to their countries.

The pollution problems that face Sweden and the developing nations have faced the United States for years. But in the past, only a few of us were concerned about the long-range consequences. To most Americans, factory smoke meant dollars in their pockets. Scientists who made warnings, like that of Ambassador Astrom, were called alarmists.

Dr. Harrison Brown is a renowned geological chemist and a Professor of Science and Government at the California Institute of Technology. Harrison Brown has measured the life-support system of this planet in terms of space, food, steel, coal, sand gravel, and other resources that are needed to support every person on this earth.

HARRISON BROWN. We have viewed our atmosphere as being a sink into which we can throw everything without having repercussions. We now recognize that our atmosphere is limited from this point of view. We have viewed our rivers as being infinite in size, having infinite capacity to take our trash and our garbage. We now know that that is not true. We have viewed our ocean as being of infinite size. We now know that that is not true. I think we've got to recognize gradually we're learning that in a sense our planet is like a spaceship going around the sun, and that we have a life-support system, and that life-support system consists of our atmosphere, our ocean—they're interacting with each other. And we've got to learn to treat that life-support system properly.

BARRY COMMONER. I think the significance of the pollution problem is that it constitutes a threat to the survival of man. We sometimes think of pollution as kind of a smelly nuisance, something that makes the eyes smart and so on. But it's really much more than that. The changes that pollution represents in the environment are destroying, I think, the capability of the environment to support human beings or, for that matter, most forms of life. We live in a thin film on the surface of the earth—the soil, the water, and the air. And we have to have the air, water, and soil in order to survive. We have to breathe air that has oxygen in it, we have to drink water, we need water for our industries, we need the soil in proper condition to grow crops.

What's been happening with pollution is that the new technological developments that we've begun to use have changed the environment in such a way as to threaten the stability of the biological systems that make up the environment.

LINDSAY. These were the warnings of the Swedish Ambassador to the United Nations and of leading American scientists, the latter, biologist Barry Commoner, author of "Science and Survival." To believe the seriousness of their statements, one should examine the evidence.

Professor Barry Commoner is the director of Washington University's Center for the Biology of Natural Systems. He is concerned about the death of Lake Erie, the two hundred million gallons of raw sewage dumped into the Hudson River every day, the serious pollution of the once-princely Rhine River, the oceans, too, which are becoming polluted, and a very serious water pollution problem that he says will hit this country around 1980.

COMMONER. Well, now we have enough information to be able to calculate the growing amount of organic waste that is imposed on our surface water. We can also calculate from experimental data the amount of oxygen that's available to the rivers and lakes of the United States to accommodate organic wastes. And what we now know is that the amount of organic wastes being put into rivers and lakes is increasing. And that its demand for oxygen will equal the total oxygen available in our surface waters somewhere around 1980. In other words, we're heading for a kind of crunch between the wastes that we're putting into our waters and the ability, as expressed through the available oxygen, of these waters to accommodate that waste. And somewhere around 1980, we are going to be producing enough waste to break down the capability of surface waters to purify that waste and organic matter will begin to accumulate in our surface waters, which means that they're going to be pretty smelly, not very good for industrial use or domestic use, and we will have a very serious water pollution problem on the average throughout the country at that point because we will have used up the self-purifying capacity of our water system.

Now, of course, this will be worse in some places and better in others, but this is an average figure, which shows how serious the problem is throughout the country.

LINDSAY. American farmers use nitrogen fertilizers extensively. The fertilizers are cheap and produce profitable returns. However, little has been said that the fertilizers have caused about fifty percent of our water pollution problem. It is industry or municipal sewage that still get most or all of the blame, but the nitrogen fertilizers get down to the ground water and wash into the rivers, where it promotes the growth of algae. The algae die, and the organic matter they contain pollutes the surface water. It was recently reported that almost every river in Illinois has reached this eutrophic condition.

This is one of the pollution problems the developing countries wish to avoid, despite the benefits of technology. From a health standpoint, it's even more serious because there might be nitrite poisoning, and blue babies can result if their food and water contains too much nitrate. Dr. Commoner says that well water in a good deal of the central valley of Southern California has reached levels of nitrate from fertilizer that exceed the limits proposed by public health officials. Nitrate is not very harmful in itself, but it can be converted into toxic nitrite by bacteria in the intestines.

Dr. Commoner explains.

COMMONER. Nitrite is poisonous because it combines with the hemoglobin in the blood and it prevents the blood from carrying oxygen. This is a particular problem in infants. So, for example, an infant that has diarrhea may have bacteria moving from its intestines into the upper part of its intestinal tract and there it can come in contact with nitrate that might be in drinking water or in the baby's formula, and as a result, the bacteria convert nitrate to nitrite, so the nitrite combines with the blood and you have a blue baby, which has to be treated right away in order to save it from asphyxiation.

This problem has already arisen as a result of feeding infants on formulas made from well water that contain too much nitrate. And in some parts of California, pediatricians have recommended to mothers that they use bottled water instead of well water. Another feature of this problem is that when plants are grown on excessive levels of fertilizer, they may contain enough nitrate in them to cause trouble when fed to infants. This problem has not yet arisen medically in the United States, but in north Germany, a number of cases have been reported by pediatricians of nitrite poisoning which results from feeding children spinach, particularly, which often contains too much nitrate.

Analyses of baby foods in this country and Canada show that the levels of nitrate that occur in these baby foods sometimes get as high as those reported in Germany as causing difficulty, and again, this is a problem we need to look at very carefully because it is likely to get worse if we don't watch the way in which we use nitrogen fertilizer.

Dr. GOULD. At the Thanksgiving weekend in 1966, the level had risen beyond emergency and Mayor Lindsay asked everyone to leave Manhattan Island. Fortunately, it was the Thanksgiving weekend, and most of the people had gone away. Even so, five or six hundred deaths occurred from this smog that settled down into the canyon-like streets of that city. And it's estimated that if there had been no holiday, perhaps as many as ten thousand would have died.

LINDSAY. Dr. Gould points out that every day chimneys in the United States pour one hundred thousand tons of sulphur dioxide into the air. Motor vehicles add 230,000 tons of carbon monoxide. This air pollution is known too well by city-dwellers who suffer rising rates of lung diseases. But now, modern technology has added new hazards to the air people breathe. Tiny particles of asbestos from building materials. And bits of glass wool from air-conditioning systems that find their way into human lungs. And then, there is the question of how much lead is natural in the modern environment. Five years ago, American scientist Claire Patterson, who is well-known for measuring the age of the earth with lead isotope-tracers, began a series of expeditions to Greenland and Antarctica. There he tunneled hundreds of feet through layers of virginal snow, measuring the industrial lead contamination deposited there by the wind over hundreds of years—industrial lead from the world's smelters and car exhausts.

CLAIRE PATTERSON. We calculate that about one hundred times more lead is in our bodies than were in our prehistoric ancestors'. I'm an avid foe of lead pollution, and in this regard I am also, therefore, on the other side of the fence from lead industries. We are opponents, and we are antagonists. For example, I feel that children living in urban areas near freeways, for example, just to take this case, are being irreparably damaged. Their nervous systems in their bodies are being irreparably damaged from fumes, from the lead in the fumes coming from automobile exhausts.

ROY NEAL. What are the effects of lead concentration on the human body? What does it do?

PATTERSON. Well, the concentration of lead in a typical American today is about two-tenths of a part per million. That means out of a million parts of a man's blood, two-tenths of those million parts is lead. Now, the concentration as it has been observed experimentally, the concentration of lead in a person's blood changes. It increases as the input of lead increases. As you intake food that's contaminated with lead, the lead level of your blood goes up. And then while this—now the leads enters the body from the intestines, and it goes through what's called the portal blood system, it goes through the liver, and then it goes throughout the whole body.

Most of the lead is excreted in the feces, but part of the lead that gets through the intestinal wall and into the body and into the blood, part of that is stored in the bone, and part of that is excreted in the urine. Now, as I say, we today, the average person has about two-tenths of a part per million lead in our blood. I think, as a geochemist, and looking at the trace metals, the other trace metals in the biosphere, in soils and plants and animals and so on, and comparing those with lead, I believe that we should have about one percent of that amount of lead in our bodies.

LINDSAY. The US Public Health Service claims that Norway, with low air pollution, has half the lung cancer of the United States. But does this mean that air pollution is a direct cause of lung cancer? This debate came up during a surgical operation in a Chicago hospital recently. The patient, a young medical student, was undergoing mediastinoscopy, a relatively new diagnostic procedure for lung cancer. The surgery is considered minor, and in no way was the patient's life endangered during debate between the lady anesthesiologist and the non-operating doctor spokesman.

WOMAN. In the incidence of respiratory diseases in New York City, now it's true you can make the same correlation with drinking pop, there may be the same increase—incidence. But people who are working with a disease, it seems to me that although it isn't foolproof yet, believed that one of the causes for increased incidence of bronchitis and general resistance to infectious disease. In other words, a patient has an infectious lung disease. If it weren't—if a lung were healthy, he might be up and around in a few days. Because the lungs are less healthy because of air pollution, the person may end up in the hospital with a chronic respiratory disease. Now I feel that there's a correlation indirectly this way.

MAN. I can't but agree with you.

WOMAN. This means that air pollution is very important in lung diseases, even though there is no established connection between cause of a specific disease.

MAN. Well, we'd have to say even more than lung diseases, because since the body defenses requires adequate oxygen content to the entire—all the tissues, then one might even say the same about other diseases ouside of the chest, but the resistance to this disease would be decreased by poor lungs.

WOMAN. I just appreciate being on this project, because I feel that air pollution is a firm subject that most people are very easy not to pay attention to. It's very easy to get up and go to work and pretend that the health of the nation is not suffering from air pollution, and I didn't want the fact that there isn't a direct cause and effect to think, well, we don't have to worry about air pollution. I think it's important that as part of this discussion, since we've discussed air pollution, that we include the fact that it's terribly important in the health mechanisms.

(Man speaks off mike, laughter).

WOMAN. It's very important as a health mechanism in terms of general resistance to disease.

MAN. One of the things that should be mentioned here, although we're taking all the precautions of sterility, we generally do not try to talk during an operation. We try to make—because there are all sorts of questions, there are all sorts of questions of memory to the patient related to the consideration of the problem of sterility. I'd like to say that as we're getting the rest of these nodes out, it appears to be more and more like sarcoidosis (?). An early sarcoidosis. Sarcoidosis is non-cancer, is that right?

MAN. That's right.

MAN. Just two years ago, we found DDT in penguins and seals in Antarctica. We know that must have come from thousands and thousands of miles away because none of it has ever been used anywhere near Antarctica. We know it must have come by water, because we have been unable to find any traces of it in the snows that cover the vast continent.

LINDSAY. Dr. Gould's warning on DDT was echoed by Ambassador Astrom's in his argument that the United Nations must hold a world conference on the environment. Ambassador Astrom pointed to the ecological disturbances brought about by man. These can lead to and have led to, he said, extinction of whole species of fish and other marine organisms, thereby causing severe strains on the food situation in the world. DDT, he said, poses a direct threat to the life of oceanic plankton and algae, for which global oxygen depends largely. And, he added, DDT can be detected in the body fat and nervous tissues of all living beings, including man.

The short-term benefits of the long-term problem of pesticide pollution was discussed by three young scientists associated with Professor Commoner in St. Louis.

MAN. You say that the cotton that's grown in the United States is not native to here.

MAN. No, it isn't.

MAN. Where is it from?

MAN. It is native. . . .

MAN. To the Middle East.

MAN. To the Middle East, yes.

MAN. I see. So then the boll weevil isn't native to the United States.

MAN. No, the boll weevil came in through Mexico in around 1898, I think. Something like that.

MAN. I see. So if you stopped growing cotton for one year or for two years, the boll weevil would not have any other plant that it could eat, and it would die.

MAN. That's right. That would probably solve the major insect problem in Southern cotton.

MAN. How do you think the money spent on pesticides compares to, say, one year's crop. If you skip one year out of five, would that be more expensive than the present spraying of chemicals to control the boll weevil.

MAN. That's very difficult to answer, but when you consider that the entire pesticide business in this country runs to about two billion dollars a year, I would say that it would probably be very close.

MAN. And the biggest use of pesticides is on this cotton in the South.

MAN. Two-thirds of all the pesticides used in North America are used on Southern cotton, yes.

MAN. That's almost one and a half billion dollars, isn't it?

MAN. Yes.

MAN. How important is the cotton that's grown in the South?

MAN. From a standpoint of manufacturing cotton fabrics, it's not important at all. Most of it is bought—purchased by the government, stored in warehouses, and then eventually shipped to overseas countries.

MAN. Do you have any idea how much the value of this cotton is annually?

MAN. No, I really haven't.

MAN. I mean, this is just not very good cotton, then, all these chemicals.

MAN. It's a very poor-quality cotton that fabric-makers in this country just refuse to use. They use it for—some of it is used for stuffing mattresses and making very, very rough kinds of fabric, but not much of it.

MAN. So this huge global pollution problem stems from the spraying of poisonous chemicals on useless cotton.

MAN. That's what it amounts to, yes.

MAN. That is really fantastic.

LINDSAY. One of the young scientists at Dr. Commoner's environmental center in St. Louis is 27-year-old Sheldon Novick. He has written a book, "Careless Atom", which was published a few days ago by the same company that put out the late Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring" in 1963. Like Miss Carson, when she warned of the indiscriminate use of chemical sprays, Novick also believes that the public should know what is happening in the expanding nuclear power industry. He is concerned with the problem of safety and cites examples of mishaps, problems of insurance, radiation damage, and a new pollution problem—radioactive wastes, all from nuclear power reactors in this country. It is reactors like these we intend to export to the developing nations. Novick claims that many within the Atomic Energy Commission share his concern.

SHELDON NOVICK. I wouldn't say that I have more information than the Atomic Energy Commission; I certainly don't. Most of the information I have, I think, probably comes from them and their publications. I am more concerned than many of them seem to be, and I can't even guess as to why they are officially not as concerned as I. I should think they would be. I know that many indi-

viduals within the commission and on its staff and in its various advisory bodies are as concerned as I, and they have expressed these views in private. It would be good if some of them would express their views in public.

LINDSAY. It is doubtful that any one of the pollutants we've talked about is actually a killer at their present levels. Federal laws do guard their permissible limits. However, scientists are continually warning that we are producing a new strain upon biological life, that we must think about the total and not just the part. For no one actually knows the effects of all the pollutants combined from air, water, soils, lead, radiation, and thermal pollution. There is also noise pollution, which presents both emotional and physical problems.

If there is an experiment unlocking this question, it may be going on now in man himself. For probably he is the guinea pig himself but doesn't know it. To probe the total effects of pollutants, we turn to a distinguished Professor of Environmental Medicine at Mount Sinai School of Medicine, of New York University, Dr. Irving Selikoff.

IRVING SELIKOFF. The question has been raised, and I think, justifiably, that there may be a very important potential problem with such things as widespread low-level radiation or the widespread contamination of air and soil with lead. It's justifiable, absolutely so, to point to these potential problems rather than wait for their description in terms of human disease which may not come about for many years. Now, some people will say that we have no knowledge that there actually will be such disease effects. That's true. But I don't think we can take the chance that therefore control of such potential hazards is unjustifiable.

I have another reason for suggesting such controls. And that is that we are beginning to understand that there may be an additive effect of many different substances. In other words, the total body burden of environmental contaminants may be important. There may not be enough lead in itself to cause difficulties. There may not be enough benz-pyrine (?) from coal soot to be a problem. There may not be enough carbon monoxide to in itself be a problem, from automobile exhaust. There may not be enough radiation exposure to in itself be a problem. But the sum of all these, the total body burden of these environmental hazards, may be significant and, indeed, we may eventually see diseases that we don't even begin to understand at this time and too, the sum total of these various low level contaminants, each in itself not very important, may be to generally shorten life. And this is something that we are beginning to study at this time.

ANNOUNCER. Second Sunday: "Pollution—How Dangerous?" continues after a ten-second pause for station identification.

LINDSAY. What are we in the United States doing about the total effects of all pollutions on living things, especially humans? There is much being done, and yet there is very little being done. It depends on the way you look at the amount of money and labor that are being spent on research and legislation. Government bureaucracy has prevented one single agency from having total responsibility over water, air, land, radiation, thermal, noise, and pesticide pollution. Instead, the recent Air Quality Act, once its regional standards are approved, will be enforced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The recently approved regional standards of the Water Quality Act are being enforced by the Department of the Interior. If there were any standards nationwide for radioactive wastes, then by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Last Thursday in the Congress Senator Frank Moss of Utah re-introduced his bill to bring the scattered agencies that guard the nation's land and water resources under a single boss, a Cabinet Secretary running a single Department of Natural Resources. Senator Moss says that unless there is a single executive department there cannot be full coordination of the presently fragmented agencies that guard the nation's health and its resources.

Senator Edmund Muskie is also holding hearings on his proposal to form a select senate committee on technology and the human environment. This would be a study committee only, not a legislative body. It would bring scientists into the Congress for the first time as consultants only, not as lawmakers. In Washington, one might say as a gag there is concern over pollution, but it is not coordinated.

The same fear of Big Brother regulating the low-cost nitrogen fertilizers on the farm is also found in the case of controversial pesticides. However, a close check is kept on the manufacture of pesticides through an effective system of guidelines as explained to NBC reporter Russ Ward by a leading Agriculture Department expert on pollution, Kenneth Walker.

RUSS WARD. Mr. Walker, you say these guidelines are effective, and yet last April an Arizona dairy cooperative took out a full-page newspaper ad protesting what it called the uncontrolled use of DDT because of the losses it was suffering in terms of milk that simply didn't pass federal standards. There's been—the American Beekeeping Foundation complained to the Agriculture Department last year that it was suffering losses. There have been complaints made by salmon hatcheries in the state of Michigan complaining about pesticides being carried through the waterways and creating losses. If we have effective guidelines, how do we account for the complaints that come in to the Agriculture Department?

KENNETH WALKER. The guidelines that I referred to just a moment ago are registration guidelines. They are guidelines that require certain information be furnished to prove that the material is safe and effective when used as directed. The federal government does not regulate the use of the material in the sense that they tell the farmer, the homeowner, whoever is using the material, that he must or you must not do something.

WARD. It's a user violation rather than a manufacturing violation, is that correct?

WALKER. Yes. Violation may be a little strong. In the case of the dairy incident that you mentioned, some of this we believe was due to drift when the material was applied, say, by aircraft. The particle size is very small, this material is very light, and it carries quite a distance.

MAN. This is what I mean when I say mankind is on a collision course with disaster. I don't see any prospect that in the next few years we are going to bring into balance the population with the food resources of the earth. We forget that we live on planet earth, which is limited. There is only a limited quantity of air, a limited quantity of water, a limited quantity of soil. The air you and I are breathing right now is air that Socrates and Darwin and all others have breathed before us. The water you drank in your coffee this morning may have been the water that flowed down the Delaware when Hudson crossed it.

You see from the beginning of time there has been a recycling. Creatures that lived before us produced wastes, including their own corpses. These were degraded or decayed biologically by nature and reused by other forms of life. This is what I mean now when I say man is the dirtiest creature ever to inhabit the earth because he is the first creature that has and continues to produce wastes which are not destroyed, which are not recycled. The glass bottle, the aluminum beer tin are practically indestructible. They'll last as long as the Parthenon or the pyramids.

LINDSAY. The director of the population center at the University of Chicago, Philip Hauser says nothing indicates that population can be slowed down in its race with economic development in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where developing nations contain two-thirds of the total population of the world. But Professor Hauser points out that present rates of world population growth could not possibly have been sustained over any long period in the past nor could they persist for very long into the future.

PHILIP HAUSER. Since present rates of world population growth cannot possibly persist, it is clear that we will have population control. The only question is, whether control will be that imposed by nature or by man, and if by man, whether control will be rational and relatively defensible or completely irrational and indefensible. If the control is imposed by nature nature would use of course the weapons of famine and pestilence as discussed by Malthus. If the control comes through man, the irrational and indefensible methods could include war, which incidentally, with the hydrogen bomb, for the first time offers the possibility of population control. Up until the hydrogen bomb, the military were really quite inept and inefficient and ineffective in controlling population growth. But the hydrogen bomb does hold forth some prospect for control.

The second irrational and indefensible method, in my judgment, would of course be homosexuality, which studies show is never accompanied by a very high birth rate. And the third, which has much to commend it, because of its beautiful symmetry, is cannibalism, because under this method the population would go down as the food supply increased, and various points of equilibrium could be decided upon, depening on various factors involved. Now, obviously, I'm not advocating these methods. But I am serious in calling attention to the fact that they are not beyond the realm of possibility if more rational and desirable methods are not effected.

LINDSAY. Ambassador Astrom warned the UN General Assembly that all efforts should be encouraged to reduce or to eliminate the harmful side effects of large-scale application of modern technology. One of the primary purposes of the world conference on the environment, he said, should be to enable the developing countries to avoid making the same ecological mistakes. One good example is the high dam at Aswan in Egypt, which was designed to produce power and to store up water in Lake Nasser to supply irrigation canals.

As the new lake fills up, it is clear to biologists that water hyacinths are evaporating much of the water that enters Lake Nasser each year. The Egyptian government is considering introducing a 300-pound sea cow, manatee, to the lake to destroy the hyacinths. But not enough progress has been made on the animal's husbandry.

Another serious problem at Lake Nasser is the disastrous spread of the disease schistosomiasis. It is reported that nearly all of the people living in the irrigated region have this debilitating disease, which is spread by snails in the irrigation water. The water is used by people for drinking and for discharging their human wastes, which contain the parasitic eggs. The only medication is toxic to humans.

ASTROM. Mr. President, let me sum up. Man depends for his survival on an infinitely complex system of relationships and balances between innumerable living organisms, all existing in or on the extremely thin crust of the earth or just above it. The system has a remarkable capacity for adaptation and regeneration. But nature's patience has a limit. Indiscriminate and uncontrolled use of modern technology indispensable as such technology is for economic and social progress

may set trends in motion which lead to unforeseen harmful effects in unexpected places.

Many of these effects are irreversible. Even if we avoid the risk of blowing up the planet, we may, by changing its face, unwittingly be parties to the process with the same fatal outcome. It seems, therefore, that a broad consideration of the environmental problems and our possible approaches to their solution is of equal interest to all peoples on earth. The United Nations provides a unique forum for such consideration.

Mr. President, there are many issues on which the members of the United Nations are divided and deeply divided. On the issue now before the General Assembly we are hopefully all united, if there is ultimately a question of collective self-preservation. I thank you, Mr. President.

LINDSAY. The resolution for a world conference on the environment was passed by the General Assembly unanimously, after other statements were heard from Nigeria, Pakistan, Canada, and Romania. More than fifty nations had drafted the resolution. The conference will be held in 1972, the first calendar opening, permitting the nations sufficient time to assemble their scientific thinking. The conference can find solutions to the pollution problem, if the nations work out the difficult economics of coming to terms with nature. They must. As Rachel Carson has said with taste, sensitivity, and imagination, man is a part of nature, and his war against nature is inevitably a war against himself.

Last November, a group of concerned citizens met together one evening in a lecture hall at the University of Chicago campus. They were the local chapter of the American Meteorological Society, and their guest speaker was Laura Fermi, an elderly brilliant lady, distinguished author and widow of the atomic pioneer Enrico Fermi.

LAURA FERMI. I am here as a member of the Cleaner Air Committee of Hyde Park and Kenwood just to give an example—oh, I see a member of our committee down there, Mrs. Ann Sykes, if I did something wrong, there will be an attack on me. To tell you a little what a group of citizens can do, the Cleaner Air Committee organized in the spring of 1959 was organized by a group of housewives who were concerned about dirt. Looking in retrospect, the main feature seems to me what our ignorance was at that time. We—our motivation was simply dirt and the frustration of having to fight a losing battle against the dirt every day. Of the health hazards of air pollution we knew only the one that got us tired. We were always tired because we had so much cleaning to do. When we went to Alderman DePres to ask what could be done, we were very surprised to find that there was a Department of Air Pollution Control, that to him dirt was not dirt but air pollution and that an ordinance had just been passed and was going to go into effect within, I think, one month of the time we were talking to him. And he said you should help the department in getting the ordinance enforced.

So, feeling so ignorant, we went around and sought information. We visited the Department of Air Pollution Control, the Armour Research that was doing the measurements of dirt—dust fall all over the city. We talked with people from coal and iron firms, with building managers, doctors, the head of the local janitors' union.

LINDSAY. Chicago air probably would be a lot filthier than it is today had Mrs. Fermi's group not taken their stand ten years ago. But it still is reported to be the second dirtiest in the country. The sulphurous, noxious air, along with other reasons, made Dr. Henry Collins, a university lecturer, flee Chicago with his wife and children to Sydney, Australia just one month ago.

Maquarie University, on the outskirts of Sydney, Australia, is so new they're still building it. It's rising against a background of fields and gum trees. There's fresh air to spare. The birds sing.

MAN. Doctor, why did you leave Chicago?

COLLINS. For one thing, you could mention the languour of air pollution that is especially bad in the fall and in the spring. I could mention the inflation which was gradually getting ever more heavily felt by me because of the expenses of my growing family. I could also mention the racial tensions which broke out in serious riots during the last several summers right near my home on the West Side of Chicago. But to tell you the truth, the thing that made me most afraid and most downcast was the unwillingness of my friends in Chicago, people whom I knew very well, the people next door in fact, who refused to recognize that there were problems.

For example, I know many people who in the same breath will say that they have never smelled or never seen the air pollution and who will also go on to say that they take pride in not seeing it or not smelling it. In plain language, there's an underlying attitude, an unwillingness to face problems which to me seem to indicate that current problems, no matter how bad, would continue to get worse.

TOM LEHRER. (Singing) Just go out for a breath of air, And you'll be ready for Medicare.

The city streets are really quite a thrill—If the hoods don't get you, the monoxide will. Pollution, pollution, You can use the latest toothpaste and then rinse your mouth with industrial waste.

LINDSAY. How far have we come since this satire was recorded in an American nightclub in 1965?

If we just look at it or just talk about pollution, without doing something about it, then another civilization will probably die from within and not by conquest from without.

ANNOUNCER. This has been Second Sunday: "Pollution—How Dangerous?" Reporter, Bill Lindsay. Field reporters, Lionel Hudson, Jay Miller, Roy Neal, and Russ Ward. Technical supervisor, Harry Dinaso. Director, Bob Sprentall. Producer, Harry Mantel.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MAGNIFICENT EULOGY TO IKE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the comments of the distinguished, patriotic and dedicated American philanthropist H. L. Hunt concerning the beautiful eulogy to former President Eisenhower by President Nixon in the Capitol Rotunda on March 31, 1969, are particularly timely. I believe they are deserving of consideration by all readers of the RECORD.

The comments by H. L. Hunt follow:

President Nixon's unparalleled eulogy of the late President Eisenhower was truly magnificent. While his words were clearly spoken for no other reason than to express what he and a grieving nation felt for a good man and a good leader, the impact of his oratory, the depth of his feeling and the warmth with which he expressed what he and the nation felt, will doubtless have the effect of raising his popularity rating of 60% in March to at least 70%.

In addition to enhancing the President's popularity noticeably in the polls, his words, spoken with such feeling, are also quite likely to have the effect of setting back the cause of crime and rioting which have been at least sympathetically tolerated, if not actually encouraged, by members of the Administrations of Mr. Nixon's predecessors and a vast number now in government.

In his masterful eulogy, Mr. Nixon literally grasped the mind of America and turned it, for 16 minutes, upon itself. Through a departed soldier of the Republic, he did something that is almost never done: the President reminded us of what is good about Republic USA. Sad though the nation was at the loss of a beloved man, who declared that "I am from the heart of America," refreshed it assuredly was at the convincing words of a man at the helm, that "America is Okay!"

H. L. HUNT.

TWO STATE SOLDIERS, MARINE ARE KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Thomas M. Deitz, Sp4c. Roger L. Garlick, and L. Cpl. Ronald B. Cassell, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO STATE SOLDIERS, MARINE ARE KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

A Marine corporal from Baltimore, an Army sergeant from Perry Hall and an Army specialist fourth class from Oakland, are the latest Marylanders to die in the Vietnam war, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Killed were:

Sgt. Thomas M. Deitz, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis M. Deitz of 4209 Penn Avenue, Perry Hill.

Spec. 4 Roger L. Garlick, husband of Mrs. Loula M. Garlick, of Oakland.

Lance Cpl. Ronald B. Cassell, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lee R. Cassell, of 8165 Park Haven road, Baltimore.

Corporal Cassell, who was 20, died March 21 in Da Nang from wounds he suffered three days earlier during an enemy mortar attack in Quang Nam province.

Corporal Cassell, who was attached to the 3d Battalion of the 1st Marine Division, was assigned to helicopter crews assisting in the evacuation of wounded and the ferrying in of supplies to field troops.

A graduate of Patapsco Senior High School, he was an active committee member of the Hut teen center during his high school years. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in March, 1968.

His mother said her son wrote that he felt South Vietnam "was too beautiful a country to be torn up" by the war.

Besides his parents, he is survived by an older brother, Robert L. Cassell, of Essex, and a sister, Mrs. Toni Hedge, of Plymouth, Mich.

Sergeant Deitz, 21, was accidentally killed March 18 when his own troops mistook him for the enemy.

He was graduated from Perry Hall Senior High School in June, 1966, and worked on a factory assembly line until he enlisted in the Army in July, 1967. A year later, he was sent to Vietnam.

He was a squad leader in charge of a rifle team. His mother said yesterday: "He was a good soldier, a good leader, liked by all his men."

Besides his parents, he is survived by two sisters, Margie L. Deitz, who attends the University of Maryland, and Barbara L. Deitz.

EULOGY OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, there is little one can add to the many magnificent tributes which have already been paid to our distinguished former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. His leadership at a time of great danger to the free world is a matter of history and his place in it is secure.

One of the most memorable events of my career in Congress took place several years ago when I and several of my colleagues were invited to General Eisenhower's farm in Gettysburg for an afternoon visit. We conferred with the former President, viewed his beautiful farm and were taken on a guided tour of the Gettysburg battlefield. I could not help but think that here was a five-star general, former President of the United States, willingly taking the time from his heavy schedule to welcome a few freshman Congressmen to his farm, personally guiding us through the historic battlefield and giving us the benefit of his wisdom and knowledge.

I do wish to pay my respects to this great statesman. We have suffered a great loss in his passing but freedom will continue to live in the world because Dwight David Eisenhower lived and defended it.

Mr. Speaker, General Eisenhower's passing was the subject of an editorial eulogy published March 29, 1969, by the Saratogian newspaper of Saratoga Springs, N.Y. I would like to share this exceptional expression with my colleagues:

IKE WAS THERE

If the essential greatness of Dwight David Eisenhower could be summed up in 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 command 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 uncommonly common man that inspired confidence and unshakable faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crisis 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 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 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 1930s; when Americans indulged in an orgy of self-doubt because Russia had launched something into space called a Sputnik; when words like "agonizing reappraisal," "brinkmanship," "U-2," "summit" and "missile gap" became 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 besting the scythe-bearer in encounter after encounter. He went down fighting, he surrendered reluctantly. More than that can be asked of no soldier.

The Eisenhower years are still too close for historians to be able to give us a balanced and dispassionate summary. The full figure of Dwight D. Eisenhower as president and elder statesman remains to be limned by a future generation.

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."

JOSEPH B. RIDDER DAY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the press of the United States is under attack, I take great pleasure in rising to praise the press, not to attempt to bury it. In particular I would like to praise Joseph B. Ridder, publisher of the San Jose Mercury & News.

It truly has been said the press of the United States is the mirror in which we see ourselves daily. Sadly, sometimes we do not like what we see, and even more sadly, some of us when faced with ugly truths, try to blame the reporting agency, instead of facing the truth. Despite this unpleasant fact of today's life, Joseph B. Ridder, and the staffs of his newspapers often have braved the wrath of their readers in the printing of uncomfortable truths. A case in point is the campaign Mr. Ridder and the Mercury & News have waged against the use and abuse of drugs in Santa Clara County. In this area they have demonstrated their determination to fully explore and to offer answers to this unfortunate and unpleasant side of our society. The stories by Sam Hanson, education writer of the Mercury & News, and by other staff members, spelled out not only the depth and breadth of the problem, but in the finest tradition of crusading American journalism, were part of the solution, not part of the problem.

I would also like to mention other areas in which Mr. Ridder has played a constructive role, including the articles on delays in payment and overcharging of medicare recipients, the series of articles on the financial problems of Cal Expo, the continuing fight against air and water pollution, and Mr. Ridder's continuing successful effort to keep their 220,000 daily customers fully informed on international, national, and local news. It is here I would like to express my personal thanks not only to Mr. Ridder, but to the individual reporters and editors, who have so much to do with the quality of the newspapers.

Mr. Ridder's efforts to improve the Santa Clara Valley have not been restricted to his journalist efforts. He has served well the University of Santa Clara as a member of its board of regents, he has worked to improve and enlarge the Triton Museum, he is serving as chairman of the Medical Research and Equipment Fund of Santa Clara County, and he has been and remains an active leader in civic and community efforts to improve the quality of life in the Santa Clara Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the City Council of Santa Clara in celebrating "Joseph B. Ridder Day" on April 11, 1969, and have introduced in the Congress the following resolution:

H.J. RES. 361

Whereas the Congress of the United States wishes officially to recognize the achievements of Joseph B. Ridder, publisher of the San Jose Mercury and News in informing the adults and youth of Santa Clara Valley of the use and abuse of drugs; and

Whereas Joseph B. Ridder and the San Jose Mercury and News through a series of articles outlined the extent and depth of drug problems not only in the Santa Clara Valley but throughout the Nation; and

Whereas he and his newspapers have continued in their information programs not only on the subject of drugs but also on many other vital and important topics; and

Whereas Joseph B. Ridder, his newspapers and reporters including Sam Hanson, education writer have been cited by the Governor of the State of California for their efforts and fight in what the Governor terms "the menace facing the younger generation through the use and abuse of drugs"; and

Whereas Joseph B. Ridder through his activities as a member of the Inter-American Press Association and the International Press Association and as a board member of the Inter-American Press Association has helped spread the American concept of freedom of the press worldwide; and

Whereas for this positive effort and for his many other important contributions to community development, the Santa Clara City Council has declared April 11, 1969 Joseph B. Ridder Day; now therefore be it

Resolved by the United States Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the Congress and people of the United States extend their sincere appreciation to Joseph B. Ridder, his newspaper and staff.

SEC. 2. The 11th day of April 1969 is designated as Joseph B. Ridder Day in his honor and in the honor of the efforts of his newspapers and staff.

EULOGY TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a time of sorrow has again blanketed our Nation. The loss of Dwight David Eisenhower touches the hearts of many individuals

not only in America but throughout the free world and inspires the emotions of people everywhere who cherish freedom.

I had the pleasure and privilege of meeting President Eisenhower on many occasions. Dwight Eisenhower exemplified compassion, dedication, and integrity. His charismatic personality and distinguished character promoted respect and admiration in practically everyone he met.

Dwight Eisenhower fought for freedom for all people and made tremendous gains. His biggest battle, however, was lost to time.

Words cannot truly express our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Eisenhower and family. I am thankful for being able to bear witness to the era of Dwight David Eisenhower for he was an inspiration to all of us.

INTRODUCTION TO A TRANSCRIPT OF A MEETING BETWEEN POOR PEOPLE OF BEAUFORT AND JASPER COUNTIES, S.C., AND REPRESENTATIVE ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, some 50 residents of Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C., met with representatives of the Agriculture Department. That same day they presented some 2 hours of testimony about conditions facing poor people in their home counties to several Congressmen. This testimony again underscores, among other things, the enormous deficiencies of the food stamp program as it is set up.

The broader aspects of the hunger problem in America are coming to be generally understood, thanks in large measure to the great efforts of Senator McGovern and his subcommittee. But I think this testimony is of special import and value. It gives a striking picture of what faces valiant people trying to eke out an existence while trapped in a pocket of rural poverty, and sheds valuable light on details and specifics of how best to change current practices and programs.

I think it is time the Congress gave its first priority to the consideration of the problems highlighted in these statements. It is clear that the Agriculture Department feels it cannot meet the challenge of malnutrition and hunger under existing legislation.

Among the problems are:

Eligibility levels in the free stamp program—$20 a month for a family of up to three, and $30 per month for a family of four or more—are so low as to make a high percentage of poor families inelgible.

The average poor family spends a higher percentage of its income for stamps than the average U.S. family spends for food—17 percent.

The poor have little or no control over their own programs and, particularly in the South, are frequently stymied by unresponsive administrators.

The great question emerging from testimony like this remains: how much longer will some Americans go hungry while others are paid not to grow food and still others spend many of their waking hours worrying about dieting? I can think of no problem that should more urgently commend itself to the conscience of this body.

The transcript of a meeting with Beaufort County welfare rights organization members follows:

MEETING WITH BEAUFORT COUNTY WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATION MEMBERS

Mrs. HAZEL FRAZIER, (Chairman, Beaufort County Welfare Rights Organization). I was born and raised in Beaufort. Our problem is nutrition, and the food stamp program, I may add, is not effective. For families which make $3,000 or less a year, the children are eligible for the school lunch and clothing program. Why not let those same families be eligible for free food stamps? Thirty dollars a month or less for a family of four doesn't make any sense. Twenty dollars for a family of two or three doesn't make any sense. These people should be immediately put on welfare.

I think that whoever is responsible for setting those levels should set it higher, at the poverty level. Someone who is at the poverty level, or a member of the National Welfare Rights Organization, or a concerned citizen should elect the people who are to work with people on these problems. It should not be done through the welfare office because in Beaufort County, if it is done through the welfare office, it won't be effective.

Mrs. GREEN (Chairman of the Food Stamp Committee, Washington, D.C., Welfare Rights Organization). There are several problems that we think need attention. One is that the food stamp bonus—the difference between the amount of money you pay and the amount of food stamps you get—is out of proportion. If, for instance, whoever has formulated this plan says that a family of four needs $150 worth of food to get the proper nutritional value, then they should be able to get $150 worth of food whether they can afford it or not. What we are getting is the minimum amount of food required for a temporary period to live on for a long period of time. In order to bring up your children as healthy beings, you need the food that is going to make them healthy.

If we are to have these emergency food programs, it should be a more effective plan. The Agriculture Department pays the farmer not to produce so much food, and then they have to go back and buy it from them again to give to the poor people. This is excess money! Why pay the farmer again to get the food that is already subsidized? One of our main points is that we spend billions of dollars in other areas overseas, and yet we are not feeding the poor at home. We have to start at home and build our people up.

CLARENCE SINGLETON, Beaufort County. I've never seen how this food stamp business was helping the poor people, especially since they say they have this pilot project now. As poor people we must quit playing the role of Lazarus. We have been eating the crumbs from the rich man's table for too long, eating what the rich man don't want.

We have been wandering for over 200 years. The government cannot say they don't have the money. They do have it, and I know they have it because the money they spend on missiles and trying to put a man on the moon with so many people hungry and dying from malnutrition—it doesn't make sense.

Mrs. GREEN. With the war in Nigeria and Biafra, we have millions of people collecting money to feed those kids over there. They're dying of starvation, sure, but so are our kids here at home. It may not be in a centralized location, but 50,000 across the nation, perhaps, are dying and will die day by day because of starvation and malnutrition.

JOE MCDERMOTT, Beaufort County. This group came from Beaufort County with several points to make. First, we want the people in Washington to know how we feel about the new food stamp program. We don't think the new pilot program is getting at the needs of hunger and malnutrition in Beaufort and Jasper Counties. Second, we came to talk directly with people who are concerned about the new pilot program in Beaufort and Jasper Counties. Third, we came to participate in the formulation of plans that would get at the needs of hunger and malnutrition in Beaufort County. For too long, people have been making decisions about what will affect other peoples' lives. The people that these programs will affect directly have nothing at all to say about them. We want to participate in some of those decisions about how the new program can best meet the needs of the poor people. We feel strongly about this. If people who are poor cannot say how a program can best rid them of their hunger, then who can?

The group would like to see $40 per month worth of food stamps made available, per person, to each family in the poverty level. Next, we'd like to see poor people get involved in the administration of the new program, if it's going to be effective. The people at the welfare department cannot communicate with the people who need food stamps. Third, we've come to meet with the Secretary of Agriculture to let him know that the program is not working. Last, it's not right to give food stamps to me and then tell me how I can use them. There are people who have to pay bills—doctor bills, electric bills—and don't have the money for food stamps. The government should give the people the food stamps and let the people do whatever they want to with whatever money they are getting.

Mrs. KATHRYN FRAZIER, Jasper County. I agree with him, because I went down to the welfare office about a week ago, and they told me that I have to pay $78 for $120 stamps. I have 11 children, my husband and I. Sometimes he don't make that much because he works on a farm, and when it's raining he cannot work. I don't get the stamps because I don't have the money to get them.

Mrs. HAZEL FRAZIER. My income is $125 a month, and I pay $46 a month for my stamps. It all depends on my other bills. When I was working and making $4 a day, it went up to $70 dollars. We go to the store and get a big bag of rice, pig feet, pig tails, neck bones, beans, black-eyed peas, and go in the field and hunt greens. That's how we manage. You go buy your bread. Now, when you buy milk, eggs, butter, bacon, and orange juice you'll really get fouled up cause you're not going to have anything left. Even buying rice, grits, beans and peas, the food stamps run out before the end of the month, and it's just a struggle.

DAN EVERHART, Beaufort County. In Beaufort County if you work on a farm they say you can't get food stamps. I went up there Monday, and they said if you get any stamps you have to pay $10. I asked "what am I going to pay that with?" I don't know.

JOE MCDERMOTT, Beaufort County. Under the new pilot program, there are only two categories that the program will affect. First, families of one to three persons with a total income of $20 or less are entitled to free food stamps. Second, if there are four or more persons in a family, with a total income of $30 or less, they are entitled to free food stamps. If there are five persons in a family

with $31 income, they have to pay something for the food stamps. How in the name of heaven can three people live on $20 or less per month? The program is not going to affect that many people in those two categories. The welfare department says there are 200 families who this program will affect. I don't believe that. If there are people who are making that kind of money, they probably would have been dead long ago! Why aren't those people on welfare without any questions asked?

ALEX SMITH, Beaufort County. I have applied for the free food stamp program, and they told me that I would have to prove that my wife doesn't make over $30 a month. I said no; I'm a man, and I ain't going to do that. Then they told me that my stamps would cost over $20, and I told them that I don't make that kind of money.

I am a farmer. Sometimes the heat comes and burns up the crops; sometimes the rain comes and drowns them out. Sometimes I don't make $200 a year. That's why I wanted to get the free food stamps because I can't pay. That's why I'm here today.

REGINA HAMILTON, Bluffton, S.C. I have a mother who is not able to work, three kids, and no husband. I earn $50 a week. We pay $20 for $40 worth of food stamps. Forty dollars is not enough to feed a family of five for a month. My kids have to go to school. I want to clothe them and feed them a good breakfast, but I can't.

ANGELA FORD, Beaufort County. I am on food stamps. My husband works at a saw mill. I have to take my husband's paycheck to the welfare office and pay $78 for $128 worth of food stamps.

I have ten kids. Some weeks my husband's income is $37. If we can't get free stamps, why not cut the price down? There are a lot of things we can't buy with the stamps: soap, brooms, and clothes.

Mrs. JOHN COPE, Frogmore, S.C. I am white, and I am on welfare. I have a master's degree, and my husband has finished one year of college. He is in alternative service and receives a salary of $130 a month. We qualify for food stamps, and have used them since August of last year. I could work, but I refuse to work. I feel it is my duty to raise my child. Even if I did work, I'd have to pay someone to keep my boy. When you pay someone to keep your children, and then you go to town to care for someone else's children, it doesn't make any sense because it's your children who need you.

