

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10532. A bill for the relief of Theodora Gouloumis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10533. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Molina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 10534. A bill for the relief of Atkinson,

Haserick & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 10535. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Magasin Eduvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 10536. A bill for the relief of Doug-

las F. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 373. Resolution for the relief of Henry D. Espy, James A. Espy, Naomi A. Espy, Jean E. Logan, and Theodore R. Espy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LT. GEN. SAMUEL C. PHILLIPS

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, while Wyoming's population is relatively small, the achievements of her citizens are numerous. I would today like to extol the accomplishments of one outstanding Wyomingite, Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, director of the Apollo program.

General Phillips was born in Cheyenne and graduated from the University of Wyoming in 1942 with a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering, later earning his masters degree in the same field. He joined the Air Force after graduation and received his pilot's wings the following year. For splendid military service, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Medal with seven Oak Leaf Clusters, Croix de Guerre, the Army Commendation Ribbon, and the Legion of Merit.

His postwar assignment as chief of the Air Defense Missile Division introduced him to the then embryonic space program. Growing with this program, he was promoted to brigadier general and respectively named director of the Minuteman project, vice commander of ballistic systems and deputy director of the Apollo program. Only 9 months after the latter assignment, he was appointed director of the Apollo mission and became the youngest officer ever to have held the three-star rank of lieutenant general.

Standing on the threshold of the great frontier of space, in an age where strong defense is necessary for the preservation of peace, we realize the awesomeness of the future and offer gratitude to General Phillips for his superb leadership, distinguished service, and unyielding interest in the welfare of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, an article on General Phillips entitled "Man at the Top of America's Space Program," which appeared in the March-April 1969 issue of the *Alumnus* of the University of Wyoming:

MAN AT THE TOP OF AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM

Launching was the smoothest of any in the Apollo series. Splashdown was right on target. The filmy lunar "spider" passed all its tests. Docking between spider and Apollo was accomplished without a slip.

You saw it all on TV and wondered at the scientific achievement of man. Perhaps you knew, but did not fully recognize, the importance of one man to this latest of American space flights. Although the Astronauts aboard Apollo 9, the personnel at the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston, the thousands

of men moving about like ants at Cape Kennedy, all work as a team, the man who stands at the top of America's space program is Lt. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, who took his bachelor of science degree at the University of Wyoming in electrical engineering in 1942.

A quiet, unassuming man, General Phillips has been with the space program almost since its inception. An officer in the Air Force on loan to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), he became associated with the Apollo program early in 1964, and in the ensuing five years has guided America through its complicated series of space flights that will culminate, hopefully, with the landing of a man on the moon next July.

One more testing flight, scheduled now to go in May, will precede the mid-summer moon landing. This flight will be a landing rehearsal within 50,000 feet of the moon in Apollo 10. Hinging on its outcome is the dramatic flight that will allow man to realize his long goal of reaching the moon. Its achievement will reflect the nation's vision and the strength of today's science and technology.

When this landing takes place it will be the culmination of years of research and test flights. Boosting Apollo 10 and the later moon landing will be Saturn V, a modification of the original Saturn I, which took 10 successful payloads into earth orbit between 1958 and 1965.

The NASA field center responsible for Saturn development is the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., directed by Dr. Wernher von Braun. The Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Texas, is in charge of developing the Apollo spacecraft training the astronauts and maintaining flight control. The Kennedy Space Center in Florida is in charge of preparing launch facilities and conducting launchings.

The first launch of Saturn IB, second generation of the Saturn family, came early in 1966. Other launchings in this series followed in July and August of 1966 and January, 1968. Largest vehicle in the project is the present three-stage Saturn V, which is capable of placing a payload of more than 125 tons into earth orbit or sending about 50 tons to the moon. Chrysler Corporation builds the Saturn IB stages at the NASA-Michoud Assembly Facility in New Orleans. McDonnell Douglas Corporation makes the Saturn IVB stage at Huntington Beach, Calif.

The Marshall Center and The Boeing Company jointly developed the Saturn V first stage and Boeing is the prime contractor.

The instrument unit sitting atop the spacecraft is the "brain" or "nerve center" of the Saturn vehicles. From this center come commands to carry out the intricate maneuvering necessary for the rocket's successful operation in space. International Business Machines Corporation is supplier of the guidance signal processor and guidance computer and is the prime contractor for the unit.

Engines for the powerful rockets, which generate a mean thrust of 205,000 pounds, are made by Rocketdyne Division of North American Rockwell Corporation.

General Phillips has been well satisfied with the nation's space program to date, with the exception of the tragic fire in Houston in 1967 which took the lives of astronauts then in training for the next flight.

However, he feels that space flight is only

beginning in the modern world. In a recent interview with *Data*, a magazine published by Queensmith Associates, Inc., in Washington, D.C., General Phillips had this to say, "Manned space flight is still in a very primitive formative stage, even with the magnificent progress which has been made. We are still in our infancy. Compare it with the airplane, for example. In the very early days of the airplane, many people said it would never be commercially profitable nor militarily applicable. Yet look at the airplane today. Look at the rate of change of technology today compared with the last 10 years."

This conviction that military applications of space are inevitable, and that this country had better be in a position to know how to operate when the need is clear, is one of the many reasons Phillips has devoted so many years as a military officer to doing what he can to further the development of space operations, according to *Data*.

"There has never been a transportation medium in the history of man that has not been exploited for economic and military advantage. Space is not going to be any exception," Phillips said.

"The gravest mistake that this country can make," he continued, "is to fail to develop the technology and the operations that will allow this country to be, hopefully, in a position of initiative in its own defense; but as a minimum to be in a position to react if it becomes apparent that some other nation chooses to use man in space as a means of furthering its own national interests by applications to military forces. And that day is coming."

The soft-spoken officer, who lives in Washington, D.C., and has an office looking out toward the nation's capitol, spends his time shuttling back and forth between Washington, Houston and Cape Kennedy. He is always on hand when a flight is launched.

He has spent much of his life travelling about the globe, even before his association with the space program. Immediately after graduation from UW he entered the Air Force as a second lieutenant and earned his pilot's wings in 1943. Wartime duties included two combat tours in England and with the 364th fighter group of the 8th Air Force. He earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal with seven Oak Leaf Clusters, and Croix de Guerre.

After the war he remained in Europe, assigned to theater headquarters, Frankfurt, Germany, until July 1945. His meritorious service during this period earned him the Army Commendation Ribbon.

From 1948 to 1950 he attended the University of Michigan and earned an MS degree there in electrical engineering, specializing in electronics. Following his graduation he joined the engineering division of the Air Material Command at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, and remained there in research and development work for six years, with two short interludes for other assignments.

At Wright-Patterson he served as director of operations in the Armament Laboratory; B-52 Project Officer; and Chief of the Air Defense Missiles Division, working on such missiles as Falcon and Bomarc.

Another period of duty in England, beginning in June 1956, gave him an opportunity to participate in writing the international agreement with Great Britain on use of the

Thor IRBM. Later, as 7th Air Division Director of Material, his duties included assisting in the completion of Thor IRBM installations for turn-over to the RAF, for which he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

Upon his return to the United States in 1959 he was assigned to the Ballistic Missiles Division of the Air Research and Development Command as director of the Minute-man program, where he continued until August 1963. During this time he was promoted to brigadier general in the Air Force, thought to be the nation's youngest general officer.

He was made vice commander of the Ballistic Systems in August 1963 and in January 1964 moved on to become deputy director of the Apollo Program. Nine months later he was appointed director of this program. In May 1968 he was promoted to lieutenant general, still the youngest officer to hold this three-star rank.

Having been reared in Cheyenne, General Phillips calls Wyoming his home, and his mother, two brothers and a sister reside there. Mrs. Phillips, the former Betty Anne Brown, is also from Cheyenne.

The general makes frequent trips to Wyoming, among them the time in the fall of 1962 when he was named Distinguished Alumnus of the University and in the spring of 1963 when he received an honorary degree from the University.

Although General Phillips is the director of America's space flight program, he is not the only UW alumnus associated with the project. Literally thousands of alumni, too numerous to locate and name, are involved in both large and small roles in this all-important program for the nation's defense and growth.

But he doesn't expect everyone else to believe as strongly as he does, "until it happens in your own home town."

THE FBI

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I served as a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a short time in the early 1940's. I have continued to hold the organization and its distinguished Director, J. Edgar Hoover, in the highest esteem. It has disturbed me through the years to see the FBI unjustly attacked by its enemies and by extremists on both the left and the right. It long has been my contention, however, that the very fact that extremists of both the left and the right have criticized the FBI is good indication the organization is carrying out its responsibilities in a completely objective manner—exactly as it is supposed to do.

There is a new book on the market now entitled "The FBI in Our Open Society," written by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. In this book the authors take a close look at much of the criticism which has been leveled at the FBI and expose it to cold, hard facts. I would recommend this book to every American as worthwhile reading. I would also like to place in the RECORD at this time an excellent editorial from the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., of April 11, 1969, concerning this book. The writer of this editorial, Mike Kingston, ably describes some of the major points in the book. The editorial follows:

OCV—639—Part 8

THE PROBLEM WITH THE FBI IS

(By Mike Kingston)

"The problem with the FBI is . . ." So runs the theme of critical books and articles about the investigative arm of the Justice Department.

The criticisms cover a lot of political territory: The FBI is a police-state agency; it's communist-infiltrated; it's fascist; it's pro civil rights; it's anticivil rights. So goes the endless list of charges that range to the FBI's organization in 1908.

The Communist party of the United States regularly charges the bureau with police-state tactics and opposition to basic constitutional rights. This figures, since the party has been under close observation for more than 50 years. Civil-rights groups are equally critical, but for a different reason. They claim the FBI ignores their cause.

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet have taken a new look at the agency in a recent book published by W. W. Norton, Inc., "The FBI in Our Open Society."

Most criticism arises from a lack of understanding of the bureau's basic nature. It was organized as the investigative branch of the Justice Department. Prior to 1908, the department's investigations were carried out either by private detectives or by agents "borrowed" from the Secret Service.

Atty. Gen. Charles Joseph Bonaparte, who was considered an outstanding liberal of his day for his record in social reform work in Maryland, felt that neither investigative practice was acceptable.

Bonaparte called on Congress for creation of the department's own staff. The proposed bureau's investigators would owe allegiance only to the Justice Department.

There were abuses of power during the early days of the FBI. Finally, the corruption and abuses of power during the Harding administration prompted a housecleaning. Atty. Gen. Harlan Stone, later a justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, named a young attorney, J. Edgar Hoover, as director of the bureau with orders to clean it up.

Hoover's course was simple: The FBI would operate within the jurisdiction designated by orders from the attorney general, the president and laws by Congress. And this is the course it has followed.

The FBI's responsibility is to investigate certain alleged violations of federal law. If Congress does not grant investigative powers to another agency, it automatically falls under the FBI's jurisdiction.

Some critics claim that growth of the bureau reflects Hoover's personal quest for power. But more accurately, it reflects expansion of federal laws the bureau is called upon to enforce.

The bureau is charged with national security under presidential order, and in this jurisdiction it has kept domestic Communists under surveillance for many years. When a law is broken, the violator is prosecuted. The CPUSA, consequently, is a vehement critic of the FBI.

Unfortunately, many liberals see the bureau in the same light. Civil-rights activists have charged that FBI agents have worked in consort with Southern officers to deprive Negroes and others of their civil rights. Some have suggested that enforcement of civil-rights laws be taken out of the bureau's hands and given to some other agency.

Typical of misinformation on which some liberals base their criticism is the death of civil-rights worker Medgar Evers in Jackson, Miss., in 1963. Many charged that the bureau should have given Evers and his family protection following threats on his life. Its failure to do so was judged proof that enforcement of civil-rights laws should be removed from the bureau's jurisdiction.

The bureau, however, is not empowered to provide protection for anyone. This is the responsibility of the local police, and Hoover

has meticulously separated federal and local jurisdictions to keep the FBI from developing into a police-state agency.

In the Evers case, the FBI did investigate and develop a case against a suspect for conspiring to violate another's civil rights. The evidence and the suspect were turned over to local authorities, who filed murder charges. Juries later acquitted the suspect on two occasions.

Criticism from the far right and the Ku Klux Klan is of a different stripe. According to them, the FBI's activities in enforcement of civil-rights laws is an indication that it has been infiltrated by Communists, although Director Hoover is spared direct criticism.

And so it goes. From the left and right, the criticism continues. Many critical exposés, the Overstreets observe and document, contain so many inaccuracies and innuendoes that at best they are "intellectually dishonest."

So the real problem with the FBI seems to be that it is operating within the framework of law and presidential order as it should. The "problem" will remain only a figment of imagination until the agency starts trying to anticipate what Congress will pass into law or sets its own standards as to which laws it will enforce and which it won't. Under Hoover's leadership, neither course is likely.

TOWNSHIP REPRESENTATION ON ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, cosponsored by 30 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, which would amend the law establishing the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—Public Law 86-380—to add two representatives from towns or townships to such commission.

The Advisory Commission, as you will recall, consists of members appointed from the executive branch, the House and Senate, Governors, members of the State legislatures, representatives from the cities, representatives of county government, and, if our bill is enacted, representatives from towns and township government. This Commission is charged with the responsibility of effecting mutually advantageous liaison between the several levels of government and orderly participation by all such levels of government in Federal programming.

There are more than 20 States which still retain the township form of government, with an estimated 40 million persons residing in these towns or townships. Heretofore, township representation on the Advisory Commission could be accomplished through selection of township officials who serve on county boards of supervisors as county representatives on the Advisory Commission. With the courts' new decisions on apportionment of county boards of supervisors and legal rulings related thereto, township officers will no longer be able to serve on county boards of supervisors in my State—and no doubt others—and as a consequence the township level of government will not be represented on the Commission.

In many States, township officers and township government play a significant role in our total governmental structure. If the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is to truly reflect all political subdivisions and levels of government, townships must be represented on the Commission.

Briefly stated, the legislation I introduce today would increase the membership of the Advisory Commission from 26 to 28 members, the two new members to be appointed by the President from a panel of at least four elected town or township officials submitted by the National Association of Town and Township Officials. The two new members may not be residents of the same State, and shall serve without compensation as is presently true with regard to members representing city and county government.

I realize, from my conversations with persons familiar with the activities of the Commission, that others have sought to expand representation on the Commission, for example to include county assessors. Our bill, however, would provide representation for a level of government—towns and townships—not a constituent office of a level of government already represented on the Commission.

Particularly in view of the fact that the provisions of this bill will represent negligible cost to government, I am hopeful that the majority of my colleagues will join in supporting this important amendatory legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ACTS ARBITRARILY IN CLOSING POPLAR BLUFF JOB CORPS CENTER

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a Job Corps center in my district has been marked for closing. A heavy preponderance of the credible evidence discloses without equivocation that a number of less effective and less efficient centers are remaining open. This is a sad commentary because we are left with the very real fact that the President and his Secretary of Labor permitted criteria other than that of efficiency and effectiveness to dictate which centers are to remain open and which are to be closed. Below are my remarks made before the House Committee on Education and Labor:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BILL D. BURLISON, 10TH DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 19, 1969

Mr. Chairman, by any rational criteria or standard the Poplar Bluff Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center has been a model for the program and the embodiment of the idea that disadvantaged young people need not be written off as lost, but with enlightened training and assistance may become productive members of society. That is, by any rational criteria except that which must have been used by the Department of Labor because the Poplar Bluff center has been scheduled for closing.

The table below compares statistically the Poplar Bluff Center with five other centers

which remained open. It is of some significance that these five centers were originally scheduled for closing and were permitted to

	Poplar Bluff	Center A	Center B	Center C	Center D	Center E
Enrollment capacity.....	224	224	216	210	168	112
Average wage per placement.....	\$1.64	\$1.55	\$1.50	\$1.58	\$1.58	\$1.90
Average wage per graduate.....	\$1.83	\$1.67	\$1.65	\$1.59	\$1.91	\$1.97
Percent of men entering military.....	7.6	0.7	2.4	0.7	3.4	1.5
Construction cost.....	\$794,026	\$993,700	\$1,004,723	\$978,712	\$775,115	\$674,814
Construction cost per enrollee.....	\$3,544	\$4,436	\$4,651	\$4,660	\$4,613	\$6,025
Operating cost per man-year.....	\$4,168	\$5,368	\$5,492	\$4,777	\$5,252	\$5,081
Cumulative appraised value of work projects.....	\$1,090,212	\$978,595	\$1,000,649	\$802,700	\$930,140	\$487,662

Announcing the closings Secretary of Labor Shultz said, "We will build on experience gained during five years of Job Corps effort, expanding those activities that have been effective and eliminating some that have shown disappointing results." The necessary implication is that the Poplar Bluff Center has shown disappointing results. I submit that the Secretary's definition of "disappointing results" differs from my own.

Corpsmen at the Poplar Bluff Center have assisted in the control of 128 forest fires.

In 1967 and 1968 the Center was involved in Tornado assistance in six cities in three states.

Corpsmen annually clean the levees in Poplar Bluff which protect this city of 20,000 from floods. In view of the potential flooding this year, their services may again be needed.

In December of 1967 corpsmen assisted in the clean up after a Poplar Bluff school burned.

During the past fiscal year the Center has spent approximately \$5,000 and many enrollee man hours completing community projects.

Cumulative appraised value of work projects is \$1,090,212.

The above catalog is by no means comprehensive and presents only the more visible accomplishments. More vital, I feel, than the center's public works is its effect on the young men who come to the center hoping for another chance to amount to something and to gain some measure of self respect. Here the performance of the center is less tangible but no less real. The Secretary cited length of stay as one of the principal criteria for determining whether or not a center should remain open. Yet, the Poplar Bluff Center ranked 14th nationally in retention of enrollees. It is worth noting that this exceptional retention rate was accomplished with a staff considerably below authorized strength. The retention rate when considered in conjunction with the modest size of the staff indicates remarkably capable, dedicated and efficient personnel at the Poplar Bluff Center.

The Secretary doubted "that pure conservation work was a useful skill for youngsters who will return to industrial areas to find work." Perhaps much of the training given at the center has agricultural application but it also has equal or greater relevance to urban employment. At the Poplar Bluff Center training is offered in baking, building trades, auto mechanics, limited heavy equipment operation and surveying. A special program in co-operation with the Brotherhood of Painters-Decorators and Paperhangers of America, AFL/CIO was scheduled to begin within the next six weeks.

"The relative isolation of many centers has contributed to their inability to retain enrollees for a period necessary to achieve significant improvements in educational and vocational skills." This criticism by the Secretary is no more relevant to the Poplar Bluff Center than the other criticisms. Poplar Bluff is a completely integrated city of 20,000, and the citizens readily accept the corpsmen. The community has two theaters, a municipal pool and park, a library, a Junior College, and several recreation areas. Nineteen miles north is Wappapello Lake and Dam for fishing and boating. Many off-center activities

remain open while Poplar Bluff was originally scheduled to remain open and then was marked for closing.

are planned in St. Louis which offers a variety of professional sports.

In addition to the \$1,059,840 capital investment which will be lost if this center is closed, the economic consequences to the area will be significant. The center spends locally more than a million dollars each year. This must be viewed in the context of a local median income of only \$2,864 and an unemployment rate of 5.6%. The loss is certain to be keenly felt by the residents of the area, but more importantly, what about the loss to the young men at the center? It is promised that they will be transferred elsewhere, but what of those who would be coming to the Poplar Bluff Center? Will centers be found for them; centers whose success is proven by experience as Poplar Bluff has been? I have my doubts, Mr. Chairman. It seems that those who can spare it the least stand to lose the most.

Mr. Chairman, the main thrust of this statement is that even though some centers are closed, Poplar Bluff should not be because the record clearly discloses that the Poplar Bluff Center is far superior to many that remain open.

TAXES UP, PERSONAL INCOME DOWN

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize once again the absolute necessity for implementing tax reform measures as soon as possible. After an extensive trip through my home district during the Easter recess, I learned just how deep the resentment of the taxpayers over present inequities really is. They are upset, and justifiably so. They are paying from 20 to 30 percent of their total income in taxes while they read of inequities that permit others to escape with little or no tax payments.

I would like to commend my esteemed colleague from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, for taking the leadership in efforts to pass a comprehensive tax reform bill during this session of Congress. His efforts deserve the support of all of us.

I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the April 16, 1969, edition of the Washington Evening Star which points out just how serious the question of taxation has become. I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

TAX TIME

The Tax Foundation has come up with some figures to confirm our worst suspicions. The average person will have to work through April 27th this year in order to earn

enough to pay his federal, state, and local taxes. That amounts to 117 days working for the government out of every 365, almost one day out of every three.

Broken down into hours, the average taxpayer spends two hours 34 minutes out of every eight working for the government.

There are other figures too, but they tell the same story. The average guy has a well-intentioned but greedy monkey on his back devouring a truly staggering portion of his earnings.

The Tax Foundation has done the arithmetic without drawing any basic conclusions. For that matter, the figures speak for themselves. With this kind of tax burden facing the average American, tax reform is more than ever a must lest the "taxpayers' revolt" become something more than a Walter Mitty dream.

GUN REGISTRATION

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the January 1969 issue of the California Mining Journal contains an excellent guest editorial by State Senator John G. Schmitz, California, which I believe deserves careful consideration by all Members of this body. With permission I include "Gun Registration by Proxy" in the RECORD at this point:

GUN REGISTRATION BY PROXY

(By State Senator John G. Schmitz, California)

Last June and July in the state legislature we fought a long, hard and ultimately successful battle against proposed new restrictions on the purchase and possession of guns by law-abiding citizens—particularly the Shoemaker gun registration bill. As refugees from tyrannies all over the world can tell us, registration of guns owned by private citizens is a pre-requisite to their confiscation, without which no government can feel secure in eliminating all the liberties of the people.

In the November elections Assemblyman Shoemaker was resoundingly defeated. It is reasonable to conclude that his defeat was primarily due to his newly acquired reputation as the author of the nation's most restrictive gun registration bill.

The people of California have spoken decisively against gun registration in any form. When President Johnson proposed it for the whole nation, the majority in Congress and many thousands of Americans writing to Washington objected vehemently. Congress defeated all gun registration bills. The only new gun bill passed by Congress appeared to be relatively innocuous, restricting interstate and mail-order sales of firearms.

Nationwide publicity was given to Congress' rejection of gun registration. There can be no doubt of the lawmakers' intent on this vital issue.

Yet now the Internal Revenue Service of the federal government is seeking to accomplish by administrative edict what the people's elected representatives in Congress—like their elected representatives in the California State Legislature—explicitly repudiated last summer. The Internal Revenue Service was given the duty of enforcing the new law on interstate and mail-order firearms sales.

In the Federal Register of November 6, 1968, Volume 33, No. 217, the Internal Revenue Service gave notice of proposed new rules on recording and reporting the sales of firearms and ammunition. The proposed rules would require all persons buying firearms or ammunition from a commercial dealer to give

their name and address, height and weight, date and place of birth, and to provide identification. Most ominously of all, the proposed rules would empower the Assistant Regional Commissioners of the Internal Revenue Service to require gun dealers to submit regular reports of the name and address of everyone buying firearms or ammunition from them.

Ever since 1938, gun dealers have been required by federal law to keep a record of firearms sales, but this record was made available to government officials only to trace weapons reported stolen or used in a crime. Now, under the proposed new Internal Revenue Service regulations, the name of everyone buying a gun or ammunition will be on permanent record with the federal government, whether or not the weapon was ever involved in any crime. If the name of everyone who buys a gun commercially is thus recorded, along with the name of everyone buying ammunition for a gun he already owns, we will have gun registration by proxy. The names, addresses, and identification of all gun owners will be available to government through the list of buyers of newly purchased guns, and buyers of ammunition for previously purchased guns, all reported to the Internal Revenue Service.

The will of the people and their representatives has obviously been flouted by bureaucrats who are supposed only to execute the laws, but in this as in so many other cases are clearly making law on their own. Every citizen who believes in and wants to defend his Constitutional right to keep and bear arms should contact his U.S. Congressman and Senator by telephone, telegram or letter and demand that this action by the Internal Revenue Service be reversed. Otherwise all our earlier and apparently successful efforts to defeat gun registration, both in Sacramento and in Washington, may prove to have been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include another article from the same publication, entitled "Gun Laws and the Right of Self-defense," and commend both to my colleagues:

[From the California Mining Journal, January 1969]

GUN LAWS AND THE RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

Some people believe that the disarmament of law-abiding Americans through restrictive gun laws would greatly reduce the frequency of violent crime. In fact it would put our good citizens at the mercy of criminals and render them unable to resist violent crimes in our homes.

The assumption that more violent crimes are committed because law-abiding citizens are free to own guns simply does not stand up to examination. New York City has forbidden hand-gun ownership to nearly everyone for more than forty years, yet it is one of the most unsafe places to live in the country. Here in California, about 80% of the convicted murderers of 1966 had previous criminal records and therefore could not legally own any firearm—yet this did not stop them.

In Switzerland, the law requires every male adult to keep a gun in his home, for defense of the nation as well as of himself and his family. But Switzerland has fewer murders per capita than any other nation in which accurate crime statistics are kept.

Criminals will always be able to get guns—if necessary by stealing them. No gun laws will deter them if they are not already deterred by the penalties against the major offense they plan to commit. The rising crime rate in this country has been the result, not of lax gun laws—actually gun laws have been considerably tightened in recent years—but of the failure of our courts to convict many known criminals, and the failure of leading opinion makers in our society, to teach that each one of us is morally responsible for his own acts.

The emotions prompting the demands to register firearms, arising from the shocking assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, are easy to understand. But they are being cynically exploited by persons and groups who have been working for years to deny Americans the right to own firearms.

The prerequisite to abolish private ownership of any type of gun is registration. Guns can only be forcibly collected if they are first registered.

If guns are registered as a result of one killing they can be confiscated as a result of another. In a period when crime and riots have become so widespread, to disarm the good men is to insure the triumph of the destroyers.

THE AMERICAN FLAG: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor to take part in an awards ceremony at the Girl Scout office in Springfield, Mo. The occasion was the presentation of a U.S. savings bond and an American flag flown over our Capitol, to the winner of the Dogwood Trails Girl Scout Council's Patriotic Essay Contest winner.

The award, I am pleased to state, went to a 14-year-old Monett, Mo., High School student named Jan Avondet, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Avondet, of Monett. Jan was runner-up last year and returned this year to take the top spot.

Miss Avondet's essay was entitled "The American Flag and What it Means to Me."

With the emphasis of the daily news on the degrading of the flag by some of the militant youth of our Nation, it is refreshing to read what this young high school girl thinks about our country's flag.

Under unanimous consent, I include the essay in the RECORD so that others may share the thoughts of 14-year-old Girl Scout, Jan Avondet:

THE AMERICAN FLAG: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Jeanne Janelle Avondet)

When I see the Stars and Stripes waving in the breeze I think of the countless men who fought and died for this flag. Their names were never all recorded but that doesn't matter because America will never forget these brave men who laid down their lives to preserve the freedom we hold so dear. To them our flag was more than a scrap of cloth. It was a symbol of all that America stands for; Freedom, equality, security, and justice.

I think of the hardships our forefathers endured and the wisdom they had in setting up a nation which has withstood the test of time.

I see people in Communistic lands trying to break the bonds which hold them enslaved. Then I realize how truly fortunate we are to have this heritage of freedom and I'm proud of our boys in Vietnam who are fighting to help the Vietnamese resist Communism. They are there so that, as Lincoln expressed it, "... government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from this earth."

There is something proud and strong in the bearing of this flag as it waves in the breeze. It stands as the undaunted spirit of

the American people. For America has never given up in the past and, as long as this flag waves, we will never surrender what we are.

Our flag stands as a challenge to every American. The challenge to strive for the day when not only American but the whole world will be free.

I hope my generation will accept this challenge. That this will be our goal in life, to bring freedom to the whole world. May we find the courage, strength, and wisdom to lead America in the path of freedom and peace.

ENGULFED IN GARBAGE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in the April 20 issue of *This Week* magazine, Mr. Thomas Fleming has written an article on a matter which is one of the most serious problems the United States will be facing for the next few years. Mr. Fleming's article is entitled: "Engulfed in Garbage," and discusses the enormous difficulties our country is facing trying to dispose of the everincreasing amounts of refuse produced by our citizens.

Garbage is becoming such a large and costly problem, Mr. Fleming notes, because approximately 5.3 pounds of waste material is generated per person on an average day across the country.

Real garbage, or what is called "putrescent matter" is not the biggest problem. This type of refuse consists of leftover food scraps and the like, which may be buried several feet under ground and, in the course of several years, will deteriorate and become a natural part of the soil. The biggest problem results from the development of technology and modern processing and packaging techniques. Almost everything America's housewives bring home from the supermarket is enclosed in plastic or cardboard, or glass containers. At 5.3 pounds per person per day, it is no wonder that our cities are running out of space for garbage dumps, and considering the contents, it simply cannot be burned in entirety. And, of course, burning adds to the pollution problem.

I would like to commend to my colleagues Mr. Fleming's article for consideration. It is a fine discussion of a problem which becomes more urgent each day:

ENGULFED IN GARBAGE

(By Thomas Fleming)

"You people have been spoiled for 50 years. Rain or shine or earthquake, your little pail of garbage has been picked off your doorstep every Tuesday or Thursday. Until recently, you didn't give a damn what happened to it after that."

Are you listening? That is the voice of a modern garbage man. His name is Leonard Stefanelli and he was speaking to a group of fellow San Franciscans. But he might well have been speaking to the entire nation, warning Americans that they are in danger of being engulfed in garbage.

His is by no means the only ominous voice. Dr. Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, says, "We have been running to keep pace with the growth of the . . . problem, and we are losing the race." Professor Ross E. McKinney of

the University of Kansas warns, "We have already allowed the problem to exceed the solution."

There are some prophets around the country predicting that by the year 2000, garbage collection may dwarf civil rights, national defense, and crime in the streets as our No. 1 political problem.

It is by no means a fanciful prediction. Recent reports indicate that Americans are already spending \$4,500,000,000 a year for refuse collection and disposal services—a sum that is exceeded only by expenditures for schools and roads.

Why is garbage becoming so big and costly a problem? Approximately 500,000 tons of residential, commercial and industrial wastes, or 5.3 pounds per person, are generated in America each day. In an average year, a family of six creates 3,860 pounds of trouble for the garbage man. Of this, 990 pounds is genuine garbage—leftover food scraps and the like, what the experts call "putrescent matter"—and 2,870 pounds is rubbish.

This last statistic is the real explanation for the garbage crisis. In earlier decades, Americans carried most of their food home in paper bags. Practically everything today's supermarket shopper buys is enclosed in plastic or cardboard or glass containers.

It doesn't really matter where the junk comes from. The problem is how to collect it efficiently and what to do with it once it's collected. To the citizen, collection would seem the most important facet of the problem. Garbage strikes have threatened a half dozen American cities with disease and social chaos in the last year or so.

Sanitation experts are far more worried, however, about what to do with the stuff once it is collected. They note that 85 per cent of the money we are spending on garbage is currently going into collection (yet a startling 12 percent of the residential population, receives no formalized collection service) and only 15 per cent of our cash is being spent on disposal.

Many people are under the impression that most garbage is burned in incinerators. Actually, there are only about 300 incinerators in the entire nation, most of them in large cities. Most of our garbage goes to what is familiarly known as the dump. There are 12,000 of these land disposal sites, as the experts call them, and a recent report of the Public Health Service declared that 94 per cent of them were "unacceptable and represent disease potential, threat of pollution, and land blight."

Nor should incinerator owners start congratulating themselves. The same government experts condemn 75 per cent of these as inadequate, either because they fail to burn enough of the garbage shoved into them or because they pour unhealthy amount into the atmosphere as air pollution.

Aside from the disgraceful condition of most dumps, there is the blunt fact that we are running out of room for them. New York will run out of space altogether in four to eight years. Philadelphia has been trying to burn 90 per cent of its wastes for well over a decade. San Francisco has had a running battle with surrounding communities over where to put refuse.

All this adds up to what might be called, *The Lament of the Garbage Man*. "People make jokes about garbage men," Eugene L. Pollock, editor and publisher of *Solid Wastes Management*, a national magazine for the sanitation industry, says. "They tend to think of them as people of little standing in the community. They don't seem to realize they are talking about the fifth largest service industry in the country. Nor do they seem to realize that a lot of these so-called garbage men are executives running multimillion-dollar operations, often using computers." He also notes several major schools grant Ph.D.s in refuse disposal techniques.

Leonard Stefanelli is typical of the new breed of garbage executive. He is president

of the Sunset Scavenger Co., one of the two private contracting firms which handle refuse collection and disposal in San Francisco. A good-looking, well-dressed 33-year-old, Stefanelli told a gathering of San Franciscans last year, "You people think of us garbage men as donkeys with strong backs and weak minds. But the fact is that we have spent tremendous amounts of money on modern research and development to try and reduce the bulk of waste as much as possible before disposing of it."

Most people know that garbage men feel underpaid. But few realize a more significant item in the garbage man's tale of woe. It is very dangerous work. The National Safety Council recently reported that their accident rate is highest in the country.

A great deal, however, is being done. A number of ingenious solutions are being tested or toyed with by scientists and sanitation experts around the country. One of the problems of the open dump is being solved by sanitary landfill—one of the best and cheapest methods of disposal now available. Usually it involves shredding, milling and compacting the refuse into an indistinguishable mass, which is dumped in trenches scooped out by bulldozers. It is then covered with seven or eight feet of earth, and natural decomposition over the next 25 years converts it into normal soil.

Landfill not only eliminates the old smoking, rat infested dump, it can also create new recreational sites for land-short cities and suburbs. Virginia Beach, Va., is building an outdoor theater on a 15-year-old landfill site. The Borough of Etobicoke in metropolitan Toronto has built a ski hill out of what they call "selected sanitary waste"—1,500,000 cubic yards of old refrigerators, stoves, bed springs, lumber, chemicals—everything but food wastes. The twin-peaked hill is expected to be 130 feet high when completed. Other communities have constructed golf courses, baseball and football fields and even swimming pools on landfill sites.

Around our larger cities, land is simply too scarce and too valuable to put garbage in it. San Francisco and Philadelphia are about to begin experiments in shipping their garbage 200 to 300 miles away by railroad.

Philadelphia has hired a private firm to lug the stuff out to the central part of the state, and dump it into abandoned strip mines. The cost will be \$5.39 a ton, a big saving over the current \$7.50 a ton for incineration. Rhode Island University, under a grant from the National Center for Urban and Industrial Affairs, is studying the possibility of burning garbage at sea in huge incinerator ships and tossing the residue overboard at selected dump sites.

The inventive Japanese have come up with another idea, a giant compactor said to reduce trash to 10 per cent of its original volume. The Japanese at first claimed that the resulting hard blocks of garbage could be used for construction work. But experts quickly demolished this idea. As garbage decays, it emits methane gas, and if you sealed these bricks inside a concrete building, within a year or so there could be an explosion.

The fondest dream of the modern sanitation expert is making garbage profitable. In the old days farmers paid for the privilege of collecting and removing garbage from Philadelphia. Today collectors get up to \$8.33 a ton for this work—plus the refuse itself—and the price is considered to be a real bargain. Paper was once salvaged for the production of cardboard. Now it is stored until a private collector comes and picks it up—at a charge of \$100 a month for this service. Some people have experimented with burning garbage to produce steam which, in turn, would run electric turbines. The Town of Hempstead on Long Island has an incinerator that drives a 2,500-kilowatt electric power plant and 420,000-gallon-a-day water desalting plant. But neither here, nor anywhere else, has anyone made such operations profitable.

The brightest hope in this department has been composting. For over 25 years, various countries—Israel, Holland, Scotland, and the United States—have experimented with pulverizing and reducing the garbage to manageable brick form and selling the stuff to farmers to enrich the soil. A few years ago, a *Fortune Magazine* story grandiosely announced the opening of a composting plant in St. Petersburg, Fla., operated by the International Disposal Corp. The \$1,500,000 plant lasted from July, 1966 until the early months of 1968, when it was closed as a public nuisance because of an odor problem. But after remodeling it is expected to start again soon.

The Florida plant joined a long line of composting plants, stretching from Scarsdale, N.Y., through McKeesport, Pa., Mobile, Ala., Norman, Okla., Phoenix, Ariz., and Houston, Tex.—most of which are already closed or closed part of the year. The reason lies in that earlier statistic about the preponderance of rubbish in today's garbage. Plastic bottles, aluminum cans, paper and glass are not very soil enriching.

Yet the composting idea has value. "These commodities we are throwing away today may someday be in seriously short supply," says Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, former director of the Bureau of Mines. Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, president of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, argues that we ought to "bank" potentially valuable wastes until we know how to get at their ingredients economically.

Still another solution would be the creation of self-destructive bottles and cans. Jerome Gould, the noted industrial designer, is working on such a project, as is Samuel F. Hulbert of Clemson University in South Carolina. Hulbert says his bottle will have the same basic elements as glass but when it breaks it will become soft and greasy and melt away.

Back on the practical, everyday level, some people are trying to take the minor headaches out of the garbage problem. Some companies have recently perfected a garbage can with a bottom made of rubber cement, that thuds instead of rattles in the early dawn. New Haven, Conn., is experimenting with the use of kitchen sink grinders in a high-rise apartment complex. The reduced garbage is piped to a central building for disposal.

All these changes, experiments and improvements point toward one conclusion. The garbage crisis can and must be solved.

The alternative may well be the policy currently being pursued in the state of Zulia, Venezuela. The government had to declare martial law and send in National Guard troops to suppress rioting stemming from a strike of sanitation men which left four dead and dozens injured. To prevent a repetition of the upheaval, authorities hastily passed several laws which clearly demonstrate the dangers of uncollected garbage in a free society. One of the laws stipulates that no couple will be allowed to marry unless they both produce certificates proving they are up-to-date in their refuse collection payments.

SALUTE TO THE PORK INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the pork industry. This vital segment of the livestock economy has made tremendous contribution to the stature and welfare of our Nation.

A chain is built stretching from the actual producer of hogs through the vet-

erinarian, the trucker, the feed companies, the livestock commission firms, the packer, the wholesaler, the cold storage man, and finally the merchant. Each plays a vital role in keeping the U.S. citizen supplied with fresh, cured, canned, or processed pork of the highest quality. As such they play a significant role as agribusiness employees and as a custodian of our Nation's health.

Great strides have been made in our ability to convert more pounds of higher quality, heavier muscled pork, from less pounds of feed. This gain made by producers has been passed on to the consumer in the form of less cost for the housewife. I commend the industry for its accomplishments and its sacrifices, and hope that they will continue to play a most important part in our meat economy.

THE PLIGHT OF CATHOLICS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the social tumult in Northern Ireland is reaching crisis proportions. Just last night in Belfast another bloody clash erupted between police and civil rights demonstrators, leaving scores injured and the streets littered with shattered glass. For a half century Northern Ireland's Catholic citizens have been cruelly oppressed—forced to live in substandard housing, forced to yield to the contemptuous and contumelious whims of the ruling Protestant majority, forced to accept "voting rights" eroded into meaninglessness by jerrymandered political districts and patently unjust property ownership qualifications.

The country's moderate Prime Minister, Capt. Terrence O'Neill, has threatened to resign unless the governing Unionist Party accepts his voting reform proposal based on the principle of one man-one vote. This reform, plainly and indisputably, must be adopted if Northern Ireland's Catholics are to achieve even the most remote simulacrum of social justice. Yet the Unionist Party—a political institution characterized by ossified rightwing beliefs—appears unlikely to yield. The plight of Catholic citizens in Northern Ireland, if it remains unrelieved, may plunge the country into utter chaos. Terrorist bombings are already taking place there.

The U.S. Government has made clear its keen displeasure at the oppression of peoples in South Africa, Rhodesia, Nigeria and here at home. It seems only just, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation should use its immense prestige and moral authority in an effort to help achieve justice for Northern Ireland's Catholics. President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers, I feel, should exhaust every possible diplomatic means to help establish civil rights in Northern Ireland. To do less would be to betray the principles upon which the United States was founded.

Bernadette Devlin, a 21-year-old

Northern Irish girl newly elected to the United Kingdom Parliament, yesterday made a stirring and eloquent maiden speech in the House of Commons outlining the plight of her countrymen. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point New York Times and Washington Post dispatches describing her speech.

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

IRISH GIRL CASTS A SPELL IN COMMONS

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, April 22.—A 21-year-old Irish girl held the House of Commons spellbound today with a maiden speech of quiet eloquence and powerful emotion.

Bernadette Devlin, barely 5 feet tall, wearing a new blue dress, looked like a shy schoolgirl as she stood in the crowded Labor back benches. But there was no shyness as she spoke.

The record books show no other case in which a member made a speech on the day of swearing-in. She also broke tradition by speaking on a controversial subject. Miss Devlin said she felt she had to do those things because of "the situation of my people."

She was there, she said, for "the oppressed people" of Northern Ireland—Roman Catholic and Protestant. She bitterly attacked the Unionist (conservative) politicians who have controlled Ulster for 50 years as men who encouraged religious hatred to preserve their own privileges.

Civil rights demonstrators in Ulster are demanding electoral reforms to establish the principle of one man, one vote for local elections, now subject to property qualifications and districting that insure Protestant control.

In Belfast today, Prime Minister Terence O'Neill demanded that members of the ruling Unionist party support his proposals to carry out the reforms, threatening to resign if they did not.

No single sentence Miss Devlin spoke in the House today is likely to be picked out and preserved among great political utterances. What mattered, in her passion and her courage, was that London was at last hearing a voice not of the Irish Establishment but of the tormented ordinary people of Ulster.

"Electrifying," was the description of one Tory member, Norman St. John-Stevas. He said it was the greatest maiden speech since the celebrated effort of F. E. Smith, later the Earl of Birkenhead, in 1906.

A hardened British Broadcasting Corporation commentator, Conrad Vossbark, called it "a speech for human freedom, illuminated by poetry." The Commons itself, hushed for long moments and then bursting out in delighted laughter at her sallies, seemed to agree.

Miss Devlin, who won a byelection in mid-Ulster last week as an independent, drew a packed house with many curious peers and other visitors in the gallery for her swearing in.

The Speaker whispered with her, held her hand and then broke up the Commons when he said loudly: "It is out of order for the House to be jealous."

The setting was dramatic because the Commons was holding an emergency debate on the crisis in Northern Ireland. It was the more dramatic because one of the first speakers was a representative of the Unionist aristocracy that Miss Devlin opposes, Robert Chichester-Clark.

In an upper-class English accent, he told how he had toured Londonderry after the riot last Saturday night and found "stark misery" of fear among the people. He blamed the Irish Republican Army for the weekend bombings.

Miss Devlin was called next by the Speaker. Beginning "Mr. Speaker, sir," in a small Irish

voice, she talked for 22 minutes with only a glance or two at some notes in her hand.

The policy of the Unionists, she said, is to keep Protestant working people agitated against the Roman Catholics so they will not rebel against the general poverty of Ulster.

She agreed with Mr. Chichester-Clark in his phrase "stark human misery" for Londonderry. But, she said, "I saw it not in one night of broken glass but in 50 years of stark human misery."

"There is no place for us, the ordinary peasant, in Northern Ireland. It is a society of the landlords, who by ancient charter of Charles II still hold the rights of ordinary people in Northern Ireland over such things as fishing and paying ridiculous and exorbitant ground rents."

She drew laughter and Labor cheers when she dismissed Mr. Chichester-Clark's I.R.A. charge as "tripe," and again when she called Captain O'Neill "the white liberal of Northern Ireland."

She charged Captain O'Neill with failing to carry out promised reforms to give more housing to Catholics, and more civil rights.

Then she spoke again of the rioting last Saturday night in Bogside, the Catholic section of Londonderry, and again scoffed at Mr. Chichester-Clark by inference.

"I was not strutting around with my hands behind my back," she said, "touring the area and examining the damage and tut-tutting every time a policeman had his head slightly scratched."

"I was building barricades to keep the police out of Bogside because I knew it was not safe for them to come in."

I saw that night on the "Bogside, with my own eyes, 1,000 policemen come in a military formation to that economically and socially depressed area, six then 12 abreast, like wild Indians screaming their heads off, to terrorize the inhabitants so they could beat them off the streets into their houses."

While denouncing the Unionists, she also had hard words for Labor, saying "any Socialist government worth its guts would have got rid of them long ago." Prime Minister Wilson, who was listening intently, joined in the laughter.

After the jabs and the ironies, Miss Devlin came to a bitter conclusion, fatalistic and very Irish. She said this whole debate was coming "much too late for the people of Ireland."

What could the British Government do? she asked. It could have troops take over altogether in Northern Ireland. "But the one common point among all Ulstermen," she said, "is that they don't like Englishmen telling them what to do."

The same objection applied to the idea of Britain's suspending the Northern Ireland Government and ruling directly. Nor would economic pressure on the ruling Unionists work.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1967]

ULSTER GIRL'S SPEECH STIRS COMMONS

(By Karl E. Meyer)

LONDON, April 22.—Young Bernadette Devlin stepped out of the turmoil of Northern Ireland and into parliamentary history today with a maiden speech that broke every precedent and astonished the House of Commons.

Miss Devlin, who will be 22 on Wednesday, spoke movingly of 50 years of oppression of Catholics in Northern Ireland and in the end seemed to say that the conflict with the Protestant majority was out of any government's control.

"It is not sufficient to state a series of negatives," retorted Home Secretary James Callaghan in closing a three-hour emergency debate on a religious conflict that has forced the deployment of troops to protect vital public utilities.

Callaghan said he would continue work with the Unionist government of Northern Ireland to try to speed up the reforms, spe-

cifically by granting one-man, one-vote in local elections. Freedom, he said, "will not grow out of a barrel of a gun."

[Rioting was resumed last night in Belfast, the Associated Press reported. Catholic civil rights demonstrators stoned shops and buses and set a police barricade aflame. About a dozen protesters were injured when police moved in to break up the melee.

[Earlier, a Protestant crowd demonstrated outside the Belfast headquarters of the British Broadcasting Corp., yelling and jeering that the BBC had distorted their aims.]

The debate began only minutes after Miss Devlin claimed the seat she won in a by-election last Thursday in Ulster, as Northern Ireland is also called.

Normally, a new member does not speak on his first day, and his first speech is usually a non-controversial effusion replete with flowery praise of his own constituents.

Miss Devlin was recognized immediately after a Unionist member from Ulster had attacked the civil rights movement, of which she is a leader, as infiltrated by Irish Republican extremists and Communists.

"Mr. Speaker, sir," said the brown-haired girl. "I understand that in making a maiden speech on the day of my arrival, on a controversial issue, I am flouting the unwritten tradition of the House, but the situation, I think, merits the flouting of such a tradition."

The packed House was silent as she recalled her own experience at a demonstration last Saturday in predominantly Catholic Londonderry, in which 216 policemen and 80 civilians were injured. She said she had helped to build a barricade to prevent Ulster police from entering the area known as Bogside, where the Catholic poor live.

"I saw that night on the Bogside 1000 policemen come in formation to an economically and socially depressed area, six and then 12 abreast, like wild Indians, screaming their heads off to terrorize the inhabitants so that they could beat them off the streets," she said.

Though she opposes all violence, she went on, she could not condemn Catholics "who wasted not one solitary stone in anger" to force back the police. Miss Devlin asserted that the ruling, overwhelmingly Protestant Unionist Party has tried to instill the idea that the civil rights movement is a Catholic uprising by forcing every confrontation in ghetto areas where Catholics live.

Prime Minister Terence O'Neill, the moderate leader of the Unionist Party, was a "white liberal," she said, who lacked the courage of his own conviction. "If indeed, sir, he has any convictions," she emphasized that the demonstrators were trying to create a just society in Northern Ireland and not to unite the Protestant North and the Catholic South in a single republic.

"Of all the solutions possible," said Miss Devlin, "the least popular would be an agreement between the two arch-tories of Ireland," she asserted, referring to a suggestion that O'Neill should confer with Prime Minister John Lynch of the Irish Republic.

Nor could she welcome troops, sent by the British government, because the "one common point" among all Ulstermen is their dislike of the English. Her point was that 50 years of apathy and neglect had made conflict inevitable and she offered little hope for peacefully ending it.

Her first-day speech, veteran members agreed, was remarkable for its eloquence and astonishing in the case of the youngest woman ever elected to Parliament. But it did not offer much help for a government coping with a condition, not a theory.

Home Secretary Callaghan dismissed her half-serious suggestion that Britain should abolish the separate Parliament in Ulster created in 1920 when the island was partitioned. To do that would be only to embroil Britain in the quarrel, risking a repetition of the very errors Miss Devlin condemned, he said.

Callaghan urged the Northern Ireland Parliament to heed the cry of the protesters, and appealed to the demonstrators to support O'Neill's attempt to bring orderly reforms. Unionist members of the Northern Ireland Parliament are due to meet Wednesday to debate a reported move by O'Neill to press for prompt enactment of equal voting in local elections, ending a system that enables a minority of Protestants to control cities like Londonderry.

The Home Secretary also said he had no evidence that the Irish Republican Army was responsible for fire-bombings of post offices and utility installations last week. The illegal IRA, he declared, was "a motley collection" unlike the Irish guerrillas who fought the English 30 or 40 years ago.

Throughout, Miss Devlin sat listening intently on the Labor benches of the House. She wore a blue woolen dress with a pastel-colored scarf. She had arrived from Belfast only 2½ hours before she made her debut.

Her arrival was delayed by a bomb-scare. Veterans said it was the most memorable entrance since Keir Hardie, a founder of the Labor Party, came to Parliament marching in front of a brass band.

OUR GREATEST GUARANTEE OF PEACE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, only through strength can we deter and prevent aggression upon us. Essentially, this is why a limited anti-ballistic-missile system to protect our missile sites that are our principal retaliatory deterrent, is advisable. Without some assurance of awful retribution should an attack be launched upon the United States, there can be but a state of precarious vulnerability for all Americans. No one, in his right mind, responsible for the protection of our Nation would be willing to accept responsibility for such weakness.

Historical perspective is helpful in establishing these hard necessities of national life. Such perspective is helped by a recent editorial by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, appearing in U.S. News & World Report, issue of April 21, 1969. In the interest of better understanding, I am inserting this editorial in the Record at this point:

THE POLITICIAN-APPEASER "COMPLEX"

(By David Lawrence)

We have heard a good deal lately about the "military-industrial complex," which implies that, for selfish and materialistic reasons, bigger defense spending is being urged upon our policy-makers.

But is it plausible that our civilian officials—the President and his Cabinet—cannot possibly distinguish between wasteful appropriations for armament and funds essential for the maintenance of national security?

What shall we say, on the other hand, about the politicians in our midst who, along with the appeasers outside of Government, favor a course which they may not realize could result in the weakening of our defense apparatus in a nuclear age?

Unquestionably, the resoluteness of the United States in waging war has been reported throughout the world as diminishing because of an alleged shift in American public opinion. The Government in North Vietnam has been encouraged to believe that it

need make no concessions at the Paris conference and that, due to pressures inside the United States, our troops soon will be withdrawn entirely from South Vietnam.

Unity at home—which is more important than ever in wartime—has not been achieved in our country. Critics of our presence in Vietnam have widely publicized proposals for appeasement—something that has proved tragic before. It is manifestly contributing today to the prolongation of the Vietnam war. For as the enemy is given aid and comfort, the chances of an honorable settlement tend to dwindle.

When World War I broke out in 1914, our people were told by some of the members of Congress that wars 3,000 miles away were "none of America's business." The imperialistic regime in Berlin took it for granted that American rights on the high seas could be violated and nothing would be done about it. Eventually, the United States was forced into the war to protect its shipping from the "unrestricted submarine warfare" ordered against our passenger and merchant vessels, even though unarmed.

Before we entered World War II, the "isolationist" sentiment rose once more. The militarists in Tokyo and Berlin misinterpreted our detachment from the conflict during the first two years as justifying the risk of an attack in 1941 on warships in our own harbor at Hawaii. They thought it would mean only a token participation by our forces in the Pacific and none in Europe. But the United States played a leading role in fighting the war to victory in Europe and in the Pacific by the use of all our armed services and resources.

This time, instead of a fascist regime in Berlin, we see a Communist Government in Moscow asserting its military power in Czechoslovakia and throughout Eastern Europe. We know the Soviets have been and still are furnishing arms and munitions to support the North Vietnamese in Southeast Asia as well as the Arab governments in the Middle East.

Fifty years ago it was not so clear what airplanes could do in warfare, and nuclear weapons which could destroy millions of human beings with one strike were unknown. Yet in the face of such dangerous conditions today, some men in Congress have become obsessed with the notion that "they can please their constituents or get publicity by calling for American 'withdrawal' from all foreign commitments.

The antiwar demonstrations in this country and in other lands have been stimulated, if not part instigated, by Communists, many of whom travel across America to help start riots and teach the tactics of rebellion. Well-meaning citizens who do not know the truth about the international situation are led to believe that our Government has a "military complex" and that more federal funds could be used for domestic subsidies if armament is reduced.

The facts of history are too often ignored. It is indeed fortunate that the American people are not fully aware of what it would mean to them if they abandoned their defense policies and began to give way to the aggressor government in Moscow. The number of its aircraft carriers and submarines has been multiplied in all the oceans in recent years, and its conventional armies are big enough to conquer Europe and thus threaten the peace of the world.

The "isolationists" in Congress say we must turn away from our commitments abroad. They do not consider the risks that such a course would create for the security of the United States. Isn't it better to spend public money to assure the protection of our people than to divert these funds to domestic use? The political appeasers may line up votes among the uninformed in our nation, but failure to maintain our capability to deter an enemy could bring on a third world war, with casualties unparalleled in history.

Negotiation from a position of strength is logical and necessary. This may cost money, but human lives would be saved and our national security would be preserved. Military power can effectively deter an enemy's strike against us. It is our greatest guarantee of peace.

IF YOU ARE ACCUSED

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, April 18, 1969, contains a brief statement on the constitutional requirements placed upon the police in criminal investigation and arrest. Of course, this brief article cannot pretend to cover each situation or the different requirements in our various State laws, but it does offer a good thumbnail sketch. I call this to your attention with the view that it might be helpful to police officers for ready reference.

The article follows:

IF YOU ARE ACCUSED

Taking the criminal-justice process from its beginning, here are the constitutional results the Supreme Court has reached:

At the time police become suspicious of a crime, or learn that a crime is committed, they must begin thinking of the Constitution.

If they plan to stop a person on the street and question him, they may do so only for the limited purpose of taking weapons or contraband away from the person. If more than that is done, the person has been "arrested," and the standard controlling police conduct is tighter. To be safe, legally, the officer should warn the suspect of his rights—to be silent, and to have a lawyer advise him before answering any questions.

If officers plan to search for evidence—either by physical search or by "eavesdropping" on conversations—they must get a warrant to do so, provided there is time. If there isn't time, they will have rigorous explaining to do in order to justify their searching.

If the search is valid, officers need not stop when they come upon evidence that will help them build their case, even though that evidence is not a weapon, stolen goods or contraband, or "instruments of the crime."

Officers who take items in violation of the court's doctrines on legal searches risk forfeiting their entire case, since illegally seized evidence is forbidden at the trial.

At any "critical" stage in the proceeding that a suspect himself is confronted by the police, the suspect has a right to be advised by a lawyer. That includes occasions when he is put in a police "lineup" where eyewitnesses to a crime may try to identify the suspect, when he is put under questioning in a police station, or when he is accosted even in his home.

If the prosecutor plans to try the suspect, he must move with some dispatch to get the trial started. Allowing a criminal charge merely to stand on the books may lead to its nullification. When the trial begins, it must be a public trial.

At the trial itself, the suspect is entitled to stay off the stand entirely. If he does so, the prosecutor may not comment upon his failure to testify as if that were silent admission of guilt.

The prosecution has a duty not to conceal any of its crucial evidence from the suspect's defense lawyer. That is particularly true if the prosecution has something in its

possession that would exonerate the suspect if disclosed.

The suspect has a right to know who is testifying against him, either in person or by statements being relied upon by the prosecution. The suspect has a right to have whatever witnesses he wishes, and these may be forced—by subpoena—to appear.

It is up to the suspect to demand or to forgo a jury trial. If he insists upon one, he can be made to suffer no extra penalty for having insisted. For example, a greater punishment cannot be meted out at the hands of a jury if a judge was not free to hand down an identical sentence without a jury.

If the crime for which the suspect is on trial is one for which the death penalty may be imposed, the suspect has a right to have some people opposed to capital punishment considered for the jury.

When the trial is over, a convicted man is to have an equal right to appeal even when he cannot afford to pay the cost of doing so. He is entitled to have the necessary papers paid for by the state.

If he loses his direct appeal, he still is not lost. He may continue to challenge his trial in an apparently unending number of "habeas corpus" petitions—demands that he be freed on grounds that he is being held unlawfully. The courts frown on "frivolous" filing of these petitions, but judges are not free to ignore them.

If the convicted man is in prison and cannot get legal advice from any outside source, he may ask a fellow inmate with some legal know-how to help him draft his papers and petitions.

NATIONAL SHRINE HOSPITAL DAY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for 47 years the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children have been one of the Nation's greatest philanthropists.

All Americans have benefited from the efforts to the Noble Order of the Mystic Shrine's efforts in behalf of needy children of all races, creeds, and colors.

Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 18, 1969 has been officially designated as National Shrine Hospital Day for the 19 orthopedic and three burns institutes located throughout the continental United States, Hawaii, Canada, and Mexico. Wherever possible, the units will celebrate the day with open houses and other birthday activities.

The 47-year-old history of Shriners Hospital has been filled with miracles, as is apparent from statistics such as more than 140,000 children of all races and creeds who have been cured or materially helped; 235,384 surgical techniques have been performed; 587,224 casts and 140,412 braces have been applied, and a staggering 13,415,823 patient days have been logged. These statistics are as of December 31, 1968.

In addition to the above figures, which reflect only the 19 orthopedic hospitals, the Shrine fraternity now has three burn units which offer the finest and most modern treatment available for burn-injured children. During the past 3 years, the burns units have treated more than 1,100 cases. Conservative estimates show average costs for each burn patient exceed \$10,000.

Mr. Speaker, as one who is not a Shriner but who is deeply grateful for what the Nobles have done, I would like to wish this fraternal order continued success in its dedicated work in behalf of our children.

There is an old saying that a man never stands as tall as when he stoops to help a child. This being so, the members of the Noble Order stand tall indeed.

A CONSTITUENT'S LETTER REFLECTS THE MOOD OF AMERICA

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from one of my constituents which I feel pretty well reflects the general mood of Americans everywhere, including myself. As a result I would like to share this letter with my colleagues. Having received permission I insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

WELLINGTON, KANS.,
April 19, 1969.

HON. JOSEPH SKUBITZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This has not been an unusual day in my life. The press coverage has been no more deplorable than usual. Advertising via television has been just as obnoxious. The same sense of doom prevails in every conversation.

A fourth-rate military power shoots down a United States plane and despite campaign criticisms and promises, we "play it cool."

A militant Negro is given a speaking engagement (which only encourages his militancy) and tells his audience that July will be hot in more ways than one.

The National Welfare Organization meets and plans "shop-ins" and "shoe-ins" to bug private enterprise out of existence. They demand more for nothing and the unorganized middle-class taxpayer works harder and pays more.

Brilliant university students expound with radical impatience, showing their immaturity and inexperience. But the American people have made youth a god and so we are afraid of them. So, if they don't like what our hard earned dollars have bought for them, they destroy it.

Federal funds help pay for "first rate housing for the poor" and the unorganized middle-class taxpayers, many of whom don't live in first rate housing, pay for it.

Six-year-olds cover their mouths and snicker at the word "love," the United States mail is loaded with filth that shocks the average citizen, students urge the end of ROTC in our colleges, but no one asks them how they would like to live without the protection of our military.

Politics, which should be an exciting and rewarding profession, has become a distasteful word.

Mr. Congressman, everyone I know is scared—scared of what is happening to our country. My husband and my son have fought for it and now I want to know how to save it.

I'm sick of everyone agreeing that we are in a bad way and going on about their business. I'm sick of our Congress and the Supreme Court being so fearful of treading on someone's rights that they walk all over the rights of the majority. Our founding

fathers would have been the first to tell us to amend their masterpiece if necessary.

I'm sick of being assured that the rabble-rousers are only a small minority. Minorities have caused revolutions before this.

Yes, Mr. Congressman, I'm sick—sick with fear.

I hope you are too.

Sincerely,

ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including the text of an article by the director of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Marion, Ill., Mr. Louis M. Frazier, Jr., a longtime employee of the Veterans' Administration who holds a master's degree in hospital administration. He discusses a subject vital to the operation of all hospitals; namely, housekeeping and control of sanitary conditions:

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SANITARIANS, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICERS, AND EXECUTIVE HOUSEKEEPERS

(By Louis M. Frazier, Jr.)

What is the relationship between a sanitarian, an environmental health officer, and an executive housekeeper? Generally, environmental health officer and sanitarian are defined as staff positions established to advise, assist, and follow up, but not to perform the basic activities that will activate their recommendations, and executive housekeeper is defined as primarily a director of operational activities that require some related professional knowledge.

Each of these three specialties has a required capability for which the basic professional knowledge is already present elsewhere on the hospital staff. Staff members with different titles and different primary professional interests not only have the basic knowledge but provide advice and assistance. This body of knowledge is available in established committees that are common to all hospitals accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. But this fragmentation of knowledge gives rise to the specialist's claim that he will provide better or more concentrated attention to the situations and problems that arise.

The limited number of publications about the relationship between these specialties indicates definite overlapping of the functions for which each claims some responsibility. This article examines each of the three specialties, comments on their relationship, and attempts to arrive at a practical wedding of the concepts.

SAME FUNCTIONS, DIFFERENT TITLES

The responsibilities of the environmental health officer and the sanitarian do not include the operational aspects of the executive housekeeper's job. The executive housekeeper is primarily an administrator, supervisor, and accomplisher of fundamental activities. An executive housekeeper has knowledge in many of the areas that concern the sanitarian and the environmental health officer but is attuned to daily operational accomplishment of tasks. The environmental health officer and the sanitarian, on the other hand, recommend the rules of sanitation, are more professionally oriented and are concerned with causes and effects.

In examining the functions of the sanitarian, the environmental health officer, and the executive housekeeper, it is apparent that very little difference exists between those of the sanitarian and those of the environmental health officer. In fact, the terms "environmental health officer" and "sanitarian" are used more or less interchangeably.

Specifically, their functions include advising about the use of sanitation methods to prevent transmission of disease by microbes. Sanitarians have become associated with safe air, water, and food and with other problems, such as garbage disposal and vermin control. They are concerned with the effects of heating, cooling, ventilation, and air flow. They are specialists in environmental problems that affect health. Some sanitarians' duties also include development of radiological health and general safety programs. Sanitarians are primarily investigators, scientifically trained and oriented to locate health hazards, make recommendations to correct these hazards, and follow up to ensure their correction.

A sanitarian is required to possess a bachelor of science degree with a major in a scientific field. To become a registered sanitarian, he must pass the examination administered by the National Association of Sanitarians. The trend appears to be toward a master's degree program for sanitarians, but a license is not mandatory in those states where no licensure law exists.

Since the functions of a sanitarian and an environmental health officer are so similar, it follows that no basic difference in functions exists, but only a difference in titles. Therefore, the remainder of this article considers sanitarians and environmental health officers as functioning in the same field.

INFLUENCE OF SPECIALISTS

The trend today seems to be to employ specialists who set up methods and controls but who do not actually practice the fundamental activities they establish. This trend appears to be present in the appointment of environmental health officers and sanitarians on hospital staffs.

