

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.

**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

**BEST WISHES TO HARRY S. TRUMAN
ON HIS 85TH BIRTHDAY**

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 216, extending to Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States, best wishes on his 85th birthday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 216

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby extends to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States, its best wishes on the occasion of his 85th birthday, May 8, 1969.

Sec. 2. The Congress expresses its appreciation to President Truman for his distinguished service as United States Senator, as Vice President of the United States and as President of the United States during the period from 1935 to 1953.

Sec. 3. The Congress expresses its appreciation for President Truman's determined and firm policies in respect to foreign affairs which, with invaluable bipartisan support, (1) helped in the immediate years after World War II to reconstruct a ravaged and weakened Western Europe; (2) firmly set the face of the United States against aggression in both Europe and Asia; and (3) provided desperately needed technical aid and other assistance in the best tradition of American generosity to developing nations struggling to create free and prosperous and democratic conditions for their peoples.

Sec. 4. The Congress further recognizes that President Truman no less heeded the plight of all Americans whom prosperity and justice had passed by and that he boldly advocated programs designed to translate the promise of a bountiful America into fulfillment for each and every American.

Sec. 5. A copy of this concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States shall be promptly transmitted to the distinguished "Man from Independence," Harry S. Truman.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORD FOUNDATION SHOULD DIVEST ITSELF OF DOW CHEMICAL CO. STOCK

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I sent a telegram to Mr. McGeorge Bundy, president of the tax-

exempt Ford Foundation suggesting that the foundation divest itself of 66,000 shares of stock held in the Dow Chemical Co. According to the foundation's estimate this stock has a market value of over \$5,500,000. I have further suggested to the Ford Foundation that the moneys realized from the sale of this stock could be turned over to the city of New York in lieu of taxes for real estate properties owned by the Ford Foundation now located in New York City. I presume the city of New York could use these funds to improve the public schools and also help in improving conditions in the poor neighborhoods of the city.

The Ford Foundation, according to its own financial report, had funds on hand as of the end of 1968 totaling \$3,780,000,000. It would appear to me that wise counsel would prevail and action be taken forthwith by the Ford Foundation.

My telegram is as follows:

APRIL 24, 1969.

Mr. McGEORGE BUNDY,
President, the Ford Foundation,
New York, N.Y.:

May I respectfully suggest that the Ford Foundation divest itself of the 66,000 shares of the stock held in the Dow Chemical Company. This stock, according to the Foundation's estimate, has a market value of approximately \$5,500,000. With all the human misery in the world it seems to me to be unreasonable, unconscionable and unscrupulous for any organization such as yours to be deriving part of its income from this source.

As a further suggestion your foundation could turn over the monies derived from this divestiture to the city of New York in lieu of taxes for properties held by your foundation in New York City. I presume the city of New York could put these funds to good use in improving their public schools and solving some of the problems in the poor neighborhoods.

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROTECT FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined my distinguished colleague in the other body, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, in introducing a bill which would protect Federal investments in the academic community. Our bill will provide for fines and imprisonment of anyone who would burn ROTC buildings, federally financed research labs, or willfully interfere with the administration or operation of any federally assisted institutions.

We have ROTC units of the Army, Navy, and Air Force on the campus of virtually every college and university in the Nation. In our space program alone, over 200 universities are conducting space research. Our nuclear energy program is inseparably tied up with university research and development. Many of our defense programs are dependent upon the cooperation of the academic community. The university team is a vital part of defenses, the security of our country, and that of the free world. We

must protect this vast investment in tomorrow.

Much research is federally financed to eliminate disease and provide for a healthy, strong America.

The time has come when we must protect our investment from subversive hoodlums and anarchists. The time has come to protect our investment in higher education from those who would destroy education. Crime against education is one of the worst and vilest forms of crime as it is an attack upon the security, freedom, and progress of tomorrow. I have been hopeful that such legislation would not be necessary, but I now believe that in the national interest such legislation is timely and even urgent.

LEGAL FEES

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I went into the well of the House yesterday to point out the very exorbitant price that this House of Representatives has paid counsel to represent us against ADAM CLAYTON POWELL in his case before the Supreme Court. I mentioned then that the legal fee was \$200,000. I find that I was in error. It is instead, \$213,055.30. And that only covers the appellate court services that we have received, my fellow colleagues, and does not count the Supreme Court appearances that have been made so far. I would hope that some of the members of the bar here in Congress would take notice, not judicial, of the compensation attorneys in New York are getting for representation of this House of Representatives in the Supreme Court of the United States.

DOCUMENTS BEING CIRCULATED BY THE MISNAMED STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that today I am placing in the body of the RECORD two documents that are circulated on college campuses by the misnamed Students for a Democratic Society. A reading of these documents clearly indicates that this organization is dedicated to the destruction of our form of government. This group should properly be named "Students for the destruction of a democratic society."

This organization contains anarchists, Marxists, Leninists, and other subversives.

It is high time that responsible college administrators, faculty members, and the citizens in general understand the objectives of this group.

It disturbs me when I note that many of our institutions of higher learning grant the demands of this subversive group only to find that new demands are presented. This group is not interested in solving problems. It exists to create dis-

order. Present campus unrest is well planned and supported by this group. A detailed study of these documents verifies these conclusions.

AMERICANS CASH IN MORE U.S. SAVINGS BONDS THAN PURCHASED

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during March for the fifth straight month, Americans cashed in more U.S. savings bonds than they bought. Purchases amounted to \$336,907,000 while redemptions totaled \$394,116,000. It is obvious that these bonds have ceased to be competitive in today's money market. It is time for Congress to act to eliminate the 4¼-percent ceiling for interest to be paid on these bonds.

There are \$45 billion worth of these bonds outstanding, about 15 percent of our national debt. They represent the savings mainly of small investors. For many, their bonds are their only savings, a nest egg against financial need. In 1960 U.S. bonds represented 20 percent of all savings. Today they are only 13 percent. We should encourage more Americans to get into the habit of buying a bond a month through the convenience of payroll deductions. But, we cannot expect them to buy bonds that are paying nearly a whole percentage point less than a bank account. I am pleased that Treasury Secretary David Kennedy has indicated that the Nixon administration is preparing to ask for changes in the bond interest rate. Back on February 18 I introduced legislation which would accomplish this end, H.R. 7015, which is before the Ways and Means Committee.

I have heard complaints from some Members of this body that there is little to do in the way of legislation. May I suggest that prompt action on the bond bill would help the Government and millions of small investors.

REORGANIZATION OF JOB CORPS

(Mr. MacGREGOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, some of us have recently been deluged with mail accusing the Labor Department of throwing Job Corps enrollees out in the cold.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In its proposed reorganization of the Job Corps, the Labor Department is closing down some residential training centers. But it is also providing every possible service to assist in transferring corpsmen to other centers or making referral to suitable jobs, on-the-job or institutional training, Neighborhood Youth Corps, or other manpower programs.

What the Labor Department's sound proposal intends to accomplish is the integration of the Job Corps into its total manpower training program. In lieu of some of the large residential cen-

ters, which have been highly expensive and have also had high dropout rates, it proposes 30 smaller inner city or near city residential centers designed to meet the needs of those young men and women who most need to be served. Arrangements will be flexible, depending upon the needs of the community. That isn't the case today.

Such an arrangement will, in many instances, permit actual training to be furnished by other manpower components administered by the Labor Department. It will enable the Department to utilize techniques which have been proven successful and will eliminate costly duplication of services.

I support the Secretary of Labor in his efforts to upgrade the training offered by the Job Corps and to cut down the expense of this operation. I hope that my colleagues will likewise support the wise decisions of Secretary Shultz.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-106)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

The Post Office Department faces a record deficit in Fiscal Year 1970, one which will reach nearly \$1.2 billion. This unhappy fact compels me to recommend to the Congress that it increase postal rates for first, second, and third class mail.

The increases that I am proposing will reduce the postal deficit in Fiscal Year 1970 by over \$600 million. If rates were not raised, that sum would have to be added to the already considerable burdens of our taxpayers. But if these recommendations are adopted, the costs of postal service will be borne more adequately by those who use the service most.

That is the way it should be if the Post Office is to become an example of sound business practices. That is also what the law requires. The Postal Policy Act stipulates that postal rates should produce revenue which is approximately equal to the cost of operating the postal establishment—after the costs of such special public services as the Congress may designate are deducted. It is in accordance with both general principle and specific law, then, that I make the following recommendations:

1. First class mail—I propose that the rates for letters and postcards be increased one cent, to seven and six cents respectively, on July 1, 1969. Air mail postage rates would remain unchanged.

2. Second class mail—The rates for newspapers and magazines which circulate outside the county in which they are published would go up by 12 percent on July 1, 1970. This increase would constitute an addition to the 8 percent increase for second class mail which is already scheduled to take effect on January 1 of next year.

3. Third class mail—Bulk rates are already scheduled for increase on July 1, 1969. I suggest that there be a further increase on January 1, 1970, so that the overall level at that time would be some 16 percent above present levels. Further, I recommend that the minimum single piece third class rate be increased by one cent on July 1, 1969.

I regret the need to raise postal rates. I can suggest, however, that these increases can help our country achieve two important goals. First, the proposal can help in our efforts to control inflation by bringing federal revenues and expenditures into better balance. Secondly, rate increases will make it easier for the Postmaster General and his associates to provide better postal service. After carefully reviewing the fiscal 1970 Post Office budget submitted by the previous administration, we have been able to achieve reductions of net outlays equal to \$140 million. A comprehensive review of all postal operations is now underway; modern management techniques are being introduced and efficiency is being increased.

Further improvements will take time—and during that time it is essential that financial pressures should not impair or reduce available services.

I would add one further comment: this Administration is determined that the cycle of greater and greater postal deficits and more and more rate increases will be broken. The only way to break that cycle is through effective, long-range reforms in the way the postal system operates. Some of these reforms can be implemented by the Postmaster General; others will require Congressional action. We will be submitting specific proposals for such reforms to the Congress within the next forty-five days.

Postal reform will not be achieved easily; there are always many obstacles to even the most necessary change. But we remain confident that we can, with your cooperation, move boldly toward our three goals: better postal service, improved working conditions for all employees, and a reduction of the recent pressure for frequent increases in postal rates.

Proposed legislation to effect the revenue increases which I have recommended here will be sent to the Congress shortly.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1969.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce my support for President Nixon's proposal to restore fiscal responsibility to the Post Office Department.

In the coming fiscal year, this Department will run a budget deficit of nearly \$1.2 billion. This is the minimum. The deficit is likely to run nearly \$300 million higher when the phase III pay increases are implemented this July.

With the postal service facing the greatest deficit in its history, we have no choice but that of supporting President Nixon's proposal to increase postal rates for all the major classes of mail.

In his message to the Congress, President Nixon said:

The increases that I am proposing will reduce the postal deficit in Fiscal Year 1970 by over \$600 million. If rates were not raised, that sum would have to be added to the already considerable burdens of our taxpayers. But if these recommendations are adopted, the costs of postal service will be borne more adequately by those who use the service most.

The President wants the Post Office to become an example of sound business practices. He also recognizes that the Postal Policy Act requires that postal rates should produce revenue which is approximately equal to the cost of operating the Postal Establishment—after the cost of such special public services as Congress may designate are deducted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we support the principles of the Postal Policy Act by voting to keep this vital Department on a sound financial basis.

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today Congress received the President's message proposing legislation to increase postal rates for first-, second-, and third-class mail. I do not believe first-class mail should absorb an increase so close on the heels of the increase to 6 cents last year, and I firmly maintain that an exhaustive cost ascertainment study of the entire postal operation should precede any discussion of further rate increases.

The President reminds us that the Postal Policy Act stipulates that postal rates should produce revenue which is approximately equal to the cost of operating the Postal Establishment. May I remind you, my colleagues in the Congress, the President and the Postmaster General that the Postal Policy Act also stipulates that the Postmaster General conduct studies of the impact of postal rate increases. To my knowledge, this has not been done.

Where would increased revenues in the Postal Department go? Under existing regulations these revenues are diverted to the general treasury and any increase would likely make a significant contribution to the budget surplus the administration has so optimistically forecast.

Before any rate increase is passed I want to see legislation enacted which would guarantee that the revenues would be channeled into a trust fund for the specific needs of the Postal Establishment.

We must guarantee needed improvements in the Post Office. This must include a guarantee that necessary machinery and buildings be provided to handle the ever-increasing volume of mail.

I submit the Congress should consider the establishment of a postal trust fund comparable to the highway trust fund which has been effective in assuring continued construction of adequate roadways.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman THADDEUS DULSKI of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee made the following remarks in a recent press statement:

First things first and that means postal reform first. Only then will we take up the matter of postal rates. I do not intend for our Committee to consider the Department's rate increase proposal until after we make some real progress on postal reform. A change in the handling of rates is an integral feature of postal reform.

As chairman of the Postal Rates Subcommittee of the Post Office Committee, I believe an exhaustive study of cost ascertainment within the Post Office must also be made before we give consideration to any proposal to increase rates.

I am certain such a study would point up areas in which costs could be reduced significantly or entirely eliminated. It would also reveal who is, and who is not, paying his fair share of the postal bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that discussion of postal rate increases at this time would be premature—putting the cart before the horse, if you will. I intend to schedule hearings immediately in the Postal Rates Subcommittee to conduct an intense, exhaustive study of cost ascertainment within the Postal Department. One of our objectives will be the setting of a target date for instituting an incremental, out-of-pocket, cost system which would permit the Department to make better rate and management decisions.

Now is the time to act to stop the spiraling costs within the Department. With expert management, costs could be reduced and we can accept nothing less than expert management in return for our citizens' postal dollars.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently it was announced that the rise in the cost of living in March was the highest for any single month in the past 18 years. Despite this startling evidence of the inflationary pressures in our economy, some Members are questioning the need to increase postal rates.

The Post Office Department's financial outlook reflects the dangerous trends in our economy. In the coming fiscal year, we expect the Department to run a deficit of nearly \$1.2 billion—without even counting the substantial pay increases Federal workers will be demanding this summer.

If postal workers' salaries are increased 4.7 percent—the amount recommended 2 months ago by the Civil Service Commission—the Post Office Department's fiscal 1970 deficit will climb to nearly \$1.5 billion. And, we know that the wage package could be even more costly.

Sound fiscal policy does not permit us, Mr. Speaker, the luxury of ignoring or trying to explain away a postal service deficit which could well climb beyond \$1.5 billion in the next year.

We have no choice. We must support President Nixon's proposal to increase postal rates for all the major classes of mail.

If we fail to support the President, we are feeding the fires of inflation.

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that increasing postal rates is not easy. When the cost of mailing a letter goes up a penny it irritates the family that might send out only one or two

letters a week, as well as the large volume mailer pouring tens of thousands of pieces into the mail stream each day.

Understandably, we all wish it will not be necessary to vote for higher postal rates.

This year one of the "hopes" is postal reorganization. The prospect is held out that postal reform will bring such sweeping economies to this big Department that we can stay with existing postal rates.

While I am impressed with these advocates' enthusiasm for postal reform, we all know that it will take years to bring meaningful changes to a Department with more than 730,000 employees.

In proposing higher postal rates, President Nixon is dealing with a problem which needs a solution now—not 10 years down the road. The facts are that the Post Office Department is likely to run a deficit of almost \$1.5 billion in the next fiscal year after Federal employees salaries are increased.

If we do not increase postal revenues this summer, this vital Department will have the largest deficit in its history.

We cannot delay. We must increase postal rates in this session of the Congress.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, none of us likes to consider a further increase in postal rates.

President Nixon has today forwarded his recommendations for increases in postal rates in first-, second-, and third-class mail.

This proposal comes as a result of the critical problems facing the postal system in this country. The President has made clear the commitment of his administration to break the "cycle of greater and greater postal deficits and more and more rate increases." He has correctly pointed out that only if we undertake long-range reforms of the Post Office can this cycle be broken.

It is for that reason that the decision has been made to increase postal rates. Once again, the President has made the hard decision based on what is right and what must be done.

A simple increase in rates does not by itself solve the problem. Given the fact that the Nixon administration understands this and the need for extensive reforms, I believe the proposal of Mr. Nixon deserves support.

The goal of better mail service and better working conditions for employees can best be achieved by providing additional revenue and embarking on meaningful reform. This is the challenge the President has given to us and I commend his proposals.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the record deficit facing the Post Office Department in the next fiscal year is another illustration of the financial toll exacted by the inefficiencies of the postal system in combination with the highest rate of inflation this country has experienced in 18 years.

Now, barely 2 years after the last increase in postal revenues we find the Post Office Department running a potential deficit of more than \$1.4 billion when postal employees' salaries are increased this July.

If we are to put a halt to this record rate of inflation, it is essential that we put the Post Office Department—with a budget of nearly \$8 billion—on a sound fiscal basis.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am reluctantly supporting the President's proposal to increase postal rates. These increases in the rates for the major classes of mail will increase postal receipts by more than \$625 million a year. This will lessen the Department's need to use money from the general fund, and help to check an inflationary spiral that has cut into the earnings of all persons but, most cruelly, has eroded the living standard of the poorer members of our society—those on fixed incomes, on welfare and on limited earnings.