ALICE WILLIAMS, Frogmore, S.C. My husband died leaving me with four kids. I was getting Social Security and paying $13 a month rent. They cut my checks off after my two children were eighteen and twenty-one, and my landlady told me I have to move because I don't have the $13 a month to pay. So I don't have no place for me and my kids to live.

LULA LOUISE BOLDEN. We have eight kids in the family and get $132 a month on welfare, and we have to pay $102 for food stamps. All of us have to go to school. I'm in the twelfth grade, and I haven't paid all my senior bills yet.

JOCLYN TRUETT, Beaufort County. I get a little check from Social Security, $40 a month. If I buy food stamps and pay my light bill, it don't leave me with nothing.

Mr. TIDMORE (Administrative Assistant to the Hon. LOUIS STOKES). I came here today representing Congressman STOKES who wanted very much to be here himself. He is very sympathetic to your cause, and we have under study right now legislation that would create a federal minimum income.

Congressman STOKES' brother is the Mayor of the City of Cleveland, and both of them grew up on the welfare rolls in the Hough area of Cleveland. He knows and understands what it means to be hungry and without food.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr. AL LOWENSTEIN began supporting the National Welfare Rights Organization long before he got elected, and I've been supporting it for many years in Congress.

I wish I could tell you that it is now just a simple matter of going back to your county and beginning to work as a citizen toward rectifying this process. George Wiley has been in and out of congressional hearings for several years now. I think that we may be making some sort of progress. I understand that there was a U.S. Senator who found out that there was poverty existing in his state, and he was properly shocked. And perhaps this week somebody else in the Congress will discover that poor people, black and white, are starving in the United States at a rate that is certainly not decreasing in number. But, what we do must turn on how we view our problem and how we attempt to resolve them.

I say that we are beginning a process in this country because the poor people are beginning to understand what their plight is, and further, are beginning to figure out how to react to it. I think you have shown by your coming here today, by being members of the NWRO, that you are attempting to responsibly change this system.

There is a new breath of fresh air in the Congress in the form of some of our members like Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA from Chicago, and a number of others who have added substantially to the liberal cause here. What we want to do is to have your help in continuing to exercise something a lot of people don't want to give us any credit for. That's the power to think and analyze your way out of your situation. Not that analysis alone is going to do it, but that at the beginning of redressing your grievances there was a George Wiley who figured there ought to be an organization of the poor, and there were staff people that thought there ought to be an organization, and they were selfless enough to join him in his efforts. There were the Fraziers and others who, acting as leaders, were able to bring us here today.

One of the arguments that I continue to use to persuade some of my colleagues who are less aware of the problems of poverty in the United States is that when you help the poor you are not necessarily helping the black people in America. I try to point out to them that there are more poor white people in America than there are poor black people. We are really all in this together. If they could only understand and act purely on the selfish basis of helping their own, since these national programs are distributed fairly among all segments of the country, we could take a giant step toward alleviating the problems of poverty in America.

So rather than tell you that we're going to come up with some legislation this year to eliminate the problem, I will say that I think we are going to make some progress. As long as each one of you is able to maintain the dignity that you bring here to this House, then you're able to go back and continue the struggle; I can assure you that there will be more Lowensteins, more Conyers, coming into Congress to try to make meaningful changes in the system which creates and perpetuates poverty. Congressman Lowenstein, I am honored that you invited me to join you in this discussion.

GEORGE WILEY (Executive Director, National Welfare Rights Organization). One of the things that really needs to happen is that welfare rights organizations are forming all over the country. We now have 250 of them in 100 cities. I don't think it is any accident that Senator Hollings suddenly got the message that there was poverty in his state. There is a Beaufort County Welfare Rights Organization, and there are numerous other welfare rights groups forming in other cities around the state, and he began to see that the poor were going to have some political muscle. I think that is beginning to happen in a lot of places around the country.

It's time for us to have our own legislation and our own proposals; it's time that we begin shaping some programs that the people have a voice in, programs that begin to meet their needs. We should try to form a coalition to push for (1) a food stamp program that makes sense and (2) reform of the whole welfare and income maintenance programs. I think the initiative that has come out of Beaufort County can be a beginning to building that coalition.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our country and indeed the world has lost one of its greatest leaders. We mourn him in death as we loved him in life, for Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Army, 34th President of the United States, had a very special place in the hearts of men and women everywhere. He had lived a full life, accomplishing more than most men would dare to dream, and when the end came he was peaceful, and he was ready. I watched some of the thousands of people who filed quietly by his casket as it lay in the Rotunda of the Capitol. They came out of a deep and profound respect for one of the best loved and most humane men of our time. That is a great tribute.

But there is a greater tribute still that we can, and should, pay to a man who dedicated his life to the causes of his country and its people. That tribute is to look to the lessons of his life and to see that what he stood for, what he tried to accomplish, and what wisdom he passed to us, is not lost, but woven into the fabric of our national future.

Dwight Eisenhower was a professional soldier and he was a man of peace. Perhaps one of his great accomplishments was in showing us that the two are not incompatible. Only a man of his inner strength, patience, cheerfulness, and good humor combined with rare modesty, could have molded together the diverse elements needed to mount the great Allied offensive that landed at Normandy and culminated in the surrender of the German armies 11 months later. For that accomplishment he will forever hold a place of affection and respect in the hearts of all free men.

In 1948, General Eisenhower refused to run for the Presidency, indicating his strong belief that the subordination of the military power to the civil power, wisely structured, was best served if professional soldiers did not seek high political office. As Tom Wicker has pointed out:

> Only a general of Dwight Eisenhower's human quality, of whom there are precious few, should ever be exempt from (that) reasoning.

He was exempt, and he was elected President in 1952, in the midst of a "con-

flict" in Korea that frustrated the American people much as the Vietnam conflict does today. And President Eisenhower brought us peace, a peace which he sustained throughout his years in office.

In his administration the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was forged; an International Finance Corporation was created; the International Atomic Energy Agency was approved, and a U.S. Development Loan Fund was established. All these, and more, were solid contributions to building peace through international cooperation.

We sometimes tend to forget—because those were peaceful and tranquil years—that President Eisenhower presided over major contributions to domestic progress, contributions that formed the basis for much that has come since. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created; the research and assistance program on air pollution was enacted; the National Defense Education Act and the Interstate Highway Act were passed; and the basic Civil Rights Act, the first legislation in this area in some 80 years, was brought into being.

Before leaving office General Eisenhower delivered an eloquent farewell address, and in it he gave us some advice we would do well to heed carefully now. He understood before many of us that "the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist." And he tried to tell us that, "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

We are engaged today in a great national debate which involves, at its heart, the determination of important priorities for ourselves and for generations to come. What should be our guides to a wise decision? Dwight Eisenhower made a start on what have become some of our most pressing national problems. We have done more and there is still more to be done. If we can bring a part of the wisdom and a fraction of the generosity of heart and of mind to the task that remains as he did to his, we shall have served his memory well.

DONALD J. WALSH RETIRES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Donald J. Walsh, business manager of Chicago's American, retired after spending 48 years as one of Chicago's most highly respected members of the press.

The Chicago's American ran an editorial on his retirement which I believe states most succinctly the feelings of all of us who know Mr. Walsh well.

I join in wishing him many happy years in retirement.

The editorial follows:

DONALD J. WALSH RETIRES

Donald J. Walsh's retirement as business manager of Chicago's American ends a Chicago newspaper career spanning 48 years. For this newspaper and its staff, it ends 18 years of active partnership with him, but it doesn't end anything else—not friendship or esteem or the good memories of working together in an endlessly worthwhile task.

Don Walsh's talents and energy have benefited many people besides this newspaper and its readers. As state director of public safety under the late Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, he helped carry thru a massive overhaul of the state police from a political patronage grab-bag to a well-organized force operating on the merit system.

He has been a creative force in many political, civic, and educational projects—Catholic Charities, De Paul university, and Hektoen Institute among them—and knowing Don Walsh, we're sure he will go on giving them the same drive, energy, and dedication that he has given to The American. We'll miss him, and we wish him luck.

MR. NORMAN R. BROWN—OUTSTANDING POSTMASTER

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the citizens and postal patrons of my congressional district and, particularly of Arroyo Grande, are very proud and elated that Postmaster Norman R. Brown has been named the outstanding postal employee of the year for the western region of the United States for States including California, Hawaii, Nevada, and the South Pacific.

We are especially pleased because we believe the award is so well deserved.

Norman R. Brown, 59, postmaster of Arroyo Grande for the past 17 years is a paraplegic. He was selected for the regional award over 10 other nominees.

Brown and 14 others, now will be considered for the national award. The finalists will attend presentation ceremonies at the Post Office Department in Washington this spring.

Regional Director Ken W. Dyal said Brown was a "very popular choice" and had an abundance of support from fellow postmasters who knew of his outstanding record of public service despite confinement to a wheelchair.

Brown lost use of his legs during an on duty accident while a member of the Oakland Fire Department 30 years ago.

Prior to his injury, Brown was an airplane pilot and was engaged in crop-dusting and in giving flying instruction. His accident occured just prior to the outbreak of World War II, preventing him for accepting a call to train British pilots.

Brown spent 5 years at Lancaster and at Terrell, Tex., teaching ground school classes while studying a new vocation. He moved to Arroyo Grande in 1945 and established a photographic studio.

He was the unanimous choice of the community for the appointment of postmaster in 1951.

Brown taught photography in high school adult education classes for 15 years. He has earned many awards in national competition and has appeared as guest lecturer before the Photographic Society of America.

He also has had many works published in Camera magazine and is one of the limited number who can legally endorse a photo with his name followed by APSA or Association, Photographic Society of America.

Brown has served as head of the civic association, president of the San Luis Obispo County Delinquency Board, president of the Arroyo Grande Rotary Club, and of the harvest festival.

He drives his own car and designed controls so that they can be hand operated. He and his wife, Gertrude, have a married daughter, Mrs. Paul Reese, and two grandsons.

Brown originally was nominated for the honor by postal service officer H. C. Anderson. He also was highly recommended by William G. Moore, Atascadero postmaster; Barbara H. Potter, Avila Beach postmaster; and Neva Hollibaough, retired Oceano postmaster.

Mr. Brown has long been an inspiration to the citizens of Arroyo Grande. To many persons he would be considered "handicapped," but Mr. Brown has overcome his handicaps and served as an example to handicapped and unhandicapped of what perseverance, effort, and self-confidence can accomplish.

I join his family and his many friends and associates in congratulating and commending him for the outstanding service and accomplishments which earned him this award.

We wish him success in his further competition.

WOUNDS FATAL TO SOUTH CAROLINA MARINE

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Marine L/Cpl Joseph L. Freeman, Jr., a brave young man from South Carolina, was recently killed serving his country near An Hoa, Republic of Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor.

Lance Corporal Freeman was killed March 3, aged 20. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. J. Lloyd Freeman of 35 Pleasant Ridge Avenue, Greenville, S.C.

Lance Corporal Freeman died of head injuries inflicted by enemy rifle fire. He entered the Marines March 25, 1968, and was assigned to Vietnam August 28 of that year. He entered Greenville High School and Greenville Technical Education Center prior to enlisting in the Marines.

Full military services were conducted Wednesday, March 19, at the Mackey Mortuary in Greenville by the Reverend Lloyd Self and Chaplain T. C. Smith.

Burial was in the Westview Cemetery, Easley, S.C.

Mr. Speaker, young Corporal Freeman, was a boyhood friend of one of my sons, and his death has brought the hard reality of war home to myself and my family. Our sympathy is extended to his parents and family, who have the consolation of knowing that he died in the service of his country and in the cause of the freedom of mankind.

INDIAN OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL FOCUSES ON NEEDS OF THE URBAN INDIAN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, of all the minority groups in this country, the urban Indian is probably the most disadvantaged—and the most ignored. Very few of us realize that there are large numbers of Indians now living in cities, with special needs that differentiate them from other groups.

It is only in the last year that a Government commission, the National Council on Indian Opportunity, has begun to focus attention on this special problem. The Commission through its Committee on the Condition of the Urban Indian, is currently investigating the condition of Indians in a number of large cities throughout the country. Recently the Committee conducted 2 days of hearings in my district, Minneapolis.

In the following article from the March 19 Minneapolis Star the Committee's Chairman, Mrs. FRED HARRIS, explains why urban Indians are faced with unique problems:

INDIANS' WOES IN CITIES CALLED WORSE THAN ON RESERVATIONS

(By Jim Jones)

Indians in the city are worse off than those still on the reservations, Mrs. Fred Harris, a spokesman for the National Council on Indian Opportunity, said Tuesday.

Mrs. Harris, a Comanche Indian and wife of an Oklahoma senator, spoke at a two-day forum on problems of the Indian Community in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Government and welfare programs encourage Indians to move to the city, she said, this causes them to compete for employment and decent housing.

The Indians are at a disadvantage under these conditions, Mr. Harris continued, because they are from rural backgrounds and usually have poor educations.

Federal funds and programs are directed toward the reservation Indian with little or no thought given to problems facing Indians living in urban areas, she said, "although half of the U.S. Indian population lives in cities."

SHELTERED LIFE

"Indians live a sheltered life on the reservation, and the transition from rural to urban life often causes frustrations.

"Reservation life deprives an Indian of his initiative," but he receives better health care because of government assistance, she said.

Indians as a group have the lowest income, poorest housing, worst health and largest number of school dropouts, she said.

"The Indian is the low man on the totem pole," she said.

Mrs. Harris, a native of Lawton, Okla., is the mother of three chidlren, Katherine, a student at the University of Oklahoma, Byron, 12, and Laura, 8. She met her husband while attending high school in Oklahoma.

DRAMATIZE PLIGHT

The purpose of the forum is to dramatize the plight of the Indian in urban areas, Mrs. Harris said.

One-fourth of the U.S. Indian population lives in Oklahoma, she said. There are 68 tribes of Indians there.

"My husband is an authority on Indian culture. He speaks the Comanche language, and he researched Indian history after graduating from law school.

"The Comanches dominated the Southwest territory, at one time," she said. "I'm proud to be a Comanche."

Oklahoma Indians don't live on official reservations, Mrs. Harris explained, they live on "trust land."

DIFFERENT PROBLEMS

Problems there are somewhat different than the ones reservation Indians face, she explained, because reservation procedure is not used.

There are prejudices, Mrs. Harris said, but the basic problem in Oklahoma is the lack of understanding.

The youth present new social problems, and there appears to be a break down in family structure in the areas where Indian women are employed.

Mrs. Harris toured Minnesota Indian reservations for three days in 1967 with Mrs. Walter Mondale, wife of the Minnesota senator.

They inspected housing, educational and health conditions at the Prairie Island, White Earth, Leech Lake, Red Lake and Fond du Lac reservations.

A series of hearings by the Committee on the Condition of the Urban Indian, of the National Council on Indian Opportunity will be held around the country, Mrs. Harris said. The council will make recommendations to the federal government, based on the findings.

BACK 'EM UP CAMPAIGN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, in April 1968, the members of the Veterans' Administration Central Office Employees' Association initiated Project Back 'Em Up.

As its title suggests, this project had but one purpose: to reassure our fighting men in Vietnam that their service and sacrifice are recognized and appreciated by patriotic Americans back home, and particularly by the employees of the VA Central Office whose duty it is to serve those who served.

Through December 1968, Project Back 'Em Up has given practical expression to this support and gratitude of VA Central Office employees through the contribution of 232 gift packages of personal items wanted by our fighting men but difficult to obtain in Vietnam.

It has resulted in monetary contributions that not only covered the mailing costs of these packages but enabled the VA Central Office Employees' Association to donate four small television sets to Bethesda Naval Hospital and Walter Reed Army Hospital.

And it has made available some 500 books to veterans in the Washington VA hospital.

The members and officers of the association, including Mrs. Hazel Redmon, its president, and Mr. Frank Dority, Back 'Em Up chairman, are to be commended for this exemplary project.

A JUSTICE SPEAKS OUT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been my pleasure to hear timely remarks by the Honorable Cameron Bruce Littlejohn, associate justice of the South Carolina Supreme Court. The justice's comments were made at the Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council banquet.

The Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council was formed as a community involvement organization with citizens and law-enforcement officials working together to minimize crime in the community. I think the mayor of Spartanburg, the Honorable Robert L. Stoddard, and his city council are to be commended for their positive approach to this problem. By taking this matter in hand, they are taking a giant step forward in reversing the escalating crime rate. Making the community aware of ways of eliminating factors that encourage crime is one of the objectives of the council. Studying and curing the breeding places of crime is another.

Honoring outstanding law-enforcement officers for faithful service is still another, and this was actually the occasion of the banquet which Justice Littlejohn addressed. Police Lt. Rembert W. Hayes received the award for 1969 Policeman of the Year in the city of Spartanburg. It has been my observation that the police department of the city of Spartanburg is composed of dedicated officers who are seeking to improve their professional competence, and Lieutenant Hayes, along with Police Director W. T. Ivey, are leaders in the endeavor.

I find it most encouraging that citizens and law-enforcement officers are working together on this problem. It is a community project to make streets safe for every citizen. I thought the Members of Congress would be interested in Justice Littlejohn's remarks on a subject that is of great current concern to each of us:

POLICE OFFICERS, THE BACKBONE OF LAW AND ORDER

(Speech of Associate Justice Bruce Littlejohn, at Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council banquet, Feb. 13, 1969, Spartanburg, S.C.)

I want to congratulate the Mayor upon his foresight in appointing this council to assist in a problem which is always present. The prevention of crime is not the work of law enforcement officials alone, but is the problem of all good citizens, and it is well to have a representative group such as the Spartanburg Crime Prevention Council constantly studying ways that violation of the law can

be minimized, and studying ways to deal with crimes that inevitably will occur.

In order to prevent a problem it is always well to determine first what is causing it. The crime and violence that flourish in America today cannot be attributed to any one cause. The causes are many and are interrelated. The causes are rooted in a number of conditions and influences in everyday life. If there were only a single cause of crime the job of preventing or minimizing the same would be considerably simplified. Since there is no one cause of crime there is certainly no single remedy. Crime and violence cannot be prevented or reduced by concentrating on any one or two phases of the problem to the exclusion of all others. A many-sided effort is required if effective results are to be achieved.

I am always amused when I hear of some individual who is thoroughly convinced that his pet peeve is the basic cause of all crime. For example, one person may say that juvenile delinquency results from the fact that mothers are working; another will be convinced that crime stems from poor housing or alcohol or drugs.

I do not pretend to be able to enumerate all of the factors which cause persons to violate the law. Some of the reasons certainly are poverty, unemployment, the breakdown of family life, absence of gun control, inadequate housing, slums, lack of training, drugs, liquor, and failure to adequately teach in our schools that crime does not pay. At the same time we can find many who have violated the law in a way that cannot be attributed to any of these reasons.

It is my conviction, if I may generalize, that crime and violence are increasing primarily because there is mass deterioration of respect for the law. In addition, the deterrents to crime have been weakened. Those who break the law get the impression that punishment isn't as sure as it used to be. This trend in their thinking must be reversed.

Too many individuals are anxious to avail themselves of all the rights, privileges and benefits which this nation affords, but shy away from the duties and responsibilities that life in a free society demands. Too many people are half boy and half man. They seek to force their own solution on everybody else's problem. The man half demands all the rights and privileges known to law. The boy half refuses to accept any of the responsibilities imposed by the law. Unfortunately there is a reluctance on the part of many of our citizens to act positively in behalf of law and order. Crimes go unreported; witnesses are unwilling to testify; citizens avoid jury duty. This is often done in a sort of "why should I get involved" attitude. The mistaken idea that law enforcement is for only those who are paid to perform it is a popular one. It is also an erroneous one.

Every individual should realize that in today's complex society he is in fact his brother's keeper. The individual must realize that as a member of society he is dependent upon other members of the same society. The individual must recognize that the more effort he contributes to law enforcement the better society will be. If each individual citizen would exert an extra measure of caution in his daily life in an effort to preclude opportunities for crime to flourish, the result in the prevention of crime and violence would be immeasurable. For example, the FBI statistics show that 42% of the cars stolen had the key left in the ignition such that it was tempting and convenient for the thief.

The demagogic exhortations of civil rights and student leaders have done much to encourage lawlessness and civil disobedience. They proceed on the theory that the answer to all social and economic problems are not to be found in legal procedures, but are to be found on the streets and solved by looting, shooting, arson and riots.

Dissent is one of the nation's priceless values. It must be protected at all times and in all areas of thought and action. But this dissent, of its very nature, requires law for both its expression and its preservation.

In our affluent society there exists a public tendency toward softness and tolerance of those who violate the law. An effort is often made to justify violations because of one's personal idea of the justness and fairness of the law. Such cannot be condoned. A person should never be permitted to take the law into their own hands by deciding which laws they like and which laws they will obey. If one is permitted to disobey the laws he dislikes, then everyone else has the same right and we are back where we started from with each man his own law.

There can be no organized society; there can be no personal security; there can be no property rights without a strong police authority. Never before have Americans been so aware of these truths.

If our system of law is to serve, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be speedily detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. Respect for the law is not increased by judges who are too lenient or prosecutors too timid, or by misguided writers and commentators who slant the news to their own satisfaction. I was disgusted to hear a commentator on a national newscast recently commenting upon President Johnson's statement relative to the actions of Mayor Daley during the Democratic Convention. He ended up the newscast by stating that "Mayor Daley still refuses to apologize"—the implication being that there wasn't any doubt that Mayor Daley should apologize.

People who went to Chicago to cause trouble should not be heard to complain if they weren't received and dealt with as at a pink tea. An unruly mob gathered, intent on disrupting the Democratic National Convention. If it be true that some innocent people were the victims of unnecessary roughness on the part of the police, it is also true that the Chicago police and the National Guard were faced with vicious, attacking mobs who gave to them no alternative but to use sufficient force to prevent the mob from accomplishing its destructive purpose. It is a tribute to the authorities that under these chaotic circumstances the convention was not disrupted, the city was not paralyzed, not one shot was fired by police, and no life was lost. As 1972 approaches it will be interesting to observe if any city's mayor in his right mind seeks either one of the national conventions. I think Mayor Daley would be equal to the situation. I also think that he will conclude that the convention should be rotated to some other town.

I am not unaware of the fact that police brutality can occur. In my 20 years of holding court it has been my observation that the American police officer is, with extremely rare exceptions, a good citizen dedicated to the enforcement of the law and anxious to do right as best he can conceive the right to be. A typical case of alleged police brutality involves a drunken bum who kicks a policeman on the shin or resists arrest. When the officer uses enough force to bring him under control and carries him to jail, where he ought to be, then comes the cry of police brutality.

The police officer is expected to act, and must act, in any kind of case which may arise. He must deal quickly with the purse snatcher and the petty thief, right on up to the sex maniac, the rioter, the arsonist, and the looter. Oftentimes an officer must make a split-second decision in order to prevent a crime or in order to apprehend a thug. He does not have time for extended deliberation and reasoning. Many times it is now or never. Unfortunately, sometimes it is kill or be killed. I have no sympathy for people in high authority, both in and out of government, who criticize the police officer who honestly performs his duties and does what he thinks best under difficult circumstances.

Demonstrators and commentators and editors and others can yell police brutality until their breath is gone, but they cannot escape the proposition that the fear that grips the heart of the American people today is not the fear of an officer with a badge. It is the fear of brazen criminals in the cities and communities. It is the mugger and robber, the rapist and murderer who make people afraid to walk the streets at night. It is fear of criminals anxious to create disrespect for the law by creating a belief that all policemen are brutal.

People are calling for better protection and for more policemen. They are asking for stiffer penalties for vicious criminals. They know that crime is the greatest enemy of a free society living under the rule of law.

I am a firm believer in the simple proposition that if that which one is doing is not bringing about the result which is sought, it is time to try something different. That which all of us charged with law enforcement are doing, is not bringing about the result that we desire. It is therefore time to try something new. We can deal more firmly with the criminal or we can deal less firmly with the criminal or we can continue in the same pattern. There are no other alternatives. The answer is obvious.

Law enforcement organizations in this country have been prepared to deal with individuals who occasionally violate the law. The criminal of yesteryear was the sneak thief or some other person who committed a crime and ran to seclusion. We have not until recently been required to deal with large numbers of people who conspire to violate the law en masse.

Many of the techniques of policing used for decades in dealing with crimes and criminals are no longer sufficient to deal with modern problems. Law enforcement organizations throughout the country are studying new problems in the light of the experiences of a few unfortunate cities, They are to be commended upon the progress which they are making in preparing for new difficulties.

It is important in this day of constant change that all of us keep abreast of what is new and different.

Systems of operation and skills sufficient for a police officer 25 years ago, or even 5 years ago, are no longer adequate. This should not startle us, for skills of the loom fixer or the farmer or the lawyer 25 years ago are no longer adequate either. Automation, greater production, development of the transportation and communication systems and the fact that there is more abundance of everything has changed the complexion of all governmental problems.

The law enforcement officer's equipment of yesteryear is completely outmoded. Formerly it was not necessary for a policeman to wear a helmet or carry a tear gas dispenser or gas mask. A 30 inch night stick was unknown to law enforcement.

It has been said that today an officer sometimes needs to be half a lawyer. Sometimes he needs to be a whole lawyer. The peace officer of today is selling to the people who employ him not only his time and physical effort, but is now more than ever selling his best judgment with law enforcement problems as they arise. Increasing crime, increasing social unrest, make police work more important, more complicated, and more delicate.

Law enforcement has always been a difficult task. Unfortunately many people believe in it theoretically until they themselves

or their friends become involved. Oftentimes a juror abhors drunken driving, but hasn't the courage to convict. Law enforcement is a difficult task because we deal with human conflicts. Nothing will deter violation of the law more than the realization that one will be apprehended and punished.

In those cities where authorities have let it be known that lawlessness will not be tolerated there has been little trouble or none at all. In cities where the authorities were slow to act to the danger signals, things got out of hand rapidly and police officers had to be supplemented by National Guardsmen.

There are no safety zones where one can stand aloof from crime. Crime is everywhere. It can and does strike at the rich and the poor, in the slum and in the penthouse apartments. Not every community has a riot, but every community is a battleground with crime. Many citizens are fighting on the side of law and order; others are fighting with the underworld; and then there are too many who are just avoiding involvement. Actually they are lending comfort to the criminal.

The solutions are not simple but there are many things which can be done. These include better training and enlargement of police forces, reframing of court procedures, more enlightened methods of rehabilitating criminals and removing the cause of crime. More time and effort and money must be invested in law enforcement. It will be an economy in the end.

America has had many problems before. We have not always solved the problem rapidly. Fortunately, we have solved them reasonably well. I believe that the American people will arise to the emergency and will do whatever is necessary.

TERROR BOMB IN WORKS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I hope that those who have been so reckless in opposing deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system for the United States will read the following Reuters dispatch. It clearly indicates how desperately necessary it is for the United States to move ahead.

The Reuters dispatch follows:

TERROR BOMB IN WORKS

WASHINGTON.—Military sources said Saturday there was growing evidence that Russia is building a massive space bomb capable of being targeted against U.S. cities at the press of a button.

The Soviet Union has been experimenting with such an orbital weapon—known as FOBS (Fractional Oribtal Bombardment System)—for at least three years.

The Defense Department refused to confirm the reports, but other sources said intelligence data indicated that a decision may have been made to add the weapon to the Soviet nuclear arsenal.

The orbital bomb is believed capable of carrying a nuclear payload equivalent to between one and three millions tons of conventional TNT.

The bomb could be launched into outer space, ready to be dropped on a selected target by remote control, either during its first orbit or on subsequent 90-minute circuits of the earth.

If deployed, it would add a dreaded new dimension to the East-West arms race.

EULOGY OF DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans who mourn the passing of Dwight David Eisenhower.

The affection which General Eisenhower earned from his countrymen is perhaps unique in this era. In a period of our history when many Americans have come to view the purposes and motivations of politicians with cynicism and even hostility, the nationwide respect for General Eisenhower is a reminder that honesty and openness are still essential to the formulation of public policy. For when public trust is lacking, essential programs will fail to engender the support necessary for their success.

The many accomplishments of General Eisenhower's career are well known. As Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in World War II, Chief of Staff of the Army, and the first Supreme Commander of NATO, General Eisenhower achieved the highest honors which can be bestowed on a military man. In addition, he served with distinction as president of Columbia University from 1948 to 1950. And, of course, he was twice elected President of the United States.

As the victorious military Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, and the first head of the NATO forces, General Eisenhower's place in our military history is assured. It was his plan which resulted in the successful invasion of Normandy in June 1944, and it was under his direction that that invasion was carried through to the successful defeat of Nazi Germany. With the fate of the entire Allied Expeditionary Force on his shoulders, General Eisenhower made the right decisions at the right time. His leadership earned him the gratitude of all of Western Europe, as well as his own fellow countrymen.

As the head of NATO, General Eisenhower molded separate and competing military powers into a successful defense force and laid the basis for the military security of Western Europe. The unity which he helped to forge has made possible the two decades of peace which Western Europe has known, and the increasing cooperation between European powers that has characterized postwar European development.

As President, General Eisenhower's record is mixed. While he failed to attack many of the longstanding problems—including poverty and discrimination—which have had so great a significance for the future of America, he did not—as some of his supporters thought he might—dismantle the social programs and institutions which he inherited from his Democratic predecessors. His decision to send Federal troops to Little Rock in 1957 in support of the Supreme Court's order that schools must be integrated also laid the basis for future Federal action in support of desegregation.

In his farewell radio and television address on January 17, 1961, General Eisenhower issued a warning to America that in recent years has taken on greater and greater significance. Although he was himself a military man, he warned in that address of the escalating power of the military and the potential implications of the encroachment of the military-industrial complex on our democratic processes.

He said:

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.

The rise in the military budget which has occurred since General Eisenhower issued that warning, and the initiation and perpetuation of the war in Vietnam, testify to the validity of his fears of an ever growing military influence on the conduct of public policy. As the General himself said:

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.

The growth of the military-industrial complex since 1961 has failed to bring increased security, and today poses very real dangers to the future of our democratic processes. As a country dedicated to liberty and the democratic formulation of public policy, we can ill-afford to ignore the threat of increasing military and industrial dominance which General Eisenhower pointed out.

Americans have traditionally reserved their greatest respect and admiration for those who serve their country with honesty and dedication. General Eisenhower brought both qualities to his long and distinguished career as a public servant. His dedication and his contributions will endure as standards by which to judge the careers of those who come after him.

A NATION GRIEVES THE LOSS OF "IKE"

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, this country and the world all mourn the loss of one of our great sons.

Dwight David Eisenhower stands as one of the most outstanding figures in the American heritage. Born from the heartland of our country, he reflected the kind of spirit and enthusiasm which gives this Nation the dynamic force it has in the world today.

But at the same time, he had a deep understanding of human emotion and a sense of compassion for those ideals which truly urge man to his highest goals.

It was this combination of driving force tempered by compassion which made "Ike" the great man he was.

He was the most capable military commander in the world, and the hand of fate directed that he appear on the scene at perhaps the most critical time in world history. He was an efficient and able President who guided his country through a period of complex transition. And his success was the embodiment of the dream of the real America.

Dwight David Eisenhower, General of the Armies, President of the United States, was one of the few men in American history who only had friends, and no enemies.

MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Good Friday and the first anniversary of the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Martin Luther King had one of the most powerful personal impacts upon society this Nation has ever witnessed. Through his words, and deeds, and life, he laid bare to a society affluent in the blessings of liberty the revelation of itself using every contrived means to close its eyes to the sufferings and injustices it perpetrates upon its black and its poor despised brothers. The suffering and oppressed were Dr. King's people and he made his life and work for and among them. More than this, so compelling and stirring was his love for and message to the oppressed, oppressor, and bystander that masses of men of every color and persuasion, in this Nation and every part of the world, were influenced by him to take up the cause of justice and the brotherhood of man which he exemplified.

He was an activist—caught in historic attention from the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955 to the Memphis garbage workers strike of 1968. He changed and improved the lives of unreckoned numbers of his countrymen and brothers.

He was a revolutionary by his ideas and deeds, "turning the world upside down" as they said of the cross figure in the time in which he lived. Like that figure, Martin Luther King caused bitterness in those who could not accept his philosophy of love, or the cause of racial justice, or the power of his technique of nonviolent revolution. And so the power that inspired also brought the hate which blotted out his life in vigorous manhood and vitality, even as he knew it might.

One year later, the life of Martin Luther King has not dimmed. Rather its meaning is a daily confrontation as our Nation broods over increasing urban turmoil and the violent directions of frustration, anger, and impatience. Over all hang the questions raised by his life and his faith: Is there a peaceful means to life for all men? Is unreconciled hatred and violence the only resolution, or is this way the course to common destruction?

Dr. Martin Luther King's monumental contributions to his fellow man expose the ugliness of suffering and injustice. His life is an eloquent statement of a compelling faith. It is the repository of a dream that one day all men will know justice.

THE LUMBER PRICE CRISIS: THE KEY IS RESEARCH

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to my colleagues yesterday, if we are to build 26 million housing units during the next 10 years and meet the demands for housing beyond that period in these United States, we must have long-range solutions to our timber supply problems in addition to the short-range solutions presently being planned.

Research is the very heart of any long-range solution. The Forest Sciences Laboratory at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg., is a key installation in the long-range planning program. The School of Forestry at Oregon State is one of the outstanding schools on this important subject in this Nation. Dean of the school, Carl Stoltenberg, has shown great leadership and wisdom in his administration of the school.

Dean Stoltenberg recently wrote to me concerning the need for construction of phase II of the Forest Sciences Laboratory in Corvallis and its relation to the long-range solution to our timber supply problem. I present it here for the information of my colleagues:

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF FORESTRY,
Corvallis, Oreg., March 5, 1969.

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

DEAR WENDELL: I should like to share with you some concerns for forestry research in Corvallis and the Northwest—a subject on which I know you are both interested and informed. Research is of course one of our primary objectives at Oregon State University. Our close partner in forestry research here in Corvallis is the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service. I was pleased to note the several increases in their forestry research budget that was recently presented to Congress. In my opinion, each of these modest increases is in an area of high priority. Such research will contribute strongly to making Oregon's forests a more productive segment of the State's economy.

However, I was disappointed that the President's budget does not provide for strengthening any of the Station's projects at the Corvallis Forestry Sciences Laboratory. And I was even more disappointed that the expansion of their Forestry Sciences Laboratory building has again been postponed.

The Congress appropriated $170,000 in 1965 for developing plans and specifications for Phase 2 of the Forestry Sciences Laboratory. These plans for an addition to the present facility were completed in 1967, but construction funds have not yet been provided.

The Forest Service has an excellent staff of scientists here in Corvallis, but their productivity is severely handicapped by their crowded conditions and hopelessly inadequate laboratory facilities.

As the demand for building materials has expanded there has not been a corresponding supply response, resulting in a doubling of the price of lumber and of federal stumpage during the past year. But still there are huge quantities of wood which fail to reach the market because of destruction from forest insects and diseases—losses which might be prevented if this laboratory had been constructed and the Station's Corvallis entomology and pathology projects had been adequately staffed.

We need to learn how to control forest insects and diseases more efficiently and without using dangerous poisons. More progress is needed in learning how to prevent erosion and damaging siltation in Oregon streams as logging pushes into the steeper, less stable terrain. These are projects that will be accelerated as soon as the proposed portion of the Forest Service laboratory is completed. In answer to my inquiry to the Forest Service for descriptive information on the proposed construction, I recently obtained the enclosed brochure which highlights the status and the need for the laboratory addition.

Is there any opportunity of providing funds to complete this key facility promptly? If you could develop such an opportunity, I would certainly urge such action, and would appreciate any action you might take to achieve this end.

Sincerely,

CARL H. STOLTENBERG,
Dean.

MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we begin now, on Good Friday itself, that awful season when every day will be the anniversary of another event that must remind us of how much can be lost by even the greatest of nations in the briefest of times.

We see with the perspective of a year how little we have done to move from the horrors of last spring to the fulfillment of the hopes of the two murdered Americans who had most personified those hopes that were in the fullest sense the best hopes of the largest numbers of our people. We enter this season with the memory of enough oratory to make the ear weary of words, of enough pledges of rededication to make pledges seem monuments of hypocrisy. Maybe that is in part why the wound at the heart is deeper and more painful now even than it was then, of why now more words invite cynicism and resentment in the hollowness of attitudes unchanged and things undone.

Which is not to say that it would be acceptable to abandon oratory and pledges for self-pity and despair. Rather, in the depth of our inadequacies and failure we read again the most prophetic of tributes paid in our experience by greatness to greatness, read it to join its prayers, and to determine to go on more urgently and more determinedly than before, the augmenting anguish of loss joining with the pressures of events to induce from us the best and most that can be done by those left when giants are struck from their midst at their time of greatest need.

A statement by Senator Robert F. Kennedy follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON THE DEATH OF THE REVEREND MARTIN LUTHER KING RALLY IN INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 4, 1968

I have bad news for you, for all of our fellow citizens, and people who love peace all over the world, and that is that Martin Luther King was shot and killed tonight.

Martin Luther King dedicated his life to love and to justice for his fellow human beings, and he died because of that effort.

In this difficult day, in this difficult time for the United States, it is perhaps well to ask what kind of a nation we are and what direction we want to move in. For those of you who are black—considering the evidence there evidently is that there were white people who were responsible—you can be filled with bitterness, with hatred, and a desire for revenge. We can move in that direction as a country, in great polarization—black people amongst black, white people amongst white, filled with hatred toward one another.

Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and to comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand with compassion and love.

For those of you who are black and are tempted to be filled with hatred and distrust at the injustice of such an act, against all white people, I can only say that I feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man. But we have to make an effort in the United States, we have to make an effort to understand, to go beyond these rather difficult times.

My favorite poet was Aeschylus. He wrote: "In our sleep, pain which cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart until, in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God."

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence or lawlessness, but love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice towards those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or they be black.

So I shall ask you tonight to return home to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King, that's true, but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love—a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We can do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We've had difficult times in the past. We will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life and want justice for all human beings who abide in our land.

Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and to make gentle the life of this world.

Let us dedicate ourselves to that and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

BYELORUSSIA

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 51st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia, and I think it appropriate that we take a moment to pause and pay tribute to these courageous and valiant people.

Despite a determined and hard-fought effort to maintain and preserve their independence, the young state could not withstand the onslaught of the overwhelming forces of the predatory Bolshevik army. However, through the years these gallant and freedom-loving people have sustained an unquenchable thirst for liberty, and their devotion to freedom and self-government is an inspiration to free peoples everywhere.

I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in honoring these great and noble people, and hope that through these messages of encouragement, they will know that we will never forget their hopes and aspirations to join the community of free nations.

A SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article, "A Symbol of a Tragedy," by the outstanding newspaper columnist, William S. White, is one of the finest pieces of journalism I have ever read. In case my colleagues in the Congress may have missed reading this article in Mr. White's syndicated column, I am delighted to bring it to your attention.

I have felt for years that this country has been cheated, because Senator RUSSELL has never been objectively considered for the highest office in the land for purely sectional reasons by those who know in their hearts what this man has meant to these United States during the years.

I still pray that fate will not decree that this country will be deprived of his further service.

The article follows:

A SYMBOL OF A TRAGEDY

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The calm, patrician disclosure of Richard Brevard Russell that he is in the cold grip of a wasting lung tumor brings a sense of elegy to the Senate, and to the country the beginning of the end of an American tragedy.

For this, one of the greatest senators of his era, and the highest embodiment of a Southern tradition of aristocratic and large-minded public service, has acted for his nation with a gallantry and a generosity which that nation has, in fact, repaid with a petty discrimination against him and all his kind.

The personal disaster that has overtaken this authentic gentleman of politics, this able and devoted guardian of true national interest, is cause for general sorrow, and for more than personal sorrow.

If no man is an island to himself, true it is, too, that when the great ones pass from the scence, all are thereby left diminished all are thereby left impoverished.

So it is that if grief for a man must now run high among those who know his personal value, higher yet should run grief for all the implications of a political life so cramped and cribbed and confined by needless and surely outmoded sectional prejudice.

For here has not been simply a senator from Georgia, but rather, in the best and highest meaning of that old-fashioned term, a senator of the United States of America.

On every single ordinary and rational test of performance, of competence, and of private and public honor, no politician in his time has more clearly and more repeatedly earned consideration for the highest office of them all.

No one who understands the Senate can doubt that for many years he has towered there. But the trouble for Richard Brevard Russell has not been that he ever lacked the ability to be an outstanding president, but only that he had himself born in the wrong place at the wrong time, and thus was forever denied even a chance at that elevation which otherwise could hardly have been refused to him.

In a word, the door to the White House was locked and nailed up against him because he was "a Southerner," and thus a member of a lesser breed without the law.

More than any other qualified man, he has been absurdly the victim of a kind of reverse "discrimination" which we might all usefully examine. For the ugly coin of bias has two sides, though we usually talk as though it had only one, and in Richard Russell's case, the coin has always fallen into heads I win and tails you lose.

The bleak, the undeniable and the foolish unfairness of the facts of his career surely presents some opportunity for national second thoughts; surely elementary justice requires some reconsideration of the political criteria of this country.

Granting if one wishes a thousand sins by a South long dead and gone, how long should this nation go on and on punishing its present Southern men of talent for what went on, or is supposed to have gone on, in its long, long yesterdays?

How many times must Fort Sumter be avenged and re-avenged? How many times must "Northern liberals" in their inner awareness of their professional inferiority to such Richard Russells as still survive, reassure themselves by seeing to it that every Richard Russell is kept firmly in his place? How long can the nation afford all this?

It used to be said, and truthfully, that it was the South which would not allow the Civil War to be forgotten. But is it not now—and has it not long since been—the other way round? When the Senate says farewell to Richard Russell something much more than the Senate will have been deprived. So, too, will have been the United States of America.

Perhaps, just perhaps, it may be that his last service will not after all be that stout leadership for a strong American defense posture to which so long he has contributed so much.

Perhaps it will instead be to recall a nation to common sense, if not to a sense of ordinary justice, so that the Civil War may be ended in politics, too, and so that qualified men may be allowed to contend for the presidency, whatever the section of their birth.

SCIENTISTS PROPOSE SONIC BOOM TESTS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune recently carried an article by Louise Hutchinson, which I believe deserves the highest consideration and widest possible attention.

For a number of years I have said time and again that we cannot proceed with the development of a supersonic transport system in the United States until we know definitely just what the effects of such aircraft will have on the citizens and animal life of the United States.

To date there is little evidence that the SST would not be harmful to the well-being of this Nation, and I cannot stress too strongly my own feeling that it would be a tragedy of our time for Congress to place its approval on further development of the SST until we have more detailed information on the effects of this vehicle upon human beings.

It is my hope that our Government will choose to conduct a thorough and careful investigation into the effects of the SST before embarking on a costly venture producing chaos throughout this country.

The Tribune article by Miss Hutchinson follows:

SCIENTISTS PROPOSE SONIC BOOM TESTS

(By Louise Hutchinson)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—A scientific panel recommended yesterday that the government start a program of supersonic flights over the United States so that citizens can learn for themselves what the daily battering of sonic booms is like.

At issue is the still unbuilt and controversial supersonic transport.

Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, who called a press conference to release the study he commissioned, maintains the sonic booms that will result from the flight of the 1,800 mile-an-hour jet are an environmental problem. That puts them in his bailiwick.

The federal aviation agency, which fired back a statement, didn't say so directly, but it clearly considers the SST and its booms an FAA matter.

The squabble may amount to little more than a rattling window pane. Any major decisions will have to be made by the Nixon administration and none of the current cast may be around by then.