The skills and knowledge they possess are already present on the hospital staff, although generally not embodied in one person. Mechanisms to give attention to this field of special interest exist in accredited hospitals in the form of the infection control committee, the safety committee, etc. and in the personages of radiologists, pathologists, physicians, dietitians, etc. These mechanisms can be activated by existing department heads.

The implication by some authors, that environmental health officers or sanitarians are needed in hospitals because environmental health controls are seriously lacking, is questionable. The hazard in the hospital environment is not a new phenomenon that has gone undetected or without active attention.

There is no question of the need for attention to the problems these specialists mention. It is a matter of degree. If this need is present in all hospitals, then the existence of other investigative bodies to which hospitals pay fees for this kind of assistance is questionable. Local governmental sanitary controls will surely continue.

Why is there a need for a full-time specialist to oversee these functions? The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals has as an important part of its surveyors' investigations the very things these specialists would review, and it accepts committee implementation and control of these sanitation requirements as being responsive to both need and practical application. Unless the Joint Commission changes its committee requirements, the environmental health officer or sanitarian would still have to work closely with established committees.

There is no doubt that a high-level committee made up of specialists and the personnel who actually carry out the functions can be effective. But management still has to implement and enforce the rules of practice that are established. A committee is a staff arm of management in that it advises, assists, and recommends. Likewise, the environmental sanitation specialist advises, assists, and recommends, although he probably would be given more specific control activities than a committee.

If a committee's know-how is not accompanied by decisive action, management might come to hire a specialist. However, management should carefully examine its own attitude and leadership. Occasionally, it takes another aspirin for a headache without looking objectively for the cause. Subsequently, Parkinson's Law comes into play, and the specialist might also have difficulty in effectuating his programs.

WHEN A SANITATION SPECIALIST?

In the author's opinion, the need for this specialized knowledge to be centered in one person depends on the size and the complexity of the hospital.

The average hospital probably doesn't need a full-time environmental health officer or sanitarian but may have need for consultant assistance. It might be feasible for a group of smaller hospitals to hire an environmental health officer or sanitarian to serve all of them and thereby give specialized attention to their individual problems.

Very large and complex hospitals probably could justify a full-time specialist to ensure proper attention, because the usual committees could have difficulty monitoring the widespread sanitation activities of a large facility. However, the standing committees would still be required by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals and other organizations. Furthermore, management must continue to have responsibility for implementation of programs and must be guided by the medical staff. Inherent in the medical staff and its professional support elements is all the knowledge that an environmental health officer or sanitarian would provide. The need for a sanitation specialist is duplication that probably is unnecessary on a full-time basis except in the largest, most complex hospitals.

THE EXECUTIVE HOUSEKEEPER

The executive housekeeper's job is primarily operational. Inherent in his job are certain staff functions that are fairly constant. In the usual situation he activates the rules and guidelines established by top management to ensure a proper environmental sanitation milieu. To do this, he must, of necessity, possess some knowledge in all the areas of environmental sanitation and their effects on health.

Because of lack of interest or control on the part of appropriate professional specialists, the executive housekeeper frequently becomes the expert in various matters. It is only natural that he should become vitally interested, because he must deal with the actual situation every day. He must be able to control or eliminate all the things the environmental health officer or sanitarian says are bad for the hospital. Whether or not such a specialist is present on the hospital staff, the executive housekeeper has to take the same actions.

The functions of the executive housekeeper in all hospitals include important staff responsibilities to the hospital executive officer, but primarily his functions are operational. The operational functions he performs cover a wide range of knowledge that includes understanding and appreciation of many subjects of primary interest to the environmental health officer or sanitarian. Some of these operational functions are basic day-to-day cleaning maintenance; collecting bacterial samples; operation of the laundry;

acquisition, distribution, and control of linen; acquisition and issue of uniforms; pest control; waste and trash removal to the point of disposal; interior decoration; and management of dormitory rooms.

To bring these responsibilities to successful operational status, the executive housekeeper must be knowledgeable about the composition of surfaces to be cleaned, the content of products used to achieve the accepted level of cleanliness, and the performance specifications of equipment. He must possess knowledge of fabrics used in linens and uniforms, as fabrics are changing radically. A good knowledge of laundering techniques and of the capability and capacity of laundry machinery is vital. Knowledge of pests and pesticides is necessary. He must know how to develop decoration plans and be acquainted with sources of furniture, furnishings, and decorative items that are suitable for hospital use.

The executive housekeeper is the staff specialist that advises top management in these areas, but above all he must be a manager with the ability to evoke from his employees performance that will ensure a clean and pleasing hospital environment.

The executive housekeeper often has a general college background. By its requirement of a bachelor's degree that includes specific related course requirements, the National Executive Housekeepers Association has expressed the desirability for generalized college training as a prerequisite to certification.

SUMMARY

There is almost no difference between an environmental health officer's and a sanitarian's responsibilities, but there is a definite working relationship between an environmental health officer, a sanitarian, and an executive housekeeper. An executive housekeeper has fewer responsibilities in the scientific or medical realm but many more in the operational realm than an environmental health officer or sanitarian. The executive housekeeper has a major role in successful hospital operation whether or not an environmental health officer or sanitarian is on the staff full time, part time, as a consultant, or not at all.

Local circumstances will determine whether a need for an environmental health officer or sanitarian is justified or whether existing and required committees can give adequate professional leadership and guidance to the executive housekeeper and other department heads. The exception will surely exist when a specialist is available who can combine all of these functions and responsibilities and apply them practically.

From a practical view point, these specialties would not mix well. The environmental health officer or sanitarian functions in many areas that are not, by current standards, part of the executive housekeeper's responsibilities, and, conversely, does not normally function in the operational areas assigned to the executive housekeeper.

MORTON COMMENDS PRESIDENT FOR CONCERTED ATTACK ON ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body owes a debt of gratitude to the President for the steps he has taken and the measures he proposed today to rid the country of organized crime.

I feel very strongly that the prime responsibility for law enforcement rests with the State and local governments. But it must be conceded that, for various reasons, local law-enforcement agencies cannot cope effectively with the grave internal threat posed by organized crime. Jurisdictional limitations and lack of sufficient funds to provide adequate manpower and modern equipment are among the most frequently cited obstacles to the attainment of this objective. Organized crime, therefore, is a matter of particular Federal concern.

The President is moving against illicit business activity on two fronts. Federal capabilities are being increased dramatically; at the same time, much-needed assistance to State and local governments is being increased.

Mr. Speaker, shortly the Congress will have the opportunity to lend assistance to the President's program by enacting legislation which will provide law enforcement with additional tools in the evidence-gathering process.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN ASSOCIATIONS' WORK IN FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, under a special order, I had the privilege of analyzing U.S. policies toward east central Europe together with about 20 of my other colleagues. Our discussion was based on a memorandum composed by the American Hungarian Federation, the Hungarian Freedomfighters' Association of America, and the Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists. Through an oversight the role of the latter two organizations was omitted.

At this point, therefore, I would like to pay tribute to all three organizations. The role and impact of the American Hungarian Federation, ably led by three distinguished American Hungarian leaders, the Honorable Albert A. Flork, judge of the Court of Common Pleas in Pittsburgh, Pa., Bishop Emeritus Dr. Zoltan Beky, president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, and by Dr. Cornelius Navori, prominent gynecologist from Detroit.

The Hungarian Freedomfighters' Association in America, under the excellent leadership of Prof. Andras H. Pogany of Seton Hall University, and Mr. Laszlo Pasztor, an outstanding research chemist from Pittsburgh, has for years been the standard bearer of the ideas and ideals of the Hungarian revolution, with a deep commitment to the tenets of human and political freedom for all peoples. The association has contributed greatly to keeping before the American people the problems of Hungarian citizens living under Communist domination. It continues to form the outstanding exile organization of American Hungarians, registering protest against actions of the Communist Hungarian Government

which damage and destroy the interests of the Hungarian people. The association also conducted, in unison with the other American Hungarian organizations, a successful yearlong commemorative program in 1966 on the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution with the assistance of prominent Americans who formed a citizens committee.

The Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists fulfilled, and continues to fulfill, a vital role in acting as the legal conscience of the Hungarians now living under a dictatorial Communist regime. In many well-documented memorandums it has exposed the illegal and extralegal practices of the various Communist governments in Hungary between 1948-69 and brought them to the attention of the Congress, the Executive, and the United Nations. In his book, "Human Rights in Hungary," the president of the federation, Dr. Laszlo Varga, a former member of the Hungarian Parliament and a practicing attorney in New York as he had been in Budapest, described abuses of law and abuses even against Communist law committed by state authorities in Hungary in the last two decades. He is distinguished by his scholarship.

It is a pleasant duty to remember the efforts of these individuals and organizations who contributed so greatly to the excellent memorandum submitted to the President and the National Security Council and to observe that the common commitment to the United States and the welfare of their former conationals unites the American Hungarian organizations in a unity of action.

THE GENERAL MUST SLEEP

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in tribute to former President and General of the Armies Dwight D. Eisenhower, I submit for the RECORD this moving poem by Kay Magenheim:

THE GENERAL MUST SLEEP

Under his Library,
Buried in a crypt,
Lies the bel-esprit
Of history's famous battle;
A reluctant
Pimpernel
In the face
Of a turbulent world betraying his victory's
grace.

And—for all mankind—Freedom,
Glimpsed at Normandy's beachhead,
Is yet a delirium
In the books stacked
Over his head.

From a half continent away,
West Point with its reveilles
Arouses memories of its renowned son,
While his country prays
In sudden appreciation
Of its heritage
That God may increase,
In his image,
The soldier of peace.

KAISER STEEL AND HELP FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Jack L. Ashby, vice chairman of the board of Kaiser Steel Corp., sent a letter to the 12,500 employees of Kaiser Steel expressing his and the corporation's philosophy in recognizing and positively acting in giving an economic and educational hand to the disadvantaged.

Kaiser Steel's principal fabricating and production facilities are located in my district in California. They also have manufacturing and fabricating operations in several additional Western States. For several years the company has been practicing a commendable minority hiring program. This hiring program in the manufacturing division's operations is substantial. Nearly 30 percent of the total new employees hired during 1968 were from minority groups. Many of these workers have been successfully trained and have moved onward and upward in their work with Kaiser Steel. The corporation, in 1969, is continuing its intensive recruiting and hiring of minorities. I might add that Kaiser Steel is giving consideration to preemployment job clinics. Also plans are being developed for additional cooperative work-study programs with the local schools and for work-study programs designed to help the high school dropouts.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD Mr. Ashby's communication to the thousands of employees of Kaiser Steel. I commend Mr. Ashby and I commend Kaiser Steel.

Mr. Ashby's communication follows:
LETTER TO EMPLOYEES OF KAISER STEEL CORP.

"One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"

Nearly all of us remember when we made our pledge this way, and most of us thought that is the way our country is—with unity, opportunity, freedom and security for all. Most of us failed to heed that some of our people were disadvantaged, and we rapidly dismissed warnings from our statesmen that our society could not long endure with part of our people ill housed, ill clothed and ill fed.

We all recognize these signs of domestic crisis now, and if you will spare a few moments more, I would like to review some of the efforts your company is making to help eliminate this malignancy and to solicit your continued good will and affirmative attitude.

You may be one of the many who have personally contributed to Kaiser Steel's efforts to provide counselling, training, employment and promotional opportunities for our disadvantaged citizens. As reported in the INGOT, last summer alone we hired more than 300 disadvantaged persons above and beyond our regular seasonal needs. Each of our locations designed its own program to best relate its abilities to the needs of its community. Less well known perhaps are other company efforts such as providing initial financing for the Riverside tutoring program, the McClymonds High School summer program in Oakland, the work study

programs in the Fontana and Bay Area, and the Skills Development projects in cooperation with the Napa and Contra Costa Colleges. In every case, the cooperation you and your fellow employees extended was vital to the success of these programs.

Another large area in which Kaiser Steel and its employees have been active is in the support of community activities which can offer so much direct help to disadvantaged members of our society, such as the Boy Scouts, YMCA's and similar organizations. In my position as Chairman of the Board of Governors of Junior Achievement of the East Bay, I am particularly in a position to appreciate the tremendous drive, energy and enthusiasm minority youngsters bring to such an organization. More than 80 percent of the members are considered disadvantaged, and yet they become strong supporters and participants in our society as a result of their experiences in building businesses of their own.

Your company considers the current domestic crisis is as great a threat to the well-being of us all as was any past military threat. It will take the same individual commitment, stability and effort plus the financial and productive capacity of our business community to resolve this problem as was required in war, plus the need for one additional essential ingredient—compassion.

The work will go forward, and your company will try to better its record. Your continued support and understanding will help us achieve the goal. Whenever you get the chance, please extend the hand of friendship and welcome to that new employee who is standing on the threshold—waiting to become a part of the Kaiser Steel family.

Together we will make this "... one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

FIGHTING HUNGER THROUGH PRIVATE EFFORT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal that is said about the dangers of famine that lie around the corner for the world population. I want to take this opportunity to tell my colleagues about a private effort that has begun to do something to meet this problem.

Two years ago a group of men here in Washington decided to attack the problem of world famine. Having learned that nearly 2 billion people in this world were starving or malnourished, that 3½ million would die that year from starvation-related illness, and having learned of the dangers of malnutrition to brain growth, especially in the early years of a child's life, and of the effect gross protein deficiency could have, this group, under the leadership of Dr. J. T. Houk and some of his colleagues, decided to take action.

The end result was the formation of a group called Famine Fighters, Inc., an agency which represents an exciting new concept in the effort to stave off hunger for the world's population. Under Houk's leadership, the Vantage Ten Ninety Fund was organized. The concept is simple—Vantage Ten Ninety is a mutual fund,

shares of which are sold to the general public through Famine Fighters, Inc., a nonprofit stockbroker organization. As is the case with any mutual fund, Vantage Ten Ninety seeks growth of capital for its investors. But the fund is organized to invest 10 to 15 percent of its assets in private companies located in the developing countries whose activity relates to the war on hunger. The hope is that this investment will help private companies which in turn will help solve the critical world food problem.

Vantage Ten Ninety is a pioneer in the mutual fund industry. Its organizers hope to follow it up with similar funds, part of whose assets will be devoted to helping in other important social efforts: loaning money to private schools and colleges; investing capital in industries which work to revitalize inner cities, and for other purposes.

I am convinced that if we are to successfully confront some of the massive problems that face our country, and indeed the world, we must continue to depend, in large measure, upon the efforts, resources, and abilities of private groups and individuals. Famine Fighters, Inc., is an impressive example of what can be done by such a group of concerned private citizens.

I want to congratulate Dr. Houk and his associates and call this important effort to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a report that tells the story of Famine Fighters, Inc.:

**FIGHTING HUNGER THROUGH PRIVATE EFFORT—
THE STORY OF FAMINE FIGHTERS, INC.**

Born of the concern for the world famine around the corner, a private whirlwind of effort has begun. Nestled in the seat of the largest government in the world, Washington, D.C., Famine Fighters, Inc., a private, non-profit stockbroking firm, has begun to sell the shares of a unique mutual fund, Vantage Ten Ninety Fund, in a unique way.

But first, a word of introduction is in order. In March of 1967, at an International Christian Leadership weekly luncheon gathering at the Washington Lawyers' Club, a group of men were informed about impending world famine. They found out that nearly two billion people in this world were starving or malnourished, and that 3½ million of them would die that year from starvation abetted illness. They were further informed that protein malnutrition caused brain damage in children, and caused lethargy, illness and early death among adults.

Four of those men, then and there, joined later by many others, pledged support to the Meals for Millions Foundation in Santa Monica, California. Gradually a group was formed among these contributors, sparked by Dr. J. T. Houk, Arthur Lane, W. Lyles Carr, and Paul T. Dahlstrom.

This group took on a life of its own. Not just "gift givers", they have been action oriented. Now called the *Famine Fighters Honor Roll*, this group spans the globe, linked by a common concern for the welfare of mankind. Honor Roll members are to be found in thirty states from Maine to California, and in ten countries including Viet Nam, and they number more than four hundred strong. Their action includes:

Donations to private organizations fighting hunger of nearly \$80,000;

Endowment, including estate planning commitments, for private charities of over \$150,000;

Organization of a mutual fund, Vantage Ten Ninety Fund, whose capital now exceeds a quarter million; and

Organization of Famine Fighters, Inc., as a non-profit stockbroker to sell the shares of Vantage to the public, with more than fifty persons now in training for the national stockbrokers' exam.

The mutual fund, Vantage Ten Ninety Fund, seeks for its investors growth of capital, within the framework that 10% to 15% of the fund's assets are being invested in private enterprise located in the developing countries whose activity relates to the war on hunger.

Participating in its overseas investments initially with the International Finance Corporation, the equity arm of the World Bank, Vantage has recently invested in the Colombian firm of Industrias Allmenticias Noel, S. A. It is one of the largest manufacturers of food products in the country, and is constructing a new plant in Medellin. Vantage has also invested in the dollar bonds of Ultrafertil, S. A., a Brazilian firm constructing what will be the largest fertilizer complex in Brazil. More than 500,000 tons of fertilizer each year will be used to stimulate farm production.

The balance of the assets of Vantage Ten Ninety Fund, 85% to 90%, are invested in a growth-oriented, diversified, portfolio comprised mostly of common stocks. The large New Jersey investment research firm of Templeton, Dobbrow and Vance, under agreement with Vantage, recommends the investment of this portion of the portfolio.

The Board of Directors of Vantage includes Rowland Burnstan, former President of Borg Warner International; Congressman Richard T. Hanna, a member of the House International Finance Subcommittee; Congressman F. Bradford Morse, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Edward N. Gadsby, former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Committee; Carol M. Shanks, former President of Prudential Insurance Company; John L. Schroeder, President of Templeton, Dobbrow and Vance; Eugene Williams, former Chairman of the St. Louis County National Bank; Francis Shurling, President of Shurling and Co., Macon, Georgia; Arthur Lane, with Haight and Company, Washington stockbrokers; and others.

Vantage Ten Ninety Fund is a pioneer in the Mutual Fund industry. It asks the investor to shoulder some social challenge along with his pursuit of profits.

Vantage Ten Ninety will be followed by four other funds, each carrying in small part, a pressing social challenge:

Vantage Twenty Fund will loan 20% of its funds to private schools and colleges to help private education remain independent.

Urban Twenty Fund will invest 20% of its funds in industries which aid the ghetto and help re-vitalize our inner cities in America.

Crusader Fund will help strengthen the moral fiber of America by loaning 20% for Christian purposes; and

L'Chaim Fund will bolster our Jewish-Christian heritage by offering loans for Jewish purposes.

Famine Fighters, Inc., has the challenge to implement the effort. It will offer the investor the challenge of fight—his kind of famine: Our lack of food; hunger in the ghetto for solid progress; our thirst for learning; our hunger for reconciliation.

Famine Fighters, Inc., sees this family of mutual funds not only as proper investments for those seeking profit, but also as vehicles for donors who wish to endow church activities, schools and colleges, or other private voluntary activities.

To bring the opportunity to people all over the world, to invest or to donate, Famine Fighters is embarking on an ambitious recruitment program.

Using a nine lesson text, prepared for home study by the Kalb-Voorhis Company, members of the New York Stock Exchange, Famine Fighters is training at home, individuals

who imagine part or full-time activity. Vantage Ten Ninety Fund is sold with a sales commission no greater than most mutual funds, yet being a non-profit corporation, Famine Fighters plans to share most of the sales commission with the salesperson himself.

In the short 3-month period from January 15 to April 15, Famine Fighters has recruited and is training nearly fifty persons who will spend from part to full-time fighting famine in this way, as licensed, registered stockbrokers.

Dr. J. T. Houk, an attorney and current part-time faculty member of the University of Virginia, President of Famine Fighters, feels that this effort has three important implications:

First, it creates responsible channels for private capital into needed areas;

Second, it can, through endowment, strengthen the pitifully weak financial resources of our voluntary private organizations; and

Third, it can offer meaningful part or full-time employment for people who are concerned about the quality of life in America and in the rest of the world.

Young people are being urged to leave their protest placards on campus, and build a career out of concern. Midcareer men and women are being urged to take on famine fighting in addition to their regular occupations. And those nearing retirement are being offered an exciting leisure occupation that can help supplement inflation-eroded incomes.

**A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL
MEAT INSPECTION**

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a bill I am introducing today to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act. It is cosponsored by 16 of my fellow colleagues and would require that imported meat and meat food products be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer.

As you may know, it is already required under law that a label showing the country of origin should appear on meat imported into this country. However, when a processor reduces this imported meat or cuts it into parts, later to be sold to the ultimate consumer, the meat loses its identity of the country of origin. It is at this point that we wish to strengthen the regulation so that the ultimate consumer, who is usually the housewife, is assured of the product being purchased. This bill would require that a label with the words "imported" or "imported in part" be affixed to any package containing meat or a meat food product until delivery to the ultimate consumer, thereby permitting that consumer his—or her—right to choose between domestic or imported meats.

The primary intention of this bill is to increase consumption of domestic meat products. It is not an anti-import bill, nor does it require an appropriation. It is meant to be a prodomeestic meat bill which will improve not only the financial plight of the grain farmers and livestock feeders, but will also contribute

significantly to the economic growth and well-being of our entire economy.

My fellow colleagues join me urging all Members of the House to give this important legislation their serious attention and consideration.

GRAPE BOYCOTT IN DELANO PERPETRATES A HOAX

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the dispute over the grape boycott has been well publicized. The most publicized picture, which has been painted, is that of grape workers who are poverty-stricken, starving, naked, forgotten, and homeless migrants. The facts, however, do not substantiate these claims put forth by the boycott organizers.

I was very pleased to see that Mr. James J. Kilpatrick visited the grape fields in Delano, Calif., and wrote a story telling the facts as he saw them and as they actually exist. His article is entitled "Grape Boycott in Delano Perpetrates a Hoax," and appeared in the April 22 edition of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star.

As Mr. Kilpatrick points out, the grape workers are not the destitute, homeless, striking migrants the union portrays them to be. There is no strike in the vineyards, the workers get good wages, and nearly 90 percent of them are permanent residents of the areas in which they work, and they do not want to be unionized.

As in all disputes, truth often becomes tarnished as the battle is waged. I, therefore, recommend to my colleagues the reading of Mr. Kilpatrick's article. I am confident after reading his remarks, that we will all have a better understanding of the true facts concerning the grape workers and the grape boycott.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

GRAPE BOYCOTT IN DELANO PERPETRATES A HOAX

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

DELANO, CALIF.—The grapevines stand in trellised ranks, green-sleeved, precisely spaced, as disciplined as troops in close-order drill. Their cross-pieces are angled at right shoulder arms; they make of the flat brown earth a crowded battlefield.

It is for possession of this battlefield that California's table-grape growers and an AFL-CIO union are struggling. The conflict long ago stretched beyond the Delano community.

For the past 3½ years, well-meaning liberals across the country—not to mention a number of politicians on the make—have been giving full-hearted support to the "grape boycott" urged by Cesar Chavez and to the supposed "grape strike" behind it. Chavez is director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO. When it comes to recruiting union members, Chavez is a flop; his UFWOC has recruited amazingly few. But when it comes to mounting a publicity campaign, the man is an undoubted genius. He turned up recently with a bylined piece in Look extolling his non-violent piety.

His "boycott" bumper stickers blossom on half a million Volkswagens. In dozens of parochial schools, such is the gullibility of

the nuns, little children compose insulting letters to grape growers as exercises in English. Hippies, Yuppies, priests, professors, political figures, and housewives with time on their hands—all of them are whooping it up for the downtrodden grape pickers of Kern County, Calif.

It is a hoax, a fantasy, a charade, a tissue of half-truths and whole fabrications. Within the past 10 days, since Chavez blundered into his first big public relations error, the union's effort has become something more—a brazen, ugly, and undisguised bid for "closed shop" power over the lives of farm workers everywhere.

To swallow the Chavez line, you must believe that grape workers in the Delano area are miserably paid, wretchedly housed, and cruelly treated. You are urged to help feed "hungry children," the victims of the system that denies men a living wage. "At present rates," says an UFWOC handout given to me last week, "a farm worker who is fortunate enough to work 40 hours a week, 25 weeks a year, would earn \$2,386."

This is moonshine. The reporter who checks payrolls, goes into the fields, talks with workers, visits their homes, inspects the labor camps, and otherwise covers the story, gets an entirely different picture. The going base wage for grape workers is \$1.65 an hour. At 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, this would produce annual earnings of \$3,432. Yet the hypothetical example has no meaning. This is not how grape workers work.

The typical Delano worker—if there is any such being—is a middle-aged Mexican-American, with little formal education and few skills beyond those of grape and vegetable culture. He has a wife and two or three teen-aged children. As a resident alien of 10 years' standing, he must register annually with the Immigration Service. Otherwise, he is free to live his proud, humble, independent life as others do.

Such a worker may have a dozen different employers during the year. He goes where the work is, from one vineyard to another. Thus, there is no such thing as an ordinary "bargaining unit," for the workers move around freely. George A. Lucas, a middle-sized grower, sent out 3,500 W-2 forms on workers last year.

In summer, the work is hard and hot; at other times, it is picnic-pleasant. Families take their lunches to the fields. Last week, I talked at length with one such family of four. With the base wage, plus incentive supplements, they expected to earn about \$325 for the week. At harvest time, this doubles. They drive a 1968 stationwagon. A son is in college.

Out in the fields, the workers speak of the Chavez union with fear and contempt. They tell of threatening telephone calls at night, of repeated acts of vandalism and intimidation. They are fearful that beleaguered growers, anxious to end the nationwide boycott, may yet sell them like so many heads of lettuce to the UFWOC, which thereafter would control when and where they worked.

It is this press-gang power that Cesar Chavez is seeking. He wants his union to become the sole source of agricultural workers, under contracts that would forbid the growers to hire any non-union man. This is what the fight is all about and it is incredible that liberals, professing a love for the little fellow, should be helping him toward his goal.

CANCEL THE CHEYENNE, MR. SECRETARY

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, back in the days when a vice president of Lockheed

was sojourning as the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development before returning to Lockheed, Lockheed embarked on a research and development project for the Army. It was for a helicopter now called the Cheyenne. Lockheed got the contract when the evaluators of the two final proposals from Lockheed and Sikorsky decided that Sikorsky's proposal was better technically, but Lockheed's "management capability" was so much better that the contract should go to Lockheed. Brave, indeed, would be the Army evaluator who would say that Lockheed's management was not great when the big boss had been a part of that management.

Once Lockheed got the contract, however, the management did not look so good. First, of course, the price began to soar. From Lockheed's original estimate of well under a million dollars each to \$1.5 million each to an "estimated" \$2.3 million each, and still rising. Apportioning the research and development costs over the program of 375 helicopters gets the helicopter up to an "estimated" \$2.8 million each—and still rising.

Now, in an almost unprecedented move, the Army has brought the technical problems to the fore. They have given Lockheed 15 days to reply in writing to charges that in at least 11 specifics the helicopter does not meet performance guarantees, and to state specific plans for curing these faults. Failure to answer satisfactorily would be grounds for cancellation of the contract.

Let us, just for the fun of it, assume that Lockheed can cure all the faults. I doubt it, but let us pretend.

Does the Army have the slightest idea what it will cost to cure them? Does Lockheed have the slightest idea what it will cost to cure them? Do either of them care at all?

For over a year Lockheed and the Army has been "negotiating" on a relatively tiny item. Not what the cost of the helicopter should be, oh mercy no. They had agreed to what they called a firm, fixed price contract on January 5, 1968. The main thing they had to "negotiate" was how much of an adjustment should be made to the price because of a delay by the Army in exercising its option from March 1967 to January 1968. On this little item they have been "negotiating" now for 16 months.

Mr. Speaker, it is 11 months ago today that I first asked the Secretary of the Army to tell me what this firm fixed price was. He has not told me, but that is fair, because he still does not know. First they said they would tell us in September. Then they said they would tell me by the end of the year. I wrote the Secretary of the Army on February 20, 1969, asking him what the "firm, fixed price" was. On March 17 I got a letter back saying that they did not know yet but that they anticipated negotiations "will be completed by mid-April."

On April 15 I asked the Army what the price was. They did not know. I asked them when they would know. They did not know. Reason: The negotiators had to stop negotiating the price in order to go back to California to write a letter explaining how they were going to make the bird fly. Presumably, they would not

write a letter saying how much it would cost to make it fly.

Cancel it, Mr. Secretary.

SPEECH OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, FOURTH DISTRICT, WISCONSIN, TO THE GRAND COUNCIL OF PULASKI ASSOCIATIONS OF NEW YORK/NEW JERSEY, APRIL 18, 1969

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to be a guest at the installation of officers and dinner dance of the Grand Council of Pulaski Associations this past Friday. The association is made up of dedicated civil service employees of Polish American ancestry, who continue to dedicate themselves to the service of our great country by personal service and raising of funds for school scholarships.

One of the outstanding events of the evening was the speech made by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI. Notwithstanding the trials and tribulations of 5 hours of air travel, due to the weather and traffic congestion, Congressman ZABLOCKI delivered an eloquent speech on American foreign policy.

I desire to bring Congressman ZABLOCKI's remarks to the attention of the Members of this House and, therefore, insert in today's Extensions of Remarks:

Toastmaster Stanley Pryor, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Karpinski, President Labowski, Officers of the Grand Council, Distinguished Guests, Scholarship Award Recipients, and Friends: It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure for me to be with all of you tonight for the Scholarship Award Dinner Dance of the Grand Council of Pulaski Associations.

It is a truly outstanding occasion which blends the gaiety and excitement of a beautiful social event with the more serious business of installing new officers and awarding scholarships to deserving young men and women.

But this is also an evening of gratitude and I would be remiss if I did not express special thanks to my distinguished colleague, the Honorable Joseph Addabbo, for arranging my presence here tonight. In particular I am grateful for his past support and encouragement in helping to make possible the American Children's Hospital in Poland. With his able assistance that symbol of the friendship between the peoples of America and Poland is now a reality.

Certainly the people of his district, the state and the nation can be justly proud of Congressman Joseph Addabbo. His consistent and energetic work in defense of our national interests and on behalf of progressive legislation represents an enviable record.

Your counsel, Attorney Stanley Pryor, has informed me about the illustrious history of this organization, which celebrated its eighth anniversary last month.

During your relatively short existence you have achieved the high goals which you set for yourselves when your individual Pulaski Associations decided to join efforts in this Grand Council.

The benefits which have flowed from your mutual efforts are the 24 scholarship awards

which you have made to encourage your children to continue on to higher education.

This is, indeed, a noble and far-sighted work you have done. By assisting young men and women to develop their talents and capabilities through education, you are providing a treasure of great worth to them, to their future heirs, and to our society.

I commend you highly for your achievements and know that they will lead on to even greater accomplishments in the future. My friends, there are many problems that confront our Nation at home and abroad. Your organization and each one of you individually can and, I know, will assist in our country's efforts to meet these challenges.

Tonight I would like to turn attention briefly to an area in which too few organizations seem to take an interest—an area in which the kind of success enjoyed by your organization seems all too infrequently to be found—American foreign policy.

We generally hear only about the failures and problems in our foreign policy.

But this situation should not blind us to the successes and progress which have been achieved in our relations abroad. I believe, for example, that the "bridge building" policy which the United States has carried on with Poland and other European countries for more than a decade has been a fruitful effort.

And since the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia, U.S. policies toward the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe have been under review.

Some have seen the Czech invasion wiping out all the gains of recent years in dealing with the Bloc countries. I cannot agree.

With respect to U.S. policy toward Eastern Europe, there have been some positive gains.

For example, because the United States was willing to sell its surplus wheat and other grains to Poland at a time of food scarcity there, the welfare of the average Polish citizen was enhanced.

Our efforts have helped stimulate the Polish economy by providing more and more consumer goods for the people. Thus the people accustomed to a better living might well rebel if the government attempted to emphasize instead the production of war material.

Thanks in part to American assistance, the economy of Poland has improved. It has improved—in fact—to the point where the country is able to pay back, in dollars, money owed to American citizens whose property was expropriated, as well as pay back funds owed our government for the earlier wheat shipments. Poland has repaid \$21 million in 1968 for agricultural products purchased in the past.

More important has been the psychological impact of our aid. From my own visits to Poland in the past few years, I know that the people appreciate these acts of friendship from the United States.

They know that when Poland needed food, it was from the capitalist West—from the United States, Canada and Australia—that help came—not from the Communist East.

No matter how often or how loudly their Communist overlords tell the Polish people that the United States is decadent and headed for the ash-heap of history—they do not believe it. They know better from the contacts they have with friends and relatives in the United States and from the fact that the Communist system had to turn to the Free World System for their needs.

This has been but one result of our bridge-building effort in Poland—a net gain for the forces of freedom against the minions of tyranny.

Today, however, any further move in Poland toward the West or general liberalization is being hampered by the increasing unwillingness of the Soviet Union to tolerate dissent within its satellite states.

While this may well be the Kremlin's dying struggle to keep its ill-gotten empire together, the Czech invasion and the so-called "Brezhnev Doctrine" of Soviet dominance in the Communist World have indeed cast a temporary setback on hopes for increased freedom in Eastern Europe.

Although our nation's ability to influence desired change in Communist countries is limited, nevertheless, I believe that the United States might well find new and worthwhile opportunities by revising its policies on other fronts, including the Chinese-Soviet conflict.

In 1965 the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, of which I was chairman, held hearings on the Sino-Soviet conflict. It was our recommendation that the United States not take sides in the dispute between the world's two major Communist nations.

In the intervening four years, however, it has become clear that the United States has apparently leaned toward the Soviet side.

Our national leaders have given a great deal of consideration to cooperation with the Soviet Union on consular arrangements, on arms control agreements, on talks over crises such as Vietnam and the Middle East, and even a possible "summit" meeting.

At the same time there has been no deliberate movement toward improving Chinese-American relations.

As a result, our posture has been widely interpreted, both inside and outside the Communist world, as favoring the USSR.

Chinese hostility, of course, accounts for much of this lack of progress. But we expected this. In 1966, for example, the Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific held hearings on U.S. policy toward China.

We concluded that while American initiatives were almost certain to be met by Chinese rebuff, we should not be discouraged or deterred from the effort.

In the case of Communist China, I do not believe we have persevered as hard as we might.

As you know, this is counter to the basic principle of strategy, that is, if a great power has two enemies who themselves are quarreling, it should support the weaker against the stronger.

In this instance, I am not suggesting that the U.S. support China against the Soviet Union in their dispute, but only that we try to achieve—in our own national interests—a greater balance in our initiatives toward each.

If we look back over the history of the past two decades—at Hungary, Cuba and Czechoslovakia—it seems clear that Chinese foreign policy has been no more aggressive, provocative or irrational than that of the Kremlin.

Further, the USSR at present is making moves to outflank the United States in the Middle East, Mediterranean, Indian Ocean and elsewhere. Communist China today poses no such threat.

While China may someday be able to inflict nuclear damage on the United States, it cannot do so today. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, could wipe us off the face of the map and might do so if it thought it could without reprisal.

In dealing with the Russian threat, our nation has found it expedient to support Tito's Yugoslavia as an independent communist power, antagonistic to the Kremlin, because of its geo-political importance. That policy has been relatively successful.

At the same time, we have seemed to forget that China is the largest independent Communist power antagonistic to the Kremlin, and even more important from a geo-political standpoint.

West Germany has recognized this fact and without any formal political ties or diplomatic recognition has established trade

relations with China which could be a potential for future cooperation.

The United States has not made similar overtures for a number of reasons, some of them not particularly relevant to our long-range national strategic goals.

The static nature of U.S. policy toward China has produced a drastic reaction among certain groups and public figures in our country. There appears to be no middle ground on views regarding U.S.-China relations.

There have been recommendations that the United States immediately recognize the Peking regime, permit it to take a seat in the United Nations Security Council, and even to grant it a "sphere of influence" in Asia.

Such recommendations are misleading, impractical and harmful to the cause of peace and order in Asia.

We may take a lesson from the experience of Canada and Italy. Those two nations expressed their intentions of establishing relations with Peking recently only to learn that Peking was not very interested in diplomatic ties with them.

The tendency to consider initiatives toward China only in terms of formal, diplomatic approaches indicates a certain lack of imagination and creativity.

I believe there are steps which might be taken short of formal negotiations.

There is, for example, the area of technology transfer. We know that Chinese are extremely interested in our scientific progress because their subscriptions to our scientific and technical journals provide one of their few remaining, uncensored links to American ideas.

I proposed, therefore, that the United States take a new initiative toward Mainland China by offering to extend our knowledge of the new "miracle" strains of food grains which have resulted in the "Green Revolution" throughout much of the developing world, especially in Asia.

Recent startling developments in the production of rice, wheat, corn—major food staples of the developing world—have checked the threat of famine in country after country.

Last year in India, for example, wheat production of rice, wheat, corn—major food million tons in 1967. The increase is reputed to be one of the greatest that the world has ever seen. A result accomplished with new and better seed strains, fertilizer and agricultural technology.

An initiative to transfer this agricultural technology to China is warranted for several reasons.

First, it is humanitarian since it would be aimed at meeting the food needs of the Chinese people.

Second, it is practical since the technology is not difficult to transfer and could be done by private organizations like the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations which developed the "miracle" grains. Taking this approach would avoid the problems involved in a government-to-government transaction.

Third, it might prove rather difficult for the Peking regime to turn down. At the present time the government of China is engaged in a "new leap forward" which counts heavily on increased agricultural production.

Although the weather this year appears to favor a good harvest, China has experienced frequent spring droughts and other weather conditions leading to poor crops.

Reliance on the new "miracle" strains would lessen China's dependence on good weather for adequate food supplies and would modify the undesirable cyclical nature of its present agricultural production.

Further, such an offer might now look more attractive to the Chinese than it would

have a short time ago. Too often it has been overlooked that hatred of the United States inside China is a valuable instrument used by Chinese Communist leaders to unify the people.

Since the recent Sino-Soviet incident at the USSARI River, there is some evidence that the Russians have replaced us as the No. 1 object of Chinese hatred.

This situation—and the somewhat more moderate tone which has characterized Peking's propaganda recently—may indicate a change in attitude.

At any rate, the Chinese response to the initiative I am proposing would make clearer the prevailing mood in the Chinese hierarchy.

Even if the offer is rejected, it will vividly demonstrate to the world that the United States has not isolated itself from China but rather that China has isolated itself from the United States.

Further, in turning down an opportunity to obtain the latest in agricultural technology, Mao and his cohorts would provide added evidence of their irrationality, stubbornness and callousness to the real needs of their people.

If our efforts are successful toward China, one effect might well be a loosening of the stranglehold which Russia has maintained on Poland and other Eastern European countries since the end of World War II.

The Communist China Embassy in Warsaw showing Katyn Forest massacre documentary film would show that Soviet Russia perpetrated the atrocities.

An even-handed policy by the United States toward China and the Soviet Union might permit more independence and freedom for the people of Eastern European countries, particularly the people of Poland—a people who historically have fought for liberty and the right of self-determination.

From personal experience I can assure you that this great dedication to freedom—a dedication epitomized in the life of Pulaski—has not died in the hearts of the Polish people.

To illustrate this, let me—in closing—relate a personal incident which occurred during my last trip to Poland, an incident which occurred in that ancient city of culture and education, Cracow.

Although my visit was virtually ignored by the Polish press, a group of Cracow students learned I would be in their city through the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America.

They searched the city until they found our American cars outside a hotel. When our party came out, one of the young men approached me and placed in my lapel a pin shaped like an anchor. It carried the initials: "P.W."

This emblem was the mark of the Polish underground resistance against Nazi occupation during World War II. The initials stand for "Polska Walczaca"—"Fighting Poland."

The young man explained to me that presently it is the symbol of those who are still fighting for freedom—that is, against Communism.

The young man and his friends risked political arrest for their boldness in approaching me and indicating their deep longing for political liberty. But their courage and strength of purpose overcame any hesitation.

They are truly to be admired for their courage, for their love of Poland and for their determination to restore individual human dignity.

Needless to say, the pin remains a cherished reminder of the love of freedom and of the indomitable spirit of the Polish people.

Their regard and respect for our country and our people is equally strong. Together

with their religious faith, America remains a beacon of hope for a better future.

I have chosen as my topic here tonight two challenges to American policy: the challenge of China in Asia and the challenge of Communist domination in Eastern Europe.

I chose these issues because I believe they illustrate the kinds of problems the young people you have honored tonight will have to face.

With a full education—made possible by the generosity and wisdom of your organization—they will be better equipped for all future challenges.

Thus, these young people and your organization, the Council of Pulaski Associations, are playing an important role in insuring that America is—and continues to be—a beacon of hope for less fortunate peoples.

We must, we shall, keep that light of hope burning bright here and abroad.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE BENEFITS TO COAL MINERS AFFLICTED WITH PNEUMOCONIOSIS, AS WELL AS TO RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, today, my distinguished colleague, Congressman SAYLOR from Pennsylvania, has joined me in introducing a bill to amend the Social Security Act for miners afflicted with pneumoconiosis, popularly known, as black lung disease. In addition, this measure provides benefits for our railroad workers.

This legislative proposal conforms with the provisions outlined in my extensions of remarks, which appeared on page 8037 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1969.

Title I, in general, is designed to make it easier for a person who has pneumoconiosis to qualify for cash social security disability benefits than it would be for other disabilities.

If an individual, age 55 or over, has pneumoconiosis, he will be considered "disabled" if he is unable to engage in his regular job, that is coal-mining; this is considerably more liberal than the existing test under which he would not be considered disabled—unless he is blind—if he is able to engage in any gainful employment.

In addition, the mere fact that an individual has pneumoconiosis assures him the benefit of the disability freeze, thereby protecting his later right to retire on benefits.

Benefits based on these new provisions would require the filing of an application in or after the month of enactment and would be available from and after that month.

Title II extends the medicare program to individuals receiving cash benefits based on disability without regard to their age. In other words, an individual receiving disability benefits, or child's benefits after reaching age 18, or widow's or widower's benefits before reaching age 60, would be entitled to medicare

benefits as though he or she actually reached age 65. In addition, it extends medicare benefits to individuals receiving cash benefits under the railroad retirement program on account of disability, without regard to their age, on substantially the same terms and conditions.

ORGANIZED SELF-HELP HOUSING

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, organized self-help housing has demonstrated that it is a social institution which can materially aid in meeting the housing needs of low-income families. These families, by pooling their own labor in a cooperative fashion, with technical assistance from nonprofit sponsor organizations, are able to reduce substantially the cost of acquiring an adequate home, and thus bring better housing within reach of those who are ready to substitute their "sweat" for the financial resources which they lack.

Though the principle of self-help housing is old, its current history in our own country stems principally from the successful project organized by the American Friends Service Committee among farmworkers in California's San Joaquin Valley. Building on this base, the Office of Economic Opportunity has worked with the Farmers Home Administration to encourage increased usage of the technique. Last year, as a tribute to self-help's demonstrated accomplishment and in recognition to its very real potential, we in Congress gave it a legislative base in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. The legislative base, however, has not been funded by Congress. Farmers Home Administration, which is to administer the program, has asked for \$4 million in sponsor funds for the coming fiscal year. No one is more familiar both with the potential which self-help housing has, and the need for an expanded program to provide this option to a broader spectrum of those families who are seeking a way out of miserable and inadequate housing, than the people who are working with organized self-help projects now. The directors of 20 of these projects, located in 15 different States, have formed themselves into a Committee of Self-Help Housing Project Directors. At a meeting here in Washington late last month, this group adopted a resolution urging Congress to fund fully the program established by last year's housing act. The text of that resolution follows, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in this and in the other body:

COMMITTEE OF SELF-HELP HOUSING PROJECT DIRECTORS, Washington, D.C.

The Committee of Self-help Housing Project Directors, composed of directors of self-help housing projects throughout the United States, convened in general session in Washington, D.C., March 24-27, 1969, have considered and do strongly urge that:

(1) The Congress appropriate for fiscal 1970 a substantial increase in administrative funds for the Farmers Home Administration in order that they can adequately staff their offices to carry out the programs of providing loans to rural families and communities.

(2) The Congress appropriated for fiscal 1970 \$5 million to be used as grants to nonprofit sponsors of self-help housing programs. This was authorized in the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act and is a part of the present budget request.

(3) The Congress appropriated for fiscal 1970 \$1.4 million to Farmers Home Administration to be used as a land development revolving fund for nonprofit sponsors of self-help housing. This concept was authorized in the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act and is a part of the present budget request.

Resolved—

(1) That these three recommendations are adopted as official expressions of this organization's position on these public issues; and,

(2) that these expressions of our position be transmitted to Chairman Spessard Holland, of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, to Chairman Jamie Whitten, of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and to other members of the Congress.

MAYNARD SCHNECK,

Chairman.

BOB MARSHALL,

Secretary.

(A list of the project directors comprising this advisory committee is attached)

MEMBERS OF THE PROJECT DIRECTORS

Harold Warstler, Macon Program for Progress, Inc., 50 East Main Street, Franklin, North Carolina.

Mr. Pete Gallegos, Home Education Livelihood Program, 219 Shelby Street, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Mr. Edwin R. Geyer, Self-Help Housing, Inc., 403 Griffing Avenue, Riverhead, New York.

Mr. James J. Cecka, Rural California Housing Corp., 2222 Loma Vista Drive, Sacramento, Calif.

Mr. Robert Marshall, Self-Help Enterprises, Inc., 220 South Bridge St., Visalia, California.

Mr. McKinley Martin, Delta Opportunities Corp., P O Box 478, Greenville, Miss.

Mr. Al Fields, South Carolina Commission on Farm Workers, 116 Broad Street, Charleston, S.C.

Mr. Maynard Schneck, Migrant Opportunity Program, 1517 S. Black Canyon Hwy., Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Ron Ivey, Colorado Migrant Council, 1441 Broadway, Boulder, Col.

Mr. Jack Hernandez, W.S.M.E., 14 South First St., P O Box 365, Granger, Wash.

Mr. George W. Curtice, Jr., South Florida Self-Help Housing, Inc., 2830 Saint Charles St., Fort Myers, Fla.

Mr. Frederic B. Presbrey, Catholic Better Community Development Commission, 1601 Jefferson Ave., Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. David Burciaga, El Porvenir Development, P O Box 56, Cantua Creek, Calif.

Mr. Charles L. Ray, Jr., Huntsville-Madison County Community Action Comm., Inc., P O Box A-F Winston St., Huntsville, Ala.

Mr. Charles Mumford, Sencland Community Action, County Hall Box 329, Whitesville, N.C.

Mr. Don Bleck, Indiana Self-Help Housing, 1424 Main Street, Elwood, Ind.

Mr. C. M. Stewart, Southeast Okla. Comm. Act., P O Box 811, Altus, Okla.

Mr. Bill Willis, Treasure Valley Comm. College, 115 West Idaho Ave., Ontario, Oregon.

Frank Lapeyrolerie, Rural Advancement Fund, P O Box 43, Reserve, La.

Mr. Louis Anderson, Jr., Friend, Inc., P O 205, Hayneville, Ala.

A QUICK AND FAVORABLE SOLUTION TO THE VIETNAM WAR MUST BE FOUND

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is now becoming clear that the new administration has decided that the United States cannot afford both guns and butter. Most of the \$4 billion already cut out of next year's budget was trimmed from domestic programs. There also appears to be a good chance that Congress will demand even greater cuts in the 1970 budget. Most of these budget cuts will also be coming out of domestic programs.

There are many programs that are vital to the continued and necessary development of the First Congressional District. Many of these programs cannot be cut without having a drastic effect on the orderly development of eastern Arkansas. But the outlook for funding many of these needed programs is destined to get worse before it gets better.

The new administration has decided that the two top priorities are now the war in Vietnam and the growing problem of inflation. I am in agreement that these are the two most pressing problems now facing our country. The consequences of these two problems are of vital importance to the people of Eastern Arkansas, as they are to all of our citizens.

The war in Vietnam is draining our human and fiscal resources that are drastically needed in order to meet our problems at home. The agony of death resulting from the war has reached into the First Congressional District, bringing the most terrible effect of this war home in a way that will never be forgotten.

A good example of the economic effect of the war is that one of the most needed projects in the First District, the Cache River-Bayou project, which is estimated to cost \$30 million could be financed for the same amount it takes to continue the war effort for about 10 hours.

The second problem, inflation, is draining the value from our hard-earned dollars almost before we can spend them. Tight budgetary controls and sizable surplus are necessary in order to bring stability back to our economy. This fiscal policy is destined to hit hardest those least able to afford it, however. For example, the current tight money situation is denying credit to many of our middle- and low-income citizens while other segments of our population still have easy access to adequate credit. The domestic programs that are being cut are designed to help those who are most in need of help through Federal programs.

The answer to many of the problems facing the country lies in a quick and favorable solution to the Vietnam war. Neither the Congress nor the citizens of our country would agree to any surrender in Southeast Asia, but it is im-

perative for the new administration and its negotiators to find a solution to this problem soon. Until they do, we are all going to have to tighten our belts still more. Our belts are already so tight that the pain cannot be ignored or wished away. This problem must be solved.

**BRAC REAFFIRMS PLEDGE TO
DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM**

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, the international president of the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees—BRAC—Mr. C. L. Dennis, sent a special message to the Transport Workers' Federation of South Vietnam, on the occasion of the federation's fifth national congress, scheduled for April 9 and 10 in Saigon.

Mr. Dennis' statement is indicative of the important functions that American labor unions are performing in building and strengthening friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world.

Considering the significant contribution the BRAC is making toward peace and prosperity throughout the world and under unanimous consent, I submit Mr. Dennis' statement for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE FIFTH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE
VIETNAMESE TRANSPORT WORKERS FEDERATION

(By C. L. Dennis, international president,
BRAC)

DEAR BROTHERS AND SISTERS: The Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees of North America, extends to the Vietnamese Transport Workers' Federation its fraternal greetings and the best wishes for a successful and profitable meeting, on the occasion of its Fifth National Congress, scheduled for April 9 and 10, 1969 in Saigon.

Like the Vietnamese Transport Workers' Federation, this Brotherhood is fully dedicated to the task of improving the social and economic conditions of its members. We are, likewise, fully committed to the cause of freedom and democracy for we are convinced that only under such system can the workers, as free men and citizens, attain not only material and social gains but the dignity and respect entitled to every human being on the face of this earth.

It is, therefore, with great pride that our Brotherhood identifies itself with the courageous struggle of the Vietnamese transport workers in their unbending decision to improve their standard of living and to preserve their status as a free nation. Without freedom and democracy all material gains are rendered meaningless.

This Brotherhood reaffirms its pledge to work hand in hand with the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF), and all of its affiliated unions, in defense of democracy and freedom, opposing colonialism, totalitarianism and aggression in all their forms; and, to defend and promote, internationally, the economic, social, occupational, educational and cultural interests of transport workers throughout the world.

We salute our Vietnamese brothers on this historic occasion wishing that your Congress fulfills your needs and aspirations and that you shall also succeed in your endeavors to remain free and independent.

With best wishes and fraternal greetings.

**ISRAEL CELEBRATES ITS 21ST
ANNIVERSARY AS A NATION**

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, last year I joined with many other Members of the House in saluting the people of Israel on the occasion of their 20th anniversary as a nation. It was my hope at that time—a hope which I am sure was shared by all our colleagues and the American people—that the succeeding 12 months would see a cessation of hostilities in the Middle East and the development of a plan to establish peace in that area.

Although a year has now passed and today we seem no nearer a solution to the underlying conflicts involving Israel and her Arab neighbors, I believe, nevertheless, that we can take comfort in the continuing determination and ability of the Israel people to preserve the sovereignty of their nation and the security of their borders.

I believe the best birthday present we can give to Israel as it attains the maturity of 21 years, is the reaffirmation of the commitment given on the occasion of her birth—that America will not permit this bastion of democracy to be overrun and destroyed by the forces of hatred and violence. We recognized then, as we recognize only too well today, that the cause of democracy around the world will be lost if it is not to be defended and preserved in the instance of Israel.

The Honorable Zalman Shazar, President of Israel, has enunciated in very eloquent terms the indomitable spirit of his people during these years of tribulation, confident that each day carries his nation "nearer to a time of serenity and security, of brotherhood and fruitful labor, of freedom and peace."

I include his remarks on this occasion of Israel's 21st anniversary at this point in the RECORD:

This year, again, the State of Israel commemorates the anniversary of its independence without peace. The inciters and the incited continue to believe that hatred and terrorism are the mission of their generation. The long chapter of Israel's efforts to defend itself has still not shaken the Arab leaders' mistaken conviction that they will attain their goals by attack, by ambush and by onslaught upon peaceful citizens. Yet, these acts of destruction and of poisonous ill will have not arrested, even for a day, the economic, scientific and cultural development of our country. Indeed, constructive activity within the land and for the land has grown mightily since those six days in 1967 and the great awakening that followed them among Jews everywhere. Creative forces long stored within us have been released, opening new horizons for our future.

At this time, the Great Powers are conducting discussions about our fate. These are, for us, days of new trials, our foes hav-

ing determined to inflame our borders and make peace even more inaccessible. We will continue to defend ourselves, never ceasing to wield our tools of creative work. Nor should we weaken in our faith that a time of co-operation and fruitful mutual understanding will yet come to our region.

Many and difficult are the tests and trials still awaiting us, but they, too, we may be certain, will be endured by our people with inner unity and patience, with a readiness to meet all tests, and with a determination never to return to a life of dependence and humiliation. Now, as always, our people have no more vital, no more sublime aspiration than peace. Now, more than ever, our people are firmly convinced that what our whole region truly needs is peace, a peace that will assure us of security. Any arrangement whatsoever that does not achieve this end is no more than a snare, a prelude to renewed warfare.

As we celebrate this anniversary of Israel's freedom, the hearts of all of us turn in blessing to our pioneers along the border areas, to our defenders throughout the land, to our brothers and sons facing the enemy forces along the length of our frontiers—on the Golan Hills, by the Jordan, the Red Sea and the Canal. In every corner where danger lurks, let the sheltering and protective hand be blessed.

On this festive day, which is a festival for the entire Jewish people, fraternal blessings, steeped in faith and encouragement, go forth to the scattered children of our people throughout the world, whose hopes are our hopes, whose concern is our concern. May they be as firmly united as the nation in the homeland and may they stand with us, close and vigilant, guarding our common future.

Our warmest wishes must be expressed today, too, to the newcomers who have been reaching Israel from many lands. May they be happily absorbed among us and swiftly meet with tranquil days.

This independence day of Israel, a holiday dear to all communities and localities of Israel's citizens, will, we trust, bring the hearts of men and peoples closer to each other. May it bring the land itself nearer to a time of serenity and security, of brotherhood and fruitful labor, freedom and peace.

May the saviour of Israel protect his people and watch over his inheritance.

**PELLEY SENDS BEST WISHES TO
ISRAEL ON HER 21ST ANNIVERSARY**

HON. THOMAS M. PELLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. PELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel are bravely attempting to commemorate the 21st anniversary of the founding of their nation under a constant harassment and bombardment from Arab guns.

I must think, however, how much more meaningful this birthday would be, in Israel and throughout the world, could it be celebrated in an atmosphere of peace.

And this peace can only come through direct negotiations between the Israeli and the Arabs, free of outside interference.

The State of Israel now is 21 years old, yet her problems are probably as severe today as at any time in her short history. A solution must be found and found soon. It is my prayer that when

Israel's 22d birthday arrives next year that solution has been found and all the world will be able to join the rejoicing.

Meanwhile, my best wishes go to Israel, her leaders, and her people on this, Israel's 21st anniversary.

IMPLEMENTING A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR OCEANIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include the following speech made by Dr. Chalmer G. Kirkbride before the monthly meeting of the American Oceanic Organization on March 20, 1969. I do feel Dr. Kirkbride's remarks will be of great interest to my colleagues. The speech follows:

IMPLEMENTING A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR OCEANIC DEVELOPMENT

(By Chalmer G. Kirkbride,¹ Chairman, Ocean Science and Technology Advisory Committee of the National Security Industrial Association, presented at the American Oceanic Organization meeting, Washington, D.C., Mar. 20, 1969)

I am happy to have this opportunity to speak to you ladies and gentlemen today for two reasons: First of all, it gives me an opportunity to state publicly that I think the commission's report, "Our Nation and the Sea," is tremendous. I support wholeheartedly the major proposals and recommendations contained in this report. It is interesting to observe that this commission was not elected. It had no constituents to whom each member had to account. It was appointed by the President to do a job that it did.

I had the pleasure of serving as a consultant to the panel on industry and private investment, and to the panel on marine engineering and technology. I observed how the men on these panels worked. They were dedicated to doing a job that in their judgment was for the best interests of the United States of America.

I will cite an incident to show you just how dedicated these commissioners were. The National Petroleum Council was requested by the Secretary of Interior to give its recommendations with regard to redefinition of the continental shelf. The NPC recommended that the "status quo" be maintained, but at the meeting of NPC when the report to the Secretary of Interior was presented for adoption, there was one man who had the courage to vote against all the others. He was convinced that his colleagues in NPC were wrong. He tried to persuade them not to make the recommendations they did. He is a very persuasive person but he was unsuccessful in changing the minds of his associates.

This man is a director of Standard Oil Company (Indiana) and he was also one of the 15 commissioners. His name? Jacob Blaustein. He had the courage to stand up for what he believed to be in the best interests of the U.S.A.

I have used this incident only as an example. Each commissioner I had the pleasure

of knowing was equally dedicated. Their excellent report reflects this in every respect.

The second reason I am happy to address you at this time is that I understand there are a number of you who represent the trade press. So I want to direct my remarks today toward a very important part of the commission's report that has been badly misunderstood by most of the popular press. Of course I am sure that none of you members of the trade press present today are guilty of this misunderstanding. Perhaps I can count on you to help get your misinformed colleagues, "on the beam."

The commission directed its recommendations toward a *national oceanic program, not a Federal oceanic program*. Time and again I have seen statements in the press and heard over the radio and television that the commission recommended a "wet NASA." Nothing could be further from the truth. The commission went to great lengths in its recommendations to avoid proposing a "wet NASA."

I want to make certain that you understand the distinction between a "wet NASA" and what the commission really recommended.

NASA was a creation of the Federal Government to carry out the Nation's exploration of space. NASA has been spending annually in the past several years in excess of \$6 billion. Tremendous industrial growth has taken place as a result, but essentially all of this private industrial growth has occurred as a result of direct or indirect contractual relationships with NASA. NASA gets its money by appropriation from Congress and you know where Congress gets the money it appropriates. In other words, the Federal Government has financed all the work of NASA, including that of its private industrial satellites who supply NASA with services and hardware.

Now this is a long way from what has been taking place in oceanic development in the U.S.A. to date. Furthermore, it is a long way from what the commission recommended for the future. The commission recommended a *national oceanic program, not a Federal program*. To have a national program we must have the Federal Government working in cooperation with private enterprise, with regions and States, and with the academic community.

In the case of NASA, the Federal Government has appropriated from tax money the funds needed to explore space. But in the case of the oceans most of the money has come from the free enterprise sector and has come out of profits. This is a distinction of paramount importance. As a matter of fact, the petroleum industry alone in the past several years has contributed far more annually to the U.S. treasury, just from its oceanic operations, than the Federal Government has spent on oceanic development, excluding defense.

The petroleum industry in 1968 paid \$1.6 billion into the U.S. Treasury from its offshore leases. Furthermore this figure does not include corporate income taxes. In addition to this, the offshore petroleum industry has invested several billion dollars in fixed assets in order to carry out these offshore operations. Compare this with the recommendation of the commission that the Federal Government increase its spending for the next 10 years by an average of \$800 million annually over the present \$500 million rate, excluding defense efforts. Even at this increased level future Government expenditures will still be substantially less than those of the offshore petroleum industry.

The petroleum industry is the leader in the free enterprise sector, but expenditures by such industries as food, maritime, recreation, chemical and mining are also substantial. You can see then that the Federal Government is indeed a distant second when compared with the total annual expenditures

by the entire free enterprise sector. The Federal Government will continue to be a distant second even with the implementation by Congress of the recommendations of the Commission. Remember, that expenditures by the private sector are possible only because industry is willing to invest out of today's land-based profits in expectation of future offshore profits.

Hence the Commission wisely recognized that in a truly national oceanic program industry would be a crucial segment. The Federal Government must recognize the vital roles of the free enterprise sector, of the States and regions, and of the academic community. A national program must have built into it organizational arrangements for obtaining information and advice from the entire marine community. Account must be taken of the accumulated knowledge and expertise from all these segments. National goals and objectives must be established with due regard to the commitments, capabilities, and long-range interests of each of these important contributors to oceanic development. Also a course for federally funded activities must be charted that will not hinder or duplicate effort by nongovernmental sources. Finally, leadership and stimuli must be provided for continued, and hopefully expanded, efforts by the private sector. We as a nation cannot afford the investment needed to attain the full potential of oceanic development within a reasonable time period unless Federal policy establishes and maintains an environment that will encourage economically sound developmental efforts by all these private segments of the marine community, working cooperatively with Federal programs. An atmosphere which permits the free enterprise system to make a fair profit must be maintained if we are to have a successful national oceanic program.

The Commission has provided for this truly national approach by recommending the formation of the National Advisory Committee for the Oceans (NACO).² In my opinion, this is the most important recommendation made by the Commission because this is a prerequisite for a truly national oceanic program. Despite its importance, this recommendation unfortunately has been overlooked by most of the press, and where it has been mentioned, its importance has not been emphasized sufficiently.

The members of NACO would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. These members, approximately 15 in number, would come from industry, various State agencies, the academic community, and other appropriate areas and should be representative of the Nation's varied marine and environmental interests. This committee would have broad advisory responsibilities. In addition, each of the principal Federal agencies concerned with marine and atmospheric matters would designate a senior policy official to participate as an observer in the deliberations of the committee. This arrangement would permit the committee to draw readily on the expert information and views of the Federal agencies.

In my opinion a majority of the NACO members should have extensive successful industrial experience and should be drawn primarily from the users of the sea, such as those engaged in the transportation, petroleum, fishing, mining, chemical, desalination, and recreation industries. Industries supplying hardware and services should also be represented.

Too frequently in the past, such appointments to Federal committees have tended to include an overbalanced representation from the academic community. I hasten to say that I have no objection to college profes-

² This was recommended by the Commission by OSTAC/NSIA, and as chairman of OSTAC, I am happy that the Commission saw fit to make this their recommendation.

¹ Also, vice president for Research & Engineering of Sun Oil Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The remarks of Dr. Kirkbride represent his own views and not necessarily those of OSTAC or Sun Oil Company.

sors. As a matter of fact, I was one myself 22 years ago. Colleges and academic institutions have not taken the lead, however, in pointing the way to exploitation of the oceans. They are not doing most of the research in this field. Furthermore, they are far behind the free enterprise sector in technological developments in oceanic fields. Industry is far ahead of the academic sector in the number of qualified men it has available to lead the way to successful exploitation of the oceans, and it is far better informed on the problems that are important to exploitation of the oceans. Industry is far better informed on what new technologies are needed for a successful national oceanic program.

I will admit that I am biased, but I am strongly convinced that the great majority of the members of NACO had better be thoroughly experienced in the free enterprise programs for exploitation of the sea. Otherwise, the chances are that NACO will be a miserable failure, and if NACO fails the proposed national oceanic program also will fail.

The commission recommended that NACO advise the head of a new agency to be created which I shall discuss later; but very significantly, NACO would also report to the President and to the Congress on the progress of both governmental and private oceanic programs in achieving the objectives of the national oceanic program. Such a report would be furnished biennially and made public. NACO would offer guidance and recommendations on long-range goals and on means for achieving them and would seek to insure that optimum use is made of the capabilities and contributions that can be furnished by all sectors.