The increase in postal rates, admittedly, is only a stop-gap measure. As the Postmaster General stated:

Rising wage costs—which account for about 80 percent of all postal costs—plus lagging mechanization and archaic management methods, are the underlying reasons for the all too frequent rate increases in recent years.

That is why I also support the efforts of the present administration to increase the efficiency of the Post Office by bringing modern management techniques to bear upon a department too long saddled with the burdens of 19th century politics and technology.

For the present, Mr. Speaker, if we are to succeed in coming to grips with the high rate of inflation we must immediately put the postal service on a sound financial basis.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the latest edition of my newsletter, the report which I send periodically to my constituents:

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

APRIL 11, 1969.

THE FIRST 3 MONTHS

By the time you read this newsletter, President Nixon will have been in office approximately three months. It is interesting to note the priorities he set for himself and for his Administration. First, he felt it necessary to begin the work of bolstering our relationships with nations of Western Europe. As a result, very early in his Administration he took a trip to the countries of Western Europe, and even his most ardent critics feel that this trip was an unqualified success. Contemporaneous with this effort, President Nixon changed the negotiating team in the Paris-Vietnam talks, and set the course for negotiations, and for operations in Vietnam.

Now, the President is intently scrutinizing the Johnson budget, hoping to be able to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government for Fiscal years 1969 and 1970. He has been handicapped in this by the fact that the Johnson Administration underestimated built-in expenditures, such as interest on the national debt, welfare payments, and the like, and overestimated revenues. Therefore, it has been necessary for the Nixon Administration to reduce expenditures of the Government by over \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 1969 just to stay even with the faulty figures he inherited from President Johnson.

Now, President Nixon is engaged in preparing his domestic legislative program. Because of the budgetary situation, much of this program will probably consist of relatively modest cash outlays at the present time, but definite starts on Government pro-

grams, many of which will be in partnership with the states and the private sector.

One of the extremely important tasks facing the Nixon Administration was to prove its credibility insofar as fiscal prudence is concerned. Not only our own people, but the whole world was waiting to judge the future of the American dollar by the actions of the Nixon Administration. The fact that Mr. Nixon has shown that he is in dead earnest in cutting Government expenses, and in showing restraint in the advocacy of new programs has caused people both here and abroad to feel more confident in the future of the Western World's economy than was felt for many months. Here in Washington, where the words "cut expenditures" were almost regarded as a joke, these words now have taken on a new and very serious meaning. It is obvious that this Administration really does intend to live within its means, and this is good news for the taxpayer, the businessman, and, most of all, to the wage earner and the individual who lives on a fixed income.

ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILES

The country is now engaged in a great debate as to whether or not a system of antiballistic missiles should be deployed. The opening salvo in the debate was released by the Nixon Administration when it announced that it had discarded the Johnson Sentinel system for its Safeguard system.

Sentinel would have deployed antiballistic missile systems around the cities to form a thin curtain to guard against sneak attacks by small nations, irresponsible attacks by Communist China, or accidental detonation of a missile by any nation. It would not guard against an onslaught by Russia or any other nation with an arsenal consisting of many ICBM weapons. The Sentinel system could be easily overwhelmed by the simultaneous dispatch of many missiles.

The enemies of the Sentinel system stated that: (1) The system had not been developed to the point we could be sure it would work; (2) Deploying it around the cities actually escalated the nuclear war because it appeared to be protecting a first-strike capability for the United States; and (3) It was capable of being expanded to a very dense, expensive, system which could cost as much as \$60 to \$100 billion.

The Safeguard system met most of the objections against Sentinel because (1) Only two ABM sites would be used immediately so that full deployment could not occur at least until the systems effectiveness had been proved; (2) These systems would be utilized to safeguard our own Minuteman locations, not our cities. Thus, Safeguard has as its objective protecting an ability to respond to a first-strike, but does not enhance our capability to launch a first-strike. (3) Since the aim of Safeguard is to protect missile sites, obviously this system could not and would not be expanded to a heavy system to protect cities. Therefore, it would not result in an escalation of the nuclear war. (4) The Safeguard system would cost at least \$4 billion less than Sentinel, and its outlay for Fiscal 1970 would be \$1 billion less.

Even with these changes, many honest, sincere people feel that no ABM system should be deployed. Their arguments run like this: (1) any deployment of antiballistic missile systems escalates the nuclear armament race. It has been pointed out above that the Safeguard deployment does not enhance our first-strike capability and, therefore, should not result in any escalation. Even so, one wonders how these well-meaning people can feel that the deployment of an American antiballistic missile system would result in escalation, ignoring the fact that Russia has already deployed an antiballistic missile system to protect both Leningrad and Moscow. If any escalation results from antiballistic missile systems, Russia has already escalated. (2) The

system will not work. This is a truly unfair accusation. The Nike-Zeus which was the forerunner of the Spartan Missile (which would be used in both the Sentinel and the Safeguard systems) has been tested several times against incoming ballistic missiles. It has been almost uniformly successful in knocking down its targets. Anyway, the fact that only two sites are to be used allows the system to be perfected before any further deployment. (3) The money could be better spent elsewhere. This then gets down to a matter of a priority for the utilization of our available resources. Most of the people who make this argument feel that sums released from scrapping the ABM could and should be used to renovate our core cities, and to do away with poverty.

In the first place, the amount of money to be spent on this system is infinitesimal compared to the cost of ending poverty. In addition, the real fight to end poverty begins with the training and educating of people. We are engaged in this great effort, and will expand these programs both public and private as fast as we possibly can.

The facts are that we must make expenditures for the defense of our country, while at the same time we are doing our very best to rehabilitate our disadvantaged people, and to rebuild many of our core cities. A wise allocation of resources, over a period of time, can and will allow us to do both. The timing of these efforts seems to be the main item of disagreement. The so-called "liberal" feels that we should drop everything to rebuild the cities. Others realize that rebuilding our cities, while we drop our guard against those who would conquer the world, would be a vain thing indeed.

The American system has allowed us to dream the dream of ending poverty. This system can be destroyed by neglect, by subversion from within, or by attack from without. We must be on guard against all three. Certainly, substituting the physical and mental slavery under which the peoples of Western Europe and Russia live for the lot of even the most disadvantaged of our people is not in accordance with the desires of very many rational Americans. Yet, if the American system falls as a result of attacks from any of the three directions noted above, then immediately that dream of ending poverty falls with it.

Those who would compare spending in the cities to spending for defense have not yet realized that they are really comparing horses and rabbits, or apples and oranges. There is actually no comparison, and neither type of spending is mutually exclusive as to the other.

So, let's deploy our Safeguard system, and reeducate and retrain our people too. We have the resources to do both. All we need is a rational schedule, and an intelligent allocation of resources. We can have, and we must have, a humane America, a fair America, and an America full of opportunity for all. We cannot have any of these unless at the same time we have an America safe from attack.

VISITORS

Mesa

Mr. and Mrs. Burdell Moody, Ken Heywood, W. L. Cowan, O. James Klein, Norval Jespersion, Mickey White, George F. Rozelle, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred R. Pennell, Maynard Schneck, Mr. and Mrs. Max Killian, David and Mark.

Tempe

Haskell Henshaw, Don Fancher, Andrew B. Mayberry, Mr. John E. Herrick, R. Gary Daniels, M. D. Burdick, George E. Niedner, Jr.

Scottsdale

William Kelley, Filmore Carlos, Billman Hayes, R. A. Fletcher, Frank Tillyou, Josephine Sawala, Guy Stillman, Dr. John H. Young, Dr. James Schamadon, John J. Gal-

lagher, Mr. and Mrs. Vernie A. Lindstrom, Jr., Hugh D. Stuart, Tom Wade, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney B. Wolfe, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Merrill, Donald E. Gentry, Cynthia and Bill Turner, Lynda Spencer, Kay Murphy.

Sun City

Mrs. Harry R. M. Crory.

Paradise Valley

Dr. and Mrs. Warren.

Chandler

Kendall Cumming, Mitchell Nelson.

Phoenix

Read Carlock, Maurine and Seth Horne, Don and Karen Vance, Rev. and Mrs. A. C. Valdez, Sr., Harriet Huntress, Margaret E. Ryan, Walter Chopiowsky, George Ilinsky, Mr. and Mrs. R. Ptak and Leslie, Dr. Arthur Lee, John D. Noble, Halbert B. Clemmer, Ferris W. Hancock, Elmer C. Coker, Oakley Jordan, Jeffrey J. Ptak, Brian E. Langston, Eugene A. Marvin.

George E. Leonard, Tom Sheridan, Douglas L. Driggs, Lonnie F. Wells, Charles A. Boyle, J. Pat Madrid, Roland S. Mosher, Barry Becker, Nicholas Sakis, Bob Carlock, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Attebery, Melvin Himelstein, Hanen H. Williams, Dr. S. F. Farnsworth, J. A. Riggins, Jr., James M. Johnson, Bill Davis, Barney Burns, Frank Hunter, Charles G. Hastings, Dan W. Cohen.

Rich Johnson, Wes Steiner, Les Alexander, Dr. Robert Pickering, Dr. Harold E. Freeman, Mr. and Mrs. Gary G. Keltner, Nell Snyder, John I. Yellott, Stuart Melton, Dr. John R. Green, Steve Morris, Neal E. Kresheck, Dr. Carl R. Bjorklund, George F. Karam, M. W. Holdship, Mr. and Mrs. Tony F. Soza, G. W. Woods, Daniel F. Gruender, Hon. Sam Mardian, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Hal L. Grammer, J. Snead Parker, Brice I. Bishop.

Mr. and Mrs. Wallace N. Brown, M. S. Horne, H. L. Fulk, J. Clyde Wilson, Robert C. Huntington, Alan G. Thiele, M. C. Titus, Roger Ernst, Mr. and Mrs. Sam B. Hearn, Fred Kemmeries, William D. Peterson, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Rosenzweig, Mr. and Mrs. John Pritzlaff, Morley Fox, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Middleton, Governor and Mrs. Jack Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Gene Hancock.

Mayor Milt Graham, Mrs. John L. Hogg, Barbara Tejada, Mr. and Mrs. Denison Kitchel, Ronald Carmichael, Leonard F. McDaniel, Catherine McDaniel, Margaret Ryan, Wayne Earley, Gordon and Ann Marshall, Sister Mary Rose.

Margaret Kleindienst, Mr. and Mrs. P. G. Rosenblatt, Hon. and Mrs. Paul Fannin, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Staggs, Ethel Kogen, Jack Kogen, W. Ken Barnhart, George Wilson, Helen Baughman, Donna Mognett, William H. Trenholme, Mrs. N. A. Winter, Jr.

Cave Creek

Lenna M. Bradbury.

Carefree

Mr. and Mrs. Charles J. West.

Globe

Jack L. Neal.

Many Farms

Bob Roessel.

Maricopa

Wayne Sprawls, Leona M. Kakar.

Tolleson

Ed Walsh.

Payson

T. L. Meredith.

Marana

Dorothy Wencher.

Window Rock

R. E. Kilgore, Norman H. Breman.

Douglas

Janet R. Demmler.

Nogalis

Mr. and Mrs. Jess Allen.

CXV—644—Part 8

Prescott

Hon. Sam Steiger.

Sacaton

Loyde A. Allison, Marshall Christy, Alexander Lewis, Sr.

Yuma

Everett Self, Tom Choules.

Springerville

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Udall.

Tucson

George M. Griswold, Evelyn Jay, Don Hammond, Benjamin F. Davis, Marvin Ball, Kenneth E. Story, Keith S. Brown, Caval Farrall, Soleng Tom, Harold R. Archibald, Mr. and Mrs. Walter J. Grace III, Howard M. Morgan, Hon. and Mrs. Morris Udall.

Litchfield Park

Harold Porter, Charls Combs.

Camp Verde

Brad Stewart.

Grand Canyon

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Verkamp.

Glendale

Anne Feichtmeir.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the President's message just read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, TO STUDY PRODUCTION OF FOREIGN-MADE GOODS AND COAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH PRACTICES IN GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 200, Ninety-first Congress, the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized to send not more than six members (four majority and two minority), and not more than two staff assistants (one majority and one minority), of such subcommittee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study (1) of the circumstances sur-

rounding the production in foreign nations of goods which are subsequently sold in the United States in competition with domestically produced goods, and (2) recent developments in coal mine safety and health practices in Great Britain, with a view to determining the feasibility of adopting such practices in coal mines in the United States.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. Amounts of per diem shall not be furnished for a period of time in any country if per diem has been furnished for the same period of time in any other country, irrespective of differences in time zones. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all after the word "Resolved," and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 200, Ninety-first Congress, the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized to send the chairman and not more than ten other members (six majority and four minority), and not more than two staff assistants (one majority and one minority), of such subcommittee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of recent developments in coal mine safety and health practices in Great Britain, with a view to determining the"

On page 2, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following lan-

guage: "including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, and Great Britain, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and within the United States to require, by subpoena".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

TITLE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment to the title. The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment: Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of new developments in coal mine safety and health practices in Great Britain."

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLLING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a technical amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: Change the word "bill" to "resolution."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I have a question. Can the gentleman from the Committee on Rules, who is handling House Resolution 347, tell us whether there has been a prior appropriation predicated on the authorizing resolution, which passed this House on February 19, an authorizing resolution to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri will have to reply that he simply does not know. I do not happen to remember whether the Committee on House Administration has reported a funding resolution. My impression on this matter, however, is that any funds expended in this connection would have to come out of funds previously authorized, so there must be some. I just do not happen to know it or the number of the resolution. It is obvious we will not have much counterpart in this situation—at least it is obvious to me—and I would think clearly they would not go anywhere unless they had money appropriated.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. He has anticipated my followup question. I think it would be of general interest to the Members to know—and I have searched the Record and cannot find it—if an actual resolution, an appropriating resolution from funds available to the House has been enacted for the Committee on Education and Labor. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that this funding, even though it comes from counterpart funds on deposit with other nations overseas, would have to come out of such an appropriation.

Having made that legislative record, my question as to the main source goes unanswered.

My real concern is whether for this mission—which I believe to be worthwhile in view of our recent mine dis-

asters, and I am willing to learn from any source available where countries have had prior and longer experience—the funding is ab initio or whether it is secondary to the other appropriation.

Mr. BOLLING. There are two points I have made. I am very unsure of the ground on this. My one point is that there is virtually funding on these committees that exists under the Reorganization Act, to which the usual resolution from the Committee on House Administration for additional funding is in addition. Presumably some of this will be counterpart. I think it is quite clear that there can be no travel without funds. I doubt if they can even start without the funds, so I think it is relatively clear that authorization is necessary, but funding is also necessary unless it is taken care of by the Reorganization Act provision.

I would be interested as to whether my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), can add any further light. The truth of the matter is that I am handling this resolution for another Member and I cannot say I know the details the gentleman from Missouri asks.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his personal opinion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the title.

The title amendment was agreed to.

The title, as amended, was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORE SUPPORT FOR MASS TRANSIT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my urban mass transportation trust fund bill with an additional 29 cosponsors.

I first introduced this bill on February 18 and then again on March 27 with 17 cosponsors. Today's introduction brings the total sponsorship of the bill to 47.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the support for this legislation will continue to mount, for our Nation is far behind in meeting a major need of our metropolitan areas: mass transportation. And, this is a need that becomes even greater as we do next to nothing to deal with it.

Mass transportation facilities are expensive to construct, and our municipalities desperately need help in financing them.

Currently, over 70 percent of our population lives in "urban America." And yet, we continue to spend great sums of money on highways and very little on mass transit—and it is efficient mass transit that we need to make our cities livable.

We now spend about \$4 billion a year in building highways—and expect to spend a total of \$60 billion by 1974 for the entire interstate highway system. On the other hand, we are spending only \$175 million a year on mass transportation.

The bill being introduced today au-

thorizes a \$10 billion expenditure over the next 4 years on mass transportation capital programs. The trust fund is financed through the existing 7-percent automobile manufacturer's excise tax.

The bill also changes the existing urban mass transportation program's Federal share ratio from two-thirds Federal, one-third local to 90 percent Federal, 10 percent local as the highway program is now funded. If our communities are to have any real choice in deciding whether to build a highway or a mass transit system, they must be given the same degree of Federal assistance for both. I have heard of too many instances in which cities have chosen to build a highway even though their needs call for mass transit because they could get 90 percent Federal funding for the highway and only two-thirds Federal assistance for mass transit—that is if they could get any portion of their mass transportation program approved at all.

I am pleased to note too, Mr. Speaker, that the support for my bill has come from Members of this body representing districts all over the country. Many come from our cities including Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis, Seattle, Augusta, Milwaukee, San Francisco, Boston, Buffalo, and Minneapolis—as well as New York.

This is also a bipartisan effort, as it should be. There is nothing partisan in our cities' need for mass transportation.

In closing, I should also like to mention that I am forming an action alliance, ZOOMass Transit, to organize the support that exists all over the country for greater mass transportation funding. Interest in this alliance and my bill has been expressed by State and local legislators from all over the country.

INFANT MORTALITY AS A RESULT OF RADIATION FROM NUCLEAR TESTS

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention new information which indicates that 34,000 infants will die in this country this year who might not have died had there been no nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and that since 1951 the same has been true of over 440,000 infant deaths.