The panel of 12 scientists named by Udall last December to probe "noise and the sonic boom in relation to man" recommended that prompt, large-scale experiments in supersonic flight be done to see how people feel about the booms.

They also proposed that a Presidential committee be set up to hold public hearings in areas of the country potentially affected by the SST sonic booms. The committee, said the panel, then could make recommendations.

The panel also got into the economics of the SST, asserting that if the jet liner to be built by the Boeing company is not allowed to fly over this country, "its development and use would face a serious handicap."

CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, KABC-TV in Chicago recently commented, editorially, about the tragedy of the absence of mandatory requirements for crash locator beacons on commercial aircraft in this country today.

I am sure that there are few who would disagree with the thinking outlined in KABC-TV's forthright commentary on this subject, and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD today the editorial entitled "Crash Locator Beacons."

The editorial follows:

CRASH LOCATOR BEACONS

The recent disappearance of a DC-3 with 32 passengers aboard has been a tragic news highlight—a highlight made even more tragic because the plane might have been located if a simple safety measure were observed.

Crash Locator Beacons which automatically give off a battery-operated signal after a crash impact, have been available for some time.

Operating on specially assigned radio wavelengths, beacon signals emitted every few seconds can be detected by search planes as far as 200 miles—depending on the altitude of the searcher.

A recent aviation safety survey shows that about 20% of all downed aircraft require a search. More than 30 planes lost in the last ten years have never been found.

(Cost of the installed Crash Locator Beacon runs from about $100 up.)

KABC-TV recommends immediate legal action requiring such a device as a safety meaure in all commercially operated aircraft.

To be effective, Crash Locator Beacons must be a standard requirement.

The cost is negligible—the potential in lives saved through shortened search time, immense. We urge authorities to enact necessary regulations now.

(NOTE.—The above Editorial was telecast a total of three times—on February 25, and 26, 1969.)

THE CONSTRUCTIVE RISE OF BLACK BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN DETROIT

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in Congress and the constituents of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan the history and progress of a black business development program now successfully operating in my home city of Detroit.

This growing program is being implemented by the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum, a nonprofit corporation of which, I am proud to state, I was the founder. What the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum—ICBIF—is accomplishing is doing much to counter criticism of the "black capitalism" concept of the Nixon administration.

Critics of "black capitalism" charge that encouraging this approach will do no more than provide fat incomes for a relatively few black business proprietors, while leaving unbenefited the vast numbers of black who seek economic advancement.

It is my view that "black capitalism" is indeed but one of many programs needed to produce economic quality for our Nation's 22 million black citizens, whose average income is shamefully less than that of white Americans. However, ICBIF is proving that, through imaginative planning and unselfish purpose, "black capitalism" can be employed as a means of greatly swelling black business ownership and, as a consequence, creating many additional job opportunities where they are needed the most.

The seed from which ICBIF sprouted was planted at a meeting of 65 black community leaders called by me and held in my westside Detroit congressional office on Sunday, August 6, 1967, just 1 week after the end of the fiery civil uprising in Detroit—July 23 to 29, 1967.

Among those in attendance were Mrs. Florine Hawkins, whose Hawkins Apparel Shop had been burned down during the disorder; Mr. L. M. Quinn, editor-general manager of the Michigan Chronicle; Mr. Edward Lacen, now deceased, director of Detroit's small business development center program; Mr. Nathaniel Smith, owner of the Speed-E dry cleaning chain; the Reverend Dr. Charles E. Morton, pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church and a member of Michigan's State Board of Education; Mrs. Carmen Murphy, head of House of Beauty, Inc.; Mr. Waymon Dunn, president of the Community Association of Block Clubs, Inc.; Mr. Lawrence B. Doss, Assistant District Director of the Internal Revenue Service; Mr. Walter M. McMurtry, loan officer with the Bank of the Commonwealth and president of the financial forum; Mr. Colin Cromwell, owner of the Motor City Super Market and now operator of Detroit's first black-owned cafeteria, the Soul Buffet; Mr. Edward Davis, the only black holder of Chrysler franchise in the United States; Dr. Austin W. Curtis, Jr., the one and only laboratory assistant to the late Tuskegee Institute agricultural scientist, Dr. George Washington Carver, and president of A. W. Curtis Laboratories, Inc.; Mr. M. Stewart Thompson, a mortgage broker; Mr. Thaddeus Gaillard, president of Great Lakes Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Mrs. Esther Gordy Edwards, vice president of Detroit's internationally known Motown Record Corp.; Mr. James Garrett, president of the Cotillion Club; Dr. Karl D. Gregory, Wayne State University economics professor; and Mr. Wardell Croft, president of Wright Mutual Insurance Co.

The fruitfulness of this August 6 meeting is evidenced by the fact that unanimous agreement was reached to continue scheduling discussions on business problems contributing to and resulting from the riot and to institute mechanisms for overcoming obstacles blocking the acquirement of financing, site locations, and casualty insurance coverage by black entrepreneuers.

In order to guarantee action on these recommendations, this gathering also appointed task force committees to explore the establishment of a central office, to determine the chief concerns of inner-city Detroit's black merchants and consumers, and to search for means by which a paid staff could be hired to make these suggestions materialize.

This group, in addition, concurred in my recommendation to call itself the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum.

From this point on, meetings of the Forum were held on virtually a weekly basis, with the task force groups convening even more frequently. Since almost all of the riot damage had occurred

in my 13th District and the adjoining First District, assisting in the development of ICBIF became a project of highest priority for my two congressional offices in Detroit.

On Sunday, August 20, ICBIF's task force on ways and means, headed by Mr. Lawrence Doss, outlined a program that catapulted the organization onto its present path of success.

Mr. Doss' committee proposed, first, that campaigns be launched to counsel both consumers and business owners of the inner city; second, that professional help be obtained to guide the formation of cooperatives, the restoration or relocation of riot-damaged businesses and the operations of new and existing enterprises; third, that the creation of architecturally impressive commercial structures in the inner city, such as shopping center and franchise ventures, be encouraged; and, fourth, that community-controlled agencies be set up to assist business people in solving their managerial, promotional, legal and financial problems, and to provide further training in business management and skilled crafts.

The task force budget recommendation of $14,280 needed to begin implementation of its program and covering the period of September through December 1967 was approved. A fundraising plan was devised and, within a few days, letters soliciting contributions were sent to a large number of individuals and organizations in the black community.

At this same meeting, the decision was made to incorporate ICBIF. It was decided that this corporate structure would be composed of a 30-member board of directors, representing all variances in inner-city thinking, an executive staff, and five advisory committees—an Immediate Business Opportunity Committee, a Long-Range Business Opportunity Committee, an Economic Education and Consumer Advisory Committee, a Committee on Financial Resources, and a Community Liaison and Public Information Committee.

While in the process of becoming incorporated and acquiring necessary operating funds, ICBIF used my West Side Detroit congressional office as its temporary headquarters. During this interim period, I assigned a member of my staff—Mr. Thomas Binion—to devote his full time and attention with the necessary supporting services, to matters of the Forum.

On October 13, 1967, the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum was incorporated under Michigan laws as a nonprofit organization "to enhance the general welfare of Greater Detroit through fostering and stimulating the expansion of business ownership by residents of Detroit's core communities." The organizing officers were Mr. Nathaniel Smith, president; Mr. M. Stewart Thompson, vice president; Miss Dorothy Quarker, my longtime administrative assistant, secretary, and Mr. Wardell Croft, treasurer.

At its first regular election, the following assumed offices: Dr. Charles E. Morton, chairman of the board; Dr. Karl Gregory, vice chairman of the board; Lawrence P. Doss, president; Nathaniel W. Smith, vice president; Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Secretary; Miss Dorothy Quarker, assistant secretary, and Wardell C. Croft, treasurer.

Also listed as directors were Edgar Brazelton, chairman of the Immediate Business Opportunity Committee; Russell S. Brown, Jr., chairman of the Community Liaison and Public Information Committee; Mrs. Agnes H. Bryant; Attorney Jesse H. Butler; Clyde Cleveland; Dr. Wendell Cox; Colin Cromwell; Dr. Austin W. Curtis, Jr.; Albert Dunmore; Thad B. Gaillard, chairman of the Long-Range Business Opportunity Committee; Mrs. R. Louise Groomes; Mrs. Roberta Hughes; Melvin D. Jefferson; Ernest Mackey; Walter McMurtry, Jr., chairman of the Committee on Financial Resources: Dr. Lon Polk, David Rambeau, Mrs. Esther Shapiro; Herbert Thompson; Edward Vaughn; Tony Vance, and Gabe Werba.

Studies by the ICBIF staff revealed, among other economic imbalances, that while over 65 percent of Detroit's inner-city population is black, 62 percent of the businesses in this area were white owned; and that 31 percent of the black-owned establishments were netting under $4,000 annually, and 60 percent were netting less than $8,000.

It also was confirmed that the biggest problem for black businessmen was difficulty in acquiring capital. This finding prompted my office to step up its efforts to have more attention given to this situation by the Small Business Administration and other Federal lending agencies.

In July 1968, Mr. Walter McMurtry resigned his position of loan officer with Detroit's Bank of the Commonwealth to become the salaried executive director of ICBIF. Mr. McMurtry also was retained as chairman of the organization's Committee on Financial Resources.

Appointed at about the same time to be ICBIF's deputy director was Mr. Carthan Spencer, the co-owner of an accounting firm and, prior to his appointment, a systems analyst with the mayor's Committee on Human Resources.

Grants and loans obtained to finance ICBIF's programs and staff needs now total over $1,500,000. The major portion of these funds was received from Detroit's big three automobile manufacturers and Michigan Bell Telephone Co., but there were impressive contributions from the black community.

ICBIF is now headquartered in a neatly renovated, two-story brick building at 6072 14th Street in the 13th Congressional District of Detroit, and is in the process of constructing an annex to accommodate its expanding activities. Also housed in the Forum's busy location are a district SBA office and a staff employed by the organizers of the proposed First Independence National Bank.

The bank, whose application for a Federal charter received preliminary approval from the Comptroller of the Currency in February 1969, is on the track to become the first black-controlled institution of its type in Detroit's history, the culmination of a dream I have long and activily pursued, even before I became an officer of ICBIF.

In 1968, ICBIF aided several new, black-owned enterprises in obtaining loans totaling nearly $1,000,000. Over 150 business-minded citizens were interviewed by ICBIF staff members during the last 6 months of the year and over 80 requests for loan assistance were processed.

Among the loan recipients were a plant which will manufacture plastic boat and automobile bodies, and which will employ 25 workers; a supermarket corporation which will rebuild and operate a large store that was burned out by rioters; a textbook publishing company, and a number of clothing shops, restaurants, and community-owned groceries.

At the present time, ICBIF is having a store-to-store survey made of inner-city business establishments for the purpose of accurately determining the number, types, outlooks, and needs of these operations. Soon to be opened by the organization are an Entrepreneurial Training Center and a Computer Accounting and Business Promotional Service.

In less than 2 years, the endeavors of the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum have had a measurable effect in stimulating the commercial ambitions of black Detroiters. The programs being sponsored by ICBIF are creating new business, strengthening existing ventures and producing more jobs within the suppressed community they are serving.

There is no reason to doubt that the concept of "black capitalism" can be of significant value in remedying the economic plight of black Americans, provided it is applied along the lines being laid by the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum of Detroit.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this Nation was shaken to its very foundation by the death of one of its greatest humanitarians, men of peace, and fighters for human rights, Dr. Martin Luther King.

Dr. King had a dream and he made that dream the dream of American society. His selfless dedication to the cause of equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity inspired people throughout the United States to seek these goals more vigorously. His profound and abiding faith in the doctrine of nonviolence dramatized the plight of the black people in our country and led to most of the major Federal and State programs now helping black citizens to rise up out of poverty.

Working with black and white alike, Dr. King did more to advance the cause of civil rights than any other Negro in the history of the United States. His achievements in this cause range all the way from the integration of lunch counters in small southern towns to the razing of slums in giant northern cities. Most

important of all, however, he raised the sights of the American people.

It was, therefore, not surprising that Dr. King was held in the highest esteem by black citizens throughout the country. The surveys done by the Kerner Commission and others revealed him to enjoy greater support than all other black leaders combined.

One year later, James Earl Ray has been convicted for this dastardly murder; yet many questions remain unanswered about this tragic event. I hope the Justice Department will not close the case on Dr. King's assassination just because James Earl Ray has gone to jail. Only if all of the facts are fully exposed can the Nation ever come close to being fully reconciled to this great man's death.

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY SPONSOR CORPS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues that the Utah State University Sponsor Corps will participate in this year's National Cherry Blossom Festival. The girls are scheduled to compete in the National Intercollegiate—ROTC—Drill Team competition on April 11 and participate in the Parade of Princesses the following day.

The ROTC Corps of Sponsors at Utah State University was founded in 1893 by 1st Lt. Henry D. Styler, the first P.M.S. & T. at the university. It was founded as an honorary society of women members with the purpose of serving as an auxiliary to and fostering interest in the then recently formed ROTC battalion. It was the first such organization formed and is therefore the oldest in the Nation.

At Utah State University, the Corps is a service organization. As such, the girls are used as official hostesses for the university. They usher for athletic contests, lyceums, guest artist presentations, commencement, and special events. They also participate in service projects for the community.

These girls, in their striking blue uniforms, have become famous throughout the campus, State, and Nation for their precision drilling. They are constantly in demand to drill at athletic events, formal occasions such as the President's review, community celebrations, and drill competitions.

Every other year, the Corps takes a 2-week trip back to the National Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C. In 1957 the USU Sponsors were the only women's drill team entered in the ROTC national drill competition. They won 10th place in competition with 38 male teams and were recognized as the first women's drill team to enter this competition and the first women's team to drill with rifles. In 1959 the Corps took first place in the coed division and 10th overall against 53 male teams. In 1961 the Sponsors took first place in the parade over 150 entries. The girls took first place in 1963 and are listed in the Hall of Fame. Fifth place was won by the Sponsors in 1965 and second place in 1967.

The USU Sponsor Corps, the only team west of the Mississippi to participate in the festival, travels to Washington, D.C., by chartered bus. After spending 4 days in Washington, the Corps travels on to New York City for a 3-day visit.

The trip costs about $5,000. The money is earned by the girls through such projects as selling pens, apples, recipe cards, and coupon books. They have collected pop bottles, stamp books, and pennies; they have sponsored four dances. The USU Student Senate also allocated $1,200 from its marginal balance to the Sponsors to help finance the bus.

Col. M. R. McCarthy is the professor of military science at Utah State University, and Capt. Kenneth S. Freeman is the Sponsor faculty adviser. Sponsor Col. Jan Seamons is commander of the Corps while Cadet Sgt. Michael Williams is drillmaster.

DIRECTOR WOODS SPEAKS OUT ON THE COMPLEXITIES OF WELFARE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the director of the Monroe County Department of Social Services, William B. Woods, is resigning April 20 after 10½ years as director.

Mr. Woods has done an exemplary job in his capacity and has shown an intuitive understanding of the complexities of welfare.

He has a realistic appraisal of the feelings of the people on welfare and he also comprehends the feelings of taxpayers.

In a recent interview, he points out that some taxpayers feel that because a person is on welfare, "What you are supposed to do is live in a hole and be handed the groceries and a shirt once in a while and this satisfies a group of people." But Mr. Woods does not believe that a person loses his rights to dignity because he is on welfare.

This is a most conscientious and wise man. He has a clear insight, after many years of work, into the problems of welfare in Monroe County.

I feel that a two-part series in the Rochester, N.Y. Times-Union, which appeared March 25 and 26, illustrates his comprehensive understanding and points out an exemplary man. Mr. Woods was interviewed by reporters Cliff Smith, William D. Tammeus, Dolores Orman, and editorial writer Phil Currie. I would like to share these articles with my colleagues:

FEW CHEATS ON WELFARE

The county has a good system to detect welfare cheats, Welfare Director William B. Woods says.

Numbers of welfare freeloaders are negligible, he indicated in a taped interview with The Times-Union. Of 20,432 on welfare here, 200 are employable, he said. Some 12,000 welfare recipients are children, he said.

Woods also said in the first part of the interview:

The case load can be trimmed only by reducing programs, such as medical care, rather than by chipping away at single cases.

The average welfare recipient is not a shiftless bum who laughs at the public.

A strong voice is needed locally to help shape state rules.

The voluntary social service agencies, and the public, tend to hide when the Welfare Department gets in trouble.

Woods, 49, is resigning April 20 as director of Monroe County Department of Social Service (Welfare) to become chief administrator of Park Avenue Hospital.

A native of Rochester, he has been welfare director 10½ years. Previously, he was administrator of the old Rochester Municipal Hospital.

Woods was interviewed by T-U reporters Cliff Smith, William D. Tammeus, Dolores Orman and editorial writer Phil Currie. Portions of the first part follow.

Q. You're leaving the welfare administration field for the hospital field at a time when it seems that there's the biggest outcry against welfare and against welfare recipients.

Do you feel like a man who's running from a burning house? Do you think the roof is about to fall in on all the liberal legislation and the good things that have come about in past years?

A. I think your premise is wrong that this is the most difficult time for social welfare.

Public welfare has never been understood by anybody in any day in any age. . . . When Demosthenes was concerned about his Athens (he) said that public welfare was a medicine that neither cured the disease nor allowed the patient to die peacefully, to paraphrase him . . . the city fathers of London (said) we must have a residency law to keep people out of the cities and they developed one about 1673 . . .

. . . and also a series of council regulations which said that anyone who had lost his job and won't work, he would be sent to gaol. And anyone that accepts a wage more than the current wage would be imprisoned . . .

New York State took over the philosophy . . . In 1662 they passed a residency law where you couldn't move from one county to another in the State of New York. In 1823 the secretary of state of New York was concerned about all the money that was spent for public welfare and he authorized an investigation of public welfare.

In 1823 the Monroe County budget was $1,800 and about $750 was spent for public welfare.

Out of the investigation came two recommendations. One was that the county build poor houses and the county had its first poor house in 1826. And the second recommendation was that the State of New York have a residency law. A residency law was initiated and lasted until 1873. . .

Then when the federal government started to take over part of the public welfare with the Social Security Act in 1935, all residency laws went out the window in New York State.

Q. You don't feel that the criticism is any more justified today than it has been in the past?

A. Well, I dont think so . . . it's always been a very difficult question and people sometimes think, "Well, I work hard for my money—why should somebody be given their living?"

The Bible states in Proverbs that the poor shall always be despised by his neighbor . . . I don't think . . . we will ever completely sell the working man on a philosophy of providing for the poor.

Q. What's been your biggest frustration?

A. One, to do things quickly and in government you do not do things quickly . . . And secondly, living within a group of rules and

regulations that are determined by somebody in Albany, when you recognize that the problems are on a local level base. To try to develop some consistency . . . is a difficult job.

Q. What do you think should be done about the problems on a local and state basis?

A. The five commissioners in Area 2 got together, the ones surrounding Monroe County, and we talked about this and we felt that there was a strong voice needed at the local level in determining rules and regulations at the state level.

And we also felt that each welfare district had its own specific problems. Rural Wayne County with its high migrant population has a different set of problems from Monroe County with a tremendous economy. And we thought that there should be a great deal more flexibility.

Q. The trend now, at least many local politicians have felt, is that one of the two governments outside the county should assume the complete role for welfare. How do you feel about that?

A. I suppose the easiest way to get rid of a headache is to give it to somebody else, if you can do it.

However, it isn't going to solve the problem and I think that this community knows more about its own problems than those on other levels.

There's a lot of pressure for state supervision and administration. Massachusetts just went into this. Pennsylvania has a state-administered system—Rhode Island, Florida. Those that I've seen, however, have developed just large bureaucracies that didn't meet the needs of the people. They cost more, these state-administered programs, and I think that . . . the community tends to slough off its responsibility. . . .

Q. What instances of this local sloughing off have there been?

A. I don't think there's been any local sloughing off, politically, anyway, under the current system where we administer the program. As I mentioned at a meeting a few weeks ago, I felt the voluntary social service agencies, and the public in general, when the Welfare Department gets in trouble, or has a problem, they have a tendency to hide rather than give us support.

The public, for example, is pounding the department about some kind of problem, rather than helping us with it or supporting us . . . As long as the taxpayer could afford to keep up a standard of living which basically meant things that were the extras, the luxury items, as long as he could purchase this, and had the purchasing power, he wasn't too concerned what his legislators did.

And we're seeing a reversal of that. He's getting pinched, and he's not getting pinched because the surpluses are going into taxes.

He's getting pinched because his credit economy is falling apart. He's generally overextending himself. He borrowed on his future and this is what's hurting.

So suddenly he's becoming interested . . . The community reacts (to) human problems by just trying to hide them in some way.

If you ask somebody—we have problems with alcoholics, what would you like to do with the alcoholics? The first thing he'll say will be, let's bury them somewhere, or let's institutionalize him so that no one sees him.

Q. Can the welfare case load in Monroe County be reduced from its present, I believe, 20,000 persons?

A. We could reduce it by abolishing the Department of Social Welfare. The reason you have a case load is the proliferation of programs.

For example, if you're not going to have any medical care program, your case load will be at X point. If you're going to have a Medicaid program, you're going to add X many thousands of people to the load. So it depends on the programming you have.

Q. Of the people who are not now on the case load, are there a significant number in the county who should be?

A. Despite what the citizen on the street thinks (sometimes they think it's easy to get welfare), I don't think it's easy and I still think it's an embarrassing kind of process for a lot of people.

And there are a lot of people who will decline no matter what, and their neighbors will help them. So I'm sure there are people who are eligible for Medicaid, and I'm sure there are people who may well be eligible for public assistance, who won't apply.

The best example of this was when medical assistance to the aged (Medicare) went into effect. When older people began to apply for this program we found that about 65 per cent of them had been eligible for public assistance since the time they were 65 years of age, but they just didn't apply.

They didn't want to. It was embarrassing. And they were living on their little Social Security checks.

Q. How many freeloaders are there on welfare in a given time? What is the range of the number of freeloaders?

A. I'd like to know what a freeloader is.

Q. A person who is receiving welfare that could be earning his keep.

A. . . . When somebody comes in and applies and they're employable, they have to by law go down to the State Employment Service and if there's a job available for them, they have to take it or they're not eligible.

We've had people who apply every month, and I get a report every month—individuals who have been offered jobs and who didn't take them and who are not given assistance. Some of them, instead of going to the employment service, end up going out and getting their own job.

Now, if there's not a job available in terms of what he can do . . . they set subsequent dates for him. We also have an employment service in the building to keep track, so that he does have to make an account of himself.

I'm sure there are some people who will go out by themselves, who may be on welfare and apply for a job.

I think people want to work, basically, and they don't want to be on welfare. The surveillance on welfare alone disturbs them. . . . Right now we have 200 people that are employable on the welfare rolls, out of 20,432.

Q. In regard to what you were saying about applying for welfare can be an embarrassing thing—do you mean simply in terms of the widely accepted Protestant ethic about work being such a wonderful purifier of man, or do you mean because there are things they have to disclose and there are things they have to go through in applying and receiving welfare that are kind of dehumanizing?

A. It has nothing to do with the work ethic. For example, a 70-year-old woman who may be applying for public assistance is not related to the work ethic. Out of 20,000 people on assistance, 12,000 are children and you're not concerned with work and children.

It's in terms of delving into their personal lives. The older person: Do you have a bank account? Where is your bank account? Do you have any relatives? Where is you son? Where is your daughter?

Her son and daughter may not pay any attention to her and she doesn't want us to get in touch with them. Or she may have a sister somewhere that we might call to ask about her.

Social information: Do you have insurance in terms of savings for your burial? What is the relationship with you and your landlord? Is he friendly towards you?

Q. Would an affidavit system remove some of that?

A. I think an affidavit system hasn't been tested enough to know whether it costs more to have a surveillance on those people you think may be defrauding you.

One advantage to an affidavit system is to probably relieve the case worker of a lot of paper work. I don't think it's been tested enough.

Q. How effective is the surveillance system the county has to uncover the defrauding of welfare?

A. I think we have a good system. There are people who thought we should have some sort of a police department of our own. However, public welfare has no police authority whatsoever.

You find that people tell on each other. Welfare clients will tell on each other. They get mad at each other or the neighbor will get mad at the next door neighbor who may be on welfare, and she'll report something. In about 90 per cent of these there is no fraudulent action.

Or the case worker may go to the home and never find the client there and will ask the special investigation unit to find out what the client is doing, and we find out the client is working. This means sending to Washington and getting all the material on Social Security and what they've paid in income taxes which has to do with their earnings and then they're arrested.

Q. Many critics of welfare would probably characterize the average recipient to be a no-good shiftless bum who refuses to work, even though he could, who fathers numerous children, who drives a big car and laughs at the public.

They probably see the women on relief as good-for-nothings who don't care for their children, who sleep with any man who comes along, adding eventually to the dependent children load. To what extent do you think this sort of thing is accurate, or inaccurate?

A. I think these are myths, generally.

You've asked a lot of questions here, and they follow the pattern of the state communities aid survey of New York State. They went out and said to people, "What do you think of public welfare?"

They came up with five items.

One was that the relief load was filled with employable people who wouldn't work and enjoyed being on welfare.

Secondly—that women had one illegitimate child after another for the purpose of increasing the allotment they got, and therefore the conclusion said that public welfare is responsible for illegitimacy, is a cause of illegitimacy.

The third myth had to do with thousands of Puerto Ricans and Negroes flooding New York State for the purpose of getting on assistance.

Four was that the relief load was full of chiselers.

And five, that the great problem with public welfare is that it's dominated by caseworkers.

These turn out to be national myths because the people in other states think the same thing . . . In speaking to groups I find that they would like to believe these myths.

So what you say to the citizen—like the citizen who shouts last night at the meeting, "All these people are driving Cadillacs—" I think they have to produce their names and their addresses.

Public welfare is provided under the law. Everything you do is under the law. The eligibility standards are within the law. And I think that I have to have names and addresses. We'll do an investigation and find out . . .

I got a call one day saying, "This woman lives across the street from me. She lives up over a bar and every day she goes down there and she gets a six-pack of beer and drinks it."

So I got the case out and it turns out to be an 86-year-old woman. Now, if Grandma

Smith wants to go down and drink a six-pack a day, I don't really care.

Maybe it's good for her. I don't care about that.

The woman that said last night, "If you're a welfare recipient how can you smoke?"

If you're a welfare recipient do you lose your citizenship? Do you lose all your chemistry so that you're sexless? The fact that you're a welfare recipient, does that mean that you have no right to sleep with anyone, or you have no right to smoke, or you have no right to drink?

What you're supposed to do is live in a hole and be handed the groceries and a shirt once in a while and this satisfies a group of people.

I don't think the general population believes that welfare should be this restrictive. And I don't think that because you're on welfare you lose your citizenship.

When you talk about being on welfare, you're talking about people that could do better than they're doing, and we have some. Then your job is to try to motivate them to do something, to do better.

But the big population we have is children, and the aged and the totally disabled and the blind and this kind of thing.

There may be some families on welfare that come from a different culture than we have.

Now the general public in Monroe County, who have lived in this culture for years, will resent that group that lives in a sub-culture, or a culture they think is not appropriate to the community.

Supposing somebody throws their garbage out the second story window. The neighbor next door is going to get pretty upset about it. But maybe to that family up there this was always the method of the disposal of the garbage.

Several studies have been done and we found out that the normal welfare family doesn't have any more children than the average family not on welfare.

There are welfare families who have 10 children. There are welfare families who have none. And the same applies for the normal population.

It's a bell-shaped curve where in the middle are the mother and father with 3.8 children.

If welfare was the cause of illegitimacy, I think we would wonder then why 85 percent of the illegitimate children never see anything of welfare. . . .

If we had thousands of Negroes and Puerto Ricans flooding this community for the purposes of getting on assistance, I think we would have seen over the last 10 years a dramatic increase in the rolls. And that hasn't occurred.

So that all of these things that you were saying . . . these become myths.

WELFARE RESIDENCY LAWS DON'T WORK

Welfare Director William B. Woods says residency laws don't work.

People don't move here to get public assistance anyway, he says.

A residency law, in which welfare assistance would be given only after a person had been in the state for a specified time (the County Legislature recommends a year) is "like a sugar pill to relieve a headache," he says.

Of more than 20,000 on home relief here, only 26 have been here less than a year, he says.

Woods' remarks are contained in the concluding half of a taped interview with Times-Union reporters. (The first half was published yesterday.)

Woods is resigning April 20 after 10½ years as director of Monroe County Department of Social Services (Welfare) to become chief administrator of Park Avenue Hospital Corp.

Portions of the interview follow:

Q. The County Legislature has just recommended that the state pass a one-year welfare residency law. I believe you've opposed such laws in the past. I wonder if you could explain to us why.

A. Residency laws don't work. They're expensive to administer.

About 1958 the state department came out with a study of residency laws. They found that those states with high residency requirements had higher migration than in those states without them.

Q. You mean eventual welfare recipients or just people in general?

A. People. The people didn't move for the purpose of getting public assistance.

Now what is a residency law supposed to do? It's supposed to keep people off assistance in the state who haven't been here a year.

They don't do it, because you usually have a clause in the law which says "but in cases of emergency the welfare director will be able to provide the family with something." You never see any one unless it's an emergency.

Right now, on the home relief load, out of 20,432 people, we have 26 people who haven't been here a year.

Now when we impose a residency law there's going to have to be some kind of an administrative detail which will cost a great deal of money.

Residency laws have been debated by the Supreme Court and they said they're unconstitutional. . . . If the state does get one, the only people it will affect are these 26 we have.

And then if they need help, we aren't going to let them starve.

. . . A residency law to the public is like a sugar pill to relieve a headache. It gives the public a feeling you're doing something to alleviate this horrible welfare problem.

The public through their legislators could drop our expenditures $5 million by doing something with Medicaid. When you look at our case load and our expenditures you go evenly to 1966 and then they both go up like this. And it's totally Medicaid.

I think that as I said before, if there were millions of people coming in here for the purpose of getting on relief and everybody says Monroe County is the mecca, why is our case load relatively the same as it was 10 years ago?

We do send people back.

In the fall we used to have a bus because migrants would get stuck here and we'd send 40 or 50 back on a bus.

Q. You were breaking regulations doing this, weren't you?

A. No, these people wanted to go back. They were basically migrants.

There are other people who come up and we say, "Well, where did you come from?" "Well, I just got here the day before yesterday from Seattle, Washington."

"Well, what are you going to do here?" "I'm going to look for a job." "What do you do?" "I make barrels."

I don't know whether there are any barrel industries here, but we tell him he should go back. And he doesn't want to go back. We'll write to Seattle and they'll give us permission to send him back. So we may take him down to a bus. And we do this to many people every year.

Q. Whenever you take the initiative in sending them back is this bending the regulations of the state?

A. We send them back without any permission of the state. The state doesn't mind as long as we pay their way back.

People don't move for public welfare.

Q. Are you saying that even though all states paid the same welfare payments, even if they were all equal, there would still be the same amount of movement?

A. There will be a movement of population.

Q. When the Medicaid program was first proposed you were one of the first to say that we weren't looking realistically at what this was really going to cost us. Do you see any way now in light of the developments that Medicaid costs can be reduced?

A. What we have in Medicaid now, probably in 1966 should have been a final goal. What happened is that the state bit off more than it could chew, overestimating the amount of money the federal government was going to supply—the standards were even above the federal standards—and then underestimating the cost.

There should have been limits to the Medicaid program. As it developed that monies were available, they could have expanded it.

For example, the state should have provided only for routine dental care. This is my own feeling. Not all the dental care, just routine dental services. Dental case, incidentally, was probably the most important part of the Medicaid program, because children who had never seen a dentist before got preventive dental treatment they needed.

But the routine dental care item in the Medicaid law would have been sufficient to do this.

(Ed. note: Eligibility for Medicaid is determined on a sliding scale which takes into account the number of persons in a family and net annual income.

(Net income is defined as total income, less income taxes, the cost of health insurance premiums, and payments made to dependents by court order.

(A single individual with a net income of $2,300 or less is eligible for Medicaid. A family of four with a net income of $5,300 or less also is eligible.)

I'm in agreement with the governor that there should be compulsory New York State Health insurance, because 80 per cent of the industry in New York State does not have any health insurance program for its employes.

What you get is the unions not wanting it because the employe is going to have to contribute a little, and the owners of industry not wanting it because they have to contribute a lot. Of course the state presumably would help subsidize it.

This would release a load on Medicare.

Probably there were certain services that should not have initially been included, such as podiatrists and chiropracters.

Certainly to be discussed is whether or not acute hospital days should be unlimited.

If the average stay in an acute hospital is 7.3 days, would it not have been sufficient for the state to say under Medicaid 10 days of hospital care is all that's provided?

They could have put in some exceptions for catastrophic illness, muscular distrophy, or multiple sclerosis. They should have started out this way.

Q. Can they go back to this point now?

A. It's a horrible problem going back.

Q. What effect do you think it had when the Medicaid law removed the restrictions on filial responsibilities as far as payments.

A. We have a great shortage in nursing home beds. I was in favor with doing away with the responsible relative law because it was more costly administering it.

I don't think we got more than $40,000 from relatives under this law, and we had to trace them all over the country, sometimes take them into court and everything else.

And not only that, there was a side effect of disrupting total families. There may be 10 children in a family. And Joe has to give $20 a month to his mother and Jim can only give $10 because he doesn't earn as much.

Pretty soon they're fighting about it.

The law itself in many respects wasn't too good. The result, however, was that many relatives, sons and daughters, who were caring for their father and mother at home

saw the opportunity to move them into a nursing home and let the public pay for it.

And this they did. This alone has caused a shortage.

There is an elderly person in a local hospital that's been there for three months, under Medicare, and there are some sons and daughters. Medicare won't pay any more because the person doesn't need to be there on the "acute side."

Medicaid has picked up on it and we're trying to get the person into a nursing home, but the room in a nursing home doesn't exist.

They tried to get the relatives to do something and they said, "Just leave her there. We don't want anything to do with her. We don't care if you shut off paying for it. We aren't paying."

So this is the attitude of relatives . . .

Q. Politicians are beating the drums about equalizing welfare payments throughout the states. Do I understand correctly that this would reduce the number of poor people moving into New York State:

A. I think it probably would be good to have a federal standard through all the states.

I don't think people move for this reason. I think people will move anyway.

And on the other hand, in West Virginia, for example, if the coal mines give out and there's nothing, there are people who won't move even though you offer them an incentive saying, "In Michigan there's a job for you and a retraining program."

They may say "I'm not moving off my slag hill. I'm staying here. I was born here and raised here and I want to stay here."

Q. Will you tell us briefly how you feel about the current proposals for children's allowances for the poor and negative income tax?

A. All of these have been tried before. In 1845 there was a guaranteed income in some county in England. I guess it lasted about 40 years.

Children's allowances is not a new one. Canada, of course, has this.

The feeling is that if you have a children's allowance you'll have more children. This is not proven true in Canada. This is not a program that solves the problem. There has to be some kind of supplementation.

I think guaranteed incomes or reverse income taxes stifle initiative. I don't think we're ready for them. . . . The economy we have now does not fit itself to this kind of thing.

Q. What about a combination incentive program where a man can work at his job and still receive a certain amount of welfare payments and pull himself up a little bit?

A. We have quite a percentage of the caseload people who are working and still getting some kind of supplementary assistance but the assistance they are getting is still at a welfare standard, which is subsistence.

What I would like to see us do . . . (Let's say) someone is on welfare. The father gets a job; he goes to collect his first pay.

Now he's no longer eligible. We close the case.

This family may be a real multi-problem family, and they've been on welfare. They've got all kinds of problems and the first thing that happens to him is he starts work and his creditors garnishee his wages. And the first thing you know, he's back on welfare.

If we could just suspend the case and follow it through and do casework until the fellow gets on his feet.

We'd help him with the problems that he might come across. This might be helpful.

Q. Were you thinking of using, as case aides, people within the poorer sections of the city?

A. Could be . . . We're beginning to do a little of this with the new careers programs. This is demonstration alone.

Q. Do you have enough case workers now?

A. Yes.

Q. More than enough if you could do away with the paperwork?

A. No, I think we'd do a better job. I don't know that we're doing our complete job now because some of the bureaucracy we're mixed up in.

ORANGEBURG GROUP PROMOTES MEMORIAL FUND FOR SOLDIER

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, people throughout my congressional district are participating in programs designed to show their support for our fighting men in Vietnam.

In the city of Orangeburg, S.C., for example, patriotic and civic-minded citizens recently established a memorial to a young soldier, Sp4c. Layne Gleaton, who was killed in Vietnam. Entitled the "Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund," this worthy project will provide much-needed personal items for our fighting men. I am very proud of the wonderful people of Orangeburg, many of whom have sons of their own serving in Vietnam, for founding such a noble program, and I feel confident that it will meet with overwhelming success.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I would like to commend the following newspaper article about this project to the attention of the Congress, as follows:

ORANGEBURG GROUP PROMOTES MEMORIAL FUND FOR SOLDIER

(By John Faust)

What began as an informal effort on the part of a few Orangeburg citizens to send Orangeburg servicemen in Vietnam packages of luxuries and necessities has turned into a determined drive to establish a memorial in memory of a fallen U.S. Army serviceman.

Under the direction of Mrs. Dorothy Passwater of Orangeburg, herself the mother of a son wounded seriously in Vietnam, a list of servicemen's names was gathered and the first package was to have been mailed with a small ceremony from the Chestnut St. Orangeburg Fire Station.

However, early Friday morning, the day the package was to be mailed, word was received by Mr. and Mrs. Yarborough M. Gleaton that their son, SP4 Homer Layne Gleaton, 20, had been killed in action Tuesday in the Republic of South Vietnam. SP4 Gleaton was to have been the recipient of the first package.

Now, instead of a loosely knit group of individuals, the Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund has been created as a memorial to the 1967 graduate of Orangeburg High School.

Friday afternoon, with the thought of the young Orangeburger's death hanging heavily over the group, the first package from the fund was addressed to SP4 Marvin H. Thomas of Orangeburg who is serving with the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam.

"It was a terrible shock," said Mrs. Passwater, "one that really shakes a person up."

Orangeburg Mayor E. O. Pendarvis, on hand for the occasion, noted: "There's not much you can say after something like this happens. I have a son in Vietnam . . . I know I'd be appreciative of anything done for my son to make his lot easier while he's serving his country.

"This group, created at first to show a small measure of our concern to our men in Vietnam," he said, "can perhaps show our grief and sympathy for the Gleaton family by expressing our support for those men who still carry the burden of our defense in that Asian country."

Already funds for bearing the cost of mailing have been received by the newly formed group. The employes of Fabric Services donated a check to the group and Capt. R. E. Sharpton of the Orangeburg Fire Department donated cash to enable the group to send their first packages to the men in Vietnam.

"I'd like for the families of the Orangeburg servicemen presently serving in Vietnam to send their addresses to the Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund," said Mrs. Passwater, "so that we may help send packages to them. All they need do is mail the name and address and perhaps a list of their special favorites in foods and other items, to The Layne Gleaton Vietnam Fund, Post Office Box 856, Orangeburg."

Capt. Sharpton said that if anyone wishes to donate cash or articles for delivery to the Orangeburg servicemen in Vietnam, they could deliver them to the Chestnut St. Fire Department substation for pickup and shipment to Vietnam.

Another Orangeburg serviceman, Johnny King, sent a letter to his wife in Orangeburg listing items most desired by Vietnamese duty servicemen.

Mrs. King noted that any articles such as scented shaving lotion, cologne, soaps and such were not to be sent as the distinctive odor could leave a detectable scent on the serviceman using them, possibly causing him to be discovered by enemy Viet Cong and North Vietnamese.

Listed by King as being most-wanted articles were: ballpoint pens, pensized flashlights with batteries, small pen knives, cigarette lighters, plastic soap cases, small packages of writing paper with self-seal envelopes, small address books, plastic toothbrush holders, dark terry cloth washcloths and nail clippers.

Also, plastic cigarette cases, small combs, small tins of nuts or vacuum packed candies, small plastic snapshot holders, small kitchen size and sandwich type plastic bags, small pocket games such as cards, chess, checkers, etc., small paperback books, cans of spaghetti, fruit cocktail or other fruits, canned cookies and many other items not susceptible to a hot humid climate.

TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 1st Lt. Robert L. Baldwin and Marine Pfc. Joseph C. Thorne, Jr., two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN ARE KILLED IN VIETNAM WAR

Two men from Maryland who enlisted in military service were killed Monday in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The dead were identified as:

Army 1st Lt. Robert L. Baldwin, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Baldwin, of Edgewater, who was killed when the vehicle in which he was riding struck an enemy land mine.

Marine Pfc. Joseph C. Thorne, Jr., 19, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James A. Smith, of Hyattsville, who died as a result of gunshot wounds he received 5 miles north of An Hoa, in Quang Nam province.

Lieutenant Baldwin, who volunteered several weeks ago to be a platoon leader, served in Company D, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 11th Light Infantry Brigade, the Americal Division.

Shortly after arriving in Vietnam last August, he took command of the landing zone at Duc Pho, and was acting company commander last winter.

A graduate of Spring Brook High School in Silver Spring, Md., where he was raised, Lieutenant Baldwin played first trumpet in both the marching and concert bands at the school. He was the photographer of his graduating class for the high school's yearbook.

At Fort Jackson, where he received his basic training, he was named the "outstanding trainee" of his class. He attended Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning.

His survivors include, in addition to his parents, two sisters, Mrs. Diane B. Greenlaw, of Laurel, Md., and Miss Carol L. Baldwin, of Edgewater, and a brother, Alan J. Baldwin, of Edgewater.

ATTAINMENT OF PEACE IS GOAL OF NEW ISRAEL GOVERNMENT

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, guns are once again being heard during this period of the Nativity and of the deliverance and I can think of no better time than to introduce into the RECORD the text of the interview with Foreign Minister Abba Eban and highlights from the address by Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister. This beleaguered little nation of Israel experiences its most holy religious season during this period.

The material follows:

SAFEGUARDING NATION'S SECURITY WHILE STRIVING FOR PEACE REMAIN CENTRAL TASKS OF NEW ISRAEL GOVERNMENT

(Highlights from the address by Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister, on presenting her Cabinet to the Knesset (Parliament), Jerusalem, March 17, 1969)

CENTRAL TASKS

As in the past, the central tasks facing Israel today are, above all, to safeguard the nation's security and to continue to strive for peace. . . . We are as resolutely determined as the previous government that there shall never again be a return to the borders and conditions which existed on June 4, 1967, and which not only enabled our enemies to threaten us with annihilation, but tempted them to believe in their capacity to carry out their plan. We want peace under conditions that will put an end to the temptation of a new Arab aggression.

The secret of Israel's endurance in the struggles and wars that have been forced upon us since we achieved our independence is the inexorable tie between survival and sovereignty and our consciousness of this tie. . . . For us, and perhaps not only for us, there is no alternative to a resolute confrontation of the struggle and the defeat of the designs of the aggressors. Our existence in this part of the world is no transient phenomenon. We are not a foreign growth in this region. We cannot be uprooted from our homeland.