Note, however, that NACO would be an "advisory" committee. Offering good advice does not guarantee a Federal role which will stimulate a truly national program for effective use of the seas—particularly not when our nonmilitary Federal programs are presently fragmented among so many different departments and independent agencies. The commission has therefore also recommended quite properly, in my opinion, the creation within the Federal Government of a strong independent civil agency with adequate authority and adequate resources to organize and conduct appropriate nonmilitary governmental programs to stimulate a strong national oceanic program responsive to the needs of all segments of the marine community. Specifically, the Commission recommended a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) reporting directly to the President. It would bring together the U.S. Coast Guard, the Environmental Science Services Administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the national sea grant program plus certain other smaller oceanic-oriented Government organizations. NOAA is the agency to which I referred earlier. By giving this agency sufficient size it will be able to undertake successfully the Federal civilian oceanic responsibilities encompassing science, services and fundamental or multi-purpose technology development.

As mentioned earlier, the National Advisory Committee for the Oceans would furnish advice and counsel to the Director of NOAA. As a result of the recommended consolidation of much of our Federal oceanic activities, NOAA would be able to direct effectively a substantial portion of our nonmilitary efforts as required by the agreed-upon national program. In addition, as the Commission points out, a major benefit of establishing a strong operating marine affairs agency would be the opportunity to assign the head of NOAA the responsibility for interagency planning and coordination. This would be done at the direction of the President. This means that the Director of NOAA would have a second responsibility; namely, chairman of the newly constituted inter-

agency mechanism. Agencies with marine interests that are outside of NOAA, such as Interior, AEC, Smithsonian Institution, NASA, Army Corps of Engineers, yes and the unclassified Navy programs would also be included. This additional assignment to the Director of NOAA would be completely consistent with the broad mission of NOAA. Unfortunately, this dual responsibility of the head of NOAA has also been largely overlooked by the press.

One more item of interest: The major result of this arrangement is that advice by NACO to the head of NOAA would in effect be advice to all Federal organizations with marine activities. Thus, through the organizational relationship of NACO, NOAA and the interagency mechanism, we could do much to insure sound national planning and program direction.

It is neither timely nor appropriate to take this occasion to discuss the pros and cons of the proposed consolidation of Federal effort. Certainly strong objections can be expected from certain quarters, just as there will be objections to various recommendations of the commission in other areas. I sincerely hope, however, that we do not let these specific objections cloud the main issue, for problem areas can better be resolved one by one as we proceed toward our main objective.

Let us realize that we need a truly national program for effective use of the seas—one that involves and is responsive to the needs of private enterprise, States and regions, and the academic community, as well as to various Federal bodies. Let us agree, also, that the Federal role should be one of leadership and stimulation, providing an environment for maximum involvement of private enterprise in economically justifiable oceanic programs. Unless this is achieved, our exploitation of the oceans will fall far short of what is possible. Most of the money for exploitation of the oceans must be generated from profits—not from taxes. Otherwise the national oceanic program will be a failure. This is in sharp contrast to our exploration of space through NASA. It is true that the Federal oceanic program will be financed out of taxes. Even so, I would consider that the national oceanic program has fallen far short of what it should achieve if the taxes paid by industry derived from its oceanic program do not exceed the amount spent by the Federal Government on its oceanic program.

Thus, to provide the proper background and guidance for the decisions necessary to achieve the goal of a national oceanic program, the Commission recognized the need for and recommended the creation of the National Advisory Committee for the Oceans. The success of a national oceanic program will be directly dependent upon just how well NACO performs its responsibilities. To achieve a truly national oceanic program will be difficult at best, because the free enterprise sector must be induced, not coerced, to cooperate. This can be done effectively only by establishing an atmosphere that provides the necessary profit incentives. It cannot be done by demanding and directing through legislation the wholehearted cooperation of the free enterprise sector. Remember, industry is by far the largest of the four sectors that must work together cooperatively to achieve a successful national program.

The creation of NACO and NOAA simultaneously is the essential beginning for Congress in implementing the recommendations of the Commission. There are some recommendations that could be delayed such as the one pertaining to redefinition of the continental shelf. Debate on such recommendations should not be permitted to hold up the implementation of other essential proposals.

The first step is the simultaneous creation of NACO and NOAA. Then the national oceanic program can get underway promptly. Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(NOTE.—The following questions and answers are provided for the record in conjunction with written remarks, "Implementing A National Program For Oceanic Development," presented by Dr. Chalmers G. Kirkbride on March 20, 1969, at the American Oceanic Organization luncheon. The answers represent the views of Dr. Kirkbride and may not necessarily be in agreement with the views of OSTAC or Sun Oil Company.)

1. Question: The Vice President of the United States referred to NOAA as a "Wet NASA" in a recent speech before the AMA in New York City. The popular Press reported his remarks accurately. Don't you think the top Government officials need as much education as the Press?

Answer: I wonder if what the Vice President did might be a result of the Press incorrectly reporting that the Commission recommended a "Wet NASA"? The use of this term is misleading, as its meaning is ambiguous and depends upon the context in which it is used. The Commission cited the need for agency consolidation to provide a focal point in the Federal Government for marine affairs (NOAA). This function might be construed as being analogous to NASA, which is the focal point for Federal space endeavors. However, as I pointed out in my prepared remarks, the Commission went to great lengths to explain the factors which are different in the case of the oceans, thereby sharply differentiating NOAA from NASA. Two of the most important differences are the source of funding and the amount of participation outside and independent of the Federal Government. For example, the cost of the civilian space effort is financed 100% by the Federal Government (NASA), whereas the civilian oceanographic effort is financed predominately out of profits from the private sector vis-a-vis taxes collected by the Federal Government.

2. Question: The Commission recommended that NACO be administratively attached to NOAA. In your opinion, does this mean that NACO would be subservient to NOAA? For example, would NACO's staff be appointed by NOAA?

Answer: Even though NACO is administratively attached to NOAA, the budgets, as well as the staffs, of the two organizations should be separate. Hence, as I see it, and I am no expert on Federal bureaucratic matters, the provision for administration attachment does not mean that NACO would be subservient to NOAA. NACO could have been placed, for example, in the Executive Office of the President. However, as you well know, there is great pressure to keep this office as small as possible. On the other hand, I doubt that an independent status would be wise because NACO is inherently too small to be unattached. Sooner or later the chances are that it would be "shot down in political flames." In a sense, NACO needs a home. I suspect the Commission concluded that on balance, it would be best administratively to attach it to NOAA. One could argue that by so doing, both organizations would be able to do their job better and more economically. Furthermore, the head of NOAA will need the advice and guidance that NACO can provide.

3. Question: Washington is full of Advisory Committees. How can we best assure that NACO, if established, does not become a "powerless" committee?

Answer: The Commission recommended that the members be selected by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. This in itself would do much to assure top flight people. In addition, the specific recommendation that NACO submit biennial public reports to the President and to the Congress on the overall assessment of the state of the Nation's marine and atmospheric effort does much to assure that their

advice will have a strong impact, thereby giving considerable "muscle" to the committee.

4. *Question:* Why is it preferable to have an Advisory Committee (NACO) which is statutorily established, i.e., why shouldn't the Head of NOAA be permitted to choose his own advisory committee to serve at his discretion?

Answer: While NACO is supposed to advise the Head of NOAA, it is not a committee solely for the Head of NOAA. It is also being asked to report to the President and to the Congress on the progress and programs of the Federal Government, state and local governments, industry and the academic community. By having NACO statutorily created and appointed by the President, the advisers are not subservient to the doers, thereby satisfying the primary requisite of independent advice.

5. *Question:* You stress the need for simultaneous establishment of NOAA and NACO. Do you see any advantage in first creating a NACO—through an Executive Act—which could be functioning while Congress is working out the details of NOAA? Do you think there is danger that Congress would decide that's enough—establishing NACO—and then drag their feet or do nothing about creating NOAA?

Answer: At first I thought NACO might be created without NOAA and report directly to the Executive Office of the President with no danger of its being ineffectuated. But after hearing the arguments of George Reedy, I am now of the opinion that it would be best if both were established simultaneously. There are dangers which must be considered if NACO is set up first, as you suggested. It is possible that NACO operating without NOAA might be much less effective than hoped for. This might lead to disillusionment and eventually destruction of NACO. In essence, NACO and NOAA complement each other and, while either might be able to perform independently, the needed effort is possible only if both exist.

6. *Question:* Regarding financing, do you favor a measure such as last year's Willis Bill to use oil lease revenues for oceanographic research?

Answer: I am certainly not an expert on the Willis Bill or Internal Federal Government monetary operations. I am not qualified to answer your question.

7. *Question:* Many people feel that most of the additional money going into oceanographic activities might be used for Federal empire building. How can we best minimize this possibility and also assure that it will be applied to solving some of the specific problems necessary to lower the cost of oceanic operations?

Answer: The Commission report pointed this out in many ways. The initial step, of course, should be to make maximum use of what capabilities we already possess and integrate them into a recognized national program through the establishment of NOAA and NACO. Several of the Commission's recommendations will have the effect of minimizing empire building. In the Federal sector, NOAA will consist primarily of the consolidation of existing agencies. The competence and facilities of those agencies not included in NOAA, such as the Navy, Army Corps of Engineers, etc., will be tapped through the Federal interagency coordinating mechanism chaired by the Director of NOAA. In addition, the existence of NACO should do much to insure that the competence and facilities already existing in the private sector and states will be utilized by serving as a natural check on empire building. Finally, the Commission recommended vigorous new programs in multipurpose or fundamental technology and national projects geared primarily to lowering the costs of oceanic operations.

8. *Question:* In reference to your remarks on the academic community, in what way does and can this group contribute to the national marine science effort?

Answer: The academic community, in addition to training the manpower required, performs many very important services. Fundamental studies of the ocean, its contents, the atmosphere above it, and the sea floor are being performed to help understand such items as the history of our planet, the origin of hurricanes, environmental prediction, and the correlation of fish behavior with the environment. Academic studies of the numerous estuaries is already an extremely important activity, especially the effect on ecology by man-made changes due to pollution, landfills, and dredging.

I feel that they have brilliant opportunities for future service. Let me cite only one example. Recently, the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal was deepened and widened. I doubt that any thought in depth was given by the Corps of Engineers to what the impact of this might have on the ecological conditions of the Chesapeake Bay. The changes in this Canal have effected a flow rate of fresh water from the Chesapeake Bay to the Delaware Bay of approximately 400% of what it was before deepening and widening. This new flow rate is such that during a substantial part of the year all of the water from the Susquehanna River and a large part of the water from the Potomac River flows from the Chesapeake Bay to the Delaware Bay. The full effects of this are not yet known. The resultant increase in the volume of water flowing through the Canal could have disastrous results. A greater knowledge of science pertaining to Chesapeake Bay probably would have provided the information to predict this end result. So without the necessary data, decisions were made in ignorance that we may later regret.

Consideration has been given and is still being given to taking water from the Susquehanna River for use in other parts of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. I am afraid that what has been done to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal has made this water no longer available, unless a complete reverse in direction of flow of water in the Chesapeake Bay is acceptable.

The normal flushing actions in the important estuaries of the Nation and their ecological impacts offer fascinating possibilities for research by competent people in the academic community.

9. *Question:* In your prepared remarks, you spoke about the NACO functions and the desired distribution of its members. However, a critical element of NACO is its leadership. Do you have any recommendations you would like to make concerning how this leadership can be made most effective?

Answer: The National Petroleum Council, which is an advisory committee to the Department of Interior, has a chairman who is the Secretary of Interior and a co-chairman who is an NPC industry member. Using this analogy with respect to NACO, if the Federal representatives were made full members of NACO, it is conceivable that the Vice President could be appointed as the NACO Chairman, with an industry member as Co-Chairman. If, on the other hand, the Federal members were designated as observers on NACO, as the Commission recommended, then it would be preferable to have an industry member as Chairman because of the major role of industry in ocean development. In addition, I feel the Chairman should also be a full time employee in view of the tremendous importance and number of duties he would be called upon to discharge. I believe a high level member of industry could be induced to come to Washington for several years similar to other Presiden-

tially appointed officials. I would hope that he would be a strong person, with considerable practical experience in an ocean-oriented user industry.

10. *Question:* Why is it necessary that the unclassified portions of the Navy Programs come under the purview of NOAA?

Answer: This point has been misunderstood and needs further clarification. The Commission did not recommend inclusion of the unclassified Navy Programs in NOAA. It was the Commission's intent that the Director of NOAA, wearing a second hat, would assume responsibility for interagency planning and coordination. This would be analogous to a prior arrangement in which the Assistant Secretary of Navy (R&D) was assigned by the President a second responsibility as Chairman of the former Interagency Committee on Oceanography (ICO). Thus, there is ample precedent for this type of role; also note that NOAA, the agency, is not the coordinator. Before we can have an effective national program, we must have a mechanism for coordinating and planning all Federal agencies with ocean activities. By having the unclassified portions of the Navy included in the interagency mechanism, we do much to assure that the nation can take advantage of the vast competence of the Navy. In fact, right now and for the foreseeable future, the Navy's programs are so large that they overshadow all other Federal effort, and to omit them would be unrealistic. Since the effort under consideration is essentially a civilian effort, it makes sense to vest the interagency chairmanship in the head of NOAA.

11. *Question:* You make a strong case for a National program. What are your thoughts on a similarly strong International program?

Answer: There have been many worthwhile international collaborative efforts in the past such as the Indian Ocean Expedition. However, I strongly believe that we should get our own house in order prior to becoming too involved in the international arena. Without the implementation of certain recommendations of the Commission, we will not have the information and capabilities to make wise commitments; but we can be most effective by building upon a strong national base. This, of course, strengthens the need for early action by Congress on NACO and NOAA.

12. *Question:* In citing the lone voice of one of the Commissioners who is also a member of the National Petroleum Council, I feel you inferred that members of the Council were not equally concerned with the national interests of their country. Isn't this issue only a difference of honest opinion by responsible, dedicated men as to what is in the best interest of their nation?

Answer: Apparently this is a more sensitive point than I had realized. My intention was to give a factual accounting of an incident which shows clearly the independent thinking and very serious approach made by the Commissioners. I want to correct my interrogator to the effect that I did not infer that the other members of the Council were not equally concerned with the national interests of the USA. I am sure they are. Furthermore, my reference to one of the Commissioners was not intended to convey any negative feeling about the position of the National Petroleum Council on the seaward definition of the Continental Shelf.

13. *Question:* What did the oil industry spend all its oceanic research funds on—scientific research or seeking out and drilling for oil?

Answer: This problem is not nearly as simple as the question implies. The petroleum industry did not just step out into the ocean and do the things they had been doing on land. Those very costly ventures into the ocean did not occur without being very thor-

oughly researched and developed prior to the venture. The petroleum industry spends large sums of money on applied research which is proprietary. They do this in the hope of competitive advantage. Some of the programs are so large and extensive that many companies join together in cooperative efforts. They support research and development work on such problems as structural design, materials, ice breakers, hurricane prediction, wave height measurement and prediction, underwater vessels, underwater welding, etc. An even greater amount is spent on research and development pertinent to underwater transportation, exploration and drilling for oil since these operations represent some of the important needs for new technology. There are no official statistics on the division of effort in each of these areas since the figures are proprietary, but if you are at all familiar with the problems with which the petroleum industry is faced, you can identify important needs for new technology and fields of research and development in which the industry is actively working. As a matter of fact, some of the aerospace companies are also actively working on these problems.

14. *Question:* The petroleum industry is all for private enterprise, yet has one of the biggest tax subsidies under the special depletion allowance guise. So, in all candor, aren't you unfair in your implied criticism of other industry subsidies such as the NASA programs?

Answer: My intention was to point out the differences between space exploration and ocean exploration. Contrary to your statement, I have no criticism of the way NASA was financed. Frankly, I doubt if it could have been done differently. No profitable enterprises have yet been discovered in space, and so the operations of NASA have been 100% tax supported. In contrast, there are many private industrial operations in the ocean which were justified only on the basis of anticipated profit. These operations have resulted in much productive research, development, and exploration.

The subject of mineral depletion allowance is quite foreign to the subject of my address. I am no expert on it and I judge from your statement that you, too, are not well informed. Hence, I would like to refer you to a factual speech by former Representative A. Sydney Herlong, Jr. (Florida) entitled, "Percentage Depletion: Loophole or Equity?", which was printed in the Congressional Record of August 31, 1967, just prior to his retirement from Congress. Representative Herlong was a member of the House Ways and Means Committee for many years and as such had ample opportunity to become expert on the subject.

The mineral depletion allowance is not limited to the petroleum industry as you imply. It is applied to over 100 minerals produced in the United States. Petroleum is only one of them. Nor is the mineral depletion allowance a subsidy any more than filing joint income tax returns vis-a-vis individual returns. People will not invest money in tools of production in the petroleum industry unless the return on this investment is competitive with similar investments they could make in other industries. A review of the facts shows clearly that the stockholders of the petroleum industry realize a return on their equity less than the average of all manufacturing industries. So if the petroleum industry were getting a subsidy of any kind, it is not showing up in an unduly high rate of return to the stockholders on the money they have invested in the business. If petroleum were eliminated from the list of minerals receiving depletion allowance prices of gasoline and other petroleum products would have to go up correspondingly. This would be necessary so that the return on stockholders' equity in the petroleum industry would be competitive with returns on investments in other industries.

The prices might have to go so high that it would result in the liquidation of the domestic petroleum industry. This certainly would not be for the best interest of the Nation.

15. *Question:* Why do you emphasize the point that the industrial membership of NACO should be predominantly from the resource industries rather than just industry in general?

Answer: I emphasize this point because I believe that it is the user industries who are the major source of the requirements for ocean development. These are the industries whose operations dictate technology and hardware needs. An overemphasis of hardware and service industry representation might tend to encourage programs for programs sake, rather than profitable programs leading to the orderly exploitation of the oceans. As I stated in my prepared remarks, there is, of course, a need for representation on NACO by supplier and service industries in order to assure a useful interchange between those who generate the requirements and those who have acquired the competence in hardware development and services. I make these statements realizing that an increasing number of resource companies, such as in the petroleum industry, are beginning to engage in hardware production while some hardware and service companies are increasingly becoming involved in resource development.

THE JOB CORPS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said and written about the Job Corps, and the Nixon administration's proposals aimed at overhauling it. Understandably, there is concern that such a serious reorganization may mean drastic changes in the nature of the corps.

To put the picture in its proper perspective, I would like to provide a few facts on how and why the administration intends to overhaul the Job Corps.

To begin with, any program that loses 65 percent of its enrollees before graduation, 40 percent of its enrollees within 90 days, and most of its enrollees within 6 months, is obviously not functioning in an efficient, productive manner. It is of benefit neither to those disadvantaged so in need of productive training and income, nor to the long-suffering, hard-working taxpayer who must bear an ever-increasing burden.

Thus, the Labor Department has devised a plan which corrects inherent weaknesses in the Job Corps, and bolsters the positive points in the program. This plan links Job Corps training with other available manpower training services so that youths participating have the full benefit of existing training programs.

Instead of emphasizing the "nature camp" atmosphere of some past Job Corps facilities located far from the enrollees' homes and incapable of training them for useful employment skills in urban America, the reformed program focuses on the real social and economic needs of the individual enrollees. Better service, superior training, and closer links with home communities are all emphasized.

The plan also makes special provision

for training youths from sparsely settled areas. Special centers with comprehensive training and support services are provided for them.

In other words, in cases where the Labor Department and other agencies do not have facilities for special needs, the area centers, coupled with the 32 remaining conservation centers, will provide whatever is necessary.

I believe that this is a positive and well-thought-out improvement of the Job Corps, not a diminution of its services or effectiveness. I would urge every Member of this body who is concerned with really helping disadvantaged youth, as opposed to making a political issue of it, to support the President in his efforts to make the Job Corps a more effective weapon against poverty.

PATRIOTISM

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many of our adult citizens could learn a great deal from Miss Sharon Elaine Pearson, editor of *Windscript*, the Pioneer Valley Academy school paper. Miss Pearson is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Pearson, of 77 Spruce Street, North Attleboro, Mass. She is salutatorian of her class and will attend Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, Mass., this fall.

I know that my colleagues will share my interest in the following editorial, entitled "Patriotism," which was written by Sharon Pearson:

PATRIOTISM

What is a patriot? Webster's Dictionary describes it as one who is devoted to his country. Whenever we think of patriotism it seems we think of the people during the War of Independence. At this time of the year George Washington and Abraham Lincoln come to our minds. Why were they so patriotic?

Let's look at George Washington. He was 100 per cent devoted to his country and became the first president because of it. He knew that in order to have a strong country we must be united. To be united we need one man over us. God, of course was the first Man, but there needed to be a human to be between God and us. Washington filled the position and we still realize our need for a president.

Abraham Lincoln was devoted to his country 100 per cent also. When he was elected he was already told that if he freed the slaves there would be war. But he knew that the right thing was to free the slaves so he wrote "The Emancipation Proclamation."

What does it take to be a patriot today? How can one be devoted to his country? And where does God fit in? A patriot is one who follows the rules set up by the government. He faces the draft board with a smile, and when he receives his card he doesn't tear it up. A patriot does his best in whatever he is asked to do—whether it be die for his country in Viet Nam or serve as President.

But then the question may arise—what if I'm told to do something that my conscience disagrees with? No matter how devoted you are to your country, you aren't 100 per cent

unless you let God lead in your decisions. God knows what is best for our country.

There is no reason for the riots and disturbances that take place. You can't be patriotic and be guilty of treason at the same time.

I think in my definition of patriotism I would add a phrase. A patriot is one who is devoted to his country to help it achieve the best that is possible for it with God's help.

SDS PLAN A SUMMER WORK-IN

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have spoken out loudly and strongly against the subversive programs of the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—a group which has contributed largely to the increased disorder on our college campuses. A recent publication of the Illinois Manufacturers Association discloses SDS plans for a student summer work-in. It appears that this group has decided to extend their activity to the "workers" in a clear-cut attempt to disrupt the normal order of our Nation's businesses and factories. I respectfully submit the description of the SDS plan to alert my colleagues to the potential chaos posed by SDS to the Nation by this summer work-in.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY PLAN SUMMER WORK-IN AT MANUFACTURING PLANTS

Student concern about poverty, poor education, the war, etc. has grown considerably on college campuses around the country. The desire to make meaningful changes can be seen in the growth of such programs as Free Universities, Tutorial programs, anti-draft unions, and the like. Students have won many small victories. But nevertheless, students are isolated. We have ignored the large section of the population: the workers.

As intellectual students who seek certain social changes we must begin to ally ourselves with the workers. We should not and cannot remain in our "Ivory tower."

In order for any student-worker alliance to come into existence, we must face squarely the misconceptions we may have regarding worker apathy. With the current strike levels higher than since the depression we see clearly that the workers are not apathetic. The Workers ARE on the move.

S.D.S. is planning a program that will help students get summer jobs in an attempt to break down the barriers that are keeping students isolated. Students involved in the Summer Work-In will meet regularly to discuss their on-the-job experiences; contradictions they may face, how to speak to certain issues, conclusions drawn from their experiences with workers. The student Summer Work-In is an opportunity for students to learn from workers.

I. HOW TO RESEARCH JOBS IN YOUR AREA

Manufacturing—A Directory of Manufacturers (from the library or Chamber of Commerce) lists plants, number employed, and sometimes a breakdown as to male and female employees.

Transportation, utilities, hospitals—Consult phone book or ask librarian for any other directories. Also try union hiring halls.

II. WHAT JOBS TO LOOK FOR

Job-seekers should try to get hired in places that have several hundred workers. Reasons for this include: a) if we want to

distribute literature, the potential is greater, b) the larger the company, the better chance of a basic union, that the workers will have a sense of organization (even if the union is a sellout one), that there will be a tie-in to workers nationally, c) in large plants in national unions there is a better chance that workers will become part of (and have a history of) mass strike movements, rebellions against sellout leadership, conflict with the gov. due to "national interest" injunctions, which might create the basis for greater mutual exchange about questions relating to opposition to gov. policies, d) the larger the company the likelier the existence of masses of unskilled jobs which we can fill, especially as replacements for workers taking vacations. If at all possible, choose a plant in the area of your school, to facilitate the possibility of worker-student alliances later on.

If you are white, select a plant where the majority are white. While Black workers might be thought of as more politically conscious, what we are trying to do is to reach white workers on the questions of the war and racism, to name but two areas. If Black, a student should get a job with Black workers; women should give special consideration to jobs where many women are employed (such as electrical industry, department stores, phone).

III. HOW TO GET A JOB

Some places hire students specifically for the summer as replacement for workers on vacations (altho usually bosses try to get by with not filling in, unless the union contract has specific stipulations and they are enforced). Most won't hire a student, and in most cases it would be best not to mention you are a student (unless you have sounded out the situation before hand by sending someone who doesn't really want the job to ask questions, etc.). If you can't say you're a student, you will have to come in as a high-school graduate with a "former place of employment" for the past 1-4 years. Talk about this with your group beforehand to work things out. In most cases indicate that whatever you did on your previous job involved some kind of manual work. You're not afraid of real work, is the idea to get across.

Be familiar, with whatever type of transportation will get you to work or say you "have a friend who works nearby". Some places won't hire you if they think you are a potential late-comer.

Draft status may be a problem, since 1-Y or even 4-F applicants are usually turned down, and 2-S immediately reveals your student status. Try not to mention it and use your wits if they do.

If you use a "background" story make sure your former boss knows about it, and make sure you were "laid off" due to slow business, etc. and not fired. Choose a salary approximate to the job for which you are applying or a little less and make sure your former boss knows this too.

If you take an aptitude test, don't show off. On a time test, answer about half the questions or they may be suspicious and want to use you in the "front office". Sometimes it is hard to judge, and if possible it is good for someone to test out the situation for you.

If you have any physical defects which can't be detected from a normal physical exam, don't mention them. Companies are wary of hiring someone with previous injuries which could be re-injured, creating the basis for a suit.

You should be at your first place looking at around 8:30 or 9:00, and don't go to your last place any later than noon. Otherwise they'll think you never get up till noon. Generally, don't wear a suit, but don't dress like a slob or a hippy. Sports jacket/dress with low heels usually will do.

If you have to sign a "non-communist" or

"non-subversive" statement, you can do so without breaking any law unless the company is doing govt. work (this would be stated). Discuss this with the group if you are unclear.

Be straightforward, use simple language and attitude, not \$20 words. Don't volunteer information, just answer what is asked.

IV. WHAT TO EXPECT ON THE JOB

Don't start sounding off the first day on the job, or even the first week. Work, learn your job and don't goof off on someone else's back, but if the workers are taking a break or goofing, go ahead (unless it will cost the job, which the others will understand). Although we're here for a short time and can't expect miracles in three months, we don't have to wait as long as we might (if it were a permanent job) to "open up" on political questions. Learn from the workers, about the work, job, history of the plant, their attitudes on every question. Listen, and participate in bull sessions. You might find out who the flinks are.

Don't be shocked by the racist remarks of the white workers, by confused political impressions, pro-war talk, "keeping-up-with-the-Joneses" talk. If the workers understood racism, the war, middle class morality, capitalist manipulation, etc., things would not be the way they are. Do let them know you're a student as soon as possible without risking the job. You can't be honest with the workers until they know. Altho some workers think students are snobs (some are), they also respect education and want their kids to go to college. Your job is to bring across the identity of interests between students and workers. Without workers there would be no universities, they create the wealth, and have the power. Without them, no basic changes can happen in the system, etc.

But we are there with a specific purpose—to talk about political issues even the student movement, since we will have a chance to "change our image" from what the press has said about us. Talking about racism among white workers is no easy thing, to point out how the boss uses race, union, sex, craft, nationality, etc. to separate workers; it is easier to sit on them if they are divided, etc. The illusions created by the coming elections will be hard to combat. We can't expect wild things in three months, but we can begin to question, to point out relationships they might not have thought about or might be afraid to express out loud, and we can begin to learn how to express these ideas without being presumptuous or arrogant. Try talking to receptive individuals; don't start by using a lunchroom for a "soap box oration." Discuss the use of literature, when to use, what kind.

Try to make a few friends to last beyond the summer, and try to get their addresses and phone numbers before you leave the job. Otherwise, it might be hard to contact them again. Concentrate on making new friends, even join a bowling team, etc.

Don't talk to workers like you know everything and they know nothing. First of all, it's not true (probably the reverse). Even if you do know more about the specifics of the Geneva Agreements or statistics on Black Oppression, that doesn't mean that by making a speech you'll get the facts across. Be patient; make it an exchange of experience, not a one-way affair. We will all make mistakes; don't give up! Discuss things with the group. The workers were all rookies once, but they survived because they had to; they had to eat.

Try to record your experiences by day or week. Just a few notes about relevant events will be invaluable for other people participating in the Work-In, for those next summer and for other publicity such as a regional newsletter or New Left Notes (or any other).

Come to work on time! Lateness is the first cause of being fired in a trial period. Don't start broadside against the union leadership. Listen, ask questions about grievances and perhaps suggest types of fights if you can think of something. But don't feel compelled to give leadership on all questions. One important result of your job may just be an appreciation of what workers are up against in their fight against the boss, the govt. and sellout union leadership. Knowledge of the implant gripes will help if there is to be follow-up along the lines of work-student alliance when you get back to school. You will be able to relate your leaflets to actual problems inside the gates.

Remember when you start talking about the war, many workers who agree with you will keep quiet, while the supporters will speak out. Don't get into knock-down, drag-out arguments with the latter, rather talk with the ones you're making friends with. Don't get yourself into a position of being 'you against the workers'. Know the facts (the group could compile pertinent bibliographies)! If you talk with workers whose sons are in Viet Nam, be careful. That's an emotional area in which it may be very hard to convince him that your idea of supporting his son is correct. Start by understanding his position of having been brainwashed all these years and seeing his son in danger 'from the other side'. To convince an already convinced student is one thing; to change the mind of this worker will be a task we will have to develop patience and understanding for.

After you are there a month or so, try to pick a few workers who are interested in your ideas and who have friends in the shop, concentrate on individual discussions with the hope of keeping these workers as contact after you leave. Talk about the possibilities of students' offering the workers assistance in any struggle coming up, on picket lines, doing research, etc. Don't necessarily start asking about union meetings. Many times they are suspended during the summer or at any rate many workers don't attend meetings. If there are meetings, go if you are asked to, but with the idea of listening rather than orating.

Since only general things have been covered here, it will be essential to keep in close contact with the group to discuss problems with them. If possible, try to have two students in the same job to compare notes, exchange experiences, and get a broader view of the place. However, if students work together, they should not team up. It will be a constant temptation to stick with the person you know the best, can communicate with easiest, etc. This is not to say that you should ignore each other on the job, just that your primary aim will be to work and communicate with the permanent workers in the plant.

MORTON SEES PRESIDENT'S TAX REFORM MESSAGE AS "IMPORTANT FIRST STEP"

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the proposals for tax reform made to the Congress by President Nixon are important first steps toward bringing our total tax system in line with the needs of the Nation in our time. Complete fairness and equity for all taxpayers are, and must be, the prime considerations in tax reform.

The proposals deal directly and forthrightly with loopholes and tax shelters which are the seed beds of inequity and tax escape for the wealthy. The stage is now set for action by the Congress to enact a law which will distribute a fair share of the burden of government to those who have had the means to avoid it.

For any administration, it takes courage to lock horns with tax reforms. There are built-in political risks and great forces of conflict generated by various economic interests. The message before us, Mr. Speaker, clearly exemplifies the courage and candor of President Nixon in facing the issue.

As a responsible legislative body, we must not consider the proposals in this message as a final package for tax reform. As the President notes, they are a beginning. More intense study is required. Further bold action will be forthcoming from this administration.

Work will have to be done in the area of foundations and exempt organizations. Further study is needed in the area of corporate securities and multiple corporations, accelerated depreciation, stock dividends, farm income, public utilities, and many other areas.

The one-step-at-a-time approach of the administration, and the obvious determination to deal with these matters, to lay it on the line with the Congress and with the American people, for us all sets a point of pride and a feeling of confidence in the Nixon administration.

CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a good deal of discussion has been heard in recent weeks criticizing the supposed lack of Presidential messages and proposals upon which the Congress could work its will. The House has been pictured in press accounts as being unable to proceed with the Nation's business because it had not yet received any guidance from the administration about what it was supposed to do.

If these accounts are to be believed, it would seem to provide additional proof for those who argue that Congress is incapable of doing anything more than reacting to the initiative of the Chief Executive. If we must wait for the firm hand of the President to guide us, then we must indeed face up to our responsibility to reform the Congress, to better equip ourselves to cope with the problems of the Nation, and to resume our rightful place alongside the executive as a coequal branch of the Federal Government.

Our colleague from the Second District of New Hampshire, JIM CLEVELAND, has placed these comments in proper perspective in a newsletter prepared for his constituents. I include it in the Rec-

ORD as a reminder to my colleagues that among the first items of business in this session should be the reform and reorganization of the Congress:

[From the office of JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Second Congressional District, N.H.]

My last report observed that although case work and committee meetings have been keeping me busy in Congress, activity on the Floor of the House was so light, that only four votes in the first three months of the session merited reporting.

This observation preceded by only a few days an incredible statement by the Leadership of the House. As reported in *Newsweek* April 21, Speaker McCormack gently but firmly prodded President Nixon "for something, anything, to keep idling Congressional machinery busy." Evidently, the days when Congress was a co-equal branch of government are gone. The "leadership" has become so accustomed to taking orders from the White House it can't shake the habit.

NO BETTER TIME FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Equally galling is the fact that *Newsweek* failed to even mention the subject of Congressional reform in its report. Many of us in Congress have been arguing for years that reform of Congressional procedures is essential if Congress is to perform its function responsibly and responsibly. We have long urged the House Leadership to move on the Legislative Reorganization Act. This bill, which, as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I helped draft, passed the Senate in the last Congress by a vote of 75-9 on March 7, 1967, but the House never even considered it.

That bill has been reintroduced and sponsored by more than 125 Republican Congressmen. It would make valuable and needed improvements in Congressional procedures. It would require members to cast votes in Committee in person, and not by proxy as now allowed in many committees, and it would make those crucial votes public. It would broaden the capacity of the minority party to carry out its function of responsible criticism. It would adapt computer techniques to many laborious operations. It would open committee sessions of the House to live coverage by television and radio. It would improve staffing and committee procedures.

Now, while we are waiting for the Administration's programs to be sent over, is the ideal time to set our own Congressional house in order. It ill behooves the Leadership of Congress to snipe at the new Administration when its own affairs are in disorder.

GARY DUCHARME, VICTIM OF NORTH KOREAN AIR ATTACK

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, a young man in my district is listed among those 29 other young men as missing in the Sea of Japan, victims apparently of a ruthless attack on their unarmed aircraft by two North Korean airplanes last week.

I did not know Gary DuCharme personally, but in my district in southern Wisconsin, there were many who did. He was an outstanding athlete at Delavan-Darien High School where he earned eight major athletic letters. He graduated from that school in 1964 and

planned to coach other young men in athletics some day.

But Gary honored his military obligation first. I have talked with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond DuCharme, and some of his former teachers. They tell me he was not a bitter young man about his obligation, but that he assumed it was something he had to do, and he did it.

Gary was to leave the service this year and I understand he had been interviewed for several jobs using the skills he had learned in the Navy. He was married to his former high school sweetheart, Linda, and together they were raising their son, Mike, 2, in Yokohama, Japan.

Gary is the oldest of eight children. His father is a World War II Navy man and Gary's youngest brother, Pat, is to be inducted into the Marine Corps yet this month.

Gary's father tells me that his son volunteered for his assignment that took him near dangerous and unfriendly lands. His work in the Navy is understandably classified and Gary's parents do not know exactly what he was doing when his plane was shot down.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how America is so fortunate to have had young men like Gary DuCharme. I wonder if America pays tribute enough to these young men who put aside personal ambition for a period of time, to lend their service to their country.

We hear so much of the others, of the so-called dissident who would turn this country into anarchy. Unfortunately when we hear of those young men like Gary DuCharme, it is all too often cloaked in a message of grief and heartbreak.

BROTHER EMMETT CORRY OF THE CATHOLIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION OPPOSES BUDGET CUTS IN EDUCATION

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at the Overseas Press Club in New York on Monday, April 21, Brother Emmett Corry, former chairman of the school library supervisors section of the Catholic Library Association stated the position of his organization concerning the announced budget cuts in education.

I ask that the text of his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY BROTHER EMMETT CORRY, O.S.F.
CATHOLIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

The Catholic Library Association deplors the recent budget cuts in education announced in Washington on April 15th. The Association is particularly concerned about those cuts in library services to the children of the nation through the elimination of Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which has provided essential books and reading opportunities to all children.

Education experts are unanimous about few things; however, most leaders in education would agree that good educational programs are not possible without up-to-date,

quality library books and educational materials. Indeed, the appellation "heart of the school" has often been used when educators refer to the school library. The recently published *Standards for School Media Programs*, jointly sponsored by the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Librarians, makes the point that a unified Educational Media Center is the hub of the school.

Since 1966, Title II of ESEA has helped many schools to begin to offer the kind of unified media program that the *Standards* suggest. In the last three years, through the foresight of Congress, this program has loaned much-needed library books and educational aids to school children and their teachers. These loans have bolstered the curricular offerings of the teachers and have been of special help to children in deprived and poor neighborhoods. The lack of books and other enrichment materials in the homes of the poor has been recognized as one of the key factors in the low performance of these children in certain standardized tests and other educational evaluations which are predicated upon middle-class, enriched backgrounds. The elimination of this valuable program, so essential to the educational progress of deprived children, is particularly deplorable.

Another aspect of the elimination of Title II will be the adverse effect it will have on the education of non-public school children. Of all the parts of ESEA, Title II has had the only significant influence on the education of non-public school children. Titles I and III have been of only minimum benefit to these children because of the lack of a Federal by-pass provision. To eliminate Title II will emasculate the whole ESEA program and, more importantly, will effectively exclude non-public school children from the benefits of ESEA.

If Title II was included in the ESEA in 1965 to provide a means of including all children in some Federal benefits, its elimination now is particularly unfortunate at the beginning of a new administration.

The wisdom of Congress in originally writing this program into the ESEA package is to be commended. It is hoped that Congress will again see the wisdom of including non-public school children in ESEA and will restore this needed part of the Act. We are confident that Congress will not abandon the commitment it undertook in 1965 to all the nation's children, including the seven million in schools in the private sector.

AIDING POSTAL WORKERS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, when President John F. Kennedy issued Executive Order No. 10988, he took a very important step toward better labor-management relations within the Federal Government. It was particularly important for our postal employees. Under its provisions, the order accepted collective bargaining and union recognition as legitimate elements within the Federal employment structure.

But this order has been found lacking, over the years, in its implementation. For this reason, I am introducing corrective legislation today.

During the intervening years more than 12,000 local agreements have been

reached with management in the postal service. The Executive order achieved one of its purposes.

But time marches on. After 7 years, the progress achieved under Executive Order No. 10988 has come to a point of stalemate. Basically, the problem is inherent in the nature of the Executive order. It has no power of law. I am not suggesting that our President is likely to turn the clock back. I am suggesting that a mechanism which involves the welfare and working conditions of the Nation's 700,000 postal employees ought to have and, indeed, must have ultimate legislative sanction.

The Executive order is weighted against employees and there is just nothing they can do about it. Its provisions may be freely violated by management—and such sadly has been the case. There is no equilibrium. Management is the prosecutor and the judge and jury. This kind of imbalance cannot work.

My bill would redress this injustice. This bill sets up an orderly program of administrative procedures and appeal mechanisms while spelling out the rights and privileges of both labor and management within the postal service. It provides for compulsory arbitration of disputes and establishes an independent labor-management relations panel to handle such matters patterned after the procedures which have governed labor-management relations in private industry for more than three decades.

It extends to the postal employee some of the basic protections which have long since been enjoyed by his counterpart in the private sector.

My bill does not weaken the existing statutory prohibitions against the strike weapon in the postal and Federal service.

The overwhelming majority of our postal employees have no fundamental urge to strike or otherwise violate the law. Rather, they have an abiding faith in the Congress as their last court of appeal for equality and justice. We must not let them down.

Mr. Patrick J. Nilan, the national legislative director of the United Federation of Postal Clerks summed up the situation in a recent speech:

When Postal management makes all the decisions unilaterally . . . when the clear intent of Congress is flouted by management in its interpretation of such basic laws as Public Law 89-301 governing work weeks in the postal service . . . when management philosophy is rooted in a "Heads-We-Win, Tails-You-Lose" concept of justice . . . when unions are compelled to seek from the courts the equity they are denied at the bargaining table . . . there is bound to be some resistiveness.

President James H. Rademacher, the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, has also expressed the same difficulties and frustrating problems in his recent speech:

It is one thing to "give" employees a temporary bargaining machine subject to revocation at any point in time. It is quite another to make it work fairly and in the public interest. It seems to me that in the final analysis such a critical and important mechanism must have the legitimacy of federal law. Congress alone has that power. It is past the hour of midnight. It is time we exercised that power.

I request the consideration and support of my distinguished colleagues in behalf of the legislation which I am introducing today as the "Postal Employee Labor-Management Act of 1969."

ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, today when the nation of Israel observes the 21st anniversary of its independence is surely an occasion which marks a splendid triumph of courage, work, and determination over a cruel and uncompromising environment.

Remarkable progress, often against incredible odds, has been made in practically every area of national endeavor in the years leading to Israel's present position. Industrial development has been vigorous, new land has been brought under cultivation, forests planted, roads built, great numbers of facilities constructed for an ever-increasing population, and significant gains made in developing an export trade.

This is not to say that all of Israel's problems have been solved. The arid and hostile climate remains to be conquered. Much must be done to stabilize the internal economy, and even though gains have been made in foreign trade, imports still outbalance exports. Larger allocations are needed for education and social welfare programs from a budget which is already heavily burdened with defense requirements.

The overwhelming goal for Israel, as well as for the whole Middle East, is to find the means to achieve a lasting peace and political stability in order that the people of this vital area may go forward together to improve their well-being. Not to reach a peaceful solution to the differences existing in this region would compound the tragedies of past conflicts. This is all the more true since technology is now close to making sufficient quantities of fresh water available for the needs of everyone. This could mean the end of one of the major sources of hostility, and create the basis for viable economies of a type not dreamed possible just a few years ago.

I am hopeful that in the near future a breakthrough will be achieved in the desalinization of sea water based upon relatively inexpensive nuclear power sources. This will make possible a thriving agricultural economy providing sufficient food for the inhabitants of the area as well as the means for increasing exports. Cheap power will stimulate industrialization, and the vast oil deposits of the Middle East could provide the ingredient for a whole host of new petrochemical enterprises.

What is needed now above all else is the promotion of international understanding and cooperation among the peoples of this region. At this point in world affairs, particularly in the Middle

East, I can think of no greater goal than that. The need for understanding is growing by the day and the hour. Despite all efforts to date, peace has not come to Israel. Stable and lasting peace is as elusive today as it has been over these past 21 years. Fighting and incursions of its borders have become a daily occurrence, almost a way of life, with its day-to-day list of killed and maimed. Once again, we hear talk of a renewed conflict on a larger scale, of a new Arab-Israeli war, and new bloodshed.

I think the time has come for the United States to realize that if the Arab States, armed with Soviet arms and trained by Soviet "technicians," should succeed in destroying Israel, it would mean the end of all Western influence in the Middle East. Not only would this strategic area come under Soviet control and domination, but for all practical purposes Western Asia up to India and perhaps all or most of Africa would be in danger of a Communist takeover. Israel's stand in the Middle East is therefore of vital interest to us all, Jew or gentile.

The United States must exert utmost efforts to bring the parties directly involved, the Israelis and the Arabs, to sit down together, to reason together, and to try to resolve their differences. This is the best, the most logical, the only way to do so. Forcing a settlement upon them, imposing a solution which will be no solution, could prove to be a fatal error. I think that if our Government saw it that way and worked toward that goal, something could be achieved before it is too late and a new conflict erupts.

The road to achieving this goal is fraught with difficulties, but the people of Israel have the will and determination to reach it successfully. On this 21st anniversary of Israel's rebirth let us honor her past accomplishments, and dedicate our efforts to the quest for a permanent peace and a future devoted to the betterment of all the inhabitants of the Middle East.

PUBLIC REVERENCE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the continuation of voluntary participation in prayer in our public schools, and to that end have introduced House Joint Resolution 337, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution to permit such prayer.

Many letters reach me every day on this subject, and I wish to insert into the Record an article on this subject, written by Rev. Robert G. Howes of the Catholic University, here in Washington, D.C., for your consideration:

CHALLENGE TO THE DEMOCRACY: PUBLIC REVERENCE

(By Rev. Robert G. Howes)

(NOTE.—Father Howes is Associate Professor and Chairman of City and Regional Planning at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. He is the representative in Washington of Citizens for Public Prayer, a

national federation of citizens' groups backing a restorative prayer amendment.)

When the U.S. Supreme Court interprets the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution in a manner which radically contradicts the consistent practice of the majority of the states, it does no singular, minimal thing. Whatever the particular practice, that interpretation immediately becomes a precedent affecting the whole future of religion in our public life. As such it must deeply concern not only whose practice is denied but also those who are involved in any way with religion as subject to and supportive of public policy.

On June 25, 1962, the Supreme Court interpreted the First Amendment as barring the following prayer:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we ask Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The prayer had been composed by a committee of religious leaders. It was made available by the State of New York for an entirely voluntary recitation by pupils and teachers in its public schools. Justice Stewart, in dissent, noted:

"The Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle . . . What is relevant to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England or in 18th century America, but the history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our government."

On June 17, 1963, the Supreme Court widened this interpretation to ban the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools of Maryland and Pennsylvania. Once again, no teacher had been required to lead prayer, no pupil to join in reciting it. Specific provision was made for abstention on the part of those who did not wish to participate. There are many pleasant phrases in the two majority decisions. Most of them are collateral remarks, *obiter dicta*, that is remarks incidental to the real deciding reason. One could, and some did, assemble such remarks and claim that the court had done nothing more serious than to rule out a residual unfairness, leaving public religion itself wholly intact.

There are, however, other *obiter dicta* which are less sanguine. For instance, in the first decision Justice Douglas enumerates various instances of government accommodation to religion. Bishop James Pike, appearing before a Senate committee in 1962, called such reasonable accommodation "the great American middle way." Justice Douglas says "our system at the federal and state levels is presently honeycombed" with accommodation. "Nevertheless," he continues, "I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes." In fact, the deed of the decisions, what the then Harvard Law School Dean Erwin Griswold called "the absolute and . . . extreme" reasoning of the court, is dangerously basic. Henry P. Van Dusen, then President of Union Theological Seminary, wrote:

"The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's recent interdictions is inescapable, prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances."

Fordham University Law School Professor Charles E. Rice said:

"The school prayer decisions, if followed, predictably will have the effect of raising agnosticism to the rank of the official public religion of the United States. The Court has now cast aside the historical affirmation by government in this country of the essential truth of theism, has embarked upon a search for 'neutrality,' a search incapable of success, and has substituted agnosticism for

¹ The New York Times, July 7, 1963.

the theistic affirmation to which a small minority has objected so strongly. And for its action the Court can point to no durable justification beyond its own inflated rhetoric and a tortured historical interpretation."²

ALL PUBLIC LIFE AFFECTED

"The Supreme Court in the Lord's Prayer and Bible ruling has continued along a path unhappily familiar to all from its earlier decisions. The same tedious arguments emphasizing the 'establishment of religion' clause are brought forth to support a position which turns its back on the total American tradition and outlaws the present practices of 39 states . . . Let us suppose that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are excluded from the American public schools for precisely the reasons given by the Supreme Court. What is the next step? Clearly, all other expression of religion in public life must now be deleted."³

To suggest that pleasant phrases en route to decision can override the deed of the decisions themselves is to ignore the heart of the matter. That heart clearly is the equation by the Supreme Court of "establishment" with public reverence, whether free or not, whether institutional and sectarian or not. Even to question such an equation, the court said in its second decision, is "of value only as academic exercises!" The situation is, in short, as it was a century ago when Abraham Lincoln commented on the Dred Scott decision:

"When all the words, the collateral matter was cleared away from it, all the chaff was fanned out of it, it was a bare absurdity. . . . The Dred Scott decision covers the whole ground, and while it occupies it, there is no room for the shadow of a starved pigeon to occupy the same ground."⁴

Five years have passed since the first prayer ban. In those years, several significant things have happened.

(1) Literally hundreds of bills were introduced in both the House and Senate calling for a clarifying amendment to restore the First Amendment to its preban interpretation and to forestall a further widening of the court's logic. There were 117 such bills on the House side alone in the spring of 1964. Senate Joint Resolution Number 1 of the 90th Congress was signed by 42 senators of both parties.⁵ It proposed a restorative constitutional amendment which would read:

"Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds to participate in nondenominational prayer."

(2) Catholic response to the prayer bans was openly mixed, though there is no possible doubt that Catholics were in great numbers part of the massive proamendment majority across the nation. The National Council of Catholic Youth officially recorded itself as opposed to the prayer bans and called upon its local units to work for reversal. Otherwise, where Catholic apathy and even support of the decisions showed itself, it has been suggested that an underlying cause was self-interest:

"It may be that some of it is motivated by the thought that if public education can be completely secularized (so that, as it has been said, 'religion' in such quarters becomes 'a

dirty word'), then there will be an increased public demand for sectarian education which can combine religion with general education. This could then be an argument in favor of parochial schools, and as public schools decline, the argument for public support of parochial schools can be advanced in one guise or another."⁶

I hope this estimate is inaccurate. I fear it may be, in at least a partial sense, accurate. Our bishops wrote once that "religion is our chief national asset," and as such what happened to it anywhere at law must affect it everywhere. I am afraid some of us have simply failed to make the vital connection between what occurred in the prayer ban decisions and those aspects of the First Amendment which preoccupy us more immediately. Too many Catholics have simply failed to appreciate that any fundamental interpretation of the First Amendment by the Supreme Court must over a period of time operate in all areas of religion and public policy, including the area of government aid to nonpublic schools under religious auspices.

(3) Eleven of the 13 justices who passed on the New York prayer issue prior to its arrival at the Supreme Court ruled it constitutional. The attorneys general of 19 states submitted a "friend of the court" brief to the Supreme Court, prior to the first decision, which said in part:

"Our founding fathers, together with the great and God-fearing leaders of the last century and a half, would be profoundly shocked were they to have been told in their day that in this year of our Lord . . . a voluntary nondenominational acknowledgment of a Supreme Being and a petition for His blessings recited by American children in their classrooms is being seriously attacked as a violation of the Constitution of the United States."⁷

It was clear from Congressional reaction that a massive mail concurring with such judgments was hitting Capitol Hill. "King-size" was how Senator Dirksen described it. Resolutions endorsing what came to be called the Peoples Amendment for Public Prayer came from the National Conference of Governors, the National Conference of Mayors, legislatures of several states, the National Jaycees, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and from such men as Billy Graham, Cardinal Cushing, the late Cardinal Spellman and Bishop Fulton Sheen. Sampling after sampling confirmed the will of the nation. The Gallup Poll in September 1963 recorded a three-to-one majority for reversing the court in its prayer decisions. In October 1964 the Harris Poll put the figure at 82 percent for amendment. Congressional home district polls backed the national sampling. Again and again there was no subject on which more of a congressman's constituents were united than on the need for a prayer amendment, and no subject in which "don't knows" ran lower, or majorities ran consistently higher. At each hearing on prayer amendment proposals, thousands of proamendment petitions were presented. About 40,000 petitions were introduced on the very first day of the House hearings (1964) by Congressman Fallon of Maryland. To the Senate hearings (1966), we introduced in behalf of amendment 35,000 petitions from Pennsylvania, 30,000 from New York and 50,000 from the Midwest. In the spring of 1967 *Good Housekeeping* magazine came up again with an 80-plus percentage for amendment.

(4) Despite all this, not one single normal floor vote has been held in five-and-a-half years in either house of Congress on even

the technicality of proposing a prayer amendment to the nation. And hearings in this critical matter were forced in the House Judiciary Committee only after a discharge petition to bypass Chairman Emanuel Celler, who was bitterly negative, had nearly succeeded.

(5) In the wake of the prayer ban decisions, things have not stood still. A number of trends have developed. Two are of major importance. First, a trend toward a kind of fearful indecision on the part of public authority. School boards everywhere were from the start anxiously uncertain about whether and how religion was to survive in the public classroom. In some instances, boards have defied the court, but this is, patently, no solution to the problem. In a few instances, boards have tried to substitute various procedures, such as God sandwiched between Thoreau and Ben Franklin for morning assembly reading. These instances, however, remain so rare that each one is the subject of national notice. In most cases the net result has been one of the following: a) to rule religion out entirely; b) to emasculate religion before it is permitted in the school, thus reducing it to the merest art, history or literature; c) to decide any particular question involving religion in the classroom in favor of parents who might conceivably object to it along lines indicated in the prayer ban record. Secondly, there has been a trend toward enlargement of the prayer ban to affect other practices of public reverence. Courts and some attorneys general have relied on prayer ban decisions to strike down kindergarten prayers and such substitutes as the singing of patriotic anthems. In the fall of 1966 the Supreme Court relied significantly on the decisions to knock out aid for church-related colleges in Maryland.

Meanwhile, it was again and again made clear by such opponents of religion in public life as Madalyn Murray O'Haire that the prayer ban would be used as a launching pad for further attacks on all surviving instances of public reverence. It is, of course, impossible to predict with precision just how far the court will go toward accommodating these attacks, but its defenses against them must be seriously weakened by the majority reasoning in the prayer ban cases.

Of course, at the very base of the prayer amendment issue stands the issue of parental rights. There is no question that God belongs in the homes and the churches of America. There is no question that a serious re-examination of His presence there is imperative. But religion is not strengthened at the hearth and the sectarian altar by denying it entry to the public classroom. Religion is not strengthened in the heads and hearts of American youth by wiping it off their lips precisely where most of them prepare for citizenship in a reverent society. What is rather indicated is a joint activity, carefully respectful of the right of dissent, which involves church, home and school. In its 1951 Statement of Belief, which recommended school prayer, the New York State Board of Regents said:

"We believe that thus the school will fulfill its high function of supplementing the training of the home, even intensifying in the child that love for God, for parents and for home which is the mark of true character training and the sure guarantee of a country's welfare."

In its Decree on Education Vatican II underlined how the principle of subsidiarity applies in public education:

"The Church gives high praise to those civil authorities and civil societies that show regard for the pluralistic character of modern society and take into account the right of religious liberty, by helping families in such a way that in all schools the education of their children can be carried out according to the moral and religious convictions of each family."

² The Supreme Court and Public Prayer (New York, 1964), p. 21.

³ June 21, 1963. The Boston Pilot is the official publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston.

⁴ Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 16, 1859; Galesburg, Ill., Oct. 13, 1858.

⁵ Senate Joint Resolution Number 6, this session, with identical language, was introduced by 45 Senators on January 15, 1969.

⁶ Griswold, Erwin N. Utah Law Review, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer 1963).

⁷ United States Supreme Court, October term 1961, Document #468.

It is suggested by those who oppose a prayer amendment that the court banned only "prescribed" prayer and that other types of religious presence in the public classroom stand unaffected, indeed encouraged. There is at the very base of the court's decisions a fatal, secularizing equation. Once this equation has been repealed, there is certainly place for reexamination of the entire gamut of that presence. Various approaches to religion as a force for morality and civic strength can and should be tested. Citizens for Public Prayer fully support such testing, but at the right time. So long as the prayer ban remains, however, there can be no compromise. Generally, those who ask substitutes for the brotherhood of prayer call for a moment of silent meditation, classes in comparative religion or the rendition of God strictly in paintings, dates and poetry. Each substitution has its weakness. Collectively, they are totally inadequate to the need of the situation.

Let's take meditation first. It is most significant that the same day the Massachusetts legislature sanctioned meditation in the public schools of the state it petitioned Congress in support of a prayer amendment. A quiet God is better than no God. But a quiet God cannot provide that experience in pluralism which a spoken God encourages. One great advantage of the brotherhood of prayer consists, precisely, in the fact that through it children from various religious backgrounds are taught that although they go freely to their separate churches and synagogues over the weekend, still they can freely find and pronounce together common words of uniting reverence each day during the week. Besides, meditation is extremely difficult even for adults. To suppose that grade school youngsters can meditate properly is a delusion.

As for classes in comparative religion, it may be that once the prayer ban is repealed we can move along these lines. But such classes will require teachers who have the wisdom of Solomon, and are objective enough to relate one religion to another without bias. And should these teachers fall even slightly, offended parents will rise to challenge them in the courts, just as parents who objected to the earlier prayer did.

In regard to religion as art, history and literature, it is true that under these aspects it belongs in many classes, so that children of a reverent people may review their inheritance. But what a tragedy it would be if God could come into school only as a footnote in classes otherwise preoccupied and minus any factor of reverence whatsoever! Religion is more than dates and pretty pictures and nice phrases. Religion is reverence. Any proposal which drains it of its prayerful blood is anemic to start with. In short, none of the suggested substitutes is, at least in its present state of refinement, adequate. None would in any way remove the tragic precedent of the two prayer ban decisions. Finally, the closer any one of them came to being a real collective reverence, the more likely it is that it would be challenged and struck down by courts under the compulsion of prayer ban logic.

MAJORITY-MINORITY PROBLEM

There is another item in the prayer amendment debate which must be pondered. This is the item of majority-minority relationships in a democracy. It has two facets. The first is: How should society accommodate in its practices a majority will against which there is marshaled a loud minority will? The second is: In the public classroom how should the dissent from prayer and the desire for prayer be handled with justice all around? In regard to the first question, it must at the outset be agreed that 50 percent plus one does not of itself make a thing right. Democracy must never be a matter of a bullheaded majority tyrannizing over a cowed minority. Neither must it ever be an oligarchy in which a minuscule elite, some-

how wiser, forces its preference on an unwilling majority. This latter state becomes what *The Boston Pilot* has called a "tyranny of the few." One thing is clear: As in all such controversial situations, a dissenting minority must be assured to the maximum reasonable extent its right of silence and abstention. To permit a minority's preference to dominate public practice, however, thus denying to an overwhelming majority its will, is an intolerable travesty of democracy. In this case, a strong argument can be mounted in support of the traditional, pre-ban interpretation of the First Amendment. Even Justice Brennan, siding with the majority in the second prayer ban decision, concedes that its factual position is far from conclusive:

"On our precise problem, the historical record is at best ambiguous, and statements can readily be found to support either side of the proposition."

But even if the court's reading of the history and the semantics were accurate, the case for a clarifying amendment would still stand. No people in a free society are required to be prisoners of words which, in that hypothesis, do not say what the people wish them to say and do not permit practices which the people overwhelmingly wish to provide for themselves and for their children. As in the flag salute situation, what is required of a wise judiciary is not a decision rendering the majority silent before an intolerant minority but one that allows the greatest prudential accommodation for dissent while the majority will prevails. The second facet of majority-minority relationships here can be expressed in a question: Is school prayer an unconscionable intrusion on the rights of the dissenting child and his parents? It must be repeated that in the three prayer ban states, school prayer had been entirely voluntary for both teacher and pupil. Tolerance is, and must continue to be, a two-way street. So long as he is respected in his right to be different, the dissenting child must learn to respect the right of the majority of his fellow students who wish to pray together. Dean Griswold's treatment of this critical matter is excellent.

"Must all refrain because one does not wish to join? . . . No compulsion is put upon him (i.e. the dissenting child). He need not participate. But he, too, has the opportunity to be tolerant. He allows the majority of the group to follow their own tradition, perhaps coming to understand and respect what they feel is significant to them. Is not this a useful and valuable and educational and, indeed, a spiritual experience for the children of what I have called the minority group?"*

A related question is often posed. Whose prayer? The answer is simple. Once the civil right of public reverence is restored in the public school, the American people again will select, with a minimum of mistakes and a maximum of good common sense, a reasonably nondenominational prayer. To suppose that any group of Americans with a sectarian majority would be so callous of its neighbors as to insist on a sectarian prayer in their public schools is to fly in the face of the great bulk of American experience. But even should, in a rare instance, such a prayer be proposed, recourse for remedy would still be open with the courts. What is clearly urgent in this entire issue of majority-minority rights is a reasonable pluralism, the kind of adjustment and prudential accommodation which mature men make with their neighbors in any complex matter in which a common decision is required. With such a responsible pluralism, the solution to difficulties such as wording a proper amendment and coming up with consensus prayers is easy. Without it, we become quickly a jungle of selfish predatory religious groups, careless of neighbors and haggling over every ap-

* Op. cit.

proach to that harmony which has so long been the major motif of our people.

A few words of prayer by children in a public place will not alone change the world. The brotherhood of prayer remains an important part of an important pattern. Clearly, however, much more than this is at stake in the fight to write a People's Amendment for Public Prayer. The whole matter of a reasonable and, reasoned pluralism is involved here. So is the survival intact of all practices of public reverence. So is every other controversial aspect of church-state relationship. So, finally, is the very workability of the democracy itself. It is simply incredible that there are still Catholics concerned with democracy, education and pluralism who cannot, or will not, understand these things. John Donne wrote that "no man is an island." It can be said with equal force that no decision of the U.S. Supreme Court fundamentally interpreting the First Amendment against the expressed will of the nation is an island—a minimal, a singular thing. Remedial action now, loud and long, is emphatically indicated. Seldom has the alternative to such action been put more strongly than by Father Joseph Costanzo, S.J., professor of historical jurisprudence at Fordham University.*

"American believers are losing by default. They have taken their spiritual heritage for granted. They have allowed a creeping gradualism of secularism, under one specious pretext or another, to take over their public schools. A vociferous and highly organized pressure group is exercising its own form of indirect coercive pressure upon the American community."

UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG MINORITY GROUPS

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when so many of our citizens tend to leave up to others, and especially to Washington, the solutions to the many problems which confront our Nation, it is refreshing to find organizations and individuals who are interested in presenting the answers to these problems themselves.

Recently, the Mutual Broadcasting System sponsored a contest in which radio listeners were asked to write about what they thought was the Nation's major political problem, how they might solve it if they were President of the United States and what they might contribute toward its solution as individuals.

Of the 3,500 essays which were submitted to the Solutions To Our Problems—STOP—contest, 25 were selected as the most outstanding by a distinguished panel of judges. The winners received \$100 savings bonds. One of these was a constituent of mine from Ohio's Seventh Congressional District. I hereby submit for the Record the winning essay of Mrs. D. T. Holmes, of 1308 Corry Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio:

UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG MINORITY GROUPS

In my opinion, the most pressing problem in the United States is unemployment among minority groups. Many of them have

* This Nation Under God (New York, 1964), pp. 131-32.

no marketable skills because of insufficient education and preparation for today's jobs, which is the basic cause of discontent, disorder, and expensive welfare programs.

As a Solution To Our Problems, If I were President, I would first, have restructured the existing programs designed to prepare minority groups for employment, so that less of the funds will go for administrative personnel and more for the training of the unemployed. Second, I would encourage private industry to establish more programs to train and hire more unemployed minority people. Third, I would establish several agencies or schools to train personnel who specialized in equipping people with marketable skills, utilizing the results of research of education and industry in the most effective methods of training these unemployed in the shortest period; then, this specially trained personnel would be sent wherever needed to cope with this problem.