This information about the hitherto unknown effects of past radioactive fallout on infant mortality rates is horrible enough in itself. But it has broader implications. It indicates that full scale nuclear war would probably mean the eventual destruction of the human race, just as Nevil Shute suggested years ago in his gruesome novel, "On the Beach."

The information has a great bearing on the current ABM debate. It confirms my feeling that Secretary Laird, in his frantic fear campaign about the possibility of a successful Soviet first strike against our missiles sometimes in the 1970's, is talking dangerous nonsense. In contemplating any such attack on our missile sites, involving more than 1,000 multimegaton explosions on or above the

ground, the Soviets would have to take account of the radioactive fallout, not only on the American people, but on countries such as Canada, Cuba, and Mexico—indeed, on all the peoples of the world, including the Russian people themselves.

If this new information is correct, it may well be that a strike of the magnitude Mr. Laird is talking about would, in the long run, be suicidal to the attacker regardless of any counterstrike.

The information I refer to, Mr. Speaker, is contained in a letter to me from Dr. Ernest J. Sternglass, professor of radiation physics at the University of Pittsburgh, and in an article by him which appeared in the April 1969 issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. From 1935 to 1950, Dr. Sternglass notes, the infant mortality rate in the United States showed a steady decline, which was paralleled almost exactly in Western Europe. In the early 1950's, infant mortality continued to decline at a constant rate in Europe, but leveled off—that is, failed to improve at the expected pace—in the United States. This trend has been a puzzle to public health officials, particularly since the extent to which the decline in mortality rates has slowed displayed unexplained variations from State to State. Only late in the 1950's did European rates of decline also begin to slow, though not as much as the comparable American rates.

The answer to this puzzle has now been supplied by Dr. Sternglass. He has shown, in his article, a direct correlation between above-ground nuclear testing and higher-than-expected infant mortality. Infant mortality rates leveled off, after the 1945–48 tests, in the States of the Southeastern United States which were in the direct path of fallout borne by prevailing westerly winds and which had sufficient rainfall to precipitate the radioactive debris. Rates leveled off in the Northeastern States with substantial rainfall after tests began in Nevada in 1951 and put them in the path of fallout. The low-rainfall States of the Western United States did not show a leveling off of infant mortality rates until the middle and late 1950's, when stratospheric debris from the large hydrogen weapons tests began to be introduced into the atmosphere. This same source of radioactive debris also affected Western Europe, and can be correlated with the sudden slowdown there in what had been steady improvement in infant mortality rates. Finally, within 2 years after the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963, infant mortality rates resumed their decline at about the pace which had prevailed before testing began.

These are not theoretical findings. Between 1951 and 1966, Dr. Sternglass estimates, 375,000 infants died in the United States who might have lived if infant mortality rates had declined as expected. Even though these rates have resumed their decline, they remain well above the level they should have reached had the nuclear setback not intervened. In consequence, 34,000 infants died in 1967 and a like number in 1968. And 34,000 more will die this year, and next year, and the year after, who might otherwise have lived.

As Dr. Sternglass has pointed out in his article, these effects on infant mortality were produced by a handful of weapons of kiloton size which are today classified as "tactical" because of their relatively modest explosive force. With this in mind, he says:

The full dimensions of the threat to the biological survival of mankind posed by a possible nuclear war become apparent.

In a covering letter sent me by Dr. Sternglass, he outlines with great persuasiveness the applicability of his findings to the current debate over deployment of an ABM system.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Dr. Sternglass' findings should properly be one of the most widely discussed and debated documents of our time. I welcome the news that this material will be aired further at a conference to be convened next month at Hanford, Wash., under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission, at which time Soviet scientists are expected to present evidence corroborating the work of their American counterparts. I hope this topic will also become the subject of fuller inquiry by the appropriate committees of this Congress, so that the American people may be fully informed about the price which they have paid—and are paying—for the casual manner in which we have introduced radioactive debris into their lives, and about the implications for the future.

In order that my colleagues may have the opportunity of according Dr. Sternglass' findings the close study they deserve, I am inserting in the *RECORD* the text of his letter to me and of his recent article.

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 17, 1969.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: In connection with your efforts to prevent the further escalation of the nuclear arms race through the deployment of Anti-Ballistic-Missile Systems, the enclosed article of mine just published in the April issue of *"The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists"* may be of interest to you.

Briefly, the article summarized mounting evidence that fallout from nuclear weapons testing has had a far more serious effect than had been anticipated. The data indicate that it appears to have led to nearly a doubling of the normally expected infant mortality in the United States of 1 to 2% of all children born.

Detailed correlation with radioactivity in the food and milk indicate that it is the unanticipated action of Sr-90 on the reproductive cells in man, in contrast with the expected action on bone, which appears to be responsible for the increases in fetal and infant mortality occurring within a few years after nuclear weapons tests.

The connection with atomic tests is particularly well illustrated by the percent changes of infant mortality relative to the normally expected values for each state in 1946 and 1950, following the detonation of the first small atomic bomb in New Mexico in 1945. A sharp rise of 20 to 30% in the excess infant mortality took place between 1946 and 1950 only in the high rainfall states directly east of New Mexico over which the radioactive cloud from the test passed under the action of the prevailing westerly winds.

The implications for the ABM decision may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The long-range biological effects of fallout appear to be some 10 to 100 times more

serious than anticipated in all past calculations of the effects of various nuclear attacks, so that regardless of whether or not defensive missiles are deployed, any kind of full scale nuclear war now for the first time threatens the extinction of mankind through the death of the children born to the survivors. Thus, no system of anti-missiles can be regarded as effective in "limiting damage" in the event of a nuclear war.

2. The long-range world-wide fallout from a massive first strike supposedly threatened by the Russian missile build-up according to Secretary Melvin Laird would necessarily be so large that it would end the Russian society through its effect on their newborn children just as it would end ours. This would be true even if not a single one of our thousands of bombs should reach Russian soil. Such a threat, being suicidal in nature, therefore loses all credibility. An ABM system would not change this situation since it necessarily merely adds to the total amount of long-lived Strontium-90 that would be added to the atmosphere in the event of a war.

3. The deployment of an ABM system, with many nuclear warheads for each of the many offensive warheads that can now be launched by both sides, would greatly multiply the total amount of fissionable material released if the deterrent should ever fail, thus further sealing the doom of mankind through the effect of still more massive doses of world-wide fallout.

4. The vulnerability of man's reproductive cells, the developing embryo and the infant to doses some hundreds of times smaller than are lethal to the adult man that nuclear bombs appear to be a form of biological weapon which does not need to reach the target it is aimed at in order to be effective. Thus, protection of any populated area by anti-missiles can be easily circumvented by aiming upwind from the target by many tens to hundreds of miles.

5. All attempts to provide a defense, either active or passive, can only lead to an increase in the total amount of weapons required to overcome any real or imagined effects a defense might have, and would therefore increase the long-range biological effects produced by a nuclear war, against which even the most elaborate shelters cannot protect. Thus, since the radioactivity of Strontium-90 only decreases by one-half in 28 years, all sources of food and drink will remain poisoned for many years at levels hundreds to thousands of times those due to peace-time testing, leading to the end of man through fetal or infant deaths in the next generation.

I hope that this material will be of use to you in your fight to end the mad race to destruction that our military have determined to carry to its only possible conclusion,

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST J. STERNGLASS,
Professor of Radiation Physics.

[From the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*,
April 1969]

INFANT MORTALITY AND NUCLEAR TESTS (By Ernest J. Sternglass)

(NOTE.—Can infant and fetal mortality in the United States be correlated with nuclear weapons tests? Professor Sternglass offers data for a close correlation between a leveling off in the decline of the fetal and infant mortality rates in the high rainfall areas in 1951–52 and the onset of the Nevada nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere. A similar correlation exists for the onset of hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific in 1954, according to the data. Professor Sternglass is a member of the Department of Radiology and Division of Radiation Health, University of Pittsburgh.)

Mounting evidence that there exists no threshold below which radiation is incapable of producing somatic and genetic effects in man suggests that especially for the sensitive embryo, fetus and infant, even relatively low-

level doses from peacetime fallout may lead to detectable increases in death rates when data on very large population groups are examined.

That such effects on the developing human embryo may in fact be observable was initially suggested by the data on fetal death rates in the Albany-Troy, N.Y. area following the rain-out of radioactive debris from a 43-kiloton test in Nevada in April 1953. Examination of these data shows that the decline of the fetal death rate changed to a much lower slope, within a period of a year or two. It remained at this lower value until 1966 even though the measured external gamma radiation dose to the population was only 0.1 rad over a period of some ten weeks following the rain-out from the passing radioactive dust-cloud. Since this incident was also followed by an increase in childhood leukemia beginning some five years later accompanied by a shift in age distribution toward older age at death known to be characteristic of radiogenic cases, the data appeared to be suggestive of a possible causal connection between the rate of change of the fetal death rate and the arrival of the fallout.

It was therefore of interest to see whether changes in fetal death rate appeared not only in the Albany-Troy area but also in New York State as a whole, and whether subsequent tests are also reflected in changes of the fetal mortality.

In New York State as a whole, the fetal death rate began to deviate from the 1935-50 rate of decline in 1951, the year that atmospheric weapons tests began at the Nevada test-site. The rate of decline slowed from the 1935-50 value, after which the death rate started to change sharply, leveling off at about 23 per 1,000 live births between 1957 and 1963. In 1964, it increased sharply to 27.3 per 1,000 live births, declining somewhat in 1965 and 1966.

In contrast to this anomalous behavior, the fetal death rate for California, which received less fallout from the Nevada test, maintained its steady decline, although a decrease in the rate of decline became evident beginning within two to three years after the onset of hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific in 1954.

CHARTING THE CONNECTION

In order to see whether the sharp rise in the fetal death rate in New York State might be connected with the accumulated fallout from weapons testing, the excess of the fetal mortality over the value expected if the 1935-50 rate of decline had persisted was plotted against the cumulative Strontium-90 deposited in the New York area.

It is seen that except for the first few years of testing in Nevada when short-lived isotopes rather than the long-lived Strontium-90 were dominant, the fetal death rate follows the same general pattern as the accumulated Strontium-90 on the ground. The two curves show the same decrease in rate of climb coincident with the temporary stoppage of nuclear testing in 1958 to 1961, and the sharp rise beginning with the large USSR test series in 1961. Two years after the test-ban in 1963, both the fetal death-rate and the radioactivity in the environment once again began to decline.

A similar pattern in the registered fetal death rate or rate of still-births exists in the data for the United States as a whole for all periods of gestation up to nine months. Again, there is a steady rate of decline, which levels off in 1951-52, coincident with the onset of nuclear weapons testing at the Nevada test-site in 1951.

The first actual rise in the fetal death rate occurred in 1954, when the first large hydrogen weapons were tested in the Pacific. A second rise took place in 1961, at the same time as the onset of large megaton weapons by the USSR in that year.

In order to see whether the pattern of infant mortality rates for infants up to one

year of age in the United States also shows such an association with nuclear weapons testing, the infant mortality rates for various states, differing in precipitation and therefore fallout accumulation, were also investigated. The results were examined for typical large "wet" metropolitan states known to have received substantial amounts of fallout, together with rural southern states that also have heavy rainfalls and lie to the east of the New Mexico and Nevada test-sites, as well as "dry" rural states in the West, largely free from New Mexico and Nevada fallout due to the low rainfall and the direction of the prevailing westerly winds at high altitudes.

The expected synchronous onset of change occurred in infant mortality rates for all four Northern metropolitan "wet" states in 1951, the same year that atmospheric tests in Nevada were begun.

The rural "wet" states of the Southeast show a generally similar pattern, but with indications of a leveling trend setting in somewhat earlier, or within one to two years after the first relatively "dirty" surface A-test in New Mexico in 1945. This debonation was followed by a series of five relatively "dirty" surface tests in the Pacific in 1946 and 1948, all of which occurred in the southern latitudes (11°N). As a result, the narrow belt of tropospheric radioactivity, typically 30° wide, reached primarily the southern part of the United States (25-35°N), where it came down in rough proportion to the annual rainfall.

CONDITION IN WEST

As expected, the "dry" rural states of the West, especially New Mexico which lies to the south of Nevada, do not show this leveling of the mortality rates either after the first tests in 1945-48 or in 1951. Instead, the rates continue to decline steadily and only when the stratospheric debris from the large hydrogen weapons tests begins to be introduced into the atmosphere does one see a leveling-off, beginning first in the mountain states of Idaho, and Colorado in 1954, and later in Wyoming and New Mexico in 1958.

The data on infant mortality for the United States as a whole show a pattern similar to that for fetal mortality, with a strong leveling trend evident by the early 50's, after a steady decline that had persisted since the beginning of the century. That no "natural lower limit" had been reached in the attainable rate is proven by the fact that within two years following the test-ban of 1963, the infant mortality rate resumed its decline at a rate approaching that prevailing prior to the onset of large-scale atmospheric testing.

The nonexistence of a natural plateau of 20 to 25 per 1,000 live births is further substantiated by the fact that in six European countries with advanced medical care comparable to that in the United States, the infant mortality continued downward so that the rates in all these countries fell below that of the United States by 1964, despite a leveling trend in these countries that began in the late 50's with the onset of large hydrogen weapons testing by the United States, the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R.

The lowest value, that for Sweden, reached 14.2 by 1964, when the U.S. rate was still 24.8 per 1,000 live births. Such a rate represents an excess of 75 per cent relative to that for Sweden, and an excess of 60 per cent relative to the expected U.S. rate of 15.5 had the infant mortality continued to decline at the 1935 to 1950 rate of decrease when the decline closely paralleled that for Sweden.

High radiation sensitivity of the fetus and infant have been determined both from animal studies and the effect of X-rays in man. This sensitivity results from the rapid cell division and organ formation characteristic of the early phases of development. It is therefore to be expected that the first serious effects of fallout would appear in the

fetus and young infant, for which existing measurements show very much higher organ and skeletal doses than for the adult.

GENETIC DAMAGE

It has also been observed (in a study by K. G. Luning and his coworkers in Sweden, published in 1963) that Strontium-90, aside from concentrating in the bone, also appears to produce genetic damage, which expresses itself in excess fetal deaths when injected into the male parent animal prior to reproduction. Furthermore, the doubling dose for chromosomal damage to human cells may be as low as 1 rad (as recently discussed by J. V. Neel). This is consistent with recent evidence for an increase in childhood leukemia many years after the irradiation of either parent at diagnostic X-ray levels (observed in a study carried out by S. Graham and his co-investigators at Roswell Park Memorial Institute). These findings suggest that both excess fetal and infant deaths are primarily due to chromosomal damage produced just prior to conception or in the earliest phases of development. No other explanation of the decrease in the rate of decline for infant mortality in the United States, as compared to other countries of equally low mortality rates, has so far been found.

Public health organizations have made a world-wide effort to understand the origin of this disturbing trend that has by now started to affect the entire world. As it was put in a recent book devoted to this problem by S. Shapiro, E. R. Schlesinger and R. E. L. Nesbitt, Jr.: "Why is it that during the 1950's and early 1960's, years of great economic advancement and expanding allocation of economic resources to medical care, the infant mortality rate decreased only moderately? Contrasting economic and medical care advances in this period with what happened to the infant mortality rate poses a difficult paradox."

There is accordingly strong evidence in the correlation of excesses in the infant and fetal death rate with nuclear testing. The human ova, sperm and fetus may be considerably more sensitive to internal radiation from certain radioisotopes than had been expected on the basis of animal experiments or observations on children irradiated in the course of diagnostic X-ray examinations of the mother prior to or during pregnancy. The estimated number of excess infant deaths since 1951 reached a total of 375,000 by 1966 in the United States alone and has continued at a rate close to 34,000 per year—this despite a gradual decline of the death rate beginning with the test ban in 1963. The serious dimensions of the world-wide infant mortality problem are thus apparent, suggesting the need for a major, international effort to test in detail the various consequences implied by the hypothesis that nuclear fallout may have played a significant role in this and other important changes in mortality trends all over the globe.

In view of the evidence of an association between nuclear testing and the increase of fetal and infant mortality in the United States, an association which appears to be of a direct causal nature, the need to end all further atmospheric weapons testing and to halt all shallow underground cratering tests that permit escape of radioactive material into the environment is of paramount urgency.

Since significant changes in the rates of fetal and infant mortality seem to have been produced as the result of tests in 1945-54 involving only a handful of kiloton weapons now classified as "tactical" in size, the full dimensions of the threat to the biological survival of mankind posed by a possible nuclear war become apparent.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. In view of what is happening, do we not want to sprinkle some of our defense mechanisms around the universities today?

SOFTWOOD LUMBER AND PLYWOOD

(Mr. STEPHENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, just prior to the Easter recess, the House Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve, conducted hearings designed to determine the causes of high softwood lumber and plywood prices and their unavailability.

Softwood lumber and plywood are basic to the interests of my rural constituents because they grow timber and manufacture these products. They are basic to the interests of my urban constituents because they represent the best possible material for meeting the housing requirements in our growing cities where adequate dwellings are in short supply.