CEASEFIRE TRANSFORMED INTO FRONT LINE

It has been our fate that while we engrossed ourselves in constructive and creative work in our homeland, we have had to defend our lives and our achievements and take up arms against attackers and aggressors. . . . It has never been our aspiration to win victory in war, but to prevent wars. It has, nevertheless, been demonstrated that when wars have been forced upon us, we have been able to fulfill our task. And there is no doubt in my heart that if a new war is forced upon us again, we shall again be victorious. . . . We will not accept any arrangement that is not true peace. We shall not agree to any "solution" which does not guarantee that this war is the last war. Unfortunately, the Arab rulers have repulsed the outstretched hand. . . . We consented to a ceasefire. The Arab States also agreed to the ceasefire. But only a few days passed before the ceasefire lines became front lines of continuous aggression waged against us by the Arab States. In truth, the war is not yet over. Day in, day out, our sons are falling at their posts. . . . The actions and utterances of the Arab rulers give no promise of approaching tranquility.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR TERRORISM

As far as violations of the ceasefire are concerned, we are not prepared to distinguish between aggression waged by regular armies and acts of murder and sabotage perpetrated by terrorist organizations. The responsibility for the saboteurs' activities must also rest squarely on the shoulders of those governments and states from whose territories the saboteurs go forth with one single purpose: to wreak murder in the midst of the civilian population of Israel . . . The Arab States must understand that the ceasefire lines can be tranquil only if quiet is maintained on both sides of the lines . . . No political factor has the moral right to deny us the authority and justification to exercise our right to self-defense against acts of murder and sabotage, irrespective of whether they are perpetrated by regular armies or by terrorist organizations . . .

"ARRANGEMENTS" CANNOT BE A SUBSTITUTE FOR PEACE

It is impossible to ignore the attempt to convene the four powers for discussions and recommendations on the problems of the Middle East . . . One cannot help wonder that one of the powers considers itself qualified to deal with Israel-Arab affairs as a neutral, although it shoulders such a heavy responsibility for the aggressive preparations which brought about the Six-Day War. Another one of the four powers is a state whose government's only constructive contribution to the aid of Israel has been the imposition of an embargo on arms for Israel. All of this government's declarations and measures since the Six-Day War are distinguished by blatant one-sidedness in matters affecting our existence and the conditions for our very physical survival. No decision can be adopted without us nor can any "recommendation" be formulated without our consent. It is a dangerous illusion to assume that any solution can be found in any arrangements whatever without real peace between the parties to the conflict . . . We cannot acquiesce in the toleration afforded to the stubborn refusal of the Arab leaders which runs counter to the United Nations charter and is opposed to all international practice to sit down with us to negotiate a solution to all problems . . . We want one simple and elementary thing, vital to us and to our neighbors: peace in the literal sense of the word, to be reached by face to face talks. This is the only way to peace . . . Israel, like every independent state or free nation, will not permit others to determine its fate . . .

STATUS-QUO SHALL REMAIN UNTIL PEACE IS ACHIEVED

We have assisted and will continue to assist Jarring in the execution of his task to bring the sides together for the purpose of establishing a permanent peace, as he was instructed to do by the Security Council resolution . . . In the absence of any readiness for peace, we have only one choice: whilst we do everything for peace, we must make every effort to be prepared to defend ourselves and to live under the present circumstances so long as there is no peace even if it should take a long time, much longer than we should desire.

ATTAINMENT OF PEACE WITHIN SECURE BOUNDARIES IS ISRAEL'S FIRM RESOLVE

(Full text of the interview with Foreign Minister Abba Eban, by Alfred Friendly, the Washington Post, March 6, 1969)

Q. The Arab states insist that Israel has never stated that it accepts the Security Council resolution of Nov. 22, 1967, or would implement it. Is this true?

A. We've made so many statements on the acceptance of the resolutions as the framework of a negotiated settlement that we can't even attach seriousness to any Arab assertions to the contrary. On Oct. 8, I myself said in the U.N. General Assembly: "Israel accepts the Security Council resolution . . . and declares its readiness to negotiate agreements on all matters mentioned therein."

That is the cabinet position. Now the Arab states have reservations about our use of the word "agreement." The word "agreement" is in the resolution. It is the very essence of our position.

That peace must grow from agreements in the Middle East, not from settlements dictated outside it. There are no Security Council resolutions calling for any action except on the basis of agreement.

Q. Have you ever declared that your implementation of the resolution would entail the withdrawal of Israeli troops to new borders? The Arabs claim you refuse to say so.

A. I was asked that by Ambassador Jarring in a memorandum presented by the United Arab Republic [Egypt]. I gave him a clear answer, namely that in a peace agreement we would replace the cease-fire lines by secure and agreed boundaries and that the disposition of troops would then be made in accordance with the new boundaries.

It is ludicrous to say that Israel and an Arab state would agree to negotiated and recognized boundaries and then would restation their troops in places where they were not entitled to be under the agreement.

The trouble is that the Arab states ask for withdrawal without peace or the establishment of new boundaries.

Q. Why has Israel not made public in more specific terms the new territorial arrangements it envisions?

A. Here we're in a quandary. When we make our ideas public it increases the complexities. We make certain proposals and the Arab states look at them, recoil and say they cannot negotiate on them. I think it is much better to say officially that at the negotiating table the whole problem of boundaries and territories is open for agreement. The territorial question is open for free discussion, anyone can make any proposals he likes for negotiation.

When I go to my colleagues to discuss possible terms, they say "Have you got an Arab government that is willing in principle to talk peace? If not, why should we fight among ourselves about something hypothetical."

If I came one day and say, "Gentlemen, Arab government XYZ says it wants peace and would like to explore its conditions, then we would have to cross the Rubicon. We would have to give our negotiators concrete positions, determining what things are in-

dispensable for us and on which matters they can be flexible.

The Arab states have never put us in the position of having to work out a detailed range of contingent positions.

They will not negotiate directly, they will not negotiate indirectly—as Nasser told *The New York Times* the other day—they will not negotiate orally, they will not negotiate with Jarring or without him. They will not even negotiate by correspondence course.

That's where the frustration lies. Unless they negotiate with us they will never know and we ourselves will never know the true limits of our flexibility and of theirs.

Q. You have said that details of a peace agreement are secondary to the principal objective, the sine qua non: an end to the long Arab campaign for the extinction of the State of Israel. Do you believe that the Arab states are, as they claim, sincerely renouncing that goal by accepting the Security Council resolution?

A. The policy of the UAR must be interpreted in accordance with the statements of its leaders and from communications to us by Ambassador Jarring. These are quite consistent: There isn't any distinction between them. They present the following picture:

They want us to withdraw in the first stage to the June 4, 1967, boundaries—what we call our nightmare map. They want us to reconstruct our own peril and put us back into the straitjacket. But this is only stage one.

Stage two is that the Arab armies would follow our retreat. Notice that in the Soviet Union's dialogue with the United States, the principle of demilitarization in Sinai is dropped: Arab troops move in to wherever Israeli troops move out. The June 4 powder keg is reconstructed.

Then the blockade is re-established. Freedom of passage in the Suez is made contingent on settlement of the refugee problem, which is at the very best a matter of years—I hope not decades.

The same is true about passage through the Straits of Tiran, the issue that exploded into the June war.

The UAR tells us that they would oppose any permanent arrangement not contingent on their consent. The Sword of Damocles would be put back into place. The May 23, 1967, crisis could be recreated whenever the UAR decided to do so.

Thereafter, the Palestine problem, as they call it, would have to be settled by allowing all the refugees back into what remained of Israel after its withdrawal. Enough Arabs must be introduced to convert Israel into something that is not Israel.

Then, Nasser says, he would make peace with the Israel that it then would have become namely another Arab state.

This is so clear, so repeatedly stated, that to assume that Nasser wants peace with Israel as a sovereign Jewish state in its own national personality is utterly frivolous.

In fact, in the last few days, the governments which are in closest contact with us have told us very frankly that they do not now believe that the UAR is ready for a peace with us on terms that Israel would accept or that friendly governments would advise us to accept.

At the most, Nasser would accept a Jewish community in an Arab state, or perhaps a sort of Lebanon. But the idea that Israel is an independent nation with roots in the Middle East, no less deep and much older than Arab roots is foreign to Nasser's thinking.

Our case is that Israel is part of the Middle East past and the Middle East present and the Middle East future. This is something that he has never grasped.

I think that this is the real essence of the conflict—that Arab intellectual and political leaders have never really solved the mystery of Israel's deep and authentic roots in the Middle East past and destiny.

Q. Is the same unwillingness that you assert on the part of Egypt to make peace true with respect to Jordan?

A. The situation is different, in the psychological sense. There are Palestinian and Jordanian leaders who say frankly that they would have preferred Israel not to exist but that its existence is an inexorable fact.

If Nasser can allow himself to dream, however vainly, of a military victory as a final solution, the Jordanians cannot possibly have any such illusions.

The question is whether there is in Jordan a sovereign capacity to negotiate. The question marks are whether Jordan can negotiate without a green light, or even an amber light, from Cairo; whether the green or amber light exists; whether it could explore a settlement with us under the pressure of the terrorist organizations; whether the presence of Iraqi troops in Jordan exercises an inhibiting effect.

But the issue is not dead. What I have in mind is an integral solution solving the problems of Israel, Jordan and the Palestinian Arabs by establishing an open boundary on the community model familiar in Western Europe, as for example Benelux.

We must look for a way of living together without a million Arabs being forced into an unwanted allegiance.

Q. How can there be the "real peace," the sincere willingness of Arabs to live in peace with Israel, unless the refugee problem is solved? Have you a proposal for its solution?

A. I used to think that the solution of the refugee problem would bring about peace. It is my conviction now that the exact opposite is true, that only peace can bring about a solution of the refugee problem.

So long as the Arab states do not want peace, they will not want a solution of the refugee problem.

The Security Council resolution is the first international recognition of the fact that the refugee solution can only come as a part of an integral peace solution. The problem was caused by war; it can only be solved by peace.

Nevertheless we did make a proposal, to which the press has given insufficient attention, that ahead of any question of peace or boundaries or recognition, we should have an international conference to charter a five-year plan for the solution of the refugee problem with the participation of Middle Eastern states, of governments which help to support the refugees and the U.N. specialized agencies. I should be anxious to know what is wrong with that suggestion. In proposing in New York in October to try to reach agreement on each of the eight or nine subjects in the Security Council resolution, of which the refugees is one, I said it made no matter to me which was discussed first.

I said let's begin with navigation, or the refugee problem, or boundaries, or take them up simultaneously with subcommittees to discuss each of them.

UAR Foreign Minister Riad's answer was to book passage back to Cairo because any response to this would have involved him in a dialogue with us. The peace idea was becoming too concrete for his liking. The proposal for a refugee conference was rejected rather nervously by him, because it is not easy to explain to world opinion that it should be rejected by anyone who cares anything for the refugees.

Q. But have you stated, even in principle, what Israel is prepared to do to solve that enormous problem?

A. We are on our guard against any manner of thinking that makes the refugee problem an exclusive Israeli responsibility. Israel simply cannot solve the problem; it can make a contribution to its solution. I don't believe the states of the Middle East can solve it alone. It has to be solved regionally and internationally. That is why we must create a regional and international framework for the refugee discussion. But when I say that peace could solve it, I mean that the psychology of peace would open up possibilities which we cannot envisage in a condition of war.

That's what I think the Arab governments don't understand. The key to the Israeli attitude lies in their hands. The moment they negotiate with us, they unlock in the Israeli mind all kinds of impulses which have been held back.

Q. In the absence of progress towards a settlement, will the Palestine liberation movement grow and capture the imagination of the Arab peoples, to the point that a political settlement becomes impossible?

A. These groups are a burden on our security in some places, but in my mind they are still marginal and not central.

Arab governments established these organizations. Without Arab governments they would have neither weapons nor support. The mastery still belongs to the Arab governments. If Nasser or King Hussein decided to negotiate peace, I believe these movements would dwindle at the negotiating stage and fade away at the settlement stage.

Q. They have not become Frankenstein's monster, more powerful then their creator?

A. I think the governments still retain executive control. The Fatah is simply a convenience for Arab governments which do not want to fight with their regular armies and yet do not want a period of tranquility leading to peace.

Q. Israel is accused of asking for a degree of security that no other country enjoys; that you refuse to gamble on the possible turning of your adversaries' minds towards a peaceful outcome.

A. On the contrary, I would settle for the kind of security which every other country has. I would take any sovereign country has. I would take any sovereign country in the world and ask what are its relationships with its neighbors in a state of peace. I would shut my eyes, pick one, and settle for that.

Q. How will the Israeli government changes affect the relationship between hawks and doves? Where do you stand personally in that division?

A. The ornithological definition is not useful. The hawk-dove phrase has done more to confuse public thinking on international problems than any other semantic device.

We are all hawks only in our ambition to make Israel really secure, and most of us are doves in our ardent desire for peace. My colleague (Defense Minister Moshe) Dayan is called a hawk but it was he who told your people on television that he "would give up a lot of territory for peace" with Egypt or Jordan. That sounds dovish to me.

Mrs. Meir, who I hope will lead the next cabinet, has said that she opposed the extreme slogan of "no surrender of territory" and that if our boundaries are to be agreed boundaries they cannot be the present ones, but that only a peace negotiation can make the discussion real.

So there is a national consensus which I have been expressing all these months.

HEWER OF PEACE

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, when the general who commanded history's greatest army turned to civilian life in 1948, he stated that he would not be changing the fundamental purpose of his life—"the protection and perpetuation of basic human freedom."

Dwight Eisenhower had protected the freedom of men by forging unity among the Allies and maintaining that unity until Hitler's "Fortress Europe" had been broken. After the war, he turned to perpetuating the hard-won freedom.

Although most of his life had been devoted to war and preparation for war, he was a man of peace. He believed as an article of faith that peace was the only climate in which human freedom could endure.

As President of the United States, he brought us out of war and then gave our Nation a period of growth and progress with uncommon tranquillity.

His success in maintaining the peace derived from a quality often underrated in leaders—good will. He trusted people and in turn they trusted him. He appealed to the best in people and they responded with their best. He reasoned with others and they refrained from shouting when disagreeing with his policies.

Hugh Sidey of Life magazine, a man who has covered many Presidents, commented on this quality last August after the general's last TV appearance:

> There are even those who dare suggest that his soothing spirit, the innate goodness of the man himself, did more to lift up the hearts of Americans and hold them together in a reasonable state of public happiness than many social reforms that have been propounded since.

His unending good will made him a unifier of men and allowed him to become an instrument of peace. The name Eisenhower translates to "hewer of iron." I prefer to remember him as a "hewer of peace."

NEED FOR STRONG FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY LAWS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing this Congress is the necessity for enacting strong Federal coal mine safety laws.

An article appearing in the New York Times magazine of March 30, 1969, summarizes the health and safety problems of the coal industry and the history of congressional failure to adequately meet these problems.

I commend it to the attention of the Congress:

THE SCANDAL OF DEATH AND INJURY IN THE MINES: MORE THAN 120,000 MINERS HAVE DIED VIOLENTLY

(By Ben A. Franklin)

"Of the 54 men in the mine, only two who happened to be in some crevices near the mouth of the shaft escaped with life. Nearly all the internal works of the mine were blown to atoms. Such was the force of the explosion that a basket then descending, containing three men, was blown nearly 100 feet into the air. Two fell out and were crushed to death, and a third remained in, and, with the basket, was thrown some 70 to 80 feet from the shaft, breaking both his legs and arms."

These sentences matter-of-factly describing the pulverization of a shift of coal miners, including the three men grotesquely orbited out of the mine shaft as if launched from a missile silo, are from the first detailed record of an American mine disaster. Antiquity probably explains the nursery rhyme quality—"two fell down and broke their crowns . . ." For this earliest remembered mine catastrophe, in the Black Heath pit near Richmond, Va., occurred March 18, 1839.

A primitive time, no doubt. The nation was then so new that Martin Van Buren, warming his feet at the coal-burning grates in the White House, was the first President to have been born a United States citizen. The daguerreotype was introduced here that year by Samuel F. B. Morse, while awaiting the issuance of a patent on his telegraph. Half the coal-producing states were not yet in the Union.

The coal mines, on the threshold of fueling a manufacturing explosion that was to make this country an unmatched industrial power, produced barely one million tons in 1839, less than 1/500th of the output today. In the absence of all but the crudest technology, men relying on the death flutterings of caged canaries to warn them of imminent suffocation obviously would die in the mines. Some mines employed suicidal specialists known as "cannoneers," whose mission was to crawl along the tunnel floors under a wet canvas before a shift, igniting "puffs" of mine gas near the roof with an upraised candle. Dead miners were not even counted. Their enormous casualty rate was not archived until less than 100 years ago.

A glimpse into this dim crevice of American industrial history is necessary to put into perspective the myths and realities of the men who work in the mines today. For the real story of coal is not its multiplying inanimate statistics—tons and carloadings and days lost in strikes. It is the agony of those men—a tale as old as Black Heath and one that is so full of extravagantly evil personalities and atrocious acts that Charles Dickens would have loved to tell it. For behind and beneath the mountains of the Appalachian coalfield, miners have remained since Black Heath the most systematically exploited and expendable class of citizens (with the possible exception of the American Indian and the Negro) in this country.

The story at last may have an un-Dickensian ending. For now, coal miners can see light at the end of the tunnel. In this 1969 spring, 130 years after the Black Heath disaster, the mining industry may finally agree to pay the modest cost of keeping its work force alive, of abandoning the embedded idea that men are cheaper than coal. And—small pittance—we may all be involved in helping pay what it costs to write this long delayed postscript to the industrial revolution; the price of bringing miners into the 20th century probably will appear, as we shall see, as pennies on our electric bills.

In the context of technological advancement in nearly every other area of human enterprise, very little has changed for men who go down to the mines in shafts. Only four months ago, 78 coal miners were trapped and killed below ground in West Virginia in one of the most volcanic eruptions of explosion and fire in the memory of Federal mine inspectors. As at Black Heath, the explosion at the Consolidation Coal Company's 27-square-mile No. 9 mine at Farmington, W. Va., almost certainly was caused by an ignition of methane gas, a volatile, highly flammable, usually odorless and invisible hydrocarbon gas liberated from virgin coal.

At Consol No. 9, a modern, "safe" mine operated by one of the wealthy giants of the industry, the daily methane emission was 8 million cubic feet, enough to supply the heating and cooking needs of a small city if it were captured and sold. The explosion hazard was dealt with there as it is generally in mining today, by only modestly more sophisticated methods than those at Black Heath.

Fresh air is drawn into the mines by giant fans and circulated and directed constantly through the honeycomb of tunnels by means of doors, ducts or sometimes by curtains called brattices (miners call them "brad-dishes"). The intake air is supposed to dilute and, by law, "render harmless or carry away" the methane and hold the mine atmosphere to less than the legal limit of 1 percent gas. Unless coal dust is mixed with it—in which case the explosion threshold drops significantly—methane will not ignite or explode in concentrations of less than 5 percent. Miners live and die today on a margin of 4 percentage points—or less if coal dust is suspended in the air.[1]

It is known that the giant electric mining machines in use for the last 20 years—machines that chew up and claw coal from the face with rotary bits the size of railroad wheels—churn up an immense amount of dust. The machines, have water sprays to settle the dust. But the machines' rapid rate of advance through the seam also liberates much methane.

The first explosion at Consol No. 9 came at 5:25 A.M., Nov. 20, during the cateye shift. It was a day after the passage over northern West Virginia of a cold front accompanied by an abrupt drop in barometric pressure. In the primitive mythology of mine safety, these natural events—the arrival of cold, dry air and a barometric low, which increases the methane liberation in a mine—have been associated for years with disasters. The legendary great mine explosions, from Monongah and Darr in 1907, Rachel & Agnes in 1908 and on up to Orient No. 2 in 1951, have occurred in November and December and in cold dry weather. The dry air dehumidifies a mine and sets coal dust in motion.

Every fall through 1967, the United Mine workers Journal had published a fraternal warning to union brothers to observe special precautions in "the explosion season." But, no research having been done in a century of such meterological coincidences, the industry can and does take no account of what it, therefore, regards as a folklore factor—which might interfere with production. The U.M.W. Journal had not got around to running the 1968 warning when Console No. 9 blew up. "We figured afterward it would be no use," a Journal editor said later.

No one yet knows what death befell the 78 men in No. 9. Miners who survive the shock wave, heat and afterdamp (carbon monoxide) of an underground explosion are instructed to barricade themselves in good air, if any, and await rescue. But during the nine days and nights that rescue teams stood by helplessly on the surface at Farmington, there were at least 16 further explosions in the mine. The first blast had burst up 600 feet through the portals and ventilation shafts, blowing the internal works of the mine to atoms and knocking out ventilation circuits. At the top, the main shaft became the muzzle of a mammoth subterranean cannon. The massive headframe, a trestled structure of bridge-size steel I-beams that support the main hoist, was blown apart. For days, a boiling plume of poisonous black smoke alternately belched from the shaft

---

[1] One example of the retarded technology of mine safety is that miners testing for gas still rely today on the Glame safety lamp of Sir Humphrey Davy, perfected more than 150 years ago. The safety lamp is rugged and safe if used properly, but it requires highly skilled operators to read it accurately, and then its accuracy is no more than half a percentage point—or 10 per cent of the margin between survival and explosion.

and then unaccountably reversed its flow and inhaled, bursting forth again with renewed detonations below.

Finally, on Nov. 29, all five shafts and portals at the mine were sealed—capped and made airtight with tons of rock, steel and concrete. Not for months, until engineers are certain that restoring ventilation will not re-ignite coked embers and trigger the millions of cubic feet of methane collecting in the primordial atmosphere below, will Farmington's dead be disinterred from their gassy grave. The same mine was sealed for more than a year following a less violent explosion in 1954 that killed 16 men (including one, Black Heath-style, topside near the mine mouth), and fires continued to burn in sealed sections of the mine even after production was resumed.

If entombing a mine fire to control it seems primitive in this day of chemical fire fighting agents and automatic deluge sprinkler systems, it is futuristic, compared with the industry's performance in disaster *prevention*. There have been profitable technological advances in the extraction of coal from the seam, and today the industry is on the brink of such a long, secure production boom that big oil companies, with some of the sharpest eyes for markets and profits in the business world, are buying up and merging with coal companies at a rapid rate. But production economies in the past have more often than not been at the expense of human economies, and Big Oil may be surprised to find itself saddled with coal's amazing insensitivity to mayhem and death. It was the fatalistic acceptance of Farmington more than the disaster itself (President Nixon has since criticized this acceptance of death as "as much a part of the job as the tools and the tunnels") that finally started the mine-safety revolution.

At first, at the daily post-explosion news conferences in Consol's cinderblock company store near Farmington (many miners are still *today* in debt to their employers' merchandising subsidiaries for nearly a full paycheck before they are paid), William Poundstone, Consol's executive vice president for mining operations, insisted that the mine was "only technically gassy." W. R. Park, a senior Federal mine inspector familiar for years with the mine, insisted it was "extremely gassy," and John Roberts, a Consol public relations man, called it "excessively gassy." Roberts, a master of malapropism who greeted the news corps before one vigil news conference by asking cheerily, "Are all the bodies here?", also described the No. 9 explosion hazard as "something that we have to live with."

Then came the parade of V.I.P.'s. U.M.W. president W. A. (Tony) Boyle came to the mine head not only to congratulate Consol on being "one of the better companies as far as cooperation and safety are concerned," but to add that if this "safe" mine blew up, "you can imagine what the rest are like." "As long as we mine coal," said Boyle, the philosophical miners' ombudsman, "there is always this inherent danger of explosion." The then assistant Secretary of the Interior, J. Cordell Moore, the department's top minerals man, flew up from Washington to add that "unfortunately—we don't understand why these things happen—but they do happen," and to venture that "the company here has done all in its power to make this a safe mine." (In fact, Moore's own Bureau of Mines had reported substandard rock dusting at Consol No. 9—the most basic of explosion-prevention measures involves rendering coal dust inert with 65 per cent crushed limestone—in all 24 of its inspections there since 1963. The bureau had cited No. 9 for 25 other safety violations since December, 1966. Moore probably saw nothing unusual in that because violations are the norm in most mines.)

Hulett C. Smith, then the Governor of West Virginia, also stood before the television cameras and observed more in sadness than in anger that "we must recognize that this is a hazardous business and what has occurred here is of the hazards of being a miner."

With that, the fuse, delayed so long, finally blew in Washington. The then Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, after eight years of more concern for California redwoods than for miners, denounced the whole system of coal mining—the technological *and* moral systems— as "unacceptable." As an astonished layman, Udall noted that Consol was mining "in an area that really is a low-grade gas field" and that "obviously it is not a solution that is completely adequate to dilute the gas by pumping in air." Within three weeks, Udall summoned a national coal-safety conference which turned out to be one of the most amazing gatherings in bureaucratic history. In a Soviet-style mood of confession, Udall publicly admitted that "we have accepted, even condoned, an attitude of fatalism that belongs to an age darker than the deepest recess of any coal mine. At every level of responsibility, from the individual miner to the highest councils of Government, we have looked with horror on the specters of death and disease that haunt our mines. Then we have shrugged our shoulders and said to ourselves, 'Well, coal mining is an inherently hazardous business' or 'It's too bad, of course, but as long as coal is mined men inevitably will die underground.' These easy rationalizations are no longer acceptable in this time in history."

The stubborn Black Heath syndrome—so costly in human life and so profitable to the industry—finally was broken. Within a week, Bureau of Mines Director John F. O'Leary, on the job one month, issued orders to his inspectors. They were to cease immediately giving prior notification of impending inspections to the operators, a practice known for years to encourage a sudden, temporary kind of mine housecleaning for the benefit of the inspector—"baking a cake," one inspector called it. They were to cease reviewing mine violation reports with owners. Where violations occurred involving imminent danger of explosion, they were no longer merely to write them down as before, they were to close the mine. The list was startling for what it said about past practices.

It is hard to tell which is more gripping—the penny-pinching, corner-cutting and profiteering waste of human life in mines still operated today—Black Heath-style—with bland abandon of what the U.S. Bureau of Mines calls "ordinary regard for safety," or the callous result, the history of human carnage in the mines. The record to date, even the most contemporary chapters of it, is appalling. In the 100 years that partial records of fatal mine accidents have been kept (the early figures are incomplete) more than 120,000 men have died violently in coal mines, an average of 100 every month for a century. The total does not include those who died of what passes for "natural causes" in work that is notoriously hazardous to health as it is to life and limb. Today, among men aged 60 to 64, the "natural" death rate of miners is eight times that of workers in any other industrial occupation.

Chronic lung diease may, in fact, turn out to be a far worse killer of miners than accidents. The U.S. Public Health Service, in unfinished research that is 25 years behind completed medical findings in British mines, has recently documented that coal dust—not the rock dust associated for decades with miners' silicosis—has become perhaps the pre-eminent threat to survival in the mines.

A prevalence study completed in 1965 found that, conservatively, 100,000 active and retired American coal miners suffered from the progressive, gasping breathlessness associated with prolonged inhalation of fine coal dust, a condition known (from autopsy observation) as "black lung" or pneumoconiosis. The U.M.W. estimates that in the 20 years that electric mining machines have been churning up greater and greater clouds of dust at least one million men have been exposed to an occupational disease whose ravages do not stop with removal to a dust-free environment.

The black-lung hazard—as the coal industry and physicians in its employ constantly point out—is as yet a qualitatively and quantitatively uncertain threat to life. It is real enough, however, to have caused more than 30,000 West Virginia miners, normally among the last in the industry to engage in wildcat strikes, to walk off their jobs for three weeks in February of this year to demand that the State Legislature include black lung in the list of injuries and diseases for which disabled miners are eligible to collect workmen's compensation benefits. Until then, only three coal-producing states—Alabama, Virginia and Pennsylvania—authorized workmen's compensation payments (generally financed by the industry) to black-lung victims, and only Pennsylvania has paid any claims. (In Pennsylvania, the benefits are paid for by the taxpayers, not the industry, which may explain how the legislation survived there. Coal has a history of very aggressive lobbying to protect its economic interest.)

In West Virginia's Statehouse last month, a doctor testifying in support of the industry's proposal of further medical studies of black lung before changing the compensation law "in haste," charged that Drs. I. E. Buff, Donald L. Rasmussen and Hawley Wells, the three crusading physicians in that state who had galvanized the miners to strike for health reform, had done more damage as "alarmists" than the disease itself. There was nothing more pathetic, the lachrymose industry witness testified, than a coal miner told to quit the only work he knows just because he is a little breathless. It was a Dickensian performance.

The coal operators, or some of them, have taken the position that pneumoconiosis does not exist. But sudden violence in the mines has been documented monotonously since Black Heath. Last year, alone, 309 miners died in accidents—"needlessly," according to O'Leary, the new and aggressively safety-conscious director of the Bureau of Mines—and the miners' death and injury rates, already the highest of any industry, are on the rise this year.

The injury *severity* rate in mines, also the highest, is two and a half times that of lumbering, nearly four times that of trucking. Since records of nonfatal accidents began to be archived in 1930, the number of men temporarily or permanently disabled digging coal has risen to 1.5 million. Today, a miner surviving a lifetime in coal (and there is one chance in 12 that he will not) can expect three or four lost-time injuries, not counting one chance in 5 or 10 of serious and eventually fatal lung disease.

Mining, like prostitution, is one of the oldest occupations in the world and is probably as impossible to stop. From the beginning, coal has been a curse on the land from whence it came, blighting the landscape with strip mines and culm banks and polluted streams, extracting for absentee owners vast fortunes from Appalachian states that are today synonymous with poverty, and plunging generations into despair.

But the scandal of gratuitous death and injury in the mines—almost all of it recognized, as the Interior Department report put it recently, as the result of the operators' "tendency to cut safety corners when profits are low and ignore good safety practices when profits are high"—has finally reached the point at which a Republican Administration

in Washington is talking about limiting coal production to save lives.

In testimony this month supporting the sudden rush of mine-safety bills in Congress following the explosion at Farmington, this radical notion was put forth by none other than Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. "It is clear that our society can no longer tolerate the cost in human life and human misery that is exacted in the mining of this essential fuel," Hickel said. "Unless we find ways to eliminate that intolerable cost, we must inevitably limit our mining of coal, which has an almost inexhaustible potential for industrial, economic and social good."

Republican coal barons must have rolled in their graves. Even from Democratic Administrations, this most destructive of industries had never received such a radical warning. In fact, Democrats in Congress have been the protectors of the industry's economic interests over the survival interests of its workers.

In 1941, at the end of three decades during which miners died at an average rate of better than 2,000 a year, a series of terrible disasters which had killed 276 men during the closing months of 1940 finally forced passage of the so-called Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act. It was conceded, as the Bureau of Mines timidly put it then, that "speed of operation and demand for maximum tonnage at a minimum cost resulted in a neglect of ordinary safety measures."

In 1941, when technology in the United States had advanced to the threshold of the atomic era, the gross and calculated neglect of ordinary prudence in the powder-house atmosphere of coal mines was evidenced by the fact that barely half the underground coal miners had been equipped with battery-powered electric cap lamps, approved by the Bureau of Mines for the absence of spark hazards. Incredibly, the rest still wore carbide lamps, which gave their light by generating acetylene gas and emitting an open, two-inch jet of flame.

In 1941, half the mines still used unstable black powder for blasting rather than the safer "permissible" explosives recommended for 30 years by the bureau. The carbide lamps were handy for lighting fuses. Some mines had advanced to the employment of "shot firers," solitary men whose job was to shoot down the drilled coal after everyone else had left the mine. It was a concession to modernity. If the mine blew up, only one man was lost.

Everyone knew that disasters could be stopped. "In view of the present knowledge of preventing explosions, disasters are inexcusable and discredit the mining industry," the Bureau of Mines said in 1940. Everyone knew that more improvements in the feeble state mining laws were being blocked than passed. But Congress heeded the industry's states' rights argument. The 1941 act gave the Bureau of Mines for the first time authority to enter and inspect mines and write reports containing noncompulsory safety recommendations, but no powers of enforcement. The states would take care of that.

Since 1910, when the Bureau of Mines was established, its engineers have been testing and recommending to the industry as approved or disapproved—as "permissible" or "nonpermissible" (words that convey more authority than the bureau had then or has today to require their use)—a whole range of mining equipment, including explosives and electric wiring, lights, drills, cutting machines and haulage devices. Such safety-designed machinery is obviously the key to disaster prevention in mines full of a mixture of inflammable methane gas and explosive coal dust.

Yet, nearly half the explosions—835 miners dead—between May, 1941, when the bureau got its authority to inspect and recommend, and July, 1952, when Congress next amended the mine-safety law, were caused by electric arcs from nonpermissible mine machinery. Most of the rest involved nonpermissible—but still not illegal—use of explosives.

Unbelievably, when the misnamed Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952 finally emerged from the coal lobby's permissible cutting machine, it contained a "grandfather clause" which allowed the indefinitely continued use of knowingly dangerous nonpermissible electrical machinery "if, before the effective date of this section . . . the operator of such mine owned such equipment . . . or had ordered such equipment." The law also set up two classes of mines—gassy and nongassy—and it stretched the loophole for nonpermissible equipment even further for the 85 per cent of mine owners lucky enough to meet the nongassy standard.

In effect, Congress told the mine operators that "if you were creating an avoidable explosion hazard before we passed this law, it's all right to go on doing so until the dangerous machinery wears out." Today, this means that spark-hazard machines—some of them rebuilt twice and three times over under the same serial numbers—are still in use in some mines 17 years after the law was passed. A count by the Bureau of Mines in 1967, when the law had been on the books 15 years, showed 1,117 pieces of nonpermissible electrical equipment in use in 159 mines.

The 1952 mine-safety act may have been one of the great legislative mirages of all time. It specifically exempted small mines, those with fewer than 15 employes. Although the small mines were depicted in the industry's testimony as too inefficient and limited in capital resources to bear the cost of retooling for the most basic disaster prevention, their number immediately doubled after the law was passed. Large mines were simply separated into smaller units to evade the law. (In 1966, the small mines were finally brought in—with all "grandfather clauses" still intact.)

Moreover, the law was deliberately written to apply to, and to give Federal mine inspectors jurisdiction over, only certain kinds of "major disasters"—defined by Congress as those killing five or more miners in one stroke. More than 90 per cent of mine deaths then occurred in lonely ones, twos and threes. Far more than half were caused by rock falls from the mine roof, largely at the working face. The 1952 law established roof-control standards, but only for established tunnels used as haulageways where such accidents were least common.

Having extended Federal safety jurisdiction to the kinds of "major disasters" that made the news wires and brought discrediting publicity, Congress emphasize that the new law was not to protect the miners from "the lack of, or inadequacy of, guards or protective devices." It was totally silent on hazards to health.

In signing the act into law, former President Truman obviously did not overstate the facts in observing that "I consider it my duty to point out its defects so that the public will not be misled into believing that this is a broad-gauge accident-prevention measure . . . I am advised that loopholes in the law were provided to avoid any economic impact on the coal-mining industry."

Congress has considered mine-safety legislation only three times in the last three decades. But in the years between enactments, there was activity. In 1962, after explosions in the Robena and Compass mines had killed 59 men, President Kennedy commissioned a task force to review the situation. Its report concluded that the industry's continuing disregard of the most basic hazards to life and limb deserved Congressional attention. For one thing, the task force proposed to put a deadline—one year after enactment of an implementing amendment by Congress—on the nonpermissible machinery "grandfather clause." It also noted that Britain, producing only a fraction of the coal output of the United States, was spending more than twice as much on mine health research.

But then in a series of private conferences with Bureau of Mines and Interior Department officials, the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, the union-negotiating arm of the coal industry, persuaded them to recommend to Congress a "grandfather clause" deadline of five years. Since Congress took no action on it, the B.C.O.A. had another opportunity last year to persuade the Bureau of Mines to propose an even further extension to ten years. The capitulation was so flagrant that the White House, overseeing the draftsmanship of the 1968 mine-safety bill, demanded its exclusion from the bill, which went up to Congress in September. It died without hearings.

Other capitulations to the industry have perpetuated the Bureau of Mines' reputation as the submissive captive of the industry it is supposed to police. As recently as a year ago, a long-proposed revision of the 1952 law specifically requiring diversion of a minimum flow of dust-and gas-diluting forced air ventilation to the working face of coal mines—a point beyond the last moving air current in the established workings—was dropped by the bureau upon the B.C.O.A.'s complaint that it would be too costly.

It has been known for years that progressive contamination of mine ventilation air—a pickup of dangerous amounts of methane or coal dust, or both—results from coursing air from one working section of a mine to another before routing it to the surface. The practice is known to have caused explosions and deaths. Yet a year ago the B.C.O.A. was still dickering privately with the bureau, demanding language in the bureau's proposals for tougher mine ventilation standards which would say that if it cost too much to provide a separate "split" of air to each active working place it would not be required until after "a reasonable time"—not, of course, defined.

It is not that any of these proposals were new. The industry could claim no element of surprise—except at the idea of being compelled to adopt them after so long a history of lethal *laissez-faire*. Mine technology has been equal to all of these proposed measures for at least all of this century—for 101,000 mine deaths.

The inclusive almanac of mine disasters published by the Bureau of Mines in 1960 (it is now out of print) says that the violently explosive and unpredictable characteristics of suspended coal dust in mines were known as long ago as 1886. A team of mining engineers which visited all the major coalfields in 1908, a year after the worst mine explosion in American history had killed 362 men at Monongah, W. Va., published a detailed report identifying every source of all the subsequent mine disasters (72,501 deaths—1909 through 1968) and recommending disaster-prevention standards which are *still* not observed.

While lobbying privily against safety, the industry has publicly promoted the idea that the death and mutilation of its workers was a cost of doing business. It got a depletion allowance on its taxes. Its workers got none for their depletion. The industry reaction to disaster was in the brave tradition of "what can you expect in an inherently risky business"—*and* with some of the most effective lobbying in legislative history to perpetuate the trade-off of cheap life for cheap coal. And it has not been alone.

Even on the left in this medieval atmosphere, the miners' union, the United Mine Workers of America, has been so concerned with helping the industry survive its post-war slump and with preserving coal's low-cost competitive advantage over other basic

fuels—oil, natural gas and nuclear energy—that it long ago sacrificed what could have been the leadership of a mine-safety crusade for high wages, mechanized high production, and the highest accident rate of any industry.

Some of the accidents were no accident. In 1947, the U.M.W. in Illinois was found to have voluntarily signed a labor contract with coal operators in that state whose terms forbade the union from seeking improvements in Illinois' mine-safety law, upon which the industry placed such store in opposing greater Federal control. The Federal law of 1941, then in effect, was no threat to the cheapest production economies; the 1941 act had been so considerate of the industry's faith in state regulation that Federal mine inspectors were denied enforcement powers.

Since 1946, moreover, the U.M.W. had become locked in an embrace with the operators nationally. Through the 1946 coal labor contract, which set up the U.M.W. Welfare and Retirement Fund and financed it by an industry royalty—now 40 cents a ton for all coal taken out of union mines—the U.M.W. also acquired an immense interest in production. The Welfare and Retirement Fund collects income from *operating* mines, not from those harried by mine inspectors or closed down for safety violations.

The U.M.W.'s obvious conflicts of interest are a legacy of John L. Lewis, the 89-year-old former president. Lewis's postwar decision to help the coal industry survive by sacrificing 400,000 miners' jobs to mechanization in return for the company royalties was regarded then as a modernizing act of industrial statesmanship. But it established alliances that obviously are not in the best interests—on mine safety, if nothing else—of the rank-and-file membership. For example, under Lewis the U.M.W. bought control of the National Bank of Washington, a profitable sideline that has furthered the appearance, if not the fact, of shared interests by making loans to coal companies.

Since Congress was no help, in 1946 the Interior Department, which was then operating the mines under President Truman's strike-induced Federal seizure order, negotiated with the unions (as a condition in the contract) safety standards unobtainable by other means. Compliance with the contract's so-called Mine Safety Code, which incorporates many of the reforms talked about since the early nineteen-hundreds, is monitored by Federal mine inspectors. But its enforcement depends on the union, through its contractual right to withdraw men from mines in violation of the code.

Compliance, according to Bureau of Mines Director O'Leary, "leaves much to be desired." The compliance average in 20 of the largest mines is 65 per cent, O'Leary has told Congressional committees, but in some states (depending on coal operator attitudes and union militance) it is as low as 30 per cent and in one state as low as 7 per cent. The U.M.W.'s "safety division" at its headquarters in Washington consists of one man.

The Welfare and Retirement Fund is not the only loser when the men walk out of an unsafe mine. The miners lose wages. When I asked him several months ago whether the U.M.W. had considered negotiating with the companies a requirement that they pay regular wages to men who left a shift while demonstrable code violations were corrected, the U.M.W.'s Boyle, a slight, normally combative Irishman from Montana, told me that that would be impossible because even among miners there were "lazy men"; there would be abuses to get pay for no work. Later, in a safety proposal prepared by the U.M.W., the union finally supported the idea that miners should be paid for time off the job if a *Federal inspector* closed a mine.

But more than any other witnesses on this year's crop of catch-up mine-safety bills, Boyle has agreed with the industry's position. On the proposed revision that Secretary Hickel and O'Leary have called the reform of "paramount importance," Boyle's stand is significantly less reformist than the industry's. In view of the miserable record of Congressional inaction and protection of the industry, the Administration this year is asking Congress to give the Secretary of the Interior the flexibility of administrative rule-making authority. After hearings, *he* would establish the safety standards. There would be the right of appeal. It is the system in use since 1938 in nearly every other area of Federal regulatory activity, and the coal industry now says it will go along with it if the Secretary's authority is suitably circumscribed to prevent "arbitrary" decisions. Boyle, however, has said he "would rather take our chances with Congress."

Those chances this year are very good indeed, partly because Boyle himself has underlined the unequal forces working for mine safety in the private sector. The U.M.W. is clearly embarrased by the reformist zeal of what it calls "Johnny-come-lately experts" since Farmington, like Udall, Ralph Nader and Representative Ken Hechler of West Virginia. For suggesting that the union bears some responsibility and that it has compromised and "snuggled up to" management on safety issues, the U.M.W. Journal recently labeled Nader and Hechler as "finks" in a front-page editorial. And the union magazine has engaged in such a Mao Tse-tung glorification of Boyle and his record as a safety crusader—it refers to him as a "union chieftain"—that the U.M.W. has become an embarrassment to its friends in Congress. While fulminating at the charges of collaboration with the industry, The Journal has *not* reported that weeks before the Consol disaster, the U.M.W. was convicted along with the Consolidation Coal Company in a Federal court in Lexington, Ky., of conspiring to create a monopoly in the soft coal industry. With the conviction, which is being appealed, went a $7,300,000 damage award, to be paid half by the union and half by the company that Boyle has praised for "cooperation." The case involved Consol's alleged withdrawal of coal marketing services from South-East Coal Company after the company went nonunion.

Moreover the coal industry can hardly cry poor this year. Because of its secure grip on a growing share—now more than half—of the fuel market in the surging electric utility business, even the National Coal Association is calling the future "glittering." It turns out that local boosters who, through depression upon depression, have been calling the state of West Virginia "The Billion Dollar Coal Field" were not far from wrong.

As Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr. of New Jersey noted in starting mine-safety hearings, coal has become so profitable that since 1966 the three largest coal producers have been taken over by other giant mineral corporations—Peabody Coal Company by Kennecott Copper, Consolidation by Continental Oil Company, and Island Creek Coal Company by Occidental Oil. According to the National Coal Association, the list of oil corporations that have acquired coal-mining companies now includes at least 20 of the major petroleum producers—Gulf, Shell, Humble, Standard of Ohio, Atlantic-Richfield, Sun, Ashland and Kerr-McGee among them. It was a relief to know, Senator Williams noted, that the safety hearings would not be "complicated" by the usual coal claims of imminent bankruptcy. To the oil owners of coal, Williams pointedly observed that the spectacle of oil-well pollution of the Pacific Ocean off Santa Barbara, Calif., and new evidence of "lung pollution" in the mines "may be trying to tell us something." "In both cases," he said, "we find at the top of the ownership structure big oil companies."