As a citizen, in addition to civic duties, such as writing my representatives about bills to improve employment among minority groups and encouraging the establishing and strengthening of the type of education necessary for the production of marketable skills, I can indirectly aid the unemployment situation among minority groups by keeping before some of these people the need for developing marketable skills. Through personal contact maybe I can give a "boost" in whatever form is needed: words of encouragement to convince a youngster to remain in school, or tutoring sessions to improve someone's reading ability or to help with someone's homework.

Thus, through some of these suggestions, hopefully we can minimize unemployment among minority groups, which will be a step toward the Solution To Our Problems.

A NEW APPROACH TO SMUT CONTROL

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the merchants of smut seem to be utilizing the mails as never before in their continuing campaign to pollute great areas of the Nation.

In my home city of San Diego, pornographic mailings have been reaching scandalous proportions. The deluge of unsolicited filth has prompted many hundreds of complaints to police and other officials whose ability to take positive action in response is limited by the often conflicting court interpretations of existing obscenity control laws.

I believe a new approach is needed and I am therefore introducing today a Right of Privacy Act which takes its inspiration from the recent Supreme Court decision in Stanley against Georgia. In this case, decided April 7, the High Court ruled that a person has the right to private enjoyment of prurient material.

My legislation is based on the belief that the basic right of privacy, as reaffirmed and interpreted by the Supreme Court, works two ways. If a man has the right, in the privacy of his home, to read what he pleases, by the same token the individual citizen should also be free to avoid exposure to materials which he finds personally objectionable. It is to this negative but certainly undeniable right that my bill addresses itself.

In drafting it, I have followed recom-

mendations made by my good friend, Ed Butler, a former San Diego city attorney who has served on the California attorney general's pornography commission. The heart of the measure is its emphasis on civil suits rather than criminal actions to deter pornographers through the possible imposition of huge fines.

The measure declares that the mailing of unsolicited objectionable material would in itself constitute an invasion of privacy, subject to court action. It would specifically prohibit the shipment of "any matter portraying sexual activities in a manner patently offensive to the average person," unless requested by the recipient.

Federal courts would be empowered to issue injunctions against the dissemination of pornography through the mails. The injunctions could be sought either by individuals or in class actions. If a dealer persisted in such mailings after being ordered by a court to halt them, he would be subject to civil as well as criminal punishment.

The bill also contains a title dealing separately—and more sternly—with the menace posed by material appealing to the enjoyment of torture and violence. In addition to the mails, this section would apply to all instrumentalities of interstate communications, including broadcasting; but it would not penalize material with redeeming social importance or matter used for bona fide political, ideological, religious or scientific purposes. It appears that greater specificity in Federal laws prohibiting mass commercial exploitation of sado-masochism may be dictated by events; at least one recent conviction for advertising a do-it-yourself torture kit was reversed by an appeals court on grounds that the statutes involved were too indefinite.

The bill would also authorize a national advisory committee to report on the effectiveness of the Right of Privacy Act, and to seek ways to promote freedom of expression while cracking down on the misuse of the mails by panderers.

The legislation is admittedly complicated, and requires thorough study by an appropriate committee of this body. I feel, though, that it would strike a balance between our need on the one hand to preserve our precious freedoms of speech and on the other to protect our citizens against a flood of patently offensive trash.

Best of all, it would hit the traffickers in smut where it hurts—in the pocket-book. Enormous fines would be made possible by this proposal. Damages could be awarded for each piece of offensive material sent out, meaning any sizable mailing could easily result in penalties which would drive the average smut merchant into bankruptcy.

MAN'S NEWEST TECHNOLOGICAL FRONTIER: THE OCEANS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, for some time now the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House of Repre-

sentatives as a whole has had in their possession the reports and recommendations of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources.

I believe with others of my colleagues that we must be prepared to move aggressively forward in this Congress to mark the first steps of implementation with regard to the first steps of realization of these recommendations. I am not unaware of the high level of competition for resources which is now going on in the land, but we can ill afford to neglect appropriate support and consideration for the requirements of this new frontier which is already beckoning substantial resources from other countries in the world not all of whom are our friends and allies. I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues recently printed remarks by Mr. Roger J. Pierce, president of one of the new oceanographic-oriented corporations based in Cedar Rapids, Iowa:

MAN'S NEWEST TECHNOLOGICAL FRONTIER: THE OCEANS

(By Roger J. Pierce, president and chairman of the Board, Hydro-Space Systems Corp., Cedar Rapids, Iowa)

INTRODUCTION

In the past, man's frontiers have been geographical on land and sea, but mostly on land, first by exploration of wilderness areas followed by low density and finally high density economic development. Economic growth was achieved mostly by initial occupation by pioneers in primitive settings with primitive tools, with little application of Science and Technology. This was followed by increasingly complex communities of towns, cities, and rural farming areas with the relatively simple technological tools of the 19th century.

By the turn of the 20th Century, new land masses to pioneer had become quite scarce and the only frontiers left were the oceans and space. To pioneer in these last frontiers requires the massive application of Science and Technology to deal with the new "mediums" of water, air and deep space. The pioneers of these new frontiers have in the past 50 years turned to the applications of advanced Science and Technology for exploration not only for the land masses but all of space and the objects in it. This includes terrestrial aerospace immediately around the earth, deep space out to the moon and planets, ocean space from the top to the bottom, and deep earth space from the surface crust to the core of the earth.

Starting in the early part of the 20th Century up to the present, we have seen technological pioneering fill up the aerospace with jet aircraft, helicopters, and myriads of smaller aircraft carrying men and materials all over the world. We have also seen deep space substantially traversed with manned and unmanned spacecraft orbiting the earth, to the moon, planets and around the sun. This is just a beginning. The end of our pioneering in aerospace and deep space is not in sight.

Today we see the beginnings of the exploration and occupancy by technological pioneering, in man's newest frontier . . . the oceans.

The ocean is a vast new parcel of real estate with great potential wealth for man to pioneer and work in. Since the real estate is water which "jiggles" around on the surface and has great pressures and low visibility below the surface, it is a "new" medium which man must conquer if he is to occupy it and work on the surface or in the depths in a reasonably comfortable environment.

The application of mass technology has made us very comfortable in traveling in aerospace in jets at 600 miles per hour. It

has made astronauts reasonably comfortable in their spacecraft orbiting the earth and soon to the moon and beyond. Man has conquered the medium of air, and the medium of cold, airless deep space to provide a friendly environment for men in their machines, and eventually fixed bases on the moon and planets.

The same massive technology which has produced the jets and spacecraft can conquer the oceans, perhaps with greater ease than in space, and provide man with a quasi-terrestrial environment and an area where he can do many more things than just travel through it. Man should ultimately be able to occupy the oceans and to do nearly all the kinds of activity in the oceans' real estate that he can do on the lands' real estate.

What a startling prospect! What a great new acreage to be opened up for man's activity for his economic benefit! It is no wonder so much has been written and said by both dreamers and pragmatic men about Oceanography in glowing, glamorous terms. They are not far wrong when they say the ocean is the "greatest potential future market," the "sleeping giant," and man's "last frontier."

So far, much has been said about Ocean exploitation but very little has been done. Not much has been done because we have not as yet applied the same massive technology to the oceans as we have in aerospace and deep space. This massive technology applied to deep space in the past has been accomplished by a partnership between Government and industry. Neither one could have done it alone. We have our comfortable jets now only because of the huge sums of money Government gave to private industry to develop their military predecessors. Alone, industry could never have acquired enough capital to fund the billions of dollars in the initial development, much less produce the present commercial jets and sell them at a profit.

The deep space effort, while given quite an impetus by the German and U.S. military efforts, has since the formation of NASA had no military connotations. The billions of dollars furnished by the Government and spent by industry in massive technology in space has in ten short years produced an almost incredible development in man's occupation of deep space by his space vehicles.

So must Government and industry team up for the exploitation of the Oceans, if we are to achieve substantial results in a relatively short time period. It must be a partnership of Government with money and industry with brains and manpower. Private industry cannot go it alone unless we wish to wait at least a century for any substantial results. So far, the ocean industry is a potential giant whose growth has been stunted by the lack of nourishment. It needs to be nourished by a substantial "national investment" in Ocean technology. In short, huge sums of money must be provided by the Government. The U.S. Congress and the public enthusiastically buy the dreams of great things to be done in the oceans, but are woefully apathetic in providing the nourishment in terms of appropriations of funds for the "sleeping giant." This must be changed if we are to make significant achievements in the Oceans.

A DREAM OF WHAT CAN BE DONE

A dream is the forerunner of reality. First you must have a dream, then you must try to make it come true. This is my dream of what man can do in the Oceans: . . .

In the future, I see a very busy ocean. I see the offshore areas and deep ocean areas thickly populated with a wide variety of surface, subsurface and bottom structures, essentially "sea buildings." These structures would house laboratories, factories and dwellings for all kinds of man's activities. I can

even envision new ocean cities in the offshore areas with their foundations on the bottom and floating ocean cities out in the deep areas.

I can see mammoth surface craft operating in ground effects just above the surface of the ocean at speeds of 100 to 150 mph carrying men and freight between land, ocean installations, and to far shores. The slow surface ship riding the waves will have disappeared.

I see sub-surface craft of all types from a 5-passenger individual "sub-mobile" much like our land cars to multi-passenger submarine busses, up to 1,000-passenger submarines and heavy freighters, all of these cruising at high speeds under the sea.

I see all this activity in fixed structures and moving vehicles on the surface of the ocean, sub-surface and on the bottom, all linked together by written, oral and visual communications.

Finally, I see all this ocean activity as an integrated "lebensraum" with land, aerospace and space activity, where man is at home in any of these spaces and maintains a community of interest by transportation and communication no matter where he sits—be it in his land home, office or factory; ocean home, office or factory; or in an aerospace craft or spacecraft. I see essentially the same kind of activity in the oceans that I see on land; the only difference is that it would be situated on water.

This is a mighty dream, but not beyond our grasp. It probably outdoes Buck Rogers and Jules Verne in its dimensions; but with the present exponential rate of rise of technology, these fantastic things might come faster than we dare predict today.

SPECIFIC EXPLOITATION OF THE OCEAN

Today we speak of the ocean as a great new potential source of food by fish farming and "aquaculture" in the sea. We speak of the ocean as a great reservoir of wealth in offshore oil and minerals. We speak of the ocean with its restless waves and tides as a great resource of potential power. We speak of it as a great area for recreation for our leisure time. We think of the ocean as a base for better prediction of the world's weather. These and many other corollary activities suggest the ocean is indeed a great storehouse of wealth for exploitation by man, provided he can work and live there.

NEW OCEAN TECHNOLOGY NEEDED

In order for man to occupy the oceans, he must have the physical means in the hostile environment to provide housing, transportation, power, communications, and all the components of living and working there, as he does on land. Here are the specific new areas where massive technology must be applied to develop the major components for ocean exploitation to make the dream come true. This is practical, scientific dreaming.

Ocean buildings: First, we need large, substantial, fixed structures in the ocean in which man can live and work. In short, we need to know how to build ocean homes and factories for many purposes and many configurations. This ocean structure of the future will be like nothing man has ever conceived or implemented in the past. It will be an entirely new concept to deal with the extremely hostile environment at the surface and the ocean currents and pressures in the sub-surface and bottom.

All previous ideas of ocean structures such as buoys and platforms must be swept aside and new concepts implemented capable of adjusting to the hostile environment to provide a near-normal environment for man to work in. This means that these structures must have little or no roll, pitch or heave due to waves and winds. They must be capable of staying in a reasonably fixed location, even though there may be high waves, winds, ocean currents and miles of water beneath them. The interiors must be at the

normal temperatures and atmospheric pressures for humans so that they can operate in a "shirt-sleeve," or normal environment.

This type of structure is almost analogous to the complexity of a spacecraft in coping with space environment, but many, many times larger to be a useful tool in the exploitation of the oceans. It would seem obvious that these large structures would have to be submerged below the surface where the water is quiet and relatively unaffected by surface waves and winds. In most cases, there must be a surface interface and a structure protruding from the surface of the ocean for access. The surface structure would be very small to present minimum exposure and reduce the effect of the forces of winds and waves, whereas the submerged portion would be very large to accommodate the human activity being carried on. In short, these structures would be much like icebergs with just a tiny portion above the surface and the great bulk and mass below the surface. Or, another way of looking at it, we would build "upside-down" skyscrapers in the ocean with only the elevator shaft peeking above the surface.

Development of such a structure could be scaled up or down from very small ones of several tons to huge ones of thousands of tons, and possibly even to future floating cities of millions of tons.

This may seem like a very rosy dream, but consider the evolution from the first small dug-out canoe of the primitive savage to the mighty ocean liners and warships of today, in the day of the canoe it would have been impossible to have predicted the modern ocean liner.

With such sophisticated ocean structures available, it would not be difficult to conceive of a busy ocean factory producing food from fish and other protein rich resources out in the oceans where the raw materials are available. It would not be difficult to conceive of these structures being used as a base for an ocean offshore oil production factory or an offshore base for mining of minerals on the ocean bottom. It would not be hard to see that they could be used for underwater hotels for recreation . . . rooms and picture windows under the sea and on the surface superstructure, sunbathing, swimming, boating, and general loafing on patios and sheltered lagoons.

Subsurface transportation: Another important component of ocean exploitation is transportation unaffected by the turbulent surface conditions. This means a new generation of highspeed submarines. Here the major problem with both very large and very small submarines is the drag of the water as the vehicle cruises at high speeds. Much technology must be expended to reduce the co-efficient of friction so that high speeds can be obtained with minimum power. Mother Nature has solved this drag problem for the dolphin and other fishes which have an extremely low drag co-efficient. Perhaps massive technology will also solve this problem so that underwater transportation will be at a speed high enough to suit the needs to the new ocean communities.

Surface transportation: Surface transportation must be lifted just above the surface of the waves where there is no pitch and roll but only the low drag of air and no part of the structure touches the water. Recent developments in "air cushion" and "surface effect" vehicles may be the solution which will eventually obsolete conventional surface ships and even advanced craft such as the hydro-folls. These "surface effect" craft could be built up to thousands of tons and carry a large payload of passengers and freight at high speeds.

Ocean "robots": Another important component for ocean activity is the ocean "robots" or workhorses. It is not sufficient for a man to travel through the ocean; he must be able to perform tasks of all kinds at great

depths and low visibility. These ocean robots will be analogous to the delicate manipulators used in handling of nuclear materials, as well as to heavy construction machinery like cranes, bulldozers, etc. In the land versions of the latter, man can sit in the seat in the open air and manipulate the various levers controlling the working members. In the oceans this is not possible, and man must be in a protected environment from the great pressures and be provided with lighting or television and have almost human-like extenders of his hands and feet to do intricate work and to magnify the forces he can exert manually. Much work has been done in "man-machines" where the motions of a man's hands can be extended and magnified by servomechanisms to actuate steel muscles and fingers with great power and delicacy. All that is needed now is to surround the man with a proper shirt-sleeves submarine shell and external, powerful, iron hands which he can control for intricate manipulation.

Communications: Still another important component of ocean exploitation is communications by the spoken voice, messages of record and by television. These will be needed for business and personal usage. Communications stations on the stable structures mentioned above can link all this activity via the use of synchronous satellites to relay the messages. This technology is already available.

Power: Still another important ocean component is power, huge quantities of power. This could come from undersea atomic reactors much the same as these reactors being built today for large quantities of power on land. There is also the possibility that the power of ocean waves and tides may be harnessed at sea and converted to useful electrical or mechanical energy.

SUMMARY OF VITAL OCEAN COMPONENTS NEEDED

Recapping the important components needed for the new areas in man's last frontier . . . the oceans, are:

1. Fixed Structures—"Ocean Buildings"
2. Surface and Sub-surface Transportation
3. Communications
4. Ocean Robots
5. Power

When these components are developed to the degree of sophistication to meet the varied needs of the ocean, then we would be indeed well on our way to the implementation of my dream for a very busy ocean.

IMPLEMENTATION

Now I go back to my original premise that it is not enough to dream, but one must get very practical to make the dream come true. I go back to my original premise that to do all these things mentioned above will take massive technology unleashed by large sums of money. This means employment of thousands and thousands of scientists, engineers, technicians, working over years in all these areas to solve the problems and produce working hardware for the major components mentioned above. This means massive expenditure of money to employ all these people.

The U.S. has this type of manpower which can be addressed to this massive technological effort. It is technologically possible for us to do all these things, given sufficient money, men and time. The main question is: When shall we start, and how much shall we start with, directed at what areas? In short: When? How much? and What? If the premise that this type of effort must be a partnership between Government and Industry is correct, it is then up to Government to establish our national goals and decide what kind of national investment we want to make in the ocean. It will then be up to Industry to carry out this effort.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would suggest that we start now, that a National Oceanographic Administration be established which would formulate the national goals and specific projects to start with, and then ask Congress for funds to carry out and implement these goals. I would suggest no less than two billion dollars per year be allocated to this effort initially, increasing as over-all national objectives in the civilian and military sectors allow reasonable increases. If this can be done, it would be a substantial start of man's advance into his newest technological frontier . . . the oceans. It would be the start of making this dream come true.

MOE MAY BE NIMBLE BUT HE CANNOT BEAT NIMBUS

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as a life member of Elk Lodge No. 434 in Bayonne, N.J., I was appalled to read a Washington Post editorial describing the latest use of technology. It seems that an elk named Moe in Yellowstone National Park has been connected to a recently launched satellite, Nimbus 3. The comings and goings of Moe as he does his elk thing are now an inerasable part of a scientist's computer.

Poor Moe. Little does he realize that an occasional sliver of light against the ice blue sky over Yellowstone is actually a beady eyed spy. His graceful movements are now just a jagged curve on a graph, his investigation of the broad and beautiful plains of Wyoming is but another statistic, and his fleet flight to escape the fingers of night can never outrun electronics. He may be nimble, but he cannot beat Nimbus.

Now I am perfectly aware that there is only a tangential relationship between the elk as an animal and the human organization known as the Elks. But this use of wildlife demonstrates a perfectly plausible way for some individuals to stifle the life of their fellow humans.

Mr. Speaker, this is not absurd. On April 11, 1968, I had the privilege of introducing into the Record a brilliant article from the Yale Law Journal by Harvard Law Professor Charles Fried. The horn which Professor Fried used to impale a masterful description of the necessity for privacy was a not entirely hypothetical proposal to monitor parolees.

I wish I could insert the entire article again, but let me give one quotation from Professor Fried which I used on March 26, 1969, in a speech before the Chicago Chapter of the Institute of Management Sciences:

Privacy is the necessary context for relationships we would hardly be human if we had to do without—the relationships of love, friendship, and trust. Intimacy is the sharing of information about one's actions, beliefs, or emotions which one does not share with all and which one has the right not to share with anyone. By conferring this right, privacy creates the moral capital which we spend in friendship and love.

Mr. Speaker, in that speech I developed the idea that the territorial imperative in lower animals has a counterpart in man which I call the intellectual imperative. The Washington Post editorial shows yet again that something which is employed in lower animals can have a powerful relevance to man. After all, we sent several monkeys into space before we launched the first astronaut. Who can say that Moe, the irredeemably bugged elk is not a trial balloon for the bugging of men? What can bug Moe can bug us all.

Professor Fried describes the ease with which a device could be inserted in a human:

These devices are so small as to be entirely unobtrusive; other persons cannot tell that a subject is "wired," and even the subject himself—if he could ever forget the initial installation—need be no more aware of the device than of a small bandage. Moreover, existing technology can produce devices capable of monitoring not only a person's location, but other significant facts about him . . . the sounds in his immediate environment—e.g., what he says and what is said to him—and perhaps in the not too distant future even the pattern of his brain waves.

That "not-too-distant future" is the present for Moe. So I would say to those who are my fellow Elks to take heed from what has happened to a literal elk.

Mr. Speaker, editorial writers of the Washington Post always do a splendid job in describing the threats of invasion of privacy. It is too late for Moe, but I insert the editorial in the hope that it is not yet too late for us all.

MOE THE BUGGED ELK

Somewhere out in Yellowstone National Park is an elk named Moe. At the moment, Moe is a very important elk, not only to his friends and relatives in the Park's herd but also to science. For Moe, to put the indignity he has suffered into modern lingo, has been bugged. He is carrying a radio transmitter along with him as he wanders through the Park's vast acreage.

Now Moe is not the first elk to become important because scientists have attached a modern-day invention to him; others of his breed have been bugged in the past. But Moe steps into the special category of very important elk because of the nature of the gadget he is carrying. His transmitter, unlike those worn by other noble beasts in the past, is keyed to the latest satellite launched by the United States. It is supposed to report to that flying mass of electronic gear every hour and a half or so on Moe's wanderings. In turn, the report is to be sent along through NASA's communications net to the scientists who are interested in Moe, and from it they chart Moe's course—up to look at Old Faithful or over to the cliffs of the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone or to the edge of Heart Lake.

Moe's wanderings probably won't be any different from those of his relatives who have been bugged in the past. Scientists can and have traced the steps of wild animals with tools far less complex than satellites. But if Nimbus 3 demonstrates that it can keep track of Moe, a new era for the biologists and conservationists will open. Then they will be able to bug whales and polar bears and seals and condors and what have you in an effort to learn more about the life cycles of these long-ranging creatures who know the world is far larger than Moe would ever believe even if someone could tell him. Thus, the space age seems about to throw

off another side benefit that will help in understanding life on this bit of the universe.

No benefit, however, comes without its disadvantages. If Nimbus 3 can tell all about Moe, Nimbus 10 or 50 or 100 can tell all about a ship or an airplane or, for that matter, a person. All it would take would be a bug attached in the right place. Thus, while Moe is clearly a Very Important Elk, we're not sure whether to hail him if he lives up to his assignment (and brings 1984 a step closer) or blows it (and postpones that day a bit longer).

ANOTHER YEAR OF SOVIET DOMINATION AND COERCION OF THE POLISH PEOPLE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching once again a significant anniversary date—a date of particular importance to Polish people everywhere, but also of interest and importance to all freedom-loving peoples.

May 3 will mark the 178th anniversary of Poland's Constitution, an event which, unfortunately, the Soviet-imposed dictatorship in Poland denies today's residents of Poland the right to observe, while it is marked by those of Polish descent in other lands, including the United States.

This year's anniversary of Poland's Constitution coincides with three other significant dates of Polish history:

First. The 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet attack on Poland.

Second. The 25th anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino.

Third. The 25th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising.

This year also marks the silver jubilee of the founding of the Polish-American Congress. This is a great organization dedicated over its existence to working as loyal American citizens to encouragement of world understanding of the continuing desire for peace and freedom of the people of Poland.

It is of special satisfaction to me that this wonderful organization came into being in May 1944 in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., with the participation of over 2,000 delegates from various Polish American groups.

The record of activity and accomplishment by the Polish American Congress is one of which all can be proud.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in my remarks a summary of the work of the Polish American Congress:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS: 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

"We, the representatives of the united Americans of Polish descent, assembled in convention at Buffalo, New York, mindful of our civic duties, solemnly pledge our unqualified service, love and affection to our country, the United States, and our active participation in its life. Desiring to give true expression to our sentiments and aims, we call into existence the Polish American Congress."

With this declaration a representative body of about ten million Americans of Polish origin had been founded at organizing convention, held on 28, 29 and 30 May, 1944, with

the participation of over 2,000 delegates from Polish American church organizations, fraternal orders, professional, educational, civic and business groups.

Under wise and skillful leadership of its officers, the Polish American Congress was the first American organization to speak out against Russian aggrandizement and warn of the folly of any attempt to appease Russia on the grounds of wartime expediency. Since 1944, its leaders have carried this warning to the public, to this Country's leaders and to the governments represented at the United Nations. Events of history, which now reveal the true menace of Communism to civilization, have proved the validity of these warnings.

The Polish American Congress has made strong protests against the Yalta Agreement, which sacrificed Poland to Soviet domination, and against the rigged elections which were staged in Poland to form the present government. It has emphasized the importance of restoring a free, independent and integral Poland as the cornerstone of European stability and as the true foundation of world peace and American security.

Numerous and comprehensive memoranda, statements, resolutions, letters, wires and booklets have been directed to Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon; Secretaries of State Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, Marshall, Acheson, Dulles, Herter and Rusk; members of the United States Congress; delegates to the United Nations; the press; the clergy, educators, and the public. In all, the Polish American Congress has called for adherence to the Atlantic Charter and respect for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

Delegations of the Polish American Congress have met Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, to plead the case of a free and democratic Poland and oppose the terms of the Yalta Agreement; presented the cause for an independent and integral Poland to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco; attended the Paris Conference, and made a tour of Polish displaced persons camps in Western Europe.

A delegation of the Polish American Congress presented the viewpoint of Americans of Polish origin to numerous leaders and diplomats of democratic countries in personal conferences in Europe.

Officers of the Polish American Congress, have testified before Congressional committees considering legislation to admit displaced persons into this country. The Polish American Congress has established a committee on displaced persons.

It has established commissions of American affairs, culture and education, civic affairs, economics and management, and information and publications to improve the welfare of Americans of Polish descent through support of their schools, parishes, press and vocational activities.

The Congress has through several of its state districts offered scholarships to young Americans of Polish origin to encourage study in fields such as social work, arts and journalism.

It has supported the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America; the Polish Immigration and Relief Committee in New York and The Polish American Historical Association.

It has published a Polish-English newspaper, the Delegates News-Letter, and a digest-size magazine—the Bulletin, containing informative articles on American foreign policy, the Polish situation and related subjects.

Cooperating with the national headquarters at 1520 West Division Street, Chicago, Illinois, are 33 state divisions in 26 states. Membership in the Congress includes more than 20 fraternal organizations and their local lodges, parishes, several Polish lan-

guage newspapers, outstanding members of the arts, sciences and professions, and business, industrial and civic leaders—also thousands of local church, civic, charitable, cultural, business, ideological, political, professional and other associations, clubs and societies, in cities and towns from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this year also marks the 25th anniversary of the Victory of Monte Cassino. Following is a summary of that significant event in Polish history:

VICTORY AT MONTE CASSINO

From the dawn of history, Cassino stood as the southern gateway to Rome. On the adjacent mountain known as Monte Cassino, many temples and altars were built to unknown deities by unknown worshipers in the dim past.

St. Benedict arrived there in the years of 525-529 and found a complete pagan Acropolis, which he rebuilt, in a Christian pattern, into the Abbey of Monte Cassino.

Here, the Poles have tried to grasp the always elusive to them freedom—when the Polish Legions under General Henryk Dąbrowski was guarding this territory for the Armies of Napoleon; then again in 1918, when Polish Army of the West was being organized from Polish-Austrian prisoners of war; and in May, 1944, when the Second Corps of the Polish Army-in-Exile wrestled the mountain from the Germans.

There were four battles of Monte Cassino in 1944 and they belong to epic struggles of World War II. The chain of hills towering above the city of Cassino blocked the northward offensive of the Allied Armies, and was transformed by the Germans into a seemingly impregnable fortress.

In the three previous battles, soldiers from seven nations, including the United States Second Corps, tried unsuccessfully to blast the Germans from their mountain stronghold. These battles raged from January until the end of April, 1944.

Then, on May 11th, 1944 at 11 p.m., the Appennine peninsula began to tremble from a renewed violence; two thousand heavy artillery guns opened fire on Monte Cassino.

At 1 a.m., on May 12th main elements of the Polish Second Army Corps—the Third and the Fifth Divisions under the command of Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, began to attack German positions, capturing under withering enemy fire and in hand to hand combat Points 593 and 569, and finally—The Phantom Ridge.

The battle lasted a whole week. The Poles advanced yard by yard, bled, died and fought, sustained by the indomitable will to win.

During the night of 17th and 18th of May, the Germans resorted to flight. With the dawn of May 18th, Polish white and red flag was unfurled above the smoke filled and blood stained battlefield.

Peace returned to ruins of Monte Cassino.

The Poles paid a heavy price for this victory; 860 officers and men killed in action, 2,822 wounded.

One year later, in March, 1945, a committee was formed for the purpose of rebuilding the Monte Cassino Abbey. It made very little progress, however.

Then on October 10, 1945, the Polish Embassy at the Vatican notified the Papal Secretary of State, that the soldiers of the Polish Second Corps are willing and ready to rebuild the Abbey. The Pope accepted this offer with deep gratitude. British Command assigned 200 German prisoners of war, who worked whole year on the project under Polish officers and men.

Thus the Poles not only conquered the enemy on Monte Cassino, but were the first to start working on the restoration of its former glory.

The gallantry and heroism of the Poles were beyond praise.

On the memorial in their war cemetery at the slopes of Point 593, these poignant words are written:

"We Polish Soldiers,
"For your freedom and ours,
"Have given our souls to God,
"Our bodies to the soil of Italy,
"And our hearts to Poland."

As Fred Majdalany points out in his book, "The Battle of Cassino": "By their selfless immolation the Poles turned that grim mountainside into a memorial to soldiers everywhere."

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising, an heroic hour which turned into a sad betrayal of the Polish people in their time of need when help could justifiably have been expected. Following is a summary of this tragic period for Poland 25 years ago:

THE WARSAW UPRISING

The story of heroic Warsaw Uprising and inhuman Soviet treachery goes back to July 1944.

The invasion of the European continent by the Western powers was progressing rapidly. In the East, the Soviet army already occupied large Polish territories won from retreating Germans.

Moscow radio, through its "Kosciuszko" station began to broadcast appeals to the Poles:

"Warsaw . . . the hour of action has struck. Your houses, parks, bridges, railroad stations, factories, buildings, stores have to be transformed into centers of resistance. The Germans will attempt to make a stand in Warsaw—to destroy whole city. In Bialystok they were busy for six weeks destroying everything and murdering thousands of people. . . . Let us do everything in our power to prevent them from committing same crimes in your city. People of Warsaw to arms."

These calls were repeated day in and day out, and finally, on July 29th, when the Russian offensive ground to a halt on the right bank of the Vistula, in Warsaw's suburb of Praga, Moscow radio sent out a more "urgent appeal to Warsaw", urging the Poles to "fight against the Germans", and "the hour of action has arrived." Warsaw never surrendered, never ceased to struggle. And now everything will be lost in Hitlerite deluge unless you save it through action . . . Poles, the time for freedom approaches. Poles, take to arms . . . There is no second to be lost. . . .

The Polish underground authorities adhered to the instructions given by Polish Government in London, where the Western Powers insisted that the Poles must actively co-operate with Russia. Accordingly, the Polish Government in Exile issued such orders.

Then, on July 31, 1944, Delegate of the Polish Government in London, and Vice-Premier of the Polish underground branch of this government, Jankowski, after having heard opinions of the Commander-in-Chief of the Home Army, General Bor-Komorowski and his Chief of Staff, General Monter, issued orders to the Home Army, to start revolt against the Germans the next day, August 1, 1944, at 5 P.M.

Three days later, on August 4th, all activities on German-Russian front ceased, although the Soviet forces already consolidated their positions in Praga. Even their heavy guns were silenced.

Instead of promised and anticipated roar of Soviet artillery, which would herald new phase of Russian offensive, all was quiet on the eastern front of Warsaw.

There was only one explanation: Warsaw had been betrayed by the Russians.

On August 17th, Premier Churchill and President Roosevelt appealed directly to Stalin to help Warsaw. Stalin did not reply.

Anglo-American Staff drew up a plan in London for bombing German positions in Warsaw by means of shuttle operations. British and American aircraft were to bomb German strongholds in Warsaw, then fly for re-fueling to nearby Luck, already occupied and secured by the Soviet army.

Stalin not only rejected this plan, but at the same time accused the Poles, fighting and dying in Warsaw, of "betrayal" and "collaboration" with the Germans.

The Poles fought on against all odds, against all hope.

They forced the Germans to send three armored divisions, badly needed on the Western front, to Warsaw. These, with incessant bombings by German planes, finally crushed the uprising.

After sixty-three days of fighting, Warsaw capitulated.

Over 250,000 Polish men, women and children died in this struggle, in which even Juvenile Scout troops rose to the height of heroism and sacrifice.

The Germans, with a teutonic fury destroyed, burned, pillaged the remnants of the city.

Warsaw did not die, however.

The indomitable Polish spirit rebuilt the city from desolation and ruins.

Warsaw, rising like Phoenix from the ashes, remembers Nazi brutality and Soviet treachery.

And it longs for the day on which a truly free and independent Poland returns to the Western family of Nations.

ELECTORAL REFORM CLIMATE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring an editorial from the New York Times to the attention of the House and especially to our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, who will soon be deciding which electoral reform method they will present to the House. This editorial provides further justification for creating a direct, popular election of the President and I strongly believe that this is the best reform method if we are to honestly create a system which is responsive to the demands of the people.

The editorial is printed in full as follows:

ELECTORAL REFORM CLIMATE

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, through its committee on Federal legislation, has given strong support to proposals for a constitutional amendment under which Presidents would be chosen by direct, popular election.

This is the only electoral reform, among several Congress is considering, that would guarantee each voter's vote counting the same and the candidate with the most popular votes winning election. It reflects the one-man, one-vote principle basic to American democracy. It deserves enactment to replace the present Electoral College system with its risk of deadlock and a denial of the popular will.

The House Judiciary Committee, which has been holding hearings on electoral reform along with the Senate Judiciary Committee, is scheduled to vote on the direct election proposal next week. It is expected to

approve direct election, but the size of its vote could prove crucial. There have been reports that President Nixon will be largely guided by the results of the committee's action.

An overwhelming endorsement by the House group would help confirm the evidence already given by opinion polls and other indicators that direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents is the reform favored by most Americans. Such an expression could also help persuade the President to take a clear stand for this fundamental electoral reform, the one he personally favors and the one he should have fought for from the start. His taking that position, even now, could make the difference between its enactment and its rejection.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS DRAMA COMPANY TO PERFORM IN WASHINGTON

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas has one of the Nation's 10 best drama companies and has been invited to perform in the first American College Theatre Festival in Washington. The festival dates are April 28 to May 12, and the University of Texas will present "An Enemy of the People" at Ford Theater, May 2-3.

Directing the play, written by Henrik Ibsen and adapted by Arthur Miller, will be Arnold Kendall, of the University of Texas Department of Drama. Cast members include Michael Bobkoff, Larry Scott Lane, James Bailey, and William Halliday, from Houston, Tex.; Mavourneen Dwyer, Montreal Canada; Karen Seal, Richardson, Tex.; Steve Bradley, Omaha, Neb.; Garry Moore, Austin, Tex.; Wayne Good, Dallas, Tex.; Raja Mitry, Victoria, Tex.; and Terry Tannen, Weimer, Tex.

ABOUT THE PLAY—EXCERPTED FROM THE CATALOG OF THE DRAMATISTS PLAY SERVICE, INC.

A small Norwegian town has just begun to win fame and wealth through its medicinal spring waters. Dr. Stockmann, resident physician in charge, discovers that the waters are poisoned. On receiving proof of this, he immediately reports to his associates, the town officials most immediately affected. The doctor is shocked to find that instead of being thanked, he is looked upon as a dangerous crank, motivated by a desire to prove that his fellow townsmen are wrong, and to bring ruin upon them. As the people who run the local paper and the town officials—among them close relatives and friends of the doctor's—do their utmost to urge secrecy and compromise, the determined doctor realized that the honesty and idealism he has counted upon to make the truth prevail, simply do not exist in the face of selfish "practical" interests. The press will not report his findings; the officials refuse to give him a hearing; he loses his position and the townspeople boycott him; ultimately his wife and children are cut off from all contact with friends and neighbors. Almost every weapon of offense and abuse is brought to bear against the family—blackmail, slander,

and eviction from their home. A single individual, a sea captain, stands by them and agrees to take the family to America. But even his good intentions are checkmated when the powers that be buy the ship and refuse passage to the Stockmanns. But all the time the doctor, morally supported by his family, carries on the magnificent fight for the truth. At the end, the townspeople, gathered outside the home which the Stockmanns must soon leave, cast stones through the windows. Stockmann addresses his family: "But remember now, everybody, you are fighting for the truth and that is why you are alone. And that makes you strong."

Mr. Speaker, 176 colleges entered this first nationwide festival. Regional committees screened the productions and made their recommendations to the central committee, according to actress Peggy Wood, cochairman of the festival and honorary president of the American National Theater and Academy. The festival is sponsored by American Airlines, the Friends of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and the Smithsonian Institution. It is produced by the American Educational Theater Association and the American National Theater and Academy.

In view of the credentials of the sponsoring organizations, the screening of the entrants was thorough. Therefore, I am proud to honor the University of Texas drama group, and all the other colleges which will perform at the festival. I would encourage my colleagues to attend at least one of these fine presentations.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 1 month since the death of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower. We are reminded of this sad event each time we have occasion to see the Stars and Stripes flying at half mast in his memory.

The month-long official period of mourning for this great American will extend but a few more days, but he will certainly be remembered long afterward. His contributions as leader in time of war and leader in time of peace will be forever recalled by his grateful country.

Dwight Eisenhower exemplified what is best in America: courage, devotion, strength of character, humility, respect for mankind, and love of homeland. He was ever ready to serve his country in any capacity: warrior, educator, Chief Executive.

We would all do well to rededicate ourselves, public officials and private citizens alike, to those ideals for which the general stood, especially during these chaotic times. This would be the most fitting memorial we could devise to honor our former President.

When our flag is again raised to full staff, may it fly over a more wholesome, united America.

ROTC IN OUR COLLEGES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, 18, and 19, at Valley Forge, Pa., the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge held a veterans summit meeting, designed to stimulate a greater understanding and deeper appreciation of the fundamental principles of our constitutional Republic and responsibilities in the American system of liberty under law expressed in the American credo. To study and examine objectively the mounting domestic problems of internal subversion, anarchy, the student revolution designed to destroy the U.S. society and its free institutions. To consider ways to mobilize and elevate respect for American traditions and support internal and external defenses of the United States, ROTC, NATO, and others.

The first speaker on the agenda was retired U.S. Army Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, former commander in chief of U.S. Army in Europe who spoke on ROTC in our colleges. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a compilation of the main points covered in General Clarke's address:

FACTS FROM A TALK ON ROTC BY GEN. BRUCE C. CLARKE, RETIRED, VETERANS' ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE, FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE, APRIL 18, 1969

1. My ROTC background:
 - a. Member of high school ROTC.
 - b. Taught 4 years ROTC at a State University.
 - c. Member of Post-War ROTC Policy Board in 1945-46.
 - d. G-3 Army Ground Forces 1946, implementing post-war ROTC policies.
 - e. Commanding General of CONARC 1958-60 supervising ROTC program of the Army.
2. This paper primarily covers Army ROTC.
3. ROTC operates on over 350 college campuses—Army on 268 of them.
4. Over 200,000 college men involved in all services.
5. ROTC major producer of junior officers for the active army.
6. This year the three sources will produce approximately the following number of officers for the active army:
 - a. United States Military Academy, 760.
 - b. O.C.S., 8,500.
 - c. ROTC, 16,500.

The ROTC will continue to be the largest single producer of officers for the Army.

7. Future plans call for Army ROTC to produce 15,000 officers per year.

8. Today's ROTC program based upon Vitalization Act of 1964 which provided:

- a. Two and four year programs, or both, as determined by host institutions.
- b. Authorized a basic summer camp to prepare cadets for the Two-Year Program.
- c. Established ROTC Scholarships, paying tuition, books, lab fees and subsistence allowances.
- d. Increased cadet pay and allowances.
- e. Expanded the Junior ROTC Program in secondary schools.

9. To assist in management, an Army Advisory Panel on ROTC Affairs, was formed in 1952. Its 13 members consist of 10 prominent educators and three other distinguished persons from walks of life other than education. The Panel is designed for direct and easy college-Army communications and

serves as a sounding board for new concepts and plans.

10. At the beginning of the present school year there were 514 Junior ROTC units with an enrollment of 102,000 students. Since that time 48 new units have been established.

11. New Senior ROTC units were added last year and 15 more were added this year.

12. Of the Army's 268 Senior ROTC units enrolling cadets in FY 1969; five are Military Colleges, nine are Military Junior Colleges and 254 are State and Private Institutions.

13. 10 years ago two-thirds of the institutions had a compulsory program; one-third were elective. Today the ratios are reversed.

14. Of the 15 top producing schools, 10 are elective, 5 compulsory.

15. There has been a decline in basic course enrollment but the advanced course is holding its own at a high level. Over 37,000 advanced course ROTC cadets in FY 1968.

16. Prerequisite for entering advance course is: completion of basic course or a six-week basic training camp.

17. Expect 3,400 to take basic camp this coming summer and enter advanced course this fall.

18. Currently 3,900 students are attending college on Two or Four-year ROTC scholarships. 5,500 ROTC Scholarships will be in effect in FY 1971.

19. Each Scholarship pays for tuition, laboratory expenses, fees, and textbooks, and a subsistence allowance of \$50 per month. Four-year winners are selected on a nationwide competitive basis. Two-year Scholarships are allocated to ROTC detachments for award to qualified students who have already demonstrated motivation and aptitude for the Army.

20. 125 of the original Four-year Scholarship selectees were appointed to the United States Military Academy last year, thus allowing a similar number of alternates to accept scholarships.

21. In anticipation of your questions I will give you some data on Negro ROTC participation:

a. 14 predominately Negro colleges are in the ROTC program—4 where students are required to take basic course—1 requires MS I—9 elective.

b. 6,635 Negroes are enrolled in ROTC in these 14 colleges.

c. Approximately 9,500 Negroes enrolled in the Senior ROTC Program.

d. As of January 1969 11.5% of the Army strength, officer and enlisted, was Negro and 3.4% of Army commissioned officers were Negro.

e. There is a definite campaign on at West Point to encourage the appointment of more qualified cadets from minority groups including Negroes.

f. Percentage of Negro Army officers will grow.

22. In 1949, I integrated, on an individual basis, a battalion in Germany. I believe it was the first. In 1951-52 I integrated a Division in Fort Hood, Texas. Since then integration is on a full and complete basis in the Army.

23. To recapitulate then, 268 college campuses in operation with 150,000 cadets enrolled, graduating over 16,000 men in June of 1969.

Now what do the critics say? The basic arguments surround: (1) Limiting academic freedom upon which universities thrive; (2) Professorial titles for PMS; (3) Curriculum not credit-worthy.

24. The academic freedom issue is that educators believe that ROTC curricula are directed from an outside body in Washington and that professorial titles are dictated by law and that faculty members are sent to the colleges from Washington—all of which impinge on the prerogatives of the school to run its own business and set its own standards on all matters relating to the college.

The truth is, the Army is flexible in these matters.

25. Academic titles for the PMS. Public Law currently specifies that "the senior officer of an ROTC detachment will be given the academic rank of professor" by the college or university to which he is assigned.

26. The basic Army standards for a PMS and assistants are:

a. All ROTC professors or assistant professors have a Bachelor's degree.

b. 35% of the PMS now have a Masters degree.

c. Plans are that all the PMS will have a master's degree by 1975.

d. All have graduated from the Advanced course of their branch—a one year course.

e. Many PMS have graduated from the C. & G.S. College—a one year course.

f. Some have graduated from War College courses.

g. All have had good or better efficiency ratings in Army assignments pertaining to their fields.

27. The Army feels that the curriculum, which is constantly being upgraded is worthy of academic credit as an elective.

28. Finally, it is through solid backing made by those assembled here, that the program will continue to be a vigorous one.

29. I encourage you to visit campuses, talk with educators, influence youngsters and motivate ROTC cadets by your meeting them on their territory. You can be particularly effective in local high schools, informing students of the scholarship opportunities. The answer, then, is that we must compete in the dialogue on campus and recognize that change is progress. We must not withdraw from the campus because critics are vocal. Progressive curricula, directed by competent officers and supported by an enlightened citizenry can keep this program vigorous.

SOFT ON CIVIL RIGHTS?

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial from the week of April 7 expresses an impatience with the administration's announced intent to address itself to the urgency of civil rights issues. It is an impatience shared by millions of black people in this Nation.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and I commend the Post Dispatch for taking a clear stand on the issue of equal opportunity. The editorial follows:

SOFT ON CIVIL RIGHTS?

Clifford L. Alexander's irate resignation as head of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission indicates that the honeymoon is over as far as the Nixon Administration's attitude on civil rights is concerned. Where does the Administration really stand?

Obtaining decent jobs is perhaps the key to the problem of Negroes in the ghettos, and Mr. Alexander was in charge, under the 1964 Civil Rights Act, of enforcing equal opportunity to jobs. He was named to his post by President Johnson and had full support from that President. He also performed effectively and courageously. Now he charges that the Nixon Administration has been soft on job discrimination and unresponsive to the need for equal treatment.

The record of Mr. Alexander's own recent treatment certainly supports serious questions about where the new administration stands. During Senate hearings, Republican Leader Dirksen accused Mr. Alexander of

"harassing" businesses on equal employment and, in what is best described as a tirade, threatened he would "get somebody fired." The next day the White House announced that Mr. Alexander would eventually be replaced with a Republican.

This threat hanging over the head of an able official was bad enough, but parts of the Administration's record on employment were worse. The Defense Department approved contracts with three Southern textile firms accused by Mr. Alexander's agency of pursuing job discrimination practices. It has been left for a private organization, the NAACP, to file suit against these firms where the Government should have acted. In addition, Secretary of Transportation Volpe changed policy requiring highway contractors to follow fair employment practices, without consulting rights officials.

Naturally White House officials deny that they are anything but eager to enforce civil rights laws. The trouble is that the Administration's record so far seems more intended for show than for real accomplishment.

The Justice Department has just filed job discrimination charges against one big Southern textile firm. This is praiseworthy but hardly enough to answer Mr. Alexander's complaints. President Nixon has ordered another \$9,000,000 allocated for cleanup and repair of riot-torn cities, but the verbal priority he gives this task hardly matches the sum proposed to do it. Secretary Romney suggests expanding the Model Cities program to all urban slums, but that would mean spreading less money in more places.

The White House says "in time" its record will make clear the Administration's desire to carry on the civil rights struggle. We hope so. Time is passing, without much practical evidence that the Administration recognizes the dangerous consequences of applying small bandages to the sorest wound in American society.

HUMAN EVENTS AT 25

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this year one of the most remarkable publications in the Nation, Human Events, is celebrating its 25th anniversary. Due largely to the pioneer work of Human Events 25 years ago, American conservatism had a rebirth as a viable political entity.

Although condemned from ultra-liberals at every turn, the editorial staff and contributors to this forthright and courageous publication have not yielded in their determination to give Americans the benefit of another point of view.

The vociferous opposition by the so-called "liberal establishment" to Human Events is to be expected. After all, the liberal, who should be the most tolerant by virtue of the very term "liberal" is the least tolerant individual in our society. As a consequence, anyone who offers an opposing viewpoint is automatically labeled a right-wing extremist by the liberal. They fully realize that Human Events stands as a bulwark of strength against the encroachment of more and more control by the Federal Government over the daily lives of all Americans and this presents a very real threat to contemporary American liberalism and everything it stands for.

Human Events continues to grow at an amazing pace, and because of this growth

conservatism is appealing to more and more people, especially the youth of America. It is indeed a privilege to salute Human Events on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. I predict for this thought-provoking, patriotic, and wholly American news publication another 25 years of success.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I would like to commend an editorial from the April 10, 1969, issue of the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation, as follows:

HUMAN EVENTS AT 25

Publication of a special 25th anniversary issue of Human Events, a magazine and political commentary, serves as a reminder of the rebirth of American conservatism in the last quarter century.

The conservative outlook has deep roots in American history, having such diverse 19th century spokesmen as John C. Calhoun of South Carolina and Fisher Ames of Massachusetts. By 1944, when Human Events was founded as a Washington newsletter, conservatism seemed to be going the way of the dodo bird. Franklin D. Roosevelt had been elected to an unprecedented third term as president. Contemporary spokesmen of intelligent conservatism were few, and almost without outlets. Liberalism in all its forms, from the mild socialist variety to varieties closely identified with Marxism, was blooming.

Today, a vastly different situation exists. The man in the White House, if not a full-fledged conservative on every issue, is strongly influenced by conservative ideas. The White House staff includes at least one well known young conservative theoretician, Dr. Richard V. Allen. Whereas conservatives hardly would have been allowed in the White House a few years ago, today they are welcome.

M. Stanton Evans, editor of The Indianapolis News, chronicles "The New Conservative Era: A Generation of Growth," in the 25th anniversary issue of Human Events.

"Political change," he notes, "is seldom unilinear and neat, and the Republican-conservative transformation since '44 has occurred as a series of ebbs and flows rather than as a single decisive thrust."

But there is abundant evidence of conservative growth and influence.

California, the most populous state in the Union, has a strongly conservative chief executive in Ronald Reagan. The Republican Party has had a major transfusion of Southern conservatism. Conservative youth groups, such as Young Americans For Freedom, are flourishing.

Perhaps the most important long-range development is emergence of conservative journalists and thinkers, authors such as William F. Buckley, Jr., James J. Kilpatrick, Dr. Russell Kirk, Holmes Alexander and John Chamberlain—several of them contributors to The News and Courier as well as to Human Events.

As yet, conservatives don't predominate on college campuses. They don't play a leading role in the New York book world. But conservatives can no longer be safely ignored by liberals. The liberal presidential candidate failed last November.

In the battle for the mind of the rising generation, conservatives aren't faring badly, though peaceniks and militants grab the headlines. The middle class is continuing to move along the conservative path. Members of the big industrial unions are beginning to act more and more conservative.

Twenty-five years of pioneering by conservatives such as the editors of Human Events is beginning to pay off in a more thoughtful public approach to politics and ideas.

CARRY A BIG LAW LIBRARY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, local police officers have become a much maligned group. Actually, they are doing basically a good job in spite of the changes in rules which have been imposed upon them in recent years as a result of a series of court decisions.

WGR-TV, channel 2, in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., carried an interesting editorial on this matter the other day, as follows:

CARRY A BIG LAW LIBRARY

J. Edgar Hoover, in the current issue of the F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin notes that today's law enforcement officer must "speak softly and carry a big law library."

He goes on to say there is nothing wrong with an officer's speaking softly and being well-versed in legal criminal procedure. Ideally, this is as it should be.

Unfortunately, in the criminal realm within which he must work, the law enforcement officer is the only one playing by the rules. This places him at a definite disadvantage.

An officer must subordinate his personal safety, his own rights and the rights of society to be sure he does not commit some error which might later result in the release of the guilty.

Vigorous law enforcement is needed to cope with crime and violence in our nation. It cannot be achieved if arresting officers are required to make an apologetic approach to every killer, rapist, robber and thug roaming our streets. If the rule of law is to prevail, the law must be enforced.

These are words to ponder . . . by J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial contains only portions of the comments of Mr. Hoover from the March 1 edition of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

I believe that the full text of Mr. Hoover's comments warrant wide circulation and attention, and I am including his entire statement, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

A newspaper columnist noted that today's law enforcement officer has to "speak softly and carry a big law library." Actually, his paraphrase of the well-known quotation from Theodore Roosevelt comes close to being true. There is nothing wrong, of course, with an officer's speaking softly and being well-versed in legal criminal procedure. Ideally, this is as it should be.

Unfortunately, in the criminal realm within which he must work, the law enforcement officer is the only one "playing by the rules." This places him at a definite disadvantage. In complying with all the procedural safeguards established for criminals, an officer must often subordinate his personal safety, his own rights, and the rights of society to insure that he does not commit some error which might later result in the release of the guilty. Criminals are usually well aware of their legal rights and take full advantage of them.

Many critics of law enforcement today substitute paper theories for grim realities. When they advocate more restraints on arresting officers, they do so apparently on

the premise that police are dealing with only law-abiding cooperative citizens who respect the law and those charged with enforcing it. While a big percentage of police contacts are with the responsible members of society, increasing assaults against and killing of law enforcement officers are indicative of the open contempt numerous violators have for police and authority of any kind.

Arguments are made that court opinions and legal restraints are not so broad as to require arresting officers to unduly endanger their lives in order to meet standards established to protect the rights of the suspect or accused. Here again, we encounter the difference between theory and practice. Judicial guidelines which are so vague and questionable that even the highest jurists disagree on their intent place a heavy burden of judgment on the enforcement officer. In crucial moments, this burden of judgment can create indecision. And as we know, moments of indecision can cost an officer his life.

The trend today, even though unintentional, is to negate the enforcement of the laws to insure that the criminal is protected. We are asking our officers to operate under an honor system in dealing with an element of our society which has no honor. Certainly, arresting officers cannot be permitted to resort to illegal tactics themselves, but they must be allowed to perform their duty with confidence and with the assurance that they have the support of the public, the government on all levels, and the courts. The powers of arrest must be as clear and positive as possible.

Vigorous law enforcement is needed to cope with crime and violence in our Nation. It cannot be achieved if arresting officers are required to make an apologetic approach to every killer, rapist, robber, and thug roaming our streets. If the rule of law is to prevail, the law must be enforced.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

NATIONAL SECRETARY'S WEEK

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, this is National Secretary's Week.

Last year I forgot to make note of the occasion. I do not think I will forget it again.

As my colleagues know, every politician, at one time or another is picketed. There are antiwar demonstrators and win-the-war demonstrators and ban-the-bomb demonstrators and build-a-bigger-bomb demonstrators. But how many have been picketed by be-kind-to-secretary posters and Remember-National-Secretary's-Week sign carriers?

It will not happen to me again.

I salute National Secretary's Week, not because of the continued threat of the secretarial corps picketing my office, but because they deserve to be acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to say thank you to Sydney Ann Dine, case worker; Vera V. Lewis, staff assistant; Judy B. Martin, staff assistant; Virginia C. McCay, personal secretary; Eleanor R. Parker, legislative assistant; Patricia Schultz, staff assistant; and Sally M. Walker, personal secretary.

REVERSED REWARD AND PUNISHMENT SYSTEM IN THE PENTAGON

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous examples in recent months of the incredibly reversed reward—and punishment system for Pentagon cost control and procurement personnel.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a few selected articles on the experience of two of these courageous people.

Irony would have it that in the office of Government employees hangs a plaque displaying the Government Code of Ethics which includes "expose corruption when it is identified."

It would be a sorry state of affairs when the taxpayers' interests can only be protected at the expense of great personal risk on the part of people like Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. McGee.

The articles follow:

PLEDGES WERE CONTRADICTED, PROXMIRE SAYS:
AIR FORCE MEMO ON WAYS TO FIRE AIDE
CITED

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Congressional investigators yesterday turned up an Air Force memo describing three ways to fire efficiency expert A. Ernest Fitzgerald. He is the man who told Congress that the C-5A transport would cost the Government \$2 billion more than it bargained for.

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), chairman of the committee before which Fitzgerald had appeared, called this "the most shocking retaliation against a public servant I have seen in the 11 years I have been in the Senate." He said that the memorandum "directly contradicted" pledges by Air Force officials that no action would be taken against Fitzgerald for speaking out.

At the same time, the Pentagon announced that it was buying 23 more of the high-priced giant jets from the Lockheed Corp. An Air Force official indicated that the cost of this latest order would run about \$541 million.

The explosive document was disclosed at a hearing of Proxmire's Economy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. On the stand was Robert H. Charles, the Air Force Assistant Secretary for installations and logistics.

Proxmire reminded Charles that Fitzgerald had been stripped of Civil Service protection 12 days after his original testimony about the C-5A cost over-run last November. Charles insisted that a "computer error" had given Fitzgerald the protection in the first place.

No further action against Fitzgerald is planned? Proxmire asked.

None, replied Charles.

Then Proxmire read him a memo entitled "Background Information Relating to the Fitzgerald Case," dated Jan. 6 and addressed to the Air Force Secretary, Harold Brown, by hsl administrative assistant John Lang.

The document explained that Fitzgerald, the Deputy for Management Systems to the Air Force assistant secretary for financial management, could be removed in three ways. One was to bring him up on charges in order to "promote the efficiency of the service."

Another was to make a "reduction in force," Civil Service terminology for abolishing his job. The memo observed that Fitzgerald had not come to his post from any other Government position and, therefore, "could neither 'bump' nor displace anyone" else.

"There is a third possibility, which could result in Mr. Fitzgerald's departure," Lang wrote Brown. "This action is not recommended since it is rather underhanded and would probably not be approved by the Civil Service Commission."

The "underhanded" technique, Lang explained, would be to convert Fitzgerald's post to a career job and hold a competition to fill it.

Charles, unruffled, said he thought the Lang memo was simply "outlining various things that could happen under certain conditions."

Proxmire retorted that it didn't sound as if the Air Force was about to promote its embattled efficiency expert. Charles would concede only that "the wording was unfortunate."

Almost lost in the exchange was the cause of the controversy, the C-5A. As Charles saw it, "we are disappointed with the increased costs" but "it is an outstanding program."

According to his arithmetic, the entire planned order of 120 planes will only cost \$4384 million or a near \$882 million more than was estimated. The difference between his figure and Fitzgerald's \$2 billion over-run is traceable to two factors, primarily, Charles is not counting an extra \$350 million to be spent making the big plane even bigger. He is also leaving out about \$650 million in additional costs that the Government now expects to pay for spare parts and auxiliary items.

Charles also testified that as much as \$500 million of the ballooning cost could be explained by "inflation." Proxmire quickly pointed out that this was allowing for an inflationary rate far in excess of any Government index.

Precisely what the Government will pay for its latest order of 23 planes, an addition to the 58 it has already purchased, is unclear for several reasons. Charles said that the "fly away costs" of the new batch would run to \$541 million. However, he left out the cost of the rapidly rising spare parts and did not figure in the Pentagon's peculiar "repricing formula."

Under this device, the greater the expense that Lockheed shows on its first production run, the more the Government pays for additional planes. For example, if costs run 35 per cent more than estimated, the Air Force pays 107.5 per cent of its contract price. But if costs run 100 per cent more, the Air Force pays 240 per cent of the contract price. For Proxmire and others on his subcommittee, this was an open invitation to Lockheed to keep its original cost estimates low and balloon them thereafter. But Charles refused to agree.

LETTER REVEALS NAVY'S MOVES TO FIRE CRITIC (By James G. Phillips)

Navy officials mapped out a plan 18 months ago to "build a case" for firing a civilian fuel inspector who reported massive thefts of U.S. fuel supplies in Thailand, newly-revealed Navy correspondence shows.

A campaign for firing John M. McGee was outlined in a letter from F. J. Leffler, chief of the Overseas Division of the Navy Fuel Supply Office in Alexandria, to Arlie F. Rankin, who then was McGee's superior in Thailand.

The letter, which Leffler has acknowledged writing, said that Capt. R. N. Jones (USN), commander of the Fuel Supply Office, "would like to fire the guy" (McGee) but that Government personnel experts had advised that "we have to build a case against him first." The letter was dated Nov. 3, 1967.

Jones, contacted by a reporter, declined comment on the issue.

McGee admitted taking the letter from Leffler's file but asserted that he came upon it in the course of his new duties at the Fuel Supply Office.

Leffler said he had written the letter because he had learned tardily that McGee had shown "insubordination" to Rankin by criticizing his fuel inspection procedures and showing a "generally poor" attitude toward Rankin.

Leffler said Navy personnel procedures would not permit his office to fire McGee at that point, however, because Rankin had awarded McGee a "satisfactory" performance rating only several months before.

A recent report by the General Accounting Office found that more than 5.5 million gallons of fuel intended for U.S. forces in Thailand had been stolen in 1966 and 1967. The report cited Rankin for lax inspection procedures—a finding that has since been challenged by the Navy.

Since the letter was written, the Navy has tried once to fire McGee and twice to reprimand him. It dropped the firing action, but the reprimands are still pending.

All personnel actions relating to McGee are currently under study by Navy Secretary John H. Chafee. A Navy spokesman said Chafee was studying Leffler's letter and hoped to arrive at some decision on the McGee case in the near future.

Disclosure of Leffler's letter marks the second time in recent months that attempts by the armed services to manufacture cases against controversial civilian officials have been revealed.

During hearings before the Joint Economic Committee last January, Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) revealed an Air Force memorandum showing ways to fire A. Ernest Fitzgerald, a high-ranking Air Force civilian who had informed Congress of cost overruns in the C-5A transport aircraft program.

MASKING WASTE

With the overwhelmingly largest part (\$78 billion) of the nation's budget going to defense, one would think strict controls would overspread defense spending. Evidently not so.

In recent weeks have come two disclosures of seriously costly waste. And the circumstances surrounding them hint they may be only the caps of much larger icebergs beneath. But what is most troubling in both disclosures is not alone the cost, but the apparent attempts by the military to cover up for themselves and penalize their "informers."

The first case involved a civilian fuel inspector for the Navy, John M. McGee, who uncovered the theft of vast quantities of jet fuel and gasoline in Thailand. After running into blocks put in his way by superiors, McGee wrote to Sen. William Proxmire (D) of Wisconsin to complain of the pilferage and the problems he was having with his superiors. The fuel theft was quickly confirmed by a General Accounting Office investigation: at least 5.5 million gallons had been stolen in 1967 alone. McGee's personnel problem wasn't so easily resolved. He was told he would be dismissed in 30 days for failure to answer a minor question on his job application. An inquiry showed he had answered the question, whereupon the Navy changed its action from dismissal to a reprimand—still an unjust harassment meant to switch attention from the fuel scandal to McGee as a service misfit.

The second case was the disclosure to Congress by A. E. Fitzgerald, a management systems deputy in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, that the C-5A jumbo air transport project was running \$2 billion over estimates. When asked, he attributed the overrun to inadequate controls and "corporate strategy" by the contractor, which gave a low first estimate with the

thought of boosting prices on the second production run. He also alluded to political pressure to pay the extra costs since the main plant was in the home state of Sen. Richard B. Russell (D) of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. For his candor, Fitzgerald was notified 12 days later that his job-protecting tenure was being withdrawn.

Congress must investigate both the unjust reprisals meted out to Messrs. Fitzgerald and McGee as well as the cowardly, self-protecting code of the military that would further mask defense waste.

THE NEW BETHEL BAPTIST CHURCH INCIDENT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that most of my colleagues have heard various reports of the New Bethel Baptist Church incident of March 29, 1969. A brief statement of the occurrences of that night and the next morning would be that a policeman was killed, the black church was then surrounded and fired upon by the police, and the persons inside were arrested and held incommunicado for several hours. A recorder's court judge was summoned at dawn and set up a temporary courtroom in the police station. After a conference with the prosecutor and a hearing, all but two of the prisoners were released.

The aftermath of these events has served to further polarize feelings in our already racially tense city. The widespread misreporting and analysis of the incident by the communications media due to the general confusion of the moment has greatly contributed to the tension.

I am very pleased to say that the Detroit Free Press, in its lead editorial this morning, pointed out the general confusion of the media and admitted to some misreporting of the events on its part. I feel that this significant editorial by a newspaper that is not afraid to admit a mistake should be inserted in the RECORD so that as many persons as possible can get a clearer view of the incident. I am also inserting a statement made to the press by Recorder's Court Judge George Crockett, who as a result of the many attacks directed at him personally, was prompted to take the unusual move of calling a press conference to correct the distortions of his action spread by the mass media. Both his statement and the Free Press editorial reflect the kind of noninflammatory comment which is so often lacking when such incidents take place:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 16, 1969]
AS WE SEE IT: DETROIT CANNOT AFFORD TO FOLLOW DPOA LEAD

The hardening of battle lines drawn by the Detroit Police Officers Association against Recorder's Court Judge George Crockett is a tragedy for the city, the courts and the police. It is a battle which should never have been joined.

We can certainly sympathize with the DPOA's anger over what it regards as a callous public attitude about the death of Patrolman Michael J. Czapski. We can sympa-

thize with Carl Parsell, president of the DPOA, when he says that all may be lost unless there is as much remorse about Czap-ski's death as there is about the damage to the New Bethel Baptist Church.