The hearings revealed that the most practical means to increase softwood supply and reduce costs over the long run is to insist upon better management of Federal forest lands. These lands, nationwide, contain 60 percent of the country's softwood timber inventory. But they provide less than one-third of the timber currently processed. Private industrial lands, on the other hand, contain only 18 percent of the softwood timber inventory but match the timber yield of the Federal lands.

The reason for this discrepancy is directly traceable to better industrial management of forest lands, reinvestment of profits in growing stock and crop development, and the incentive to obtain maximum wood fiber from every acre.

The significance of this serious deficiency in Federal forest management has been recognized in the National Timber Supply Act introduced by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who is chairman of the Forestry Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee. I applaud his action and have cosponsored an identical bill with Mr. ASHLEY, of Ohio.

I have long been aware of the benefits which can accrue to the Nation through the proper management of its vast forest lands.

The pioneering effort in this regard was introduced to Federal forest management as long ago as 1960 by Georgia's senior Senator, Senator RUSSELL. He demonstrated superior foresight at that time by devising the means for the Department of Defense and its several military departments to realize the potentials of the considerable acreages of forest lands on its various training areas. It had developed that in 1960 military timber sales in Georgia were drastically curtailed due to lack of appropriations and a resulting shortage of necessary manpower.

In response to this need, Senator RUSSELL worked with the Department of Defense to develop a feasible method of funding its forestry activities so that the people in areas surrounding military establishments would not be denied the

timber raw material so necessary to their local economies and so that the military forests would not decline in value and productivity through neglect.

He established the concept of a revolving fund for military timber sale receipts so that dollars generated by forestry on military lands could be returned for further improvement of those forest lands. This concept was established in the military appropriations bill of 1961 and has worked with telling effect since.

The concept of this little-known legislation is simple. It permits the Department of Defense to use a portion of its timber sale receipts to offset forest management costs, with any excess going to the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. At the same time it represents one of the most significant pieces of conservation legislation in our Nation's history since it has resulted in the development not only of magnificent, productive forests throughout the United States where military bases and training areas are situated, but it has enhanced the outdoor recreation facilities for those communities nearby and our men in the Armed Forces and their families. I cannot praise too highly the contribution the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has made to the public interest in this matter. It is noteworthy that the plan proposed in the National Timber Supply Act which we cosponsored embraces the identical principle.

The Department of Defense has approximately 2,416,000 acres of commercial timberland under intensive management. One and one-half million acres are administered by the Army, 309,000 by the Navy, and 607,000 by the Air Force.

The following table shows the vastly improved forest management made by the Army alone during the 7-year periods before and after 1961, when the aforementioned authorization act was passed, providing assured funding:

	1955-61	1962-68
Managed forest (acres).....	1,165,000	1,500,000
Timber harvest (board feet)....	538,000,000	1,279,000,000
Income.....	\$10,568,000	\$26,781,000
Project costs.....	\$5,950,000	\$15,591,000

At the present time, the Army's level of annual income exceeds \$4,500,000 and current forest management accomplishments are at the following annual levels:

Tree planting (acres).....	12,000
Prescribed burning (acres).....	193,000
Timber stand improvement (acres).....	17,600
Road and trail construction (miles).....	1,608
Road and trail maintenance.....	5,731

I am pleased to note that the Army's excellent forestry program embraces five posts in Georgia, including Fort Gordon in my district. In fact, the 440,000 acres of forest managed in Georgia by the Army constitute nearly one-third of its total. These forested acres during the past 7 years have yielded 620 million board feet of timber and \$13.2 million in income against \$4.2 million invested.

Another indication of the payoff that now is being realized by the Army's intensive forestry effort is the fact that they expect to increase their harvest 7 percent annually for the next 20 years. Another

point of interest is that on the 425,000 acres of commercial timberland on three Georgia installations, total sales in the past 7 years have generated \$13 million in income, yet the inventory of standing timber has risen 227 million board feet in the same period. This is having your cake and eating it, too.

The Air Force and Navy forestry programs are not as far advanced as the Army's, but they, too, are starting to show substantial improvement since the 1961 authorization act.

The Air Force manages 607,000 acres on 25 bases, compared to 460,000 acres on only three bases between 1955 and 1961. Reforestation covered 2,420 acres in 1961 and 7,750 acres last year. In total, the Air Force has reforested 38,728 acres since 1960. Other forest management activities accomplished during 1968 include timber stand improvement on 2,372 acres; firebreaks built, 282 miles; firebreaks maintained, 1,952 miles; prescribed burning, 86,840 acres; roads constructed, 40 miles and roads maintained, 1,493.

The Navy's program covers 309,000 acres on 80 bases and the level of management tripled since 1961. The current annual allowable cut is 30 million board feet, compared to an estimated 10 million board feet annually in the 7 years prior to 1961. Since then, the Navy has completed 20 insect control projects, 10 erosion control projects, developed 359 separate management plans and completed 547 individual contracts.

The importance of sustained funding to sustained forest yields is a basic tenet followed by private forest industry companies too. Major firms operating in my own district aggressively conduct their forest management programs regardless of ups and downs in the market place. By keeping every acre productive they assure the eventual return of their investment in the land.

When one considers that growing a crop of trees to maturity takes anywhere from 25 to 100 years, it is apparent that long-term assured funding is vital to attaining maximum forest yields. Application of this tested principle for forest management to the millions of acres of national forests could return untold benefits forever to the American people in terms of materials, recreation opportunities, and dollars.

The hearings conducted prior to the Easter recess clearly revealed the need for increasing timber harvest on public lands to meet the housing goals which are already upon us. During those hearings I examined several qualified witnesses as to how Senator RUSSELL's effective military management plan could be applied to other Federal agencies.

The application will require legislation and it will require careful observance by the Congress to make certain that the potential benefits are being realized.

I am persuaded that both of these elements are present in the National Timber Supply Act introduced by me and my colleague who serves with me on the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I will work vigorously to win total support of the Congress for this sound approach not only to the solution of our national housing goals but to the maximum realization

of our forest potential in the interest of all the people.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio and the others in this body for adopting the worthy concept of the distinguished Senator from my home State.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY FACES BANKRUPTCY

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence Seaway—the fourth seacoast of our country—is dangerously close to going bankrupt.

This is the conclusion of a Department of Transportation report and an audit by the Comptroller General's Office, as well as any one who studies the financial problems facing the seaway.

The Department of Transportation is now considering a 20- to 40-percent increase in toll rates.

That is why I hope that the Public Works Committee will be holding hearings on my bill, H.R. 9877, to restructure the financial makeup of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the seaway's debt now stands at \$146.7 million. My legislation will convert this indebtedness into a permanent U.S. investment. The Corporation would pay the Government a fair dividend return on its investment at the interest rate at which the Corporation is now paying the Treasury.

The seaway is the only federally supported waterway required to be self-sustaining and fully amortized through commercial earnings. My bill is not a Federal subsidy of the seaway although many competing transportation systems do receive subsidies. It will relieve the financial strain on the seaway by eliminating the necessary or repayment of the debt in 40 years. Yet, the U.S. Government will be assured of a greater return on its investment in the long run.

The Comptroller General's audit showed that 1967 revenues for the seaway totaled \$6.1 million. Expenses, including interest payments, amounted to \$8.8 million—a deficit of \$2.7 million. The Transportation Department projects that the deficit for 1980 will be even larger—\$3.1 million, despite an anticipated increase in traffic.

It is clear, then, that the seaway will not be able to reduce its debt and, in fact, the debt could increase due to interest payments being deferred.

However, a toll increase is not the answer to the problems of the seaway. We must find alternative financing for it and my bill offers such an alternative.

Government reports project that the amount of seaway traffic will increase only 10 percent by 1980. The seaway must attract a greater amount of traffic.

Many of the major port cities are now attempting to bring in this additional traffic by modernizing their facilities.

For example, Chicago is making every effort to increase security at its port facilities to combat pilferage which, some reports indicate, has driven traffic out of the Chicago area.

Additional traffic can be brought into the system with an extension of the shipping season. Now the seaway is open about 8 months a year. We have the technical know-how to break up the ice along the seaway and there is no question that a shipping season of 10 months will substantially increase revenues.

Mr. Speaker, the dismal economic forecast for the seaway is due, in large measure, to the projection that general cargo will drop 25 percent by 1980.

While bulk cargo, such as iron ore and wheat, have provided the greatest tonnage, general cargo is the major revenue producer.

General cargo has the greatest economic impact on the port cities also. In Chicago, each ton of bulk commodities, such as iron ore and wheat, adds \$7 to \$9 to the city's economy; each ton of general cargo adds \$24 to \$26.

The trend in shipping today is toward containerization. In order to effectively compete, the seaway's major ports must improve their handling facilities.

My legislation will place the seaway in an improved financial position to attract and handle additional traffic. By assuring the cities of the economic soundness of the seaway, the cities will be given the added impetus to expand and improve their port facilities.

The shippers, in turn, will not be faced with a toll increase and will continue to use the seaway. Many shippers, not presently using the seaway, will be drawn to it by its steady rates and improved facilities.

A RESOLUTION TO CHANGE THE TERRITORIAL LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with increasing frequency other maritime nations have abused the use of international waters under the guise of territorial sovereignty which extends seaward to unrealistic distances.

The most offensive instance is the case of Peru which claims that its territorial and fishing limits extend some 200 miles seaward, and which has acted on that claim with violence.

On March 19, 1969, the U.S. tuna fishing vessels *San Juan* and *Cape Ann* were seized by a Peruvian gunboat while fishing approximately 23 miles off the coast of that Central American nation. This distance is 11 miles beyond the internationally recognized 12-mile limit for fishing rights, a distance claimed by the majority of maritime nations including the United States and Russia.

On February 14 of this year, a Peruvian warship fired upon the same *San Juan* causing an estimated \$50,000 damage to the vessel.

Now, Peru is not alone in the position she takes with respect to her fishing and territorial limits. Chile and Ecuador also claim the 200 mile limit.

These three nations have accounted for more than 80 seizures of U.S. fishing vessels since 1961.

These acts are grave, the costs are great, and lives have been endangered.

But, moreover, these acts point up a weakness in our foreign policy, a weakness which I believe can be strengthened initially by changing the territorial limits of the United States.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would provide for a policy of reciprocity in our territorial waters.

The United States would continue to maintain a minimum 3-mile territorial limit and a 12-mile fishing limit.

But, this resolution would permit the United States to be flexible and to adopt a territorial limit equal to that of another nation when another nation claims a greater distance, as in the case of Peru.

It is a sad commentary on the abilities of maritime nations to adhere to uniformity with respect to the rights of other maritime nations, yet the latest figures indicate that only 29 of 98 maritime nations of the world now observe the traditional 3-mile territorial limit.

Russia and other Communist nations claim a 12-mile territorial limit, equal to their claimed fishing limit.

Indeed, the *Pueblo* tragedy points up the fact that even the 12-mile limit will not be respected by at least one Communist nation when it feels it can exceed that limit without fear of reprisal.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this resolution would add strength and support to the Hickenlooper amendment which requires that U.S. aid be stopped to any nation which seizes American property and for which no settlement is made within 6 months. It would give a negotiator in such a situation a stronger position from which to bargain.

I believe that our foreign policy is in dire need of backbone, and I believe that this resolution will contribute to that end.

THE PROGRAM INFORMATION ACT

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this January 16, while introducing the Program Information Act, H.R. 338, I rose on the floor of the House to issue a call to action—a call to action by the Members of the House and of the other body, and to the membership of the appropriate committees and subcommittees into whose jurisdiction this bill has now passed.

A recent event makes the need for this bill all the more acute; namely, the publication of the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. This third comprehensive OEO catalog is no better than the previous effort, the second OEO catalog.

The new catalog, compiled for the Executive Office of the President by the Office of Economic Opportunity, was released about 2 years after the second one, the OEO Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs, and is the product of much deliberation by the executive branch—a BOB task force representing 12 Federal agencies, BOB Circular A-89, OEO In-

structions 1800-1, and much concerted effort by many hard-working persons. Because they did not come to grips with essential issues, the resulting catalog is inadequate and, in fact, a failure.

Meaningful information is the open sesame to Federal assistance programs. The lack of such information handicaps everyone, but especially those in greatest need. It is evident that one cannot apply for Federal assistance without knowledge of what aid is available. For that reason, the Federal Government has a moral responsibility to supply complete information on its Federal assistance programs to all of its citizens, and not simply a privileged few.

I regret to inform the House that the Federal Government has again failed to discharge this basic responsibility. The new 1969 OEO catalog of Federal domestic assistance does not represent any major breakthrough of the bureaucratic screen surrounding Federal assistance. It is essentially a rehash of the 1967 version.

The OEO catalog fails in these particulars:

First. A program is not defined precisely. How can 150 different departments and agencies gather information and follow uniform procedures if they do not know what they are looking for?

Second. Programs are omitted or grouped in a general, meaningless way. It is impossible for the layman to understand what type of Federal assistance is available even after studying the entire book, line by line, page by page.

Third. The definition of program is not consistent with that used in other Federal information services or brochures. The result?—different agencies end up working at cross-purposes.

Fourth. The catalog does not uniformly supply the basic and essential Federal program information elements needed by local officials, such as: First, the eligibility requirements of a particular program; second, the average time necessary for processing an application; third, the deadline for filing an application; fourth, the reporting and evaluation requirements imposed on the recipient; and fifth, other obligations—all the strings attached—assumed by the recipient of Federal assistance.

Fifth. The catalog does not tell those seeking aid how much money is available. How can someone plan a program intelligently without dollars-and-cents figures?

Sixth. No effort is made to cross-reference related programs, except through a very inadequate index. Again, those with a particular area of need have to scour the entire 551 pages.

Seventh. No effort is made to keep the catalog up to date as to changes in programs, including additions and deletions.

The inadequacies of the new catalog are not surprising, since it is based on BOB Circular A-89, the deficiencies of which I pointed out on the House floor last October 11—1968. I stated then that the circular, the 12-month work product of a special Bureau of the Budget task force representing 12 different agencies, failed to make hard decisions on specifics. It did not offer an adequate definition of a program; it too often repre-

sented a compromise of the agencies, who were fearful that full disclosure of programs would result in the elimination or reorganization of Federal programs; and it failed to give careful consideration to what local officials, who use the catalog, need to know.

The one lesson to be learned from the new Federal catalog is that the bureaucracy itself cannot be relied upon to raise its bureaucratic screen shielding Federal programs. The shield must be raised by Congress. Congress must adopt legislation requiring the executive branch of the Government to publish full and meaningful information on all Federal assistance programs.

For those of you who may have any lingering doubt as to the desirability of adequate program information, I challenge you to contact any State, county, or local official, or others who seek Federal aid and assistance, and discuss with them the present system—the ease and facility with which they obtain adequate program information. You will find that the system needs to be improved.

To demonstrate the need, let us examine each of the charges I listed before.

First. The lack of a program definition results in the omission of programs or permits the grouping of them in such a general way that it is impossible to understand what type of Federal assistance is available.

Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget have very candidly admitted to me that no effort was made in BOB Circular A-89 to define a program except in a most general way.

There are so many programs of such a diversified and complex nature that development of an adequate definition is difficult, but for practical purposes some definition is better than none at all. I believe a program needs to be described so that it reflects one coherent activity. An applicant must know where to go and who to see to obtain a specific benefit. A local official must know what the Federal Government is supplying for each activity. The Program Information Act gives this comprehensive definition of a program: "any program providing Federal benefits, regardless of whether it is identified as a separate program by law or by any administering agency, which can be differentiated from any other such program on the basis of its legal authority, its administering office, its specific purpose, the specific benefits it provides, or the specific qualifications of its beneficiaries."

The failure to define a program has serious consequences. If an agency can define for itself what is or is not a program, an agency can omit programs on the grounds they do not fit the definition.

The new OEO catalog still does not include all Federal assistance programs. It omits Project Themis, a DOD program, funded at over \$25 million, providing money to universities. Furthermore, if the new catalog is going to list AEC's "Nuclear Science and Technology Research and Development" at page 434, it should also list the activities of the Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Department of Defense, which provides large amounts of funds for fairly diversified research. Or, if the new catalog is

going to list the Library of Congress "Research and Referral Services in Science and Technology" at page 467, it should also logically refer to the Oceanographic Sorting Center in the Smithsonian Institution. And, if the new catalog is going to mention the Special Foreign Currency Program of the Smithsonian Institution at page 517, it should refer as well to similar programs potentially benefiting Americans in the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Commerce, which are only a few of the agencies that utilize the Public Law 480 "excess" funds.

Obviously, inconsistency between agencies and departments as to what constitutes a program can only be confusing to the user of the catalog and can often lead to unwise decisions as to which program best fits a given need.

Equally as important is the fact that the list of programs presented in the new catalog is, in many cases, so general as to be meaningless. The result is that program groupings shed very little light on what assistance is available. For example, under the new program heading on page 122, "Educationally Deprived Children," the catalog lumps together educational aids for delinquent children, for children of the poor, and for migratory children, as well as a small health program. A migratory child has problems different from those of a delinquent one; a health program and an education program are two activities, not one.