Whether or not by corporate edict from these powerful new coal owners, the fact is that the National Coal Association, the largest industry group, is taking a remarkably calm and even welcoming view of the strenuous safety legislation before Congress this year. By enacting the Nixon Administration bill, which is among the strongest of the lot, Congress could close all the old loopholes at once and take—for coal—a daring new step into industrial human ecology. The Nixon bill would require mine operators to attack the black-lung epidemic among miners by reducing coal dust contamination in mine air to 4.5 milligrams of respirable dust per cubic meter of air, as a starter. The standard is a compromise of the U.S. Public Health Service's 1968 recommendation—3 milligrams. It would become effective six months after passage of the law and could be lowered later by decision of the Secretary of the Interior. The dust-control problem is publicly pictured as a cost nightmare by the industry. The Bureau of Mines estimates that the cost will be only pennies per ton.

The economics of mine safety are the one great unknown in this year's reform spree. No one knows what the cost of a century of neglect has been. Lee White, the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which regulates wholesale electric power rates, opened the door a crack during Secretary Udall's post-Farmington *mea culpa* last December by observing that, as a nation, we have lost money as well as life in the mines, "and we must pay." The F.P.C. is anxious to pass on to consumers "all savings in costs that are properly made," White said. But if it takes an increase in the cost of electricity to indemnify the miners who dig the coal for steam-electric power, "I believe the American people are willing and should be willing to pay that extra cost . . . For all I know, we are not talking about increased rates but only a smaller decrease in rates."

Some but not all of coal's new 20-year and 30-year contracts to supply the huge fuel demands of electric power contain escalator clauses, which would permit certain price increases to pay for safety. But a share-the-cost program may not be as easy to work out as White made it seem; one reason that the coal industry is so mercilessly cost-conscious has been the strong downward pressure on prices exerted by the electric utilities, including the Government's own Tennessee Valley Authority, the biggest of all coal consumers. The average value per ton of coal at the mine has dropped from $4.99 in 1948 to $4.62 last year.

It may be significant that John Corcoran, the president of Consol—a moderate man to start with, by coal industry standards, and one who has been deeply affected by the Farmington disaster—also is chairman of the National Coal Association and a director of the American Mining Association and the Bituminous Coal Association. The industry does seem to be speaking with a new voice. But the coal industry is still a very loose coalition of new humanists and old buccaneers. And as one of its publicists put it recently, "We are like any association—we reflect the lowest common denominator. We have a few members who think the world is flat, so we have not publicly endorsed the use of globes."

CHARLES M. STOREY

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we join today in greetings and tribute to Mr. Charles Moorfield Storey, one of America's most distinguished and intrepid barristers; a significant figure over the decades in education and business and

in public affairs; and, above all, one of those rare public men whose contributions to the commonweal do not depend on titles or publicity. He now turns 80, still battling and twinkling, a Boston Brahmin whose concerns and vision reach far beyond the Boston Common, whose example of the upright life has uplifted countless of his countrymen with its demonstration that character and wisdom can aid in the pursuit of justice and peace, with its affirmation that a life of harmony and quality can respond to the demands of compassion and commitment.

He has served the U.S. Government and influenced scores of his family and friends, themselves elected and appointed to Government, to serve that Government more effectively and more generously than they would otherwise have done. And he has served countless groups and institutions, from Harvard and Boston to prisoners of war and children, advantaged and disadvantaged. Community and country are the better that this honorable man has been amongst us, and he will continue, engaged and invaluable, for decades yet to come.

HEMISFAIR 1968

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago April 6, HemisFair 1968 opened its run in San Antonio. Six months ago, the exposition closed. It was everything that I hoped it would be when I asked my colleagues to approve U.S. participation, and I believe that the confidence of the House was fully justified.

Never in history before last year did any world exposition ever take place in the Southwest. HemisFair was built on a 92.6-acre site in downtown San Antonio, and its cost was about $156,000,000. Most of the buildings, including the U.S. Pavilion, were designed as permanent structures, and even now some are being used, and others are awaiting conversion. HemisFair was not, and was never intended to be, an exposition on the scale of Expo '67 or other world fairs; it was a special category exposition, limited in its scope and purpose, and intending to show one special theme: the confluence of civilizations in the Americas. San Antonio is 250 years old, and in that time all the people of the Americas have passed through the city, and some have stayed. This is true of the Americas; the Western Hemisphere is the product of many civilizations, joined into a confluence that contains the strengths of many. That was the story of HemisFair.

People came to see this great show: 6,384,482 people in all. I think that most were pleased by what they found. They found the U.S. Pavilion showing a critically acclaimed film; they found the Institute of Texan Cultures telling it like it was and is; they found the Alexander Girard collection of folk art, the outstanding collection of its kind anywhere in the world; they found perhaps the greatest exhibition of Spanish art treasures ever brought to this country on loan; they saw the exhibits of virtually every country of the Americas, and learned that in our diversity there is great strength. At HemisFair one could see his work and his world in large perspective; one could see 90 miles from the Tower of the Americas, and life in miniature from a distance of less than a yard. It was all there, the old and the new, the changing and the unchangeable.

Mr. Speaker, I envisioned HemisFair as an event that could teach, and could bring new momentum into the community, and it did those things. HemisFair also created a new sense of progress in San Antonio and the Southwest, a new determination to do great things where in the past nothing was done at all, and a knowledge that indeed this is a world and ours a time and place well fit for all men to live in. I believe HemisFair was a success. I intend to offer my colleagues a full and detailed report on HemisFair at an early date. In the meanwhile, I call your attention to the 1969 "Book of Knowledge Annual," which reports as follows:

HEMISFAIR '68

HemisFair'68 made San Antonio, Texas, the most exciting and interesting place in the United States during the six months of its run (April 6–October 6). HemisFair celebrated the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio, a city famed for the Alamo and renowned for its grace and beauty.

The theme of HemisFair was "Confluence of Civilizations in the Americas." The fair was meant to show how people from all over the world came to the United States and founded a new country and a new way of life. It also took a look into the future to see what it might hold for the United States and the world.

HemisFair occupied a site of 92.6 acres in the heart of downtown San Antonio. Over six million people attended the fair. They saw exhibits from more than thirty nations as well as industrial exhibits.

Altogether the buildings erected for HemisFair cost $156,000,000. Most world's-fair buildings are torn down at the closing of the exposition. But at HemisFair many buildings were built for permanent use. Among these are the theme structure, the 622-foot Tower of the Americas, a great Convention Center, the United States Pavilion, the Texas Pavilion and others.

U.S. PAVILION

The United States Pavilion at HemisFair consisted of two buildings: an exhibit hall and a 1,200-seat theater. In the exhibit hall were exhibits showing the people of the United States and their achievements. Across a connecting plaza, the theater showed a unique film on the largest curvilinear motion-picture screen in the world. The circular theater contained three separate sections. During the 23-minute film, the walls separating the sections were raised so that the three audiences merged into one. At the same time, the three separate motion pictures merged into one.

TOWER OF THE AMERICAS

The dominant structure at HemisFair was the Tower of the Americas. This 622-foot concrete tower has a rotating restaurant and observation decks at the top. The Tower of the Americas is the tallest observation tower in the Western Hemisphere. On a clear day visitors could see the horizon 90 miles away. Three glass-fronted elevators carried visitors to the top.

TEXAS PAVILION

The biggest exhibit building at HemisFair was the Texas Pavilion, called the Institute of Texan Cultures. The building, which cost $10,000,000, contained exhibits showing the contributions made to Texas by pioneers from many lands. Each nationality group in Texas was represented by a separate area of exhibits. These exhibits included artifacts of all kinds, as well as pictures and sound, which presented the story of the founding and development of Texas. At the center of the Texas Pavilion, visitors could sit on the carpeted floor, and see above them, projected on nearly forty different screens, slides and movies about Texas' past, present and future.

Probably the most unique of HemisFair's exhibits was the Alexander Girard Folk Art Collection, a stunning display of over ten thousand dolls and other miniatures from countries all over the Western Hemisphere.

FOREIGN EXHIBITS

Foreign exhibits at HemisFair were housed in a section called Las Plazas del Mundo—Plazas of the World. Canada, one of the large exhibitors, welcomed visitors with a display showing how Canadians live, how they are governed, and their country's place in the world. Spain displayed priceless art.

Other foreign exhibitors were Belgium, Bolivia, Colombia, France, Italy, Japan, Korea, Portugal, Panama, China, Thailand, Venezuela, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, West Germany and Switzerland.

Mexico contributed a pavilion filled with valuable paintings and artifacts. One of the most popular attractions at HemisFair were the mariachis, who performed on a floating stage in a lagoon just outside the Mexican Pavilion.

Los Voladores de Papantla, the famous Flying Indians of Papantla, Mexico, thrilled HemisFair visitors with a daily reenactment of a 400-year-old ritual. The authentically costumed Indians performed a complete ceremony, climaxed by a rain dance performed on a 12-inch disk at the top of a 114-foot-high pole. At the end of the ceremony, four of the Indians descended from the pole, flying head down on ropes secured to their waists. The flyers made 32 turns around the pole, fanning out some thirty feet in a spectacular ritual defying death itself. The ceremony is one performed by the Totonac Indians today just as it was four hundred years ago.

INDUSTRIAL PAVILIONS

The Radio Corporation of America sponsored an exhibit showing present and future use of computers as teaching aids for children. The exhibit included live demonstrations of children learning with the help of an advanced computer. A short distance away, International Business Machines showed how a computer can be connected to a loom to weave any design. Visitors drew any design they liked, and the computer commanded the loom to weave it.

The Coca-Cola Company Pavilion featured 120 puppets in a colorful and imaginative show enjoyed by children and adults alike. The Bell Telephone System sponsored a popular magic show. The Gulf Oil Corporation presented a miniature freeway where drivers could test their skills safely. General Motors, the Ford Motor Company, the Eastman Kodak Company and many other industrial exhibitors participated in HemisFair.

THE FAIRGROUNDS

HemisFair was designed for people, and the walking distances from any one point of the grounds to any other point were short "People expressways" shortened distances and made walking easier. Those who wished to ride could choose a sky-ride or a miniature monorail. A lagoon and a waterway system ran throughout the grounds, and many visitors saw HemisFair from gondolas.

HemisFair was built in an old part of San Antonio. The builders of the fair decided to restore 27 old homes and historic buildings in the grounds rather than destroy them. Old houses became restaurants, clubs and visitor centers. And an old warehouse became an exhibit hall. A carriage house became a sidewalk restaurant, while an old school served as HemisFair headquarters. The old buildings, scattered throughout the HemisFair site, offered charm and contrast to the sleek new buildings all around. The grounds were enhanced by a waterway, which included a rerouted San Antonio River, and by twenty fountains of all kinds and sizes. Sculptures, more than a hundred of them, dotted the grounds. They represented artists both recognized and new, and works in every mode from plastic to welded steel.

Food at HemisFair ranged from traditional hot dogs to exotic dishes from all corners of the world. A Mexican restaurant, two French restaurants, a Polynesian restaurant, a Philippine restaurant and many others offered food at every price and to every taste.

PROUD SAN ANTONIO

World's fairs seldom produce any profit, and HemisFair closed at a loss. The underwriters of the loan used by HemisFair had to pay for the losses, but they did so gladly, because HemisFair had brought 6,384,482 people to San Antonio, and they spent $134,000,000 in San Antonio alone. But more important than the money was the fact that HemisFair did start San Antonio moving ahead, and it did focus new attention on a proud old city, and that is exactly what the supporters of the fair hoped for.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
U.S. Representative.

ABOUT MORALITY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am often impressed with the thinking and excellent writings of the very fine newspapers in the 20 counties of the First District of Georgia. I feel the editorial which follows from the Swainsboro Forest-Blade of March 26 shows full well the awareness and keen understanding of some of the activities of certain segments of our population today, which we read about and view so much on our television screens:

ABOUT MORALITY

Repeatedly, in recent months, we have been coming across the phrase, "middle class morality." Each time we see it in print it is like a wet mop in the face. The hippies head for a Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco to rid themselves of it; movie reviewers find enlightenment in movies which portray persons trying to escape it; even book reviewers are given to hailing authors who create depraved demons who deplore their middle class morality upbringing and violate whatever they fancy middle class morality to be.

It has come to be a standard phrase in the terminology of the literary license takers who defend any behavior as being simply a protest against middle class morality. At least two national magazines of recent date have devoted space and photographs to young people who represent to be busily engaged in purging themselves of this middle class morality malady, in order to be useful spokesmen for the cohorts of the unorthodox and unclean of our time.

There must be about 150 million people in this land who came out of middle class morality and that is three out of every four living and breathing Americans.

The code did not differ greatly from one part of the country to another, nor from one religion or color to another. In essence it has been: work a full day for a day's wage, save for a rainy day, fear God, defend the Flag, help the sick and poor, preserve the family, and do unto others as you'd like them to do unto you.

It was never a complicated code, and it was inbred, in every American community. It wasn't imported from any land; it wasn't carried here by any national or religious group. It was part of the beginning and the growth of America. Each incoming group had to prove itself, to be sure. And it took a little time. But the once-hated Irish did it; the Jews did it; the Chinese did it; the Negroes did it. They didn't do it as a group, or a race; they did it as individual Americans who liked the code and adopted it as a way of life and then stood proud as a peer of every other American who earnestly endeavored to pay his own way and held his God and his Country higher than himself.

Middle class morality doesn't tolerate either malingerers or maligners.

Middle class morality isn't a sickness of our society; it is the spine of it.

GOVERNMENT OPENS UP UNDER PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, once again President Nixon forged a policy favoring openness of communication between his administration and the American people.

On the troublesome question of executive privilege, where the need of Congress to obtain information must be carefully balanced against the duty of the executive branch not to disclose information incompatible with the public interest, the President has come down squarely on the side of maximum disclosure.

President Nixon has created a formal and strict procedure for cases where there might be a question of whether to disclose or not. A department head who feels information should be withheld must take his case to the Attorney General, and if there is agreement that withholding is necessary, the matter goes to the President for a final decision.

President Nixon clearly is operating on the premise that the public interest will require withholding only in rare instances.

Many newsmen already have expressed amazement at the access to high Government officials in the administration. The President's news conferences have been examples of the new level of candid communication between the people and the new administration. And the new policy on executive privilege serves as still another example that the Nixon administration is doing everything possible to assure an open administration.

The text of the President's memorandum to agency and department heads and editorials on the executive privilege policy from the April 1, 1969, Chicago Tribune and the April 3, 1969, Washington Post follow:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, MARCH 24, 1969

Subject: Establishing a procedure to govern compliance with congressional demands for information.

The policy of this Administration is to comply to the fullest extent possible with Congressional requests for information. While the Executive branch has the responsibility of withholding certain information the disclosure of which would be incompatible with the public interest, this Administration will invoke this authority only in the most compelling circumstances and after a rigorous inquiry into the actual need for its exercise. For those reasons Executive privilege will not be used without specific Presidential approval. The following procedural steps will govern the invocation of Executive privilege:

1. If the head of an Executive department or agency (hereafter referred to as "department head") believes that compliance with a request for information from a Congressional agency addressed to his department or agency raises a substantial question as to the need for invoking Executive privilege, he should consult the Attorney General through the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice.

2. If the department head and the Attorney General agree, in accordance with the policy set forth above, that Executive privilege shall not be invoked in the circumstances, the information shall be released to the inquiring Congressional agency.

3. If the department head and the Attorney General agree that the circumstances justify the invocation of Executive privilege, or if either of them believes that the issue should be submitted to the President, the matter shall be transmitted to the Counsel to the President, who will advise the department head of the President's decision.

4. In the event of a Presidential decision to invoke Executive privilege, the department should advise the Congressional agency that the claim of Executive privilege is being made with the specific approval of the President.

5. Pending a final determination of the matter, the department head should request the Congressional agency to hold its demand for the information in abeyance until such determination can be made. Care shall be taken to indicate that the purpose of this request is to protect the privilege pending the determination, and that the request does not constitute a claim of privilege.

RICHARD NIXON.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Apr. 1 1969]

NIXON LEVELS WITH THE PEOPLE

President Nixon has instructed his official family that the practice of withholding information from Congress on the ground of "executive privilege" is not to be exercised unless the President himself specifically approves. This step represents a welcome departure from the secrecy and "news management" which have prevailed in the executive departments for many years.

Mr. Nixon's own experience in government probably influenced his decision. He became acquainted with executive suppression of factual information in his very first term in the House as a member of the 80th Congress of 1947–49. When the 1946 election produced Republican majorities in both houses of Congress, President Truman moved to forestall the investigation he anticipated into communist infiltration of his administrator.

On March 21, 1947, he issued an executive order designed to prevent Republican investigators from obtaining documents and other information to guide their committee inquiries. Former Sen. Jenner of Indiana described this instrument as one thru which the President could "lay an absolute embargo on information demanded by Congress from the executive agencies."

Mr. Nixon, as a member of the committee on un-American activities, played a prominent part in the investigation which exposed Alger Hiss, a high functionary of the state department, as a soviet espionage agent and perjurer. Yet thruout that inquiry Nixon was keenly aware that the administration had placed every possible obstacle in the committee's path to hamper the search for truth.

While a senator and Vice President, Nixon saw the same procedures in operation on at least two other occasions. In September, 1951, President Truman issued a supplementary order authorizing non-military departments and agencies to impose a "security" censorship. Together, these two Truman orders turned out the lights on practically everything that the executive branch wanted to keep from the Congress and the people.

Nor was the Republican administration which Nixon served as Vice President without fault. On Jan. 21, 1954, when the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy was headed toward a public confrontation with the department of the army and its secretary, a strategy huddle was held in the White House. Sen. McCarthy had charged loose security practices at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and had protested when an honorable discharge was handed Maj. Irving Peress to hustle him out of service after he had pleaded the 5th amendment 33 times under the senator's questioning.

Plans by the White House conferees were intended to embarrass Sen. McCarthy by advancing the counter-charge that he had sought an army commission for a staff member who faced induction. When McCarthy tried to bring the White House meeting into the open, he was stopped by an executive order of May 17, 1954, that all secrets of the executive branch were to remain privy to those concerned.

During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations the doctrine was promulgated that "news management" was permissible on the ground that news was "part of the arsenal of weaponry" available to a President, and that it was "the inherent right of a government to lie to save itself."

We trust that President Nixon has acted out of revulsion to these efforts at concealment and suppression and that he has wisely decided that honesty with the people and Congress is the best policy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 3, 1969]

THE PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

The most distinctive characteristic of a democratic system is that it operates in a goldfish bowl. Except in matters of national security, where a certain amount of secrecy seems unavoidable, the public and the Congress are entitled to know what the executive branch is doing and why. Yet a constant struggle is necessary to prevent bureaucrats from hiding information about actions which may tend to place them in an unfavorable light.

It is highly significant, therefore, that President Nixon has underwritten the public right to know with specific instructions to his official family. Not only has he proclaimed a policy of complying "to the fullest extent possible" with congressional requests for information. He has also instituted a formal procedure that any executive official must follow if he wishes to withhold information from Congress on grounds of "executive privilege." The first step is to seek clearance from the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice and if that office and the Attorney General see a reason for withholding the data the request must then go to the counsel to the President for direct submission to him. Information can be withheld only if the President gives his specific approval.

Undoubtedly this strict rein upon the invocation of secrecy is intended to bolster good relations between the Republican President and the Democratic Congress. Quite a number of congressional committees are planning probes into Administration actions and policies, past and present. Apparently Mr. Nixon believes that the best way to get along with them is to permit a free flow of information in executive files, except in rare instances where the national security stands in the way. In addition to easing executive-legislative relations, this is an essential safeguard against widening the credibility gap that always exists in some measure between government and citizen.

It is well to remember also an open-information policy is easily stated but often difficult to observe with fidelity. At this point we are delighted that the President has so fully recognized the public right to know and hope that he will give a literal interpretation to his words when the going gets rough.

DAVENPORT'S MR. HISTORY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, enclosed herewith is an article entitled, "Davenport's Mr. History." It is a story of Mr. Roy McNabney who is a great student of history and is an articulate speaker on the subject. He has properly motivated and helped us use and benefit from history. All of us need to do this more than we do and it is good that we have people in our community like Mr. McNabney with ability and desire to share his talents with other people and, thereby, make them wiser and better.

The article follows:

DAVENPORT'S MR. HISTORY

(By Hortense Finch)

Ninety years young Monday, Roy Francis (Mac) McNabney, dapper as ever, still maintains sharp interest in an amazing variety of things from sports to history.

Regardless of the weather, McNabney never misses a conversation-sparked get-together twice weekly with old and new friends at downtown Davenport Shannon's. After that, he saunters around the corner to his favorite retreat, the public library.

"In my lifetime, I've read my way through several PhD. dissertations," he claims.

Born in Hampton, Ill., he was educated in public schools there. As a senior, he won a scholarship to attend a Congregational school in Port Byron.

That was where he developed a life-long interest in history. One of his proudest accomplishments is the completion of a unique, documented history of the United States mail system. It includes such details as stage lines used, bridges crossed, and taverns used as depots.

McNabney says he spent at least 30 years researching the project, going back before the American Revolution to the present.

He also is the author of a 77-page record of the ferry boat, a work covering a time span of 120 years and including a graph listing pilots, owners and engineers by decades. Dr. William Petersen of the Iowa State Historical Society has often quoted from McNabney's writings in his own books on Mississippi River lore.

McNabney's other hobbies include playing such instruments as the saxophone, violin, mandolin and bass horn. He used to play in the Moline Plow Co. band and organized the Palmer School band of 40, which played for special school events.

He was selected a few years ago to compile a card index tabulating under various headings all significant articles that had appeared in local newspapers from their beginnings to the present. That index of more than 800 cards with amazingly complete information is now in the Davenport Public Museum.

McNabney, who formerly did varied research in the Academy of Science which preceded the present Davenport Public Museum, is generally recognized as the best informed authority on early history of the Quad-City area.

He often receives mail requests for specific information. Recently he received an inquiry about the first use of X-ray in the detection of a crime.

McNabney recalled that a man had stolen a diamond from a Davenport jewelry store and hidden it in a seam. He was taken to a doctor's office where an X-ray examination revealed the diamond's location.

His first job was with Hartz and Bahnsen, Rock Island wholesale and retail druggists. One of his first jobs was to help make rock candy. One evening McNabney forgot to shut off the burner used to heat the syrup. When he entered the room the next morning, he found rock candy syrup everywhere.

When he was 20, he took a job with a wholesale drug firm in Chicago. One of his jobs was to fill glass containers with Vaseline and then pound in the corks with a rubber mallet. One day while doing this he broke the glass bottle. Countless glass slivers were imbedded in his hands. Later he was rejected for military service for that reason.

While working for the Modern Woodsmen in Rock Island later, McNabney helped organize, about 1907, the first semi-professional football team in the area. They played a regular schedule each Saturday afternoon. McNabney has continued his strong interest in many kinds of sports.

While employed by Schmidt Brothers Gas Engines Co., I originated work sheets for piece work. This was a totally new idea, something no place else was using at the time," he recalls.

Eventually, McNabney became a timekeeper for Palmer School of Chiropractic students.

"Checking students' attendance every hour was a real challenge," he remembers. "I soon became known as the 'Czar.' Actually, I was offered every type of bribe you can imagine. But we kept meticulous records. In fact, the system I instituted was described as the best by both the medical boards of New York State and Canada."

When McNabney discovered students were cribbing answers on the lapboards the school provided, he stopped this by shellacking the boards. To keep students from erasing grades or signatures, McNabney stamped these things on with raspberry juice, which he calls "absolutely indelible."

"At any age, McNabney would be a remarkable man," says Dr. E. G. Senty, his physician, "but at 90 he's really amazing. For instance, he follows all sports events as keenly as any teenager. He knows exactly what's going on nationally and internationally, as well as locally. He's a true gentleman."

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY: MICROCOSM OF THE REVOLUTION?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, profound and rapid changes are taking place in our Nation that affect every part of our lives, from politics to technology to education to religion. We are in a revolutionary era that influences even the most traditional institutions like the Roman Catholic Church.

The Wall Street Journal has devoted a front-page article to the current tension within American Catholicism, concentrating on Catholic University of America. Simply put, the question is: How much or how little authority should there be at the official university in this country of the Vatican?

Another article in the Milwaukee Metro News approaches the same question by examining the fight of several conservatives at Catholic University, particularly Dr. William Roberts, a professor of international law and relations, for evolutionary rather than revolutionary reform at the university and within the Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is much food for thought in these two articles about the continuing revolution in America. I include the above-mentioned articles from the Wall Street Journal of January 9, 1969, and the Milwaukee Metro News of January 8, 1969, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 9, 1969]

CHURCH AND CAMPUS: FREEDOM OF INQUIRY IS AT ISSUE IN CONTROVERSY AT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY—PROFESSORS ASSERT THE RIGHT TO DIFFER WITH HIERARCHY—BIRTH CONTROL IS DEBATED—CARDINAL O'BOYLE'S REBUTTAL

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—"The University venerates the Roman pontiff as its Supreme Ruler and Teacher and submits unreservedly to his Apostolic Authority as the only safe norm of truth."

So state the statutes of the Catholic University of America here in the nation's capital. CU is the largest American university formally accredited by the Vatican (6,300 students) and one of relatively few such institutions in the world. CU is also distinctive in that it traditionally has been run by American Catholic bishops as a body rather than by a particular religious order or diocese. Yet this supposed citadel of orthodoxy has lately become something of a center of dissent.

Theologians on the university faculty have openly taken issue with the hierarchy on birth control. Their stand has stirred protests among other local priests and ordinary church-goers, and it has opened up a struggle over academic freedom and the authority of the church's presiding bishops. An inquiry into the dissent at Catholic University, starting this month or next with findings due in March, will help determine how far any change will go.

It was last summer that a handful of CU theologians mounted a rostrum at Washington's Mayflower Hotel to express total disagreement with Pope Paul's just issued encyclical, "Humanae Vitae," which opposes artificial birth control. "History shows that a number of statements of similar or even greater authoritative weight have subsequently been proven inadequate or even erroneous," the theologians declared. They then advised Catholic couples that "artificial contraception in some circumstances is permissible and indeed necessary to preserve and foster the values and sacredness of marriage."

OUTSIDE SUPPORT

Even then, the professors had supporters outside the university. And since the CU theologians' declaration, some 700 Catholics across the country have signed their manifesto, while dozens of Washington priests have joined a running birth-control wrangle with Washington's Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle. Moreover, the university has become immersed in the more subtle and probably more significant contest over church authority and academic freedom.

The CU controversy underscores some of the hard questions confronting the Catholic Church and Catholic higher education in particular. Among them: Does the authority of the Pope and bishops govern or merely guide the individual conscience? Is unorthodox theological opinion to be expressed only in the classroom and academic journals? Or can priests use modern means of communication such as the televised press conference?

"This was not a question of rebellion," declares one CU dissenter. "This was theological truth we felt a duty to convey to Catholics in the U.S. If there had been other ways of dialogue between the bishops and theologians, we could have saved a lot of trouble."

Another asserts: "The academic-freedom controversy embodies the whole problem: Can this university be a true American university and still be fostered and maintained by official church sponsorship?"

Some CU theologians say the bishops haven't seen anything yet. "The bishops think they have trouble with us; we're over 35, over the hill," exclaims one of the dissenting priests. "Wait until they deal with the young seminarians coming in."

BRIGHT AND BRASH

At this point, the university's dissidents can't speak out publicly; they've been silenced pending the outcome of the inquiry. But they're quite ready for battle with the bishops. Those facing the inquiry are 21 faculty members at the university's school of theology. Among the leaders is the Rev. Charles Curran, whom the board of trustees tried but failed to fire in a 1967 battle over birth control. Others are the Revs. Robert E. Hunt, Daniel C. Maguire and Berard Marthaler. By and large, the 21 are bright, young and brash. They like to dress informally, often appearing in wooly sweaters when not required to wear clerical garb, and they're adept at dealing with the press.

To the dissenters, 72-year-old Cardinal O'Boyle seems a symbol of the church's past and particularly of its peculiar mixture of conservative doctrine and social liberalism. The cardinal holds strict views on church, sex and family life, yet has championed the rights of minorities. "He's the last of the Renaissance princes," comments one bishop.

Cardinal O'Boyle's concept of church authority is at the heart of his conflict with the theologians. As he puts it: "When disputes arise in the church, the Pope has the last word. The Pope and the rest of us bishops are the only teachers appointed by Christ for his church. What's going on now, it seems to me, is that the theologians and other priests are appointing themselves to teach, even to teach in a way that contradicts the instructions of the local bishops and what's more the teaching of the Vicar of Christ."

THE TRUSTEES' ROLE

Cardinal O'Boyle could have summarily dismissed the 21 dissenting theologians last fall: as chancellor of the university, he is responsible for maintaining its "orthodoxy of doctrine." Most faculty members think that he wanted to fire the dissidents but feared hostile reaction and met opposition in the university's board of trustees. The 30-member board, composed equally of bishops and laymen and headed by retired Monsanto Co. executive Carroll A. Hochwalt, was split on the birth-control issue. It ducked the controversy by convening a board of inquiry, under faculty auspices, to determine whether the theologians should be punished or praised.

The inquiry is to determine whether the priest-professors violated their "responsibilities to the university" by their public dissent. "Birth control is a symbol; the question is the relationship of the theologians to the church," declares one faculty member.

The inquiry will take testimony in closed session for at least a week. The priests will be represented by the prestigious New York law firm of Cravath, Swain and Moore. (A member of the firm, John Hunt, is a brother of the Rev. Robert Hunt, one of the most outspoken of the theologians.) The American Association of University Professors, which hopes the hearings will set standards for academic freedom at church-related institutions, will have an observer on hand. "Catholic higher-educators all over the country are watching this one very intensely," says Jordan E. Kurland, associate secretary of the AAUP.

Most close observers expect the inquiry to vindicate the theologians. Four of the board's five members are themselves CU professors, and they are likely to be eager to uphold the principle of freedom of inquiry. Furthermore, the theologians' dissenting views have been echoed by many other critics within the church.

"My feeling is we'll come out okay in the inquiry; the board of trustees won't censure them (the theologians) but might give some guidelines," says one CU administrator.

"In the long run, if the inquiry is conducted correctly, it will do nothing but strengthen the university," declares John Murphy, acting dean of the graduate school of arts and sciences.

A TOUGH ASSIGNMENT

One possibility is that the board might gently reprimand the priests for issuing impetuous public statements; the specific focus of the inquiry is not the merits of their ideas but the propriety of their utterances. Setting standards for the professors' off-campus actions poses obvious problems, however. "It's like trying to write rules to define good taste; this is mighty hard to do," concedes Donald Marlowe, chairman of the inquiry and dean of CU's engineering school.

Even before the current dispute, the university had made significant strides toward establishing independence from the bishops' control. The biggest breakthrough came in 1967 when the board of trustees attempted to fire Father Curran. The board, then controlled by the bishops, offered no explanation for its action, but all sides assumed his fault was freely expressing liberal views on birth control.

The entire faculty, supported by the students, went on strike and closed the school. Within a few days, Cardinal O'Boyle relented and restored Father Curran to good standing with a promotion. "After that, no one can stomp on us," declares one participant.

The strike led to a revamping of the board of trustees giving laymen half the votes. More laymen were installed as university administrators. (Sooner or later, a nonchurchman may head the university; even now a layman is among the candidates being considered for permanent rector to replace an acting head.) Outside consultants were hired to advise on the school's long-range academic and financial course. Faculty committees were established to draw up a statement of CU's goals; their ringing affirmation of academic independence—"The only constraint upon truth is truth itself"— was endorsed by the trustees.

THE LAST STRAW

But the 1967 set-to also left hard feelings, and the bishops could find the university's course an increasing annoyance. "Curran just stiffened their (the bishops') necks," says one priest. "The faculty had better think twice about reacting that way again. It could be the last straw."

The university not only stirs up controversy but also asks the hierarchy to help pay its bills. This year the bishops agreed to increase their contribution from $2.3 million to $4.5 million, or 20% of CU's $22 million annual budget; the money is collected by local appeals in each diocese. At the least, the theologians' dissent will make fundraising among the faithful more difficult, and it could enhance the bishops' inclination to demand orthodoxy from the institution.

Besides money, the hierarchy has another hold over the university: It controls the assignment of the priest-professors. At a moment's notice, local bishops can recall the theologians from the university faculty to their home dioceses—and without giving reason. (Father Hunt is subject to the conservative bishop of Newark.) Indeed, the dissenters major worry is that they will be quietly consigned to obscure parish duties after the coming inquiry ends, particularly if it does not entirely exonerate them.

If the theologians were recalled, some might well balk at the transfer, rising stronger punishment for insubordination. Or the faculty and students could rally behind them and raise a ruckus on campus. "We'd have a real crisis here," worries one CU administrator.

TRAINING NUNS AND PRIESTS

Going beyond the present controversy, observers say CU's troubles reflect conflictive concepts of the role of the Catholic University of America. The bishops, particularly the more influential, such as Cardinals John Krol of Philadelphia and James Francis McIntyre of Los Angeles, regard the university as a service arm of the church. The university has traditionally been a training ground for nuns, priests, canon lawyers, social workers and parochial-school administrators.

Stressing these practical benefits is one way to persuade parishioners to contribute to a distant university when local Catholic colleges are also appealing for funds. Thus, Cardinal Krol has urged his flock to forget the theologians' "unprecedented rejection of the teaching of the Vicar of Christ" and remember CU's "80 years of service to our church and society."

The university's faculty, particularly the theologians and other young, assertive members, believe their special responsibility is to tackle the church's tough controversies. These range from the obscure and ecclesiastical, such as the standing of certain priestly orders, to the obvious and practical, such as the question of whether the church should dispose of its extensive, expensive hospital and school systems. "The bishops darn well better have the best intellectual resources they can afford when they deal with these difficult decisions," says one bishop.

When the university was founded in 1887, the American bishops envisioned it as the capstone of the church's education system in the U.S. For more than a decade, it was the only Catholic graduate school in this country and harbored lofty academic ambitions.

HAPHAZARD GROWTH

But as the years passed, CU's scant financial resources became dissipated in a widening array of assignments. Undergraduate courses and graduate departments proliferated in haphazard fashion. The university now operates separate schools of education, law, nursing, social work, theology, cannon law and philosophy. Its campus, located in a racially integrated middle-class neighborhood about three miles north of the Capitol, is crowded with a mixture of aging stone edifices and modern buildings. It is dominated by the magnificent domed National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, in which Luci Johnson Nugent was married.

On the undergraduate level, CU failed to become a national institution; most of its students come from seven nearby states. On the graduate level. It faltered in competition with other ambitious Catholic institutions, such as Fordham, Notre Dame, Georgetown and St. Louis University. However, some departments, including engineering, physics and Semitic languages, have established excellent reputations.

Now the university's officials believe they must make hard choices in order to survive and succeed. Many think some of the professional schools should be abolished or deemphasized. Some argue for a dramatic expansion of undergraduate enrollment, now one-third of the student body, to reduce per-capita costs and establish a broader fundraising base. Everyone agrees the curriculum must be pruned and certain departments given priority; the question is which ones.

The university's church connection logically argues for an emphasis on theology, philosophy and the humanities. "CU could become, and should become, the Catholic theological center of the country," insists Acting Rector Nivard Scheel. But ironically, much of its current strength lies more in engineering and physical sciences.

There's debate, too, on how closely the university should remain tied to the church. The more radical faculty members argue that all bonds should be severed. But the bishops, who take an intense paternal pride in CU, are unlikely to endorse such a separation.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) News, Jan. 8, 1969]

REVOLUTION IN THE CHURCH: CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN TURMOIL—CENTER OF RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION

(By Stephen P. Athanasius)

WASHINGTON.—One does not have to be a Roman Catholic or even a Christian for that matter, to comprehend that the Church in America is undergoing a profound change in its very structure and foundations. Many have likened what is taking place in the Church to a "revolution" and indeed that is exactly what it is.

Even school children know that a successful revolution must have a base of operations, and it stands as a monument to irony that the launching pad for the revolution against the Church is located at The Catholic University, (CU), of America in Washington, D.C.

CU is supposed to be THE most Catholic of Catholic educational institutions in the nation. Article two of the statutes of CU says that "the University must look to the welfare not only of the students enrolled but also of all the faithful in the USA . . . thus the University should be the national centre of Catholic culture, and should be held as such by all."

In fact, Pope Leo XIII, not exactly known as a Conservative in Church circles, said in a letter to the late Cardinal Gibbons approving the establishment of CU that it ". . . promises rich and salutary results both for the spread of sound doctrine and the defense of the Catholic religion . . ."

What has been taking place at CU during the past several years amounts to exactly the opposite of what was intended, to say the least.

The New York Times of September 29, 1968 notes that Washington's Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle (who up until his enforcement of Pope Paul's ban on artificial contraception was never accused of being a Conservative by anyone) had been "stung by the fact that nearby CU had become the center of the resistance movement . . ." against orthodoxy in the Church.

Commenting on the now famous dispute in Washington between Cardinal O'Boyle and some 50 disobedient priests the Washington Post noted "that many of the priests involved in the Washington dispute caught the message of this kind of religion while studying at CU, where such notions have flourished for some time, first in the Department of Religious Education and more recently in the School of Theology."

Indeed even some of the former faculty members of CU have begun to speak out on the truly Un-Catholic developments in recent times. Msgr. Eugene Kevane, wrote in the Spring of this year that CU's purpose and objective has been increasingly interpreted "in terms of philosophical positivism." He wrote in the Catholic Education Review that "this has made it increasingly difficult for Christian philosophy to function on this campus as the Church intends and for the theology to maintain either its authentic nature or its central position within the institution."

Needless to say with such ideas it is not surprising that Msgr. Kevane was ousted as Dean of CU's School of Education in November 1967 by the then Acting Rector Rev. John Whalen.

The Avant-Garde at CU had gathered around Father Whalen since 1962. Whalen described himself in an October 1, 1967 edition of the New York Times as "an adherent of the 'radical center' in disputes over academic, doctrinal and liturgical freedom on Roman Catholic campuses."

Although Whalen himself is no longer the Acting Rector of CU, his team has remained in full charge of the University. He has been succeeded in that position by Brother Nivard Scheel, whose only apparent qualification for the post is that of having served as Whalen's "executive assistant" for a year. Previously he served as principal of a Brooklyn high school. The aim of the Whalen team is to completely capture CU for the Religious Revolution. After only six years, they have been about 90% successful. Most of their former opposition is gone, and the heirarchy of the U.S. Roman Catholic Church appears to have given up the fight.

The Whalen crowd thus far has received only one serious challenge from the side of traditional orthodoxy. That is from a little known faculty member by the name of Dr. William Roberts. Roberts is unique on two counts in his struggle against the revolution. First, he has neither given up nor been ousted from CU. Second, he has sued the University, and in fact his case is now pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia.

Roberts, who has been a full time faculty member at CU for 23 years incurred the wrath of Whalen and his group when he accepted an appointment on the staff of the New Catholic Encyclopedia (of which Whalen was the editorial operations director) at the request of the then Rector at CU. Roberts, whose philosophical and theological orthodoxy have never been in question, was a threat to the unity of the Avant-garde which Whalen had assembled around him at that time. So Whalen apparently set out to do Roberts in. Roberts responded by speaking out against those who were attacking the then traditionalist Administration at CU.

Thus the conflict between Whalen and his gang and Roberts began. In the words of the former Rector at CU, Bishop William J. McDonald, Roberts had been "harassed" and "tortured" by faculty members in charge of the University. After a couple of years the situation got so bad that the Board of Trustees, in an effort to mediate the problem, authorized the Rector at CU to enter into a contract with Roberts establishing an autonomous Institute of International

Law and Relations, with Roberts as its Director. The Institute was to have rights and obligations with those of all the other schools at the University.

The Chancellor at CU, Archbishop (now Cardinal) O'Boyle, said the establishment of the Institute was a "definite settlement of the situation." Obviously, the CU faculty leaders wanted to remove Roberts from the mainstream of the University where they felt he might damage their advancing cause of heterodoxy. Yet even as they did so with the establishment of the Institute, the Whalen crowd began to push for Roberts' complete dismissal from CU. The ink on Roberts' contract wasn't even dry when their attacks began.

In spite of pressure, villification and harassment, Roberts was able to develop the Institute so rapidly that it had 86 graduate students within the two years after its initiation.

However, under pressure of the faculty leadership, whose ire increased proportional with the Institute's success, the Administration started to restrict the Institute by cutting financial support and by excluding the Institute from participation in grants, academic consultation, etc. This forced Roberts to bring action against the University asking for a permanent injunction againt the violation of his contract and for damages.

Ten days after Whalen took office, the Academic Senate (which is completely controlled by the revolutionaries) passed a resolution recommending to the Board of Trustees the dissolution of the Institute on eleven weeks notice, or at the beginning of the Second Semester 1967/1968. The Board of Trustees approved the Senate's recommendation although 86 graduate students in the Institute were (against their will and intention) forced either to withdraw from the University or to transfer to CU's Politics Department, which is notoriously weak and which at that time had a mere nine graduate students enrolled. The Institute's faculty which Roberts had assembled, and which were as orthodox as he is, were confronted with a similar choice. In addition, Roberts' contract was breached and he was transferred back to the environment in which he had been "tortured"—all this after devoting nearly three years to the successful development of the Institute.

Roberts' two attempts to have the District court issue a preliminary injunction failed, although observers agree that testimony in court showed clearly the malicious character of the action taken. The Institute was dissolved on February 7, 1968, and the University moved on the same day to have Roberts' appeal from the denial of the injunction dismissed. The dismissal motion of the University was denied and Roberts filed his appeal on June 24, 1968. Since that time the University, through the rulings of Chief Judge David Bazelon has, in what appears to be a clear violation of procedural rules, delayed any further progress of the appeal.

As of this writing the matter stands thusly: (1) Although the answer to Roberts' appeal would have been due 30 days after he filed it on June 24th of this year, the University did not answer until October 10, 1968. Motions made by Roberts asking the Courts to expedite the matter were ignored. (2) A number of motions made by Roberts more than three months ago have yet to be acted upon by the Court. This being the case, oral argument has not yet been ordered although the appeal was filed more than five months ago. The appeal should have been expedited in keeping with the Interlocutory Appeals Act and in keeping with Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Appellate procedure. However, Chief Judge Bazelon,—well known for his ultra-liberal positions, has seen fit to grant this unusual delay in proceedings to the CU revolutionaries and thus, to deny speedy trial and justice to Roberts. Needless to say, these revolutionaries, like all those before them, believe that passage of time will be of benefit to them.

(3) All graduate students and the entire full time faculty at the dissolved Institute have joined Roberts in his appeal as friends of the Court. All of them are vitally interested in seeing the Institute, a bastion of orthodoxy in the sea of heterodoxy at CU, re-established.

Pending action by the Court on his appeal, Roberts continues to serve as Professor of International Law and Relations at CU's Department of Politics.

In the opinion of many observers, including this reporter, the case of Dr. William Roberts vs. Catholic University of America is a microcosm of the struggle within the Catholic Church in this nation.

There is little question that the revolutionaries at CU are pulling out all the stops to win this one. It is their last hurdle before complete victory. Roberts, for his part, is still fighting and wondering why all those who have gone before him have given up before the battle. If Roberts will just look at the present state of Catholicism in America, he will have his answer.

A FOREIGN AID MODEL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Israel's managerial, technical, scientific, and medical personnel are assisting developing nations throughout the world. Israel's experience should serve as a useful model to other nations interested in providing useful aid to underdeveloped countries.

The following article by David Horowitz appearing in a recent issue of Israel magazine provides a reminder to us of the valuable service performed by enlightened foreign aid:

ISRAEL AND THE THIRD WORLD

(By David Horowitz)

Israel takes pride of place among the nations providing technical aid to the developing countries—this aid being measured in proportion to the contributors' population. From surveys issued by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), it emerges that one and all of its 20 members, beginning with the United States and including Britain, Canada, France and West Germany, are far outstripped by the Jewish State in the relative amount of technical assistance extended to the Third World.