And we can understand the DPOA's feeling that its efforts to find the guilty parties were frustrated by what the DPOA considers speedy and summary action by Judge Crockett.

But the attempt to have Judge Crockett removed, either by petition and concurrent resolution by Gov. Milliken, by impeachment, or through the Judicial Tenure Commission, is no way to approach the problem. This may relieve DPOA anger, but it will do nothing to solve the problem reflected by it.

The DPOA will not end, by this move, the danger of racial polarization. It will not end the feeling among many of the black community that the police are racists and that this is a racist society. The police cannot win, in this way, the broad support of the whole community which police demand and have a right to expect.

What is at issue here? Certainly it is no longer what exactly it was that transpired at New Bethel church that Saturday night. The most important facts of that incident are all too tragically clear: A policeman dead, another wounded, four black civilians wounded.

The issue is whether the police were right in arresting some 142 people, and whether the events that followed in the next 12 hours conformed both to the reasonable rights of the state to protect itself and the reasonable rights of individuals to their civil liberties.

Thus the real issue that divides the DPOA and Judge Crockett is not an enormous one of competency, or the assumed right of the police to judge a judge, but only what constitutes the rule of reason.

In fairness to all concerned, Judge Crockett's court that Sunday was chaotic. Mechanically, with 142 people arrested, detectives and uniformed police working overtime and interested but uninvolved parties entering and leaving, the system broke down. The police could not process the cases and Judge Crockett could not fully control his court.

In the confusion that swirled around the courtroom proceedings that day, the facts of what took place were reported inaccurately by many media, including this newspaper. We have since corrected those errors and we think there are human factors which explain them, but the original inaccuracy cannot be excused. In part, the error was ours and we regret it.

Even now, studying a transcript of the court record, it is all but impossible to sort out the details. It appears that a number of persons were released before the regular noon court session began and that Assistant Prosecutor Jay Nolan told the court he wanted to hold only 10 of the original 142 arrested. At that point, Nolan himself did not even know how many persons were being held. Two of the 10 were held, one for assault with intent to murder and the other for carrying a disabling chemical spray.

Mr. Nolan asked that the other eight be held either because they had positive nitrate tests or because police suspected "a speck of nitrate." Judge Crockett ruled that nitrate tests on prisoners held incommunicado without benefit of legal counsel were unconstitutional.

When these were disposed of, Mr. Nolan then recommended the release of all others. Judge Crockett, acting on the prosecutor's motion, so ordered.

That, then, is really what the fight is all about. Is a nitrate test, without counsel, legal? The question has yet to be decided, though the Supreme Court has ruled that a blood test on an unconsenting suspect is legal. Certainly the issue is a reasonable question.

And how long may suspects be held? If there had been only one suspect, would six

hours, or 12 hours, have been too long for police to question him without counsel or advising him of his rights? The Supreme Court has ruled it would be. But with 142 persons to be questioned, before they are even suspected of a crime, how long is reasonable? Even Solomon in his wisdom would be hard put to offer an answer to satisfy all sides.

Both sides in this debate, and all other concerned citizens, should also remember that justice is slow. The Algiers Motel case and the Rouge Park case are not yet settled. They, too, try the patience.

If mistakes were made, as they were, it seems evident that they were human mistakes, compounded by confusion and tension. Judge Crockett is considered an eminent constitutional jurist, and attorneys and judges of all persuasions have supported him, just as others have condemned him.

The questions are, essentially, ones that reasonable and knowledgeable men can disagree about. They may be debated for years. What is important in this time and circumstance is that the debate not become irrational, and that light, not heat, be cast upon it.

STATEMENT BY JUDGE GEORGE CROCKETT

The distortions of fact and the confusion over this Court's actions in the recent events at New Bethel Church compel me to make certain facts clear. I am personally deeply affronted by reports and stories which have clearly and deliberately twisted the truth and the law in this matter.

More serious than any harm to me personally is the profound damage being done to this Court and to our entire community by those who would use this tragic affair to intensify community hostilities which are already so deep and divisive.

The actions taken by me in my capacity as presiding judge, following the New Bethel Church shootings and the mass arrests, were legal, proper and moral. Indeed, it is precisely because I followed the law, equally and without partiality, that questions and accusations are being raised. If I were to have reacted otherwise, if I were to have ignored my judicial and constitutional responsibilities and followed the often accepted practices of condoning long police detentions, of ignoring prisoners' rights to counsel and of delaying the hearing on writs of habeas corpus, possibly the adverse publicity about Judge Crockett may have been averted. But in doing so, justice would have been denied.

I deplore the senseless shooting of the policemen. I also deplore the armed assault on a church, particularly a church occupied by men, women and children, whom we must presume to be innocent until and unless evidence to the contrary is presented. I deplore, too, that so many innocent people were rounded up by the police, incarcerated for many hours in violation of their rights as citizens, and that some officials who are sworn to enforce equal justice have complained because I have done so.

Michigan law requires—does not suggest, but requires—that "any judge who willfully or corruptly refuses to consider an application action, or motion for habeas corpus, is guilty of malfeasance in office."

Moreover, "any justice of the Supreme Court and any judge of a Circuit Court may issue a writ of habeas corpus . . . upon his own motion whenever he learns that any person within his jurisdiction is illegally restrained of his liberty." By statute, Circuit Court, as used in this rule, includes Recorder's Court.

Justice last Sunday demanded a prompt judicial examination and processing of the persons arrested. If there was any sound legal basis for their detention, they were detained; otherwise they were entitled to be released and they were released upon reasonable bond.

Let us review the sequence of events following the shooting of the officers and the storming of the church by police, which occurred some time before midnight Saturday.

At 5 A.M. I was called—not by the police but by Representative Del Rio and Reverend C. L. Franklin, the church's pastor, who came to my home and awakened me. As presiding judge of this Court for the day, I went immediately to the police station. I requested a list of the prisoners and was told—about six hours after they were taken into custody—that police didn't know whom they were holding.

I then talked with Commissioner Spreen who agreed to furnish a list. He also agreed to set up a courtroom on the first floor of the police station. I requested that the Prosecutor be called, and Assistant Prosecutor Jay Nolan arrived. The press was present. Mr. Nolan, the police and I agreed on the processing of the prisoners. They were to be brought immediately outside the temporary courtroom in groups of 10, beginning with the women. But they appeared before me individually and each was interviewed separately by me in open court.

The cases of 39 arrestees were then heard and determined as follows:

15 Detroit residents were released on \$100 personal bond to reappear at noon.

1 man (the church janitor) was discharged with consent of the Prosecutor.

1 man from Ohio was released on \$100 personal bond and ordered to reappear at noon.

22 persons from out-of-town were remanded to custody until noon. All persons released on personal bond appeared at noon as directed.

Further hearings were terminated by the entrance of the Wayne County Prosecutor who, in the presence of the Court, issued verbal orders to the police countermanning a court order. The Prosecutor, in the presence of the Court, prevented the police from producing any further arrestees for the hearing.

I have condemned the Prosecutor's action as not only contemptuous, but also as having racial overtones.

Subsequently, in a letter to presiding Judge Robert E. De-Mascio dated April 1, I declined to press the formal contempt charge. To pursue the contempt proceeding, I felt, would aggravate the already tense community confrontation.

Moreover, the Prosecutor himself, after the contempt incident, and before the Court reconvened at noon and after the Court reconvened, himself released or requested the release of some 130 arrestees.

It is essential to emphasize that the vast majority of those released, approximately 130 persons, were released with the Prosecutor's concurrence. Despite this fact, the press has several times referred to my actions in terms of "unwarranted leniency." There was no unwarranted leniency.

By noon, the number of prisoners whose disposition was under question had been reduced sharply. Out of approximately 142 persons arrested, only 12 remained to be processed. Two of these prisoners I ordered held without bond because there was evidence to do so. Another I released on \$1,000 bond after his attorney said he would vouch for him.

The other 9 prisoners were those who, police said, had positive nitrate tests. On this question, I hold that such tests are unconstitutional when taken without the presence of counsel or at least upon advice to the prisoner that he is entitled to counsel at this critical step in his interrogation. For me to have held those nine men, without objective evidence and under those circumstances, would have been improper. The police had many hours to identify those nine men. They should know who they are. If those men committed a crime, the police must gather evidence to make a case that will hold up in court. They still can do so if their investigation warrants it.

I am most anxious that criminals be apprehended, tried and brought to justice. But I will not lend my office to practices which subvert legal processes and deny justice to some because they are poor or black.

I understand, of course, why the hue and cry arose. An angry Prosecutor, lacking police evidence or testimony which might produce a probable suspect, and resentful that ordinary and undemocratic police practices were challenged, chose to divert public attention to Judge Crockett. And some of the media, particularly the Detroit News, picked up that lead and began their campaign to help the police and the Prosecutor's office continue their efforts to dominate and control the courts and legal processes. The judiciary cannot allow its independence to be threatened in this fashion.

Finally, and regretfully, let me repeat that this whole case does have racial overtones.

Can any of you imagine the Detroit Police invading an all-white church and rounding up everyone in sight to be bussed to a wholesale lockup in a police garage? Can any of you imagine a church group from, let us say, Rosedale Park, being held incommunicado for seven hours, without being allowed to telephone relatives and without their constitutional rights to counsel? Can any of you justify the jailing of 32 women all night long when there was admittedly not the slightest evidence of their involvement in any crime? Can anyone explain in other than racist terms the shooting by police into a closed and surrounded church?

If the killing had occurred in a white neighborhood, I believe the sequence of events would have been far different. Because a terrible crime was committed, it does not follow that other wrongs be permitted or condoned. Indeed, constitutional safeguards are needed even more urgently in times of tension than in ordinary times.

The best guarantee to avert the kind of social disaster that occurred in Detroit in 1967 is prompt judicial action with strict observance of constitutional rights.

I intend to continue to maintain law and order in my court by dispensing justice equally and fairly, by protecting each individual's rights, and most importantly, by upholding the independence of the judiciary and the dignity of this court.

If the real dangers to our community are to be uprooted, let the news media and all other forces of truth and justice concentrate on the underlying causes of crime and social disorder as described by the Kerner Commission and as identified by virtually every responsible commentator in America. The causes are steeped in racism . . . racism in our courts, in our jails, in our streets and in our hearts.

CHALLENGE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, ever since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea nearly 20 years ago, the specter of an aggressive world Communist movement has acted as a buffer on any threats to the American Military Establishment. No one denies that some of the threats have been real and serious, but even those actual instances of aggression have added extra fuel to the demands of the establishment for an increasing share of our resources.

Between 1950 and 1960, total defense

expenditures more than doubled, and it is already certain that by 1970 we will see more than a doubling of the 1960 defense budget level. And of course there is no letup in pressures for more and more funds for that wonderfully nebulous catchall termed "national security."

But, even as those pressures for higher military spending mount, a counterforce to the establishment is gaining strength. For the first time since Korea, the Nation is being aroused into realizing that "national security" means that as much emphasis must be put into internal problems as it does for external affairs.

And as the stress for immediate domestic solutions increase, a natural abrasion occurs with the equally strong push by the establishment, an abrasion which involves the prime control of power and authority in America.

Thus, we find that behind the intense surface struggle over deploying an ABM system, over testing MIRV warheads, over going ahead on a new \$12 billion manned bomber, there lies a more basic and key issue—the debate of our overall national priorities and the need to represent the will and judgment of all citizens.

Until recently, and even despite President Eisenhower's poignant warning, the military-industrial-political-educational complex—with its tentacles stretching from these very Chambers of Congress into the majority of our large educational institutions throughout the country—remained virtually invisible. No target was vulnerable for criticism, no one person—one thing—could be pointed at as a culprit.

Now, the veil is lifting, the secrecy fading. We see how the pleas for "defense and security" are really no more than further extensions of establishment tentacles, that too many "foreign threats" originate here as the schemes of the complex to cement their control over the Nation.

I am not for weakening national security, I am not advocating retrenchment of all our national defenses. What I support is a strong Nation, a Nation built upon freedom, justice, and equity, and I believe in a symmetry between external and internal priorities, a symmetry largely lacking today.

It is vital that all of us know the totality of the military-industrial-political-educational complex before we can cope with it. We cannot set priorities without a perspective on the complex and on the forces now challenging the establishment.

With these thoughts as an introduction I would now like to insert into the RECORD a series of informative articles presenting a wide background on the establishment and on the confrontation now going on in this country. I, therefore, include the following articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Progressive, April 1969]

CHALLENGE TO THE PENTAGON

Something special and significant and promising is happening in the nation and the Congress. For the first time in two Cold War decades, substantial numbers of Americans and their elected representatives are openly challenging some of the myths that have misguided the foreign policy of the United States.

There is a new and growing awareness that this country has become a Warfare State—that the military establishment has attained a position of power and influence that is utterly disproportionate to any external threat and that poses a drastic danger to peace abroad and progress at home. The standard scare propaganda ground out by the Pentagon's huge and costly brainwashing apparatus is finally being met with at least a measure of skepticism.

This is one positive result—the only one, in our judgment—of the Vietnam disaster. The reaction has finally set in to the innumerable military misjudgments that have beguiled Presidents and the public into an ever more disastrous adventure. In an interview with the *Reader's Digest* only a few weeks ago, Admiral John S. McCain Jr., the commander-in-chief of the Pacific Fleet, declared: "We have the enemy licked now. He is beaten. We have the initiative in all areas. The enemy cannot achieve a military victory. He cannot even mount another major offensive. . . . I am convinced that that is why he has come to the conference table in Paris—to try to win there what he has failed to win on the battlefield."

The Admiral's assurances, published under the heading "IN VIETNAM THE ENEMY IS BEATEN," reached the *Digest's* millions of subscribers just as the latest Vietcong offensive was claiming the highest American casualty tolls since the spring of 1968. Time and again the assessments of the military experts and their civilian spokesmen have been exposed by events as erroneous at best and fraudulent at worst. It is a record that, in time, was bound to induce disbelief.

Another factor in the new and healthy skepticism toward the brass is the immense proportion of national resources allotted to "defense." While domestic needs suffer calamitous neglect, hard-pressed taxpayers find the Pentagon gobbling up the lion's share of the Federal budget and are advised to prepare for substantial increases in the current \$80 billion-a-year military outlay. Estimates for the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system alone range up into the hundreds of billions, and there is no lack of other costly gadgets on the Pentagon chiefs' "wish list."

Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat, who surveyed his constituents last month and found unprecedented sentiment for curbing military spending, took the Senate floor to declare that the "unwarranted influence . . . by the military-industrial complex" against which President Eisenhower warned eight years ago is not a future peril but a clear and present danger. "The danger has long since materialized with a ravaging effect on our nation's spending priorities," Proxmire told his colleagues.

Despite the massive propaganda barrage mounted in behalf of the ABM by the military and its eager protector, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, nearly half of the Senators and scores of members of the House have publicly declared they will oppose funds for missile sites this year—a degree of resistance to the Pentagon's pressures that would have been unthinkable a few years ago. Their motives vary—some are most concerned with economy, others with the dangers of nuclear accidents at the ABM sites, still others with the likelihood of a new arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the increased peril of accidental or intentional war. What matters most, however, is that a substantial segment of Congress is now willing to stand up to the military behemoth, and is convinced that the voters will agree.

Potentially the most important accomplishment of the Ninety-first Congress is the appointment of a special Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee to investigate the impact of the military on American foreign policy. The inquiry will be conducted by Senator Stuart Symington, Missouri Demo-

crat, the only Foreign Relations member who also serves on the Armed Services Committee. Symington, a former Secretary of the Air Force, has been on cordial terms with the military-industrial complex in the past but he, too, has shown recent signs of independent reappraisal, and delivered one of the Senate's more vigorous attacks on the ABM program. His new assignment provides the opportunity, if he will take advantage of it, to expose the full extent of military meddling in the nation's conduct of foreign affairs. It is no exaggeration to suggest that a sufficiently energetic inquiry could change the course of history.

Even in advance of the Symington study, some recent disclosures afford at least a few fragmentary clues to the pervasiveness of Pentagon manipulation of the levers of national power.

Item: After embarrassing revelations in the press, Secretary Laird was forced to scuttle an ambitious Army "master plan" to promote the virtues of the ABM. The scheme, approved last year by Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor, would have encompassed such tactics as planting favorable articles in scientific journals, staging special classified briefings for members of Congress, producing elaborate exhibits and orientation programs to brainwash communities programmed for Sentinel sites, and enlisting industrial contractors in extravagant advertising campaigns—all at public expense.

Item: Senator William Fulbright, Arkansas Democrat, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has called attention to the teams of colonels from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces dispatched around the nation to conduct "national security seminars" that are barely disguised exercises in propaganda. "We must take over the guard all around the world to fill the power vacuum left by the withdrawal of the British and other Western powers who no longer have the capability," says a typical excerpt from one of the seminars. "Prominent Americans sit back here in the United States and say that it is all right to let the Communists take over South Vietnam . . . that it would not affect the rest of Southeast Asia . . . and they scoff at the domino theory largely because they don't have to live there," says another. The Pentagon says the seminars are "non-political and present only factual data."

Item: The armed services are spending \$4 million a year on a lobbying force of 339—140 military and 199 civilians—to maintain military "liaison" on Capitol Hill and feed the Pentagon's point of view to Congress. "It appears to me that admirals and colonels could be used to better purpose and effect," says Mike Mansfield of Montana, the Senate Majority Leader, but from the military's point of view the purpose and effect are worth the expenditure. The same undoubtedly is true of the 200-man operation presided over by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, which includes a major general and at least sixteen colonels and spends \$1.6 million a year.

Item: General David A. Burchinal, deputy chief of U.S. forces under NATO, has apparently been acting as a one-man State Department in negotiating the renewal of Spanish leases on four American military bases. According to reports that have been publicly denied and privately confirmed by Administration officials, Burchinal went far beyond his authority in offering verbal assurances of American military support to the Franco dictatorship. The episode is high on Symington's investigatory agenda.

These are merely illustrative cases that happen to have come to light in recent weeks. The bulk of the iceberg remains hidden, and it is a safe assumption that only the most persistent effort will bring much of it to the surface. But what we know suffices to demon-

strate the critical need to expose the full range of military mischief-making in a nation that still prides itself, anachronistically, on the notion that its military is under the civilian control of its elected Government and under constant scrutiny by the public.

No one should be more concerned with this matter than President Nixon; it is his constitutional authority that is most directly challenged by the power of the Pentagon. His predecessor paid a heavy price—the ultimate political price—for succumbing to the blandishments of military thinking. Mr. Nixon faces critical decisions—on extricating the United States from the dismal swamp of Vietnam; on negotiating with the Soviet Union for a reduced level of armaments and an easing of international tensions; on allocating America's resources to those purposes requiring priority attention; on liquidating reckless "commitments" made in the fervor of Cold War zeal and avoiding the new pitfalls that are bound to confront the nation in the future. On each of these points the President's choices can be subverted by the pressures of unchecked Pentagon power.

Unfortunately, the President's ambassador to the military chiefs, Secretary Laird, gives every indication of being more concerned with protecting their interests than those of the President and the nation. By past performance and present pronouncement the Secretary is clearly identified as the willing handmaiden of the brass. His public comments on the need for military "superiority," on the course of action to be pursued in Vietnam, on ABM and other military hardware projects, have already indicated that he does not mind narrowing the options of the White House or undermining the efforts of the State Department. He is a dangerous man surrounded by other dangerous men, and he is likely to be one of the most powerful men in Washington for some time to come.

Laird's position at the helm of the Defense Department makes it all the more urgent that every possible ray of illumination be cast on the operations of the military apparatus. The need for such illumination has long been great. For the first time, there are signs that Congress and the people want to bring the Pentagon out into the light.

[From the Progressive, Feb. 1969]

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT RIDES HIGH (By Erwin Knoll)

(NOTE.—Erwin Knoll is Washington correspondent for The Progressive. Mr. Knoll has worked in Washington as a reporter and an editor for twelve years, and he is a former White House correspondent for the Newhouse newspapers. He is co-author with William McGaffin of "Anything But the Truth.")

"The business of America is business," Calvin Coolidge said. Increasingly, the business of America is military business—a business that claims the lion's share of the Federal budget, that employs almost eight million Americans, that preoccupies the nation's leading scientists and engineers, subsidizes its universities, dominates its foreign policy, and distorts its domestic life. It is a business that looks forward, despite its great growth in recent years, to a new spurt of expansion in the Administration of President Coolidge's most recent Republican successor.

When Congress imposed a \$6 billion reduction in Federal spending last summer as its price for approving the Johnson Administration's ten per cent income tax surcharge, Richard M. Nixon saw a clear and present danger to the Republic. There were, he warned, "disturbing . . . recent suggestions and hints" that President Johnson would attempt to effect savings by cutting back on military expenditures.

"To cut these segments of the budget—at a time when America's strategic superiority is in increasing doubt—would be blind and

reckless economy. It would be an irresponsible and potentially dangerous decision," Nixon declared. Instead, he proposed, the reductions "can and should be made in both the foreign and domestic spending programs not directly related to present and future American security."

There was no reason to believe, then or thereafter, that Johnson did not fully share Nixon's sense of national priorities. "Foreign and domestic spending programs not directly related to present and future American security" had lost every skirmish in the competition for Federal dollars over the last five years. Nonetheless, the charge that Johnson had somehow opened up a "gravely serious security gap" became a dominant theme in Nixon's Presidential campaign.

President Nixon enters the White House committed, at least by campaign rhetoric, to a program of Pentagon spending that could make the recent past look like an idyllic interlude of unilateral disarmament. On the eve of Election Day, Nixon's campaign headquarters disclosed the price tag for his policy of military "superiority"—a Pentagon budget of \$87 billion by 1972. The projection assumed an end to the Vietnam war, which accounts for about \$30 billion of the current \$82 billion military budget. Reassuringly, Nixon's aides projected economic growth which would produce enough new revenue to permit this huge increase in non-Vietnam Pentagon expenditures without increased taxes or significant reductions in domestic social programs.

The Nixon spending forecast was high enough to send shock waves through the liberal ranks in Congress, though some optimists were inclined to write it off as political balderdash. In fact, however, the \$87 billion figure is modest compared to some being circulated at the Pentagon, where the conveniently rounded target of a \$100 billion budget is often cited these days. The military chiefs' "wish list" of proposed new weapons and weapons systems already includes enough hardware to top the \$100 billion figure by \$10 billion or so.

"A central question facing the new Administration and the American people," Senator George McGovern recently observed, "will be whether we use the \$30 billion now being dissipated in Vietnam to improve the quality of our society, or permit it to be gobbled up by the military for a new string of gadgets and adventures such as the ill-advised anti-ballistic missile system." Every advance sign from the new Administration points to a depressing answer to this question. The Nixon campaign promised rich rewards to the gadget-greedy military men, the profit-hungry defense contractors, and the Cold War hard-liners in Congress.

It is from this last group that Nixon recruited his Secretary of Defense, former Wisconsin Representative Melvin R. Laird, whose appointment sent an anticipatory thrill down Pentagon corridors and through corporate board rooms. Defense contractors "hope to find an ally" in Laird, *The Wall Street Journal* reported, noting that as a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee the new Secretary "sharply criticized what he felt was overemphasis on cost factors in selecting and developing weapons systems." In an editorial, the *Journal* doubted that industry would find Laird a soft touch—"Certainly he realizes that intelligent defense policy can't be set simply by pouring out more money and turning things over to generals and admirals." But Laird's record leads to no such certainty; he has described the brass as "highly intelligent citizens with a broad grasp of our military potential and future needs . . . well-equipped to make meaningful recommendations for policy."

Laird "goes into the job of Secretary of Defense with an expressed philosophy close to the military chiefs he is supposed to con-

trol," wrote George C. Wilson, *The Washington Post's* Pentagon correspondent. That philosophy, as expounded by Laird on the House floor, in committee, and in his 1962 book, *A House Divided: America's Strategy Gap*, embraces abiding faith in the inevitability (and desirability) of a continuing Cold War; uncompromising rejection of the notion of nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union in favor of "American nuclear superiority"; eagerness to assign the top national priority to arms procurement; and contempt for the feeble efforts mounted by former Secretary Robert S. McNamara to apply a measure of "cost-effectiveness" restraint to swollen military budgets.

In the House, Laird has been an able and vigorous campaigner for an expanded nuclear Navy, a strengthened anti-submarine force, more Polaris missile submarines, and increased funds for Pentagon research and development programs. The military chiefs' "wish list" could not fall into gentler, more receptive hands.

At his first post-appointment press conference in December, Laird backed away from some of the more extreme language in his 1962 book—the advocacy, for example, of an American "first-strike initiative" against the Soviet Union. The book was written, he said, "in a period of confrontation. We are now in a period of negotiations, and I think that should be considered as we face the future." Laird declined to discuss specific military questions, but he reaffirmed his conviction that "the United States should maintain a superior position as far as its defensive forces are concerned."

In his last (and most thoughtful) defense "posture" statement, McNamara attempted a year ago to persuade Congress of the rationality of nuclear parity. "To put it bluntly," he said, "neither the Soviet Union nor the United States can now attack the other, even by complete surprise, without suffering massive damage in retaliation. This is so because each side has achieved, and will most likely maintain over the foreseeable future, an actual and credible second-strike capability against the other. It is precisely this mutual capability to destroy one another, and conversely, our respective inability to prevent such destruction, that provides us both with the strongest possible motive to avoid a strategic nuclear war."

Laird's longing—and Nixon's—for "a superior position" explicitly rejects this view, and opens incomprehensible vistas for future military expenditures. An anonymous Nixon aide recently gave *Congressional Quarterly* a hint of the bizarre new numbers game we may soon be confronting. He said:

"We've got to take a good look at the targeting situation. We'll have to see how many targets each country would have to hit in order to wipe out the other. For the sake of argument, say we have 100 targets that the Soviets must hit in order to wipe out this country; but because of the greater Soviet dispersion, let's say we have to hit 1,000 targets. So in raw terms, we must have a ten-to-one edge in missiles to even achieve parity. I don't know what the actual figures are on this targeting, but I don't think the proportion is too different from what I've just described."

Such reasoning can ultimately widen the "security gap" to vast dimensions, as the Nixon aide went on to illustrate. "If we have 100 missiles," he added, "assume that only eighty get off the ground in the event of a Soviet first strike. Perhaps thirty of these will malfunction on the way and the Soviet ABM system will kill twenty-five. So if it takes forty assured hits to deter the Soviet Union then we have a gap of fifteen missiles. This is the sort of thing we have to take a good, hard look at in the weeks ahead."

The multi-billion dollar corporations that thrive on military business are also taking a good, hard look, and they like what they see. In a recent series of interviews with executives of aerospace firms in Texas and California, Bernard D. Nossiter of *The Washington Post* found unbounded, unqualified optimism about the outlook for future defense contracts and profits. James J. Ling, who presides over the \$3.2 billion Ling-Temco-Vought conglomerate, the nation's eighth largest military contractor, told Nossiter, "Our future planning is based on visible contracts. One must believe in the long-term threat."

On the basis of that belief, LTV Aerospace Corporation, Ling's prime defense subsidiary, projects total sales of \$1.3 billion in 1973, compared with \$530 million in 1968. The 1973 estimate includes \$322 million for the new Navy VSX plane A-7; \$1 million for the Navy F-8 fighter; \$320 million for the VFX fighter-bomber; \$149 million for missile work; \$270 million for other military-space contracts, and \$230 million for non-military, non-space production.

LTV Aerospace's cheery forecast reflects industry-wide expectations. In a study of "The Post-Vietnam Defense and Space Market Environment," the Electronics Industries Association concluded a year ago that arms control agreements "during the next decade are unlikely," that the "likelihood of limited war will increase," and that "thus for the electronics firms the outlook is good in spite of [the end of hostilities in] Vietnam."

Items on the military chiefs' "wish list" that help account for the industry's happy outlook include:

An expanded anti-ballistic missile system, costing \$8 billion to \$14 billion more than the \$5 billion already scheduled for the "thin" Sentinel missile defense system and building toward the ultimate goal of a fully operational anti-Soviet ABM at a total cost of \$40 billion to \$60 billion. The Johnson Administration's decision to begin work on the ABM, Nixon argued in the campaign did not represent the beginning of a new arms race but rather "a belated decision not to lose a race already in progress—a race in which the Soviets threaten to leave us behind."

A new strategic bomber, the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft (AMSA), to replace the B-52 and B-58 at a cost of \$10 billion to \$15 billion. An industry source told *Congressional Quarterly* that "despite the fact that grade-school arithmetic can demonstrate that the manned bomber doesn't make sense in the missile age, a small group of generals who can't forget the glory of 1,000-plane B-17 raids are pressuring the country into a \$15 billion anachronism." But Nixon associates say Presidential approval of AMSA is "highly likely."

A much larger successor to the Minuteman missile, estimated to cost \$10 billion to \$12 billion. This would give full vent to the Nixon-Laird strategy of "superiority."

A new sea-based successor to the Polaris missile, operating from surface ships as well as from new submarines, at a projected cost of \$10 billion to \$12 billion. The new "super-quiet" attack submarine that Secretary Clark Clifford approved for procurement last October is already being referred to in the Pentagon as "First of the Nixon Class."

Other items on the "wish list" that are likely to meet with the new Administration's favor include a new continental air defense system priced at about \$14 billion; massive additions—estimated to cost as much as \$10 billion a year—to the nation's stockpile of defense supplies, which Nixon charges has been "seriously depleted" in recent years; new emphasis on military applications of the space program, including the Air Force's long-simmering Manned Orbiting Laboratory, and an across-the-board increase in military research and development funds.

"The real danger," said the 1968 GOP campaign book, *Nixon on the Issues*, "does not stem from existing weapons, but from possible breakthroughs by the huge Soviet research and development establishment. The United States can afford to be selective in our own weapons only if we are resolute in maintaining a comprehensive lead in research and development. Recent events have already put our lead in jeopardy. The belief that a strategic balance of power can be maintained, based on a common 'plateau' of technological achievement, ignores the volatile progress of science today, which is incomparably more rapid and variable than ever before."

The military chiefs and their civilian suppliers may be forgiven for assuming that Nixon has promised them a blank check in place of the generous—but fixed—allowances they have received in recent years.

Increasing military expenditures Senator Eugene J. McCarthy recently wrote have given the Pentagon "greater and greater influence upon our foreign policy, upon our domestic policy, and upon the educational institutions of the United States." Two universities—the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Johns Hopkins—appeared last year on a Defense Department list of its top 100 contractors. Pentagon figures showed that "nonprofit institutions"—most of them universities—received \$665.3 million of the \$6.5 billion in defense research contracts during fiscal 1968. The "military-industrial-academic establishment," McCarthy charged, has become "a kind of republic within the Republic."

It is a cozy republic—a comfortable welfare state with an assured future. The relationship between Pentagon procurement officers—some 5,500 military and civilian personnel are employed in procurement—and their suppliers is less a buyer-seller arrangement than a genial partnership. The \$45 billion a year now allotted to procurement allows an ample margin for error, and the margin is full and overflowing.

In hearings conducted last fall by Senator William Proxmire's Joint Economic Subcommittee on Economy in Government, expert witnesses testified that major defense contractors earn profits about seventy per cent higher than the average for firms engaged primarily in non-defense work. A. W. Buesking, a former Pentagon official, told the Subcommittee that the \$8 billion Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile program returned a forty-three per cent before-tax profit based on net worth to the prime contractor, the Boeing Company. After taxes, he added, Minuteman profits would have been about twenty-one per cent on net worth—about double the going rate in non-defense industries.

Proxmire called the record "appalling," but it is by no means exceptional. Although the Pentagon acknowledges that price competition in contract awards reduces costs by an average of twenty-five per cent, the volume of competitive bidding has been declining steadily, now accounting for less than twelve per cent of the contracts awarded. About a third of the Defense Department's purchases are based on "competitive negotiated contracts," in which price may or may not be a factor, and more than half—including most of the largest contracts—involve no competition of any kind.

Official regulations governing defense procurement declare that price competition should be the rule, but there are exceptions—seventeen kinds of them by latest count—and they are generously invoked. One exception is "urgent need," and it covers most situations not encompassed by the other sixteen. The contract watchdog agency, the Renegotiation Board, which Senator Proxmire helped save from threatened extinction last year, is governed by exceptions too, including one that automatically exempts from scrutiny all com-

panies that do less than \$1 million in defense business a year.

"I would estimate that if all the exemptions were lifted, we would have jurisdiction to check for excess profits on at least another \$8 billion or \$9 billion in Government purchases and it could go as high as \$10 billion," Lawrence E. Hartwig, chairman of the Renegotiation Board, said last fall.

In its munificent tolerance of error, the Pentagon shrugs off the fact that research and development contracts tend to run up final costs more than double their original estimates. Similar "slippage" occurs in hardware procurement, as Proxmire demonstrated when he discovered that the Air Force was preparing to pay the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation \$2 billion in excess of the \$3 billion originally planned for 120 C-5A Galaxy transport jets. A. E. Fitzgerald, deputy for management systems in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, said "corporate strategy" was at least partially responsible for the cost increase, but explained that the Government would pay the tab "because, I suppose, we want the aircraft badly enough and to keep the base active at the plant."

Despite occasional investigatory excursions such as Proxmire's, neither the brass nor the contractors need fear the consequences of Congressional pique. When military appropriations come up for review, the most ardent watchdogs of the public treasury suddenly betray benign indifference. Their main concern is to see to it that their constituencies get a fair share—or more—of the military largesse. Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, whose state is splendidly endowed with defense installations and ranked tenth in the nation in Pentagon contracts last year, has already served notice of the approach he will bring to his new chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee: "There is no hesitation in my mind in stating that we cannot continue to support a war, be capable of honoring our commitments abroad, and maintain an adequate defense posture without substantially increasing the size of our defense budget in the near future. As reluctant as Congress will be to accept that statement, I make it unequivocally and without fear of contradiction." A Nixon spokesman says, "There's very little difference between Nixon's philosophy and that of the Armed Services Committees of Congress. I see no reason why they shouldn't get along."

"Is it an industrial-military or a military-industrial establishment?" Nossiter asked in one of his *Washington Post* articles. Do new weapons expenditures originate in the inventive design shops of the contractors to be sold to the Pentagon, or do the corporations respond to the requirements of the brass? "There is no simple answer to the question," he wrote. "Indeed, some authorities think it should more properly be called a military-industrial-political complex to account for the influential Congressmen who press requirements on the Pentagon and contracts on their constituents." The home district of Representative L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, is often cited as the archetypal example; it has been described as a "microcosm of the military-industrial complex," and includes a naval station and shipyard, an air base, an Army depot, a missile plant, and a mine warfare center.

The complex has come a long way since President Eisenhower warned in his farewell address that its "total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the Federal Government." The present prospect, Senator McGovern said, is this: "Powerful industrial giants eagerly pressing for more military business, Pentagon defense planners eager to get on with new weapons production, Congressmen whose districts profit directly from the anticipated contracts, and millions of Americans from the blue collar aircraft worker to

the university physicist drawing their paychecks from the production of arms." The military budget has almost doubled since Eisenhower left the White House. Will it double again in the next eight years?

In his 1968 campaign book, Nixon took note of Eisenhower's warning against "the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." I do not think it will happen as long as you have in positions of leadership in the United States men who are aware of the danger," Nixon said.

But are such men in positions of leadership? Neither Nixon's record, nor Laird's, nor that of Henry A. Kissinger or Lee A. DuBridge, the President's principal advisers on national security and scientific affairs, offers much in the way of reassurance. All have been far more troubled by the prospect of a "security gap" than by the likelihood—indeed the actual existence—of the democracy gap, the peace gap, the social welfare gap that inevitably accompany military dominance. Their preoccupation, once the rathole of Vietnam expenditures is plugged, seems likely to focus on the search for new and bigger ratholes.

"If the Defense Department is to maintain its current mission in the world," Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr said last summer, "I would seriously doubt that any sizable reduction can be made in the defense budget in the foreseeable future." He was right, of course, but what should the "current mission" of the Defense Department be? That is precisely the question requiring an urgent reappraisal.

There has been no sign that such a reappraisal is on the new Administration's agenda. The outlook is for business as usual, and business promises to be very good indeed.

[From the Washington Monthly, April 1969]

THE MILITARY COMMITTEES

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

(NOTE.—Seymour M. Hersh formerly covered the Defense Department for the Associated Press.)

The Congressional debate this year over the anti-ballistic missile system (ABM) marks the beginning of a revolt against one of the most awesome tyrannies on Capitol Hill: the military committees. Debate over military policies is nothing new in Congress—the manned-bomber controversy and the F-111 are just two of many examples—but the ABM debate represents the first time in recent history that a group of protesting legislators went outside the military committees to take a major defense issue to the people. Leaders of the attack were Senators not usually associated with military affairs: the voices of such men as John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.), Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), and Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.) suddenly replaced those of John Stennis (D-Miss.) and Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) in a major military debate.

Public reaction to the location of certain ABM sites was strong—particularly in the suburbs of Boston, Seattle, Detroit, and San Francisco—and the ABM rapidly became the most controversial domestic military issue since the debate over civil defense forced the Kennedy Administration to abandon its elaborate fallout-shelter program. But unlike the situation then, the continuing debate over the ABM system, coupled with the Vietnam war, has initiated or encouraged exploration of several broader issues: the role of the military in American foreign policy, the relationship between the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the ABM, the future of the arms race, and most importantly, the ability of Congress to deal wisely in the area of military policy.

It could mean the end of an era.

In a Senate speech in February, after the Pentagon's decision to put ABM missile sites

near cities had led to a nationwide protest, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) spelled out a possible future approach to military issues. He urged Congress to begin asking questions about all facets of military appropriations and noted that "national defense programs have somehow been above the battle—it has always been implicit in many of our debates that it is perhaps unpatriotic to question the recommendations of the Department of Defense."

Waving the flag has long been a way of life for the military committees. The special relationship between the military committees and Congress as a whole began during World War II and has prospered through the growth of what is commonly called the Military-Industrial Complex, that maze of defense corporations and individuals which produces the goods and services needed to run the \$80 billion-a-year corporation controlled by the Department of Defense.

Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has sometimes delved into military matters when they have been closely related to foreign policy—and seems newly determined to do so on a regular basis in the future—the four Congressional committees which ordinarily oversee military programs are the Senate Armed Services Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the House Appropriations Committee. Membership on any of these committees is commonly regarded as a plum assignment; it brings prestige to the Congressman (because the largest chunk of the federal budget comes under his scrutiny) and it can confer a strong influence on the location of defense facilities (the six ranking Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee have 43 military bases and plants in their districts).

The ABM presents an unprecedented example of how a military contract quickly becomes a porkbarrel issue for Congressmen. One study published in 1967 noted that as few as 29 of the major contractors for the ABM employ as many as one million persons in 300 plants located in 172 Congressional districts in 42 states. All told, 15,000 firms would profit from a full deployment of the ABM. A member whose district embraces a major naval installation is, not unsurprisingly, invariably a strong booster of increased funds and weapons for the Navy. He becomes a special pleader on a committee in which he is supposed to be an overseer of all military expenditures.

A year ago this month, President Lyndon B. Johnson bowed knowingly in the direction of this reality during the rollout ceremony for the giant C-5A Galaxy cargo plane at the Lockheed aircraft plant in Marietta, Georgia. Mr. Johnson, who had flown to the plant for the ceremony, told the crowd: "I would have you good folks of Georgia know that there are a lot of Marietta, Georgias, scattered throughout our 50 states. All of them would like to have the pride that comes from this production. But all of them don't have the Georgia delegation."

Even those renowned for their high ethical standards are not immune from special pleading of a more sophisticated sort. Senator Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.), the widely respected titan of the Georgia delegation, who was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee until he succeeded Carl Hayden as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee recently, led a 1967 fight to kill the Pentagon's proposal for a fleet of Fast Deployment Logistics (FDL) vessels, arguing that the ships would commit America to being a world policeman. When the issue came up again last year, Russell surprised his colleagues with silence. The reason for Russell's switch: he did not wish to clash with his long-time friend, Senator John Stennis (D-Miss.), who was then the second-ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee and is now its chairman. Stennis had good

reason to be grateful to Russell for keeping quiet. A few months earlier Litton Industries, the contractor for the FDL, had begun work in Pascagoula, Mississippi, on a \$130 million shipyard financed and owned by the state, but leased to the company.

Benefits also accrue to supporters of the military committees, even when they are not members themselves. Senator Russell B. Long (D-La.) learned last year that the Pentagon, after 20 years of pleading by the Louisiana Congressional delegation, had agreed to give permanent status to Fort Polk, an Army base constructed in the state during World War II. No serious Pentagon official contended that there was a military justification for making the base permanent (and thereby eligible for a recurrent slice of the \$1 billion annual pie for military construction). But Long had been a strong supporter of the war in Vietnam, and this was his reward. As one Pentagon official told *Congressional Quarterly* at the time: "You'll never see Senator Long voting to cut defense appropriations. It's really quite a neat little system, with subtle mutual understandings."

The failure of Congress to come to grips with the growth of military power is primarily the failure of the seniority system, which has left control of the four major committees dealing with military affairs in the hands of four elderly, conservative, southern Democrats who score higher than most Republicans on the annual voting charts published by the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action.

The four men—Russell, 71, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Stennis, 67, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), 63, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and George H. Mahon (D-Tex.), 68, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee—are all superhawks. They chafe at military waste but approve multibillion-dollar defense bills with minimal debate. They believe that America's well-being depends upon a preponderance of military might. They feel that a lack of preparedness before World War II and Korea almost brought disaster to the United States. To these men, excess of military might is a reasonable goal.

Some samples from the record demonstrate the degree to which these men hold their views.

During a rare closed-door debate over the ABM last October, Senator Russell and then-Senator Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) had this exchange:

"CLARK. There comes a time when the tens of millions of casualties are so enormous that civilization is destroyed, and if there are a few people living in caves after that, it does not make much difference.

"RUSSELL. If we have to start over again with another Adam and Eve, then I want them to be Americans and not Russians, and I want them on this continent and not in Europe."

Congressman Rivers, when asked to explain his advocacy of the ABM deployment, replied: "I don't know why a nation that is approaching a trillion dollars in the gross national product can't afford a gadget to protect its civilization." And when asked for his views on the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, he said: "I have no confidence in any Communist anywhere on earth."

Senator Stennis, in a report by his Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigation last fall, said "Our national security can ill afford to have professional judgments of military officials given inadequate weight by their civilian superiors."

The Constitution provides that the Congress, through its military committees, has the responsibility to "raise and support armies" and to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

During its recent history, Congress has turned out to be much better at the former.

The sad truth is that outside of legislation in military pay, construction, and manpower—areas of less than primary importance—the military committees have largely become a conduit through which the armed forces are able to secure the weapons systems and funding they desire, whether needed or not. In recent years the committees have frequently challenged the decisions—and sometimes the authority—of the Pentagon's civilian leadership in areas involving military strategy and equipment, especially when such decisions ran counter to recommendations by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

A favorite target was Alain C. Enthoven, Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of Systems Analysis. The attack centered on what military committee members considered to be Enthoven's over-reliance on computer studies and under-reliance on military requests. At one point, it produced this dialogue during last year's House Armed Services Committee hearings on the Navy's proposal for nuclear frigates:

"ENTHOVEN. I expressed the view that the added benefits from the nuclear frigate were not worth the added costs.

"CHAIRMAN RIVERS. And that advice was followed, wasn't it? The answer is 'yes' or 'no.'

"ENTHOVEN. Followed to some extent. The Secretary did decide to build a frigate.

"RIVERS. Mr. Secretary (Enthoven), I am trying to be very patient with you. When I tell you to answer 'yes' or 'no,' you do it."

Rivers is an extremist in tone and style, but what he says is endorsed and supported by other members of his committee and the other military committees in Congress. He is an avowed and abusive advocate of the military; the others are simply not as abusive.

Rivers almost prides himself on his lack of subtlety. In the last election, which returned him to Washington for his 15th term in the House, he again used the proud and accurate campaign slogan, "Rivers Delivers." He is quick to remind his constituents that he has single-handedly brought Charleston "90 per cent" of its rich honeycomb of defense activity. Other reminders are close at hand. The entrance to the Air Force base is called Rivers Gate; Route 52 through Charleston is Rivers Avenue; a housing project on the Navy base is named Men-Riv Park. His Congressional district also includes a Marine Corps air station, an Army depot, a shipyard, a Navy training center, two Polaris missile facilities, a Navy supply center, two Navy hospitals, a Marine Corps recruiting depot, and a military payroll of \$200 million a year.

He acceded to his position as chairman of the Armed Services Committee after Carl Vinson (D-Ga.) retired in 1965 at the age of 81. Like Vinson, Rivers runs the committee as an autocracy; nothing passes the committee unless he wants it to, and he provides little time for debate, even on such important matters as the ABM. Committee members who dissent on critical issues face the prospect of wrath and revenge from Rivers. In contrast to Senator Russell's toleration of differences when he ran the Senate Armed Services Committee, dissent on the Rivers committee is perceived by the chairman as a personal affront and a violation of etiquette.

One committee member who challenged Rivers on a key issue suffered through almost a year of being ignored whenever he wanted to ask a question at a hearing. He got back in the chairman's good graces when, after long months in Coventry, he finally received recognition at a hearing and proceeded to give the witness—Robert S. McNamara—a rough interrogation. "After that," the chastened member recalls, "Rivers thought, hell, maybe I wasn't such a bad guy after all."

Only in the last few years have a few members of the House Armed Services Committee begun to speak out on critical issues

and file minority supplements to committee reports. Although it could hardly be called a rebellion, Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.), Frank E. Evans (D-Colo.), and Robert L. Leggett (D-Calif.) have publicly voiced objections to the committee's position on the ABM and the draft. (Evans has since left the committee; Leggett and Pike are permanent occupants of Rivers' doghouse.)

But most young committee members choose not to fight. "Why follow Rivers?" one was asked. "It's awfully hard not to wave the flag," he replied.

Another strategem Rivers employs to enlarge his control and minimize debate on military matters is the deliberately tardy distribution of committee reports to members of the House, thus leaving them little time to read them before voting. Last year, for example, Congressmen received the committee's 91-page report on the ABM only three days prior to the floor debate, for which only two hours had been allotted.

If seniority were not the sole criterion for determining chairmanships in Congress, Rivers clearly would not be running the House Armed Services Committee today. Some members privately (or furtively) express strong reservations about Rivers' qualifications for the job, mainly on the grounds that he has small patience for, or comprehension of, the complexities of a nuclear age. He prefers the no-nonsense approach to military matters typified by former Air Force General Curtis LeMay, whose judgments he valued far more than those of a McNamara or an Enthoven. And he is not alone in this view. As one senior member of the committee put it: "There's a feeling on the committee, and not just with Rivers, that guys like Enthoven are really anti-military and are interested in cranking the military machine down."

The Senate Armed Services Committee, while comparatively elevated in style and sophistication, has much in common with its counterpart in the House. The committee has aptly been called "the ratifying arm of the Joint Chiefs of Staff," a description implying a belief that military judgments are best made by military men, not by the Pentagon's civilian leadership. If there is greater room for dissent on the Senate side, it is a matter of degree: dissent is tolerated, not squelched. But in none of the military committees of the House or Senate are outside views actively sought.

Both Senator Russell and Representative Mahon have candidly acknowledged that no witnesses outside of the Administration testified at their committees' extensive budget hearings last year. The issue arose in the House during debate on the \$72.2 billion defense appropriation bill in September. Representative Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.) said:

"We find the United States involved in a war in Southeast Asia, which, at this point, seems to be regarded by a majority of the American people as an ill-advised venture. Yet I do not find in the processes of the House any place where these questions get raised in an appropriate way or in which these policies are reviewed carefully and in which there is genuine development of contrasting opinions."

Fraser asked:

"Do you [the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee] obtain independent information that is not otherwise available to the committee, do you bring in outside experts who are not part of the federal establishment, do you seek out people who may have some detached or objective viewpoint which is separated from any career concern in the military establishment?"

Chairman Mahon replied that the answer was no. Then he added:

"It is true that out of the six volumes of hearings which we held on the pending bill, practically all of the testimony came from

officials of the government. It is well known that all citizens are welcome to appear before the Committee on Appropriations and especially all members of the House are invited to appear. While we do not actively solicit witnesses from outside the government, we do welcome them when they ask to be heard."

The same question came up before Senator Russell during the closed-door hearings on the ABM last fall. Here is the colloquy between Russell and Senator J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and a critic of the ABM:

"FULBRIGHT. Did I understand the Senator to say that no witnesses were brought into the hearings on this matter except Administration witnesses?"

"RUSSELL. We had no request whatever. We heard all the witnesses who wanted to be heard. None of the Senators who have this great technical acumen as to the missile came before the committee . . .

"FULBRIGHT. Is it the practice of the Senator's committee never to have witnesses except those of the Administration?"

"RUSSELL. No, that is not our policy.

"FULBRIGHT. But in this case, no witnesses except those under the Administration did testify; is that correct?"

"RUSSELL. We heard all the witnesses who requested to come."

While Russell is narrowly correct—no outside witnesses went through the formality of writing the committee, asking to be heard—he did let it be known last year that he did not want outside experts to testify on the ABM. At that time, some two dozen scientists, including four former Presidential science advisers, had indicated their willingness to testify in opposition. John Sherman Cooper (D-Ky.), a respected member of the Senate and a leader of the anti-deployment forces, has pressed for assurances that such witnesses will be heard in open session this year. Senator Stennis, the new chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has agreed to hear their testimony, although it should be noted that the anti-ABM scientists have all been testifying before committees that do not normally deal with military affairs.

Many members and aides voiced criticism of the staffs of both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. "The committee staff and the Pentagon are very close," one aide to a liberal Senator said. "I would sooner deal with a nest of scorpions than with the Senate Armed Services staff at budget-cutting time."

Retired military officers are generally not welcome on the staffs of the Armed Services Committees, but the military pressure is there just the same. One former member told how his colleagues were all in the reserves and "kept pressing me to join—begging me and begged me to take a commission." Pressure also came from the military, which services Congress with squads of young, bright officers to help handle constituent requests. In 1967, the legislative liaison staffs of the Pentagon helped Congress with 155,000 written and 360,000 oral requests.

The military also supplies the requested transportation and facilities to help coordinate the many overseas study missions and junkets undertaken annually by the military committees and their staffs. No pretense is made any more by either Congress or the military that these trips are all strictly business. The main source, however, for the military committees' affection and support for the military stems from the deep convictions of their members.

As one senior member of the House Armed Services Committee said proudly: "I don't know of anything that the Defense Department has asked for that our committee hasn't given them. We haven't cut out any broad programs. We try to get even more planes and more submarines for the military."

This Congressman, like other senior members, refused to discuss Rivers—"a person doesn't normally fault his family"—but he did express his feelings on military affairs and procurement this way:

"Since the United States of all nations on earth is less guilty of military aggrandizement and more interested in keeping peace, military might in our hands is the best place for it. It is in the interests of humanity that the United States is adequately defended."

If any permanent change is to take place in the relationship of Congress to the military, it will come first in the Senate. The emancipating issue there was the ABM. It all began last April 18 when Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) introduced an amendment to a Senate defense authorization to strip all procurement funds for the ABM from the legislation. He won only 17 votes but raised the basic issue. Moments later, Senator Cooper, who is highly respected by members of the military committees, offered an amendment calling for a delay in deployment of the ABM until the Secretary of Defense had certified in writing to Congress that the system is feasible. It was a direct challenge to the role of the Armed Services Committee and was quickly recognized as such by Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), an Army Reserve major general and the leading hawk on the committee.

"What we must realize," Thurmond said, "is that the Soviet danger is the major threat and it must be faced resolutely. The Sentinel system ABM is only the beginning, and is but a step in the right direction. It is time to listen to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the more defense-minded Members of Congress." Cooper's amendment lost by only three votes, 31 to 28.

Stennis, floor manager for the bill, summed up much of his committee's position by resorting to the traditional theme—heard often among members of the military committees—"If you only knew what I know." He told the Senate at one point in the debate that "I wish more Senators could have heard briefings about the capacity of Communist China at this time in this field."

It was precisely on this point that the Senate movement gained its greatest strength. Cooper joined forces with a number of liberals, including Percy, Hart, Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.), and two important members of the Armed Services Committee—Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), former Secretary of the Air Force, and Margaret Chase Smith (R-Maine), the committee's ranking Republican—to stage a second battle over the ABM in mid-June. But the leaders of the fight decided that for once they would, as one person close to the campaign put it, "know more than they [the Armed Services Committee] knew."

In essence, the small group led by Cooper put itself through an exhaustive series of briefings designed to give them as much information as was available to the military committee members. It was, in effect, a rump Armed Services Subcommittee on the ABM.

Cooper's leadership was important; the military men trusted him and felt that he, unlike some of the others, would have supported the ABM if he believed that it would buy security for the United States.

The group worked hard, and Senator Russell graciously provided access to all of the information the Senate Armed Services Committee had—the kind of cooperation that would not have been possible on the House side of the Capitol.

Another element in the rump group's efforts was a small, little-known lobby, the Council for a Livable World. The group is represented in Washington by John Sillard, an attorney and son of the late nuclear scientist, Leo Sillard, and Thomas Halstead, a former Arms Control and Disarmament Agency official. The Council sponsored a

series of seminars and briefings on the ABM for interested Senators. Former Presidential science advisers Jerome B. Wiesner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and George Kistiakowsky of Harvard appeared before small gatherings of Senators—usually over lunch—to give their views on the ABM, which Wiesner recently described as "a bad joke perpetrated on us by Mr. Johnson and Mr. McNamara in an election year." Off and on, more than 25 Senators attended the sessions.

In intention and result, the Council for a Livable World conducted a highly successful lobby effort. "Until this operation," Halstead explained, "there had never been a serious attempt by a lobby to challenge the military committees." As it was, many members of the Senate who became convinced of the folly of the ABM preferred to remain anonymous.

The Council was instrumental in getting Hart involved in the issue, and he, in turn, as a respected member of the Senate establishment, was influential in persuading Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) and Symington to take a public stand. In Symington's case, it was his first break with Stennis over a significant military issue during their long association on the Armed Services Committee. "For many years," Symington told his colleagues in June, "I have been hearing about this international Communist conspiracy; about the necessity to put up billions and billions more dollars of the taxpayers' money to defend the free world against Communism in North Vietnam, in South Vietnam, and all over the world. But after studying the Soviet defensive system to the best of my ability . . . I believe that the warnings that have been developed about the Soviet . . . defense system have been much exaggerated." The *Philadelphia Inquirer* commented that in Symington's case, it was as if "a member of the defense establishment suddenly threw up his hands and shouted, 'Enough! I've followed you people long enough and you are wrong, and it's time someone said so.'"

Nevertheless, the challenge had not been enough. In August the Senate again voted in favor of ABM deployment. Another attempt failed in October, in a vote clouded by the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

A similar drive against the ABM was organized in the House, but the tiny band of Democratic liberals who led it—including Sidney R. Yates (D-Ill.), Jeffery Cohelan (D-Calif.) and Robert L. Leggett (D-Calif.)—were unable to broaden the attack to include many members of the military committee establishment.

Congress failed again this year to liberalize its rules for committee assignments and any revisions in the seniority system seem far off.

What's to be done?

The Joint Chiefs of Staff this year requested more than \$100 billion to maintain the military strength of the Pentagon. Right now there are 13 major weapons systems—ranging from new fighter planes to missiles and aircraft carriers—whose production has been approved but backed up because of the Vietnam war.

Those concerned with the extent of military influence in the nation must work to build their lobby of public opinion; to develop a forum as persuasive as that of the men who advocate unlimited spending. Congressmen should take advantage of the offer made by Russell and Mahon and testify before closed hearings of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, and make noise about what they tell the committees. Those members of the military committees who are willing to take a public stand in defiance of their leadership should be given more floor support, and more effort should be made to insure a good attendance on days of key votes. (During many important votes last

year on all issues, conservative members, who know how to count, were there; the liberals were often absent.)

Lobbying groups such as the Council for a Livable World should be given more financial aid and encouraged to seek out other issues besides the ABM in which it is possible for nonmembers of the military committee to get some expertise. At this date, with no prospect for internal reform in the Congress, the only battle possible is largely a public relations one: the issue of military spending must be taken to the people again and again.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 13, 1969]
MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX: WASTEFUL
GIANT THAT AFFECTS US ALL

(By William McGaffin and Robert Gruenberg)
(NOTE.—William McGaffin and Robert Gruenberg are members of the Chicago Daily News' Washington bureau.)

WASHINGTON.—"In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought..."

That was Dwight D. Eisenhower—President, general and educator—speaking on Jan. 17, 1961, three days before the end of his eight-year Presidency. To a nation that appeared largely unlistening, America's greatest contemporary soldier was warning of the "military-industrial complex."

That warning underlies a historic confrontation now building between the American public and the military and industrial planners and spenders and policy makers.

That confrontation—triggered by the Vietnam war, the antiballistic missile debate, and other recent crises—may make the Eisenhower farewell as historically memorable and important as the farewell of our first soldier-president, George Washington.

"The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist," Gen. Eisenhower said of the military and industrial forces that—together with a 3.5 million-man defense establishment—has become a permanent part of the American experience.

"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."

In the plush carpeted headquarters here of a leading aerospace contractor, an executive—reminded of Gen. Eisenhower's words—snapped:

"That damned speech."

"There's a great outpouring under way from all the people who want money for social programs . . . But the key operative phrase in that speech is 'unwarranted influence.' Everyone overlooks it because they need a favorite whipping boy."

Critics deny "overlooking" it. The military-industrial complex is an all-embracing conglomerate, reaching into virtually every corner of American life, they say.

It is, at once, a system, an attitude, a giant dynamo of men, machines and money. It has in two decades enveloped the American life and economy in:

—Billions of dollars in waste;

—Airplanes that don't fly, missiles touted in words as empty as the space they are to fly in, and giant trucks that never roll;

—Congressmen who vie for a slice of the defense pie so that constituents from the red clay lands of Georgia to the antiseptic suburbs of Southern California can keep working;

—Lawmakers, not a few with Pentagon-awarded commissions, voting to approve with little or no opposition the billions of dollars for which the military asks;

—An aerospace industry that underpins a considerable share of the nation's economy—estimates run from 10% to 30% of the working force—which is dependent on ever-increasing, more sophisticated arms development;

—A university-scientific-technological community, handmaidens to industry, drawing their sustenance, too, in large part from the Pentagon.

That is the military-industrial complex, overlay upon overlay, and expanding each year.

That is also, according to its defenders, the price of the nation's security. Its proof, they say, is that no nation has dared attack the United States since World War II. That is undeniably true, but the critics of the military-industrial complex point to developments in the national life that, they say, are undermining it from within.

The "unwarranted influence" that Gen. Eisenhower warned about travels with the Pentagon brass after retirement, the critics say.

In 1959, an investigation by Paul H. Douglas, then senator from Illinois, revealed that 88 of the 100 top defense firms had 721 retired officers of colonel (or Navy captain) rank or higher on their payrolls. Ten companies employed 372—more than half.

Pentagon figures, disclosed for the first time in 10 years, show that today 2,076 former officers are working for 98 of the top 100 companies. The top 10 firms had 1,065 former officers.

"I do not claim nor even suggest that any conspiracy exists between the military and the 100 largest defense contractors," said Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), one of the military-industrial establishment's sharpest critics.

"But what we have here is almost a classic example of how the military-industrial complex works. It is a question of what can be called the 'old boy' network, or the 'old school tie.'"

While retired officers get their chances to go to industry, legislators at the same time hold military commissions themselves. One hundred of the 435 House members and 39 of the 100 senators have officer ranks ranging up to major general. They are on the active, inactive and retired lists.

A number of Senate and House members said they could not see a "conflict of viewpoint" in holding the commissions and simultaneously voting on military appropriations.

The military-industrial combine also embraces the nation's educational institutions. Some schools are listed by the Pentagon among the "top 100" of the nation's defense contractors.

Last year educational and nonprofit institutions held \$772 million in research contracts—\$16 million more than in 1967. High on the list of defense contractors were the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in 10th place with \$119 million, and Johns Hopkins University, in 22nd place with \$57.6 million.

More than all this, say the critics, is a foreboding that the nation has become unured not only to having military influence in managing its civilian affairs, but disregarding "conflicts of interest" in sensitive positions.

This was highlighted recently by the appointment of David M. Packard as deputy secretary of defense. Packard is cofounder of the Hewlett-Packard Co. of Palo Alto, Calif., electronics systems and computer manufacturers.

In the 12 months ending last Oct. 12 his firm's sales to the Pentagon, other federal agencies and defense contractors totaled \$100,685,000.

The Senate, confirming him, overrode the protest of Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), who called it approval of "a conflict of interest that is clear on its face."

But Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Com-

mittee, argued in behalf of Packard. Packard has, said Stennis, "the very talent we would like to see."

For all the wealth and talent it has commanded, however, the military-industrial complex has, through the years, made some big mistakes.

The Pentagon recently compiled a list of 68 major weapons systems that cost nearly \$10 billion—slightly more than all the money the government proposes to spend for education in the year beginning July.

The \$10 billion list was typed on plain, white paper, not like the usual blue-topped Defense Department publicity releases, and it was available only to those who knew of its existence and asked for it.

This modest approach was understandable for the \$10 billion list was a catalog of abandoned projects that included mistakes and misjudgments on weapons systems fit only for museums or the scrap heap.

The list was also a forceful reminder that the military-industrial complex is hardly infallible.

The Pentagon cites its new missiles with pride—hailing them in elaborate brochures and publicity releases as a deterrent to war. Nevertheless the average of success does not appear to be too good, in view of the expertise, the time and the money assigned to the projects.

Yet the wisdom of the military-industrial combine has not been seriously challenged since World War II.

WHATEVER MILITARY WANTS FROM CONGRESS IT GETS

It is virtually a truism that whatever the military—backed up by the defense industry—demands from Congress, it gets, despite occasional trims in appropriations.

For being "against defense" is not a position that could popularly be held—or so it was thought.

Just how much money was needlessly added to the huge defense bill may never be known. But some examples from the Pentagon's list may provide a clue.

The largest item is the nearly \$1.5 billion devoted by the Air Force to a new, manned bomber, the B-70, which ended up a museum piece.

Another big one is the \$511 million the Air Force invested in a futile attempt to build a nuclear-powered airplane. But that is an understatement of the cost. The figure does not include \$500 million that the Atomic Energy Commission poured into it, and the \$14 million the Navy contributed.

Birds, animals, fish, Indians, Greek gods and press agency provided names given to some \$4 billion worth of hardware that went nowhere.

There was \$2.7 billion in Air Force missiles (Navajo, Snark, Rascal, Skybolt, Talos, Mobile Minuteman, Q-4 Drone, Goose and Crossbow).

There was \$993 million for Navy missiles (Sparrow I and II, Regulus II, Petrel, Corvus, Eagle, Meteor, Rigel, Dove, Triton, Oriole and Typhon).

And finally, \$339 million for Army missiles (Hermes, Dart, Loki, Terrier, Plato and Mauler).

The list has many omissions.

One is a "small item" of \$27 million, spent by the Navy to take the New Jersey, a World War II battleship, out of mothballs and send it to Vietnam. It was the brainchild of Sen. Richard Russell (D-Ga.), chairman last year of the Senate Armed Services Committee and whom the brass did not dare offend.

It went to Vietnam in mid-1968 and is scheduled to return home soon. During its brief stay it has tossed shells into enemy positions—a function already being handled by bombers, artillery and smaller warships.