Because the new catalog lists several programs under one "program" heading, it can only refer to them by title, describing none in detail. The "programs" presented on pages 89, 473-474, 476-480, and 483-485 of the new catalog are little more than lists of titles. I quote from page 89 of the new catalog, under "Civil Defense":

The Federal Government: (1) surveys all structures to designate space as shelters from radioactive fallout; (2) provides funds for developing community shelter plans, (3) procures and distributes radiation monitoring instruments, food, medicine, and sanitation items, (4) matches funds for personnel and administrative expenses, emergency operating centers, survival supplies and equipment, and training, (5) provides adult education and guidance as well as special training in workshops, universities, and the Civil Defense Staff College for architects, engineers, city planners, and state and local officials, (6) provide attack warning, (7) donates surplus personal property such as vehicles, pumps, generators, and fire fighting equipment, and (8) loans engineering stockpile equipment (pumps, generators) for use in disasters such as floods or droughts.

I list all the civil defense programs in our listing of programs—House Document 399, 90th Congress, Listing of Operating Federal Assistance Programs Compiled During the Roth Study—at Nos. 12.5-12.15 and 12.17-12.21. Instead of lumping them together by title, I describe each of them as a separate program in my catalog.

Second. The OEO Catalog fails to set forth clearly the eligibility requirements for a particular program.

When so many programs are summarized under one heading, as they are in the new OEO Catalog, it is impossible to give precise eligibility criteria for each program individually. When the

eligibility requirements are summarized for each program into a very generalized statement, the resulting description of eligibility is meaningless.

For example, I would like to quote from the program listed in the new OEO Catalog at page 79, "Shipping and Shipbuilding Assistance."

Any United States citizen may apply for these government aids. Aid is contingent upon applicant's compliance with stipulations of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and the implementing regulations of the Maritime Administration.

All this says is that to be eligible, one must be eligible. To compare this description, I would refer you to the eligibility requirements given in our listing for the two programs described above. Quoting our No. 6.27:

Section 601(a) of the Act provides, in effect, that in addition to the applicant being a U.S. citizen, the Maritime Subsidy Board must determine that the proposed operation is required to meet foreign-flag competition and to promote the foreign commerce of the United States; that the applicant for subsidy can supply the proper ships and possesses the necessary qualifications to enable him to conduct the proposed operations in the prescribed manner; that the granting of the subsidy applied for is necessary to place the proposed operations of the vessels on a parity with those of foreign competitors, and is reasonably calculated to carry out effectively the purposes and policy of the Act.

Or, for example, the new OEO Catalog lists "Nuclear Education and Training," at page 433. This one program description is actually a summary description of at least 11 different operating programs, providing no specific information about any of the 11. I quote the first two paragraphs from page 433 of the new OEO Catalog:

Through fellowships, traineeships, loans of nuclear material, equipment grants, and other financial support, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) encourages promising graduate students and research scientists to pursue careers in nuclear science, nuclear engineering, and health physics, and assist the nation's educational institutions to train the specialized personnel required in growing number to meet the expanding needs of nuclear science and industry.

Opportunities are available to colleges and universities to obtain nuclear training equipment, materials, and services; traineeships to strengthen their capability for graduate teaching and research; and financial support for faculty training institutes for instruction of high school or college faculty. Individuals for whom assistance is available include graduate students, research scientists, and science faculty members of high schools and colleges.

In contrast, the following are the titles of those programs from our listing of programs, the programs this one description above attempts to summarize:

No. 14.1: Nuclear Material and Services—Loans and Grants.

No. 14.2: Nuclear Training Equipment Grants.

No. 14.3: Faculty Training Institutes for High School Science Teachers.

No. 14.4: Faculty Training Institutes for College Science Teachers.

No. 14.5: AEC Special Fellowships in Nuclear Science and Engineering.

No. 14.6: Traineeships for Graduate Students in Nuclear Science and Engineering.

No. 14.7: AEC Special Fellowships in Industrial Medicine.

No. 14.8: AEC Special Fellowships in Health Physics.

No. 14.9: Laboratory Graduate Fellowships.

No. 14.10: AEC Postdoctoral Fellowships.

No. 14.14: AEC Summer College Intern Program.

Because the OEO program description summarizes all 11 operations, it is not able to provide specific information about any of them. Compare this with my catalog. One of these 11 programs, for instance, No. 14.7, "AEC Special Fellowships in Industrial Medicine," provides the following information under Eligibility:

Physicians with M.D. degree and one year of internship.

These nine words, so simple to provide, indicate something: who should apply, and almost more important, who should not apply. In contrast, the nine-line paragraph called "Who Can Apply and How to Apply" on page 433 of the OEO catalog does not give such specific indications of who is eligible and who is not eligible. I quote:

Colleges and universities may apply for (1) financial assistance to conduct Faculty Training Institutes (supported jointly by AEC and National Science Foundation), (2) grants on a 50-50 matching basis to procure nuclear training equipment, (3) loans of materials related to nuclear technology, or financial assistance to procure such materials and related services, and (4) financial support for traineeship programs. Graduate students who are U.S. citizens may apply for fellowships and traineeships for university study or thesis research at an AEC laboratory. High school and college science teachers may apply to a sponsoring university to participate in a Faculty Training Institute. College and university faculty and students may apply to AEC laboratories for research participation or summer student trainee appointments.

In addition to its general listing of who may be eligible for assistance instead of providing precise eligibility requirements, the new OEO catalog does not set forth the precise criteria agencies use for selecting the recipient. It is not enough to state, for example, that hospitals both public and private may apply for aid under a particular program. The hospital administrator needs to know what factors will be evaluated in deciding which institution is to receive assistance.

Compare, for example, the description in our listing of the program for "Industrial Development Loans," under the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce, with the description in the new OEO catalog. The new OEO catalog, at page 72, states that certain companies are eligible if they are performing certain activities. I quote:

Private businesses are eligible if they are starting new plants or expanding existing facilities in redevelopment areas and/or Economic Development Centers. Local development companies are eligible if they are constructing plants for lease to new or expanding firms that will create permanent new jobs. The project must not be a relocation and the funds must not be available from other sources on terms that would allow the applicant to carry out the project.

Our listing of programs—for program No. 6.51—gives this for Eligibility:

Businessmen, public agencies, Indian tribes and local development groups located in EDA-designated areas and that have been approved by an agency of the State or political subdivision directly concerned with economic development.

A listing of all EDA-designated areas is available at EDA Area Offices.

More important, our listing of programs, under Assistance Prerequisites lists the criteria which will be used in deciding whether to approve the loan application. I quote:

In addition to the conditions that an applicant must be located in an EDA-designated area and may not borrow to relocate his business, EDA requires that: A. The requested funds not be obtainable from other sources on terms that will permit the accomplishment of the project; B. The project not be in an industry experiencing a long-run overcapacity situation; C. There be reasonable assurance of loan repayment; D. The project be consistent with the EDA-approved Overall Economic Development Program (OEDP) for the area; and E. The project construction contractors pay prevailing wages to meet requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

EDA also requires that at least 15% of the total eligible project cost be supplied as equity capital or as a subordinated loan, repayable in no shorter period of time and at no faster amortization rate than the EDA loan.

At least 1/3 of the 15% is to be supplied by the State or a community or area organization. There is an exception for projects involving financial participation by Indian tribes.

EDA may also waive the "5% community requirement" in certain hardship cases and allow the applicant or other non-Federal sources to supply the funds directly to the project.

To stimulate investment by private lenders, EDA encourages the applicant to borrow as much as possible of the project cost, above the first 15%, from private lending institutions. Such loans may be repaid before the Federal loan and may be secured by a lien having precedence over the Federal lien, if EDA determines it necessary for the project.

Not only does this description indicate who is eligible, but it also provides the priorities under which the program is conducted which would favor particular applications or classes of applicants. Not only are the contestants indicated in this competition for funds; but also the groundrules are indicated which tell how the winner will be chosen.

Third. The catalog fails to supply Federal deadlines and processing times.

One of the most critical problems facing a local administrator is coordinating the requirements of the Federal Government with those of State and local authorities. Our catalog lists filing deadlines as well as the average time for processing an application. This information is important: there is no purpose in proceeding with plans to apply for Federal aid in a particular year if the deadline has already passed. There is no purpose in proceeding with plans to apply for Federal aid if the Federal and State or local time requirements cannot be meshed in a satisfactory manner. Despite the obvious desirability of this information, OEO makes no effort to incorporate it. This information can be supplied in many instances—our catalog makes specific provisions both for application deadlines and approval/disapproval time. While ques-

tionnaires for these sections of our catalog were not answered by the agencies in every instance, in many cases they were. Additional answers could be obtained if one were in a position—as Congress is—to require it.

Fourth. The catalog fails to set forth the obligations of the recipient.

A bulletin from the National Association of County Officials correctly points out that Federal money is not "free money" but often imposes heavy obligations on the recipient. Sometimes these obligations are merely reporting and evaluation requirements. Often they require matching funds. In some cases, Federal funds are only available for establishing the program; the local governmental unit is obligated to pick up the tab from there. In other cases the Federal program requires the creation of very expensive and detailed plans to become eligible for assistance. Unfortunately, one of the most serious deficiencies of the OEO catalog is its failure to make any effort to describe the obligations. This is purely public relations gimmickry. Tell the good but conceal the bad.

Unfortunately too, local officials often do not realize all the strings and obligations that go with Federal aid, because these facts are omitted from the catalog. A brief résumé of the program requirements could really help the local officials decide whether or not they have any interest in a particular program. For example, my catalog includes the following items of information: "Use Restrictions" on the aid received, "Assistance Prerequisites" necessary before one can receive program benefits and the "Post-Grant Requirements" for receiving any aid.

Fifth. No funding information is supplied.

The local planner needs basic funding data, such as authorization appropriations, regional allocations, and remaining funds available. Inadequate information as to funding only raises false hopes back home. Here again, the OEO catalog makes no effort to incorporate such vital information. The Midwest Research Institute study of Federal aid programs lists this type of information as among the most needed, but often the most difficult to obtain. This need has also been emphasized by Charles L. Schultze, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who stated that State and local governments "need fiscal information—how much money is available under both formula and direct project grants, and for what periods."

At this very moment, the Federal Information Exchange System is compiling money figures, but publishing them in different volumes, using a list of programs incompatible with the list in the new catalog. This is unfortunate. The catalog and the FIXS should describe the same programs, in providing the money figures that will, by law, go to the Governors and legislatures in the various States. The recently passed "Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968," Public Law 90-577, in section 201, requires the various Federal agencies, on request of a State Governor or legislature, to notify them "of the purpose and

amounts of actual grants-in-aid to the State or to its political subdivisions." It is inexcusable that such money figures are not provided in one coordinated information system. The catalog and the FIXS should describe the same programs, and provide the funding information being supplied under Public Law 90-577 to the States.

Sixth. Cross-referencing of programs.

One of the most significant pieces of information to be provided local authorities is information on programs involving the same area of activity. A college administrator should be able to turn to the catalog and readily find all programs providing scholarship aid. Otherwise he may fail to apply for the program best suited to his school. Yet, the OEO again fails to provide this information, except through an inadequate index.

There are several reasons for these deficiencies. First, OEO did not request the agencies to supply information as to related programs. Second, even if it had, many agencies do not have information on related programs. In developing our catalog we required the naming of related programs. As a quick survey of my catalog shows, many agencies failed to answer this inquiry. We were frankly told by some civil servants that this information was not available to them. Undoubtedly some program managers failed to respond as they feared disclosing to Congress needless duplication or overlapping.

The importance of this information is underscored by the June, 1968, issue of *American County Government*:

One question which often arises concerns what program among the four or five designed to meet the same need is most appropriate for a particular county. Sometimes federal field personnel are not informed completely about newer programs within their own areas of concern. Federal departments and agencies still have difficulty relating similar programs to each other or to the scores of different comprehensive and functional planning requirements. Each individual grant-in-aid program has its own set of special requirements, separate authorizations, and appropriations, cost-sharing ratios, allocation formulas, administrative arrangements, financial procedures, and reporting requirements.

In fact, the new OEO Catalog omits the elaborate indexes that were in its previous catalog, and the index that remains is a 16-page, generalized subject-matter index of little use, characterized by generality and lack of coherent precision. Assume for a moment that a potential applicant were interested in programs related to historic sites, monuments and documents. In the new OEO Catalog, he would look under "history" and find the following:

Historic building survey-----	358
Historic preservation-----	280, 358

He would turn to these pages, and find two programs, skimpily described at page 358. He would turn to page 280, and find a program entitled "New Communities," evidently not related to historic preservation. Finally, by searching, he would find on page 283 the program, "Historic Preservation Grants," not where the index indicated it should be. In looking through the index, I could not find the program, "National Historical Sources

Grants," at page 458, listed under any logical category.

I would compare this with the index in our listing of programs. This index, incidentally, was the creation of a part-time effort by one person, completed in only a few days. I do not claim it is perfect or complete, but it is better than the professional effort in the new OEO catalog. At page 20 in our listing is the following entry:

Historic sites and monuments: acquisition or restoration grants, 7.156.

Federal surplus real property, 19.3.

National Register of sites, buildings, 8.83; public lands, transfer, 8.81.

Historical societies, humanities grants, 24.5.

History: source documents, publication, 19.5.

This entry lists six possible programs. By turning to the programs themselves, and looking at the entry, "Related Programs," missing from the new OEO catalog, one would discover two more possible programs, No. 8.66, and No. 8.82.

The lack of adequate information on the part of the agencies themselves is demonstrated by the fact that a number of agencies purchased copies of my own catalog.

Seventh. No effort is made to maintain up-to-date information.

The new OEO catalog succeeds the 1967 catalog. Or, in other words, there is a 2-year gap in up-to-date information. BOB Circular A-89 envisions an annual catalog, in effect authorizing a 12-month gap in publishing timely information.

Obviously, with Congress almost continuously in session, new programs are added, old ones dropped, and others are not funded. Likewise, the agencies are constantly changing programs under broad congressional authorizations. In fact, the former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare advised us last year that one reason for not answering our questionnaire is that programs were in such a state of constant flux that most of the information would be obsolete by the time responses were prepared. If this is true, the situation is outrageous. No one can plan intelligently under these conditions. The agencies must provide some stability in programs if they are to permit systematic planning at the local level.

Such changes in programs, however, necessitate changes in the published information, which is impossible if the pages are glued in. If information is to be timely and thus useful, it should be published in a looseleaf form so that substitutions can be made when necessary. Of the major commercial program catalogs with which I am familiar, all of them are updated at least monthly, some even biweekly. All of the information does not change that fast, but much of the information, such as deadlines, current regulations, funding status, and application backlog, must be up to date, or it is worthless.

ADEQUATE UP TO DATE PROGRAM INFORMATION IS NOT IMPOSSIBLE

Adequate, up to date, comprehensive program information is not impossible. My staff produced it.

Last June 25, our study in the RECORD showed that it was not impossible to furnish adequate program information. One staff member and no more than one volunteer at any given time managed to produce our listing of over 1,050 operating Federal assistance programs. I do not claim our listing is complete or perfect. But I invite you to compare the examples of program descriptions from the new and old OEO catalogs with the equivalent descriptions from my listing of operating Federal assistance programs which appear at the end of this statement—see appendix A.

My staff produced our listing the way almost anyone would produce a catalog—by researching the matter, and then going directly to the program managers in the various agencies. The OEO catalog was produced in the same manner. But the end products are obviously quite different.

What then is needed is not so much manpower, but willpower—the desire to produce adequate, useful, up-to-date information and the willingness to make the hard, very detailed decisions involved in standardizing the term “program,” so that a single source can be produced with well-defined programs, lucid and complete program descriptions, and thorough cross-indexing.

It is precisely this desire to face and solve a most serious problem that the BOB task force lacked. The task force report is characterized by the failure to take any definite, positive positions, and, in effect, all it said was that OEO could continue to produce its catalog, as long as the other line agencies were not limited or restricted in producing theirs.

For example, the task force report suggested that the catalog be developed “through an evolutionary process, probably taking several years.” Since 1965, there have been at least two attempts by the Office of Economic Opportunity to create something approximating a Government-wide catalog, and at very significant cost to the taxpayer. The printing costs alone of these two catalogs exceeded \$400,000. It seems to me that there should be sufficient information available after Government-funded studies and years of catalog publishing, both by OEO and by commercial firms, to know what should be in the catalog without undergoing years of evolution. The initial printing costs for this third OEO catalog are estimated to be over \$170,000. That is expensive evolution. What the task force report was really saying was that no one was willing to make the decisions required in order to create a genuinely useful catalog.

As I indicated, my catalog also leaves much to be desired. We were, of course, only able to obtain that information the agencies were willing to supply. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare refused to cooperate last year; others, for example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, only supplied part of the information requested.

Yet my small group collected a catalog which met with high acceptance—at very little cost.

The following remark is typical of the

reaction to our listing. It came from a State office of community affairs:

Probably the most helpful tool for all who are involved in Federal assistance on a State or local level would be the publication of a catalog similar to that which Representative Roth has inserted in the *Congressional Record*. If this type of a catalog could become the “bible,” probably substantial savings could be made by ending much of the brochure and catalog production of the various Federal departments and agencies. Likewise, false or inaccurate information would easily be identified and could be corrected in the next edition. It would also identify those programs that are not operating in the manner described. I am sure such a catalog would be of assistance in considering legislation. The Roth catalog supplies sufficient general information as well as specific data to be of value both to the average civic-minded person as well as for those who are involved in government.