The Third World? The term was coined as an afterthought in the cold war. Some years ago, the talk used to be only about the Free World *versus* the Communist World, as if nothing else existed. Then it dawned on the pundits that also present was the Third World, comprising the underprivileged, underfed, under-educated two-thirds of humanity who had not yet accomplished their Industrial Revolution.

What we are witnessing today is a global version of the 18th and 19th century drama in Europe and America, where the wealth of a small ruling elite was opposed to the shrieking poverty of the masses—the drama that stirred a Marx to revolt and a Dickens to pity. In those developed countries, the class gap is now rapidly closing, thanks to the upsurge of democratic forces striving for social justice. But another gap, a veritable abyss, at present separates the poor nations from the rich nations. And mass communications media only serve to make the "have-nots" in backward areas the more keenly aware of their plight, which contrasts so glaringly with the material comforts of the "haves" in the developed lands.

It is widely taken for granted, more often than not with a matter-of-fact shrug of the shoulders, that all-round disaster looms ahead if the "have" and "have-not" gap is perpetuated, if some countries continue to enjoy a standard of living more than 20 times higher than that of other countries, and if something does not happen quickly to give the lie to the factual finding of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) that "up to half of the world's population is still hungry or malnourished, or both."

The tragedy is not lessening but increasing. The disparities are not narrowing but widening. Both sides are drawing away. In the developed countries, the trend is towards ever-growing prosperity, overheated activity, inflation, tight capital markets. In the underdeveloped lands, the trend is towards outright famine. As modern medicine cuts the death-rate, there are more and more mouths to feed—and there is less and less food available. According to an OECD survey, during the past decade the world may have lost the ability to feed the mounting populations of the less developed nations, especially as surplus stocks of food held by the highly developed nations are depleted. With every passing day, the number of famished men, women and children increases.

The worsening of economic conditions in the developing countries is accompanied by political instability. There is an obvious correlation between the stagnation or deceleration of economic assistance to, and the escalation of domestic unrest and international tension in, the Third World. There have been no shooting wars inside the developed world in the past 20 years, while the teeming millions of Asia, Africa and Latin America seethe with disquiet, with internal and external strife which erupts into local conflicts threatening to kindle a world conflagration. Well over a dozen wars and revolutions have exploded during this period in the Third World, embroiling in some instances the Great Powers, dangerously, but so far at least not fatally.

How extinguish the conflicts? How overcome the despair and the despondency that give rise to friction and open clashes. How tackle the population outburst, the deterioration of terms of trade, the debt explosion, the specter of famine, the disease, the ignorance? What hope of rescue is there for the Third World if its real economic growth *per capita* is so low that at the present rate it will take more than a generation to double the existing average income or rather pittance per head of $100 a year—which is too much to die and too little to live on in dignity?

What is needed—there is no mystery about the remedy to the many woes—is an all-out offensive on world poverty by a massive, efficient transfer of know-how and capital from the developed to the developing lands. But the developed nations are reluctant to project onto the world arena their own domestic solutions of the Welfare Society and redistributive taxation.

As stated, Israel—herself a small country faced with epic difficulties stemming from unprecedented demographic expansion, scarcity of natural resources, and an onerous defence burden—has an outstanding record of service to the Third World. Thus, in the past 10 years, some 2,000 Israeli experts in various fields have gone out to a great many developing countries. They were active chiefly in Africa, but were also to be seen roaming the jungles of South-East Asia and the heights of the Himalayas, the plateaus of the Andes and the tropical valleys of Latin America. At the same time, some 12,000 Third World students took training in Israel,

mostly in agriculture, medicine and engineering.

How explain the magnitude and, for that matter, the efficiency of Israel's help to the Third World? Many factors are at play. First there is the fact that Israel herself is at once a developing and a developed nation. Her rich fields were reclaimed from the wilderness, her factories were built on the sands. She is still fighting the desert, which covers the greater part of her territory. She can see both sides of the picture, and she has acquired invaluable do-it-yourself experience in making the transition from a backward to a progressive economy.

Next, or perhaps first and foremost, there is the moral motivation. The Jewish people came into being thousands of years ago with a humanist mission, with spiritual values which fired its creative forces down the ages. The national Jewish renascence in Israel was inspired by something bigger than the need to establish one more sovereign political entity on earth. The millennial martyrology and tenacity of the Jewish people were for a larger purpose. Narrow nationalism in resurrected Israel would have been an anticlimax to a unique history so fraught with vicissitudes and sufferings.

Then again, there is the opportunity to score politically—though Israel might well have overlooked this chance but for the initial moral impulse. Geographically, Israel is situated in the heart of the developing world. Her integration can best be effected by a constructive effort of assistance to her neighbors. Boycotted and blockaded as she is by her immediate Arab neighbors, she leapfrogs them and gives a helping hand to a wider circle of Third World countries, which repay her with friendship and sympathy. In contradistinction to the Arab States, which go to the Afro-Asian community of nations with quarrelsome slogans, with intrigues, with even armed intervention, Israel seeks to promote the economic, technological, hygienic, cultural, humane well-being of the needy peoples.

Last, and certainly least, are the economic considerations. In 1967, Israel companies carried out construction and public works in the developing countries to the tune of $55 million. Of course, such large-scale activity stimulated the export of Israel products, particularly building materials, to the countries where the work was being executed. Israel's exports to developing nations rose from $50 million in 1961 to $114 million in 1967. But these business transactions, while appreciable, were by no means a decisive element in Israel's policy.

Now, there are three facets to Israel's assistance: exemplary, executive, advisory.

To begin with, Israel sets a striking example of successful development inside her own frontiers. Most impressive and significant are her achievements in the expansion and improvement of agriculture, namely, the growing of food—and food is what the Third World is literally crying out for! According to the FAO, agricultural production in the world at large has stagnated in the last few years, while the food needs of developing countries will have doubled by 1985. In its report, *The State of Food and Agriculture* 1967, FAO notes that "*per capita* food production in the developing countries is estimated at more than four per cent less in 1966 than in the peak year of 1964 and lower than in any year since 1957."

The present standard of food production in the developing nations is too low to provide even a proper standard of nutrition. About half of the world's population is said to be still hungry or undernourished. At the same time, the countrysides of the developed nations suffer from unemployment or underemployment, and a vast pool of manpower remains under-utilized for economic growth and expansion of production.

With modern technology there is no doubt that agricultural production can be quickly, even spectacularly, multiplied. In Israel, the results in growth and production were achieved by a population predominantly inexperienced in agriculture, in an arid country with scarce natural resources, particularly water. They were obtained mainly by the application of capital, know-how and science. Israel's agricultural production went up in one decade, from 1955 to 1965, by 156 per cent in real terms, while farm employment went up only by 6.5 per cent. The value of production per employed person increased by over 140 per cent and today averages ten times more than in developing countries and is even higher than in France, Germany and Japan. In some branches of agriculture, such as milk production, Israel boasts of the highest yield in the world per cow. Within a single decade the irrigated area was enlarged by 74 per cent and net fixed assets per employed person by nearly 100 per cent. Agricultural exports increased by 96 per cent and the value of total agricultural output by 238 per cent.

In general, the economic development of Israel contradicts the superficial and widespread assumption that development and democracy are incompatible. At the last meeting of the Board of Governors of the World Bank, President Woods mentioned Israel as an example of outstanding success in economic growth. The achievement of a growth rate of 10 per cent per annum, in real terms, for 15 years under conditions of democracy certainly represents a contribution to the solution of the problem of rapid economic growth combined with a pattern of political freedom.

The second, executive method of promoting economic development is the direct one of handing out technical assistance on the spot. Here Israel is well ahead.

In irrigation and agriculture, in medical assistance and in education, her experts are engaged in the primary task of raising the standards of development, of social welfare, of technical proficiency and of education.

The third, advisory method is one of political support for increasing capital transfer to developing nations and the formulation of a plan that would greatly accelerate such transfer. The question of flow of capital to developing nations is a clear-cut case of priorities. Some $39 billion of domestic fixed-interest securities are launched each year on the capital markets of the world, as against some $3 billion of international and foreign securities. According to the United Nations Committee on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) Secretariat Report:

"During the period 1960–66, there has been a substantial increase in the volume of net issues by both the public and private sectors of these countries. Public and private borrowing on a net basis rose from approximately $16.7 billion in 1960 to $39.2 billion in 1966."

The share of developing nations in this gigantic accumulation of capital is negligible, and limited to two or three countries enjoying special conditions.

The 1967 Review of the OECD, *Development Assistance, Efforts and Policies*, puts the case in unequivocal and strikng terms: "The problem for the Members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is essentially one of the degree of priority which is being given to aid. Governments may consider as obstacles to increases of assistance such conditions as balance of payments difficulties, fear of overheating the economy with resultant inflation, and budgetary limitations. The last item is merely a polite way of saying that domestic claims such as more roadbuilding, agricultural support, defence, space exploration, or more generous social security scales take priority. Of course, one should not set these various objectives one against the other. The choices which underlie budgetary decisions are not made in terms of absolute priority but of shifts at the margin. And a slight marginal shift in some larger budgetary areas could provide quite substantial increases in aid resources. The problem for countries wishing to provide assistance is also, like that of the recipients, essentially political."

Israel's contribution, in the form of the so-called Horowitz Proposal, is designed to overcome the difficulties faced by developing nations in gaining access to the captial markets.

A summary of the proposal is given in the Report of the UNCTAD Secretariat:

"The proposal rests on the generally accepted premise that the flow of aid to developing countries needs to be greatly increased and that the terms of assistance have to be softened considerably so as to permit an adequate net transfer of resources to developing countries and also to prevent explosive debt situations from emerging. It further assumes that because of budgetary constraints, there are limits to the growth of official aid flows but that the requisite resources for aid can be found in the capital markets of developed countries. Since funds on the capital markets can only be raised on commercial terms, there is need for subsidies to make these funds available on soft terms to developing countries. Thus the proposal envisages an international institution raising funds on national capital markets of developed countries on normal commerical terms and relending these funds through the IDA to developing countries at low rates of interest for a suggested period of 30 years. The difference between the cost of borrowing to the institution and the lower rates of interest on lending would be covered by an interest equalization fund. The resources for this fund would be obtained through budgetary allocation of the developed countries to the IDA, through the allocation of some portion of net income of the World Bank, or through some combinations of both methods."

In 1964, the first UNCTAD Conference in Geneva expressed its "strong interest" in the plan, and the study by the UNCTAD Secretariat of the Horowitz Proposal, submitted to the Second UNCTAD Conference in 1968, took a positive stand towards its possibilities and favorable effect on the transfer of capital to underdeveloped countries.

The Horowitz Proposal is intended to provide a link of collateral and of concessionary terms for the borrower, and a reasonable yield for the lender, by making it possible to borrow hard and lend soft.

With this three-prong approach—presenting a model of development, extending technical assistance, and suggesting political economic planning—Israel is striving to build a life-saving bridge to the emerging nations of the Third World, so that they may cope with their most vital problem—that of economic and social growth.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR GENERAL EISENHOWER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of affection for General Eisenhower across the length and breadth of America has been an inspiration to all of us.

The simple wave of a hand as the funeral train passed through the heartland of America was refreshing in this period of history which has been so fraught with controversy.

A memorial service for General Eisenhower was held at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Fla., March 31, and I think much of what was said by Acting President Stanley Marshall; Student Government Supreme Court Justice James Tait, speaking for the students; and Dr. Robert Spivey, chairman of the department of religion, who spoke for the faculty; represents the real heart of America.

The material referred to follows:

REMARKS BY ACTING PRESIDENT STANLEY MARSHALL, FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, MARCH 31, 1969

We assemble here briefly today to honor the memory of a good man—of a loved and respected American citizen who gave a lifetime of service to his country. We pay tribute to a soldier—a military man who commanded troops from throughout the free world—an administrator who served as president of one of this country's most distinguished universities—a politician who held this nation's highest office when he served as the 34th President of the United States—and, a statesman who enjoyed the respect and affection of peoples on every continent.

Dwight David Eisenhower was an average man who rose to challenges faced by few men in our lifetime. From a modest background in the rural heartland of America, this Texas-born, Kansas-raised boy became a leader not only of his compatriots, but of men everywhere who were dedicated to freedom. He was thought of by millions as a decent, honorable man who did his best to find decent and honorable solutions to the problems faced by mankind.

A military man who was skilled in forging together other military men from a number of nations to fight an awful war, Eisenhower also served as a soldier in the battle for peace. A military man in an establishment that sometimes wished it could throw off the yoke of civilian control, Eisenhower insisted that civil government and civil control were and should be superior to the military. A military man who had spent virtually his entire adult life in uniform, President Eisenhower warned the American people of dangers involved in a powerful military-industrial combination.

Although he was President of the United States, most people seemed always to think of Dwight Eisenhower as General rather than President. Perhaps this is true because as President he may have been less a partisan politician than many of his predecessors. President Eisenhower wanted to heal the ravages of war and strife, external as well as internal. He wanted the American people to recognize their obligations to the freedom of nations throughout the world, and to the freedom of the individual at home. This battle-tried soldier yearned for peace for all mankind and during most of his administration our nation fought only a cold war of words rather than a hot war of bombs.

Only history can truly and objectively assess the contributions of David Eisenhower but to the men and women of my generation Ike holds a unique and a very warm place in our hearts. He represented to us and for us, those age old tenets of the worth of American society and democracy. He believed in God, in country, in family, and in duty; in essence, he believed in the simple virtues that have, despite many imperfections, brought greatness to our country and our system of government. He was, as all of us are, an imperfect man in an imperfect world who gave the best of himself and urged us to give the best of ourselves. As one historian has written, President Eisenhower sought national unity and not personal power as he attempted to reconcile the differences among Americans and among nations. To what greater task can any man dedicate himself than peace and brotherhood? What greater tribute can we pay to Dwight Eisenhower than to carry forward and to implement his goals of national unity and reconciliation of our differences with other nations of the world?

Soldier, administrator, President, statesman—man of unbounding courage and good will—man of unquestioned loyalty to his beliefs—man of untiring dedication to the tasks set before him—the name of Dwight David Eisenhower will be remembered as more than a great general and a great statesman. He will be recorded in history as a man of courage and integrity and virtue who believed in the goodness of man and took account of that belief in everything he did.

REMARKS BY JAMES TAIT, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT, STUDENT GOVERNMENT, SPEAKING FOR THE STUDENTS OF FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER, MARCH 31, 1969

In this time of strife, both domestic and international, this nation will sorely miss the wise counsel of our most outstanding "soldier for peace." General Eisenhower had that rare ability to create in all men a will, a drive for peace. He was able to turn the energies of freedom-loving, peace-loving men toward the betterment of man, rather than against one another. When necessary he would vigorously defend the democratic ideals of this nation. However, he showed a deep respect for the basic dignity of man, individually and collectively, in assisting them to determine for themselves the best approach to peace and freedom. His record speaks for itself—General of the Armies, Supreme Allied Commander, welding together men of many nations to overthrow the tyranny of one man, of one nation over the lives of many and posing a threat to others; President of the United States, bringing an end to a deadly war and also assisting in the overthrow of a man threatening the individual freedom of many Americans, presiding over a peaceful era.

Although we will sorely miss him, he has left us a legacy. I hope that all men will accept this legacy and commit themselves to the ideals for which he stood—to allow his rare ability to continue in spirit. He was such a man.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—REMARKS BY DR. ROBERT A. SPIVEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION, SPEAKING FOR THE FACULTY, FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, MARCH 31, 1969

Supreme Commander of the Allied Military Forces during World War II, President of a distinguished institution of higher education, and President of these United States. Yet in all these offices, Dwight David Eisenhower towers as a person.

In his column from yesterday's New York Times, James Reston captures the spirit of this man:

"The nation mourns the death of President Eisenhower almost as if it were grieving for the loss of its own youth. For Ike was a symbol of a simpler age, and he lived long enough to become part of all the old American legends of the frontier

"The '60s have enhanced his reputation. They have been years of solemn, clever, and calculating men, and in contrast the old soldier seems open, straight, natural, joyful, and trustworthy.

"It was not so much what President Eisenhower did in the White House but what he didn't do that seems in retrospect so much more important than it did at the time.

"He did not misuse power. He did not allow his former colleagues on the Joint Chiefs of Staff to drag him into unnecessary military adventures, and while his native caution and conservatism limited his achievements on the homefront, they also limited his risks and blunders overseas . . .

"Few men at the top of American politics in recent years have managed to make their way through the tangles and conflicts of Washington with so little personal rancor as Eisenhower. There was nothing mean or petty about him, and he never allowed political differences to loiter down into personal animosity.

"The historians so far have not rated him among the great presidents, but his contemporaries are certainly agreed that he was a remarkably warm, fair, and attractive human being. It was the personal Eisenhower rather than the political Eisenhower that triumphed, maybe because he was the living model for so many popular American myths.

"To the present young generation, he may be a magnificent square, but in his own time he proved once more that the squares usually inherit the earth. . . .

"Ike will have his place in the story of this tremendous time. He proved that simple goodness can still be a power in the world and that luck helps. He didn't "fade away" like the rest of the old soldiers but fought for life years after his obituary got dusty on the stone.

"This may be why even this cynical age has taken his death with such genuine regret and sorrow."

In a sense his death represents the reaffirmation of simplicity, goodness, trustworthiness, and normalcy. During recent years we have become accustomed to unexpected, catastrophic, tragic ends for our national heroes—Martin Luther King, Robert and John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The unexpected and seemingly unexplainable violence that has characterized our recent past causes many Americans to believe in hidden, sinister forces at work to destroy our nation and its heroes. But in President Eisenhower's death, there is a certain triumph of normalcy, a simple, dignified ending to a man's days that were spent in service and loyalty.

It is altogether fitting that his funeral and our memorial be on this day, at the beginning of holy week in which religious folk throughout this country celebrate the triumph of life through Jewish Passover and Christian Good Friday and Easter. It is altogether fitting that he be buried in the spring of the year when dogwood and azaleas declare the goodness and beauty of life. In all these manifestations of triumph, Eisenhower shared. Toward religion he was unreflective, yet broadly committed. He exemplified affirmative trust, not so much to the institutional church, but to his offices and in his presence among other human beings. Few could resist his person or resent his popularity—"we do like Ike."

Eisenhower's stature with the intellectual community was never particularly great. Probably the least distinguished part of his career was his tenure as president of Columbia University. Certainly he never considered himself an intellectual. Yet the university community does indeed respect and honor him as a leader and as a person. His finest hour, in the view of many educators, was his sharp criticism of the "military industrial complex" as he left the office of the Presidency of the United States. He was able to remain critical of that very "complex" which helped catapult him into national prominence.

His real stature was that he towered above by not elevating himself. He expended himself in service to country and others; he did not seek to expand himself. He was not an intellectual, but he did quietly serve truth.

A review of a recent movie ("The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie") about a teacher and her students points to the relevance of the example of President Eisenhower: "Those charged with the education of the young are responsible not only for the distribution of information, but for the stimulation of character. And often it takes a character to make a character. There is a desperate need for innovators who are able to stimulate unrealized potential and nourish the humanity of a student. But how risky the enterprise becomes when those who are unwhole attempt to make others whole; when the frustrated try to mold the young in their own defective image." President Eisenhower served the truth in his own quiet way, without making the mistake of imagining himself a savior. He liked to play the game of golf.

President Nixon shared the last words of President Eisenhower. "I have always loved my wife. I have always loved my children. I have always loved my grandchildren. I have always loved my country." That was Dwight David Eisenhower. That also represents his triumph, and ours if we will, of normal, simple, trusting goodness.

"RESIDENT POWER" MOVES MODEL CITIES IN MINNEAPOLIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of our key urban development efforts, the model cities program, is moving into an important new action phase as the 63 "first round" cities submit their comprehensive plans to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for final review. My district, Minneapolis, was fortunate enough to receive one of the early planning grants and our local residents' organization is now completing work on its 5-year plan for a 500 square block area in south Minneapolis.

On paper, model cities may seem like an abstract concept in public administration but I know that in my district this program is very real and very human. Certainly the most significant aspect of the model cities in Minneapolis is the key role played by residents. I am inserting in the RECORD today an excellent five-part series from the Minneapolis Star which spotlights this role.

The articles follow:

ARRIVED WITH FANFARE: MODEL CITIES GOAL: MEET UNFILLED NEEDS—I

(By Kristin McGrath)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In November 1967 a section of south Minneapolis containing about 10 percent of the city's population was selected to be one of the first Model Cities project areas in the nation. The preliminary planning phase of the project in Minneapolis now is nearly over. Following is the first of five articles examining the present status and likely future impact of the project.)

The Model Cities program arrived in Minneapolis with a lot of fanfare a year and a half ago.

Minneapolis residents were told that the city had been chosen as one of the first cities to receive federal money to plan a program that differed in two major ways from previous federal programs for cities.

First, the program was an attempt to make an impact on specific neighborhoods by coordinating various agencies, levels of government and private organizations and by creating new services where unfilled needs emerged.

A large section of south Minneapolis—bounded roughly by downtown, Lyndale Av., Hiawatha Av. and 36th St. was chosen as the area for the program.

Second, the program called for meaningful resident participation in both planning and implementation.

FINANCIAL UNCERTAINTY

At the time of acceptance, city officials estimated that once the planning was completed Minneapolis would receive about $33 million to carry out a five-year project. Now they see they don't know how much the city is likely to receive.

Planning of the program, which was scheduled to be completed Feb. 1, is still going on, but residents and officials involved now are beginning to venture some optimism.

This week, a preliminary and locally unapproved draft of the first part of the plan was sent to federal officials for review. The current timetable calls for the rest of the plan to be submitted by May and for the "action" phase of the program to start in July.

The part of the plan submitted this week is limited to an analysis of the problems of the area, a list of goals for the program and some general proposals for achieving the goals.

Other parts of the plan—including budgets, maps, timetables and specific project proposals—will be submitted later.

Major goals, which will be the basis for future proposals, are included in the first part of the plan. These goals include improvement of the area's housing, commercial and industrial areas and transportation; improvement of police protection, schools and health, welfare and recreation services; raising the average income in the area by reducing unemployment and underemployment and by providing more meaningful employment and better welfare benefits; and working toward creating dignity and a "sense of community."

Specific proposals, all of which are in the discussion stage, range from possibilities to pipe dreams.

Some suggestions that are considered within the realm of possibility include a large-scale housing project in one neighborhood, general rehabilitation of homes through low-interest government loans, clearance of abandoned buildings, improved services to senior citizens through such programs as a hot meal home delivery service, and more extensive day-care services for children of working mothers.

The pipe dreams include a "guaranteed annual income" for all area residents, a new "Southdale" on Lake St., and creating a social services shopping center where residents could use welfare credits to shop for health, family counseling and welfare services.

Putting priorities and price tags on these proposals will be the task of planners during the next two months.

Why has it taken so long to plan?

The answer lies in one of the two major federal requirements for the program: resident participation. The residents' group that emerged from that requirement is the 107-member Policy and Planning Committee (P&PC), which was elected last spring.

Ask a resident and an official why the planning has taken so long and they will both point to the P&PC—but their explanations will differ.

City Coordinator Thomas Thompson said, "The residents have had to learn the whole field of community planning and plan at the same time." William English, P&PC chairman, said the residents simply refused to plan until officials made them a "full partner" in the project.

By most accounts, it took a full year—from November 1967, when Minneapolis received the planning funds, to November 1968, when the residents hired their own staff director—for the residents to become satisfied with their status in the program.

"The program triggered a revolution in the neighborhood," said Mike Roan, the new director. "For a long time all of the residents' energy was spent fighting for their rights and they didn't have any energy left to plan."

Most residents and officials agree that the delays have been inevitable. However, if the delays continue much longer, Minneapolis probably will lose a race for funds to carry out the project.

If Minneapolis submits its complete plan in time for federal officials to review and approve it this fiscal year, which ends June 30, competition for funds still will be limited to the first 63 cities selected for the program. Nine of these already have had their plans approved and have been given money to carry out some projects. Thompson says the complete plan should be submitted by May 1 in order to assure review this year.

If, however, the plan isn't approved until the next fiscal year, Minneapolis will probably be splitting the pie with most of a total of 150 cities that have been approved for planning.

The increased competition probably will not affect the $4.6 million in Model Cities funds that have been tentatively set aside for the Minneapolis project. However, it would be likely to affect the amount of money received for specific projects from other federal departments.

"The project is at its critical stage now," Roan said. "It could either become one of the best Model Cities projects in the country or it could fall flat on its face."

TEN THOUSAND MAN HOURS: MODEL CITIES PLAN INVOLVES RESIDENTS IN DECISION-MAKING—II

(By Kristin McGrath)

Peggy LaBore is one resident who knows what "resident participation" means.

Resident participation is the latest catch phrase in federal programs for cities. The programs began to stress resident involvement after critics complained that earlier programs, like urban renewal, ignored the people they were supposed to help.

The Model Cities program places a high priority on resident participation. Federal officials reviewing plans for the project in south Minneapolis will be asking questions like: How active have the residents been? Do the participating residents really represent the area? Are the residents contributing to the plan or are they just rubber-stamping work by their staff?

Miss LaBore, an attractive brunette in her mid-twenties whose expression and bearing sometimes make her seem older, is one member of the 107-member Policy and Planning Committee (PPC), which is the resident-participation component of the Minneapolis Model Cities program.

As an individual committee member she is no more typical than any of the others. Members range from a housewife with five children who dreams of installing moving sidewalks up and down Nicollet Av. to a man in his 80s who is still living for the future by spending 30 hours a week working on a plan to improve conditions for senior citizens in the area.

There is a Yale graduate who runs a house for male boarders, including Indians, fresh from the reservation, who have nowhere else to go; and a lawyer with a walk-up office on E. Lake St. who dreams of new and beautiful houses and shopping centers in the Model Cities area.

Peggy LaBore is an unmarried AFDC mother who has worked as a traveling, magazine saleswoman and in a potato-chip factory.

"I went on welfare because I just couldn't make enough money to live, and I just sat around feeling sorry for myself for being on welfare for the last eight months," she said.

Her depression ended when she decided to go to school and was given a student loan from the University of Minnesota. Now she nearly has completed work toward a degree in sociology and hopes to get off welfare and become a welfare case worker within a year.

She doesn't mind talking about her past because she considers it an asset. Because she has had a tough time, "people trust me. They know I can understand the problems and needs of the Model Cities area."

She has a down-to-earth understanding of the Model Cities area. She views its problems from the vantage point of a shabby, upstairs apartment in a house that has been neglected so long it defeats all attempts to make it look homey or cheerful.

Her plea for better pre-school, day-care facilities in the Model Cities area is prefaced with an account of the time her daughter was left tied to a chair at the home of a woman who runs a baby-sitting service.

When she says teen-agers in the area need a place to spend the night when they go home, she mentions the neighbor girl whose stepfather often tries to assault her when he has been drinking.

When she talks about improving tenants rights, she cites the woman with 12 children who was moved out of her rented home on one day's notice so the house could be torn down for an apartment building.

Miss LaBore is typical of the committee in that she is more aware of the area's problems and more sophisticated about federal programs than are average residents of the area.

She admits that spending three nights a week for the past several months on the program has made her into a kind of "professional resident." A few weeks ago, for example, she flew to Kansas City, Mo., to present two programs for retarded children in the Model Cities area to federal officials.

Several residents on the committee fear that the sophistication they have gained through participating in the program will result in their no longer being representative of the area. "My greatest fear is that we will become another level of the establishment," said William English, PPC chairman.

To guard against this, committee members have hesitated to speak for the area and have searched out the opinions of other residents. Last fall, for example, the committee insisted on a series of public meetings before beginning the problem-analysis section of the plan. The opinions of many nonmember residents who attended those meetings have been incorporated into the final plan.

The amount of time Miss LaBore has spent on Model Cities also is fairly typical. There have been 364 resident-committee meetings during the past year with a total estimated attendance of 6,835, according to a recent report. By January, it was estimated that members had spent 10,000 man hours—all of it free time—on the project.

None of these statistics answer the key question federal officials will be asking about resident participation in the Minneapolis Model Cities program—whether the residents have been making a meaningful contribution to planning the program. It would be possible for the residents to spend all of that time on side issues while the staff did all of the nuts-and-bolts planning of the project.

Miss LaBore objected to that suggestion. "We are not a rubber-stamp outfit," she said. Other residents and officials go even further, saying the residents' committee is less of a rubber-stamp outfit than the Minneapolis City Council.

"We usually have to trust the advice of our staff," said Alderman Richard Curtin, who represents part of the Model Cities area on the City Council. "But those residents are trying to become experts themselves. Maybe with 107 people they can do it," he said.

"We'll trust our staff as soon as we're sure they're working for us," said English.

Meanwhile, the residents' role in planning has ranged from word-by-word scrutiny of staff proposals to writing the proposals themselves.

The senior citizens, for example, have been meeting all day every day, and they're writing every word of the old-age component of the plan themselves. They occasionally will invite a staff person to one of their meetings, ask him specific questions and then invite him to leave.

One staff member emerged incredulous from that experience. "Those senior citizens are the most militant planning group in the whole Model Cities area," he said.

IN MODEL CITIES PROGRAM: "RESIDENT POWER" TAKES OVER—III

(By Kristin McGrath)

Resident participation is something that officials hoped for in the Model Cities program. "Resident power" is something they didn't bargain for; but resident power is what they got.

The residents on the 107-member Model Cities Policy and Planning Committee (P&PC) have started calling themselves the "City Council of south Minneapolis."

"It's not an inappropriate title," commented Gerard Hegstrom, alderman for much of the Model Cities area and DFL-endorsed candidate for mayor. "They have planning power and budgeting power. If that's not power I don't know what is," he added.

Two recent examples show how much power the residents have.

One item on a recent P&PC agenda was a rezoning request from the Franklin National Bank, which wanted to move to a new location. All zoning requests are handled by the City Council. But since the land in question was in the Model Cities area, the council wouldn't touch the request until the P&PC officially decided it did not object to the rezoning.

Another item was a request from Swedish and St. Barnabas Hospitals for P&PC approval of an application for federal money. The hospitals had applied to the Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Department for money to help pay for staffing a mental health unit. HEW told the hospitals to get approval from the P&PC first.

How did the residents' committee get so much power?

The answer lies at least partly in the sparkle that comes to the eyes of William English, P&PC chairman, when he talks about Model Cities power. "In other cities that have the program residents have to beg the officials for what they want. Here we don't beg. We negotiate," he said.

English, 35, a black activist who plays down his degree in sociology and his employment with Control Data, Inc., and plays up his involvement with Sabathani Community Center and other community causes, is admired in some quarters and mistrusted in others for his ability to turn on a crowd.

He became interested in the Model Cities project through his work at Sabathani and has been active in the program since its preliminary stages. "At the beginning of the program we went into it because we thought it was about time some of the federal money started coming to south Minneapolis," he said.

"As we learned more about the program, we understood that residents were supposed to become involved. We thought then that our involvement would be advising good things and hoping someone would listen.

"Then we realized that the federal government was trying to force the cities to let the residents have real decision-making power. We saw that City Hall didn't really want us to have power, but we also knew that the politicians didn't want to lose all of that federal money. With that as a weapon we could force them to make us a full partner.

"At first just a few of us realized that, but we managed to convince the others," English continued. He said he considers part of his responsibility as P&PC chairman is "to warn the members every time they're about to give up some power and make sure they know what they're doing."

English gives the impression that he enjoys his role as keeper of the power almost as much as he likes playing the local officials against the federal officials.

He said the residents have gained their power through a series of struggles in which they used two major tactics: confrontation and the sit-down strike.

The sit-down strike was the main weapon in the first major struggle with the City Council last spring. The residents refused to plan the program until the relationship between the residents and the council was spelled out in writing, English said.

The result was a resolution passed by the council last March 29, in which the council gave the P&PC "the right and responsibility for initiating program planning and policy decisions," for the Model Cities program. It also says the P&PC can "completely change, alter and rewrite, or delete and add to, the work program" for the project at any time.

THREE MAJOR CONFRONTATIONS

Since then, there have been three major confrontations between the residents and City Hall. In the first, the residents succeeded in delaying a code enforcement project that already was underway. The residents objected to the project on the grounds that it should be delayed until the residents had completed a physical redevelopment plan for the Model Cities area.

In the second confrontation, residents demanded the authority to hire staff for the program themselves based on their own criteria. After a stalemate lasting several months, city officials managed to find ways to overlook the Civil Service nondiscrimination and veterans-preference requirements in order to meet the residents' demands.

The third confrontation concerns demands by residents to stop all new construction in the Model Cities area until the residents have approved an overall land-use plan. The fight is still going on, but English said he thinks the council eventually will comply by holding zoning densities at present or lower levels until the plan is finished.

"They know we'll have another sit-down strike if they don't," he said.

LEARNING ON BOTH SIDES

English said that as the program has progressed, "each confrontation has become less severe: People are learning on both sides." However, he said bitter confrontation probably will occur during the implementation stage of the program. He said he expects the worst fights to be between residents who want to retain low-housing densities and developers who want to build apartment buildings.

Besides strengthening their power base on the local level, the Minneapolis Model Cities residents have joined in efforts to organize Model Cities residents on a regional and national basis.

English and other residents have gone to meetings in New York, Dayton, St. Louis and other cities. English said he hopes that the result of those organization efforts will be "at least a strong national Model Cities lobby, if not a whole new level of government."

So far, city officials say they have taken the power struggle of Model Cities residents pretty much in stride. "The residents have used their power well. There was some slowness and difficulty in the beginning, but that was due to their lack of experience," Hegstrom said.

"Because of the Model Cities program, the council has a better image of citizen par-

ticipation in general. It's not as much a threat to the establishment as some people thought, although the residents might furnish some individual political treats," he added.

Alderman Richard Curtin, who also represents the Model Cities area, said, "We give the residents power because we want to, not because of any threats," Curtin said some officials have "gotten fed up" with the residents' confrontation technique.

Nevertheless, the experience with the Model Cities residents has made officials more willing to listen to other resident groups, such as the Tenants' Union, Curtin said. "Our constituency is changing, and we have to learn to judge the people taken seriously at City Hall by different standards," he added.

MODEL CITY AREA PROBLEMS, GOALS FORMULATED—IV

(By Kristin McGrath)

The atmosphere in the meeting room was intense. South Minneapolis residents who were there to formulate goals for the Model Cities project thought they were onto something.

A few seconds before, someone had exclaimed, "Social power!", and everyone had fallen silent, thinking.

A staff advisor began hesitantly: "What I see as social power is that people in this area should have the same ability to shape the social goals of this whole city as the people in the other parts of the city seem to be shaping what we believe in here."

"Yeah," agreed a resident. "Culturally, man, I may not want the same social goals, but I should have the opportunity to create my own little bag."

"Okay, so let's examine what social power is, anyway," said another.

"Social power," began another resident, weighing his words, "is the ability to determine and control the social environment in which you live. The cats in Edina determine by-and-large the sociability of that community. They all do it. They have, therefore, social power—you see what I'm saying—by the sheer nature of their education and affluence and whatever. They have it.

"Whereas in my neighborhood, I do not have control of social power. I did not want a Guthrie Theater. We didn't need no Guthrie. What we wanted was . . . was, you know . . ."

"A bugaloo party," another resident broke in. "A bugaloo place where the Guthrie is," he continued, dancing.

"But we cannot create that kind of environment because we do not have social power," the first resident continued. "When we get that symphony out of Northrop Auditorium to play hillbilly music for us at Nicollet Field, that's when we have social power."

After this and several hours more of deliberation the goal was decided on: "To sensitize the broader community to the acceptance and appreciation of cultural and social values other than their own."

The goal was eventually put into its slot in a document listing dozens of the problems of the Model Cities area, goals for a five-year program to attack the problems and general proposals for carrying out the goals. The document which is more than 300 pages long, is currently under review by federal and local officials and residents.

The 300-page report is more than a laundry list of problems and proposals. It also is organized into priorities and cross-referenced to show possible areas of coordination or conflict.

For example, providing more and better employment for Model City residents is one goal, but its ranking in the plan depends on how well it fulfills a higher piority goal, which is to increase the incomes of Model Cities residents.

Proposals for employment opportunities which come from various committees working on the plan are judged according to how much income the jobs will produce. In one instance, a task force on economic development suggested new shopping centers for the area; the idea was rejected as a source of new employment because the jobs it would provide would be largely dead-end and low paying.

URBAN PLANNING THEORY

By planning for goals that are arranged on a priority basis, and by judging specific proposals according to their ability to fulfill those goals, the Model Cities plan for Minneapolis has put itself on the frontier of current urban planning theory.

Urban sociologist Herbert Gans, in a book published late last year, said the new emphasis on goal-oriented planning grew out of dissatisfaction with earlier planning approaches which concentrated on buildings rather than people, or which judged programs according to goals set by agencies rather than by the people they served.

However, Gans concludes his planning-for-goals proposal with the comment that it is easier said than done.

But if it does work, it will give the residents a yardstick for judging all of the present and future programs affecting the Model Cities area. "Instead of going to an agency and asking, 'What can you do for us?', the residents will say, 'Here is what we need; can you do it?'," explained Tom Walz, one of the consultants hired by the residents to help write the plan. "The residents might decide, for example, that they don't need a family counseling service, that they can do it better themselves," he suggested.

The goal-oriented approach might also force agencies and governmental units serving the Model Cities area to overhaul their services in the area. For example, the section of the plan that deals with recreation says that the purpose of recreation programs is not to keep people occupied but to teach them skills to make them more effective members of society. Presumably, if the Minneapolis Park Board does not come up with ways to meet that goal, the residents will find someone else who will.

REWARDS FOR AGENCIES

Mike Roan, director of the Model Cities project here, said that some of the federal "bonus" funds for the project probably will be used to reward agencies that find ways to fulfill the residents' goals.

Minneapolis has tentatively been allotted $4.6 million in federal Model Cities "bonus" funds which are intended to be used to supplement other federal and local financing for projects or start new projects.

The funds can be used to supplement the local share of projects up to 80 percent of the total cost. For example, if the Park Board received $500,000 for a recreation program on the condition that it contribute another $500,000, the Model Cities residents might decide to pay $300,000 of the local share if they thought the program was worth that much in terms of meeting major Model Cities goals.

Some of the agencies and departments Model Cities residents will be dealing with, have already started thinking about goal-oriented planning.

Several federal departments have instituted a new kind of accounting system called Program-Planning-Budgeting (PPB) which tries to relate programs and projects to overall goals as well as to existing resources and bureaucracies. However, established institutions have to deal with very complicated existing structures in making the change, and progress has been slow.

Minneapolis city government also is working on switching over to the PPB system. The change, which will affect all departments under the city coordinator's office, is expected to become effective in about two years.

How the goal-oriented Model Cities program will mesh with a new goal-oriented city government is still very much a matter of speculation—but even the speculation is like playing with fire next to old and established institutions.

"The federal government is going to encourage this kind of thinking in old-line institutions as well as new ones," said City Coordinator Thomas Thompson. "The Model Cities program just might become the impetus that leads to reorganization of other departments," he said.

IN MODEL CITIES PROGRAM: BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE IS A GOAL—V

(By Kristin McGrath)

Duane Franke, a lawyer with a walk-up office on E. Lake St., is getting ready for a piece of the action in the Model Cities program. He is not alone.

One of the major conclusions that has come out of more than a year of planning a Model Cities project for south Minneapolis is that the project ought to be by the people as well as for them.

Franke is one member of the 107-member Policy and Planning Committee (P&PC) which is made up of elected residents. The P&PC is in charge of planning a five-year program to improve the social, physical and economic environment of a large section of south Minneapolis bounded roughly by downtown, Hiawatha and Lyndale Avs. and 36th St.

Federal officials are now reviewing a preliminary draft of the first part of the plan. If planning continues on schedule, specific projects could begin as soon as July.

The residents want as much control over those projects as they have had in planning them.

DOING HIS HOMEWORK

Franke has been spending several nights a week for the past year working on the plan. He is chairman of the Physical Environment Core, which is in charge of developing programs to improve housing, commercial and industrial facilities, transportation and other programs concerning land and buildings in the area. He is also chairman of the Economic Development Task Force, which is trying to find ways to bolster the area's sagging economy.

Participating in the planning, Franke, said, "has taught me more than my first 10 years of law practice."

Just getting to Franke's office from downtown is a lesson in the magnitude of the problems his committees have been trying to solve. Near downtown, many homes that were squeezed together on 30-foot lots in 1890 look as if they haven't been repaired since. Lake S. itself is a jumble of signs, obsolete businesses and abandoned buildings. Traffic crawls, and pedestrians have to shout to be heard over the noise.

Projects to attack problems like these will be among the first tangible results of the Model Cities program.

FUNDS EXPECTED IN 1969

The projects will be part of a comprehensive urban renewal plan now being prepared for the entire area. Funds to carry out at least some of the projects are expected to arrive this year under the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP of the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

NDP is a new procedure that eliminates the long waiting periods of former urban renewal projects. Minneapolis has applied for inclusion in the new program, and local officials expect the application to be granted in the next month or two. When that happens, funds are expected to be available in the Model Cities area.

City Coordinator Thomas Thompson said

he expects most of the initial financing to come through the NDP program, with lesser amounts coming from other federal departments which are giving priority to projects in Model Cities areas.

Franke said residents planning the program were opposed to urban renewal at first but eventually decided that "there has to be urban renewal to accomplish any of our programs."

DISTINCTION CITED

However, the Model Cities proposal differs from former urban renewal projects by giving the residents control over the program, Franke added. "Historically, the people affected by renewal haven't had any say in it. But we are writing a program that includes our priorities and has built-in resident control."

The residents already have set their priorities for the first year of the project, and they predictably reject the kind of renewal that makes enthusiastic use of the bulldozer for other programs which concentrate on low-income housing.

One such program already has started—and the residents are in control. It is the Used Housing program, in which the local renewal agency buys homes on the open market, rehabilitates them and rents them at a reduced rate to families eligible for public housing.

Residents on the Housing Committee control the program by approving each of the homes proposed for acquisition before allowing the renewal agency to buy it.

The residents also hope to use renewal funds within the next year to tear down about 50 abandoned homes in the Model Cities areas; to provide federal grants and low-interest loans for residents to fix up their homes, and to conduct a detailed study of the Phillips neighborhood and some commercial and industrial areas along Franklin Av., 29th St. and Lake St. to determine whether more extensive clearance and redevelopment projects are warranted.

CORPORATE PROPOSAL

Eventually, the committee hopes to start at least three resident-controlled corporations. One would build federally-subsidized housing for low- and moderate-income families. Another would provide transportation services, such as taxis, charter buses and shuttle-buses to meet such needs as getting senior citizens to doctors and shopping facilities.

The third corporation would be in charge of a historical preservation demonstration project. The project, which would cover one block, would restore and preserve historically significant buildings on the block and require new construction to blend in architecturally with the old buildings.

Franke himself hopes to participate in the corporation that will build federally-subsidized low-income housing. "Before Model Cities, I didn't know 221d–3 (one of the subsidy programs) from the man in the moon," Franke said. "Now I know that lawyers sit right in the middle of those programs. It probably will change the whole direction of my practice."

Committees working in other planning areas also have been proposing ways to retain resident control over the project. One of the more popular ideas is creating an ombudsman system, in which persons in close touch with residents would have influential positions in governmental departments and service agencies.

CONSOLIDATING SERVICES

The residents' corporation idea also is common. The senior citizens, for example, have prepared a proposal for a service center that would consolidate medical, welfare and other services for senior citizens in one place. The center would be run by a nonprofit corporation, with senior citizens making up at least half of the board membership.