One of its most recent, publicized exploits was wiping out a machine-gun nest with a 1,900-pound shell from one of its 16-inch guns. In premilitary-industrial complex days

the job was handled more cheaply—and probably more efficiently—by infantry or artillery weapons.

No one explained the military-industry complex and the mingling of politics with the influence of industrial giantism better—if unwittingly—than President Lyndon B. Johnson at the March 2, 1968, rollout ceremony at Marietta, Ga., for the giant C-5 cargo plane, built by Lockheed Aircraft Corp., the nation's No. 1 defense contractor.

"I would have you good folks know there are a lot of Marietta, Georgias, scattered through our 50 states," he said. "... All of them would like to have the pride that comes from this production ... but all of them don't have the Georgia delegation."

He specifically cited the influential Sen. Russell and former Rep. Carl Vinson, both chairmen at the time of Senate and House armed services committees.

In 1968 Georgia was second only to Mr. Johnson's Texas in capturing prime contracts for airframes, assemblies and parts. Together the states accounted for nearly half the U.S. production.

Today so many military bases and defense installations dot the Georgia landscape that an unknown Pentagon wit once said, "One more in the state will sink it."

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

SPEAKING OUT: THE WEAPONS INDUSTRY IS A MENACE

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

(NOTE.—Dr. Lapp, as a member of the Manhattan Project, participated in the development of the first atomic bomb. Since 1950 he has been a free-lance consulting physicist, specializing in defense problems. His latest book, *The Weapons Culture*, appeared this spring.)

The United States is becoming a weapons culture. The health of our entire economy has come to depend on the making of arms. The machinery of defense, lubricated by politics and technology, has become a juggernaut in our society. Pressures exerted by the giant corporations that compose our military-industrial apparatus are felt in the Pentagon, in the White House and in Congress. Congressmen are re-elected depending on their success in winning defense contracts for their constituencies; government funds support vast military research projects on campuses across the country; the scientific community has been largely corrupted or silenced by military domination.

President Eisenhower warned of this ominous trend in his farewell address back in 1961: "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."

That warning has become the present reality. Since the end of World War II, and especially since Korea, the manufacture of arms has ceased to be an emergency measure whereby private firms do their bit for Uncle Sam. Instead, many U.S. corporations have become primarily arms makers. Their business and their profits depend on winning more and bigger contracts from the Department of Defense. Some companies, like North American Rockwell, General Dynamics and McDonnell Douglas, exist almost entirely on government arms contracts. Without this money many of them would go bankrupt, and places like Southern California or the state of Washington would become economic disaster areas.

Consider, for example, a single company—Lockheed Aircraft. In the past seven years this California-based concern has won a total of \$10.6 billion in defense contracts. Uncle Sam provides 86 cents of every dollar of its corporate sales. Lockheed is not just an isolated example. During these same seven years

38 companies each have done more than one billion dollars of business with the Pentagon.

No nation can devote so much of its ingenuity, manpower and resources to the works of war without being deeply changed in the process. Our commitment to weapons making has distorted the free-enterprise system of our economy into a kind of "defense socialism," a system in which the welfare of the country is permanently tied to the continued growth of military technology and the continued stockpiling of military hardware.

This massive "peacetime" commitment to arms is new to the American experience. When one looks back and surveys the post-war years, one startling fact emerges: During these years the United States has devoted one trillion dollars to its national security! And half of this vast expenditure occurred during the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations.

These billions of dollars have meant jobs for many Americans—for electronics specialists in Boston's Route 128 necklace of defense plants; for rocket men in factories spread out over Utah's broad valleys; for aircraft workers in Southern California, Texas, Georgia, Washington, Kansas and Missouri.

President Eisenhower omitted any reference to political influence in his indicting phrase, "the military-industrial complex," but it is the crux of the matter. Powerful members of Congress champion defense systems out of self-interest. Georgia's defense bounty may be traced, for example, to the power of its Senator Richard B. Russell, who is chairman of the potent Armed Services Committee. Our senators and representatives approve the appropriations that control the fate of many a defense plant. It takes a brave legislator to vote against funds that mean jobs for some of his constituents. He becomes vulnerable not just to the disemployed defense worker but to campaign charges that he failed to support the national security program.

The power of the military-industrial complex has been greatly aided by advanced technology. Science has become the key to modern arms. Today's weapons systems, especially those involved in hurling nuclear warheads at intercontinental range, are incredibly complex. Nuclear research has fashioned compact packages carrying the explosive power of a million tons of TNT. Chemical and electronic ingenuity have combined to perfect rockets like Minuteman and Poseidon that can carry from 3 to 10 warheads, each dispatched to a separate target. More and more our great national decisions involve complex technology and secret data about weapons.

Consider, for example, the recent decision to build a thin Sentinel system to defend against ICBM's fired by Red China. This \$5 billion project may escalate to \$40 billion. Yet the public had precious little to say in this momentous decision. In a sense, even a democracy as modern as ours is dictated to by technology. When a weapons system becomes "ripe", then it dominates its makers. In the case of ballistic-missile defense, the United States spent \$4 billion in research and development, so before the decision to deploy it was made, powerful forces urged its production. Robert S. McNamara, who recently resigned as head of the Pentagon, put it bluntly: "There is a kind of mad momentum intrinsic to the development of all new nuclear weaponry. If a weapons system works—and works well—there is strong pressure from many directions to procure and deploy it out of all proportion to the prudent level required."

One way to pressure the American people into supporting larger defense outlays is to sound the alarm about Soviet strength. Thus in the 1950's it was alleged that there was a "bomber gap," and public support was whipped up for mass production of B-47's and B-52's.

Even before the bomber gap vanished into thin air, a "missile gap" was born. John F. Kennedy hammered away at the missile-gap issue in his 1960 campaign, decrying Eisenhower's years in office as "years the locusts have eaten." Yet when Kennedy became President and had time to study the available information about Soviet missiles, he discovered that the missile gap was in our favor. Nonetheless, Kennedy pressed Congress for authorization of more Minuteman and Polaris missiles.

Now a new gap is in the making—a "megaton gap." A megaton means a million tons of TNT, or 75 times more power than the A-bomb that eviscerated Hiroshima. At some time in the future the Soviet Union may be able to hurl more megatons at the United States than we can fire back in return. This does not and cannot alter the fact that a small fraction of the present United States nuclear firepower can knock the Soviet Union out of the 20th century. Having excess kill power—overkill—is not militarily meaningful.

The heart of our strategic policy is our capability to inflict unacceptable losses on the enemy's homeland. It's damage, not megatons, that counts. I have calculated that as few as 45 ballistic missiles can strike at 60 million Russians living in 200 Soviet cities. No, my arithmetic is not nutty—each missile can be armed with from 3 to 10 nuclear warheads targeted on individual cities. The total megatonnage in this hypothetical attack amounts to only 21 megatons—roughly one thousandth of that once carried by our SAC bombers. But 21 megatons is the equivalent of 21 million tons of TNT, or 620 times the explosiveness of the combined power of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs.

If my figure of 45 missiles seems too low, then let's triple it. That figure would amount to less than a tenth of the actual number of missiles in our strategic strike force. Adding more ICBM's to the U.S. arsenal, or magnifying the megatonnage, does not really alter the nuclear balance of power.

But the very concept of "enoughness" in military power is a punishing blow to the solar plexus of the military-industrial-political complex. Defense affluence is based on open-endedness—on there never being enough of anything, even megatons. The United States has already stockpiled over 50,000 nuclear weapons and has a capacity to double this number rather quickly.

The man in the street is not supposed to question matters of national security. But whose judgment is he to trust? The politicians are themselves deeply implicated in the military-industrial complex; the generals traditionally don't know what the word "enough" means, and industrialists covet contracts.

There is sound reason for gloomy forecasts about defense socialism. The United States cannot afford to lay down its nuclear arms until it is safe to do so—and that day is far from dawning. Force of arms still rules, and the United States has no choice but to maintain its armed vigilance. Moreover, it cannot become complacent about its power to deter war by depending on the *status quo*. For this reason military research and development should never cease.

But the need for weapons improvement should not be viewed as a *carte blanche* for defense industry. Rational determination of force levels is of paramount importance to the nation's security. Excessive weapons deployment may not only be wasteful, it may provoke competitors to unplanned arms increases, and thus escalate the arms race with no real gain in our national security. But "how much is enough" is the perplexing question that this country has avoided facing squarely.

I admit that precise definition of "enoughness" is impossible. No single person or computer can be relied on to spell out how much is enough. There must always be an insurance

factor—a margin for error, but not for irrational excess. Even if by some magical process we could find a neat answer to how much military power is enough, we lack the mechanism in our democracy for a techno-military consensus. Our democracy depends on a system of checks and balances, but such restraints are lacking for the military industrial complex. Our Congress is ever ready to vote for larger defense appropriations; not once since Hiroshima has the Congress failed to fund a weapons system. It has even pushed some that the Defense Department did not want. Under congressional insistence the U.S. spent about \$1.5 billion on a nuclear-powered airplane—against the best advice of scientists. When the project was finally abandoned, the money turned out to be a complete loss.

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy were pressured by Congress to deploy a ballistic-missile defense system. Had they yielded and authorized the system in the late '50's or early '60's, the resulting radars, computers and missiles would have had to be scrapped as useless. Yet when more advanced systems gave some hope of a thin defense shield, and the Sentinel system was authorized, what did members of Congress do? They immediately demanded a "thick" system—one which Defense Secretary McNamara was careful to point out would be worthless against a massive Soviet attack. Furthermore, McNamara warned it would encourage the Soviets to accelerate their ICBM program, and thus add a new spiral to the arms race.

Twenty-three years of the postwar era have failed to educate the Congress in the realities of nuclear power. We should be considering arms cutbacks, not increases, but this prospect frightens Congress and terrifies the aerospace industry, which is becoming a kind of national industrial welfare program.

There is no easy panacea for correcting America's techno-military ills. But we must begin by recognizing the inherent dangers to our society if we do not control our arms industries. Public exposure of the problem is essential. The Congress must provide itself with authoritative independent advice on techno-military problems. To this end I would urge the creation of a National Analysis Council to study and report on many of the problems that Congress is now handling in a horse-and-buggy manner. For example, the Congress may soon be asked to fund a new Advanced Manned Strategic Bomber. I would urge that it subject this proposal to a concentrated and objective analysis by a National Analysis Council, so that its full significance and value can be determined for the benefit of all members of Congress.

I would urge that the growth of defense socialism be curtailed by applying geographic and contract controls to all new prime military awards. For example, it might be feasible to limit a corporation's involvement with defense work by prohibiting the awarding of new contracts when a company already does more than half of its business with the Defense Department.

These are, I admit inadequate approaches to the overall problem. We cannot treat a cancerous condition so superficially, but we must begin somewhere—and soon. If we perpetuate our weapons culture, we will turn ourselves into a veritable Fortress America, questing for evanescent security and, in the words of John F. Kennedy, "forever racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 23, 1969]

DOUBTS RISE ON HILL OVER ARMS NEEDS (By Warren Unna)

The President's decision to go ahead with deployment of a modified Anti-Ballistic Missile system triggered a double volley: Con-

gressional doves found a new military escalation compounding their misgivings about continued U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

But these two issues—the ABM and Vietnam—may well have caused something even bigger: An increasing skepticism, even disbelief, in what the Pentagon says it needs and wants as a share of the national pie.

Criticizing the military now has evolved all the way from being considered high heresy to somewhat unpatriotic to perhaps respectable legislative inquiry.

Congressmen are becoming increasingly aware that the military budget proposed by President Johnson for the coming fiscal year and which some of them think President Nixon may even exceed, is no less than \$80.2 billion. This is almost identical to the \$80.6 billion the United States spent in fiscal 1944 at the height of World War II—although inflation and the nation's expanding wealth make such comparisons difficult.

"We are still fighting the leftover Joe McCarthy era," Rep. Otis G. Pike (D-N.Y.), a member of the House Armed Services Committee, said the other day. "If you vote against anything the military wants you are being 'soft on Communism.'"

LARGE ISSUE

"I think the larger issue really is how one perceives the world today," declared Rep. Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.), a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the liberal Democratic Study Group. "Do we really need it? Are the Soviets really about to attack us? What country in the world really threatens the United States today? It turns out there really isn't anybody."

Fraser hastened to add that the United States should, of course, retain a defense capability, a nuclear deterrent. But he estimated that would cost \$8 to \$10 billion a year, instead of \$80 billion.

The Senate's most senior Republican, George D. Aiken of Vermont, says even Russia has come to feel she can no longer spend her last ruble on defense: "The Defense Department has been running hog wild. Some people have got worried for fear we've become a military government."

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), who personally suspects the Nixon defense budget now may exceed President Johnson's tentative submission in January, declared in an interview: "The days of the Defense Department asking and receiving are over. It will no longer be automatic. You have to achieve a balance somehow between external security and internal insecurity."

SERIES OF ACTIONS

Buttressing these individuals' storm warnings have been a series of actions on both sides of Congress.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, focal point of the doubters, has intruded into the heretofore sanctified jurisdiction of the Pentagon's greatest defender, the Armed Services Committee.

Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), even managed to force the Armed Services Committee to open its usually closed doors to the public and television this past week because Armed Services realized Gore's new Disarmament Subcommittee promised open doors and rough public questioning of Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird.

Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), a Secretary of the Air Force under President Truman, is taking on the vast range of military and industrial influence on foreign policy in a new Foreign Relations subcommittee he heads.

On the House side, liberal Democrats, with some Senate assistance, have jumped the old committee jurisdictional disciplines by summoning civilian military authorities to Capitol Hill next Friday and Saturday for a conference on "The Military Budget and National Priorities."

Their announced objective is to get enough documentation to persuade their colleagues to think twice about arms escalation when they start voting military authorization and appropriation requests.

Within jurisdictional lines, Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), normally considered a safe friend of the establishment, has reactivated a dormant Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments under the heretofore docile House Foreign Affairs Committee.

A House Government Operations subcommittee this past week started following through on a charge by Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.), that the Bureau of the Budget gives kid-glove treatment to Pentagon requests.

A few weeks ago, Rep. Richard D. McCarthy (D-N.Y.), nudged by a wife who was disturbed by a TV documentary on the extensive U.S. military involvement in Chemical, Biological and Radiological Warfare (CBR) research, asked the Pentagon authorities involved to come over and explain to him and his colleagues.

Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), of the House Armed Services Committee, one of the Pentagon's best friends in Congress, apparently became so disturbed with reports that the military had sunk some \$1.3 to \$2 billion into a "dream tank" which is never expected to roll that he organized a special investigation subcommittee.

HELICOPTER COST

Rep. Pike took the House floor in mid-week to air his own difficulties with the Army in trying to make it disclose how much Lockheed's new Cheyenne battle helicopter finally will cost.

Pike said the Army assured him last year that there was to be a fixed-price contract and the 375 helicopters on order probably would cost around \$1.5 million apiece. Now, he declared, the Army has sent him a figure marked "classified" which is about \$2,250,000 per plane.

Pike termed it: "The military-industrial complex at play—a case history."

Pike also has been holding a series of House Armed Services subcommittee hearings investigating how such an expensive and presumably sophisticated U.S. Navy managed to make so many mistakes in the Pueblo affair.

On Thursday, Rep. Paul Findley (R-Ohio), until now a leading Republican hardliner on defense matters, issued an anti-Vietnam statement which lifted the eyebrows of his colleagues with this sentence: "If military policies, with or without escalation, inherited from President Johnson are continued much longer they will become Nixon policies."

TRUTH QUESTIONED

"Quite frankly," Rep. John Brademas (D-Ind.) said the other day, "many of us simply don't believe that Defense Department officials always tell us the truth about much of what they do, especially about what they spend."

Brademas, who came away from the CBR briefing a few weeks ago regarding it as still another pitch for more money, complained of the difficulty of Congressmen, individually or collectively, trying to match their doubts against the Pentagon's super hard sell, on an \$80 billion budget.

"I hope that the unusual occurrence of a Republican President and a Democratic Congress will result in Congress being far more suspicious of the military," Brademas said. "It is high time we got back to what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they wrote a separation-of-powers Constitution."

Rep. Jeffery Cohelan (D-Calif.) declared it common knowledge that the Pentagon budget requests were "watered." One trim he is convinced should be made is in military manpower and bases overseas. A joint Pentagon-State Department study last fall found that the United States now has approximately 450

bases overseas containing a total of 1,715,000 in military personnel and families and costing about \$4.8 billion a year to maintain.

Reps. Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Melvin Price (D-Ill.), a high ranking member of both the Atomic Energy and House Armed Services Committees, differ from their other liberal Democratic colleagues in believing that the United States Gross National Product is increasing at such a rate you can have both guns and butter.

H-BOMB BATTLE

And, while always for giving the military close scrutiny, they can't forget it was they who went to plead with President Truman to get started on developing the H-Bomb. They say the opposition at that time, which included the military, was quite similar to the anti-ABM arguments today.

But despite the increasing outspokenness against the military in Congress today, the full Establishment in the House and part of it in the Senate still is very much pro-Pentagon.

They might be described as the "Whatever our boys need" school. Only "Our Boys" (usually spoken with a heavy Southern accent) no longer means the doughboys of World War II and Korea but the ever ingratiating generals and admirals who specialize in cultivating powerful committee chairmen.

On the House side, the realities of power are in the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

The full House Appropriations Committee and its key Defense Appropriations Subcommittee are chaired by the same man—Rep. George H. Mahon (D-Tex.), described even by his critics as "a true believer."

SELF-PRESERVATION

In a recent interview, Mahon declared: "I think self-preservation is the first law of men and nations. We must be careful that we don't become a second rate power in relation to the Soviet Union. The social programs are all right, but if we don't have adequate defense what good are they?"

Serving with Mahon on his key subcommittee are 10 other Congressmen, all conservatives: Reps. Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla.), a major general in an Army CBR unit; Jamie L. Whitten (D-Miss.), George W. Andrews (D-Ala.), Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa.), John M. Slack Jr. (D-W. Va.), Joseph P. Addabbo (D-N.Y.), Glenard P. Lipscomb (R-Calif.), William E. Minshall (R-Ohio), John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.) and Glenn R. Davis (R-Wis.), who was put on the subcommittee this year to succeed the ranking Republican and now Defense Secretary, Melvin R. Laird.

By tradition, subcommittee recommendations go through untouched by the full Appropriations Committee and then, if the leadership has its way, pretty much untouched on the House floor.

"What the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees recommend will get through because they know much more about it," Speaker John W. McCormack (D-Mass.) declares. McCormack personally regards the Atlantic as "our first line of defense" and is convinced the next war will never provide a post-Pearl Harbor period to gather up the pieces.

UNIFORM VOTING

The House Armed Services Committee under Chairman Rivers is known to have almost uniform votes on most all defense authorization matters, 37 to 3. And last year when one committee bill was on the floor Rivers saw to it that one of his own men was in the Speaker's chair so that no unfriendly amendments could be recognized.

"The difference between the Armed Services Committee and other House committees," one Congressman said, "is that in the

others they ask, 'Do you really have to have it?' and in the Armed Services they ask, 'Do you have enough?'"

In 1962, the former House Armed Services Committee Chairman, Carl Vinson (D-Ga.), wrote a fatherly letter to Rep. Pike, then a freshman, commending him for a nice try.

"Some things proposed by the Executive Branch are virtually impossible to change," Vinson wrote. "This is particularly so in the area of defense. I personally am reluctant, and indeed refuse, to substitute my judgment on a military matter for the judgment of those so much more qualified to make decisions of a military nature. In the vernacular, you didn't have a chance. Simply stated, there are some things that the individual Congressman cannot do."

In the House, the vast number of members and single committee assignments aid and abet the seniority system. The conservative leadership sees to it that only the "right" men start their climb on the "right" committees.

Moreover, the liberals privately acknowledge that their instincts invariably propel them to apply for seats on committees concerned with social issues, rather than with Armed Services and Appropriations.

On the Senate side, committee or subcommittee chairmanship may come quicker but the Armed Services, and Appropriations Committees again have a decidedly conservative makeup. And in today's pigeon-holing, conservative means pro-Pentagon.

The Senate Armed Services Committee is headed by John Stennis (D-Miss.), another military "true believer" who during last year's authorization hearings on the Sentinel ABM managed to have only Defense Department witnesses testify approvingly behind the Committee's closed doors.

Similarly, the Senate Appropriations Committee is headed by Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.), another military "true believer" who for years headed Armed Services.

In a speech before the National Security Industrial Association Thursday night, Russell went beyond the Defense Department's current military needs to anticipate the hardware which will be needed once the Vietnam claims are over.

"There would be little merit to a course that would win a war against poverty in our backyards if we jeopardized the security of our very home," Russell declared.

ELLENDER IN LINE

If Russell's current bout with cancer forces him to vacate his chairmanship he will be succeeded by Sen. Allen J. Ellender (D-La.), another conservative Southerner but one who currently happens to be on a rampage against military appropriations.

Criticizing the latest ABM request, Ellender said the other day: "Unless we can dispel the fear between us and the Russians we're never going to get together."

No one is predicting how much the military might be cut back this year as Congressional opposition really is just getting started. All seem to say that the lead will have to come from the Senate, where the opposition includes some of the leadership and is far stronger than in the House.

There already is some speculation about trying to impose an over-all 5 or 10 percent cut on whatever the Pentagon finally comes up with, or perhaps arbitrarily setting a \$75 or \$70 billion ceiling and letting the Pentagon live with it as best it could.

Some even are suggesting a more obscure way of attacking military expenditures: Committing the Administration to social welfare expenditures first then leaving the White House to puzzle out how to maintain a Republican posture of economy and still deal with defense needs.

NO MIRACLE SEEN

Most legislators who knew Defense Secretary Laird during his 16 years in Congress

acknowledge his expertise from sitting on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. But they look to no miracles now that he has joined the Administration.

They say even a Laird can't master the Pentagon labyrinth in any short period of time. And they cite his own comments that he now has new responsibilities—defending defense needs.

The realists among today's doubters on Capitol Hill are not saying they have the Pentagon on the rout. They only are hoping to start putting the Department of Defense truly on the defensive.

This posture would replace a post-World War II offense which now has the Pentagon absorbing some two-thirds of all Federal tax receipts and spending not only more than the profits of all American business, but also more than Federal, state and local governments combined spend for health, education, old age, retirement assistance, housing and agriculture.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 8, 1968]

ARMS FIRMS SEE POSTWAR SPURT—LEADERS SHOW LITTLE INTEREST IN APPLYING SKILLS TO DOMESTIC ILLS—I

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

NOTE.—This is the first of two articles on the plans and expectations of the great aerospace companies when, and if, the war in Vietnam is brought to an end. Their potential role in domestic programs is examined in detail.)

The shrewd and skillful men who direct large, sophisticated defense firms look forward to a post-Vietnam world filled with military and space business.

For them, the war's end means no uncomfortable conversion to alien civilian markets. Quite the contrary, and with no discoverable exception, they expect handsome increases in the complex planes and missiles, rich in electronics, that are the heart of their business.

The view these firms take of their future has political significance. Some Government officials and economists have been suggesting that the major aerospace companies are capable and ready to use their considerable managerial skills and engineering expertise to solve a broad array of pressing social problems. No less an authority than Defense Secretary Clark Clifford recently said:

"We now have a military-industrial team with unique resources of experience, engineering talent, management and problem-solving capacities, a team that must be used to help find the answers to complex domestic problems as it has found the answers to complex weapons systems. These answers can be put to good use by our cities and our states, by our schools, by large and small business alike."

This kind of thinking raises hopes that the aerospace industry's ability and interest in domestic areas will supplant its concern with defense dollars. So, the argument runs, there need be no fear that the industrial wing of what has been called the "military-industrial complex" will remain a continuing source of pressure for ever-expanding arms budgets.

However, an extended survey of industry leaders in Dallas, Fort Worth, San Diego and Los Angeles—the heartland of the aerospace world—offers little support for this view. The great defense contractors display only a marginal interest in work outside their accustomed military-space sphere, devote only a fraction of their resources to it, and, for the foreseeable future, see no economic reason to change their ways.

"Basically, we're a big systems builder for military weapons. Over 90 per cent of our business is military. We're in that business to stay."

So says Edward J. LeFevre, the canny vice president in charge of the Washington office

for General Dynamics, currently the Nation's largest defense contractor.

"Our future planning is based on visible contracts. One must believe in the long-term threat."

This is the view of James J. Ling, the extraordinary Texan who has put together almost overnight a \$3.2-billion conglomerate with enough defense subsidiaries to make his Ling-Temco-Vought the eighth biggest military contractor.

"Defense spending has to increase in our area because there's been a failure to initiate (new weapons systems)—if we're not going to be overtaken by the Soviets."

Thus John R. Moore, the handsome, white-haired president of the Aerospace and Systems Group, the military heart of North American Rockwell, the ninth ranking contractor.

On the other side of the street, a top official at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency despairingly agrees. The official, who asked that his name not be used, says:

"I'm not sanguine about any reductions in military spending, especially since the election. We are now at the edge of a precipice where we can escalate sharply. The industry thinks that agreements to limit arms are unlikely and will go all out to realize their expectations. We are at the threshold of another round in the arms race, just as we were eight years ago when we went all out for long-range missiles."

FROM THE "BLUE BOOKS"

The best way of discovering how an aerospace company sees its future is to peek at its "blue book," the loose-leaf folder that projects in voluminous detail sales, profits and other data for the next five years. These volumes are the core of any large corporation's plan and usually are kept under lock and key.

However, the LTV Aerospace Corp., the most important defense subsidiary in the Ling empire, opened its book to a visiting reporter (appropriately, it is bound in blue plastic) and here is what it showed:

TOTAL SALES

1968, \$530 million: A-7 Navy Attack Plane, \$245 million; F-8 Navy Fighter, \$82 million; New VFX Fighter-Bomber, \$1 million; Missiles-Space, \$70 million; Other Military-space, \$67 million; Non-military, Non-space, \$65 million.

1973, \$1.3 billion: New Navy VSX Plane, A-7, \$322 million; F-8 Navy Fighter, \$1 million; VFX Fighter-Bomber, \$320 million; Missiles-Space, \$149 million; Other Military-Space, \$270 million; Non-military, Non-space, \$230 million.

Competitors of LTV Aerospace will be struck by the firms' calm assumption that it will win the development contracts for the two new Navy planes. But more important is the company's forecast that five years hence it will earn more than 80 per cent of its dollars from military and space work, nearly the same share it is now receiving. Moreover, this slice will come from a sales total more than twice as large as the company enjoys today.

The breezy optimism of LTV Aerospace is a special case, even in the wonderland of defense contractors. Its parent, Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., is the unique creation of the slightly unbelievable James J. Ling.

A high school dropout at 14, Ling, with \$3000, opened an electrical contractor's shop in Dallas after the war. Ten years later, he parlayed this into a modest equipment company and, by a series of audacious financing operations, ultimately picked up defense firms. Braniff Airways, the big Wilson Company (meat packing, sporting goods, drugs) and the substantial Jones & Laughlin steel company.

The metallic and fast-talking Ling now presides, at the age of 45, over a sprawling conglomerate that betrays some uncertainty

about its identity. Executive suites in the new and stark 32-story Ling Tower in Dallas are elaborately paneled in aged wood; neo-classical statuary and 18th century Italian paintings give them the air of a modest gallery or an Edwardian bordello; deep pile carpeting runs from wall to wall (chartreuse for LTV Aerospace, beige for LTV Electro-systems and gold for the parent LTV Inc.).

CHANGE OF MOOD AND MOTIF

In contrast, the defense divisions of North American Rockwell in Los Angeles exude an air of brisk, antiseptic, scientific competence. Doors are in bright, primary colors, trimmed with aluminum; furnishings run to the functional; impressionist reproductions hang outside the offices of lesser executives and bold, dribble-school abstractionists decorate the quarters of the upper echelon.

But whatever their differences in imagery, a common theme runs all through these firms, an almost religious belief in the efficacy of engineering logic. "The buzz word," says a bemused observer, "is systems analysis," a disciplined and systematic attack on problems that begins by determining what something is intended to do. (A systems engineer would not try to build houses; he would attempt to optimize shelter and its related sub-systems of water, sewerage, heating, power, recreation, transportation and the like.)

SOLEMN ESSAYS ON THE FUTURE

So each company begins its forecast of future sales with a solemn, schematic essay in global political projections, attempting to evaluate possible courses of action in the same way that different metals might be compared for strength, lightness and heat resistance.

For example, a study compiled last year by the Electronics Industries Association, "The Post-Vietnam Defense and Space Market Environment," attempts to measure six different ways in which the war will end. The report concludes that "U.S. Escalation" is the likeliest route; a "Soviet Diversion" in Europe or elsewhere is the second likeliest and "U.S. Compromise" from "domestic pressures," the course now being followed, is rated a weak third.

Happily for the industry's members, the document forecasts that arms control agreements "during the next decade are unlikely," the "likelihood of limited war will increase" and "thus for the electronic firms, the outlook is good in spite of (the end of hostilities in) Vietnam."

THREE POSSIBILITIES ENVISIONED

At North American Rockwell, producers of electronic equipment for strategic bombers, Navy reconnaissance jets and a small family of missiles, these geopolitical scenarios are, properly enough, composed by the marketing division. In a post-Vietnam world, the company envisions three possibilities: Limited War, Cold War on Detente (with arms limiting agreements). The house judgment is that something between Cold and Limited War is the best bet.

Nonengineers might charitably regard these exercises as naive and misleading. Obviously, as in the case of the Electronics Industries Association's forecast of war's end in Vietnam, the best of computers can go wrong. But this is not the point. These forecasts govern the planning of aerospace firms and provide them with a rationale for promoting their views and wares.

SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECIES

To an undetermined extent, the companies can be expected to use their influence to make their prophecies self-fulfilling. By no mean coincidence, their views of the world outlook usually coincide with conditions that would maximize their military orders.

The companies are understandably guarded in talking about the effect of more

immediate political changes on their future. But they leave little doubt that an important source of their optimism lies in the departure of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and the election of Richard Nixon.

"People are pressing for new programs more intensely than ever," says W. Paul Thayer, the quiet ex-test pilot who runs Ling's LTV Aerospace. "With McNamara stepping out, that was the turning point."

J. Leland Atwood, the low-keyed president and chief executive officer of North American Rockwell, an aviation designer for nearly 40 years, employs the cautious euphemisms of many modern corporate executives.

A LITTLE MORE AWARENESS

"All of Mr. Nixon's statements on weapons and space are very positive," he says. "I think he has perhaps a little more awareness of these things than some people we've seen in the White House."

Samuel F. Downer, the financial vice president for LTV Aerospace, covers the walls of his sparkling new Dallas apartment with his own paintings and is proudest of a cityscape that looks west on New York's Wall Street ("because it's all there, the flag, the church and money"). For the energetic Downer, the postwar world must be bolstered with military orders.

"It's basic," he says. "It's selling appeal is defense of the home. This is one of the greatest appeals the politicians have to adjusting the system. If you're the President and you need a control factor in the economy, and you need to sell this factor, you can't sell Harlem and Watts but you can sell self-preservation, a new environment. We're going to increase defense budgets as long as those — in Russia are ahead of us. The American people understand this."

Richard E. Adams, the plain-spoken engineer who directs advanced projects for the Fort Worth division of General Dynamics, producer of the controversial F-111 fighter-bomber, also talks of the domestic political realities that favor expanding military business.

WHERE THE POWER IS

In any conflict between increased spending on social programs and spending on defense, he says:

"We know where the power is (on Capitol Hill and among the Executive Departments). There's going to be a lot of defense business and we're going to get our share of it."

These political estimates, global and domestic, are carefully translated by each company into dollar terms, new weapons systems and the amounts that will be spent for them. There is a standard industry view here and it runs like this:

Vietnam is eating up about \$22 billion a year of the \$80 billion defense outlay (the war's cost is actually about \$6 billion more but this sum would be spent on repositioning American forces elsewhere if they were not in Vietnam). Of \$2 billion of the Vietnam budget, however, buys the advanced weapons that the aerospace crowd makes. Thus, the war's end will do little damage to these companies: "We are little impacted by the cessation of hostilities." Military payrolls and makers of uniforms, artillery shells, C-rations and the like will bear the brunt of any cutback.

Thus the end of hostilities opens up great new opportunities for sophisticated munitions makers. They and their Pentagon colleagues will press for bigger research and development budgets, an outlay guaranteed to produce new designs that military men could find irresistible. Several new weapons already designed will be ordered for extensive production. The VFX, a new Navy fighter-bomber; the VSX, an anti-submarine plane and the AMSA or Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft, a new bomber, all fall in this category.

THE PENTAGON'S "WISH LIST"

Over and above these items, each worth several billion dollars, are those on the Pentagon's "wish list" as it is known in the trade. It comprises more fighter wings; A V/STOL, or Vertical/Short Takeoff and Landing, transport; thickening the "thin" anti-ballistic-missile system so that it supposedly could shoot down Russian as well as Chinese nuclear missiles; a new fleet submarine armed with missiles.

Also, a new intercontinental ballistic missile for the Air Force; new light attack aircraft; a new series of interceptor planes and a new generation of MIRV, the Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicle, a missile with several warheads, each capable of being electronically guided to a different target.

Looking at this shopping list, some knowl-

edgeable Pentagon officials see post-Vietnam defense budgets conceivably rising to \$100 billion a year in dollars of present purchasing power.

The aerospace executives are more modest. They think defense budgets will fall by \$5 to \$10 million after the war, but then begin to grow at some constant percentage of an expanding gross national product. Space budgets, it is thought, will be held on their current plateau a bit longer, but in time will gently start climbing again, too.

Again, a table of some representative firms reflects the industry's view of the near future. What follows is very unofficial. Some parts of the table are based on percentages provided by the companies and from inferences drawn from them. Few companies are as open with their books as LTV Aerospace. Percentages represent military-space sales.

	1968 sales		1973 sales	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
General Dynamics:				
Fort Worth	\$800,000,000	95	\$1,400,000,000	95
Convair Div.	300,000,000	95	(1)	95
North American Rockwell Aerospace and systems group	1,900,000	95	2,400,000,000	95
Ling-Temco-Vought:				
LTV Electrosystems	220,000,000	87	400,000,000	81
LTV Aero-Space	530,000,000	88	1,300,000,000	82

¹Unavailable.

(If Convair fails to win the big new contracts for which it is now competing, its military-space business will drop in 1973 to 60 per cent of total sales.)

(Electrosystems expects \$140 million in additional sales from new civilian companies it intends to acquire.)

NO MAJOR SHIFT SEEN

The point again is that everybody expects a brisk rise in business and no substantial change in the dominant share bought by the Defense Department and NASA.

To be sure, this is not the whole story. Ling has bought up a string of nondefense companies that turn out steel sheets, tennis rackets and packaged hamburgers among other things. Combined, they dwarf his sizeable defense subsidiaries.

North American, the big plane and missile maker, merged last year with Rockwell, a conventional producer of parts for trucks, autos, and heavy construction equipment as well as textile looms. Five years hence, the company expects its commercial products to be generating more sales than its defense orders.

Even General Dynamics, which was frightened away from civilian business after a disastrous experience with jet airliners a few years ago, expects to work on parts for other companies' commercial planes if it loses too many military contracts.

Moreover, the very corporate divisions that focus on Pentagon business have all made some cautious stabs at nonmilitary markets.

None of this, however, detracts from the central theme: The great aerospace firms have a strong appetite for military business. They look forward to expanding, not contracting, their sales in this sphere.

WHICH COMES FIRST?

To what extent are these expectations self-fulfilling? Do new weapons systems originate in the fertile design shops of the companies, then to be sold to the Pentagon? Or are the firms simply passive contractors, responding to what the trade calls a "military requirement?" In sum, is it an industrial military or a military industrial establishment?

There is no simple answer to this question. Indeed, some authorities think it should more properly be called a military-industrial-political complex to account for the influential Congressmen who press require-

ments on the Pentagon and contracts on their constituents.

There are differences even within the same division of a single firm.

For example, John W. Bessire, the manager for pricing at General Dynamics' Fort Worth Division, says:

"We try to foresee the requirements the military is going to have three years off. We work with their requirements people and therefore get new business."

But a few doors away, in the enormous plant where a dozen or so of the swingwing F-111s are quietly produced each month, the advanced projects director, Richard Adams, takes a different view:

"Things are too systematized at the Pentagon to invent weapons systems and sell them on a need. Even if you invent one, all you do is give the military an idea and you'll end up in a competition (with another firm for the production contract)."

President Moore of North American Rockwell's Aerospace and Systems Group, sees the process as one of joint parenthood.

"PEOPLE GETTING TOGETHER"

"A new system usually starts," he says, "with a couple of military and industry people getting together to discuss common problems. By far the largest part of the business comes from requirements established by the Defense Department or NASA."

"But it isn't a case of industry here" (gesturing with one arm outstretched to the ground) "and the Government here" (pointing with the other to the air). "They are interacting continuously at the engineering level."

One of the shrewdest and most important civilian officials at the Pentagon also sees the initiating process as a seamless web. "Presures to spend more are going to be there," he says. In part, they come from the industry selling new weapons ideas, he thinks, "and in part from the military here."

"Each (military) guy has his own piece, tactical, antisubmarine, strategic. Each guy gets where he is by pushing his own particular thing. Don't forget, too, part of it is based on the perception of needs by people in Congress."

If the origins of increased defense spending can't be isolated surgically, talks with the men in the industry make it clear that they are expecting enough to go around in the

years after Vietnam. This is one important reason why Secretary Clifford's proposal that they turn their talents to social problems as well is regarded as unnecessary and unwise.

In fact, one of the industry's most sophisticated men, President Atwood of North American Rockwell, remains convinced that Clifford's speech "was aimed at his own department, at small business firms—but not really at us."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 9 1968]

DEFENSE FIRMS LEERY OF CIVILIAN WORK—"NO-RISK" CONTRACTS HEIGHTEN APPEAL OF ARMS BUSINESS—II

(By Bernard D. Noissiter)

The last time the White House published a detailed review of the economic consequences of peace, it foresaw a future rich in profitable social opportunity for the great aerospace firms.

"Today's defense plants," it said, "often take on the character of gigantic job shops . . . and their workers are quite adaptable" to similar civilian production. Even the more specialized engineers and scientists are compelled "to adjust to frequent and rapid shifts in requirements."

The document, "The Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament," continued:

"Several new disciplines—such as operations research, systems engineering and computer technology—have been widely used in defense R & D and strategic weapons programs . . . It is likely that further research would demonstrate the utility of these disciplines in solving a variety of problems in such nondefense uses as Government operations, educational technology, the design and operation of multiple purpose water resource projects, and the design of urban mass transportation systems."

Thus armed with flexible men, blue collar and white, reinforced by new managerial techniques, the report reasoned:

"If there are large-scale nondefense research and development projects . . . many defense contractors should be and will be able to compete effectively for such contracts . . . It has frequently been urged that the Government undertake large new research programs in such fields as urban transportation, pollution control, oceanography, weather forecasting, methods for organizing medical and hospital care and techniques of education . . . Those who have suggested the undertakings are confident that existing defense contractors would secure many of the contracts for research work."

This was the cumulative wisdom of Gardner Ackley, former chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers and a supporting crew from Defense, Labor, Commerce and other departments. It was published in July, 1965 and, so far as is known, has not been improved upon since.

The document was reassuring for two reasons. It suggested that the great military contractors easily could and would convert their electronic swords into social ploughshares. It implied that the Nation, therefore, need not worry about an industrial group with a vested interest in arms.

Three years later, many of the aerospace companies have indeed dabbled their toes in these waters. But, as an extended inquiry discloses, they have found the temperature chilly and uninviting. Several aerospace executives like to think they can someday make what one former Air Force general calls "megabucks" in commercial and social markets. But even the most sanguine think that day is far off. As a result, they have invested little of their time and less of their stockholders' money pursuing this track.

The large defense contractors see no need to chase commercial chimeras; they expect and are planning for bigger and better arms

business once Vietnam is out of the way. More importantly, the industry wonders whether the techniques required to build an electronically guided, supersonic, missile-equipped jet plane can be used to rebuild ghettos or cleanse the air. Moreover, even if the skills were convertible, there is a prevailing view that the "megabucks" would be made by the traditional manufacturers, by General Motors rather than General Dynamics.

Dwight K. Warner, an earnest industrial engineer who is the manager for market analysis of General Dynamics' Convair Division at San Diego, says:

"It's hard to get a handle on this. With a military system, you can analyze the threat, the mission, the required speed and firepower. These are measurable, tangible things. But how do you measure the goals for New York City or Washington? People are not homogeneous. It's hard to identify the problem. It's such an emotional thing. Finally, what could we sell? Mass transportation? General Motors and the others have it locked up. The customer we have, we understand him and he understands us."

Even the optimists, like James J. Ling, chairman of the multibillion-dollar Ling-Temco-Vought, says:

"Systems analysis can make a complete study of a problem. We do have that capability, we do have that talent. But whether you can become a hardware manufacturer depends on the case."

The distinction is crucial. As everybody in the special world of aerospace knows, the money is in the "hardware," producing the goods and not the design.

HARD TASK FOR SLIDE RULES

As engineer Warner suggested, social and commercial problems demand an understanding of human behaviour and institutions that doesn't lend itself easily to slide rules and computers. Within the aerospace industry, the story is told of some bright young engineers who employed systems analysis to design an optimum machine for extracting coins from parking meters. They constructed a wonderful armoured vehicle that removed, stacked and sorted the money without the intervention of human hands. It was, they properly claimed, absolutely thief-proof. But when they took their blueprint to the California town that had requested the device, it was turned down cold. Three engineers had made no allowance for the 20 per cent that the mayor's son had been skimming from the meters.

TRW Inc., a comparatively small defense contractor, is one of the more ebullient firms in the field. It recently proclaimed: "Techniques for dealing with the future, together with TRW's long experience in systems engineering, are now being applied to complex civil problems."

These words appeared at the end of a study that TRW had offered to the state of West Virginia. The study was supposed to answer, among other things, how land should be assembled for new cities in the undeveloped countryside and where these new towns should be located. The systems analysts at TRW assumed away the first question by recommending that Federal land should be taken over. They then proposed a site "near enough to Washington, D.C., so that it can become an example for visiting foreign statesmen." Potential government clients do not find this sort of thing very helpful.

There is a telling acronym in the business, "GIGO". It stands for "Garbage in, garbage out" and means that no flow chart, no computer will produce answers better than the material fed into them.

EXPERIMENT IN CALIFORNIA

Two Governors of California, Edmund (Pat) Brown and Ronald Reagan, have encouraged the huge aerospace firms in their state to turn their attention toward non-

military markets. The Governors' concern is understandable; California receives by far the largest share of defense contracts—\$6.7 billion or 18 per cent of the national total in fiscal 1967—and someday the bonanza might end. So, the Governors provided funds for defense contractors to study mass transportation, air pollution and communications.

The outcome, aerospace men agree, was not happy. William L. Van Horn, director of operations for General Dynamics' Convair Division says:

"We'd never specialized in these areas. We felt that the universities and Rand (the Rand Corp., a research group) could contribute more than we could."

Van Horn observes that his company's difficulty with the mass transportation study for the San Francisco region was one any businessman would recognize.

"We found there was no customer. The area is divided into so many political authorities, there was no one you could talk to."

North American Rockwell's Aerospace and Systems Group also tackled a phase of the transport study. But the vice president for engineering and research, Bernard Haber, says he doubts that his team even mapped out the relevant boundaries.

Under the aegis of an indulgent military, aerospace firms have become accustomed to surrounding a problem with scientists and engineers. For California, complains Haber, "the level of effort was too low." The company was given only an amount equal to the annual salaries of three to five professionals compared to the seventy to one hundred for which it gets paid on a new plane.

LOW ECONOMIC REWARDS

The disturbing fact, from the standpoint of the aerospace companies, is that the economic rewards for solving civil problems appear to be low. As a rule of thumb, the industry figures that if it earns \$20 million from the research on a device, it will pick up \$200 million for developing and testing it and \$2 billion in production. This is why everybody says that "the money is in the hardware."

But many aerospace firms suspect that even if they design a better transport system, more conventional corporations will earn the big money from producing the vehicles. A case in point is Ling's LTV Aerospace. Its Missiles and Space Division designed for the Marine Corps a tough, new eight-wheel jeep, the MACV. LTV earned \$20 million for developing the vehicle but lost the \$200-million production contract to another concern.

There is another, crucial economic consideration that makes civilian work unappealing. Quite simply, you have to invest your own money, not the Government's, in it. Van Horn of General Dynamics estimates that for every \$10 million he invests on a military contract, he must put up \$100 million for civilian business of an equal size.

Defense contracting is a peculiar form of enterprise and aerospace firms live in an oddly protected world. They are, says former Air Force Gen. Robert Richardson, "no risk" firms. Richardson dealt with them for several years as deputy to Gen. Bernard Schriever, head of the Air Force Systems Command. Now, he works for Schriever's consulting firm in Rosslyn and has received a liberal education in the limitations of the aerospace companies.

AN IDEA THAT FAILED

He and Schriever had elaborate plans to construct a "General Motors of building" from aerospace talent and turn it loose to create "optimum communities." He still thinks that systems analysis techniques can "build environments a hell of a lot better than the guy who scribbles on the back of an envelope." But he has concluded that the "no risk" nature of the aerospace firms disqualifies them from this undertaking. He

and Schriever now hope to teach their techniques to traditional building firms.

What Richardson means by "no risk" is this: Typically, aerospace companies do not spend their own money to build plants; they lease factories constructed by the Government. LTV Aerospace, for example, uses 6.7 million square feet of office, plant and laboratory space; it owns only 70,000 feet or a shade more than 1 per cent.

Much of the elaborate equipment in aerospace factories is also Government-financed. General Dynamics put \$20 million into its Convair plant at San Diego and the Government matched this with \$20 million worth of machines.

Defense contracts themselves are complex affairs, but in general, they provide liberal allowances if the cost of a weapons system exceeds the estimated price—and it usually does, by a substantial margin.

The heady days of World War II and its cost-plus contracts are over. But even under the so-called "fixed price" agreements now in vogue, the Government will underwrite as much as three-quarters of any unexpected cost up to some pre-determined ceiling.

PRODUCTION LINE UNDERWRITTEN

Finally, the Government finances the production line itself. It does not wait for delivery before paying for weapons systems but provides "progress payments" during the various stages of construction.

Many authorities insist that there is no other way to finance the exotic items that aerospace firms make, that no conventional firm would spend its own money to build a relatively few copies of an extremely high-cost item that can be sold to only one customer. But this hothouse environment hardly equips aerospace firms for the competitive rigors of commercial or civilian markets.

John R. Moore, the president of North American Rockwell's Aerospace and Systems Group, drove the point home in a discussion of the conditions his company would require to undertake, for example, a high-speed transit system.

"If the Government provided the risk capital," he said, "and if the vehicle contained enough technology or patentable elements so that we could close out other producers and if we could market it, then it would be viable."

But where, outside of the Pentagon, can such conditions be met?

Despite all these obstacles, there is a nagging belief in the industry that it should widen its scope. The Washington representatives of the major aerospace firms are a special source of internal pressure, urging their companies to explore the prospects for earning the growing sums of Federal money they foresee will be spent on slums, schools, pollution and the like.

At the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Federal-State agency charged with reviving the impoverished areas of 13 states, the executive director, Ralph Widner, reports, "We have been drawing aerospace people like flies." Several companies, like TRW Inc., have expressed an interest in contracts dealing with the broad spectrum of problems with which the Commission is grappling.

Widner is a hopeful sceptic, doubtful that defense management techniques now can make a major contribution but convinced that someday they will. His Commission is financing a proposal from North American Rockwell to build some small clinics and other health facilities. The modest experiment will work if the company can do the job cheaper and faster than traditional firms.

MERGER EYED CIVILIAN MARKETS

So, too, North America itself, primarily a defense contractor, merged last year with Rockwell, chiefly a maker of vehicle parts. The company now talks hopefully of fusing North America's technological skill with

Rockwell's commercial aptitude and thereby widening markets for both.

Even General Dynamics, the most solidly entrenched in defense work is taking a cautious look at other markets. About 500 of the scientists and engineers at its San Diego complex, perhaps 5 per cent of the total payroll, are engaged on oceanographic problems. The firm is very proud of a computerized buoy it has designed, constructed and stationed at sea. The buoy periodically feeds back data on current flows, temperatures, salinity and other useful hydrographic information.

At LTV Aerospace, President W. Paul Thayer is restlessly searching for non-defense business, too. He plans to increase from 5 per cent to 10 per cent the share of research money his company now spends on civilian markets.

Even companies that are dubious about their ability to exploit new designs in non-defense areas think they see a possible way out. As that master of conglomerates, James Ling puts it, "I frankly don't see how we could tackle things like urban renewal or pollution. But we could buy a company to do it."

The industry may or may not draw some comfort from the Rand Corp., a striking case of forced conversion. Essentially an Air Force "think tank," Rand was compelled to modify its ways when Congress placed a ceiling on the funds that Government agencies could spend with such research centers. Today, says Henry Rowen, the scholarly former assistant secretary of defense who now presides over Rand's fortunes, the corporation is earning about one-fifth of its \$25 million in fees each year from civilian work.

FROM AIR TRAFFIC TO CRIME

Its engineers, physicists, economists, lawyers and others are exploring congestion in the air lanes over New York, technology and the press, crime in New York City and other matters outside Rand's familiar path. Albert Wohlsetter, a prominent war games theorist, sits at Rand and looks at the comparative economic situation of whites and Negroes. This is much like turning Herman Kahn loose on a study of the stability of Keynes' consumption function.

There is still another reason for Rand's shift. As Rowen says: "There's been a big change in attitude in the last ten years. Vietnam turned off a lot of specialists, particularly the younger ones with no career commitments." In other words, to attract young scholars, Rand must offer them something besides plotting scenarios for global holocaust.

Rand, of course, is not General Dynamics, and the Congressional ceiling was a powerful spur for change. President Rowen is a great admirer of the aerospace firms with which he once dealt—"they really are smart guys with a respect for the intellect." But even he is of two minds about their ability to move out of defense markets.

"They're really good at one product," he says, "a product of high quality engineering with a lot of science built into it. They don't have long production runs—500 copies of anything is a long one. So they are good at airplanes, missiles, space vehicles, electronics. There's little relationship between that and any condition in the cities."

But he goes on:

"They have learned how to mobilize a lot of engineering talent and this is generalizable. Give them problems on the physical side, not the social, problems in transit or pollution and maybe they'll do poorly, but they'll do a lot better than the rest of American industry."

However, he adds, "It is unreal to expect them to make any significant contribution in a short time."

INDUSTRY DISPLAYS CONFIDENCE

This conclusion is echoed in the industry. At General Dynamics' Fort Worth Division,

Richard E. Adams, the director of advanced projects, goes to a blackboard and plots on a time scale the prospects for defense and civilian business. Far out to the right, he draws a slowly widening band of civilian orders.

Adams is one of the few industry men encountered in this survey who thinks that someday there will be international agreements limiting missiles and other weapons. So, he began working on a schematic study to determine which of several social areas—mass transit, waste disposal—offered the most profitable prospect for his company. His superiors, however, cut the project short.

The company, he says, "is unwilling to forego opportunities on programs that look real for something way out in the future."

In the Los Angeles executive suites of North American Rockwell's defense arm, officials talk seriously of "looking hard" at pollution, exploiting the ocean beds and other non-military work. But President Moore of the Aerospace and Systems Group readily acknowledges that this effort has a low priority because he can see "no payoffs until the late 70s or 80s."

It appears, then, that the major producers of sophisticated weaponry will continue to devote some time and money to tentative forays into non-defense business. But their words and plans make it clear that the bulk of their resources will be spent on the development and promotion of new arms. The assumptions of Ackley and other official thinkers have no resonance in the cool, clean plants where the aerospace men bend their talents to what they know best, the production of increasingly awesome instruments of destruction.

NEW HOPE FOR CONSUMERS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently President Nixon selected a fellow Pennsylvanian to serve as his fulltime special assistant for Consumer Affairs. She is Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, who has, in effect, been promoted to this national office from a similar position she has held in Pennsylvania for some 14 months.

I am pleased to extend my congratulations to Mrs. Knauer. I believe that she brings to this vital advisory post a sincere determination to defend the interests of the American consumer. She has demonstrated in Pennsylvania that she can perform effectively as the consumer's spokesman in consumer affairs.

Largely because of Mrs. Knauer's efforts, Pennsylvania is investigating and taking legal action to stop deceptive and fraudulent sales practices of magazine subscription sales companies. She is well aware of the unscrupulous tactics utilized by many magazine subscription sales organizations in their dealings with consumers.

Her firsthand knowledge of this situation, I am certain, will serve to focus due Federal concern on subscription sales frauds on a nationwide basis. The problems she has experienced in Pennsylvania are prevalent all across the country.

Furthermore, the deceptive sales practices of certain American businesses—particularly those engaged in sales of

some encyclopedias—are smearing the image of the American free enterprise system around the world. I was appalled recently to learn of the scandal involving American encyclopedia companies which has been running rampant in Sweden for several years.

I wish Mrs. Knauer well as she begins a most necessary and extremely difficult task. Her efforts, however, will be richly rewarded in the knowledge that the American consumer is getting a fair deal in the marketplace and at his own doorstep, and that American businesses are dealing honestly with consumers around the world. I should like to include in the RECORD at this point the Christian Science Monitor's recent article on Mrs. Knauer's appointment:

MRS. VIRGINIA KNAUER COMES ON CONSUMER SCENE

(By Josephine Ripley)

President Nixon's appointment of Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer (pronounced now-er) as full-time Special Assistant to the President for consumer Affairs would seem to indicate that consumer issues are to receive the same close attention in White House councils today as they did in the previous administration.

Thus there appears to have been a reassessment of the role of consumer adviser since the appointment in February, of Miss Willie Mae Rogers of Good Housekeeping magazine who was to serve only as a part-time, nonsalaried consumer consultant to the President.

Miss Rogers resigned four days later following widespread criticism of her appointment.

Mrs. Knauer comes on the scene with all of the prerogatives of the office formerly held by Miss Betty Furness, including her title, her position as chairman of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests and as executive secretary of the Consumer Advisory Council.

Mrs. Knauer made a smooth, poised debut before television cameras at the White House press conference immediately following her appointment. Never at a loss for words, she always seemed to find the right ones.

After all, consumer issues are not new to her. She has been dealing with them for the past 14 months as director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the State of Pennsylvania.

She had high praise for Miss Furness, saying, "I think Miss Furness did a fantastic job in communicating with the public and making clear the administration's deep concern for the welfare of the consumer."

"And I expect to do the very same thing." If this includes speaking on behalf of consumer legislation before congressional committees, she will make such appearances when they are called for.

Further underlining current White House thinking on consumer affairs, she described President Nixon as "devoted and dedicated to the idea that this administration shall represent consumer needs at the highest level."

AS SHE SEES THE JOB

Her job, as she sees it, will be "to advise the President on matters of consumer interest and also to represent consumers themselves at the highest level of government."

Her first assignment will be the same as that which Miss Rogers was to undertake. That is, an evaluation of existing consumer programs within the various government departments.

The purpose is to make sure that these programs "are responsive to the needs of consumers," to determine whether there is duplication and to find out if they "are really doing what they were designed to do."

Mrs. Knauer's political savvy comes from

experience. She served eight years as a member of the Philadelphia City Council and was the first Republican woman to be elected councilman-at-large.

Consumer groups are reacting cautiously to her appointment. She is not widely known outside her state. Some say they are glad she is not "another home economist" which was one of the criticisms of Miss Rogers.

Not that consumer organizations have anything against home economists. It is just that they would prefer to see this job in the hands of someone more familiar with the legislative processes.

There was prompt and favorable reaction to the appointment from Capitol Hill where Sen. Frank E. Moss (D) of Utah, chairman of the Senate subcommittee for consumers saw it as evidence of the President's intention to "preserve the consumer post as a significant pillar of his administration."

Mrs. Knauer has been closely concerned with consumer legislation passed by the Pennsylvania legislature and backed by Republican Governor Raymond P. Shafer who has said he does not feel that consumer issues should be left to the Democrats.

PRESIDENT SAYS LITTLE

President Nixon has said little, if anything, on consumer subjects since his election. So far as is known, no consumer message will go to Congress in the near future. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson set the precedent for such messages and many consumer bills were passed by the 90th Congress.

In a statement published in Business Week before the election, the President said he felt that "consumer interest is far too basic to be left in the hands of a single adviser. In the next Republican administration, it will be the explicit responsibility of every department and agency head to foster consumer welfare."

This was taken to indicate, at that time, that the White House consumer office would be abolished. But this has not happened and Mrs. Knauer will soon take up her duties in offices in the Executive Office Building, adjacent to the White House.

Mrs. Knauer will establish residence in Washington. Her husband is Wilhelm F. Knauer, a Philadelphia attorney. They have two children and one seven-year-old granddaughter. Mrs. Knauer will receive a salary of \$28,000 in her new post.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENT: AN EXPERIMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Washington is our Nation's showcase to the world as well as its capital. When such trumped-up and emotional issues as home rule for the District of Columbia are being publicized around the country, our citizens are never reminded that the District never has, never can, and never will pay its own way. Washington exists only as a Federal Capitol—it is here to house our Government and to serve the people of the Nation. The taxpayers pay its bills, and the elected national representatives should properly run it—just as article I, section 8, of the Constitution, including the District together with "forts, magazines, arsenals, and dockyards" plainly provides.

From time to time, we hear anguished

screams of "police brutality"—louder and louder demands for trial boards to harass and hamper honest local police—more and sadder crocodile tears for the "juveniles" and the "underprivileged minorities" whose crimes of violence prey on innocent citizens—and better and better "constitutional" protection for the vilest criminals, the filthiest obscenities, and the most obvious subversion.

To illustrate this point, I am inserting several clippings from Washington newspapers during the last 3 weeks.

Decent Americans will surely agree that there is something very wrong in our Nation's Capital when a veteran police officer feels it necessary to go armed in his own neighborhood; when an officer with 19 years service in keeping peace is given immediate "administrative leave" for shooting a fleeing two-time rapist caught in the act; when the Mayor announces his displeasure and suggests retrial of two officers found not guilty by a police trial board; when a rapist walks free because his distraught victim kills herself—and rulings of the Supreme Court leave no evidence for trial; and finally, when a juvenile in the custody of U.S. marshals in the District of Columbia jail finds himself "homosexually raped"—with medical evidence to substantiate his story—by a dozen adult cellmates.

Washington has frequently been cast in the role of an "experiment" in various things—integration of schools, self-government, total franchise. Has not this experiment of letting the inmates take over the supervision of the asylum demonstrated that it should be terminated forthwith, lest the next 3 weeks be worse than the last?

The articles follow:

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1969]

POLICE BULLET KILLS BOY, 15, AT RAPE SCENE

A 15-year-old Anacostia youth was shot to death by a District policeman early today as he was fleeing the scene of the rape of a 69-year-old widow in Congress Heights.

Police identified him as Edward William Rawlings of 4000 Livingston Road SE.

His family described the youth, who attended Hart Junior High School, as something of a "loner" but seemed incredulous that he had been involved in such a case.

The Metropolitan Police Department officer who shot the youth, Victor Kuklis, said he entered the house in response to a neighbor's call and found the youth inside and the woman stripped nude on the floor. Kuklis said the youth headed for the front door, and he ordered him to halt several times. The youth had unlocked two locks and was turning around when Kuklis fired twice, police said. One shot went into the door jamb, but another hit Rawlings in the right side. He was pronounced dead at Hadley Memorial Hospital.

Kuklis, sent to the scene after neighbors reported a woman screaming, said that he could not enter by the front door because it was still locked, but was able to get in through the back door which had been left ajar by the intruder, police said.

Kuklis reported that the widow had partially wrecked the living room in her desperate efforts to fend off her assailant.

The widow told police she had been talking on the telephone and getting ready to go to church today, and had not heard the intruder come into her home. She looked up and saw him in her living room, carrying a knife and demanding money.

She told police she gave him all the money she had—\$1—and then the intruder told her he was going to rape her.

The woman was bruised during the struggle and was screaming incoherently when Kuklis entered, but police reported there were no knife wounds. The assailant had the knife in his hand with the blade out when he first demanded money, police reported.

The weapon, a pocketknife, was found in the youth's pocket along with a \$1 bill, police said.

Rawlings, a Negro, had no record here as a juvenile, authorities reported.

Police said the youth was about 6 feet tall and weighed about 150 to 160 pounds.

Rawlings was identified at the D.C. Morgue by friends of the family.

The shooting occurred at 12:01 a.m. and the department placed Kuklis, who is white, on administrative leave with pay at 1:40 a.m., under administrative procedures ordered by Mayor Walter E. Washington earlier this year. Kuklis, 44, has been a police officer here for 19 years.

Young Rawlings lived with his mother and sister in a third-floor apartment of a red-brick building facing the Oxon Run Park.

Mrs. Arlizzie Rawlings, who makes venetian blinds for a firm in Northwest Washington, expressed disbelief that her son could have done what homicide detectives described to her early today.

"I'd like to find out what happened because I don't believe a 15-year-old boy could do anything like that," she said.

Mrs. Rawlings and her daughter Brenda, 16, as well as neighbors and teen-age friends, described the boy as something of a loner.

"He was very quiet," was the general comment.

His mother said he liked to play his electric guitar, always alone, and infrequently left the house except for school. His attendance in the eighth grade at Hart was fairly regular, his family reported. He had failed a grade or two in Richmond, Va., where the family lived until 14 months ago, they said. Edward's father, now separated from the family, lives in Richmond.

They said Edward returned to Richmond to visit a girlfriend and other close friends nearly every other weekend. He seemed not to have any close friends here, they added.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 3, 1969]

SECOND RAPE LINKED TO SLAIN YOUTH

A 54-year-old Anacostia woman has identified the 15-year-old youth slain as he fled the scene of a rape yesterday as the person who robbed and raped her in her home in the same general neighborhood two weeks ago, police said today.

The youth, Edward William Rawlings of 4040 Livingston St. SE, was shot to death by Metropolitan Police Officer Victor Kuklis at the scene of a rape and robbery of a 69-year-old widow. The police officer said the youth, who was armed with a knife, refused repeated orders to halt.

Homicide Squad Lt. Patrick Burke reported that the attack on the 54-year-old Anacostia woman occurred a block and a half away from the scene of yesterday's case.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 9, 1969]

PROSECUTION OF SUSPECT NOW IN DOUBT—VIRGINIA RAPE CASE COMPLAINT KILLS SELF

A woman cabdriver, who reported she was raped by a passenger 10 days ago, shot and killed herself in her apartment Sunday afternoon, after brooding with a friend about what she said had happened, Alexandria police said today.

Alexandria Commonwealth Atty. Early Wagner identified the suspect in the case as Moses Alexander Currie, 20, Negro, of Alexandria, said today he did not know whether it

now would be possible to bring the rape charge to court.

"Police are investigating to see if medical evidence, and statements made by Miss Moore to police are enough to bring this case against this man," Mr. Wagner said.

Police said Doris Jean Moore, 30, white, a driver for Yellow Cab, picked up two men at about 2:15 a.m. in Alexandria and took one to the city's train station.

Police said the second man, reportedly asked to be taken to Episcopal High School, at King and Quaker streets, but pulled a razor, climbed into the front seat and forced Miss Moore to drive to the 4400 block of W. Braddock Road, where the alleged attack occurred.

Police said Mr. Currie, lists his occupation as a cook at the Episcopal High School and lists his address there.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 8, 1969]

ALEXANDRIA TRAGEDY: RAPE VICTIM, 30, KILLS SELF

A woman cab driver who police said was raped by a passenger 10 days ago shot and killed herself in her apartment Sunday, Alexandria police reported today.