On the other hand, OEO catalogs have not been accepted as satisfactory. The following are examples of these observations:

SUPERFLUOUS PUBLIC RELATIONS LANGUAGE

A planner from Michigan:

There is too much superfluous public relations language, thereby allowing less space for facts.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS NOT GIVEN

From a department of community development:

The information needed most, availability of funds, is not really available except through direct contact.

WHO BENEFITS?

A big city planning commission:

Would be good if the catalog included the amount of appropriation and what magnitude of assistance may be available to individual, municipality, state, etc.

BACKLOG INFORMATION

A State department of planning and development:

Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs could be more specific regarding requirements, benefits, and funding—no information on applications backlog, etc.

REQUIREMENTS OF APPLICANTS

A city-county planning board:

They lack detail in descriptions of each program and the qualifications necessary for each community to meet in acquiring aid or assistance.

WHO TO CONTACT

A State office of planning coordination:

Finding individuals who will assume some responsibility in Washington is usually quite difficult.

TOO GENERAL, VAGUE, HENCE MISLEADING

A State office of community affairs:

Much of the balance of catalogs and brochures put out by Federal agencies are virtually useless if not damaging, as they frequently describe programs which are not sufficiently funded or all the funds are committed, or the program by regulation is not operative in your area . . . For the most part these brochures and problem-oriented catalogs approach the level of propaganda.

A private planning consultant in Rhode Island:

Too general in information content. This is true for all Federal publications with the exception of program handbooks and man-

uals. Actual operating examples are always lacking.

A regional commission:

The writeups could be more specific and meaningful. They were probably written by each agency under a general outline that does not probe for consistent facts.

A local consultant in Georgia:

Limited in content. It is difficult to find specific programs, not specific enough about available benefits, not detailed enough in scope.

Chairman of a college urban studies program:

No “nitty gritty” aids to those of us unable to spend time in “grantsmanship” Washington run-arounds.

A private company:

Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs and the Vice President's *Handbook* are too vague in specific eligibility requirements and application procedures to be of much help. They sit in my bookcase and are little used.

A university cooperative extension Service:

When you start with a community problem, research the available programs (catalogs) and select three or four that seem to fit the needs, you nearly always end up with failure. I have yet to see the catalog description of a program that will meet the needs of the communities of our state.

INACCURATE DESCRIPTIONS

A private planning consultant in Pennsylvania:

They do not go into as great detail as private services and are somewhat inaccurate in program description.

INCONSISTENT FORMAT

A State office of community affairs:

The OEO Catalog has many errors, lacks necessary information and particularly is lacking in consistency under the section titled “Authorizing Legislation.”

NOT INCLUSIVE

A State department of public instruction:

Federal government catalogs are too disjointed. The two recent catalogs (OEO Catalog and the Vice President's *Handbook*) were started in the right direction but are still not inclusive enough. There are just too many communication gaps when information services are so decentralized.

INADEQUATE INDEX, NOT CURRENT

A teachers college:

Too little too late, not adequately indexed, not sufficiently current, good only for general leads.

A city legal department:

Both of the named catalogs (OEO Catalog and the Vice President's *Handbook*) are not very useful because they do not have fiscal data, nor are up-to-date, nor cross-referenced.

Professional “grantsman in residence,” Washington, D.C.:

The OEO Catalog is so poorly indexed as to be almost unusable. The Vice President's *Handbook* is almost as “big picture” in its approach as the *Government Organization Manual*. Most agency catalogues are “clue sheets” rather than working guidelines for someone who wants to implement a program.

And all of this is true for the new OEO catalog as well. As with good public relations documents, the new OEO catalog tantalizes the reader, and then ob-

scures the unpleasant information. It very generally indicates who might apply, but does not go into detail. Precisely what kinds of services or benefits one can receive are not made clear, and precisely who can apply is generally not given.

Even more significantly, the unpleasant aspects are not given. Prerequisites for obtaining benefits are not given. The duties required of an applicant after receiving benefits are not given. If the beneficiary receives some sort of aid, the restrictions on its use, if any, are not given.

In short, all the strings and obligations that go with Federal aid, and which are so critical for the recipient to know in advance, are in no way indicated.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I repeat my call for action, and repeat my call for passage of the Program Information Act, H.R. 338. Both the House and Senate Government Operations Committees have asked for reports on the measure; those reports are now in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget. Every day lost in enacting this legislation means a day lost helping those in greatest need. There is no reason for delaying this first simple, necessary step to improve Federal aid. The enactment of the Program Information Act will accomplish the following benefits:

First. It will create a single, Governmentwide catalog of programs—one, complete, reliable, up-to-date source—helping all potential program beneficiaries, not just the privileged few.

Second. It will eliminate other catalogs, saving money. BOB Circular A-89 still permits duplicative effort; this should stop.

Third. It will ease the current burdens on program officers, who now answer endless inquiries for information that could be supplied by a complete, well-disseminated, up-to-date catalog.

Fourth. It will help Federal administrators, as well as Congressmen, understand full scope and complete structure of all related Federal assistance programs.

Fifth. It will place the catalog responsibility under the jurisdiction of a central agency having the authority to gather such data. Since the agency will not operate any of the programs involved, more uniform information and lack of administrative bias will be assured.

Sixth. It will set minimum standards for those items of program information to be provided on a Government-wide basis, and will provide a uniform definition of the term "program," counteracting previous disinterested and sluggish attempts at coordinating, uniformity, and proper indexing.

Seventh. It will call for frequent updating of information, insuring reliability.

Eighth. It will call for simplification and consolidation of all the various application forms and program guidelines a potential beneficiary would use to benefit from each Federal assistance program, especially on a cross-agency basis. The Bureau of the Budget has that statutory authority now; it should exercise it.

Ninth. It will help in the creation of a

single, central information system, by placing the catalog effort and FPKS in the same office. The list of programs used in each of these should be coordinated and made uniform. Information provided as a result of section 201 of the "Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968," Public Law 90-577 should be provided as well in this same central information system.

The problem is a serious one. We need more complete and timely information than we are getting. The solution is fairly straightforward. Do away with the publications that are not pulling their own weight and in their place put together a single publication that will do the job. There is no sense in putting together a single publication that will simply carry forward the old mistakes. The new Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance regrettably does just this. We, the Congress, should keep it from happening again.

APPENDIX A

[From the new January 1969 catalog]

Program Title: Highway Beautification.

Nature and Purpose of Program: This program provides financial assistance to State highway departments for the purpose of beautifying highways and communities by: Controlling outdoor advertising signs, billboards, and displays; controlling the establishment, use, and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to highways; landscaping and otherwise enhancing the scenery along Federal-aid highways, and by other means.

The Federal share of costs incurred by control of outdoor advertising and junkyards is generally 75 percent. An amount equivalent to 3 percent of funds apportioned to a State highway department for Federal-aid highways is allocated to that department for landscaping the roadside development, including acquisition and development of publicly-owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities necessary to accommodate the traveling public. Matching State funds are not required.

Who can Apply and How to Apply: Any State highway department may enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Transportation.

For Information Contact: Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20591; or Regional or State offices of the Bureau of Public Roads; or State highway departments.

Printed Information Available: *Public Participation in Highway Beautification; Highways to Beauty, 1966*—\$20. Available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Authorizing Legislation: 23 U.S.C. 131, 136, and 319.

Administering Agency: Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.

[From June 1967 OEO Catalog of Federal Assistance Programs]

Program title: Highway Beautification.

Nature and Purpose of Program: This program provides financial assistance to state highway departments for the purpose of beautifying highways and communities by: controlling outdoor advertising signs, billboards, and displays; controlling the establishment, use, and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to highways; landscaping and otherwise enhancing the scenery along Federal-aid highways, and by other means.

The Federal share of costs incurred by control of outdoor advertising and junk-

yards is generally 75 percent. An amount equivalent to 3 percent of funds apportioned to a state highway department for Federal-aid highways is allocated to that department for landscaping and roadside development, including acquisition and development of publicly-owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities necessary to accommodate the traveling public. Matching state funds are not required.

Who Can Apply: Any state highway department may enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Transportation.

For Information Contact: Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20533; or Regional or state offices of the Bureau of Public Roads; or State highway departments.

Printed Information Available: *Public Participation in Highway Beautification Highways to Beauty, 1966* (20c). Available from Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Authorizing Legislation: Highway Beautification Act of 1965; P.L. 89-285; 79 Stat 1028; Sections 131, 136 and 319, Title 23, USC as amended by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1966, P.L. 89-574; 80 Stat 766.

Administering Agency: U.S. Department of Transportation.

ROTH: No. 11.6—HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION—LANDSCAPING AND SCENIC ENHANCEMENT

Authorizing Statute: Title III of Public Law 89-285 or Section 319(b) of United States Code 23—Landscaping and scenic enhancement.

Administrator: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Public Roads.

Nature of Program: Federal-aid is available to a State for landscape and roadside development within the highway right-of-way of the Federal-aid systems and for acquisition of interests in and improvements of strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to such highways, including acquisition and development of publicly owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities within or adjacent to the highway right-of-way reasonably necessary to accommodate the traveling public, without being matched by the State.

Eligibility: Payment directly to State. They may then reimburse county, city or other local government if required by State law or agreement.

Available Assistance: Progress and final payments in cash.

Funding Use Restrictions: Planning, survey, appraisal, construction.

Appropriations Sought: Fiscal year 1969—\$70,000,000.

Past Appropriations: Fiscal Year 1968—\$0; Fiscal Year 1967—\$64,115,055; Fiscal Year 1966—\$60,000,000.

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968—\$0; FY 1967—\$64,115,055; FY 1966—\$57,301,703.

Average Assistance: Landscape—\$42,000/Proj.; Scenic Easement—\$32,400; Rest Area—\$47,300/Proj.

Post-Grant Requirements: Normal Federal-aid procedures are followed; review and approval of State's program, plans, inspection of construction, accounts audited, etc.

Washington Contact: Mr. Fred S. Farr, Highway Beautification Coordinator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1717 H. Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20591. Telephone number: 967-3437 (202).

Local Contact: State Highway Commissioner of State Highway Director in Capital City of each State.

Application Deadlines: None—except June 30 of each fiscal year for which funds are available.

Approval/Disapproval Time: Normally less than one week.

Related Programs: Section 319(a) of this same law permits State to request Federal-aid for work within highway right-of-way limits under normal highway program at corresponding pro-rata share of cost.

ROTH: No. 11.7—HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION—CONTROL OF JUNKYARDS

Authorizing Statute: Title II of Public Law 89-285—Section 136 United States Code—Control of Junkyards.

Administrator: U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Public Roads.

Nature of Program: The Congress hereby finds and declares that the establishment and use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty.

Eligibility: State directly benefits to extent of 75 percent of cost. Final beneficiary is owner of junkyard in existence at time of passage of Act.

Available Assistance: To State—cash; Through State, junkyard owner has premises adjacent to Interstate or Federal-aid primary system screened, relocated, removed or otherwise disposed of at no cost to him.

Funding Use Restrictions: Survey, appraisal, screening or relocation of junkyard. Appropriations Sought: FY 1969—\$10,000,000.

Past Appropriations: Fiscal year 1968—\$0; Fiscal year 1967—\$15,000,000; Fiscal year 1966—\$3,000,000.

Obligations Incurred: Fiscal year 1968—\$0; Fiscal year 1967—\$6,863,683; Fiscal year 1966—\$2,189,785.

Average Assistance: Screening \$3,875 Junkyard; Removal, Relocation \$7,330 Junkyard.

Assistance Prerequisites: Junkyard must be located within 1,000 feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way of the Interstate and Federal-aid primary system, visible from the traveled way of the system and outside of zoned industrial areas or unzoned areas of similar character.

Post-Grant Requirements: Normal Public Roads Federal-aid procedures apply—review of design, inspection of construction or removal, inspection to insure continued maintenance.

Washington Contact: Mr. Fred S. Farr, Highway Beautification Coordinator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20591. Telephone number: 967-3437.

Local Contact: State Highway Commissioner or Highway Director in Capitol City of the State.

Application Deadlines: Normally, end of each fiscal year for which funds are available. Presently, June 30, 1967.

Approval/Disapproval Time: Average elapsed time usually less than one week.

Related Programs: None other by this agency.

ROTH: No. 11.8—HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION—CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Authorizing Statute: Title I of Public Law 89-285 or Section 319(b) of United States Code 23—Control of Outdoor Advertising.

Administrator: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Bureau of Public Roads.

Nature of Program: Title I of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides for control of outdoor advertising in areas adjacent to the Interstate and Federal-aid primary system. Signs must be limited to commercial and industrial zones and areas and comply with standards to be set by agreement between the individual State and the Secretary. Exempt from control are on-premise signs.

Objectives of the program are protection of the public investment in such highways, promotion of the safety and recreational value of public travel, and the preservation of natural beauty.

Eligibility: Payment directly to State. They may then reimburse the owner of a sign which has been removed, or the owner of the property on which it was located.

Available Assistance: Progress and final payments in cash.

Funding Use Restrictions: Removal of non-conforming signs, and related activities.

Appropriation Sought: Fiscal Year 1969—\$5,000,000.

Past Appropriations: FY 1968—\$0; FY 1967—\$78,500,000 (combined with junkyards and landscaping); FY 1966—\$10,000,000 (combined with control of junkyards).

Obligations Incurred: FY 1968—\$0; FY 1967—\$347,739; FY 1966—\$2,169,712.

Average Assistance: Since the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides that non-conforming signs do not have to be removed until July 1, 1970, few signs have been removed to date. For this reason we have little experience on which to base a determination of average costs.

Post-Grant Requirements: Normal Federal-aid procedures are followed; review and approval of State's program, plans, inspection of construction, accounts audited, etc.

Washington Contact: Mr. Fred S. Farr, Highway Beautification Coordinator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20591; Telephone 967-3437.

Local Contact: State Highway Commissioner or State Highway Director in Capitol City of each State.

Application Deadlines: None—except June 30 of each fiscal year for which funds are available.

Approval/Disapproval Time: Normally less than one week.

Related Programs: Control of junkyards and landscaping.

REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL SUPPORTS BILL TO REQUIRE PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the efforts of the National Capital Housing Authority, headed by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to purchase the Regency House in Washington, D.C., and I urge speedy and favorable action by the Congress on the bill I am introducing today to require prior approval by Congress of transactions between the National Capital Housing Authority and property owners in the District of Columbia.

As our colleagues know, the Regency House is a luxury apartment building, complete with swimming pool and underground garage, which the National Capital Housing Authority is attempting to purchase for public housing. The explanation offered for this purchase by NCHA is that Regency House will provide housing for elderly poor. In reality, however, this purchase represents a social-science experiment designed to integrate poor people into high- or moderate-income areas. If it is a practical and financially sound experiment, it should not suffer from close examination.

First, Mr. Speaker, if this purchase is a prudent venture, then the District of Columbia government and the Federal Government should have no fear of tax losses in taking a \$2,475,000 piece of private property from the tax rolls and converting it into a nontaxable piece of public property. The fact of the matter is, the District of Columbia government is woefully short of adequate tax revenues. This is especially borne out by the cries to the press now emanating from the District of Columbia government for a commuter tax on citizens of other States to meet its expenses. Much of this demand for funds could be met if the District of Columbia government would practice economy in its fiscal affairs and would stop removing valuable pieces of property like Regency House from its tax base.

Just as ridiculous is the statement by the executive director of the authority, Mr. Edward Arnov, on March 6, 1969, in defending the removal of Regency House from the tax rolls. He said:

The Authority does not pay full property taxes for any of the developments it owns. It is only the Federal Agency that makes a payment in lieu of taxes to the District of Columbia. This payment amounts to 1/4 to 1/5 of full city property taxes.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see Mr. Arnov's reasoning. I know the taxpayers of Virginia and Maryland do not share this sort of reasoning. The citizens of Virginia and Maryland want neither a commuter tax nor higher Federal taxes to make a payment in lieu of taxes. I am also afraid Mr. Arnov, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and their supporters at the Department of Housing and Urban Development have failed to recognize other revenue losses that result from a policy of moving out taxpayers from private high-rental housing to accommodate nontaxpayers who pay little or no rent. The impact will be felt further when the Washington City Revenue Division adds up its losses in income, sales, license, gasoline, and other taxes from those who will be dislocated by conversion of the Regency House, and other projects like it, to public housing. The fact that most all of these taxes will be lost to the city is borne out by statements to me that the people to be dislocated intend to move as far away from Washington as it is possible to go.

Mr. Speaker, it just takes common-sense to see the full impact of the loss in tax revenue, income, and citizens to the Nation's Capital as a result of this policy. Apparently our social science experts cannot appreciate these losses, or perhaps they just do not care about what happens to the Federal City as a result of testing their own pet theories.