Another way to give residents some of the action is to make them "para-professionals." Under this approach, residents would be hired by schools, social agencies and health facilities to help the professionals in charge by providing first-hand knowledge of the area.

Another method is to break out of the established programs completely and start new services for the Model Cities area. One new service might be a store-front academy to educate youths who are unwilling or unable to adjust to normal school surroundings. Another would be to train Indians for work and life in the city while they are still on the reservation.

The residents also hope to increase their influence by decentralizing existing departments and services into separate units for the Model Cities area. Among the proposals are a separate police precinct and court for the area, a new mini-bus transit system for the area and a health care center for Model Cities residents. The South Side School Pyramid, which was recently organized, is another example of this approach.

CONSUMER RATING SYSTEM

Finally, the residents hope to start a consumer rating system for the area. Businessmen, for example, would be inspected by a team of residents to see whether they were overcharging their customers or charging excessive interest for credit. Businesses found satisfactory would be given a sticker for display. Some social and governmental services would be similarly rated.

All of this is summarized in one of the highest priority goals of the first part of the Model Cities plan: "To improve the quality of urban life through increasing resident involvement and influence in the affairs of the community."

Local and federal officials are likely to read that statement and absent-mindedly nod agreement. They may find out once the projects get under way that the statement is anything but a vague generality in the minds of the residents.

NLRB MEMBER SPEAKS OUT

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, no public official or agency can expect to be immune from criticism. But distorted, slanted accounts of an official's performance in office are another matter. They deserve condemnation. The widespread campaign to discredit the National Labor Relations Board is clearly a case in point. NLRB member Gerald A. Brown put the lie to that propaganda during the University of Arizona's fifth annual conference on collective bargaining and law. His comments setting the record straight deserve wide circulation. I am pleased to place before the House an article from the AFL–CIO News setting forth Mr. Brown's comments.

The article follows:

CITES DISTORTIONS: NLRB MEMBER CONDEMNS BUSINESS PROPAGANDA DRIVE

TUCSON.—Slanted and biased reports of National Labor Relations Board decisions can have only a harmful effect on the nation's collective bargaining system, NLRB member Gerald A. Brown told the University of Arizona's fifth annual conference on collective bargaining and labor law.

"Distorted accounts of the board's activities have appeared recently in the Readers' Digest and other publications," Brown said.

He noted a report last year that the nation's major corporations had joined with the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and other employer groups in a $1 million campaign to help change public opinion about the labor laws.

"The labor board welcomes honest and informed criticism," Brown said. "But I have a different reaction to an organized campaign which represents a disservice to employers, employes and the general public."

The board does not seek immunity from fair comment but is concerned "about the harmful effects of the existing well-financed propaganda campaign" against the present labor law, he told the conference.

Since Big Business launched its propaganda campaign, Brown said, he has noted these propaganda techniques in critical news stories and editorials—"the use of slanted or biased news, ridicule and belittlement, color words, fear technique, guilt by association, false conclusions from fallacious reasoning, and name calling."

He cited as "distorted accounts" those in the Readers' Digest and other publications which "carefully select a few cases, gloss over or misrepresent the facts, accuse the NLRB of bias and prejudice, and conclude with emotional words predicting dire consequences for our system of free enterprise, consumers and the civil rights of all citizens."

Such accounts, Brown noted, "do not mention that almost all the cases cited have been approved by the courts" after judicial review. The "quoted authorities usually represented the losing side in the cases discussed, but this fact is nowhere mentioned."

"If a case is to be reargued before the public, both sides should be heard. It is true that the board has sometimes been reversed by the courts, but our critics ignore the fact that the reversals have been at the expense of unions as well as employers, and blame the board whatever the results."

EDITORIAL HIT

Brown quoted a Wall Street Journal editorial of Dec. 2, 1968, asserting that in requiring employers to furnish unions with employe name-and-address lists, the board was forcing employers to help unions organize their employes. The editorial said in part:

"In this instance the board didn't even find out what employers thought. The regulation was adopted without benefit of the sort of formal rule-making procedure where companies and unions could argue for or against it. The summary nature of this action led an appeals court to declare the (Excelsior) rule invalid."

The fact is, said Brown, that the board not only heard oral arguments by unions and management but invited, and received, written briefs from the CofC and the NAM more than eight months before the Excelsior rule was adopted.

Another fact, he said, is that the rule has been approved by more than a dozen other courts besides the one cited by the business paper. The Supreme Court recently agreed to hear arguments on the one adverse ruling.

Brown produced copies of three newspaper editorials in the Macomb, Mich., Daily, the Richmond, Calif., Independent and the Northern Virginia Sun, Arlington, Va. Each editorial "appeared to represent the independent view of the paper" in which it appeared but two were identical, the board member noted. All three repeated employer charges that the board has "disregarded fraud and gross misrepresentations" by unions and "rewarded strikers for flagrant misconduct by forcing employers to reinstate them with back pay."

A REPUBLICAN LOOKS AT HOUSING

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), is not only one of the ablest and most knowledgeable people in Congress and in the Republican Party in the field of housing, but he is also one of those most committed to the humane objective of decent housing for all Americans.

At the recent National Housing Conference, held in Washington last month the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) delivered a major address of great significance in which both his knowledge and his commitment are clearly evident.

I am deeply pleased to be able to bring this important message to the attention of our colleagues by including it as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, BEFORE THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, MARCH 10, 1969, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We are meeting here today, all with some expertise in the field of housing—for the purpose of discussing housing needs and how they may best be met. The situation is somewhat changed from a year ago. We now have as a part of federal law, "the largest new programs concerned exclusively with housing"—we also have a new President and a new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

I would be the last to say that the first produced the latter two, although there may be some minor connection. You are no doubt encouraged by the reassurances you have already had from the Nixon Administration that our concern with urban problems is as great as your own. Our responsibilities today are infinitely greater.

At the same time, I do not think that you can take it for granted that this Administration is wedded to the programs of the past—committed to failures and excuses and goals that have a cloak of unreality. We intend to make this a "can do" Administration.

If we are to dig for success, you cannot require us to use time-worn shovels, if we can produce a steam-shovel that works much better.

I have participated in executive sessions and heard some of the foremost advocates of present housing tools, damn them for a lack of production. This is a part of politics and something that I can understand. But the hour is late. Some of our programs, as we all know, are in grave trouble. The panacea of increased appropriations in a time of financial crisis is proving to be not enough.

What shall we do?

We must be inventive and realize that the solutions are not just with passage of another law, but how well we handle the law that we already have on the books.

Certainly, with the creation of over 30 new programs in the last eight years in the HUD area, we should have all the tools needed to produce housing for our people, particularly those who so badly need it. We are fortunate to have in charge of those tools a man whose production record is one of the best of our times. Further, we know that his heart as well as his fine mind is behind the work he is undertaking. I am speaking, of course, of George Romney, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

I believe he is a man that deserves your support in the fullest. You cannot reach the goals you have set unless you give him the support to lead you there. And we all know that if there is a job that needs support it is the one that George Romney has undertaken. Fortunately, he has brought to his task a group of men whose records of accomplishment are second only to his own. It is not a group picked solely for its political flavor. You know that because some of your fervent supporters are among his Assistant Secretaries. He has assembled these men to make an all-out attack on the goals that were left unfinished by the previous Administration. In that Administration, there was a great deal of talk about those goals, but little progress was made towards reaching them.

Secretary Romney is 10 days short of serving his second month in his new job. He is hard at work. He has wasted no time. But already there are those political figures who are taking him to task for not meeting goals other people set. I say give him time.

The NHC strongly backed a goal of over 800,000 public housing units in 1949. It envisioned reaching that goal in six years. It is now 20 years later and we have not reached it. Do not take a man to task who has not been two months on the job.

I suggest that we drop the cliche, "Let George do it!" and all of us pitch in—not with criticism, but hard work. If we are going to make comments, let us make them be constructive. Remember—if there is any chance of realization of the goal of 6 million low and moderate income housing units within the next decade, all of us here and thousands of others besides are going to have to contribute heavily.

As I have said, there are dozens of old and new programs at HUD that can produce through government backing thousands of new housing units. But let us face it, some of HUD's highly touted programs are barely turning over and what turnover there is, is expensive.

I think we have to look at the past and the present and see what our tax dollars—and they are your tax dollars as well as mine—are producing. Then we have to make judgements. And if we have programs that for mystic reasons, HUD and the Bureau of the Budget long ago decided to phase out, be sure that the phaseout is not immediate and leaves a void unfilled by new programs that may produce and may not.

If we are going to phase out the 202 and 221 (d)(3) programs, for example, let us be sure that we have at hand the ability to go forward with the replacement programs. Let us not find out after we have stifled the operating programs through administrative decision that we have also discarded their needed production before there was anything to take its place.

There are some programs I admit that are duplicating efforts. Rent supplements, and rent certificates, now known as the section 23 leasing program, are examples. Rent Supplements approaches 8,000 units under payment. Rent Certificates now has 93,000 units in its pipeline; 17,000 awaiting approval for contract; 16,000 approved for contract; 28,000 signed for occupancy; 32,000 occupied.

Why we have these two programs competing after their respective records for the past three years I do not know. There was a great deal promised for rent supplements. In terms of the promise of the previous Administration's publicity, and its comparative unit cost which can only increase with time, the promise has not been fulfilled.

In contrast, what little was promised for rent certificates, has been far exceeded. We have housed with this adjunct of the public housing program over 100,000 people, very possible that many more than has rent supplements.

I think it is time for an evaluation. We do not need to burden HUD with the cost of running two parallel programs, particularly since the rent supplement program will, if it does grow larger, soon be faced with the fact that it does not have the bureaucratic means to check the eligibility of its tenants, a matter which should already be of concern to it. If it creates that bureaucracy or hires it as it must, the expense of rent supplements will be catastrophic.

The money being poured into the rent supplement program could be well diverted elsewhere. The 202 program, the water and sewer program, mass transit, and others could well do with its appropriations since its goal is being fulfilled much better by another program in all phases of its operation.

Let me add, however, that it is my personal opinion that FHA has done a workmanlike and the best possible job it could with rent supplements. It is the basic concept of the legislation as originally conceived by the previous administration at HUD that is flawed. This produces difficulties at once—expensive and duplicating.

For those who have misplaced their faith in rent supplements, I may sound a little harsh. If so, I think it also a little harsh on the taxpayers to have considerably less than 10,000 units produced in the three years that have passed since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1965, when the previous Administration was promising better than 300,000 units for the program when the Act was passed.

Again, it is not the FHA effort, but the legislation that is flawed.

Amongst other unfinished business we have the matter of new towns. Legislation in 1966 and 1968 has to date produced few applications. This is understandable. New towns by any definition are tremendously expensive. They require large amounts of patient capital and the careful assembly of considerable acreage. They also require a considerable amount of "know how". To get all three together is a long time job.

I am both encouraged and worried by late reports from meetings held and attended by dignitaries from this organization, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, members of Congress, Governors, Urban America, Potomac Institute, Urban Coalition, HUD and other prominent groups.

At these meetings there was a wealth of talent and, predictably, a number of individuals with varying definitions of what New Towns are and should do. One individual was reported to me as reminding the assemblage that they must use such available HUD tools as public housing and urban renewal in putting together New Towns.

Now I see no reason for inflicting urban renewal on a brand new town. That is planning ahead with a vengeance. As for public housing, it is hoped that everyone in the new town will have a decent, safe, and sanitary home. If that includes public housing, I can see no objection.

Into any new town, however, we must put the basic engineering and economics that make a town work. That means simply jobs for everyone except the retired. New Towns cannot be a dumping ground for the cities' unemployed. We cannot build for failure. We must build for success. Moving the unemployed to the countryside is simply transferring unsolved problems. If we are to entice people to New Towns it must not be just because they are attractive and well planned, but because they give whoever comes the opportunity to improve his lot, starting with the absolute necessity of employment as the rock on which to build.

Towns are born of economic necessity, generally as links in a giant transmission belt. Our American "New Towns" to date have in large part not been overly successful. I think this is because they are being proposed not because of economic, but because of social necessity. In too many cases, the driving force

is not to eliminate problems, but to transfer them. If such is truly the case, we are but moving failures from one area to another less able to support them.

That is why I speak of the absolute need for providing basic economics for New Towns. The basic engineering if you will, the jobs that the head of every family must have to make lives supportable. To attempt anything else, to start with any other premise is to indulge in an exercise in futility. And let me emphasize that for every job that a new town provides a man and his family, it must also, within his needs and means, provide him with a decent, safe and sanitary home. Let us have it no other way.

As housing experts, I think we must face the demands of the present and know that the needs of the people we are so desperately trying to serve are here and now. The low income families of this country need decent, safe, and sanitary housing now. Anything that prevents that goal from being reached is self-deceiving.

I am disturbed when I am told that housing production is being inhibited by long-standing HUD regulations, however well intended. I fought last year to insure that urban renewal residential projects included at least 20 percent housing for low and moderate income families. I am now told that this hard won provision of the law is in conflict with a HUD administrative interpretation of Title VI of the 1964 Housing Act that provides that HUD programs, principally public housing, must be balanced between racially-impacted areas and non-racially impacted areas of the same community. To build in the former, you must also build in the latter.

As a long time advocate of civil rights, I am concerned that this interpretation has entrapped us. I can remember—and so can you all—of housing policies advocated for the purpose of inducing integration that produced instead segregation. And I know too that the news media today represent the black militants as desiring segregation. Yet here we have an administrative ruling, based upon an interpretation of the law as yet judicially undecided, that is prohibiting housing activity in slum areas, in urban renewal, and in non-slum areas because there the HUD cost guidelines would be breached.

I am most disturbed that administrative regulations can defy the law. I do not think that the Executive Department can dictate to the Legislative. If it can, I think we should find that out here and now and correct the matter.

What really bothers me, however, are policies that are holding down housing production, that are stopping needed replacement of slums with decent, safe, and sanitary housing, that are telling the people who have waited the longest for relief from urban pressures that they must wait longer.

What have such policies produced? They have produced angry charges from leaders of the black community of Pittsburgh that no attempt is being made by HUD to build in, and upgrade, their ghetto community. It has resulted in stoppage of public housing, urban renewal, and model cities activities in Pittsburgh, Washington, and other communities.

Now these programs are struggling with enough difficulties and handicaps, not the least of which is sufficient appropriated funds, without being hamstrung by administrative regulations, however well intentioned. We need new thinking attuned to the times of now!

Secretary Romney is being often reminded of the goals set by people whose own records of production leave a great deal to be desired. If all of us are sincere in approaching, reaching, or exceeding those selfsame goals—and we would not be here if we were not so motivated—we should get behind him—Republican, Democrat, or even Independent and give him the support that he will need to meet the goals that he inherited from the previous Administration. Whether that support be administrative, legislative, executive, or manual the Secretary of HUD must have it to fulfill the needs of our time. I pledge him my support. I suggest you give him yours.

A STRONG AMERICAN PRESIDENT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the concern for reform of our presidential election system is widespread. In pursuing constitutional amendments toward this goal, Congress should keep in mind the nature of the American Presidency and how it might be effected by proposed electoral reforms. Milton Viorst writes on this important subject in the following article from the April Washingtonian:

THE GUT ISSUE OF ELECTORAL REFORM
(By Milton Viorst)

While Congress picks away at the mechanics of the various plans for electoral college reform, the overriding and forgotten question seems to be what kind of Presidency do we, as a people, want.

If the answer is a strong Presidency, then there is a serious flaw running through the major proposals under consideration. For what these proposal have in common, however they may differ in detail, is permanent provision for election of a minority President. If, however, there is a consensus that in these difficult times the country needs strong leadership, then a constitutional amendment that weakens the Presidential office by sanctioning a minority mandate would be a mistake.

Where these proposals go astray is in their preoccupation with procedures that will assure the continuity of constitutional rule. They aim, above all, to eliminate the possibility of governmental paralysis, currently threatened by deadlock in the electoral college or, at the next level in the process, in the House of Representatives. These, of course, are vital concerns which the Congress can no longer overlook. But, engrossed by the need to modify the methods of Presidential election, Congress seems unaware that it might very well be giving new shape to the Presidency itself.

President Nixon's proposal—to divide a state's electoral vote in ratio to the popular vote that each candidate receives—is not the worst of the plans under consideration. It is probably more democratic than the current winner-take-all system in each of the states. In its detail, it does tidy up significant constitutional lapses. In addition, it possesses the virtue of realism, the President says, in that the states might be persuaded to ratify it. But it perpetuates the possibility that a man who has come in second in the popular vote might be elected President—and, under this system, Nixon himself apparently would have become President in 1960. As long as Congress is taking the trouble to amend the Constitution, it would surely be unwise to retain this dangerous defect.

But more disturbing than the retention of old defects is the introduction of new ones. President Nixon proposes that in the event no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, a plurality of forty percent will suffice to elect a President, Senator Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), the principal advocate of direct election of the President, proposes that, in the absence of a clear majority, forty percent of the popular vote be established as a minimum plurality. But, again, what this attachment to the forty percent figure indicates is concern with the mechanics of continuity rather than with the quality of the Presidency.

In our system, there is no justification, save expediency, for abandonment of the majority rule principle. It is one of the democratic practices that has served us well. If we apply plurality to Presidential elections, it may spread in unforeseen and unfortunate ways. Once accepted, why not drop the minimum to thirty-five or even twenty-five percent? By building a minority Presidency into the Constitution, both the Nixon and the Bayh proposals threaten to debilitate the Presidential office.

Of course, it is not inevitable that a minority President will be a weak President. Lincoln and Wilson were very strong with mandates of some forty percent, while Harding was feeble with more than sixty percent of the vote. Presidential strength is, in part, psychological and not institutional. But the writers of a constitution cannot take the chance that the proper psychological man will somehow find his way to the White House. They must, rather, build the best possible institutions within which everyday, responsible men will function. And, unquestionably, the prospects of a strong Presidency are greatly increased if the President is the choice of a majority of the voters.

In our time, most Americans seem to agree on the need for a strong Presidency. The importance of Presidential leadership in the field of legislation seems reaffirmed by the current wallowing of Congress. Though President Johnson tended to excess in the exercise of his powers in Vietnam, it is generally recognized that a decisive hand is necessary for the conduct of foreign policy. Only the extreme right and the extreme left, these days, quarrel with the concept.

What is less widely perceived is the necessity—and difficulty—of a President's being master in his own house. On coming into office, a President faces a massive civil bureaucracy and powerful military establishment, both confident they will be around long after he is gone. They are accustomed, if not to the exercise of power, then to the pursuit of routine. A President, whatever his electoral mandate, finds it hard enough to translate his policy decisions into action, and a weak President is at a profound handicap.

From the historians of the Kennedy years, we have learned something of the magnitude of the problem. Largely because he felt insecure about his narrow electoral victory, President Kennedy allowed himself to be dragged by the military into the disastrous Bay of Pigs adventure in April 1961. During the second Cuban crisis in 1962, he was astonished to learn that his instructions to remove ballistic missiles from Turkey had simply been ignored. Other countries have had even unhappier experiences when the residual power of the bureaucrats, military or civilian, has been pitted against the transitory power of an elected leader. Certainly, any steps taken to weaken the office weigh the odds against the Presidency.

It is also probably true that the institutionalization of a minority President will encourage the proliferation of third parties. It is far easier for an outsider to shoot for forty than for fifty percent of the vote, whether popular or electoral. In times of national stress, a George Wallace or a Joseph McCarthy—working a single issue, exploiting some peculiar grievance—could conceivably gamble and win, though the combined vote of the two regular parties was overwhelmingly the greater. From the experience of other countries, one could even argue that a system which encourages minority parties tends almost inevitably to produce weak Presidents.

The answer to the problem is provision for a run-off election between the two leading candidates in the event that no candidate receives a majority vote. Many other democracies utilize this procedure without problems. France conducts its run-off exactly a week after the initial election day, obviating a second extensive campaign. With two candidates contesting head-to-head, the run-off ballot could be easily prepared and quickly counted. Certainly, the complexities are not beyond our capacity.

Interestingly, both the Nixon and the Bayh plans already include provisions for a run-off, if no candidate receives forty percent of the vote. Why not raise the ante to a clear majority? The price would be small. The result would be a President certain of his mandate from the people and, in our system, that would be an asset of incalculable importance.

SENATOR JACKSON, REPRESENTATIVE ROYBAL PROPOSE UNIQUE NEW HEALTH MEASURE TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TRANSPLANTING HUMAN ORGANS, AND TO IMPLEMENT A COMPREHENSIVE TREATMENT PROGRAM TO AID VICTIMS OF CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, in introducing legislation in Congress to establish a National Commission on transplanting human organs, and to implement a comprehensive treatment program to aid victims of chronic kidney disease.

This unique new health measure, entitled "The Artificial Organs, Transplantation, and Technological Development Act of 1967" is designed to provide a thorough review of the full range of medical, legal, social, economic, technical, and humanitarian problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of the astoundingly rapid progress of medical science toward making transplantation of human organs, and the use of artificial organs, practical alternatives in the treatment of disease.

In addition, this legislative proposal has been enthusiastically and wholeheartedly endorsed by the National Kidney Foundation as a major step forward in planning and implementing a national program for the treatment of kidney disease.

Kidney malfunctions are among the first five causes of death in the United States. The prevalence of kidney disease is 7.8 million, with an annual death rate of 100,000 or more. Ironically, only about 1 to 3 percent of the 7,000 to 10,000 cases of end-stage kidney disease receive artificial kidney care or transplantation. Both public and private sectors are making every effort to meet the challenge but, unfortunately, this is not enough.

Senator JACKSON's Senate bill, S. 88, and my own identical House bill, H.R. 8, represent a joint congressional effort to provide a national forum for considering the broad, complex problems associated with human transplantation and the use of artificial organs, while, at the same time, establishing an ongoing model kidney care program from which we can gain vital knowledge and experience.

We believe that this measure cannot only help resolve some of the most difficult and pressing medical health questions confronting the American people today, but that it also can lead to a real breakthrough by making the recent fantastic discoveries of medical research available as proven lifesaving treatments to enable thousands of our fellow citizens to continue to live productive and worthwhile lives—when today many of these people are dying for lack of money, facilities, and trained personnel to provide the essential care they require.

The Jackson-Roybal bill is a two-part measure.

One section would set up a National Commission on Transportation and Artificial Organs to deal with the often promising, sometimes disturbing, ramifications of human transplantation and the use of artificial organs.

The seven-member Commission would not stop at kidney transplantation, but would look at the whole field of potential and current organ transplants, including heart, kidney, liver, and lung, and present its findings to the President.

Another section calls for an expenditure of $20 million in the first fiscal year, and $30 million in each of the next 4 fiscal years, for the establishment and operation of a nationwide system of integrated artificial kidney and human kidney transplant centers.

This section is based on key recommendations of the report of the blue-ribbon Gottschalk Committee on Chronic Kidney Disease, submitted to the Federal Bureau of the Budget last September at the request of the President.

The Gottschalk report showed that many of the problems encountered in the transplantation of kidneys are common to the transplantation of other human organs.

We have the technical know-how to keep over 7,000 people alive today who are dying annually because of kidney disease—but the patient care cost to the individual is prohibitive.

To remedy this situation, the Jackson-Roybal bill includes an amendment to the medicare provisions of the Social Security Act, bringing hospital and medical health benefits to patients whose kidneys have failed, who require a kidney transplant, or whose infected blood needs weekly or twice-weekly dialysis or rinsing by the kidney machine.

In many cases, these patients are able to work and support families. Their survivors could be an even greater burden on our tax rolls were it not for this weekly rehabilitation of the breadwinner.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the full text of the statement issued today by the National Kidney Foundation, endorsing the Jackson-Roybal bill:

KIDNEY FOUNDATION ENDORSES PROPOSED LEGISLATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The National Kidney Foundation has given its enthusiastic support to two measures designed to relieve the plight of the nation's 8,000,000 sufferers of kidney disease.

The two bills, identical in content, were simultaneously introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives by Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D. Wash.) and Rep. Edward R. Roybal (D. Calif.) as numbers S. 88 and H.R. 8, respectively.

Speaking for the national health organization, Foundation president Dr. George E. Schreiner described as a "national emergency" today's delivery of life-saving medical services to the vast number of kidney disease victims.

"It is a tragedy that in these times of medical enlightenment and scientific progress, our resources permit us to bring adequate medical care to less than ten per cent of the many thousands of kidney disease sufferers who so desperately need it," he declared.

Dr. Schreiner is professor of medicine at Georgetown University and director of the Renal and Electrolyte Division of Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Citing the modern miracles of kidney transplantation and the artificial kidney machine—as well as new drugs available for the detection and treatment of kidney disease—Dr. Schreiner lauded the efforts of lawmakers to bridge the vast gap between the best of medical care and enormous need.

Dr. Schreiner also noted that the National Kidney Foundation's trustees and medical board long have been on record in support of similar measures.

The bills specifically provide for $20-million for the first year and $30-million per year thereafter for the establishment of training and treatment centers for transplantation, and dialysis centers and home dialysis programs from which patients can be redirected to kidney transplantation when medically indicated.

Another provision of the bills establishes a national commission to study the full range of medical, legal, social, economic, technical and humanitarian problems involving the role of the Federal government in the prevention and treatment of disease in which transplantation and/or artificial organs may be a factor.

In order to provide a somewhat more specific and detailed explanation of the Jackson-Roybal bill's major provisions, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following narrative summary of S. 88 and H.R. 8:

The "Artificial Organ, Transplantation and Technological Development Act of 1969" would amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, social and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of rapid medical progress towards making transplantation of organs, and the use of artificial organs a practical alternative in the treatment of disease.

In addition, the bill would also amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs.

Finally, the bill proposes a variety of mechanisms for financing the programs outlined, and encourages close cooperation among all the federal agencies and departments to achieve the bill's objectives.

Section 2: Following the introductory section of the Artificial Organ, Transplantation and Technological Development Act of 1968, Section 2 of the bill amends Part B of Title III of the Public Health Service Act by adding the following three new sections:

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TRANSPLANTATION AND ARTIFICIAL ORGANS

Under new Section 319 a seven-member National Commission on Transplantation and Artificial Organs would be appointed by the President, with the Chairman and mem-

bers selected on the basis of their qualifications in medical, legal, social, economic and technical fields. The members of the Commission could hold no other U.S. Government position during their period of service.

Over the three-year period for which it is proposed to function, the Commission would review and report on all medical activities in the nation in the field of transplantation and the use of artificial organs for the treatment of disease, and would review legal, social and technical problems associated with this area of medicine. It would also consider various ways by which the Federal Government can participate in developing the knowledge and facilities for the appropriate use of transplantation and artificial organs in the treatment of disease, and make projections of the public need for readily available facilities for this purpose.

The Commission would consult with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for review and comment regarding its studies, reports and recommendations. Its reports would be submitted to the President who would in turn transmit them to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation as he deemed appropriate.

In the performance of its functions the Commission could hold hearings, procure services of expert consultants, enter into contracts, and transfer funds to Federal agencies. These agencies would be authorized to supply information and to detail personnel to the Commission upon its request.

ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS FOR THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF KIDNEY DISEASES

The proposed new Section 320 to the Public Health Service Act defines a series of provisions related to financial and other assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community kidney treatment and training programs. Funds would be authorized to be appropriated in the amounts of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $30,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year ending in and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. These funds would be used for assistance in providing information, services and grants for planning, training, construction, renovation and percentage contributions towards the operation of Regional Kidney Centers and Community Dialysis Units.

Kidney Centers

A "Kidney Center" for the purpose of this section of the bill is defined to mean a "Regional Kidney Center" established within or as a part of a medical school or hospital that has demonstrated a high level of professional competence in relevant medical disciplines. The purpose of such centers would be:

(a) to train medical and supporting personnel;

(b) to provide transplantation treatment for patients with chronic uremia where this form of therapy is indicated;

(c) to provide dialysis treatment when medically indicated in connection with training, research and transplantation;

(d) to engage in research and the development of new techniques;

(e) to coordinate with and establish appropriate relations with one or more local Community Dialysis Units, and,

(f) to assure that knowledge and treatment of kidney disease will evolve in a balanced fashion;

This section of the bill also includes in the definition of "Kidney Center" a local "Community Dialysis Unit" established in conjunction with and in a continuing relationship with a Regional Kidney Center.

The purpose of such units would be:

(a) to provide a central training and treatment facility for the care of persons having chronic kidney disease;

(b) to provide training and supervision to physicians, staff members, and to patients who are candidates for home dialysis;

(c) to foster and promote the availability and wider use of the equipment and techniques of home dialysis.

Federal assistance grants to kidney centers for these purposes would include:

(1) 100 per cent of the costs directly related to the training of physicians, staff members, patients and their families;

(2) 100 per cent of the costs for construction or renovation of existing facilities and for the necessary equipment to establish a Regional Kidney Center under the provisions described above;

(3) 60 to 90 percent of the costs for construction or renovation of existing facilities and for the necessary equipment to establish a Community Dialysis Unit under the provisions described above. The percentage contribution would be determined on the basis of the economic status of the particular community involved pursuant to guidelines established by the Secretary.

(4) 90 per cent in the first year of full operation 60 per cent in the second year, and 30 per cent in the third year, and thereafter, of the operation and maintenance costs of Regional Kidney Centers and Community Dialysis Units established pursuant to the bill. *Provided,* however, that grants under this subsection could be in lesser amounts if the Secretary determines that Centers and Units are capable of meeting a larger share of the costs of operation.

(Under the Social Security—Medicare provisions of the bill, the Secretary, in many cases, would find that local centers and units were capable of meeting a larger share of their operational and maintenance costs.)

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON KIDNEY DISEASE PROGRAMS

The purpose of new Section 321 of the Public Health Service Act is to establish a National Advisory Committee on Kidney Disease Programs. This Committee would consist of 12 members, appointed by the Secretary, four of whom would be currently in Government service and eight not otherwise in the employ of the United States. The term of appointment for each member would be four years.

The Committee would advise and assist the Secretary on regulations, policy and administration of the bill as it pertains to the diagnosis, treatment and care of patients suffering from kidney disease. The Committee would also review and make recommendations on grant applications under section 320 of the bill for the establishment and operation of regional and community kidney disease treatment and training programs.

In addition, the National Advisory Committee on Kidney Disease Programs would review and make recommendations on kidney disease programs of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including, but not limited to, those in the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, so that the methods, facilities, and programs of these agencies could most effectively be utilized. Particular attention would be paid to the coordination of activities of these various agencies in a given region so as to insure adequate geographical distribution of services and avoid duplication of facilities and services.

Section 3: This section of the "Artificial Organ, Transplantation and Technological Development Act of 1969" would amend the medicare provisions of the Social Security Act so that:

1. any individual who according to accepted medical authority, judgment and practice requires continuous intermittent dialysis for kidney failure would be eligible for both the hospital insurance benefits (Part A) and supplementary medical insurance portion (Part B) of the Medicare program, regardless of that individual's age or insured status. Such individuals would be allowed to enroll in the supplementary medical insurance program at any time. Coverage would begin on the first day of the month of enrollment and terminate at the end of the calendar quarter in which the individual no longer requires dialysis.

2. "medical and other health services" which are covered under the supplementary medical insurance program would include: "continuous intermittent dialysis and any other items or services required for or in connection with the treatment of kidney failure (including items or services under the supervision of a physician, furnished in a place of residence used as the patient's home, if the provision of such items or services meets such conditions relating to health and safety as the Secretary may find necessary); and

3. individuals qualifying solely because of the requirement of dialysis are limited to receiving payments under either the hospital insurance program or the supplementary medical insurance program for only those expenses incurred for items or services (including continuous intermittent dialysis and kidney transplantation) which are necessitated by such individuals' kidney failure or by conditions directly or indirectly related thereto or caused thereby.

Section 4: This section of the bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the effectiveness of the coverage extended by the amendments made by section 3 of the bill to individuals with kidney failure, giving particular attention to the need for increasing the duration of the benefits provided in the case of such individuals and for any other adjustments which may be indicated because of the unique nature of their condition and the treatment required. Within six months after the effective date of the bill the Secretary would transmit to the President and the Congress a report containing his findings of fact and any conclusions or recommendations he may have.

Section 5: Under this section, the head of each department, agency and instrumentality of the United States would be authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the maximum extent possible, in carrying out the provisions of the bill.

Section 6: This section provides that, except as otherwise specifically provided by any amendment made by the bill, there would be authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Section 7: This section states that the foregoing provisions of the bill would become effective as of the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of the bill.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CELEBRATES 28TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago this past month, the National Gallery of Art was first opened to the public. Housing one of the finest collections in the world, it holds more than 30,000 works of art created by more than 2,000 artists. By viewing the Gallery's collection of sculptures, paintings, drawings, prints, tapestries, and furniture, Americans from all 50 States have gained a deeper appreciation of the history of art.

Established by a joint resolution of Congress in 1937, the National Gallery is directed by a Board composed of the

Chief Justice of the United States and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and the Smithsonian Institution, representing the Government, and five outstanding private citizens who represent the public sector. The Gallery building was constructed with funds generously donated for that purpose by Andrew W. Mellon of Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Mellon presented to the Gallery his own private art collection, and this is the nucleus around which the Gallery's present magnificent collection has been built. Over 200 generous Americans have donoted works of art to the Gallery.

The National Gallery has the responsibility of assembling a collection of art "representative of the best in the artistic heritage of America and of Europe." An excellent program of art education provides visitors with free tours and lectures as well as weekly concerts. The Gallery lends films, film strips, and color slides to schools, libraries, and colleges.

It is a pleasure to include in the RECORD the April calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art:

CALENDAR OF EVENTS, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, APRIL 1969

John Constable

Beginning the 30th of April, 66 painting by the English landscape artist John Constable will be shown for a period of six months on the Main Floor. This is the second in a series of intimate exhibitions devoted to individual artists in the large British art collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon.

The selection offers an opportunity to study the full range of Constable's oil paintings. It includes still lifes, landscapes, studies of sky and clouds, and one of his most successful protraits, *Miss Mary Freer*. The most important picture is *Hadleigh Castle*, a scene of melancholy grandeur "as moving as the most sublime poem by Wordsworth," in the words of John Walker, Director of the National Gallery. Constable observed the magnificent ruin while on a tour of Essex in the summer of 1814 and made several studies before completing this final version in 1829.

Mr. and Mrs. Mellon's collection is rich in landmarks of the artist's life: *Dedham Mill and Lock*, where Constable worked for his prosperous miller father; *Osmington Village, with the Church and Vicarage*, scene of his honeymoon; and *Coast at Brighton; Stormy Day*, the coastal area where he vacationed with his family.

Notes for the fully illustrated catalogue ($2.50 postpaid) are by Ross Watson, who also prepared the J. M. W. Turner catalogue for this series.

American Music Festival

The 26th festival, devoted exclusively to the music of American composers, begins April 20 under the direction of Richard Bales. Concerts by the National Gallery Orchestra, recitalists, and chamber groups are scheduled in the East Garden Court Sunday evenings at 8 p.m., through May 25.

Rembrandt Tercentenary

Continuing on the Main Floor is an exhibition commemorating the 300th anniversary of Rembrandt's death. Assembled from the National Gallery's holdings are 23 paintings, more than a dozen drawings, and a selection of 77 of the most distinguished prints in the collection. An illustrated catalogue is available at $3.00 postpaid, with an introduction by the Dutch painting and print authority Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, Professor of the History of Art, Yale University.

J. M. W. Turner

Closing on the 20th of this month is an exhibition of 16 painting by Joseph Mallord William Turner from the British collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. A catalogue is available with text by Ross Watson. 10" x 7½", 32 pages, 16 black-and-white illustrations. $2.75 postpaid.

Daily film program

The National Gallery of Art (52 min.): weekdays, 2 p.m.

The American Vision (35 min.): weekdays, 4 p.m., Sundays, 1:00 p.m. Auditorium.

Recorded tours

The Director's Tour. A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director. Portable tape units rent for 25¢ for one person, 35¢ for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

Tour of Selected Galleries. A discussion of works of art in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last approximately 15 minutes. Small radio receivers rent for 25¢.

Gallery hours

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

Cafeteria hours

Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., luncheon service 11 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Sundays, dinner service 2 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 31, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 6

*Painting of the week**

Perugino. *The Crucifixion with the Virgin, Saint John, Saint Jerome, and Saint Mary Magdalen* (Andrew Mellon Collection). Gallery 8, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Camille Pissarro. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

The Art of the Icon. Guest Speaker: Mary Chamot, formerly Assistant Keeper, the Tate Gallery, London. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

National Gallery Orchestra. Richard Bales, *Conductor.* East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 7, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 13

*Painting of the week**

Cézanne. *Le Château Noir* (gift of Eugene and Agnes Meyer). Gallery 76, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Claude Monet. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Artist and Patron in Western Art. Guest Speaker: Sterling A. Callisen, Professor of Art, Pace College, New York, N.Y. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

David Rubinstein, *Pianist.* East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 14, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 20

*Painting of the week**

Gentile da Fabriano. *Madonna and Child* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 5, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Edgar Degas. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda. Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Rembrandt's Etchings. Guest Speaker: Egbert Haverkamp-Begemann, Professor of the History of Art, Yale University, New Haven. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

26th American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra. Richard Bales, *Conductor.* East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, APRIL 21, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 27

*Painting of the week**

Jacques-Louis David. *Madam David* (Samuel H. Kress Collection). Gallery 56, Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week

The Achievement of Paul Gauguin. Rotunda, Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour

Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture

Rembrandt and the Italian Baroque. Guest Speaker: Joos Bruyn, Professor of Art History, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Lecture Hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert

26th American Music Festival: The Montgomery Chamber Ensemble. Assisted by Jeanne Chalifoux, *Harp*, and Eugene Dreyer, *Violin*. East Garden Court, 8:00.

We in the U.S. Congress are indeed proud of this fine national art museum, and salute John Walker, Director of the National Gallery, and his good staff for their contribution to the enrichment of our national life, through preserving the cultural heritage of this Nation and of the world.

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

WOMEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the elimination of discrimination in American life—whether discrimination based on race, sex, religion, national origin or any other irrelevant factor—must continue to be a central objective of the American people and their Government. For discrimination denies the fundamental moral basis of American society. And discrimination of all kinds—whatever the superficial differences between them—are basically parts of the same ugly whole.

For these reasons, I recently addressed a letter to President Nixon, recognizing that he shares my convictions in this respect, proposing alternative arrangements within the executive branch of providing more effective Federal leadership and involvement in the fight against discrimination based on sex.

At approximately the same time, the distinguished correspondent of the Women's News Service, Vera Glaser, prepared a series of five articles entitled "The Female Revolution" in which she

surveyed the state of women's rights and opportunities and responsibilities today. The wide and prominent coverage given this series by major American newspapers suggests, I believe, the importance of the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I most strongly urge those of our colleagues who have not already done so to read these articles, for they comprise the most comprehensive and persuasive picture of the realities of the woman's position in American society which I have seen in recent years.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the text of my letter to the President and the series by Vera Glaser as a part of my remarks:

The PRESIDENT
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As one who is familiar with the constructive interest you have always displayed in the general question of the expansion of women's opportunities and responsibilities, the protection of women's equal rights, and the elimination of all forms of discrimination based on sex, I feel encouraged to approach you in these first weeks of your Administration to propose concrete steps toward achieving these worthwhile objectives.

Specifically, I propose for your consideration two alternative arrangements, either of which would provide for more effective federal involvement and leadership in assuring for women and girls equal opportunity and equal protection of the laws:

First, establishment of an independent commission with a full-time chairman, appointed by the President on a bipartisan basis from among men and women with a demonstrated interest in and commitment to the strengthening of women's rights and opportunities; members would be chosen both from within and without the Government, would be served by a professionally competent staff, and would be responsible for making relevant studies, reviews and evaluations of matters affecting the status of women and for transmitting appropriate recommendations to the President and Congress.

Second, establishment within the Executive Office of the President of:

(a) an Office of Women's Rights and Responsibilities and the appointment of a Special Assistant to the President to head this office and also serve as chairman of

(b) an interdepartmental committee of the same name composed of appropriate department and agency heads; the functions and responsibilities of the special assistant and the interdepartmental committee would be analogous to those of the Special Assistant for Urban Affairs and the Urban Affairs Council, i.e. to strengthen policy direction and consistency, improve coordination, and provide for effective evaluation of Government performance in the area of women's rights and responsibilities;

(c) a Citizens Advisory * * * area of Women's rights and responsibilities would also be appointed by the President on a bipartisan basis composed of men and women with special information and concern in the subject area who would be responsible for advising the President and the interdepartmental committee on relevant matters and stimulating action in the private sphere.

Although either alternative would significantly improve the Government's ability to enlarge women's opportunities and end discrimination, my personal preference would be for the second plan which has the great advantage of more visibly and convincingly committing the Administration to effective action. Should you or your staff desire further details about either proposal, I shall be delighted at the opportunity to furnish them.

I do not believe it is necessary in this letter to detail the many areas in public and private life in which women and girls continue to be victims of discrimination, nor to document charges of discrimination with a host of ugly examples. Your own intimate knowledge of government and society has, I am sure, provided you with the necessary insight, and the work of many groups and organizations and individuals, including the recent President's Commission on the Status of Women, has furnished all too impressive a volume of evidence.

Economic, social and legal discrimination against women and girls—in employment, education, compensation, retirement and many other areas—continue to weaken our social structure and distort our system of moral principles. An Administration dedicated to the goal of moving ahead together as a united people would, I am confident, find it especially fitting and proper to continue the struggle against a form of discrimination which divides and demeans our people.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Very sincerely,

FLORENCE P. DWYER,
Member of Congress.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 17, 1969]

THE FEMALE REVOLUTION: WOMEN ARE ON WARPATH AS DOORS OF BUSINESS AND POLITICS STAY CLOSED

(By Vera Glaser)

(NOTE.—This is the first of five articles on the rising discontent among women over the inequities in American public and business life. The author, a well-known Washington correspondent, interviewed men and women in politics, business, education, and in the home for this series. Recently Mrs. Glaser caused a stir at a Presidential press conference by asking Mr. Nixon why he hadn't appointed more women to high posts. The exchange triggered considerable comment in the press.)

WASHINGTON.—A mink coat, a job, and all those shiny electrical applicances are no longer enough, it appears, for the American woman.

She wants something bigger, shinier, and far more explosive called "an even break."

Although the number of doors opening today for women seems limitless, the most important ones remain bolted up tight.

The executive secretary, for example, who makes decisions and handles her boss' job on his off days may find it unfair and infuriating, but when he quits he'll be replaced by a man, and she'll be the one to "break him in."

The female eying a "male" career area can expect ridicule and roughing up, as Barbara Jo Rubin learned when a man jockey threatened to "ride her into the rail." Or she may be turned down flat for no apparent reason, as were qualified lady scientists who applied for astronaut training.

Given the attitudes prevailing in the United States today, few were surprised when Sen. Margaret Chase Smith did not win the 1964 Republican presidential nomination after a pioneering try. It was highly revealing, however, when the second spot went to a man whose qualifications by any reasonable standard were inferior to hers.

Working women, civil rights experts, and a growing number of "contented" housewives believe sex discrimination is a serious national problem.

Some equate it with the Negro's drive for civil rights, and indeed women today stand legally about where the Negro stood in 1940.

Rep. Florence Dwyer is taking that message directly to the President of the United States. She is urging him to name a White House adviser charged with making better use of the abilities of the nation's women or to set up an independent agency to strengthen women's rights and opportunities.

The New Jersey lawmaker, who is a ranking Republican on the House government operations committee, is no professional feminist. Her initiative comes at a time, however, when the Nixon Administration is under fire for shutting women out of a top policy role.