The woman, Doris Jean Moore, 30, shot herself in the chest with a .22-caliber pistol at 5:03 a.m. in the presence of a friend, police said. They said she had been upset since the attack.

The attack occurred on March 29 after she had picked up two passengers at Duke and Alfred Streets at 3 a.m. She took one to Union Station in Alexandria and the other, giving a destination in western Alexandria, pulled a knife and raped her.

A 20-year-old suspect has been apprehended and held for action from a grand jury on a charge of rape, police had previously reported.

On Sunday, police said, Miss Moore, was talking to a male friend as they were sitting on a sofa in her apartment. Two other women were present in another room. Miss Moore had been upset and became more so, threatening to kill herself, police said. She mentioned the rape at the time, police were told.

The friend tried to console her, but without warning she went to a closet, got the pistol and shot herself before the friend knew what she was doing, according to police.

The friend called for help, but she was pronounced dead at Alexandria Hospital. Police listed the death as an apparent suicide.

Clifford Furman, manager and vice president of Alexandria Yellow Cab, Inc., said the victim was a "nice young lady," describing her as "real dependable—a hard worker."

After she was assaulted she was switched from night to day driving, he said.

Furman said Yellow Cab has two other women drivers, but "I don't hire them any more—this is no place for a woman to be driving."

Commonwealth's Atty. Earl F. Wagner said today he doubts he will be able to prosecute the rape suspect now that the complaining witness is dead.

"It looks like the end of the thing," he said. "It's a right serious case and a right sad one."

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 8, 1969]

TWO EXONERATED POLICE FACE BOARD RETRIAL

Sources close to Mayor Walter E. Washington report he plans to order a departmental retrial of two policemen who were cleared of mistreating a motorcyclist they arrested last June.

The sources said Mayor Washington "was disturbed" by the decision of a three-man Police Trial Board that found the pair of

14th Precinct patrolmen not guilty in February. The officers in the case are William B. Caton and Alfred W. Folkman.

They were accused of wounding Marvin D. Vincent, 33, of the 5000 block of Hayes Street NE, four times during a bullet-riddled chase, struggle and arrest that ended in the darkened stairway of his brother's house.

Both officers were charged with using excessive force in arresting Vincent. Folkman also was charged with conduct unbecoming an officer in accidentally shooting the victim. Caton in addition was charged with unauthorized use of his revolver, disobedience of a police order and conduct unbecoming a gentleman.

Caton, according to testimony at the Trial Board hearing, shot at Vincent from the scout car during the chase.

The incident occurred the night of June 6, 1968, when the policemen stopped Vincent because his motorcycle appeared to have altered tags on it. When he couldn't produce a registration for the vehicle, he was ordered to drive ahead of them to the 14th Precinct station house.

However, the officers reported, Vincent raced off. Caton admitted firing at the motorcyclist, hitting him once. Folkman was driving. During the ensuing struggle, Vincent was hit accidentally by bullets from the guns of both officers. He was wounded in the ankle, lower back, stomach and chest. He escaped but later gave himself up to the U.S. marshal.

[From the Sunday Star, Apr. 20, 1969]

LUTZ GRANTED JURY TRIAL ON GUN CHARGE

Retired D.C. Deputy Police Chief Clarence H. Lutz, exonerated by a coroner's jury Friday in the fatal shooting of a 16-year-old youth during a holdup attempt, pleaded not guilty yesterday to a misdemeanor charge of carrying a dangerous weapon.

Lutz was granted a jury trial June 9 by Court of General Sessions Judge Edward A. Beard yesterday after appearing with attorney Joel Finkelstein.

U.S. Attorney David Bress said yesterday that no determination has been made as to whether the shooting case would be presented to a grand jury.

Police said the shooting victim, described as more than 6 feet tall and weighing 195 pounds, was Henry Gross Jr. of the 4900 block of 9th Street NW. He was shot once in the stomach by Lutz when he and another youth attempted to rob the retired policeman at gunpoint as he entered his car at 16th and Decatur Streets NW Tuesday night.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1969]

EIGHT HELD IN SEX ATTACK ON YOUTH (By William N. Curry)

Eight D.C. jail inmates yesterday were charged with sexually assaulted a 16-year-old youth being held by U.S. marshals in the U.S. District Court holding cell last Friday.

The youth had been placed in the lock-up although the U.S. Code says that juveniles kept in jail must be "held in custody in a room or other place apart from adults if facilities for such segregation are available."

C. A. (Al) Butler, the chief deputy marshal for the District, said the cellblock has separate facilities and he normally uses them for juveniles. "A breakdown in communication" led to the youth's being placed with adults, he said.

The U.S. marshal transporting the youth from Florida to New York City did not tell local marshals the youth was under 18, Butler said. The youth did not look like a juvenile and Butler said there were no papers traveling with him.

A Justice Department spokesman said a form giving the youth's age as 17 accompanied him. He was born April 26, 1952, according to court papers.

Butler said, "There has been a tightening up of normal procedures to hopefully prevent a recurrence." The Justice Department spokesman said the chief U.S. marshal for the United States was investigating the incident.

The youth had been placed in the holding cell Friday afternoon. After rebuffing one sexual advance the youth, who is white, was homosexually raped by 10 to 12 black adults, police said.

When he was getting on a bus for the D.C. jail, where he was to have spent the night, the youth told marshals of the attack, Butler said.

Medical tests substantiated his claim, and yesterday Stephen M. Schuster Jr., the investigating assistant U.S. attorney, filed sodomy charges against the eight.

General Sessions Court Judge Justin L. Edgerton ordered the men, already in jail, held without bond.

Those charged were: Delano R. Tarlton, 18, of 154 3d st. nw.; Charles Canty, 23, of 278 15th st. se.; Kenneth Thomas Jr., 24, of 4269 Foote st. ne.; Michael E. Jones, 20, of 640 Rock Creek Church rd.; Tyrone Parker, 21, of 1122 21st st. ne.; Larry Curtis, 21, of 5068 8th st. ne.; Tyrone Flowers, 20, of 418 D st. ne.; and Henry Smith Jr., 18, of 1343 F st. ne.

THE FIRST NATIONAL AVIATION SYSTEM PLANNING REVISION CONFERENCE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the First National Aviation System Planning Revision Conference which opened today under the auspices of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration and to commend Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, Federal Aviation Administrator John H. Shaffer, Deputy FAA Administrator David D. Thomas and Associate FAA Administrator for Plans Oscar Bakke for their efforts and initiative in scheduling this historic conference.

This conference, which will conclude on Friday will hopefully point the way toward the development of a national aviation system which will meet the future needs of this important segment of American transportation. This week's conference is the first in a series of annual conferences designed to continually update the planning and goals for a modern aviation system.

This conference and those to follow deserve the serious consideration of every Member of Congress and I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the opening remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary Volpe and by Administrator Shaffer:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE BEFORE THE FIRST NATIONAL AVIATION SYSTEM PLANNING REVISION CONFERENCE L'ENFANT PLAZA, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 23, 1969

I want to welcome you to the Department of Transportation—and to L'Enfant Plaza. Unfortunately, the Department doesn't own L'Enfant Plaza. But General Quesada—our first FAA Administrator does. It looks like Jack Shaffer has a very bright future.

I want to congratulate you leaders of the aviation industry and the people at our Federal Aviation Administration for arranging this conference. It represents sound government-industry cooperation at its best. I was, in fact, so impressed with the plans for this meeting that when I first heard of them, I asked that the date be postponed to permit all the members of our new Transportation team to participate. I wanted them to be part of this meeting. I think all parties will benefit. I might mention our new Transportation team is very much aviation minded. My number one assistant—Jim Beggs—is from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Paul Cherington heads our policy staff and Secor Browne is in charge of our research and development. And Jack Shaffer you all know.

I also want to mention Ben Darden who heads our new FAA Office of Aviation Policy and Plans. Ben just came to us from New York where he was a member of Mayor Lindsay's staff charged with formulating air transportation policies. Before that he was on the City's Planning Commission. He's young—32—a veteran FAA air traffic controller and a lawyer. And we think that's a good combination of experience.

My advice to you can be stated directly—think big! There is no other way!

The prime assignment President Nixon handed me when I became a member of his Cabinet was to prepare a long-range plan for meeting the Nation's growing transportation needs. This first projections of our Nation's future growth are beginning to come in. They are absolutely astonishing! Certainly, you in aviation are familiar with the expansion in your own industry. But we look to tremendous growth in every mode of transportation.

One of the main reasons for this growth is of course, population increases. Twenty-four hours from now—at 9:45 tomorrow morning, America's population will be some six thousand soles greater than it is right now. But transportation demand is increasing faster than the population and one of the consequences is that there will be seven thousand more airline passengers tomorrow than there are today. Another—and this is not your problem but it is certainly one of mine—tomorrow there will be ten thousand more vehicles on our Nation's highways than there are today. But in the face of this, I still submit that our future is bright indeed; so let me suggest as a theme for this meeting a section of the famous quotation of James Burnham that one airline publicized a few years back. I quote: "Make no small little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood." Again, gentlemen—think big. There is no other way!

I would also urge that you leaders of the aviation community use your time here together to discuss informally among yourselves another matter—a matter that is the natural consequence of your deliberations here.

I have during the past month had the opportunity—along with my fellow members of the Cabinet—to work on the national budget. We have been looking deep into the government's cash drawer. I know what is in there now. I know what expenses we have coming up. I know what income we can expect. And I tell you frankly, gentlemen, the government, under the existing arrangements, cannot provide the facilities needed to support the predicted growth of your industry. Additional funds are needed, and they are simply not going to come wholly from the Federal Government. The money must come from those who derive special benefit from these new airport/airways facilities.

It is no secret—especially to this group—that the Department of Transportation shall be sending up to Congress within a very short time new legislative proposals urging the adoption of a number of aviation user charges—funds which will be used to pro-

vide needed new facilities. I cannot discuss the details of our proposals but I certainly want to emphasize their importance.

One of the best indications of the significance of these proposals is that President Nixon listed improvement and expansion of our airports and airways as one of his ten top legislative priorities.

I feel fairly confident that there can be agreement in all segments of the industry that some form of user charges are necessary. If there is no such universal agreement, then we are in very bad shape—of that I am sure. I am not so confident, however, that there is full agreement in the industry on how these charges should be allocated. This concern of yours is understandable and I am hopeful that there will be debate and discussion concerning this. We solicit your ideas.

The danger, however, is time. General aviation is feeding about 150 new planes into the system every week. During the same seven-day period, your carriers are adding about fifty thousand new passengers to your lists—the seven thousand a day I referred to a few moments ago.

Every day spent in debate and argument thus only compounds the size of our difficulty. I remind you that there is a tremendous lead time involved here before our plans become physical realities. The interval from the day the Congress passes new charge legislation to the actual operation of a newly purchased I.L.S. (instrument landing system) must be measured not in weeks—but months, many months.

In addition to the time-factor danger, gentlemen, there is, again, the danger that in the inevitable necessity for compromise we might come up with too little. Any restriction of flight operations is objectionable even today. Given the ever growing demand for air travel, any additional restriction of operations in the future would be intolerable. Again, I urge you to think big.

Let me here make my own position clear. I favor no one type or mode or means of transportation. Nor am I against any. My purpose is only to insure that every time the government spends a dollar, it secures for the American people, a full dollar's worth of well-reasoned value.

Gentlemen, I wish you well in your deliberations. I am looking forward to studying the results of your confidence. They will be carefully considered in our planning.

Thank you.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY JOHN H. SHAFFER, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, TO THE FIRST INDUSTRY/GOVERNMENT PLANNING REVIEW CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 23, 1969

Good morning. I am delighted to have an opportunity so early in my tenure to speak to you and to add my personal welcome to this, the first Planning Review Conference. I want the communication circuits between the Office of the Administrator and your interests to be open and freely used. I regret this joint industry/government conference the vehicle for and the right time to inaugurate that kind of service.

You're probably familiar with the studio card, popular in some business establishments, which reads: "This is a non-profit organization. We didn't plan it that way, it just happened."

I like to think that at some point in the near future, after surveying the air traffic system, we will be able to say: "It didn't just happen; we planned it that way."

Planning then is the immediate business and the prime purpose of this conference. This is a get-together to exchange viewpoints, compare proposals, and merge resources. Before the seminars are concluded tomorrow, there will have been many spirited discussions—maybe some sacred cows will have been

slaughtered. Unquestionably, some new ideas will be born.

But I'm hopeful that the program will provoke more head-nodding than head knocking, that it will produce more open doors than closed minds, and that there will be more agreement than argument. Like any planning effort, this exercise is a means to an end—a point of departure toward a new order of understanding of where we're going and what it takes to get there.

There are two points I would like to make. One: we're not going to get anywhere in terms of building a more effective, efficient system if we persist in compartmentalizing civil aviation in our thinking or in practice. As we said on page two of one of the books we put in your hands before you came here, the National Aviation System in its broadest sense "encompasses the manufacturers of aircraft airframes, engines and components; the private, business, and airline operators of aircraft; the regulators of the economic use of aircraft; and the providers of the airways, the airports, and ground access facilities and services."

Virtually anything that's a problem for any one segment of the civil aviation society is also a problem for its other members, or interferes in some way with the effectiveness or the profitability of their operations.

The National Aviation System Plan, therefore, must meet the needs of civil aviation in its broadest sense, over and above the desires of any of its artificial divisions.

According to the Federal Aviation Act, passed by the 85th Congress ten-and-a-half years ago, the FAA was created "... to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, and to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft ..."

That emphasis on "civil aviation" and "civil and military aircraft" is my own. As I look on it there are only two classes of aviation—civil and military. The enabling legislation identified civil aviation as an entity, not a conglomerate; that is the way I think of civil aviation, and that is the way I suggest we ought to treat it.

Those who comprise this civil aviation family are well represented here today. Our purpose is a mutual one—to bring into being a new aviation system designed to accommodate everyone who wants to fly.

We're hard pressed to do that today, at least in certain busy air transportation centers. The forecasts have caught up with us. The congestion that has been predicted for so long has arrived. The marvel to me is that the system has been elastic enough to absorb the growth that has occurred, consistent with safety.

Nearly all of the industry statistics show that actual growth has outpaced the forecasts. When the National Airspace System design was established in 1964, the forecast called for handling 13 million IFR operations a year by 1975. Yet by 1967, the number of IFR operations had climbed to more than 16 million and the revised estimate for 1975 had gone up to 33 million.

Fortunately, this doubling in volume is well within the growth capacity of the computer-based system. But all of the other elements in the civil aviation operations network are not as readily expandable. At present, there are far too many potential choke points in the system. These range from terminal airspace limitations to such surface problems as inadequate access roads, deficiencies in baggage handling, and a shortage of gate positions.

The most immediate problems, however, relate to the lack of capacity in the airways/airports system. Our forecasts on air traffic growth are meaningless unless the restraints to growth are overcome.

My number one priority, therefore, will be to win support for the Administration's air-

ways/airports legislative package—a package that has real substance to it—and to commend that package to all of civil aviation.

Now, where are we going to get the substantial resources we need?

The legislative program we have proposed to the Congress faces up to the fact that large outlays of funds are essential if we are to maintain the high level of safety and while improving the efficiency in air travel.

The new and expanded airways program contemplated by the Administration will require a very substantial investment for the automation of the air traffic control system, as well as other new terminal facilities and equipment. And it would double the existing grant-in-aid program.

To help finance these expenditures, we have proposed additional taxes on the users, since the users are the principal beneficiaries of these improvements.

It is worth noting at this point that when we reduce schedule delays—with safety—through improved facilities, we will virtually eliminate the vast waste of resources—fuel, equipment and crews. Without going into the other costs implicit in current delays, I would guess that the waste in fuel alone exceeds \$80 million for the carriers.

These dollars are the debt service on a Billion dollars which these same users could employ productively. And unless we accomplish the improvements we seek to cope with the rapid growth in air transportation, things will get worse; not better.

We can no longer live with alternating periods of feast and famine in terms of public sympathy or fiscal support for civil aviation facilities. Neither can we afford to vacillate on equipment requirements or operational procedures that can mean life or death in a crowded sky. We must recognize the realities of air transportation as they exist today and will exist tomorrow, and make a sustained effort to establish both the near-term and long-range capabilities those realities demand.

The second point I want to make is that: we don't need to wait on any "round-the-corner" technology to do this job. The middle years of this century have been remarkably fertile technologically. We can be very busy throughout the next 10 or 20 years by simply exploiting the science and technology available to us.

Updating and improving our airports and airways is not a basic research project, an R&T program, or a technological WPA. The big job is to buy and integrate. It's squarely up to us to seize this once in a lifetime opportunity, too long dormant, and take the quantum jump in air traffic management and safety which computer-based technologies have made possible.

An industry that can automate ticket scheduling, inventory control, even baggage handling, can't afford to lag in the areas where accuracy, speed, and efficiency are vital to safety!

The NAS system now in the process of implementation is a major step in the right direction. The short-term objective is to complete that system as quickly as possible and to augment it as soon as possible with better means of data acquisition, more efficient use of the airspace, and increased runway capacities.

One of our problems is that we can't turn off the present system while we install the new one. We can't put up a "closed for alterations" sign. The automated system was designed to blend into the existing one, preserving the traffic flow and maintaining safety standards during the transition. This is a neat trick but one that can't be performed overnight. Fortunately, as I have said, we have the technologies. All we need now are resources and resourcefulness. I'm confident that resourcefulness exists in abundance within our ranks.

I have one final thought this morning. As we discuss the future of aviation over these next few days, and as we consider what automation will do for us, let's bear in mind that flying and flight control are still tasks that people do best. Planning is also a people function. We're not about to automate the man out of the system. As we move farther downstream in the automation process, the controller will become more and more the manager of a ground-based system, just as the aircraft commander will be increasingly the manager of an airborne system.

I think crew acceptance of the new system will come readily, for it will upgrade rather than downgrade the pilot's role. At the same time it will greatly increase his efficiency and the overall safety of his aircraft.

Automation offers the opportunity to relieve the pilot of routine physical tasks so he can be a better master. The devices will be his dependable slaves, while his own talents are freed for matters requiring the exercise of his judgment, not his muscle.

The talents essential to civil aviation will not diminish in the future; they will grow, just as the prospects for greater air transportation productivity will increase in direct proportion to the wisdom, the energy, and the quality of leadership we assert in planning the course and complexion of the National Aviation System.

NEEDED: A NEW SYSTEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, unemployment compensation is one of the most important protections that workers, their families, and communities have. National policy and a State-by-State system of jobless insurance were formulated more than 30 years ago. Since then, shamefully little has been done to keep the system realistic and effective, as the economy and standards of this country have steadily advanced. An article entitled "Needed: A New System of Unemployment Compensation," in the February issue of the Advocate, the national monthly magazine of the Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, makes a compelling case for the need to modernize the present unemployment compensation system, and how it can be done. With unanimous consent, I insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A NEW SYSTEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Unemployment compensation laws need a drastic upgrading to provide adequate protections for today's workers.

For the past 30 years, unemployment compensation benefits have remained nearly static because of interstate competition for business.

On the other hand, wages and prices have soared in this period, so the system has lost ground in achieving its original objectives.

As a result of these disparities, maximum weekly benefits have declined from 65 per cent of average base wages to 42 per cent. A \$3,000 tax base which represented 95 per cent of covered wages in 1939 now represents only 53 per cent.

As a result, even though as many as 80 per cent of the unemployed receive maxi-

mum benefits in a number of states, the system no longer provides weekly payments that maintain a minimum standard of decent living for unemployed workers. As a matter of fact the benefits paid by 45 states are currently below the poverty level yardstick of the United States government.

As inadequate as existing benefits are, they do not even cover all workers.

Many RCIA local unions have been able to negotiate supplemental unemployment compensation benefits. But this is an inadequate substitute for a thorough modernization of the structure on a nationwide basis to provide proper protection for all unemployed workers.

To bring about a comprehensive revision of the unemployment compensation system, the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security has prepared a model law, and it recommends adoption by all states. The long-term goal of the AFL-CIO is to bring all wage and salaried workers into the protection of the system.

Currently excluded are establishments with fewer than four workers, agricultural workers, employees of agricultural processing establishments, non-profit institutions, state and local governments, subcontractors, and individuals working under contract who in fact have an employment relationship.

Further, the present regulations for qualifying for benefits are arbitrary and restrictive and should be brought up-to-date: The AFL-CIO recommends that:

1. Employment should not be required in more than two quarters of the base year.

2. Low wage earners should not have to work longer than high wage earners to establish their right to benefits.

3. Outside limits should be defined as follows: Where a multiple of the weekly benefit amount is used, it should not require base year earnings of more than 30 times the weekly benefit amount; where a multiple of high quarter is used, it should not require base year earnings of more than one and one-half times high quarter earnings whether expressed as a multiple of the weekly benefit amount or of high quarter earnings. That is, when the weekly benefit amount is one-twentieth of the high quarter earnings, the base year earnings should be not more than 30 times the weekly benefit amount.

4. A claimant should not be required to meet more than one formula or type of wage qualifying requirement.

Regarding payments, a flexible maximum weekly schedule should be set up so that benefits will automatically keep pace with wages.

The Federation recommends that weekly benefit payments should be equal to two-thirds of the worker's full-time earnings, and in no case be less than one-half. This amount should be computed on the gross earnings on those weeks of the base year when wages were highest.

Every claimant should be entitled to at least 26 weeks under state law. For variable duration provisions, this should be the minimum rather than the maximum.

The "waiting week" should be eliminated or at least compensated retroactively after a few weeks of unemployment.

Unemployment compensation should be paid during labor disputes:

In the case of lockouts;

Lay-offs during negotiations;

An employer violation of any state or Federal labor law, or any arbitration decisions;

To workers not directly interested in the labor dispute; and

If a labor dispute occurs at a location other than the worker's place of employment.

The model statute also includes provisions to secure the soundness of the funds, including the raising of the taxable wage base to at least the \$7,800 used by the social security system.

SUCCESS STORY IN SOUTH KOREA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Emerson Chapin in "Success Story in South Korea" concludes that Korea "has become one of the success stories of the U.S. assistance program."

Having recently returned from a survey trip to South Korea, I commend the following article especially to those of my colleagues who have not seen firsthand the relative political stability and the impressive economic progress of this small yet ruggedly anti-Communist country:

SUCCESS STORY IN SOUTH KOREA

(By Emerson Chapin)

It was only a few years ago that South Korea, wracked by poverty, political chaos and popular discontent, was widely regarded as a sinkhole of American aid. Now this small, ruggedly anti-Communist country enjoys relative political stability and is making impressive economic progress. It has become one of the success stories of the United States assistance program. How did this startling reversal come about?

Officials familiar with South Korea's history since the war with the Communist North insist that the ingredients for success had been there for a long time, however obscured they may have been in the dark days of the early 1960s. They are convinced that the apparent miracle is genuine and likely to continue, although as Assistant Secretary of State William P. Bundy has pointed out: "While Korea's achievements are considerable, its major problems require that they be kept in perspective."

Economic growth was at the rate of 7.6 percent annually over the 1962-67 period, with an 8.4 percent rise in 1967 and a surprising 13.1 percent for 1968, but it started from a very low base. The living standard is perceptibly rising, as indicated by the sale of new homes, television sets, refrigerators, more food and better clothes; but per capita income is still not much above \$140 a year, deep pockets of poverty exist and the gap between urban and rural income has been growing. Although considerable progress has been made toward democracy, the overriding need for stability and order and the government's vigilant anti-communist policy lay a heavy hand across certain sectors of society. However, to those familiar with the spirit of defeatism that so long prevailed among the Korean people, the key element is a new feeling of self-reliance and self-assurance that has begun to pervade the country. "We can do it ourselves" has become the motto for a people who long were inclined to ask: "How can we ever succeed?"

The United States helped to pave the way by patient investment which kept this war-shattered nation supplied with food and other necessities, laid an infrastructure in a land almost devoid of natural resources, created educational opportunities, built several layers of experienced administrative personnel and ended Korea's international isolation. Political stability, painfully attained under the Park Chung Hee government after a period of crisis and strife, established a climate in which businessmen and others could look to the future, inflation could be checked and coordinated planning begun. Once the watershed was passed, momentum built up rapidly, Austerity and hard work paid off. Three years ago, the United States aid mission was expanding; now it is being rapidly reduced.

An unintended tribute to South Korea's progress is the intensified campaign of harassment and terror carried on since late 1966 by Kim Il Sung's North Korean regime. Early in this decade, the Pyongyang government may well have felt it could afford to wait patiently until the South fell like ripe fruit into its hands. They can take this for granted no longer. The communist government, itself now in economic difficulties, has carried out a bristling rearmament program and Kim asserts that he intends to reunify the peninsula, by force if necessary, before the end of 1970.

The attempted raid on the Presidential mansion in Seoul by a carefully trained team of 31 North Korean agents in January of last year, closely followed by the seizure of the United States intelligence ship *Pueblo*, brought to world attention the intensification of the military confrontation that began when six American soldiers were deliberately slain from ambush by communist infiltrators during the visit of President Johnson in November 1966. The extent to which American military strength in Korea had been depleted because of priorities for Viet Nam was revealed during the *Pueblo* crisis. The modernization of South Korea's large forces had also long been lagging. Now that situation has been to a large extent corrected and the United Nations Command has repeatedly warned the North Koreans that their campaign of provocation and terror could have dire consequences. There is now little doubt that any overt North Korean attack across the demilitarized zone could provoke general war. Indeed many South Korean generals appear to hope that the North's provocations may provide an excuse for "hot pursuit all the way to the Yalu River." Officially, Seoul's objective is to build up the nation's economic and political strength until, in President Park's words last October, "it cannot be curbed at all and will overflow into North Korea, thus becoming a current for national unification."

II

That the Koreans are a tough, resilient people is attested by their preservation of a national identity and culture despite incursions over the centuries by the Mongols, Manchurians and Chinese, Japanese, Chinese and Russian armies fought over Korean soil, and from the turn of this century until 1945 Japan exercised a stern occupation rule that sought to stamp out national feelings and traditions. After World War II the country was cut in half, without reference to the wishes of its own people. The arbitrary division along the 38th Parallel separated the more industrialized North, with most of the country's natural resources, from the densely populated, largely agricultural South.

The savage war that raged for three years after the North Korean attack in June 1950 caused more than 800,000 military and civilian casualties among South Koreans, left property losses estimated at \$3 billion and made 25 percent of the population homeless. In addition, the communists carried off 6,000 technicians and industrial managers to work in the North. An already poor country was made much poorer.

Even without the effects of the war, the South Koreans had major handicaps to overcome. Years of Japanese occupation had left a majority of the people illiterate in their own language. Subordination of native Koreans in the colonial régime meant that there were few trained and experienced administrators. But Japanese repression, instead of crushing Korean nationalism, stirred only a more intense patriotic feeling, channeled into oppositionist activity. Those who became Korea's leaders after 1945 had been in exile or had devoted themselves to resistance and had little experience in the positive aspects of governing. This experience, coupled with the outspoken, often contentious Korean character, meant that in the long reconstruction period much of the national

energy was spent in political feuding and infighting.

Since the Panmunjom armistice settlement of 1953, the United States has provided more than \$3.6 billion in aid to Korea. This has been supplemented by funds from international aid programs and private charitable enterprises. In the immediate postwar period, emphasis necessarily was on relief—feeding people, and clothing and sheltering them—and on the repair of war damage. With this went efforts to lay the foundation for eventual economic and industrial development.

By 1957 much of the war damage had been repaired; the economic growth rate averaged 5.3 percent annually from 1954 to 1957. But as the régime of the aging President Syngman Rhee became a prey to corruption, repression and mismanagement, this rate dropped to 3.6 percent in the 1958-61 period and was largely nullified by the rapid rise in population. Discontent and poverty pushed the nation to the point of student revolution (1960) and the subsequent bloodless coup of 1961, in which a military junta dominated by Major-General Park Chung Hee displaced the inefficient and fumbling civil government headed by Dr. John M. Chang. Meanwhile, despite the political instability, the aid program was slowly achieving results, and in 1962, having concluded that a base had been constructed for an independent South Korean economy, the United States shifted emphasis. It selected five major areas of development designed to push the country toward an eventual self-supporting economy. These five priority areas were power, mining, transport and communications, key industries, and investment and agricultural credit.

Much of the credit for what has happened since then must go to the strong, stubbornly determined leadership of President Park. With the best of intentions but impeded by a lack of civil administrative and technical experience, his junta inaugurated an ambitious five-year economic plan in 1962. Initially this faltered and many of its projects had to be abandoned or deferred. The new régime also found itself embroiled in a number of scandals. Pressed by the United States, General Park converted his military régime into a nominally civilian government by general elections in 1963 and enlisted the aid and experience of many of the old-line politicians and bureaucrats who had previously been denounced and purged. Before the new administration could gather strength it drifted dangerously close to a crisis point in 1964, when economic deprivation and pent-up frustrations seemed to be pushing the populace toward revolution. But President Park refused to yield and stamped down hard on the activities of the students and intellectual dissidents; the crisis passed, a period of political stability followed, and a number of favorable elements finally coalesced to provide the long-awaited turn upward. Progress has been at an accelerating rate since then.

Contributing factors, in addition to American help in building an industrial base, were the mood of stability following the establishment of strong political rule and the resulting feeling in the government as well as business that they could plan ahead. Control of what had threatened to become runaway inflation in 1963 and 1964, and the gradual elimination of distortions in the economy, brought long-needed incentives into play. Savings were encouraged. The opportunity to make money has increasingly attracted the large-scale foreign investment needed for industrial development.

American officials almost uniformly profess admiration for the native energy and talent of the Koreans. "We had to find several layers of technicians in government and develop an additional layer of competence in industry," said one high-ranking American in

Seoul. "We could provide equipment but we had to wait for competence in personnel to develop. Now they've got competence. There's plenty of native initiative, and an almost kinetic energy, but without financing there was no way to apply their talents."

Finally, there was a general willingness to accept American aid at face value and welcome American assistance as well intentioned. South Koreans are anti-communist and in general pro-American, no matter what occasional frictions arise. Unlike some other Asian nations, the Seoul government did not accept American aid resentfully, looking uneasily for strings that might be attached.

That the economic and industrial spurt has continued unabated into this year despite North Korean threats and subversion is attributable to President Park's decision to press ahead resolutely on the economic front even while cooperating with the United States in taking strong measures for military security. There is no doubt that one aim of the Pyongyang government has been to create insecurity in the South, hinder economic planning and frighten off foreign investment. To some extent, its threats have succeeded in stirring uneasy feelings and fears among both the urban and rural populace. But the President has told the people that continuing the drive for prosperity is equally as important as military preparedness in thwarting the communists. In addition to promising that South Korea would repulse all aggression, he has warned that "if North Korea triggers an all-out attack on the South, we should counterattack immediately and take this opportunity to achieve national reunification, thus resolving, on our own initiative, the national tragedy of territorial division."

The possibility of a South Korean "overreaction" to Northern provocations is one of the prospects that troubles the United Nations Command in Seoul. This Command, under an American officer, General Charles H. Bonesteel 8d, has jurisdiction over the Republic of Korea forces in Korea, 550,000 strong, as well as the U.S. Eighth Army, about 50,000 strong. It has been the aim of the United States military to resist firmly all North Korean attempts to stir up trouble, but otherwise to "cool" the situation and maintain first priority for Viet Nam.

There have been periodic clashes with the North during what has become the world's longest military armistice. The Command nevertheless tended for many years to maintain a fairly relaxed attitude along the 155-mile-long demilitarized zone. Not so now. In years past it was assumed that the communists would not risk a general war, and American troops performing onerous and often dangerous duty in the front line dubbed Korea "the forgotten front." Now, however, the actions of Kim Il Sung have led some observers to believe that he might indeed be tempted to try to unify the country by force. "It isn't enough to analyze his intentions: we have to make our plans on the basis of his known capability," one American officer said. That capability is strong.

The North Koreans have 350,000 men at or close to the front line, with 8 divisions along the demilitarized zone and 10 in reserve. There is a Red Guard militia of 1.2 million men to back them up. The air force has 500 jet aircraft, including probably 60 MIG-21s operating from underground hangars. The navy is thought to have 186 ships, including four submarines and 60 high-speed torpedo boats. There are known to be 66 surface-to-air missile sites. The army is said to have about 900 Soviet-built tanks and adequate artillery. Americans and South Koreans have the highest professional respect for the combat ability of these tough, highly trained and disciplined fighting men.

Since 1966 the North Koreans have stressed the training of guerrilla forces, according to

the South Korean Central Intelligence Agency, which has played a leading role in anti-guerrilla operations. Units of 500 men have been established, each led by a major-general, each assigned to a specific province in the South. The men have undergone actual combat training in the demilitarized zone. The number of men available for infiltration missions into the South has recently been put at 30,000 to 40,000 by American officials. In December, Kim Il Sung tightened his military control, purging his long-time Defense Minister, General Kim Chang Pong, and installing General Choi Hyon, generally regarded as the North's leading guerrilla warfare specialist.

The United Nations Command reported 543 serious incidents in the demilitarized zone in 1968, compared with 445 in the previous year. According to a South Korean spokesman, a total of 172 North Korean infiltrators were killed out of 1,087 who attempted to cross the line; most of the rest were presumed to have been driven back into the North. About 160 other agents and guerrillas were killed below the truce zone. The U.N. forces suffered more than 150 casualties. The resolution of the *Pueblo* incident, with North Korea returning the 82 surviving crewmen after accepting an already repudiated "apology" from the United States, had no apparent effect in alleviating the state of open confrontation. In a "1968 summary" speech at a meeting of the Military Armistice Commission, Major-General Gilbert H. Woodward of the United States declared that "Communist North Korea has made 1968 the bloodiest year in Korea since 1953" and charged that its aggressive activity "involved assassination, terror, cold-blooded murder, kidnapping, mutilation and brutal attacks against U.N. Command personnel."

Between October 30 and November 2, the North Koreans put ashore 120 agents from high-speed boats along the mountainous east coast area in what was believed to be a bold effort to lay a basis for an eventual campaign of guerrilla warfare on the Viet Nam model. By January 10, a total of 110 of these men had been killed and 7 captured, but the South Koreans were compelled to mobilize 40,000 regular soldiers and militiamen and initiate a large-scale security program to protect farm families from terrorism in the remote rural region. President Park has predicted that Pyongyang will increase its infiltration of guerrillas and agents, and U.S. analysts have expressed concern over what they believe may become a program of subversion patterned on that pursued by the Hanoi regime in South Viet Nam in the late 1950s prior to the outbreak of open warfare in Viet Nam.

But there are important differences between South Viet Nam and South Korea. Northern agents usually find themselves conspicuous and are quickly detected when they appear either in cities or in rural areas of the South. A system of high rewards for reporting enemy agents and severe penalties for concealing them has proved extremely effective: even family members returning to their old homes from the North after years of separation usually are turned in to the authorities. The Seoul government has announced that it has broken several large rings of agents, including one that operated on the big island of Cheju fifty miles off the southern tip of the peninsula. Both Korean and American officials are convinced that the people of the South, with memories of the war years, will remain hostile to overtures from northern agents, but there is some nervousness about how the population would react to a widespread campaign of terror throughout the countryside.

In the rugged country north of Seoul, American and South Korean troops maintain a state of extreme alert. Since early 1968, defenses have been reinforced, all positions heavily sandbagged and another American brigade (from the Seventh Division)

moved north of the broad Imjin River. A chain-link fence, electrified in many places, has been erected along much of the 155-mile line, backed up with minefields, tank traps and explosive charges. Electronic detection equipment has been brought in to slow the infiltration; bloodhounds also are used. A defense in depth, with new strongpoints constructed between the front line and the bustling city of Seoul, only 30 miles away, affirms the military's determination to prevent any repetition of 1950, when invading forces reached the capital in little more than a day. A ring of Hawk missiles has been installed around Seoul, which is only three-and-a-half minutes' jet time from the border.

Last summer there was considerable concern that the militant rulers of Pyongyang, misinterpreting the lack of a military response to the *Pueblo* seizure and the raid against the Presidential mansion, might stage an "Israeli-type" offensive in a chosen sector, bite off a chunk of territory, then call a halt and await the reaction, knowing that the United States, heavily committed in Viet Nam, wishes to avoid a serious involvement in Korea. This worry was strongest among South Korean staff officers, who lack much of the advanced equipment of the U.S. divisions, and whose men in the rainy season must often spend a disproportionate amount of time in maintenance and repair of installations, roads and bridges rather than in combat training. High officials in Korea believe that war came very close in January 1968, when success in the attempt to assassinate President Park might well have prompted the South Koreans to march north; nor do they discount the continuing danger.

However, General Bonesteel has kept his forces under strict orders to avoid escalation, and spokesmen in the Military Armistice Commission at Panmunjom regularly convey stern warnings to the communists that force will be met with force. The Seoul government feels that Pyongyang could not desire full-scale war in present circumstances, since this would be suicidal without outside help. The North Koreans could hardly want intervention again by Chinese forces. As for the Soviet Union, it must now be exercising whatever restraining influence it can on them; and however reckless they may be, this influence must be considerable since they rely on Moscow for supplies and weapons.

The South Korean armed forces are the third largest in the non-communist world. They include a 540,000-man army, a strong air force, a small but effective naval component and a 2 million-member militia force. The army has 19 active divisions, including the two serving in Viet Nam, and 10 in reserve. Its quality and capability are highly regarded by American advisers and its contingent in Viet Nam has demonstrated its toughness. However, low pay for its largely drafted servicemen, limited food rations and shortages of modern weapons and equipment raise complaints from top officers. The air force has more than 300 modern planes, including F-84s and F-86s and the F-5 Freedom Fighter. But delivery of F-4C Phantom jets from the United States, originally scheduled for 1968, has been postponed until probably the middle of 1969. Air defenses have been dramatically strengthened, however, by missiles and by a rapid build-up of American air power following the *Pueblo* incident. U.S. supersonic fighters are now dispersed at five major bases, many of them in concrete revetments.

High officials in Seoul, still uncertain over the motives for the *Pueblo* seizure and the raid on the President's Blue House, feel that in the long run these actions backfired by stimulating the strong reinforcement of South Korean's defenses. While they hope to keep the military situation damped down, they believe that in a combat situation they can cope with whatever forces the North Koreans may launch against them.

III

A rapid increase in foreign investment indicates that there is considerable international confidence in South Korea's military security, though some businessmen believe the current rate of investment might be several times as high if the threat of trouble from the North could be eliminated. A special mission from private American industry, commissioned by President Johnson and led by George W. Ball, visited South Korea in the spring of 1967 and submitted a very favorable report. It noted the attractions of an investment law that welcomes 100 percent foreign ownership and permits repatriation of capital and profits on a liberal schedule.

In the first half of 1968, Ford decided to assemble cars and trucks in Korea, Caterpillar and International Harvester decided on long-term credit extensions, and Baldwin pianos was going into production. National Distilleries outlined a program to produce synthetic alcohol from petrochemicals and Union Oil of California contracted for a joint project to build a big thermal power plant near Seoul. Plans progressed for a large integrated iron and steel mill and for a large petrochemical complex with participation by seven important U.S. companies. A country that five years ago had to import all refined petroleum products now has a second major refinery in operation, with construction of a third and fourth under way. Total foreign capital projects approved by the government from 1962 to 1968 had reached 113 by late December with \$91.5 million involved. U.S. investors head the list, with Japanese second.

Exports, which amounted to only \$32 million in 1960, rose at an average of 42 percent annually during the First Five Year Plan. Last year's goal of \$500 million was slightly exceeded. The target for this year is \$700 million and that for 1970 is \$1 billion. Exports of plywood and textiles to the United States head the list. Industrial production has soared, tax collections rose about 50 percent last year, and unemployment and under-employment have been substantially reduced from the dangerously high levels of a few years ago. Wholesale prices showed an increase of 7.1 percent in 1968, slightly exceeding the 6 percent that the government had set as a desirable limit. The policy of liberalized imports was reversed somewhat, checks being put on such luxury items as air-conditioners, television sets and refrigerators, in a move to slow consumption and improve foreign payment balances. The Economic Planning Minister, Park Choong Hoon, has noted that the nation's imports were approaching \$1 billion annually, making it about 20th among the world's markets.

Taking account of the lag in agricultural development, the government reached a fundamental decision in October to raise the official price paid to farmers for rice deliveries by 17 percent, thus encouraging greater production, raising farm incomes and shifting consumption to other grains. Diversification of farming, livestock breeding, off-season farm projects and agrobusiness ventures are being promoted and the government has recently invested in seed research to improve plant strains.

The Second Five Year Plan, which began in 1967, has already been revised upward, since most of its goals appeared attainable at least a year ahead of schedule; and the foreign-investment goal was almost attained last year. Marked improvement in living standards is projected. South Korea is expected to be self-sufficient in food-grain production and free of reliance on grant aid from the United States by 1971. The revised estimates indicate that the growth rate will average 10 percent annually and international trade will reach three times the 1965 rate. Education will be broadened and improved and science and technology, hitherto neglected, will get more help. Perhaps most important, the growth of population, which

pushed the crowded land past the 30-million mark this year, is beginning to be stemmed by a government-supported family-planning program. The rate of increase has been cut in five years from 3 percent to 2.4 percent; plans call for a decline to 2 percent by 1971 and hope is voiced for reaching 1 percent by 1986.

Many economic hazards remain. Chief among them is inflation as government budgets rise almost 50 percent a year and the amount of money in circulation soars. American advisers see danger in the tendency of the newly confident Korean officials to attempt too much too fast. Some projects, such as the Seoul-Pusan superhighway, the petrochemical complex or the integrated steel mill may be more a matter of national prestige than sound economic ventures under present conditions. The economic atmosphere is heady in Seoul these days, and Americans hope Korean planners will not be carried away by their enthusiasm. Nevertheless there is rejoicing over the new mood that has replaced the defeatism of years past.

Corruption has almost a way of life in Korea, as in many underdeveloped countries, and eliminating it is an arduous process. At the grassroots level, underpaid civil servants are vulnerable to temptations of many sorts, and underpaid teachers have been prone to accept favors from parents for advancing individual pupils in the highly competitive educational system. The Park government, like its predecessors, has periodically been rocked by scandal, although the President himself is free of any suspicion. Recently the government, under opposition pressure, has acknowledged gross profiteering by big business monopolies and companies assisted by the government in attracting foreign investment: investigations are in progress. These incidents have not shaken the faith of the governing Democratic-Republican Party in its policy of promoting big business and industry as the fastest means of spurring economic development.

IV

Any estimate of the degree of democratization in South Korea will depend on the standard one sets. For reasons not of their own making, the Koreans were late starters. Democracy was largely discredited in the late 1950s under Dr. Rhee and in the 1960-61 period when an elected government proved incapable of effective rule. Now, eight years after the military coup, the President and the 175 members of the National Assembly, chosen at four-year intervals, are the only elective officials; all other posts, national and local, are filled by appointment. All political organizations are right of center and a prominent politician has remarked that it will be many years before the country can afford the luxury of any organized left-of-center activity. The left-wing movement, by its squabbling and factionalism, has gravely impaired its own prospects and many of its members have joined the parties of the right. In general, politics are more a matter of personality than ideology—and Korean personalities are strong.

In many sectors the harsh hand of repression has been felt: the far-reaching network of intelligence agents is reported to have compiled extensive dossiers on several million people, particularly intellectuals and student leaders. The groups that led the student opposition to the treaty with Japan a few years ago have been effectively broken up, and professors who lost their jobs then (many of them are back in teaching posts) are not expressing their views publicly. The universities are administered by educators who have shown themselves friendly to the Park regime. Opposition politicians who have spoken too boldly about the personal lives of the governing hierarchy or who view communism less than harshly have sometimes been imprisoned—a situation that has not always damaged their popularity.

Nevertheless, foreigners who go to Korea expecting to find a repressive police state are likely to be pleasantly surprised. Politicians are outspoken and election campaigns have been waged with considerable heat. There is little doubt, in fact, that if his opponents had been able to submerge their differences and wage a united campaign, Park Chung Hee would have been defeated in his first Presidential race in 1963. Newspapers tend to be generally critical of the government—critical of almost everything it sometimes seems—reflecting the tradition of resistance that dates back to the Japanese occupation. National Assembly debates are often stormy and sometimes violent, for oppositionists there, at least, have a public platform where they cannot be muzzled.

Though various ministers have come and gone, the Cabinet headed by Premier Chung Il Kwon has preserved an unusual continuity. Mr. Chung, former Chief of Staff during the Korean War and later Ambassador in Washington, has held office for five years. Though the Park government is nominally civilian, seven of the ministers are retired generals and 25 other former generals are members of the National Assembly. Twelve of South Korea's 29 ambassadors abroad are former high military men and three-fourths of the state-run enterprises and companies supported by government investment have retired generals as their presidents.

For some time attention has been focused on the Presidential election of 1971, when President Park reaches the end of the eight years which he is constitutionally permitted to serve. Fears are being voiced that the President may find it advisable to amend the Constitution or suspend it under a declaration of emergency in order to continue his leadership and prevent a disastrous struggle for power. After having initially denied any intention of seeking a constitutional amendment, leaders of the government party have begun this year to talk publicly about such a step as a means of assuring "public stability." Dr. Yu Chin Oh, the brilliant constitutional scholar and former university president who has been leading the opposition New Democratic Party, stresses that independent South Korea has not yet had a normal constitutional transfer of power and declares that a legal succession is the very essence of the democratic process. Following the 1967 general elections, which prompted some well-grounded charges of fraud and rigging, the government party now holds a little less than two-thirds of the Assembly seats, but with the support of 12 independents it has adequate strength to force through an amendment. The consequences might be grave.

There is also speculation about the plans and prospects of Kim Jong Pil, 43 years of age, long President Park's right-hand man, who as a lieutenant-colonel provided the directing force in the 1961 coup, served as the initial head of the South Korean CIA, then organized the Democratic-Republican Party as the vehicle for the changeover to civil rule. He went into political exile twice when his rivals seemed to have the upper hand, and last May, finding his position again being eroded, resigned from the party chairmanship and declared himself finished with politics forever. Few politicians take this declaration seriously. Whether the President might designate him as his successor, and whether this would precipitate a destructive political struggle, are already topics of keen interest in Seoul.

Much of the new confidence so plainly evident reflects South Korea's improved international standing. The normalization treaty with Japan, finally pushed through after 13 years of off-and-on negotiations with the old enemy, went far toward removing a national inferiority complex. It opened the door to \$800 million in grant, loan and investment aid from Japan over a

10-year period, eased long-standing mistrust and brought two complementary economies into possibly fruitful relations. The difficult decision to send troops to Viet Nam and their impressive performance there has given South Koreans a feeling that they are now playing an important role in the international containment of communism while repaying a debt to the allied nations that came to their aid in 1950.

South Korea has also ended her long international isolation by seeking a significant role in regional and international affairs. It was largely Korean initiative that brought about the nine-nation conference in Seoul in 1966 which gave birth to the Asian-Pacific Council (ASPAC), and South Korea has continued to play a prominent role in this organization, advocating recently that its members, except for Japan, be linked in a collective security grouping as envisioned by President Nixon. Koreans provided the initial impetus for the 1966 Manila Conference. President Park, Premier Chung and other officials have traveled widely in Asia, seeking to make their country and their policies better known. South Korean missions have been dispatched on long tours through Asia, Africa and South America to promote good will and offset the diplomatic efforts of the Pyongyang régime, backed by the communist bloc, in the continuing contest for support among United Nations members.

Reunification remains the overwhelming national goal, and the Republic of Korea—the only Korean government recognized by the international organization—remains committed to the United Nations formula for reunification: nationwide elections under U.N. supervision. Though the annual debate on the "Korean question" at the United Nations attracted little outside attention, it long remained a vital matter for the South Koreans, an indicator of the degree of international support for their regime against the intensified communist offensive. When the item finally was removed from automatic annual consideration on the Assembly agenda last year, the voting indicated that South Korea retained substantial majority support.

The demarcation line running near the 38th Parallel in Korea is probably the most tightly closed border in the world and there presently seems little prospect of loosening it. After two decades of living with this barrier, the South Koreans have achieved a remarkable degree of political stability and economic growth; they probably have not yet reached the point where they can hold on to one without the other.

EDWARD J. DELANEY RETIRES

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the southern end of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts has for 31 years profited from the wisdom of Edward J. Delaney, editor of the Fall River Herald News. Mr. Delaney has decided to retire from his newspaper career at this time. I know I speak for all the citizens of Fall River and the surrounding communities served by the Herald when I say that Mr. Delaney's guiding hand will be sincerely missed.

In his quiet but deliberate way, Ed Delaney established high standards for the Fall River community. As a newspaperman and an editor, he has truly served his Nation through the community

in a way much needed in our country today.

I know that my colleagues join me in saluting his outstanding career and wishing him a fruitful and satisfying retirement. A most fitting tribute expressed by Ed Delaney's associates on the Fall River Herald News on April 12, 1969, follows:

EDWARD J. DELANEY RETIRES

Edward J. Delaney, who has just retired after 31 years as editor of The Herald News, has been a major figure in the public life of Fall River all that time. Throughout his career he has had the best interests of the city and this area at heart. As the editor of The Herald News, he worked tirelessly to help Fall River through its difficult transition from the industrial patterns of the past to those of the age of technology.

In the course of his long career as an editor, Edward Delaney naturally became well known to virtually everyone in public or political life in New England and in the nation. He was respected everywhere and by everyone as a newspaperman and a humanitarian. He was, however, averse to publicity, and whenever possible, shunned the spotlight. Although his opinions were sought by everyone interested in promoting a civic cause, he never imposed them on anyone. He was always glad to help, always prodigal of his time and energy, but invariably preferred to remain in the background when public acknowledgement was given.

His assistance in making the United Fund a reality, in the development of SMTI and Bristol Community College, in promoting the Fall River Development Corporation and in numberless other causes was invaluable. So was his private assistance to numberless individuals who needed help of all kinds. His generosity in all ways was his salient characteristic in public and private.

Now, as he retires into what everyone hopes will be many years of health and pleasure, he takes with him the genuine affection of the entire staff of The Herald News and the genuine good will of the city of Fall River. He served them both well.

NLRB STRIKES AGAIN

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, another strange decision has been handed down by the National Labor Relations Board. Entitled "Unfair" the action is discussed in the April 23 issue of the Wall Street Journal. The editorial follows:

UNFAIR

At the Scott Air Force Base in southern Illinois, the National Labor Relations Board has held a St. Louis contractor guilty of an unfair labor practice. What, exactly, was the contractor doing?

Well, it seems he refused to bargain with a carpenters' union on a disputed issue. A description of that issue tells something of what's wrong with labor relations generally, and especially with the Federal involvement in them.

The construction firm, putting up two new barracks on the base, purchased 300 pre-machined wooden doors. When the doors arrived, the carpenters union insisted that its members be given the unloading job usually handled by lower-paid laborers. (If you haven't noticed, construction pay runs high; the average worker's hourly earnings far exceed those of any other production-worker group.)

Although the carpenters had a no-strike clause in their contract, they called in "sick" for 15 days; finally, the construction firm worked out a compromise. Peace, however, proved to be impermanent. The union carpenters insisted that they be paid not only for installing the doors but, in effect, for the processing work done on the doors (by members of another carpenters' local, incidentally) before the doors were received.

That, not surprisingly, was too much for the contractor to swallow. He stood fast, even though he is being assessed \$100 a day by the Corps of Engineers for failure to complete the project.

There certainly is unfairness in this situation but somehow we can't see that the NLRB has put its finger on it.

ADMINISTRATION COMMENDED
FOR CHANGES IN 1970 CENSUS

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the administration has ordered a sharp reduction in the number of questions to be asked in the 1970 decennial census, as well as a rewording of some of the most sensitive questions.

Last month, I expressed to Commerce Secretary Maurice H. Stans my belief that many of the questions which were drafted by the previous administration invaded the privacy of the American citizen. I also introduced a bill designed to limit the questions to be asked.

I am happy to report that by letter dated April 17, the Secretary advised me that he has ordered a number of changes in the census questionnaire. For example, 80 percent of the American people will only be asked a total of 23 questions. Fifteen percent will be asked 66 questions and only 5 percent will be asked the full 73 questions.

In addition, the Secretary has either deleted or reworded a number of objectionable questions dealing with the adequacy of kitchen and bathroom facilities to remove any implication the Government wants to know with whom they are shared.

I believe these revisions are a step in the right direction. In light of the fact that the extensive preparation for the 1970 census was already completed by the previous administration, it appears that more extensive changes, although desirable, could not be instituted without delaying the census entirely.

I, therefore, endorse and applaud the administration for making these zero-hour revisions of longstanding plans for the census in an attempt to overcome the objections that have been voiced and I am especially gratified that the Secretary has already committed himself to take further steps to be implemented in future censuses, including submitting proposed questions to Congress 2 years in advance of future censuses, increasing the number of representatives of the general public to advisory committees which contribute to the formulation of census questions, and appointing a blue-

ribbon commission to examine a number of important questions regarding the Census Bureau including whether or not the decennial census can be conducted on a voluntary or partially voluntary basis.

I am happy to insert into the RECORD at this point the letter I received from the Secretary, as well as an enclosure which explains the purposes and uses of the 1970 census information:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: The main purpose of this letter is to advise you of some immediate changes in census procedure which I have ordered. These changes include a substantial reduction in the number of individuals who will be asked to respond to the longer census forms. Approximately three million households previously designated to receive a 66-question form will now receive a questionnaire containing only 23 questions.

Questions relating to the adequacy of kitchen and bathroom facilities have been reworded to remove any implication that the government is interested in knowing with whom these facilities may be shared.

The Secretary of Commerce is exercising greater supervision over the general operations of the Bureau of the Census and independent experts have been retained to advise on census matters.

The questionnaire which will be mailed to households in 1970 will be accompanied by a cover letter explaining the great need for census data and emphasizing the confidentiality of all responses.

In addition to these changes, which are being implemented immediately, these further steps will be implemented after the 1970 census: (1) proposed questions will be submitted to the appropriate Committees of Congress two years in advance of future censuses; (2) an increased number of representatives of the general public will be appointed to various advisory committees which contribute to the formulation of census questions; and (3) a blue-ribbon Commission will be appointed to fully examine a number of important questions regarding the Census Bureau, including whether or not the decennial census can be conducted on a voluntary or a partially voluntary basis. The Commission would also examine and offer proposals for modernizing and improving the operations of the Census Bureau.

Because the 10-year lapse of time between decennial censuses can result in unfamiliarity regarding their nature and purpose, I felt it might be helpful to provide you with some basic data and information concerning the questions to be asked in 1970, the scope of the data sought, and the uses to which the results are put.

Some of the most frequently asked questions, along with my answers, follow:

1. Question. *Is the 1970 census more extensive than previous censuses?*

Answer. No. The number of questions to be asked in 1970 is about the same as in 1960, less than in 1950 and 1940, and far less than in some earlier censuses. Of the average household heads to be queried in 1970, four of five will answer 23 questions, three of twenty will answer 66 questions, and only one of twenty will answer 73 questions. Under certain unusual circumstances, some household heads will be asked to answer 89 questions.

2. Question. *Will the citizen's right of privacy be protected in the 1970 census?*

Answer. Yes. Whatever a respondent reports remains strictly confidential under the law. Every employee of the Census Bureau takes an oath of confidentiality and is subject to severe penalties for violation of the oath.

In the long history of the census, there has never been a violation of the confidentiality of the information given.

3. Question. *Would the 1970 census yield adequate results if the response were voluntary rather than mandatory?*

Answer. Voluntary response at its best falls far short of response to a mandatory inquiry. Since the first Decennial Census in 1790, response has been mandatory. It is so in every other country of the world where a census is conducted. Professional statisticians will testify that a voluntary census would be unreliable and practically useless. A voluntary procedure would yield distorted and deficient statistics for whole groups of people and for entire areas. This procedure would very likely be especially prejudicial to low-income groups.

4. Question. *Who uses the census results?*

Answer. Census data are used by every Federal government department, State and local governments, and the private sector. Many laws depend upon accurate census reports. Questions such as those on housing are specifically required by statute. Government ment programs on poverty, housing, education, welfare, agriculture, transportation, veterans, and senior citizens require and rely upon the census tabulations. Many of the decisions of the Congress would be almost impossible in the absence of reliable census data.

These questions are illustrative of those which have been asked in recent weeks. The answers are necessarily brief. Enclosed is a memorandum which explains in more detail the purposes and uses of census information. If you have questions concerning the 1970 census we would be pleased to discuss them with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

MAURICE STANS,
Secretary of Commerce.

PURPOSES AND USES OF 1970 CENSUS INFORMATION

1. NAME, SEX, RACE, DATE OF BIRTH, AND MARITAL STATUS

Questions 1 through 12 are designed to identify household occupants by name, relationship to head of household, sex, race, age and marital status. These questions will be asked of 100 per cent of the population.

2. THE HOUSING QUESTIONS

The Census of Housing, required by act of Congress in 1940 (13 U.S.C. 141), contains thirty five (35) questions regarding the adequacy of housing facilities. Fifteen questions will be asked of 100 per cent of the population; five will be asked of 20 per cent; five will be asked of 15 per cent; and ten will be asked of 5 per cent. Some sample questions and comment on their uses follow:

Kitchen and bathroom

Question H-3 (100 per cent): Do you have complete kitchen facilities?

- ☐ Yes, for this household only.
- ☐ Yes, but also used by another household.
- ☐ No complete kitchen facilities for this household.

Question H-7 (100 per cent): Do you have bathtub or shower?

- ☐ Yes, for this household only.
- ☐ Yes, but also used by another household.
- ☐ No bathtub or shower.

Comment: The absence of a kitchen and/or a bathroom for the exclusive use of the household is a major indicator of urban blight and slum conditions. This information is needed by HEW, HUD and other Federal, State and local agencies.

Value of property

Question H-11 (100 per cent): If you live in a 1-family house which you own or are buying—

What is the value of this property, that is, how much do you think this property (house and lot) would sell for if it were for sale?

Comment: Section 301 of the Housing Act

of 1948 (12 U.S.C. 1701e(b)) directs the Secretary of HUD to prepare and submit to the President and Congress estimates of national urban and rural non-farm housing needs. The requirements of various public laws make it necessary to determine the value of property and, as an alternate, the rent paid for rented units.

Housing equipment

Question H-22 (15 per cent): Do you have air-conditioning?

Question H-27 (5 per cent):

- a. Do you have a clothes washing machine?
- b. Do you have a clothes dryer?
- c. Do you have a dishwasher?
- d. Do you have a home food freezer which is separate from your refrigerator?

Question H-29 (5 per cent): Do you have a battery-operated radio?

Comment: When the Congress provided for the Census of Housing, it included the words "housing (including utilities and equipment)." The presence of certain household equipment provides a measure of adequacy of housing and of levels of living. The items included above are those which have particular effects on the needs for power, water and waste disposal, and related services. The question concerning radio is related to the need for communication in case of emergencies or power blackouts.

3. PLACE OF ORIGIN AND MIGRATION

Questions 13 through 19 are concerned with identifying the country of origin, languages spoken, and patterns of housing mobility. These questions will be asked of 15 per cent of the population. Some sample questions and explanatory comments follow:

Birthplace of parents

Question 14 (15 per cent): What country was his father born in?

Question 15 (15 per cent): What country was his mother born in?

Comment: These questions, along with that regarding the birthplace of the individual, serve to identify those groups known as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and Cubans. The census is the only source of information concerning the numbers, distribution, and characteristics of these groups. This information is of importance to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Congress, HEW, and to other Federal and State agencies.

Residence 5 years ago

Question 19 (15 per cent):

a. Did he live in this house on April 1, 1965?

b. (If no) Where did he live on April 1, 1965?

Comment: The Departments most needing this information are Agriculture, HEW, Labor, Commerce, and HUD. This information is also of importance to the Council on Urban Affairs, which has established a subcommittee to consider the problems relating to internal migration.

4. EDUCATION

Questions 20, 21 and 22 deal with the number of years of school attended. They are designed to reveal the educational level of individual citizens, and they will be asked of 20 per cent of the population.

5. MARRIAGES AND BABIES BORN

Questions 24 and 25 request information concerning marriages and the number of babies born. They will be asked of 5 and 20 per cent of the population, respectively. The purpose of these questions is to provide information needed in the preparation of estimates of the future growth of the population. All agencies of Government are concerned with such estimates, and with information on the rates of growth of the white and non-white populations. Agencies such as HEW and HUD which are concerned with family welfare and the care of dependent children need this information in implementing their programs.

6. MILITARY SERVICE

Question 26 asks whether male respondents have served in the military and, if so, during what period. This question is asked of 15 per cent of the male population. This information is needed by the Veterans Administration and other Government agencies.

7. EMPLOYMENT AND OCCUPATION

Questions 27 through 39 are concerned with employment history and status, amount of time worked, occupation, and related facts. These questions will be asked of 20 per cent of the population. Examples follow:

Did you work any time last week?

Question 29 (20 per cent):

a. Did this person work at any time last week?

b. How many hours did he work last week (at all jobs)?

Comment: The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 necessitates that the Department of Labor have census data on employment, unemployment, and occupation. Census data on unemployment are used to establish the eligibility of communities applying for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and for a wide variety of other programs.

Place of work

Question 29-c (20 per cent): Where did he work last week?

Comment: The Department of Transportation and HUD are concerned with major transportation and traffic problems associated with trips from home to place of work. This question provides data necessitated under the Highway Act of 1965 and also provides estimates of daytime population needed by the Office of Civil Defense.

8. INCOME

Questions 40 and 41 request information concerning income from all sources, including employment, welfare, veterans' benefits, etc. These questions will be asked of 20 per cent of the population. Income data are needed by a number of Government agencies and for a variety of Federal programs. For example, income data are needed to implement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and also for allocation of funds under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The Appalachian Regional Development Act necessitates information on per capita income. The Department of Agriculture needs this data for its food distribution programs, including the school lunch program.

FIRSTHAND REPORT ON TABLE
GRAPE BOYCOTT

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many newspaper editors from the East have tried to present views and positions concerning the California table grape boycott—but like so many students, clergymen, and sociopoliticians, they have never seen a grape picker.

James J. Kilpatrick has visited Delano, Calif., the table grape center and, firsthand, talked with grape pickers.

His report ought to be interesting and instructive to the uninformed.

I insert his report in the RECORD at this point. The report appeared in the Washington Star on April 22, 1969:

GRAPE BOYCOTT IN DELANO PERPETRATES A
HOAX

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

DELANO, CALIF.—The grapevines stand in trellised ranks, green-sleeved, precisely spaced, as disciplined as troops in close-order drill. Their cross-pieces are angled at right shoulder arms; they make of the flat brown earth a crowded battlefield.

It is for possession of this battlefield that California's table-grape growers and an AFL-CIO union are struggling. The conflict long ago stretched beyond the Delano community.

For the past 3½ years, well-meaning liberals across the country—not to mention a number of politicians on the make—have been giving full-hearted support to the "grape boycott" urged by Cesar Chavez and to the supposed grape strike behind it. Chavez is director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO. When it comes to recruiting union members, Chavez is a flop; his UFWOC has recruited amazingly few. But when it comes to mounting a publicity campaign, the man is an undoubted genius. He turned up recently with a bylined piece in Look extolling his non-violent plety.

His "boycott" bumper stickers blossom on half a million Volkswagens. In dozens of parochial schools, such is the gullibility of the nuns, little children compose insulting letters to grape growers as exercises in English. Hippies, Yippies, priests, professors, political figures, and housewives with time on their hands—all of them are whooping it up for the downtrodden grape pickers of Kern County, Calif.