I believe we all can agree, Mr. Speaker, that the National Capital Housing Authority should utilize sound financial practices in the conduct of its business, and should be capable of making sound decisions involving the housing of the low-income and elderly poor in the District of Columbia. However, information available to me is that the Authority is \$24 million in the red and that its financial records are in such a state of confusion that the General Accounting Of-

fice has trouble understanding them. Their failure to operate the Authority on a financially proper basis lays all the operations of the Authority open to suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia government and the National Capital Housing Authority should have adequate long-range and annual plans for housing low-income families as well as elderly poor in our Nation's Capital. I do not believe there is a comprehensive and coordinated plan of this nature. Most communities, cities, and States prepare and submit plans of this nature on a regular basis. But not the District of Columbia government. They just spring surprises on everyone. The poor do not know what is planned for them in the way of housing; the Congress does not know; and neither does the city council. No wonder things have become such a mess in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the authority for regulations on housing criteria; cost of construction or acquisition of housing; rules on tax revenue loss that can be sustained; and maximum and minimum features required in low-cost housing. I meet with confused answers from the authority. Actually, the authority has no specific regulations. Instead it relies on HUD circulars, experience or "rule of thumb." The people and Congress should demand that the city government produce workable, practicable regulations, not guesses.

Another matter of importance, Mr. Speaker, is that the authority should as a first priority create new housing, not purchase existing housing. Its program to construct low-cost, low-income housing is woefully inadequate to meet the needs stated by the community. Some members of the community have been hollering for 10 years about the shortage of public housing for the poor, destitute people of the Nation's Capital. But, Mr. Speaker, while the authority's stated aim a few years ago was to construct 500 to 1,000 units per year, their present program has only constructed the following low-income housing since 1964:

Housing units built and occupied	
1964	234
1965	441
1966	230
1967	0
1968	753
1969 (planned)	87
6-year total	1,745

Only as late as day before yesterday, the executive director of the authority, Mr. Arnov, stated before the press that there is a critical immediate need for 5,000 housing units for the poor and needy in this city.

The Housing Authority and the Redevelopment Land Agency have the land on which to construct housing. But they use the excuse that it is cheaper to buy luxury housing than build new housing for low-income citizens. This policy is just making more so-called ghettos out of existing housing. Frankly, I think the poor people of this city are being hoodwinked by these social scientists and hack politicians in charge of public hous-

ing. The authority and the Commissioners hold out a few air-conditioned apartments, with swimming pools for the aged and a 200-car garage for people who are supposedly too poor to buy a car or too old to drive, as a big social-economic advancement. Meanwhile, millions of dollars are going into a few plush projects and nothing but promises and studies are being made to satisfy the real housing requirements of the large families who really need it. This policy is hurting the great majority of people who are poor and without adequate housing. Congress did not appropriate funds for low-income housing to be wasted in this manner. The intent of Congress was to build low-income housing for the needy.

As an excuse for not building new housing for the needy on land already set aside for this purpose, the authority, the Commissioners, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development hide behind a HUD regulation wherein HUD has interpreted, from the fringes of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that the law requires the District of Columbia government to buy or build low-income housing for minority races in non-minority-impacted areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the law and this action on the part of HUD does not build public housing. The policy is self-defeating and wasteful of tax dollars.

I might add that I have taken this matter up with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and asked him to modify his regulation so that we can build some housing for the poor people who need it. However, I am not supported in this action, to my knowledge, by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia. Apparently he is not interested too much in straightening out this housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, the National Capital Housing Authority, as it is currently organized and operated under the District of Columbia Code, needs a drastic overhaul by Congress.

To correct these many problems I am introducing a bill today to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, which established public housing in the Federal City, to require certain prior approval of the activities of the National Capital Housing Authority. My bill will also require the Authority to prepare an annual comprehensive plan describing each of its projects and submit this plan through the District of Columbia government and the President to the Congress. This bill will also require the authority to prepare regulations for eligibility for housing, specific requirements for special features, rules as to costs per square foot for such housing, and tax losses permitted in acquisition of housing. It will also require the authority to give priority to construction of housing for low-income families on real property owned by the government of the District of Columbia or its agencies. My bill will state that the primary purpose of the act is to promote decent housing, not to achieve arbitrary racial, social, or economic balance. Finally, the bill will bring the authority under adequate fiscal controls.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate action on my bill.

MASS TRANSPORTATION MUST PROCEED IMMEDIATELY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, spokesmen for the District of Columbia government are coming to the Capitol this week for presentation of their fiscal year 1970 dollar requirements for the District of Columbia operations. I have had a considerable interest in providing every assistance to strengthen the District government, including ample Federal contribution.

In line with this I am deeply disturbed at the very serious financial losses to the District of Columbia resulting from the failure of the city administration to build its transportation system. In the last day there has been some encouragement reaching us through press accounts reporting the Deputy Mayor's indication to the Senate Appropriation Subcommittee that the District freeway construction may soon be underway. Press observers report this could very well signal the critical go ahead on transit funds for the basic rapid transit system.

The combined losses of the freeway and transit delays to the citizens come to over \$150 million per year. As I reminded my colleagues last July, every day of postponement in initiating construction of our mass transit system alone, because of escalated construction costs of labor, material and land acquisition is costing us \$250,000 daily. As time passes and the costs from Maryland and Virginia freeways are included this figure could well double. Such losses are unconscionable.

These effects fall upon citizens and taxpayers everywhere, here and throughout the Nation. It is also a serious regional problem and one in which the city administration appears not to have fully considered the regional effects. This was emphasized recently in a letter from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Washington Metropolitan Council of Government's Transportation Planning Board, pointing to the failure of the District to meet the transportation planning requirements for regional planning. These requirements call for consultation with other regional jurisdictions before adoption of a highway plan.

The Congress, as well as all of the citizens of the National Capital region, have a great interest in this matter, and Congress must maintain its vigilance in these vital affairs.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION SAFETY STANDARDS ASSISTANCE ACT

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Federal Construction Safety Standards Assistance Act of 1969. This legislation would establish a Con-

struction Safety Standards Board in the Department of Labor which would develop minimum safety standards for the construction industry and provide financial assistance to the States for the purpose of carrying out State construction safety standards programs.

The purpose of this act is to promote the health and safety of all construction workers in the United States. This responsibility would be charged to a Construction Safety Standards Board in the Department of Labor. After making necessary investigations and studies, the Board would formulate a set of minimum safety standards applicable to the construction industry. These standards would be designed to assure safe working conditions for employees at construction sites within any State.

The Board would also be responsible for reviewing and approving State programs relating to the administration and enforcement of these standards and for paying half the cost of the State programs. Any State wishing to participate in this grant program would submit its plan to the Board through an appropriate State agency along with an assurance of compliance and adequate provisions for administration and enforcement. Upon approval, the Board would agree to pay half the cost of the State program, not in excess of \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year.

The need for such a program is reflected in the grim statistics: in 1967, 20 percent of the 14,200 industrial fatalities and 11 percent of the disabling industries were in the construction industry. It is obvious that greater safety protection must be afforded all those engaged in construction work.

One of the advantages of this plan is that it would extend this protection to all construction workers, not just those engaged in Federal contract work. It is estimated that some 2 million workers are not involved in federally related construction work. Are their lives any less important than those of men working under Federal contracts? Is there any reason for giving them less safety protection than those working on Federal projects? It seems to me there is no justification whatsoever for denying these 2 million workers the protection which some would extend only to those who just happen to be working under a Federal contract. We must strive for comprehensive and uniform safety standards to cover all construction workers.

A second advantage of this plan is that it places the major administrative and enforcement responsibilities with the States which are in the best position to implement these standards at construction sites within their boundaries. As such, the plan is both workable and consistent with the principles of federalism. It recognizes the need and advisability of Federal-State cooperation in this area. On the one hand, the National Board is responsible for setting the standards, approving State plans, and footing half the bill for State programs. On the other hand, the State is responsible for seeing that these standards are properly administered and enforced.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interest of construction safety that this measure

be enacted and I ask the support of my colleagues in securing its passage.

STUDENT UNREST

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for some time many of us have shared a concern over the student unrest on our campuses. Disorder and disruption threaten to rip the fabric binding our institutions of higher education. The disturbances have been too widespread, too deeply rooted, and far too frequent for us to ignore. Despite our concern, the number of incidents grows with each passing day. This morning's paper reminds us that students seized buildings at George Washington University and American University. A boycott at Howard University's School of Social Work continues. Cornell remains in a state of chaos. City College of New York was closed again today in light of nonnegotiable demands presented by students.

As a reflection of the concern of the Congress and our country, the Special Subcommittee on Education has been holding hearings on the problems of student unrest. It has been our hope that these hearings might shed some light on the problems confronting our institutions of higher education. Out of the hearings, and from the disturbances of the past year, one lesson is vividly clear to me: We must improve communication and our capacity to accommodate competing claims if we are to resolve campus disputes. And we must find a way to resolve such disputes if our institutions of higher education are to survive.

It is in the hope of improving communication and facilitating the accommodation of competing claims that I introduce today a bill to establish a Federal Higher Education Mediation Service. This Service, modeled on the National Labor Relations Board of the 1930's, would make a Federal mediator available to assist in the resolution of campus disputes. I introduce this bill for discussion, fully cognizant of its controversial character. But the current chaos has indicated to me an underlying evolution toward a system in which students would play a role. The problem is to reduce violence and the attendant property destruction, personal injury and campus disruption and at the same time facilitate the evolution.

I think it should be made abundantly clear that I do not encourage Federal interference in the internal policies of our institutions of higher education. Nevertheless the Federal Government has long had a very real and substantial interest in the welfare and functioning of its educational institutions. Recent years have witnessed a tremendous expansion of Federal support to universities, in academic facilities and dormitory construction, in teacher training, in research grants, and in student financial assistance. Federal funds going to higher education have more than doubled in 4 years and are now on the order of \$4 billion.

Out of the current turmoil have come cries of a breakdown in communication, a lack of understanding, and references to a generation gap between faculty and students and administrators and students. A mediation service might assist in bridging that gap and keeping the line of communication open. This is essential, grievances, left unattended, fester without remedy and now more frequently find a voice in destruction and disruption, rebellion and riot. I believe the need is apparent for extrajudicial techniques to resolve certain kinds of conflict situations.

Mediation is a method uniquely designed to aid in the resolution of group differences that are not conducive to solution through the dictates of law. While a law can set guidelines, it cannot resolve claims where the claims of all parties are legal and interests are legitimate. In such circumstances, resolution can only be acceptably achieved through accommodation.

A mediator serves many important functions in this process of accommodation. He facilitates communication between the parties, transmits messages from one party to another, seeks understanding of both positions, and generally keeps the proceedings functioning. Parties to the dispute quite understandably see the dispute from their own point of view. Robert Burns once asked for the gift of seeing ourselves as others see us. This insight would be particularly useful in the settling of disputes. But another gift would also be useful in this process. It is the gift to see others as they see themselves. A mediator facilitates this mutual understanding.

Such a formal grievance procedure will give individuals a stated method of voicing complaints, it provides a method for getting the affected parties together in a calm, problem-solving atmosphere. In the process, the issues are clarified, cooled down, meaningful dialog is made possible, and disputants realize it is not necessary to create a crisis confrontation to have their viewpoint heard.

Such a service could provide students, faculty, and administrators with the opportunity to defuse explosive situations, to occasionally face parties with the tempering question, "What would you do about it if you were in my place?" and to demonstrate beyond any possible doubt that problems can be discussed, debated, and dealt with in nonviolent fashion.

The use of the Service this bill would establish would be completely optional and would be used only when settlement cannot otherwise be obtained. Despite its optional feature, I believe the very existence would tend to moderate the disputes on campus. All parties would know that others could make application for the services of a mediator. In order to forestall such applications, the universities would be motivated to institute internal procedures so as to be informed of student and faculty concerns and to deal with them. The faculty and student bodies, both atomistic collections of individuals not readily disposed to let anyone speak for them, would be led into a minimal organization. That very organization should tend to separate the revolutionary minority from the great majority

who accept the system but who do have honest grievances. If the majority feel their grievances can be met within the system, they will not be inclined to follow the revolutionaries.

The bill which I am introducing recognizes students, teachers, and administrators as parties at interest. At the request of any of these parties or upon its own motion, the Mediation Service may proffer its services. The faculty will be represented by any officially designated bargaining agent or body or application may be made by petition of 25 percent or more of the faculty. Students will be represented by the elected student government or by petition signed by 20 percent of the enrolled students.

Our institutions of higher education are far too important to society for society to stand by idly while they fall victim to the disruptive tactics of a minority of students and faculty. The future of society depends on our educational institutions. It is essential that our institutions be permitted to perform their function in an atmosphere of academic inquiry to the satisfaction of all parties involved in the learning process. It is for this reason that I offer this bill for this purpose of discussion. It is my hope that this discussion will aid in the resolution of the difficulties presently confronting higher education and in achieving a greater understanding of the interests and problems involved.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the budget cutters in the Department of Labor have done it again. And again the victims are the youths of New York City, as well as the rest of the Nation.

Two weeks ago some 1,800 New York City youths enrolled in Job Corps centers had their hopes dashed by the administration's decision to close 59 of the 113 Job Corps centers.

Last week the Department of Labor announced that it would provide funds for less than 50 percent of the Neighborhood Youth Corps jobs requested by New York City. Although the city requested \$27.2 million for summer Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, the Department of Labor has allocated only \$10.7 million. There will be only 23,900 summer jobs instead of 50,000 as requested. Some 25,000 out-of-school teenagers will have no summer employment. The result will be that the pressures and tensions which have beset New York City during the past several summers will be further aggravated.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps program has in the past provided a variety of job opportunities in Government and private industry, ranging from office work to community organizing, with some students serving as tutors and others as recreational aides. During past summers these jobs have done much to alleviate pressures unleashed by the high

number of ghetto youth desperately in need of employment. Indeed, as the tensions and pressures in our major urban areas mount, the Federal Government is cutting back its support of the very programs which are needed most to alleviate those pressures. The Labor Department has said that the figure of \$10,775,000 is "a final one."

Last year the Johnson administration asked for a \$75 million supplemental appropriation for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Congress finally appropriated \$15 million—too little, but at least New York City received an additional grant of approximately \$1.5 million.

This year the Nixon administration is not even asking for a supplemental appropriation. A spokesman for the Secretary of Labor was quoted in the New York Times of April 20 as saying that he saw "no signs of a supplemental appropriation from Congress."

I call upon the administration to ask for a supplemental appropriation, and to fight for it, if present appropriations are insufficient to meet the compelling needs of our youth for summer jobs.

Early in this session of Congress, I introduced a supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 2972) for the Economic Opportunity Act. It would provide \$232 million, bringing the fiscal year 1969 appropriation to the full authorization.

I urge the Appropriations Committee to bring this bill to the floor. Congress must recognize its responsibility to provide funds urgently needed for this and other related Federal projects in order that these programs can achieve their maximum potential effectiveness. If Congress appropriates additional funds, then the administration will have no excuse for failing to provide adequate support to critical summer employment programs such as the one now threatened in New York City.

In order to alleviate tensions this summer and to create additional economic opportunities for its poorer citizens, New York City this year sought a Neighborhood Youth Corps allocation of \$27.2 million to provide jobs for 50,000 teenagers for 9 weeks of the summer. With the \$10.7 million it has received from the Federal Government the city will now be able to provide only 23,900 jobs—less than half those sought by the Human Resources Administration. These jobs are for 10 weeks of employment, and average 26 hours per week. This contrasts with the 1968 summer program, which employed some 46,000 youths at its peak and averaged about 40,000 per week during the 9 weeks of its operation.

It is also dismaying that New York City has not allocated any of its own funds for the summer program. In the summer of 1968 the city contributed \$5 million which was added to the \$11.7 million in Federal funds for the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

However, the Federal Government must recognize that severe budgetary strains are making it increasingly difficult for urban governments to meet all of their multiple needs, and that Federal support must, as a consequence, be dramatically increased if even the most basic needs of our urban centers are to be met.

In view of the tight squeeze on both local and State funds in New York this year, it is unthinkable that the Department of Labor should have reduced its support from last year. If summer disorders are to be prevented and, fundamentally, a start made to meet the needs of the cities, it is imperative that the Department of Labor reconsider its decision and that it provide New York and other cities with the necessary funds to expand—not contract—summer employment opportunities for urban youth.

Over a year ago the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders made it clear that inadequate employment opportunities in the major urban areas of our country constitute a primary cause of the disorders which have begun to take on the character of an annual event in our cities. Subsequent investigations, including last month's report by the National Urban Coalition, on the lack of progress since the issuance of the Kerner Commission report confirm that unemployment remains a critical cause of urban tensions.

If Congress now fails to heed that advice, it should at least understand that pious condemnations of lawlessness and rioting will not conceal the fundamental fact that it is Congress itself, as well as the executive branch, which must bear responsibility for the steady deterioration of our urban communities. For self-righteous calls for law and order will continue to be a bankrupt substitute for a national policy that is truly committed to the eradication of the causes of poverty and despair in our society.

PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE WAR ON ORGANIZED CRIME

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has committed his administration to a concerted and positive effort to reduce, and hopefully eliminate, the influence of organized crime in this country. His proposals are sound and deserve the wholehearted support of every American.

Much of the present concern with crime focuses superficially on disorders in our cities. Time and again we are inundated with reams of statistics about the increase of crime on our streets, about the tremendous cost to the Nation in lives and resources incurred by the ever-rising rate of criminal activity. But, we have frequently been guilty of emotionally discussing the symptoms of the problem rather than conducting rational inquiries into the causes of crime.