"The economic, social and legal discriminations against women and girls," Mrs. Dwyer wrote the President, "continue to weaken our social structure and distort our system of moral principles."

To men, the yakking about feminine "equality"—some of it strident—is mystifying, irksome, and sometimes funny.

Don't women have the vote? they ask.

Aren't big corporations and government clamoring for secretaries?

Women are driving taxis, they'll tell you. They're delivering mail. They're plumbers and, yes, even wrestlers. With a skilled labor shortage developing, just look at those openings for women in mathematics, pharmacy, accounting, optometry.

Nowadays a woman can enjoy a home, husband, kids and a job, providing she keeps up with the housework.

In short, those who don't realize the American woman is emancipated are blind.

"Are you kidding? We might as well be in a ghetto!" snapped Rep. Martha W. Griffiths, (Dem.), Michigan, wife, lawyer, former judge, and eight-term Congresswoman.

In recent years, as more women have taken jobs and engaged in direct economic competition with men, a quiet revolution has been occurring.

No one denies the fair sex has made progress, but it is also difficult to deny they are cut off from the leadership role to which their education, training, and numbers appear to entitle them.

As a result, the revolution, boiling from campus to executive suite, is becoming not-so-quiet. Women are increasingly outspoken on what they see as their second-class status.

Like Negroes, they are calling for a piece of the action.

A revealing glimpse of how their aspirations are regarded at the highest level was offered recently by President Nixon himself.

Replying to a question on Negroes at a news conference he spoke eloquently and at length, leaving no doubt he is deeply concerned and working hard to improve his relations with them.

To a query on women a few minutes later, his rejoinder was brief and accompanied by indulgent male laughter. The President, it was apparent, hadn't troubled to do homework on this one.

Women represent half the population and a majority of the voters. Yet it had not occurred to the President that he might be cheating the ladies by including only three of them when some 200 top jobs were handed out.

He promised to "correct the imbalance very promptly."

To do that he would have to issue firm instructions to his cabinet and top-level aides, a step which apparently has not been taken.

The first division chief to be dropped by Nixon's Interior Secretary Walter Hickel was a woman, attorney Ruth G. Van Cleve, whose administration of the Office of Territories won her a federal award.

While a flurry of Presidential distaff appointments can now be expected in an effort to offset the negative publicity, the most important test of leadership will come on follow-through.

Unless the President exerts sustained pressure on business and government officials to equalize opportunities down through the ranks, where sex bias often occurs, there will be no steady upward flow of female executive talent. The naming of a few showcase women will be mere "tokenism."

"I have been discriminated against far more

because I am a female than because I am black," said New York Rep. Shirley Chisholm, first Negro woman to be elected to the U.S. Congress.

"They said I wasn't qualified because the clients wouldn't accept a woman," said a bitter losing contender for a job as account executive in an advertising agency. "Can you imagine what would happen if they said that to a Negro?"

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 18, 1969]

IS WOMAN'S PLACE AT HOME? SHE WANTS A FREE CHOICE BETWEEN FAMILY AND CHANCE FOR SUCCESS IN OUTSIDE WORLD—II

(By Vera Glaser)

(NOTE.—The American woman's push for a bigger role in business, the professions, and public life stirs reactions in both sexes which tend toward emotion rather than logic. It challenges deeply held religious concepts. It exposes the pervasive use of sex in America to limit the individual's life.)

WASHINGTON.—Tests of brain power, judgment and emotional stability show women to be the equals of men in everything except brute strength. Women live longer, spend less time in the hospital.

"Many women surpass in ability the average president or justice," writes Goodwin Watson, professor of social psychology at Columbia University, "but it will be many decades before a woman becomes President of the United States or Chief Justice of the Supreme Court."

Meanwhile India is led by a woman prime minister, Indira Gandhi, and Golda Meir has been chosen prime minister of Israel. A woman sits on Denmark's Supreme Court.

The rise of several new women's rights organizations in the U.S. and the tone of their offensive testifies that the ladies are increasingly resentful of what they view as outright discrimination.

Women are not working for fun, they point out, but in many cases for economic necessity. They resent being cut off from the top dollar. Of 27 million women workers, one-third of the nation's employed force, 5 million are the primary support of families and 3.5 million are supplementing their husbands' substandard wages.

Despite a law requiring equal pay for equal work, the sexual salary gap is widening. Most women are boxed into jobs that are dull or ill-paid. The most interesting and rewarding positions are tagged "men only."

Women are less welcome in graduate schools, often vetoed for professorships. Sixty percent of elementary school and ninety percent of high school principals are men.

Only six per cent of U.S. physicians are women compared to 75 per cent in the Soviet Union. Only four per cent of U.S. lawyers and judges are women, eight percent of the scientists, nine per cent of professors, one per cent of the engineers.

The number of women in the U.S. Congress is dwindling, having dropped from a peak of 18 in 1960 to 11 in 1969, less than two per cent of the membership. Sweden has 12 per cent, Norway 10, Ghana nine, and India seven.

The American male, by and large, does not give women the same break he gives men in business, the professions and public life.

Many unions and employees do not accept women for apprenticeships or managerial training, thus cutting them off from promotions.

Women are short-changed on social security and civil service retirement benefits, according to testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

"The most tragic and senseless waste on this century," was the way President Lyndon Johnson described the under-utilization of the American female.

He made a showcase effort to place them in top federal jobs but there was little if any follow-through.

"A Nixon Administration will not be as blind to the contribution women can make to the the leadership of this nation," the candidate promised last October.

The ladies are waiting.

That many women prefer a housewifely role, even the militants admit. But those who don't, they contend, are entitled to a free choice in the market place, including access to education and jobs based on merit, not sex.

The American woman's push for a bigger role in business, the professions, and public life stirs reactions in both sexes which tend toward emotion rather than logic. It challenges deeply held religious concepts. It exposes the pervasive use of sex in America to limit the individual's life.

Whatever logic supports the concept of "equality" for women, however, often crumbles before a single thrust:

"You can't escape biology. Women have the babies. Their first duty is to tend them. There's no way around it."

For the woman who accepts that role, there is no problem. Many indeed seem to glory in it.

For the others, the dilemma can be excruciating. Without denying the deep satisfactions of home and child, many women seek something more, are capable of more, but find themselves trapped, prevented from marketing college degrees or skills by lack of household help or disapproving attitudes.

Society dictates that rearing children is the woman's unique responsibility. Some view this as women's natural role. Others term it discrimination.

Questioning it is not popular in a society where male sexuality constantly feels threatened by so-called emasculating females, but it will have to be dealt with.

David Dietch, a financial reporter, writes that the Swedish national income could be 25 per cent higher if women's labor potential were fully utilized. The standard of living in France would rise 35 per cent if women were as professionally active as men.

Just as Negroes were for years stymied as janitors or domestics, society rules that woman's place is in the home. From the earliest glimmerings of her intelligence, a girl's motivation for a career is sabotaged. The effect of centuries of conditioning makes women, like Negroes, doubt their own capacity to achieve in a competitive society.

Although the housewife is constantly told her job is as important as anyone's, where are the professional men or women willing to trade with her? If she tends to feel inferior or sensitive to the term "housewife," who can blame her?

Twenty years after graduation a survey showed 90 percent of college women troubled by a sense of disappointment, frustration and futility.

The view that women ought to be economically supported by marriage, described by some as "the traditional prize offered in exchange for female subjugation," is coming under challenge.

Tolerance is developing for the concept that is care and support of children are joint responsibilities.

Support is growing for the repeal of legal bans on abortion, which would give women a free choice in child-bearing.

Whether it is advisable to go as far as the Soviet Union is questioned. There the rearing of the young is almost entirely trusted to professionals. Divorces are easy and abortions legal. The system has drawn charges that it is causing families as such to "wither away."

What is needed in the United States, femininists says, is acceptance of the view that the married woman cannot reasonably be expected to reach male career status if she must also be house cleaner and full-time child rearer, and that scarcity of well-run child-care facilities is the main factor imprisoning women in the home.

Nobody, neither men or women, really wants to do the bulk of what constitutes "woman's work," according to psychologist Sylvia Hartman. She categorizes much of it as boring and not valued by society.

Although men's work can be equally dull, as women learn when they undertake it, society values it, which makes a difference.

Until women are given a real choice—unpressured by men—between home and outside world, no one will really know how many prefer the hearth or how many are forced into it by social mores.

Today the average woman's life expectancy is almost 74 years. About half of today's women are married by 21 and have their last child by 30, leaving three decades of active life ahead.

As physical attractiveness fades, prevailing standards tag the mature woman as hasbeen. Facing up to this is often her first impetus toward some outside activity.

As she seeks satisfying outlets for her brains and energy, she then confronts another reality. There are limits to where her ability can carry her in the male-dominated outside world.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 19, 1969]

WITH LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL—LAW CONTINUES TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST WOMEN OF AMERICA DESPITE ORDERS AND DECISIONS—III

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Shocking and unfair as it may seem, the Supreme Court has never accorded women the protection of the 14th amendment.

"What we need," said Rep. Martha Griffiths, (Dem.), Michigan, "is for a Justice to look at a case involving a woman just once and say this is a human being, that the equal protection clause applies."

She urges working women to organize and finance legal prosecution of sex discrimination cases, taking them to the Supreme Court, as did the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in pursuing landmark racial decisions.

Men tend to laugh off suggestions that the ladies are not equal. They cite four recent laws and two Presidential orders, all designed to ban discrimination against women.

In 1963 Congress passed the equal pay for equal work law.

Yet the median annual salary for men ($7,200) is almost twice that for women ($4,200) and the gap is widening.

The average woman college graduate can expect to earn less than a man with a grade school education.

In 1964 the civil rights law prohibited discrimination based on sex (as well as on race, religion and nationality). It set up the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to handle complaints.

Although thousands of sex complaints poured in, EEOC's lack of enforcement powers placed the real follow-through in the lap of the Justice Department. So far it has refused to bring a class sex bias suit, although many have been initiated on behalf of Negroes.

A 1967 law permits women in the military to rise to the rank of admiral and general.

The male hierarchy has yet to name one.

A 1966 law bans bias because of age, but women in their 40's and 50's still get the brush.

The Nixon Administration itself violated the law's intent by announcing, through Assistant HEW Secretary Patricia Hitt, that high-ranking federal jobs would be filled by women between 25 and 35. Apparently realiz-

ing it had flubbed, a story was put out the following day expanding the age limit to 50, although this too violates the law.

By executive orders President John Kennedy created the Commission on the Status of Women and President Lyndon Johnson banned sex bias in federal hiring and promotions and in firms doing business with the government.

The government itself appears to be ignoring the orders.

"Widespread negative attitudes of men" were blamed in 1967 study for the fact that only two pct. of federal woman employees occupy the higher positions although the bureaucracy is one-third female.

Whether the government will cancel a contract because of sex bias remains to be seen. Racial bias by federal contractors was countenanced long after it was outlawed by executive order and only recently have offenders been slapped on the wrist.

In the area of equal access to education, an important case is now before the New York Supreme Court. Alice de Riviera's mathematical brilliance placed her in the 99th percentile in a city-wide competition, but the nearest coed high school with a top-caliber math department is a three-hour round trip by subway from her home.

Viewing the journey as dangerous for a 13-year-old, her parents are trying to enter Alice at Stuyvesant High, an all boy school with comparable math instruction which is more conveniently located.

Ironically, the head of the New York City Board of Education defending the exclusion of girls from Stuyvesant is John Doar, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's civil rights division.

Doar personally enforced the legal right, secured under the 14th amendment, of Negro James Meredith to enter the University of Mississippi.

Major roadblocks to legal equality for women are state laws, originally passed as "protective," but now serving to bar women from jobs and advancement.

Some limit the number of hours women can work, cutting them off from management training and supervisory positions.

Others set a limit on the weight (usually 35 pounds) a woman may lift on the job.

World War II proved women could hold their own in such physically taxing jobs as operating lift trucks in longshore industries and working on factory production lines. Physical limitations, feminists say, should depend on the individual's capabilities rather than sex.

Women still do not have equal property rights in many states, nor the right to custody of their children.

Last year a Connecticut woman convicted of disorderly conduct and resisting arrest was sentenced to three years imprisonment. Had she been a man, her sentence would not have exceeded one year.

When a legal aid association took the case, the federal district court ruled the statute under which she was sentenced invalid. Sixteen other women were released at the time, all having served more than maximum for a man.

Similar discriminatory sentences against women have been handed down in the courts of Pennsylvania and Maine. Although the Connecticut and Pennsylvania laws were struck down by lower courts, they have not been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and such practices may exist in other states.

A single Supreme Court decision could nullify state laws perpetuating the inequities, but over the years it has been impossible to achieve.

In 1924 the high Court upheld a New York law prohibiting employment of women in restaurants in some cities after 10 p.m. under the guise of "protecting" them. It excepted cigarette and flower girls, ladies' rest room attendants, hotel elevator operators, and charwomen—obviously less lucrative jobs or those which men did not want.

In 1958 and 1960 the High Court upheld exclusion of women from Texas A. and M., a state college.

Another possible way to nullify discriminatory state laws is the equal rights amendment, which women's groups have tried for years to push through Congress. It would amend the U.S. Constitution to read, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

The amendment was endorsed by Presidents John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon, but has had tough sledding.

It has been reintroduced in the 91st Congress. Should it pass, ratification by the states could take years. Those with discriminatory sex laws may resist.

Some legal experts prefer the alternative of carrying suits against the discrimination up to the Supreme Court, a course requiring time and money. There are enough working women to finance it if they mobilize.

A decision like Brown vs. Board of Education, by which the Supreme Court in 1954 banned school segregation in the states, would give women a solid legal foundation on which to fight sex bias.

A case which may become such a landmark is Weeks vs. Southern Bell, in which the Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans recently ruled in favor of a woman applying for the job of switchman for which she had seniority. She had been turned down because of a state weight-lifting regulation. The lower court held that was justified, but in the recent decision the Appeals Court ruled the employer has the burden of proving all or practically all women could not perform the duties of the job. If Southern Bell takes the case to the Supreme Court, the decision will have national repercussions.

Attorney Marguerite Rawalt, former head of the National Association of Women Lawyers, has been active in many such cases. Miss Rawalt helped found a fund to recruit other women lawyers to fight court battles for women's rights.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 20, 1969]

WILL WOMEN SHOW THEIR MUSCLE TO GAIN GOAL OF EQUAL RIGHTS?—IV

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Some astute men are saying that the push for women's rights may contain the seeds of violence.

"When women stop cooking and start demonstrating, it will be a lot worse than Detroit and Newark," warned Norbert Rayford, a member of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

"It is an open secret that some women are looking for an effective and dramatic method to protest discrimination," wrote Lt. Col. Stephen Harrison in a graduate thesis on women as an untapped management resource.

His view is underscored by a professional woman who said, "All we need is an incident like the Montgomery bus boycott and a charismatic leader. We are sick and tired of watching men, some with less ability, move up ahead of us."

Should disorder occur, it seems likely it would be triggered by blue-collar women in labor unions who now number 3.5 million and who are bringing most of the court cases on sex bias under Title VII of the civil rights act. This group understands collective action, has often walked picket lines.

One reason the extent of the ferment is not more widely realized is that many men—and the mass media which is dominated by men—are unaware of it, unsympathetic to it, or refuse to admit it exists.

Five new militant women's groups have sprung up in recent years. Some older organizations have stepped up their efforts to storm new legal beachheads.

Newswise, however, they are not accorded the status of the racial push, although women involve a larger segment of the population. Most women's rights stories draw a "ho-hum" from editors and are buried in back pages.

The difference may lie in the fact that the Negro drive has been accompanied by violence and thus far the women's effort has not.

In the forefront of the fight is the National Organization for Women (NOW), a militant and vocal group headed by Betty Friedan, author of "The Feminine Mystique."

Formed three years ago, NOW has grown to 2,500 members, including 125 men. It maintains a Washington headquarters at 1424 Sixteenth st., N.W., (zip 20036). Dr. Cathryn Clarenbach, NOW's chairman of the board, keeps the ball rolling in the Middle West where she serves on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin at Madison (zip 53706).

Now is urging a vastly expanded network of child-care centers, supported partly by federal money, to let more women work outside the home or continue their education.

It wants full income-tax deduction for child-care costs for working parents, equal access of women to poverty programs, and an end to the exclusion of women from certain public restaurants.

A more select and conservative group is the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), headed by Elizabeth Boyer, 7657 Dines rd., Novelty, Ohio (44072).

WEAL's membership includes deans of women, college professors, attorneys, judges, writers and business executives. They plan to concentrate on employment and higher education aspects of sex bias.

WEAL plans also to tabulate and distribute Congressional voting records on issues of concern to women.

Over the years the National Women's Party has lobbied actively for the equal rights amendment, as has the National Association of Women Lawyers under President Ruth Gentry Talley and the National Federation of Business and Professional Women under President Hope Roberts.

Mrs. Talley works out of the American Bar Center at 1155 East 60 st., Chicago, Ill., (60637), and Mrs. Roberts from the Federation's headquarters at 2012 Massachusetts ave., NW., Washington, D.C. (20036).

Three other radical groups, on which information is scanty, are operating in and around university campuses. They bear a resemblance to the Students for a Democratic Society which has played a key role in fomenting campus unrest.

These are the Radical Women (mostly white college women), Women's Liberation Movement (mostly white and young), the October 17 Movement (an offshoot of NOW's New York Chapter and which is roughly half white and half Negro).

Women's Liberation Movement picketed the crowning of Miss America in Atlantic City recently, protesting that it was a "degrading, mindless-boob-girlie symbol."

Despite the combined efforts of these groups, the nation as a whole has been slow to recognize that prejudice against women is as costly and demeaning as racial bias.

Should women decide to use their political clout, they could move mountains, but the women's vote has not yet become a cohesive national force.

On paper women voters could clobber the men whom they outnumber by four million. In the big "swing" states of New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Ohio, with a total of 119 electoral votes, the distaff majority of 1.2 million could easily sweep a national candidate to victory.

Generally, however, women have been

namby-pamby about standing up for their rights. Many are hostile to women political candidates. They are suspicious of the concept of equality, a view often rooted in religious beliefs.

Until women themselves mobilize more effectively, the climb toward "equality" will be painfully slow.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 21, 1969]

WHAT DO WOMEN REALLY WANT?

(By Vera Glaser)

WASHINGTON.—Should things be so equal between men and women that love songs and romantic poetry are rendered obsolete? Should a man no longer be able to invite a lady to dinner and expect to pick up the tab?

The answer from most realistic, red-blooded women is a resounding "No!"

Only the most militant call for an out-and-out egalitarian society. Most women recognize that a job is not life's only fulfillment, and may find their deepest satisfactions in home-oriented activities.

The majority recognize that sex prejudice, like racial and religious bias, may never be entirely wiped out.

If put to a vote, the kind of society they prefer might well be similar to the present one, but with the more obvious injustices and discriminations removed.

It is their hope that once men realize what they are doing to stifle women, they will take a more fair-minded stance. Society, they hope, will smile rather than frown on freedom of choice for all of its members, including women.

A prominent woman leader, married and the mother of two, was asked what the fair sex lacks specifically in the way of "equality."

She produced a four-page, typewritten, single-spaced roster of reforms on which she felt reasonable people could agree. Condensed, it called for action on five major fronts:

1. Equal protection under the law.

2. Equal job opportunities and pregnancy leave.

3. An expanded system of day care centers for children.

4. Legalized abortion.

5. A poverty program that does not discriminate against women.

On the legal front, current laws and practices which make distinctions against women were a special target. Any of the following, she pointed out, would be unconstitutional if race were the criterion:

Enforcing higher college admission standards for girls, discouraging or placing quotas on women seeking admission to law and medical schools, permitting publicly supported high schools and colleges to admit only one sex;

State laws banning women from certain jobs, restricting their hours or the weights they may lift on a job;

Heavier court sentences for women than men for the same offenses.

The Justice Department, she urged, should participate in cases involving sex bias in the same manner it has pursued on racial bias.

Marital property laws, she is convinced, are due for overhaul. They should be identical for both partners.

For example, husband and wife should assume joint liability for the support of the household and children in money or services, and for the personal expenses of a partner who is unable to work.

State laws which permit a husband to leave his wife a tiny fragment of his property, and in some cases nothing, or where wives lack the same legal powers as their spouses, should be revised.

On the job front, the federal government should vigorously enforce equal pay for equal work laws. It should upgrade salaries for such "women's" occupations as clerical, nursing, and teaching.

It should name women to top federal positions in recognition of their abilities and as an incentive to young girls. It should set an example in opening up promotion opportunities to women up and down the line.

Pregnancy leave should be granted in the same way as that for other temporary disabilities.

A system of efficiently-run day care centers, partly financed by the government should be established as a service to the family and the nation, not as a sop for women.

On the poverty front, the program should give as much attention to the needs of deprived girls as boys. It should recognize that a third of all poor families are headed by women.

Women should be accepted into military service under the same standards as men.

To some, her proposals may seem as far out today as space travel seemed 10 years ago.

But the pressures of a competitive world are building, and the United States may have to reassess some attitudes to properly capitalize on all of its human resources.

On an individual level, the woman who is treated with fairness and dignity by a man will have only more—not less—respect for him as a man. As in all areas of prejudice, it has been demonstrated that a feeling of equality lifts everybody up. It pulls no one down.

PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it has now been a year since President Johnson announced the curtailment of bombing in Vietnam and the move toward negotiations of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

I know we are all deeply disappointed that, despite the diligent efforts of top officials of two national administrations, peace has so far eluded us.

But I believe that now is a most appropriate time to reemphasize and reinvigorate our search for a workable basis for achieving our goal of a just peace in Vietnam.

Certainly, the cause of peace in Southeast Asia is one in which every American has an intense, personal interest.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I share with all my colleagues in the House an urgent desire that we find equitable terms on which to build an enduring peace with freedom in that war-torn part of the world.

In recent weeks, there have been indications, both in Vietnam and at the Paris negotiations, that hopefully foreshadow a greater degree of diplomatic flexibility on both sides, as well as improved prospects for conducting meaningful discussion to end that tragic conflict through an agreed settlement which would preserve the honor of the United States, protect our vital interests, while allowing the people of South Vietnam to determine the affairs of their own nation in their own way.

We should be quick to seize these opportunities as a possible turning point in the movement toward a just and lasting peace in Vietnam.

Then, we can join with the other members of the world community of nations in working with the people of a Southeast Asia—no longer ravaged by the terrible scourge of war—to turn the tremendous resources and energies of the entire area, once and for all, away from conflict, and toward the creative task of building a more secure foundation for a better way of life in the future.

BIRMINGHAM FESTIVAL OF ARTS

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the city of Birmingham, Ala., which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, honors a nation during its annual festival of arts. This spring Italy was the honored nation in the planned activities from February 20 through March 30. The calendar of events included ballets, plays, concerts, Italian art exhibits, opera, and the international fair.

Congratulations are in order to this year's festival chairman, Mrs. Alan B. Drennen, and the festival of arts president, Sidney Smyer, Jr. Their tireless efforts resulted in one of Birmingham's finest festivals to date.

As the Birmingham magazine, the monthly publication of the chamber of commerce, stated in its festival issue, the true climate of a city is much more than its temperature and humidity, its sunshine and rainfall.

There is the climate of the mind, of the spirit, of the energy, and of the imagination. The truest climate of a city is measured through its people.

Because of the involvement of its people, Birmingham is celebrating this spring a festival of arts known around the world.

To it, people give their time; hundreds of hours.

To it, people give their money; thousands of dollars.

For it, they create.

For it, they labor.

In it, they participate; the fullest measure of their interest. More than 200,000 people enjoyed the 1969 Festival of Arts' Salute to Italy and The Healing Arts, browsing among the citywide art exhibitions, applauded the dozens of plays and concerts, viewed the television features, lunched at the downtown sidewalk cafes, toured the spectacular International Fair, heard noted authors.

For 18 years, Birmingham has dedicated America's oldest continuous arts festival to the conviction that through the unity of the arts, nations and men can become united.

From without, in 1968, the festival honoring Greece received a letter of endorsement from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. The resulting story was transmitted worldwide by the U.S. Information Agency.

This year the Vatican made Birmingham its first loan of art objects since sending The Pieta to the New York

World's Fair. The letter of notification stated:

The Holy Father is happy to be able to contribute in this small way, hoping that this will be a practical acknowledgment of the Italian Catholic community's cultural and religious contribution to the development of Alabama.

From within, the festival has stimulated unity between Birminghamians of foreign descent and native citizens. It embraces all local arts groups, focusing their talents on a singular subject.

This year the festival was chosen one of 20 top travel events in America for March by the National Association of Travel Organizations in Washington, D.C.

Its growth has been a continuing quality, with setbacks, and some years better than others. But of one fact all Birmingham people can be certain in 1969 upon the opening the Salute to Italy and The Healing Arts.

Because of what they have wanted to do for it, because they would settle for no less, their Festival of Arts has attained true world eminence.

As for the performing arts—which is what Birmingham's Festival of Arts is all about—one could not but be impressed with what was produced, heard, and seen between March 14 and March 30 throughout the city.

The first performance of "Romeo and Juliet," by an American ballet company, opened the festival on Friday night, March 14, danced by the Alabama Ballet Company of the University of Alabama. Alexander Bennett, former principal dancer of the Royal Ballet, taught the Royal Ballet choreography of the classic love story.

At the other end of the spectrum, the foremost Italian portrait sculptor in the world, Gualberto Rocchi, completed a bust of the Honorable Lister Hill, immediate past senior Senator from Alabama. The bronze sculpture was dedicated on March 30 in Birmingham's Medical Center, completing the festival's double salute, to Italy and the healing arts.

In between were more than 50 Italian-related performances.

Three operas of the contemporary Italian composer, Gian-Carlo Menotti, were festival presentations. His three-act composition, "The Consul," which was awarded "best musical drama of the year" by the New York Drama Critics Circle, was performed by the Birmingham Civic Opera Association at Clarke Memorial Theater, March 28–29. Two one-act Menotti operas, "The Telephone" and "The Old Maid and the Thief" were productions of the Samford University Speech and Drama Department March 21–22 and 24–25 at the campus Arena Theater.

Music from the Italian opera, "La Gioconda," was played by Allegro Music Club on March 25 at the Birmingham Museum of Art. The concert was planned around the most famous music from the work, the ballet, "Dance of the Hours." Other composers honored on the program were Scarlatti, Dello Joio, and D'Agostino.

In recognition of Italian church music, Palestrina's "Mass of Pope Marcellus" was sung by the choir of Independent Presbyterian Church, directed by Joseph Schreiber, on March 30. In contrast to Palestrina's composition, written in 1562, an all-English contemporary mass, the "Festival Mass of William Marsh," was a highlight of the Pontifical Mass on March 23 at St. Paul's Co-Cathedral. Guest organist was Michael G. Baird III of the University of Alabama. Dr. Patrick Moultis directed the choir.

A "Salute to Italy" by the Birmingham Creative Dance Group featured five dances, including "The Red Dancing Slippers," a ballet for children from an Italian story, and "Homage to Italy." Both dances were choreographed by Laura Toffel, director of the creative dancers. The performance was March 23 at 3 p.m. at the new theater at Birmingham-Southern College.

The Festival's two principal stage productions were as far removed from each other in tempo and mood as Venice and Sicily. One, "The Menaechmi," is a belly-laughter. The other, "Six Characters in Search of An Author," is probing and philosophical.

Samford University Players gave four performances, March 14–15 and 17–18, in the campus Arena Theater.

A Festival of contemporary Italian film was the offering of the Junior League of Birmingham, March 24, 25, 26 at the League building, 2212 20th Avenue South. Those selected were "Casanova 70," Ponti, director; "Red Desert," Antonioni; and "Juliet of the Spirits," Fellini.

Birmingham television celebrates the Festival, too. WBRC–TV presented a half-hour special on the events and personalities as did WBIQ–TV, educational television.

Listed below is a calendar of activities during this year's Festival:

PRE-FESTIVAL EVENTS

Thursday, February 20

Cinema Unlimited presents "Tosca" starring Franco Corelli in color, Alabama Theater, Matinee and evening.

Friday, March 7

8:30 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia, Birmingham-Southern College—Birmingham Civic Ballet Ensemble.

Saturday, March 8

3 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia. Birmingham-Southern College.

8:30 p.m. Ballet Festival Italia. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

Sunday, March 9

3 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

FESTIVAL EVENTS

Friday, March 14

8 p.m. University of Alabama in Birmingham presents Alabama Ballet Company in "Romeo and Juliet." Shades Valley High School.

8 p.m. Samford University Drama Department presents "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Samford University Arena Theater.

10:30 p.m. Reception following performance of "Romeo and Juliet", Shades Valley High School, honoring "Miss America," Judith Ann Ford of Illinois.

Saturday, March 15

Noon. Books and Authors Luncheon. Tutwiler Hotel. Three national authors.

8 p.m. "Romeo and Juliet." Alabama Ballet Company. Presented by the University of Alabama in Birmingham.

8 p.m. "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Samford University Arena Theater.

8:30 p.m. "Fiddler on the Roof," starring Joe Cusanelli, Municipal Auditorium. Benefit performance sponsored by Council of Jewish Women.

Sunday, March 16

3 p.m. Ballet Festival, Italia. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

3 p.m. Art exhibit. Birmingham University School Town Hall Gallery. (x)

3 p.m. Connoisseur Concerts, "Musical Italy Revisited," Birmingham Museum of Art. (x)

Monday, March 17

8 p.m. "Six Characters in Search of an Author," Samford University, Arena Theater.

Tuesday, March 18

8 p.m. Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Hans Richter-Haaser, pianist. Temple Theater.

8 p.m. "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Samford University Arena Theater.

Wednesday, March 19

8 p.m. University of Alabama in Birmingham presents Town and Gown Play, "The Menaechmi" Clark Memorial Theater.

10 p.m. Town and Gown Reception honoring Festival of Arts.

Thursday, March 20

8 p.m. "The Menaechmi" repeat performance. Clark Memorial Theater.

8 p.m. ETV program. "Salute to Italy." 30 minutes. All ETV channels.

Friday, March 21

1 p.m. to 10 p.m. International Fair Opens Municipal Auditorium. Opening ceremony by Mayor George Seibels at 1 p.m.

8 p.m. Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Temple Theater.

8 p.m. "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Telephone." Samford University drama department opera production at campus Arena Theater.

8 p.m. "The Menaechmi" Clark Theater.

Saturday, March 22

10 a.m.-10 p.m. International Fair.

10 a.m.-5 p.m. Studio Art Tours. (x)

6:30 p.m. Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce and Ambassador's Reception at Art Museum. Dinner and fashion show at Birmingham Municipal Auditorium and exhibition hall honoring Italian Ambassador to U.S., His Excellency, Egidio Ortona.

6:30 a.m. "Salute to Italy." Channel 6.

8 p.m. Patrons Artists Council, east. (PACE) art exhibit. Roebuck Community Center. March 20–22. (x) "The Menaechmi." Clark Theater.

Sunday, March 23

1 p.m.-10 p.m. International Fair.

10:30 a.m. Liturgical Service of the Mass. St. Paul's Co-Cathedral, Third Avenue and 22nd Street North.

1 p.m.-5 p.m. Studio Art Tours. (x)

3 p.m. "The Red Dancing Slippers." Birmingham Creative Dance Group. Birmingham-Southern College Theater.

Monday, March 24

10 a.m.-10 p.m. International Fair. Municipal Auditorium.

8 p.m. "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Telephone." Samford University drama department operas. Arena Theater.

8 p.m. "Italian Film Festival." Presented by Junior League of Birmingham at Junior League Building. 2212 20th Ave. South. (x)

Tuesday, March 25

10 a.m.-10 p.m. International Fair. Municipal Auditorium.

2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m. "Italian Music." Allegro Music Club, Birmingham Museum of Art. (x)

8 p.m. "The Old Maid and the Thief" and "The Telephone." Samford University Drama department operas. Arena Theater.

8 p.m. Italian Film Festival. Junior League Building, 2212 20th Ave. South. (x)

Wednesday, March 26

10 a.m.-6 p.m. International Fair.

8 p.m. Italian Film Festival. Junior League Building. 2212 20th Ave. South. "An Attitude and Media." (x)

Thursday, March 27

8 p.m. ETV. "Salute to Italy."

Friday, March 28

8 p.m. Birmingham Civic Opera, "The Consul," with Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Clark Memorial Theater.

Saturday, March 29

6:30 a.m. "Salute to Italy." Channel 6

7 p.m. Italian Film Festival, "An Attitude and Media." Junior League Building, 2212 20th Ave. South. (x)

7:30 p.m. Architects Ball. Birmingham chapter, American Institute of Architects. Roma Country Club.

8 p.m. "The Consul." With Birmingham Symphony Orchestra. Clark Memorial Theater.

Sunday, March 30

4 p.m. Pope Marcellus Mass. Giovanni Palestrina. Independent Presbyterian Church. (x)

7 p.m. Italian Film Festival. "An Attitude and Media." Junior League Building, 2212 20th Ave. South.

ART EXHIBITS

Saturday, March 1

Birmingham-Southern College. From Marlborough Gallery, N.Y., and Fonino Galeria, N.Y., Paintings and Sculpture.

March 14–30

Birmingham Museum of Art. "The Pope's Tiara" and the Garibaldi relics. From Findlay Galleries.

Samford University Buchanan Gallery. Hammer Gallery, N.Y.

March 17–30

Birmingham Public Library, Rare book exhibit. The Salvadore Dali Bible.

The Festival of Art Honor exhibitor.

Children's Department, Winners of elementary city art.

March 16–30

Town Hall Gallery, Birmingham University School. Crescenzi Gallery. Paintings.

March 20–22

Patrons Artists Council, East, (PACE) art exhibit. Roebuck Community Center.

10 a.m.–5 p.m. Studio Art Tours.

March 21–26

International Fair. Municipal Auditorium.

Birmingham School Exhibit.

Italian Reproductions from Doges Palace, Venice.

March 22–29

Parochial Schools "Spring Art and Music Festival" at Eastwood Mall and Five Points West shopping center.

March 14–30

Exchange Security Bank.

Gallery 31.

Littlehous-on-Linden.

West End Baptist Hospital.

Henderson's Fine Arts Downtown and Mountain Brook.

Indurall Decorating, 2223 Seventh Ave. South.

Relay House. Exhibit of Ray Ellis, New York water colorist.

Miles College, Paintings and other art.

PACE, Patrons, Artists Council, East. Roebuck Community Center.

"The Club." Paintings.

Downtown Club. Paintings by Cornelia Rivers.

Municipal Auditorium Exhibition Hall Piranesi Prints.

Pizitz Department Store.

University of Alabama Medical Center. Bust of Lister Hill by Rocchi.

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 1st Sgt. Edward C. Cofield, Sp4c. David A. Russell, and M. Sgt. Willis F. House, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DEAD IN VIETNAM—ALL ARMY MEN, ONE HAD BEEN LISTED MISSING EARLIER

Two Maryland men were reported killed in action in Vietnam and a third, previously reported as missing, has been listed officially as dead, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Killed in action were:

Army 1st Sgt. Edward C. Cofield, 34, the husband of Mrs. Sylvia A. Cofield of Takoma Park, reported killed March 16.

Army Spec. 4 David A. Russell, 21, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard I. Russell, of St. Clement Shores, near Leonardtown, killed Monday by sniper fire near Can Tho.

Army M. Sgt. Willis F. House, the husband of Mrs. Elizabeth G. House, of 7509 East Furnace Branch road, in Glen Burnie, first reported missing March 13.

Sergeant Cofield, awarded the Bronze Star for valor in October, 1968, was killed in a surprise ambush by the Viet Cong outside his base, near Da Nang.

Born in North Carolina, he moved with his family to Washington when he was 13 and quit high school to join the Army.

Sergeant Cofield had been in Vietnam since June and was scheduled to return home June 7. He had been in the Army for 12 years.

According to his wife, he was a "devoted soldier and father, and died fighting for something he loved."

He had many friends who criticized the war in Vietnam as an unjust war, she said, but he always replied that he was fighting there "so you can voice your own opinions."

He had a daughter, Lynda, 14, and two sons, Victor, Charles, 5, and wanted both to follow in his footsteps, she said.

Specialist Russell, who was on a secret mission at the time of his death, was a photographer for the Army and had planned to go into commercial photography upon discharge.

He had been in Vietnam for nearly six months.

One of nine children, he graduated from Leonardtown High School and worked for the Naval Air Test Center at the Patuxent Naval Air Station.

According to his mother, he had planned to go to photographic school in San Francisco and then go into partnership with a friend.

He was stationed at Long Binh, in South Vietnam, but was on a mission taking motion pictures when fatally wounded.

Besides his parents, he is survived by five brothers, Richard I., Jr., Robert S., Donald G., Charles P., and Karl F.; and three sisters, Linda Marie, Agnus Cecilia and Carolyn Anne, all of Leonardtown.

EDITOR ASKS JOINT PROJECT BY BAR, PRESS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished executive editor of the Chicago Tribune, Mr. Clayton Kirkpatrick, recently proposed that in an effort to improve the quality of justice, a project be undertaken jointly by the press and bar.

I believe that Mr. Kirkpatrick's proposal is deserving of the most serious consideration, and it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD today, an article which appeared recently in the Chicago Tribune outlining his suggestion, which I believe should be immediately attempted.

The Tribune article follows:

EDITOR ASKS JOINT PROJECT BY BAR, PRESS—STAND AGAINST NEWS RESTRICTION DEFENDED

A joint project by the press and bar to improve the quality of justice was proposed last night by Clayton Kirkpatrick, executive editor of The Tribune.

At the same time he proposed a moratorium on the debate which has lasted for five years between editors and lawyers over restrictions on press coverage of court proceedings in criminal cases.

Kirkpatrick, in an address before the quarter-annual dinner meeting of the Chicago Bar association, in its headquarters at 29 La Salle st. detailed his reasons for proposing both the joint project and the moratorium.

AWARDS ARE PRESENTED

At the meeting, the American Bar association's Gavel awards were presented to stations W-G-N and WGN-TV jointly and to Station WBBN-TV. These awards, previously announced, are for programs contributing to knowledge of the legal system. Receiving them were Ward L. Quaal, president of WGN Continental Broadcasting company, and Edward R. Kenefick, WBBN-TV vice president and general manager.

Kirkpatrick told the assembled lawyers that less than one per cent of those who pass thru courts on criminal charges in Cook county ever are mentioned in the news media.

Thus, he observed, the alleged prejudicial publicity involved in the "free press-fair trial" controversy "can never affect more than a tiny fraction of defendants in criminal cases."

MUST GET NEWS

Then he cited statistics to illustrate how much more important it is to the public in general that the quality of justice be improved.

Kirkpatrick referred to Chicago Crime commission reports showing 50,361 burglary, robbery, and murder offenses committed within Chicago last year, with 18,771 of these "cleared by arrest" by city police. He noted that numerous other robberies, burglaries, and murders were committed in suburban Cook county.

"Yet for the entire county of Cook only 1,825 indictments charging these offenses were returned by grand juries," Kirkpatrick continued. "The indictments named 2,690 persons as defendants. Of the 1,840 defendants to these charges tried in the Criminal courts only 728 were sentenced to the penitentiary."

MANY GET AWAY

From these figures, he noted that chances of committing burglary, robbery, and murder in Cook county and escaping jail are better than 50 to 1.

"I submit that this is a shocking indictment of our whole system of criminal investigation and prosecution," he said.

Kirkpatrick, also citing soaring national crime rates, said he thought his listeners would find in these and other available statistics "a far richer lode of defects in justice than in the few highly publicized cases which gave rise to the present tensions between the press and the bench and the bar."

He suggested that "some of the time, money, and talent" the legal profession has devoted to "restraining the press" be devoted to the proposed new project.

He added, "The need seems so compelling to me that I think the press would join you."

PRESS STAND DEFENDED

Kirkpatrick also defended at length opposition of the press to restrictions which have been imposed on news coverage of criminal proceedings with intent to assure fair trials.

He said some of these restrictions "have created ideal conditions for corruption, incompetence, and indifference among policemen, prosecutors, and judges."

"They put a muzzle on the watchdog which serves as the proxy observer for all citizens in the courts," he said. "This is a greater hazard to justice than so-called prejudicial publicity."

He said the goal of management of the nation's legal processes should be both a free press and a fair trial, rather than one or the other.

Kirkpatrick said there has been steady deemphasis by newspapers of crime news because studies have shown crime news is far down in reader preference.

"We don't cover crime for sensation and scandal but because it is a serious social problem," he said.

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator BYRD, the senior Senator from Virginia, made some very pointed and timely comments in reference to the proposed expansion of Washington National Airport.

The remarks of Senator BYRD were commented on editorially by the Staunton (Va.) Leader. Because I think it is of considerable interest to all Members, therefore, I would like to include the editorial of Friday, March 21, of the Staunton, (Va.) Leader as follows:

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr., D-Va., is undoubtedly right in his opposition to expansion of National Airport, which carries most of the air traffic in and out of Washington. It lies on the Virginia side of the Potomac and offers somewhat faster access to the capital than Dulles International Airport once the passenger is on the ground.

Dulles is also in Virginia. As Sen. Byrd said in a Senate speech, it "was built specifically to provide for the day when National became overcrowded, and it is clear that day has arrived."

It arrived some time ago, as many Stauntonians and others residing in the Upper Valley who fly out of Shenandoah Valley Airport to Washington have been saying.

Airline demands for expansion of National won some support last year. But as Sen. Byrd told his colleagues, architects can provide workable plans for expanding terminal facilities but "are powerless to create more air space, and that air space is alarmingly full". That it is, as any airline passenger with National as his destination, departure or transfer port could tell the government.

Why the big airlines have persisted in using National rather than Dulles has been a puzzle for some time. The Dulles facilities are thoroughly modern, the skies are not crowded, and neither are the runways or loading bays. Good highways and fast public transport have been provided. But refusal to make the shift from National has resulted in the handling there last year of 10 million passengers, although the rated capacity is four million.

Congress should not appropriate funds for expansion of National Airport, especially when huge public funds went into construction of Dulles to accommodate the increased traffic foreseen. There are grave risks to life in the crowded skies over National—a fact which, coupled with a turn-down by Congress, the expense and public dissatisfaction, should force airlines to restudy their traffic patterns and transfer a heavy volume of their business to Dulles.

SENATE—*Monday, April 14, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for the beauty of the world about us—for buds and blossoms, for verdant hills and lush meadows, for gentle rains, for the calm warmth of the sun and caressing breezes, for the star-lit night, for the lyric notes of the birds, and for all that combines in the symphony of nature to remind us of our origin in Thee. Create in us a character and spirit in harmony with the world about us that we may serve Thee in newness of life.

Bless this land, which Thou hast given us, with honorable industry, sound learning, pure manners, and true justice that we may be a united people who walk and work and witness to the glory of Thy higher kingdom.

For it is in Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 10, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on April 10, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, April 14, 1969.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 3, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan.

S. 586. An act for the relief of Ngyen Van Hue.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-96)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

As the Members of Congress know, I have had under consideration the question of whether to send to the Congress this year a message on the state of the Union. I have decided against doing so. However, to assist Congress in formulating its plans, I would like to indicate at this time some of the principal legislative proposals that I will be sending in the weeks immediately ahead, and to report on the development of Administration plans and priorities as they relate to domestic programs.

The first twelve weeks of the new Administration have been devoted intensively to the pursuit of peace abroad, and to the development of new structures and new programs for the pursuit of progress at home.

Peace has been the first priority. It concerns the future of civilization; and even in terms of our domestic needs themselves, what we are able to do will depend in large measure on the prospects for an early end to the war in Viet Nam.

At the same time, the first days of this Administration have afforded us a unique opportunity to study the nation's