It is a hoax, a fantasy, a charade, a tissue of half-truths and whole fabrications. Within the past 10 days, since Chavez blundered into his first big public relations error, the union's effort has become something more—a brazen, ugly and undisguised bid for "closed shop" power over the lives of farm workers everywhere.

To swallow the Chavez line, you must believe that grape workers in the Delano area are miserably paid, wretchedly housed, and cruelly treated. You are urged to help feed "hungry children," the victims of the system that denies men a living wage. "At present rates," says an UFWOC handout given to me last week, "a farm worker who is fortunate enough to work 40 hours a week, 25 weeks a year, would earn \$2,386."

This is moonshine. The reporter who checks payrolls, goes into the fields, talks with workers, visits their homes, inspects the labor camps, and otherwise covers the story, gets an entirely different picture. The going base wage for grape workers is \$1.65 an hour. At 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, this would produce annual earnings of \$3,432. Yet the hypothetical example has no meaning. This is not how grape workers work.

The typical Delano workers—if there is any such being—is a middle-aged Mexican-American, with little formal education and few skills beyond those of grape and vegetable culture. He has a wife and two or three teen-aged children. As a resident alien of 10 years' standing, he must register annually with the Immigration Service. Otherwise, he is free to live his proud, humble, independent life as others do.

Such a worker may have a dozen different employers during the year. He goes where the work is, from one vineyard to another. Thus, there is no such thing as an ordinary "bargaining unit," for the workers move around freely. George A. Lucas, a middle-sized grower, sent out 3,500 W-2 forms on workers last year.

In summer, the work is hard and hot; at other times, it is picnic-pleasant. Families take their lunches to the fields. Last week, I talked at length with one such family of four. With the base wage, plus incentive supplements, they expected to earn about \$325

for the week. At harvest time, this doubles. They drive a 1968 stationwagon. A son is in college.

Out in the fields, the workers speak of the Chavez union with fear and contempt. They tell of threatening telephone calls at night, of repeated acts of vandalism and intimidation. They are fearful that beleaguered growers, anxious to end the nationwide boycott, may yet sell them like so many heads of lettuce to the UFWOC, which thereafter would control when and where they worked.

It is this press-gang power that Cesar Chavez is seeking. He wants his union to become the sole source of agricultural workers, under contracts that would forbid the growers to hire any non-union man. This is what the fight is all about and it is incredible that liberals, professing a love for the little fellow, should be helping him towards his goal.

A GENERATION OF GROWTH

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of its 25th anniversary by the Washington newsweekly, Human Events, is an excellent indicator of the upswing of conservatism in the United States since the mid-1940's. Although supported by well-wishers of the stature of Herbert Hoover, Pierre S. duPont, Col. Robert R. McCormick, Raymond Moley, Robert A. Taft, and Gen. Robert E. Wood, Human Events sallied forth in 1944 on an understandably modest scale. Today, I understand, subscribers have exceeded the 100,000 mark, demonstrating that topical and responsibly presented conservative causes have an ever-increasing market among citizens today. Presently headed by a three-man corporation of Tom Winter, Allan Ryskind, and Bob Kephart, this expanding voice of conservatism tallors the lessons and experience of the past to the newly emerging problems of today and the future. An impressive list of nationally known columnists cover just about every aspect of current affairs for Human Events while its readers enjoy, in addition, the service of on-the-scene reporting here in the Capital.

Human Events is not an isolated case in this present thrust forward of the forces of conservatism. M. Stanton Evans, author, lecturer, and presently editor in chief of the Indianapolis News, outlines for our encouragement the progress made by conservatism generally over the past 25 years. Reviewing the issues, personalities, and organizations which have spearheaded this mounting drive over the past quarter century, Mr. Evans supplies the fuel of hope and confidence for the years to come.

I insert the article, "A Generation of Growth" by M. Stanton Evans, which appeared in the 25th anniversary issue of Human Events, in the RECORD at this point:

NEW CONSERVATIVE ERA: A GENERATION OF
GROWTH

(By M. Stanton Evans)

(About the author: Mr. Evans, a former managing editor of Human Events and now a contributing editor, was graduated from Yale in 1955, magna cum laude and Phi Beta

Kappa. In 1959 he left *Human Events* to accept his present position as editor of the *Indianapolis News*. He received the *Freedom Foundation* award in 1959 and 1960 for his editorials and, in the latter year, also won the *National Headliners Club* award for "consistently outstanding editorial pages." He is the author of *Revolt on the Campus*, *The Liberal Establishment* and *The Politics of Surrender* and co-author of *The Committee and Its Critics*, *The Fringe on Top* and *The Law-Breakers*. Mr. Evans' many articles and reviews have appeared in many national magazines, including *Modern Age*, *Christian Economics*, *The Freeman*, *The Individualist* and *National Review*, of which he is an associate editor. Mr. Evans is in great demand as a speaker and has addressed scores of campus audiences throughout the country.)

In the 25 years since *Human Events* was founded, many objectives set forth in its prospectus have been realized. Many others remain to be accomplished.

The generation since 1944 has seen a major transition in American conservatism: The gradual phasing out of the "old guard" whose writ ran back to Hoover and Coolidge, and the dawning of a new era of conservative politics whose pre-eminent spokesmen are Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan. On matters of principle, the two schools of conservative thought are closely related; in matters of approach and articulation, they are very different.

Human Events has been a vital link between these dissimilar eras. It helped sustain the principles of limited government and responsible defense of the nation's interests until a new political leadership could emerge, bridging the gap between Robert Taft in the '40s and Goldwater-Reagan in the '60s.

When this publication was launched with the help of Hoover, Gen. Robert Wood, J. Howard Pew and others, it was a struggling enterprise. Its first office was the apartment of editor Frank C. Hanighen, and its circulation was counted in the hundreds. Over the years *Human Events* has grown in scope and influence, and its advance supplies both a reason for and a measure of the steady march of the conservative enterprise.

Conservative history has wheeled through a cycle of regeneration. As the "old guard" variant declined, encouraging liberal belief that the philosophy was doomed forever, the new guard, unnoticed, had begun to spring to life.

In part these changes have been owing to differences in objective circumstances: Shifts in population mix and therefore in that kind of political attitude derived from economic interest; the manifest failure of leftward programs to solve the problems they are supposed to solve; the speed with which events have outstripped the liberal analysis of the world in which we live and its resistant difficulties.

All these have contributed not only to the growth of conservatism, but to the rise of a substantially different kind of conservatism.

These things alone do not account, however, for the recent waxing of conservative strength.

Equally important has been the investment of enthusiasm and energy by the partisans of what one historian described as the thankless persuasion. Conservatism is considerably more appealing as a political formula today than when the historian's verdict was rendered, chiefly because conservatives themselves have refused to accept that verdict.

Although various commentators have reasons to ignore conservatism and resolutely insist on doing so, any objective observer can testify to the change. It has dawned on usually liberal journalists like Joseph Alsop and Tom Wicker, journals like *Time* and *Fortune*—even *The New Republic*.

Thus *Time* suggested at mid-point in last year's election that Barry Goldwater had been four years before his time and that "the

American electorate has moved sharply rightward since Goldwater's conservative banner had waved for naught in 1964." Countless such assertions could be cited from other liberal spokesmen.

In 1944 one could find few expressions like this from conservative sources; much less from liberal ones. There was not much by way of self-conscious conservatism; few political organizations dedicated to conservatism, no functioning conservative publication, no conservative youth activity.

Today there are numerous publications and groups engaged in disseminating the conservative point of view. There are groups which work with Congress, in the realm of practical politics, on theoretical matters, on foreign policy, on domestic questions, on the campus. The total record of growth is impressive.

The easiest way to judge this transformation is to look at the political record.

In 1944 Franklin Roosevelt was President of the United States, gearing up for the series of post-war conferences in which liberal foreign policy doctrine was put to the test of practice and from which it was to emerge as a resounding failure. Although domestic changes were somewhat in abeyance because of the war, the social engineers of the New and Fair Deals were laying plans for peacetime welfare initiatives, seeking to use the network of wartime regulations to collectivist advantage.

The Republican party of that era featured some congressional leaders of conservative outlook, principally Taft; but the presidential wing of the party was firmly under liberal domination. Wendell Willkie had been the party nominee in 1940 and was still a major force in the GOP. Thomas Dewey was to capture the nomination in 1944 and again in 1948, and would help to engineer the Eisenhower victory over Taft in 1952. At the national level, the Republican party during this period presented little serious challenge to the liberal rulers of the nation.

The Deweyite approach of emulating the Democratic opposition, with a few changes of rhetoric and some sober promises to administer things better, did not prove appetizing to American voters. Nor was Republican strength in Congress particularly impressive. The GOP had in part rebounded from its low marks of the '30s, but the crushing loss of '48 wiped out its gains and restored it to minority status.

It was not until the development of the new Republican conservatism that the GOP began to make stable and substantial gains in the battle for control of Congress.

The nature of the change in the presidential arena is simply stated: In 1944 the liberals controlled the Republican party and the party did not gain control of the White House; in 1968 the conservatives controlled the Republican party and the party did gain control of the White House.

Dewey was nominated by the Eastern wing of the GOP, ran a campaign aimed at winning liberal votes, and lost the election.

The comparison omits matters of nuance and degree, but nevertheless epitomizes the basic alteration which had occurred in the GOP and in the country.

Political change is seldom unilinear and neat, and the Republican-conservative transformation since '44 has occurred as a series of ebbs and flows rather than as a single decisive thrust. Conservative sentiment has advanced at given periods—only to be pushed back at a subsequent test of strength. In the course of these comings and goings, the "old guard" of Taft and McCarthy was by degrees displaced.

The terminal year for this process was 1958, when William Knowland was defeated in California and John Bricker lost in Ohio. William Jenner had retired that year, and Joe McCarthy had died the year before. With the '58 balloting, the old guard was pretty well eliminated. And since that was the only guise in which many commentators recog-

nized the political Right, they concluded that American conservatism was finished.

That same election, however, saw the faint beginnings of the conservative new guard—not to be recognized as such for several years to come. Barry Goldwater, first elected as an Eisenhower coat-tail in 1952, won a thumping re-election victory against the national tide. In the months ahead, he was to emerge as the conservative leader in American politics, and to give the Right a whole new outlook and ideological style. Goldwater was the first new-breed conservative, and it was under his influence that the Republican party began to build toward new majority status.

The cataclysm of 1958 occurred because previous Republican victories had not been based on stable foundations.

The victory of '52, like that of '46, had resulted from a kind of flash-flood of political sentiment, without necessary preparation in the realm of ideology or political demographics. The Republican tide rolled in, but the contours of the land could not retain it. By the 1960s these contours had begun to change, so that there is now reason to suppose that GOP gains of recent years, given appropriate effort and resolute leadership, can be made to stick.

The Republican win of '46 embodied a recoil from the astringencies of war, a desire for reversion to the free and normal ways of peace. The victory of '52 involved similar motives, plus the enormous personal appeal of Gen. Eisenhower. As special cases deriving from a temporary interplay of forces, neither supplied a realistic formula for conservative or Republican victory in the future. The victories of '66 and '68, on the other hand, were founded in some elementary and enduring facts of political life.

Republicans gained a congressional landslide in 1966 and a presidential victory in 1968 because the taxpaying sector of American politics has been growing in relative strength and has sought out candidates who will resist the further growth of leviathan government.

Census figures show the suburban, home-owning group in America is increasing rapidly in size and has become the most important single element in our politics. This alteration has been accompanied by expanded public concern on the issue of government—as in the Gallup surveys which show a rapid increase in the number of people who think that government is the "biggest threat to the country in the future."

In 1959, one year after the last Eisenhower by-election, Gallup found only 14 per cent of his respondents who thought that government was the biggest threat to the nation. In 1965, one year after the Goldwater presidential run, Gallup found the level of concern had gone up to 37 percent. And in 1968, midway in the Nixon election campaign, he discovered that no less than 46 per cent of his respondents held to this opinion. The direction and velocity of this political change are obvious.

Equally important in recent conservative-Republican victories has been the fact that the GOP has broken free from the regional strait-jacket which confined its efforts to three-quarters of the country, leaving the House and Senate seats and electoral votes of the South to the Democrats. Although the GOP still has far to go in this respect, its gains are tangible. Within the party, the nominations of Goldwater in '64 and Nixon in '68 were achieved through a coalescence of the Midwest and Western states with the South. It was this same kind of coalescence, in turn, which produced Nixon's victory in November.

In Congress, the significance of the South is plain. The GOP could never hope to achieve a stable majority in the national legislature so long as a quarter of the country was yielded by default to the opposition. Under these circumstances, the party was re-

quired to win a massive landslide elsewhere to achieve a simple congressional majority.

The obvious alternative was to break into the South, and thanks to conservative insistence the party has at last begun to do this. Net Republican gains in Congress over the past several years are almost entirely owing to seats the GOP has picked up in Dixie.

If nothing else had been achieved in the last generation, this penetration of Democracy's most fabled bastion would in itself justify conservative confidence in the future. This is an achievement of enormous magnitude, capable in itself of working a revolution in our politics.

At long last the conservative segments of the nation are beginning to move into common alignment. If and when this transposition is achieved, the conservative dominance apparent in the last two Republican conventions can become equally apparent in the nation's politics at large. Republican majorities can be assembled both in Congress and in the electoral college, and those majorities can be distinctively conservative in nature.

This is not, however, the only kind of change that is afoot. We are also in the midst of a major intellectual revolution, pushing us in a similar direction.

Since ideas are the ultimate source of all political decision, this could be the most significant difference between '69 and '44. Indeed, the rise of conservative strength in the realm of ideas has been far more dramatic than its increase in the immediate world of politics. The political change can be measured in terms of a few percentage points; the intellectual change cannot be portioned out so precisely, but the conservative increase has been by a factor of 10 or more.

A simple way of gauging this is to observe the growth of conservative publications. *Human Events*, as noted, had only a handful of subscribers during its first year of publication. It now has over 100,000. And it has been joined by many other journals working in behalf of conservatism, including the refurbished *Freeman*, *National Review*, *Modern Age*, and others.

Added to this has been the development of a whole new body of conservative literature—hundreds of books whose counterparts did not exist a generation ago. The flourishing growth of the Conservative Book Club is sufficient witness to this change.

The ranks of conservative scholars have also grown, and their defense of traditional values, of the free enterprise economy, of reasoned opposition to the menace of communism, have far greater impact than was possible in 1944. The attainment of such people as Milton Friedman, George Stigler, Warren Nutter, Stefan Possony, Gerhart Niemeyer, Eric Voegelin, Stanley Parry, Yale Brozen, Martin Anderson, Richard Allen, and countless others have had decisive effect on scholarly and political opinion and will do much to shape our national attitudes in the years ahead.

Conservatives are still a woeful minority in the scholarly community, but their members are legion compared to 25 or even a dozen years ago. And their intellectual influence is far in excess of their numbers.

One obvious result of the new conservative literature and new conservative scholarship has been the growth of student conservatism.

Despite the publicity lavished on the hyperthyroid "New Left," conservative groups on campus continue to grow and prosper. Both the Intercollegiate Studies Institute and the Young Americans for Freedom increase their membership with every passing year, while the Young Republican National Federation has become a durable outpost of informed conservative opinion. The recent boorishness of the New Left has served, moreover, to give fresh impetus to conservative action on the campus.

It is this growth of a strongly motivated philosophical conservatism which most distinguishes the conservatism of 1969 from that of 1944. Conservatives in this interval have become conscious of themselves as conservatives, with developed answers to and criticisms of the proposals of the liberal left. This is a momentous change.

The usual pattern of modern politics, in America and in Western Europe, presupposes a leftist monopoly in the arts of verbalization and deployment of opinion. Conservatives have been the party of possession, alternately fighting off and yielding to the swarming ideologies of their liberal foes.

Now, to a large extent, conservatism has become not merely a temperamental but a philosophical interest. The "old guard" variant was not strongly ideological, and while it featured many men of high intelligence—Hoover and Taft most prominent among them—it operated in terms of certain unstated assumptions about American life which were not sustained by scholarly endeavor. It was a "seat-of-the-pants" kind of conservatism, strong on history and precedent, perhaps, but not suited to the rigorous demands of a highly verbal age.

The new Right in America is marked by the confluence of intellectual and political energies.

Goldwater and Reagan—while themselves not scholars—have relied on the inventive resources of conservative theoreticians. So also, to some degree, has Nixon—the examples of Nutter, Allen and Anderson coming most prominently to mind. This was the kind of help which was infrequently available, if at all, to the political leaders of the old guard Republican party. The conservative and Republican interest of 1969 can draw on deeper intellectual resources than were available back in 1944.

The new self-consciousness of conservatives is evident in the number of conservative groups which have come into being, and in the kind of activity they pursue.

There now exists, to mention only one example, the vote record service of Americans for Constitutional Action, which allows the public to assess the performance of its representatives on conservative-liberal issues. This kind of litmus test did not exist in 1944, so that philosophical inconsistencies in Washington could not be checked out very easily back home. Nowadays a congressman who strays too far from conservative principle will hear about it from his constituents. The intervening years have provided both stronger motives toward conservatism and improved techniques for attaining it.

Willingness of conservatives to seize the philosophical initiative has brought other benefits as well: The rigorous conservative critique of government welfare programs, urban renewal projects, Medicaid, the "War on Poverty," public housing and so forth, has finally broken through to the liberals themselves. It has become fairly respectable in liberal-left circles to denounce these things, to proclaim that the big government welfare system has failed and that there must be new efforts to decentralize and equilibrate power. These are things conservatives have been saying for years.

Some part of this dawning realization stems from the fact that the programs have, quite simply, failed, and that anyone who takes the trouble to examine the results can find out as much. But until conservatives like Anderson, Brozen and Friedman started assembling the data, few people had bothered to do the examining.

There is a terrible inertia in such bureaucratic undertakings, and the normal procedure has simply been to pile new programs on the old ones, without inquiring too closely into whether the old ones had accomplished anything or whether the new ones were likely to. Conservative work on such questions has finally moved the stone; and while the iner-

tial drag is still there, it is not particularly unusual these days to find liberals espousing programs and theories originally fostered by people like Friedman or Roger Freeman or some other conservative scholar.

The impact of these economic, geographic and intellectual changes taken together is apparent. As Louis Harris put it in a post-election survey, "America is in a politically conservative mood."

Harris found that 38 percent of his respondents designated themselves as conservatives, as opposed to only 17 percent who said they were liberals. He noted that a poll four years previously showed 34 percent conservative and 20 percent liberal. Although the figures in such inquiries tend to move up and down, depending on sample variations and/or other types of nuance, Harris concluded that the net movement in political sympathy had been "a moderate but perceptible drift to the center and right of center during this period."

Specifics to back up this contention were assembled by the American Conservative Union, which found not only that U.S. opinion was conservative, but that it was getting more so. Thus a 1964 inquiry by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan found public feeling on "big government" to be moderately liberal, but a follow-up two years later found it to be moving strongly toward conservatism. The second poll showed 38.5 percent saying government was "too powerful" as opposed to 26.8 percent who said it wasn't.

ACU likewise collated a number of inquiries from Survey Research and Gallup showing strongly conservative opinions on such things as school "busing," classroom prayer, compulsory unionism, taxes, a bombing halt in Viet Nam and "bridge-building" with the Communists. In most categories, conservative opinion predominated and was on the increase.

In 1944 welfare liberalism was the accepted orthodoxy in America, both intellectually and politically. In 1969 it is accepted no longer. For liberalism, the philosophical string has all too obviously run out. The drive and resilience are gone, and the nation is casting about for alternatives.

The convergence of forces examined here suggests the likely alternative is the conservative philosophy of limited government, constitutional restraint, and free play for the market economy. In large part, indeed, the shift has already begun, and this is a sizable attainment for the forces of conservatism.

A beginning is not, however, a victory—and there are still many problems for conservatives to negotiate. Miscalculation of resources, failure of will, default of leadership, could prevent the fulfillment of conservative objectives. For readers of *Human Events* it has been a trying but on the whole rewarding 25 years. The next 25 can be even better, but only if the proper sort of effort is forthcoming.

WHERE WE STAND

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article entitled "Where We Stand," appearing in Michigan Natural Resources magazine, published by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources on pesticides and pesticide contamination of our environment.

That fine article, outlining pesticide hazards to the Great Lakes and to the

Great Lakes Basin States, merits careful reading by anyone interested in a decent, fit, safe, and wholesome world in which to live. It follows:

WHERE WE STAND

As I review pesticide events of the past year I am greatly encouraged. My confidence is restored that in the not too distant future we will see the hard pesticides become unnecessary, unwanted, and virtually abandoned. There have been gains and losses, of course, but progress has been solid and gratifying. A year ago in the pages of this magazine I stated my alarm over environmental pollution by persistent insecticides. This has been amplified and echoed by conservationists in this state and across the nation. I now restate my concern and report to you significant happenings of this momentous year.

Let me first outline events that set the stage and discuss some basic concerns that bear directly on the matter. The entire pesticide matter flared up in the fall of 1967 when, to curb an outbreak of Japanese beetles in southwestern Michigan near Lake Michigan, a proposal was made to apply nearly 3 tons of dieldrin. The proponents were totally within their legal authority, and felt that this was in the best interest of the people of Michigan. However, we felt that there were safer ways to get at the problem, and we opposed the spray program. Further, the Environmental Defense Fund, a team of dedicated, concerned scientists retained by Michigan citizens, took the matter to court and at the same time brought action against 56 Michigan municipalities that used DDT to control Dutch elm disease.

The dieldrin court action, although unsuccessful, stalled the application of dieldrin until too late in the fall, and the area was not treated. However, the DDT suit remained alive, and during the next few months 53 out of 56 cities stipulated to the Court that they would drop plans to use DDT against the elm bark beetle that carries Dutch elm disease, if they could be relieved from suit.

Unfortunately, the entire dieldrin affair brought two state agencies into an eyeball to eyeball encounter. The whole matter was very important, however, because both agencies had the best interests of the people of Michigan at heart. Naturally we felt the broader viewpoint of concern for the entire environment was proper, wherein the other folks were "after the beetle" to protect the immediate, local interest of home owner and fruit grower, and to prevent spread of the beetle to other production areas.

WE ARE MAKING PROGRESS AGAINST HARD PESTICIDES, AND PUBLIC SUPPORT HELPS MICHIGAN GAIN CONTROL

To resolve this, our Governor appointed a three-man Pesticide Advisory Panel—an entomologist from one state university, an ecologist from another university, and an industrial entomologist who is also a naturalist. They advised that an application of dieldrin in the fall of 1968 would be the lesser of two evils, the other being uncontrolled application by private interests. The Environmental Defense Fund again took the matter into court, this time in Wisconsin, but the case was remanded to Michigan, where it met the same fate as in 1967. So an application of 3 tons of dieldrin and $7\frac{1}{2}$ tons of chlordane on 4,600 acres was made in the fall of 1968. The entire affair has been very complex and there is no need to detail here the parade of legal processes and chains of evidence that were involved.

More important is why this encounter occurred. Use of pesticides was the immediate issue. But the real reason was that man's technology has caught up with, or worse, has passed his ability to harness, understand, or use it intelligently. Here are some of the salient points as I view them.

We, as conservationists, see two major obstacles facing the world. One, we will have more and more people to the point of desperation. Two, the environmental pollution that all of us have created and will continue to create promises to stifle our very existence. The natural pollutants, from carbon dioxide to coliform bacteria, and the durable by-products of our exploding technology—persistent insecticides, radioactive wastes, aluminum food and beverage cans, and a host of other long-lasting wastes—are haunting us right now—today!

As a conservationist, I will not attempt here to discuss Obstacle Number One, except to recognize that it exists, is critical, and is vital. Any married couple with two or more children has already added to the problem. Obstacle Number Two is a direct result of Obstacle Number One, and it is to the problem of the alteration and degradation of our total environment that we conservationists can and must address ourselves.

Pesticides used in Michigan bear directly on this world problem of environmental waste. Simply, we define a pesticide as a chemical used to kill anything you don't want—weeds, rough fish, fungi and mold, insects, rats, and sea lampreys. I have no quarrel with use of most pesticides. My main concern here is insecticides, the bug killers, and not all of them—only a few.

TROUBLE FROM A FEW

We clearly recognize the tremendous value of pesticides to our health, our comfort and our prosperity—to food production, to industry, and the home. We can live without pesticides, but not as well. We are concerned for the most part with only a few of the insecticides, the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons—those that persist in the environment, spread rapidly over the earth, and later become concentrated in the tissues of living things, the effects of which are just now beginning to be detected and understood.

Let me share with you one experience that we have had recently in Michigan. It involves persistent insecticides, and it involves a big chunk of our real estate. Michigan is blessed with lots of "fresh water" and I quote those last two words. Our waters are not as inherently productive as the oceans, but they are worth a lot to us.

We have more shoreline than any other of the "lower 48" states and more fresh water within our boundaries than any other state. Waters from one-third of the total land area of four states drain into Lake Michigan. The Lake itself measures 22,000 square miles with 1,600 miles of shoreline, and is nearly 1,000 feet deep. About 80 percent of the shoreline has potential for outdoor recreation and the variation in habitat makes the lake inherently capable of supporting a wide range of aquatic life. It is significant as both a sport and commercial fishery. Lake Michigan is also a principal source of drinking water—1.5 billion gallons daily. Industry uses another $4\frac{1}{4}$ billion gallons. It is a major international seaway.

Lake Michigan lies off to the side of the main stream of water flow through the Great Lakes, like an appendix. Water circulates within the lake, but discharges very little out through the Straits of Mackinac—about one percent of the total lake volume per year. This means that any stable, persistent substance that finds its way into that lake is going to be there for a long, long time. And that is just what has been occurring with certain persistent, chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides.

What happens when these toxic substances—virtually insoluble in water—begin to accumulate? Recent findings show that DDT was the most probable cause of the death of nearly one million coho salmon fry hatched in state fish hatcheries from eggs taken from Lake Michigan salmon. Many Lake Michigan fish now have DDT levels up to 10 parts per million, plus dieldrin in the

range of 0.25 parts per million. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration permits 7 parts per million of DDT in beef and pork, and considers 0.3 parts per million of dieldrin as an "actionable level", a level at which the meat is seized and destroyed.

Where have these pesticides come from? Within the Lake Michigan watershed, including Chicago and Milwaukee—two of the major metropolitan areas of the Middle West—live 6 to 7 million people. Along its shores is one of the major fruit-growing regions of the nation with its accompanying spray schedules. In the northern part of the Lake Michigan basin lie extensive publicly-owned and industrial forests—spraying here, too. Certainly, over the past two decades, many hundreds of tons of DDT have been released in the watershed from a wide variety of sources, as far as a hundred miles from the lake, right down to the shore itself. Cities and parks with their Dutch elm disease and mosquito control programs, state, national and industrial forests, homes and backyards, farms and orchards, spray remnants dumped down the drain or in the creek—all have contributed. Dieldrin undoubtedly came from a narrower range of sources—somewhat more recently—from farms and orchards, homes and backyards, and even from woolen moth-proofing plants.

Runoff from city and farm and forest finds its way downriver or out of the atmosphere. Dust storms and rain add their share of DDT from points west and from global circulation. Regardless of the source of the DDT, once it reaches the lake, much of it is going to stay there, and this has been going on for the past 20 years.

GREAT LAKES IN DANGER

The Lake Michigan situation is only an example—a big, easy-to-recognize example of environmental contamination. Large bodies of water store these pesticides. Tiny organisms pick up the chemicals and store them. Larger organisms eat the little fellows who in turn are eaten by larger critters until top members of the aquatic food chain—fish-eating birds—store vast quantities of the stuff in their fat. Fish and other aquatic animals take DDT and dieldrin directly from the water passing over their gills. The lowly clam can concentrate DDT 70,000 times greater than his water environment.

The effects of this storing-up of pesticides in animals from smallest to largest is not completely known, but gaps are beginning to be filled in. Man, for the first time in his history, has chemicals at his disposal that can completely alter his own food chain. By wiping out certain insects or minute sea-creatures he removes link after link in the very delicately balanced chain of life on which he depends. The complexities of the whole food chain are involved, they are subtle, and they are real. Enough is known now about the persistent pesticides DDT and dieldrin, to name two, to know that they affect the reproductive cycle of certain animal species. I have already mentioned that DDT was the most probable cause of the loss of close to one million coho salmon fry raised from Lake Michigan nurtured eggs. The DDT in those fish was picked up in Lake Michigan. DDT fed experimentally to falcons and ducks significantly affects reproduction—either by reducing hatchability of eggs or survival of young, or causing thinner egg shells, abnormal behavior, and egg breakage. This could well explain the disappearance of the peregrine falcon from the entire eastern United States and western Europe, and the recent decline of the osprey and our national bird, the bald eagle.

We know that the pink shrimp, the same as used for shrimp cocktail, can be killed by four-tenths of one part per billion of DDT after two days exposure. One part per billion is the same as one ounce of chocolate syrup in one thousand railroad tank cars of milk, and that's mighty weak chocolate milk.

It would be nice if we could prove beyond a shadow of a doubt how DDT directly affected man. But these effects are indirect, we think, and subtle. Effects on lower level organisms are better known, but even here the story is not completely clear. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence for us to be greatly concerned and to start bringing the unnecessary and widespread use of these persistent chemicals to a halt. Keep in mind, though, that these specific pesticides are only one of the many environmental pollutants that are of growing concern to all of us.

OUR POSITION IS CLEAR

Our position on pesticide use can be simply stated. There have been some misunderstandings of this position, but it is one I have always held and which has not deviated from the philosophy and policy adopted by the Michigan Conservation Commission as long ago as March, 1966, for use of pesticides on lands we administer:

1. When chemical control is necessary one should use only the most selective chemicals, in the smallest effective dosage, with the safest carriers.
2. Where possible, cultural or biological controls should be used in preference to chemical control.
3. Where proper alternatives are available, the persistent insecticides should never be used.
4. Where alternative methods of control do not exist, the harm to the total environment from persistent pesticides should be carefully weighed against the calculated harm of the pest before the application is made.
5. When persistent insecticides must be used they should be used under as carefully controlled conditions as possible at the time of year when the environmental conditions will make their use the least harmful.
6. No opportunity should be overlooked to bring pressures to bear which will result in the eventual abandonment of persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides.

We are encouraged because we see progress on one big point—the general public is beginning to be interested and concerned and that's the first step toward acceptance and action. Go to any farm and garden store or department store in Michigan in the spring, and you'll see people reading pesticide labels carefully, although it is a problem for anyone with bifocals to read tiny black type on a green label background.

DDT has been dropped from Michigan State University recommendations for Dutch elm disease control in Michigan. Most cities no longer will use this chemical for that purpose. DDT is no longer registered by the Department of Agriculture for mosquito control. No commercial pesticide applicator can use DDT for this purpose and retain his license.

For the first time in Michigan history a governor has recognized pesticide pollution as a serious problem. His pesticide advisory panel has recommended decreasing use of persistent insecticides, increasing research and monitoring, tightening up of pesticide regulations, and setting up a pesticide review or control body at the state level.

Our Legislature has considered the pesticide situation serious enough to set up a 10-man joint Senate-House committee to review use of pesticides by everyone.

In Wisconsin, concerned conservationists, aided by the Environmental Defense Fund, are battling to show scientifically and legally, that DDT is a pollutant in the waters of that state—a much-needed precedent.

The pesticide committee of the federal-state water pollution enforcement conference for Lake Michigan has recommended establishment of tolerable residue levels of DDT and dieldrin in Lake Michigan fish at levels so low that they can be achieved only by virtually banning the use of these chemicals in the Lake Michigan watershed. It also

recommends that state pesticide regulatory authorities and an interstate pesticide coordination committee be set up.

People are concerned. At a hearing in the Legislature last spring on a pesticide control bill there were as many in attendance as we often see at a hearing on deer herd management—and that is really something.

This concern about pesticides is only part of a feeling that many people are having—and expressing—of the need for a cleaner environment. People are seeking solutions to the problems of a technology-ridden world.

Foresters, farmers, and horticulturists have made great strides toward elimination or restricted use of persistent insecticides. They would instead lean more and more on short-lived but effective chemicals, and on other control methods. We are happy about this.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

But we have a long way to go. Federal and state agencies, and the universities, still recommend some persistent chemicals even though they recognize and also recommend safer alternatives to control the same bugs. We'd be somewhat happier if their publications would point out differences between pesticides when there is a choice. This ought to be done and done quickly. Out of date publications should be discarded or revised.

Some chemical companies still recommend DDT and its family of hard or persistent pesticides, without reservation. Oh sure, they urge caution. Beware of getting poisoned! But what about environmental poisoning—less dramatic but perhaps just as important to the survival of the race of man. To read some of those ads, you'd think their products were as safe as talcum powder.

We urge action on several points.

We urge a hard look at these deficiencies.

We urge all agencies and all segments of the universities to take a look at these pesticides and to show concern for the entire environment—not just their own restricted "area."

We urge that pesticide tolerances be included more firmly in interstate and intrastate water quality standards.

We urged a stepped-up educational program to bring this concern to the public.

We urge a national inventory of the sources of pesticide pollution and a monitoring of these sources.

We urge tight enforcement of present and future pesticide laws and regulations.

We urge accelerated research to document the direct and indirect effects of pesticides, and to develop safer pest control methods—for the individual, the public, and the world.

We urge a regional approach to pesticide problems to accommodate the many problems found in different but related locales.

A recently approved four-state agreement between natural resource agencies of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan was designed to halt the flow of persistent pesticides into Lake Michigan. This agreement is a model that we hope will stimulate similar action in other regions of the country. We also hope to broaden its effectiveness by bringing the executive offices and agriculture departments of these states into the effort.

We will work to identify and correct, in its earliest stages, environmental contamination by pesticides.

We will work to develop and improve the ecological conscience in all of us, and we will work toward the day when government at all levels will be more of a trustee of natural resources, rather than a referee between the many users competing for a resource.

All of us are growing exceedingly weary of being buried in the filth and waste spawned by our technological society. We like this way of life, and we all use it, day in and day out. But if sanity is to remain a part of our life, we must root out and eliminate sources of environmental pollution. Short of this, man has no hope of surviving on this planet.

DO WE HAVE AN ADMINISTRATION THAT IS COMMITTED TO CIVIL RIGHTS LAW ENFORCEMENT?

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances surrounding the recent resignation of Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, points to a most disturbing state of affairs in the effort to make good on long overdue pledges to minority groups in this country to end discriminatory employment practices once and for all. The gains which have been made in this critical area have been hard fought and hard won. If one thing has remained clear above all others throughout the political and social tumult which we have lately endured, it is the compelling fact that any retreat from a policy calling for strict enforcement of laws which exist to eliminate injustices that have lasted a century or more is completely unacceptable. Yet Mr. Alexander's statement, upon submitting his resignation, indicates that the present administration may be on the brink of initiating a policy of "go slow" or even worse, abandonment, with respect to the goals and guidelines of the EEOC. Mr. Alexander stated that, in his judgment, "vigorous efforts to enforce the laws on employment discrimination are not among the goals of this administration."

What causes the Chairman's observations to be all the more disturbing is the open threat, delivered only one day before the announced termination of Mr. Alexander's chairmanship, by the minority leader of the other Chamber, to "get somebody fired" if what he termed the "harassment" of companies by the EEOC did not cease.

Mr. Speaker, I do not consider the conscientious executing of responsibilities by Mr. Alexander and the members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to be harassment within the generally accepted meaning of that term.

Whether or not the minority leader's remarks were merely an injudicious coincidence with efforts by the Nixon administration to replace the Chairman with a Republican is not the point here. The point is that Mr. Alexander, as Chairman of the EEOC, was in a unique position to know the attitudes and intentions of executive department heads concerned with enforcing the equal opportunity laws of the land, and, as such, he has clearly stated his belief that he sees a "crippling" absence of commitment to the effort to decisively end job discrimination. The impact of his statement and the circumstances surrounding these developments ought not to be ignored or minimized.

I want to commend my distinguished colleague (Mr. HAWKINS) for his actions in bringing this matter to the attention of both this body and the public, and to commend also the Members who have offered documentation on job discrimination brought out in EEOC hearings.

The recent hearings in Los Angeles have been described by some as a "carnival." In light of hearing that charge, I wonder just whose brass ring is being threatened? The findings of those hearings are a matter of public record and speak for themselves. If there was some impatience demonstrated on the part of certain witnesses representing minority groups, is it any wonder? As my fellow California delegation member (Mr. HAWKINS) has pointed out, the brief and inconsequential indignities which may have been shown some employers during those hearings are certainly nothing compared to the unending indignities suffered by minority groups during decades of indifference to and exclusion from genuine equality of opportunity.

A public relations blitz generated by a particular industry is no substitute for a program of direct action to combat unfair employment practices on the part of either labor or management groups. For years we have witnessed the tragic spectacle of the black man stuck forever at the bottom of the vocational totem pole—always the servant, never the master. For organizations to open the doors to the most menial of jobs and then tout their generosity with claims of having achieved socially conscious compliance with the law is absurd, since many such organizations are still systematically denying access to upper level positions to minority groups. This is both legally unjustifiable and morally despicable.

The exact intentions of the new administration are, thus far, unclear. What has been and remains lucidly clear is that an honest commitment to equal opportunity for all citizens, be it among the jobseekers, house hunters, the voters, or whomever, is socially demanded and legally required. Any attempts to compromise the law or to patronize—while actually excluding minorities—can be neither concealed nor tolerated. The southern textile mill which is suddenly granted a previously outlawed contract, the local school district which is suddenly granted a previously outlawed Federal grant, the technological corporation which is suddenly granted a previously outlawed Government contract—all of these actions must not go unquestioned if the circumstances surrounding them do not appear to be clearly legal. There can be no rationalization for allowing these matters to escape the scrutiny of public officials who must be intent upon guaranteeing that civil rights laws so dearly won will be firmly enforced. I will exercise my responsibilities in these matters to the fullest and I respectfully urge my colleagues to exert the same effort.

AID COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN LAOS A NEW CONCEPT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in the April 29 issue of Look magazine, Mr. An-

thony Wolff in "The Welcome Americans" presents a new approach by AID to community development in Laos.

The objective of Loring Wagonner while living as an AID Community Development adviser in Phone Hong for more than 3 years has been to improve the conditions of life in an underdeveloped area while strengthening its political unity—before a Vietnam situation is reached.

How is Loring Wagonner achieving his objective? Rather than viewing community development as construction of physical facilities, he views community development as social development. Through provoking social change, AID achieves a reasonable return: a few first steps toward economic development, a perceptible increase in political stability, and a heightened resistance to terrorist attacks.

As a new approach by AID to community development, I commend my colleagues the following article:

[From Look magazine, Apr. 29, 1969]

NEXT DOOR TO VIETNAM: THE WELCOME AMERICANS

Exotic village names like Phone Hong have become daily front-page fare for Americans ever since World War II and the expansion of American military power in the Pacific. Especially since the war in Vietnam, Far East datelines have prefaced stories of bombings and strafings and body counts, delivered in daily installments.

Luckily, Phone Hong is in nominally neutral Laos, and just far enough from neighboring Vietnam to escape U.S. military attention. While half a million U.S. soldiers are fighting it out next door, the total American presence in Phone Hong is Loring Wagonner, his wife Ann, and their children, Peter, seven, and Adam, two. Loring has lived in Phone Hong for more than three years, working as a Community Development Adviser for the U.S. Agency for International Development. AID's job is to improve the conditions of life in an underdeveloped area while strengthening its political unity, before things get to the Vietnam stage. Loring's AID budget for Phone Hong, slashed from \$60,000 when he started, was \$7,000 last year.

He is not concerned about the cut in AID support, partly because local effort is rising to take its place, but mainly because, in his catechism of community development, less is more. "Community development is social development," he insists. "The raw material is the minds of the people. The method is to develop organization, and the hoped-for results are social changes. For years, community development meant pouring money into schools, dispensaries—physical facilities. AID officials are beginning to realize that a pretty school does not improve education, and a nice dispensary does not bring better health."

Loring likes to think of himself as a "subtle agitator," provoking change while trying to soften its impact on the traditional Laotian culture. Last September, he accepted an invitation to visit Ban Kham, a nearby village interested in participating in the AID program. Ann Wagonner remembers: "Loring began to talk to the villagers about the problems that would come with progress. He told the elders that they could expect to be outdated; that customs which had served for so long would now be obsolete. He reminded them that progress is often painful and lonely, especially for the old. He pointed to the village teacher: 'The changes we are going to make in education may bewilder you. You may have a student who stands up and questions what you say!'

He will say that you are wrong, and you will be shocked to find that he is right!'

"One of the elders thanked Loring for telling them the truth. He said that in fifty years of hearing foreigners, mostly French colonials, speak Lao, none spoke as well as Loring. The elder said, 'Thaan [Honorable Sir] Loring has learned to pull the strings of the heart with our language.'"

Loring's fluency is not always enough to smooth the way. His educational reforms in particular have had unhappy—though perhaps unavoidable—repercussions in Phone Hong. Laotian teachers are fixed in the French mold—they lecture to large groups of students from thrones of unimpeachable dignity. Threatened by Loring's ideas of student freedom, only four out of 25 of last year's teachers agreed to come back for the next semester.

On another occasion, Loring used films to introduce progressive techniques in agriculture and health, only to find, Marshall McLuhan notwithstanding, that the villagers were visually illiterate. One villager was asked if he would like to fly in a plane like the one in the film. Indicating with his hands the small size of the plane on the screen, he protested that he wouldn't fit into it.

Adapting the medium to the audience—rewriting traditional Laotian morality plays into commercials for change—he did better. In one, a poor farmer is converted to a new strain of "miracle rice," and becomes so rich that he can contend for the hand of the chief's daughter. Another folk play was revised into a pure-water story. It featured the deathbed agony of an old woman poisoned by pollution, and the triumph of good over evil through the boiling of drinking water. Simple, perhaps, but successful. There were 35 cases of cholera in the Phone Hong area the year before the play was given. There have been none since.

For its small investment in Phone Hong's future, the U.S. AID program gets a reasonable return: a few first steps toward economic development, a perceptible increase in political stability, a heightened resistance to terrorist attacks. For the Wagonners, whose investment of themselves, their love and their concern has been great, the program has paid off richly. Here is what Ann Wagonner writes to a friend of their life in Phone Hong:

"... We are content to live here in an age equivalent, perhaps, to the 14th century. We have watched cattle pulling carts, water buffalo doing the heavier work in the fields, and even the lumbering elephants who do the heaviest work of clearing the jungle. Our little village does not have electricity, water is drawn from wells by hand, and very often the rice paddies serve as bathrooms. At nighttime, by 9 p.m., when the last of the cookfires have flickered out, the village is asleep, and the absolute silence, unmarred by mechanical noises, is magnificent. From one kilometer away, you can hear the clear note of a buffalo bell as the beast grazes. If a baby wails in the night, a mother at the other end of the village stirs. At 2 a.m., the village butcher begins his work by candlelight, and by 4 a.m., the village is awake, fed, and working in the fields.

"The Lao food can be delicious: sticky rice, accompanied by a vegetable-and-meat soup; then chopped meat with very hot peppers wrapped in leaves and dipped in a hot pepper sauce, washed down with raw homemade whiskey. Some of the local delicacies are less appetizing to us: raw chunks of liver swimming in blood, an unwashed goat fetus in rice wine, a completely rotten egg, etc. After a meal, the Lao sit around picking their teeth and burping, and a hostess gauges her success by the number and loudness of the burps she hears. . . .

"We have many friends here. Not only have we learned to speak the language, but we were adopted by a young Lao orphan girl

who wanted to get married. (By Lao custom, she needed a father to give her hand in marriage.) Thus, we have approximately 400 'receives' in our immediate vicinity on whom we can call for help as easily as we are called upon. When our parents came from America for a visit, they were immediately accepted as 'Honorable Grandparents.' Our children are treated as village children, and are safe anywhere. A village mother will watch, scold and play with any children in her sight, knowing that the other mothers in the village will do the same for her children.

"The Lao have the comfortable custom of calling each other by family names even when they are not related. If I speak to an older woman, instead of using the disrespectful 'you,' I must insert Honorable Older Sister, Honorable Mother, or Honorable Grandmother; and she will respond in the same courteous style. There are many observances which must not be neglected: to bend lower than the head of a respected or older person when passing near, not to show the sole of the foot to anyone, not to touch, even by mistake, a person of the opposite sex.

"I was once asked to come to a house where a young mother had dengue fever. As I was leaving, I saw the woman's two-month-old baby. The mother had lost her milk. I was still nursing my own baby and had plenty, so I become a temporary wet nurse. From then on, mothers would push gangly one-and-two-year-olds at me, saying, 'Please will you nurse my child? I want him to be strong like Ee Noi!' The child would grin at this point, showing a row of glittering teeth, and I would make my excuses. . . .

"We have had much pleasure in Laos and much hard work. Most of all, we have felt a sense of identity with the people we are trying to help.

"During the past three years, Loring has trained competent Lao to administer the AID program here, and hopefully these bright young men will find us a useless nuisance before two more years have passed. We will have accomplished our purpose here and we will leave. Certainly we will never regret the years we have spent here, though we both love to be at home in America and we realize we can't stay in Laos forever. Meanwhile, we enjoy each day as it comes. An unsullied countryside, a wholesome life, and a psychologically calm people: what more could we ask to experience?"

UNTOUCHABLES, JUNIOR GRADE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the close-knit society of untouchables in Government appears to be so entrenched in our National Government that according to the Herald of Freedom for April 4, 1969, we find that even the No. 2 men in both State and the Pentagon qualify as untouchables.

Mr. Speaker, I include the April 4 Herald of Freedom, as follows:

THOSE "No. 2" MEN

State "Number Two" Richardson and Pentagon "Number Two" Packard are two more international men in an international-minded administration. Both have been directors of World Affairs Councils which have taken over the propaganda and "educational" activities of the discredited Institute of Pacific Relations. One was picked for his high post in spite of his lack of experience and the other in spite of an obvious conflict

of interest due to his company's defense contracts.

Elliot Lee Richardson was born in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1920, the son of Dr. Edward P. Richardson and the former Miss Clara Shattuck. He graduated from Harvard with an A.B. degree in 1941 and obtained his L.L.B. from Harvard Law School in 1947, after having served in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1945. At Harvard he was editor of The Law Review. He married Miss Anne Frances Hazard August 2, 1952; they have three children, Henry, Anne Hazard and Michael.

Richardson's first position (1947-8) was as law clerk to the famous judge, Learned Hand, who was at that time superior judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Judicial Circuit. As of 1949 Judge Learned Hand had completed forty years on the Federal bench, having first been appointed by President Taft in 1901. His thousands of decisions were described by Felix Frankfurter as "an enduring source of truth-seeking and illumination."

Richardson then became a law clerk to the great Frankfurter himself from 1948 to 1949. Frankfurter by then had progressed from being a Harvard law professor, who had been supplying law clerks to Supreme Court and Federal judges for many years, to being a Supreme Court Justice (appointed by F. D. Roosevelt January 5, 1939). Frankfurter's pro-Bolshevik-Communist bias is well known and was stated in a letter written to him by Theodore Roosevelt on December 19, 1917, in which he stated:

"You have taken, and are taking on behalf of the Administration an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and the other Bolshevik leaders in Russia; an attitude which may be fraught with mischief to this country. . . . Here again you are engaged in excusing men precisely like the Bolsheviks in Russia, who are murderers and encouragers of murder, who are traitors to their allies, to democracy, and to civilization, as well as to the United States, and whose acts are nevertheless apologized for on grounds, my dear Mr. Frankfurter, substantially like those which you allege."

Among Frankfurter's proteges at Harvard were such subversives as J. Robert Oppenheimer, Lawrence Duggan, Harry Dexter White, Alger Hiss (for whom Frankfurter was a character witness), Lee Pressman, Harold Glasser and Owen Lattimore. Frankfurter was on the National Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union with such (subsequently identified) Communists as William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Louis Budenz and Scott Nearing. He was an intimate of Harold Laski who taught with him at Harvard and then went to the London School of Economics and established what became known in academic circles as the "Frankfurter-Laski Axis." Laski eventually secured a teaching post in Moscow.

From 1949 to 1953 Richardson was with the Boston law firm of Ropes, Gray, Best, Coolidge and Rugg, having been admitted to the Massachusetts Bar. In 1952 he was also a lecturer on law at Harvard. From 1953 to 1954 he was a staff assistant to U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall, after which he went back to his law firm from 1954 to 1956. Saltonstall was a former governor of Massachusetts who was elected to fill the unexpired term of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who resigned from the U.S. Senate February 1944. Saltonstall was known as a "liberal Republican" because of his stand on civil liberties and international cooperation. He was a sponsor of U.S.-Soviet "Friendship Rallies" and of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship of which Corliss Lamont was chairman.

In January, 1957, Richardson was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. His

present boss, Rogers, was then Attorney General of the United States and in 1959 Richardson was appointed U.S. Attorney in Massachusetts under Rogers. The N.Y. Times tells us that "During those years Mr. Richardson was widely regarded as one of the brighter and more creative spirits in an Administration that was not noted for them. He became identified with the moderate, even liberal, wing of Republican thought." One of the "several notable convictions" won by U.S. Atty. Richardson was that of Bernard Goldfine.

When the Eisenhower Administration was succeeded by the Kennedy Kingdom, Richardson was selected to be a special assistant to Attorney General Bobby Kennedy. He tried in 1962 for the Republican nomination for Massachusetts Attorney General but lost in the primary to Edward W. Brooke, now the U.S. Senator from Mass. He was a partner in the firm of Ropes and Gray from 1961 to 1964 at which time he was elected Lt. Governor of Massachusetts. In 1966 Richardson ran for Attorney General of Massachusetts and allowed his second cousin, Francis W. Sargent to run for the position he then held as Lt. Governor. This was a maneuver which supposedly was to make the ticket stronger. It resulted in Sargent taking over as governor when President Nixon appointed Governor Volpe to be U.S. Secretary of Transportation.

In his 1966 campaign for Attorney General, Richardson was assailed for making charges against his opponent that he could not substantiate (N.Y. Times, 1/5/69). A more interesting item, however, was the long list of Democrats who supported Republican Richardson. In the Record American (Boston) of Nov. 4, 1966 a full page advertisement stated: "The office of Attorney General is too important . . . that is why we and thousands of other Massachusetts Democrats support Elliot Richardson for Attorney General." Among the signers were Henry Com-mager and Adam Yarmolinsky. The ad also carried a quote from John F. Kennedy, Washington, 1956: "I want to show the very high regard in which Mr. Richardson is held by all who know him, including myself. I have worked with him on many occasions in the past and always found him to be extremely able, dependable and fair-minded." Richardson was also supported by the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA).

The endorsement of Adam Yarmolinsky should be enough to warn anyone against the endorsee. Yarmolinsky attended Harvard at the same time as Richardson, graduating two years later. During his sojourn at Harvard Yarmolinsky was head of the Marxist Club, a founding member and editor of the Marxist magazine, Yardling, which presented the views of the Young Communist League. He admitted attending meetings of the Communist Youth League and an investigation by the Army into his left-wing background quoted him as stating, "They (the Young Communist League) believed and I was inclined to believe that a so-called Communist government was a desirable end." As a free-wheeling commissar in the Defense Department during the Kennedy Kingdom, Yarmolinsky was instrumental in trying to destroy the morale of the Armed Forces of the United States. High-ranking military personnel had their every word and action carefully scrutinized by Adam and his "Whizz-Kids." He became so powerful under (?) McNamara that reportedly no one could be hired, assigned or discharged at the Pentagon without his O.K. Exposure forced Yarmolinsky out of public life but he continued and continues to be active "behind the scenes."

Endorsement by Yarmolinsky did not mitigate against Richardson and he was elected Attorney General of Massachusetts. One of his more regrettable acts in this capacity was granting permission for a "documentary" film

to be made of the inmates at the Bridgewater State Hospital for the criminally insane. These unfortunates were photographed in their degenerate and private activities and the film, entitled "Titticut Follies," was shown and is still being shown commercially. It is from this post that Mr. Richardson moves into his new position of Number Two man in American diplomacy as Under Secretary of State.

He is quite acceptable to the "Liberal Establishment" in spite of his "limited experience in foreign affairs." The N.Y. Times of January 1, 1969, in announcing the selection of Richardson, stated:

"Although Mr. Richardson has no official experience for the Under Secretaryship, he has traveled widely. In 1961, as president of the World Affairs Council in Boston, he visited Africa for a first-hand look at emerging nations. He has also attended policy seminars at Salzburg, Austria."

With the Institute of Pacific Relations thoroughly discredited and exposed by extensive hearings and investigations, its work did not cease but was continued by other groups. The internationalists have never ceased to propagandize and among the "educational" organizations through which they work are the various regional World Affairs Councils. In the House of Representatives report of hearings on Tax-Exempt Foundations appears a document called Recommendations of the President to the Trustees (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) signed by Alger Hiss and published in the 1947 yearbook of that organization. It states in part:

"Among the special circumstances favorable to an expansion of the endowments own direct activities, the most significant is the establishment of the United Nations with its headquarters in New York, and with the United States as its leading and most influential member."

The United States (via Alger Hiss-Ed.) was the chief architect of the United Nations and is its chief support. The opportunity for an endowed American institution having the objectives, traditions and prestige of the endowment, to support and serve the United Nations is very great. No other agency appears to be so favorably situated as is the endowment for the undertaking of such a program.

"So far as we have been able to ascertain, no other agency is contemplating the undertaking of such a program. Consequently, I recommend most earnestly that the endowment construct its program for the period that lies ahead primarily for the support and the assistance of the United Nations. I would suggest that this program be conceived of as having two objectives. First, it should be widely educational in order to encourage public understanding and support of the United Nations at home and abroad. Second, it should aid in the adoption of wise policies, both by our own Government in its capacity as a member of the United Nations, and by the United Nations Organization as a whole."

"The number and importance of decisions in the field of foreign relations with which the United States will be faced during the next few years are of such magnitude that the widest possible stimulation of public education in this field is of major and pressing importance. In furthering its educational objective, the endowment should utilize its existing resources, such as the international-relations clubs in the colleges and international conciliation, and should strengthen its relationships with existing agencies interested in the field of foreign affairs. These relationships should include close collaboration with other organizations principally engaged in the study of foreign affairs, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the developing university centers of international relations, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, and local community groups interested in foreign affairs, of which

the Cleveland Council on World Affairs and the projected World Affairs Council in San Francisco are examples.

"Of particular importance is the unusual opportunity of reaching large segments of the population by establishing relations of a rather novel sort with the large national organizations which today are desirous of supplying their members with objective information on public affairs, including international issues. These organizations, designed to serve, respectively, the broad interests of business, church, women, farm, labor, veterans, educational, and other large groups of our citizens, are not equipped to set up foreign policy research staffs on their own. The endowment should supply these organizations with basic information about the United Nations, and should assist them both in selecting topics of interest to their members and in presenting those topics so as to be most readily understood by their members."

"We should urge the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations to supply similar service on other topics of international significance. Explanation should also be made by the endowment as to the possibilities of increasing the effectiveness of the radio and motion pictures in public education on world affairs."

What Hiss was describing and recommending was a huge brainwashing operation to be performed on the American public. Such organizations as the Foreign Policy Association and the World Affairs Councils, fronting for the Council on Foreign Relations, pretend to be "non-partisan" and educational but are strictly World Government propagandists. Richardson has been closely associated with this as a member of the board of directors and president of the World Affairs Council of Boston.

Mr. Richardson was described by the N.Y. Times as having all the attributes of the proper Bostonian, family background, and "the distinctive New England upper-class way of talking." We are told, however, that his intimates know him "as a great party man with a robust sense of humor, a good dancer and avid skier, even an adventurer." Drew Pearson was not quite so kind in his comments, recollecting that Richardson had a good record in government and was "a far-sighted HEW executive" but he had a problem—alcoholism. It sounds strange, coming from Pearson, but he states:

"It is a firm rule of the State Department that an alcoholic is a security risk. The theory is that he's subject to blackmail, or can be indiscreet under the influence of liquor and leak security information."

Citing a record of fifteen automobile arrests for Richardson, Pearson states that his first brush with the law was at the age of nineteen when he was arrested on May 6, 1939, at 8:30 P.M. for operating under the influence of liquor on Beacon Street in Boston. Pearson quotes the arresting officer as stating: "Richardson was very abusive at the time of his arrest and threatened to have me fired." After pleading guilty to the offense, Richardson was fined \$75 and his license was suspended. For an offense in April, 1951, Richardson pleaded guilty and was fined \$200 and his license suspended. This was for striking a stop sign and going through a hedge at 2 a.m. in Brookline, Mass. Of his numerous arrests, three involved driving under the influence of liquor and most of the others involved speeding.

Richardson is a long-time close personal friend of Secretary of State Rogers who has explained his choice as "springing mainly from a desire to have as his deputy someone with whom he is personally close and compatible, a man who would serve as his 'alter ego.'" Both are members of the "Eastern liberal wing of the Republican party."

Number two man in that other important government department, Defense, comes out of the West and, like Richardson, has been connected with a World Affairs Council,

having become a director of the World Affairs Council of Northern California in 1958. David Packard was born in Pueblo, Colorado, September 7, 1912, the son of Sperry Sidney Packard and Ella Lorna Graber. He received his A.B. degree from Stanford University in 1934 and his E.E. in 1939, having worked for the General Electric Company in Schenectady, N.Y. from 1935 to 1938. He married Miss Lucile Laura Salter on April 8, 1938 and they have four children—David Woodley (a professor of humanities at the University of California at Los Angeles), Nancy Ann, Susan and Julie Elizabeth.

Packard is a self-made multi-millionaire electronic instrument manufacturer. His appointment caused raised eyebrows because of a "conflict-of-interest" possibility due to the fact that his firm did \$34 million worth of business with the Defense Department last year and another \$7 million with other federal agencies and had \$60 million in sales to government prime contractors. Some sort of a trust arrangement has reportedly been made to make everything proper but Packard has said he has no intention of living on his \$30,000 government salary.

Packard founded his company thirty years ago with his partner, William R. Hewlett, in a garage with an initial investment of less than \$600. The company, which is the designing and production of electronic measuring instruments, was incorporated in 1947 and now produces more than 2,000 different types of instruments in 17 plants and employs 13,000 persons.

Last year Hewlett-Packard embarked on a "long-range program to increase its sale of non-strategic products in Eastern Europe." Packard carried on correspondence with Sen. Walter Mondale, who strongly favors East-West "bridge-building," and disclosed that his firm had assigned several sales engineers to full-time duty behind the Iron Curtain "traveling in the territory and providing on-the-spot assistance to the East European purchasers and users." The firm participated in different fairs, shows and exhibitions and Packard stated: "We anticipate this new effort will cause our East European sales to more than double in 1968, with an even further substantial increase the following year." He was unhappy, however, because the firm's sales were limited by the "high level of unilaterally imposed U.S. export controls."

Packard cited "better understanding" as a reason for lowering U.S. controls to allow a larger volume of East-West trade: "We believe a larger volume of East-West trade can and will contribute to a better understanding, without in any sense providing substantial aid which would strengthen our enemies, or potential enemies." Unfortunately it is not "understanding" he is after but "money." He is described as a "contemporary man" who "doesn't try to pack everything into an ideological box." He reportedly counts himself a fan of former Secretary of Defense McNamara, stating, "McNamara did a very good job in the over-all job. But I hope we can do a better job."

It has been pointed out that Packard's description of his products as "non-strategic" is not quite accurate as these highly sophisticated instruments used in electronics and analytical chemistry could definitely have military application. It could just be, therefore, that our new "Number Two" man in the Defense Department has been aiding and abetting an enemy against whom we are in active combat. It has been pointed out that weaknesses such as excessive drinking are exploited by the Communists and used by them for blackmail purposes, making a person with such a failing a security risk. It could well be that our "Number Two" man in the State Department has placed himself at the mercy of our enemies and can be manipulated by them because of a present or past drinking problem. As two of the earlier

Nixon appointments, Richardson and Packard lead the sorry parade of dubious ap-

pointees. Their connection with the World Affairs Councils indicates their World Gov-

ernment bias and undoubtedly was a factor in their selection.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 24, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rear Adm. James W. Kelly, chief of chaplains, U.S. Navy, offered the following prayer:

And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt harken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and do all His commandments . . . that the Lord thy God will set thee on high, above all the nations of the earth.—Deuteronomy 28:1.

Let us pray: Eternal God, who with sovereign power controls the destinies of men and nations, we invoke Your divine blessing upon this august and distinguished body, assembled here to address itself to the affairs of state.

Strengthen its Members with the knowledge that as they pursue the best interests of our land and people, remaining sensitive to Your will, they go, indeed, about Your business.

Grant them vision to see that the strength of the Republic rests in faithful expression of the public will through responsible representation.

Through every word uttered and every deed undertaken in this Chamber this day, undergird and strengthen both the American way of life and the world's hope for the future.

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Gelsler, one of his secretaries.

EULOGIES TO THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT A. EVERETT, OF TENNESSEE, AND SENATOR E. L. BARTLETT, OF ALASKA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the House membership that the closing date for eulogies to the late Congressman Robert A. Everett, of Tennessee, and Senator E. L. Bartlett, of Alaska, has been set for Friday, May 2, 1969. This has been set as the cut-off date for all insertions that will make up the compendiums of eulogy to these two Members of Congress who, but for their untimely passing, would now be serving in the 91st Congress.

REAR ADM. JAMES W. KELLY, CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, U.S. NAVY

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to have the chief of chaplains of the U.S. Navy, Rear Adm. James

W. Kelly, here today to offer our opening prayer.

I have known Captain Kelly for a number of years. We attend the same church in Arlington and I believe him to be one of the truly great men in our armed services today. He agrees with us here in Congress that as long as we can have open prayer and express our allegiance to Almighty God, as he has just done, that our Nation will stand.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more I would like to say about him but to have a man like Chaplain Jim Kelly in a position of spiritual leadership in our armed services is a true asset to our Nation. I have seen the reflection of his work in many places across this country and throughout the world.

I personally look forward to having Chaplain Kelly lead us in prayer again in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of this week and the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished Speaker is going to offer a resolution today, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is going to call up House Resolution 347. The printing resolutions reported by the Committee on House Administration are going over until next week. They will be called up sometime next week.

The rest of the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are three bills:

H.R. 254, to authorize the expansion of the Canine Corps of the District of Columbia Police;

H.R. 4182, to authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District of Columbia Training School; and

H.R. 9526, to exempt certain public international organizations from the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

On Tuesday: H.R. 4153, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, will come up under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 9825, civil service retirement amendments, subject to a rule being granted; and

House Resolution 17, to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States.

In addition, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), has advised that he will call up by unanimous consent some 10 bills which have been unanimously reported by his committee some day next week. A list of those bills follows:

BILLS REPORTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

H.R. 9951, to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments, etc.

H.R. 2718, extending for additional temporary period suspension of duties on certain classifications of silk yarn.

H.R. 4229, continuing for temporary period suspension of duty on heptanoic acid.

H.R. 4239, amending Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent payment of multiple customs duties by U.S. owners of racehorses purchased outside the United States.

H.R. 5833, continuing to June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

H.R. 7311, amending Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes.

H.R. 8644, making permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots.

H.R. 10015, extending to July 15, 1971, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum.

H.R. 10016, continuing until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap.

H.R. 10107, continuing for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle.

This program is subject to the usual announcement that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

We have no further program for this week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think that the heavy grist of business we have today can be completed so that a session tomorrow will not be required?

Mr. ALBERT. I believe with the gentleman's cooperation we can complete the business today.

Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.