All too often we have ignored the basic resource which permits this situation to continue; all too often we have failed to make the connection between the increasing crime rate, and the most pervasive aspect of crime in this country—organized crime. Without the vast resources of the Cosa Nostra "families," without their willingness to exploit human misery for profit, without the complicity of millions of citizens, organized

crime could not drain from \$20 to \$50 billion a year from our economy.

I am indeed heartened by the President's message of yesterday and his package of proposals for attacking this problem. I think the time has long since passed when we could tolerate the evil and the human deprivation which organized crime encourages. I think the time has come when we can no longer permit the resources of this great Nation to be funneled into the pockets of a handful of societal parasites. We can no longer quietly acquiesce in the corruption of public officials, in the destruction and infiltration of legitimate businesses, in the unwitting duplicity of citizens who place illegal bets, in the exploitation of our urban poor by individuals who deal in human misery.

The President and his advisers have put together a legislative and administrative package which is aimed at eliminating the most dangerous and pervasive aspect of crime in this country. They are to be commended for their efforts and given every measure of support necessary to insure that their endeavor is a successful one.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS FACING OUR CITIES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the social problems facing our cities are immense. It is unnecessary for me to reiterate the statistics on costs of urban needs in the fields of housing, education, mass transportation, and others. The needs are staggering.

The Nixon administration has been assessing our national needs, the resources available, and the most effective means of channeling these resources toward the solution of these problems. President Nixon has indicated he believes that private enterprise can and must play a much larger role in creating job opportunities for underskilled persons and the hard-core unemployed. He has suggested tax credits as an incentive to bring the managerial skills of private entrepreneurs to work on these social problems. Whether the Congress will approve this approach will be determined in the coming months.

The executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, speaking before the Detroit Economic Club and the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce on March 17, laid out the challenge to business to enter the social arena and lend the problem-solving capacity of private enterprise to government. Mr. Arch N. Booth referred to the massive cooperative effort put forth by American business to put man into orbit around the moon. He suggests that the same spectacular results could be obtained in the solution of urban problems if we systematically committed the necessary human and natural resources to this effort.

Another very significant point made by Mr. Booth was a realization that the solution of our urban problems is impor-

tant to stockholders, that involvement of business in community problems is a sound long-term investment for business.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other thought-provoking suggestions in this speech and I commend it to my colleagues' reading:

MEN TO MATCH THE MOUNTAINS—1969

(By Arch N. Booth)

Everyone, sooner or later, develops his own personal philosophy.

And everyone, I suppose, somewhere along the way, comes by some favorite words which support his particular philosophy—and turn on the inspiration for him, and light up thoughts in his mind which somehow strengthen him. It's a little more than mere motivation.

Today, I want to use some words which have become favorites of mine, to serve as the theme for what I want to talk with you about.

These words may be familiar to you. They were written by a man by the name of Samuel Foss, back in the days when the pioneers of America were moving westward across this country. The words are these:

"Bring me men to match my mountains,
Bring me men to match my plains;
Men with empires in their purpose
And new eras in their brains."

I hope that idea appeals to you: having men to match the mountains—with new eras in their brains.

I am recalling these stirring words to your mind today for two reasons:

First, because they reflect the spirit of imagination and of determination which has always been the best constructive attitude of the citizens of this country in every period of progress and accomplishment in our history; and

Second, because these words—"men to match the mountains"—are, I am sure, more pertinent right now than ever before.

They describe exactly what we need in 1969.

We, as businessmen, are today, in a new era.

We face new challenges.

We aren't using covered wagons. We have jet airliners. We have supermarkets, computers, automation.

But we are pioneers, nonetheless.

We are being called upon to enter into new dimensions of activity—to set new goals—to develop new flexibility, which may not be too easy—and to persist with a new sense of determination and accountability.

We are confronted by a whole new range of mountains: mountains of problems—mountains of opportunity.

And—we need to be able to make ourselves able to "match those mountains."

Let us take a sharp, realistic look at today's situation.

What do we see?

Well, we see a dynamic economy, and a high rate of employment—which is good.

At the same time, we see the cities of America beset by massive economic and social problems, human problems—which is not so good.

And this is principally what I want to talk with you about . . . the problems of the cities, and what businessmen can do, are doing, and should do, to meet these problems—and to make the most of the opportunities which grow out of these problems.

The problems of the cities affect the entire nation.

They are, in fact, a part of a revolution which is changing the norms, the standards—and the quality—of our way of life.

The government is committed, irrevocably committed—by the force of public opinion—to try to rid the country of its urban problems.

This is the same as it has been for some time now.

There is, however, something new and different in the picture.

It's a new day.

As you Tiger fans would perhaps say about it, "It's a new ball game."

What's different about it is: the attitude of the Administration toward business and industry.

For the first time in 35 years, government officials are turning to private enterprise—and are inviting private enterprise to play a major role in the solution of the nation's economic and social problems.

This new attitude can be felt—at least, I can feel it from where I work in Washington.

For quite a few years now, I have been a neighbor to the White House.

My office window looks out over Lafayette Park—and the front of the White House is in full view a block away.

I have watched this neighborhood become the focal point for the hurly-burly of war and peace, recession and boom, pomp and tragedy—and, more recently, the protest demonstrations of certain elements of our society.

I have become accustomed to political changes.

Many times in the past, I have been able to guess fairly accurately what new and daring pronouncements might be forthcoming from our eminent neighbor.

But, right now, it is not easy to make predictions.

The wheels are turning, but what I see is a process of calm deliberation setting in.

Instead of showmanship, impulsiveness, salesmanship, razzle-dazzle and catchy rhetoric, the accent is on good, solid homework.

There is a deliberate pace in the White House—and the occupant is described as "cool—meticulous—competent."

Research is going on at greater depth.

Task forces are turning in reports.

There seems to be a reaching out for the possible, instead of a groping for the spectacular.

Teams of competent individuals—not just teams of politicians—but teams of knowledgeable leaders, are being brought together to administer government departments.

And—through it all, comes clearly the note that the Nixon Administration does not want to go it alone in facing up to today's urban problems, but wants the help and cooperation of business in new working partnerships.

The central question, then, is:

How can a corporation help remove the causes of the problems of the cities? These are people-problems—normally called, "social"—or "socio-economic" problems and considered the responsibility of government.

How can the strength of business, and the full strength of our voluntary system or organized effort be mustered to work with government to prevent the urban crisis from demolishing the structure of the American community?

The problems are as numerous as they are severe.

It is easy to overgeneralize about what can be done.

But in many areas, there are already encouraging stories of results of the pioneering action which business firms—through the spending of their own talent and money—have already taken to help solve urban problems. Here are just a few examples:

During this past summer alone employers, cooperating with the National Alliance for Businessmen, recruited, trained and placed 146,000 hard-core unemployed.

In housing—the insurance industry has pledged a billion dollars for developments in deprived areas.

In very low cost housing—the prefabricated home manufacturers have developed

units for sale or rent—and have negotiated adjustments in union practices, and in the supporting roles of city government, to make this housing available.

In air pollution—the automotive and petroleum industries are spending millions of dollars in an effort to solve the problems.

I could give you many other examples of this sort. They indicate one thing, namely, that the process of solving socio-economic problems—and of remaking our cities—represents a new area of activity for business, but that it can be done—and it must become a normal part of business operations.

To help pioneer this new approach, the National Chamber has recently researched and published case studies of successful projects carried out by business (many times with government cooperation) to solve the people-problems of the cities. Such projects as:

- Hard-core job training.
- Housing for low-income families.
- Summer youth employment.
- Entrepreneurship in ghetto areas.
- Jobs and advancement for minorities . . . and so on.

These case studies are blueprints of planning and action. They show the action taken, the mistakes, the successes and the outcome. One of these case studies, incidentally, is about a project here in Detroit:

The story of collaboration by business with public education—to make high school education more relevant to the needs of students in the inner city.

These new areas of action for business managers call for new insights and reoriented skills.

To help meet this need, the National Chamber—using special methods developed by the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University—has launched a program of Urban Leadership Workshops.

These Workshops are designed to train businessmen and others to adapt their skills and to develop new capabilities to enable them to do things they were not trained to do:

- To identify and analyze the problems of their community;
- To determine the causes of the problems;
- To establish priorities;
- To set up a plan of action, and
- To mobilize the total resources of the community—the combined efforts of all the important groups and organizations in the area, public and private.

These Urban Leadership Workshops have been completely tested—and we intend to conduct 50 of them in principal cities, and thus to cover the major metropolitan areas of the country.

These Workshops tie in with the basic process which the National Chamber has developed for dealing with urban problems—and which is called "Forward Thrust."

This is not a fixed program. Rather, it is a technique—a strategic approach to community problem-solving.

It is a process by which the leadership of a community can bring to bear on specific local problems, the coordinated thinking, experience and action of all voluntary and governmental groups.

It was developed over a 10-year period, in cooperation with many state and local chambers of commerce.

And it has the support and cooperation of a good many national organizations, such as these—to mention a few of them:

- The National League of Cities.
- The United States Conference of Mayors.
- The National Municipal League.
- The International City Managers Association.
- The Urban League.

There are program guidelines and manuals and a full set of tools ready for use. They

are not a pat formula, but they provide valuable ideas about how to get action.

Let me tell you about a new bold approach. Believing there is widespread need for information—need for action—need for cooperation between the Nixon Administration and businessmen everywhere—we decided to "shoot for the Moon," so to speak.

On March 26, we're going to hold the most gigantic "town-hall" type of discussion ever staged in America.

On that day—March 26—the National Chamber will conduct a closed-circuit telecast from Washington, D.C., to 26 receiving cities—including Detroit, of course.

The members of President Nixon's Administration—including Cabinet and the new Urban Affairs Council—will discuss plans and programs which deal with today's problems of the cities.

This will be a "live" meeting, with full-color video, and a two-way audio hookup between Washington and the 26 receiving cities.

The telecast will reach more than 25,000 people—from 2,000 cities and towns—representing 4,000 voluntary action organizations.

This will not be a "show," or a "presentation"—it will be a two-way discussion—involving local leaders and Washington officials—talking about crime in the streets, welfare problems, manpower training, housing, health care, and the role of voluntary action.

This exchange of questions and answers—in the unprecedented conference in which you can participate without having to leave your home city—will provide the rallying point that we need.

What else do we need? We need morale! Surely, every person in this room must be filled with a deep concern about the severity of today's problems—and the threat of these problems to America's future.

As I go about my work, and as I talk with people from all over the U.S.—and as I read some of the significant studies and reports that are being made—the thought keeps nagging me that the situation is almost out of control.

The message I get from some of the urban experts is plain and stark. We are told that, "We are strangling ourselves with numerous uncoordinated public and private efforts. These are doubly ineffective, because so few people have grasped either the immensity or the severity of the problems."

We are told that, "The quality of life itself is in serious danger."

That, "Giant population clusters have already become unmanageable, and that future growth projections are little short of ominous."

That, "The nation is on a collision course with stark destiny."

That, "Failure to embark on a wholly new dimension of leadership is the equivalent of national chaos."

In the face of all of this disheartening discussion, we need to build our morale.

With all of our resources of leadership at hand, we cannot, of course, afford to lose hope.

But what lies ahead is a gigantic task of improving society itself—improving our own man-made environment—and improving the social and spiritual quality of life itself.

If we saw "the crisis of the cities" in that positive light, we could deal with it more effectively. It would improve our morale.

We must not let ourselves come to think of our communities as a mass of failure. This would undermine the forward drive of all who are working toward improvement.

For a community to make truly effective use of its potential energy and resources, it must be motivated by a positive vision—it must think well of itself—it must have the high morale that comes with success and the prospects of greater success. So we need to emphasize the positive approach.

Then, too, business management men will need some new guidelines for action.

The new factor in the picture is that business today is being invited by government to cooperate fully—to become involved on a large scale, to assume responsibility and accountability for the solution of social and economic problems of disadvantaged people. So, for this new role, we need guidelines.

The role of business is a reasonably normal one—it is simply a role of leadership—of analysis and organizing and management.

But, this is different from the normal role of organizing capital and manpower to manufacture and distribute and finance goods and services.

It is different from serving on committees working toward community growth and improvement.

It is different from electing individuals to public office, turning the government over to them—and hoping for the best.

Today, leadership means being concerned enough to be committed to help take charge of the situation—and particularly, to help take charge of the things for which, normally, we have not had responsibility.

Leadership means involvement and commitment.

Leadership means vigilance. It means learning a vast amount that most of us hadn't thought we wanted or needed to know.

As business moves to accept the new challenges—and to accept the new opportunities of our times—by cooperating with government—business is, in reality, adding a new dimension to its functions—is moving into new, untried relationships and is engaging in a strange sort of "courtship dance" with government.

And, when you come right down to it, it is pretty much of an improvised effort.

It is a performance without ground rules, and without fundamental agreements as to policy—and even without helpful theory—to govern immediate reactions, and long-range consequences.

And we have the right to wonder how this new trend will affect private enterprise—and what sort of changes this trend might bring about in our way of doing things, and in society as a whole.

For example, will the government slow down its rate of growth as it unloads some of its responsibilities on to business?

Will corporations grow larger? Will the business community have more say in the formulation of national policies?

At any rate, we definitely are in a new era for private enterprise—and business is accepting a new responsibility for the well-being of society, as well as for its own well-being.

What about it? Many questions are raised.

I make no pretense to knowing all the answers.

Out of my experience in organization work, however, I would like to offer a few suggestions.

First of all, businessmen must work harder, I believe, at the job of understanding the governmental process—and at the job of participating in government.

This does not mean lobbying.

It does not mean knowing how to "open doors" in government departments and agencies, on Capitol Hill, and in the Administration.

Basically, it means understanding the issues with which the government is dealing.

More than that, it means understanding how the government works—and understanding the government's problems and frustrations from the government's own point of view.

It means, above all else, earning the respect and confidence of the men and women, at all levels, who are the government.

Second, the business community must be positive and constructive in all its relationships with government.

I am sure the progressive business leader, concerned about today's vital problems will accept every opportunity to offer constructive proposals—and seek constructive cooperation.

I am equally sure he will take exception to government proposals if necessary—but he will be moderate in statement and will offer constructive alternatives, and will not automatically reject government proposals just because they are government proposals.

This is the day and time to narrow the areas of disagreement and to be positive in relationships with government officials—to win confidence in business integrity.

Third, to be successful in working with government, we will have to be successful in politics.

This does not mean that you need to run for public office.

It means—be active and useful in the political party of your choice.

It means—have a real part in selecting, nominating and electing qualified candidates to public office.

It means—contribute of your time and cash—in the primaries, and in the general elections.

To work hard enough in politics to be successful in politics, will call for substantial commitments of thought and time and effort. But, our business is at stake, and the future of the country is at stake. You can't afford not to work on that basis.

Then—after your candidates are elected, the way to help them be successful is to keep in touch with them, visit with them about their problems, be working partners with them.

So my plea is—learn to be successful in politics. This is certainly the foundation for understanding the governmental viewpoint and having constructive working relationships.

And now—turning strictly to the management and operation of your own business in this new era—you have an educational job to do.

It's public relations work. It is this:

In most instances, it is necessary to educate stockholders and the investment community to understand and accept the fact that the involvement of business in community problems is a sound, long-term investment for business.

Today's business leaders are, to some extent, on the horns of a dilemma.

When they try to "do good in the community"—say, by hiring dropouts and hardcore unemployed—many of their stockholders get very angry.

There now are an estimated 24 million stockholders in America.

And stockholders have a way of pressing for their own interests.

Militant stockholders argue that their companies have no right to retain earnings to contribute toward the solution of public problems—and that the companies should permit the stockholders, who are the rightful owners, to decide for themselves how their money should be spent. They have a valid point. It can be added to the cost—cut profits.

On the other hand, when managers try to work out profit-making agreements in their efforts to solve community problems, they sometimes bring down on their heads the wrath of citizens, civic leaders and politicians with accusation that the business firms are being heartless and money-grubbing—and have no respect for the needs of the people.

Both points of view are right, in a superficial way.

A continuous educational campaign is called for—there is room for deeper understanding on both sides. The public, and stockholders in particular, increasingly are endorsing an active leadership role by business in areas traditionally considered the

province of government. That's a favorable opinion climate.

Next—and this cannot be emphasized too much—no matter how involved businessmen become in solving the problems of the cities, businessmen must continue to be totally committed to the profit principle.

The business corporation exists to earn a profit. That's good because profit is a yardstick for efficiency—and a goal to motivation.

Once we understand this, we are then in a position to establish ground rules which allow for a profit incentive. Then we will have self-generating, self-renewing motivation.

Government and business leaders are studying possible new ways for getting corporations more fully involved. Among the ideas under discussion are:

Tax incentives; broadened use of the insurance principle to cover higher risks; arrangements for relaxing anti-trust regulations; use of more public-private corporations such as COMSAT.

Cooperation of this sort should be stepped up.

Finally, we must recognize that this new era of public-problem solving—and of preserving the incentive system—calls for the involvement and commitment of all businessmen and corporations, not just some of them.

Most businessmen believe strongly in the old adage, "Mind your own business"—but every business firm, large and small, must recognize that its own special world cannot flourish, if the human problems of our day are not solved—and if the structure of society in America is permitted to decay and crumble.

In all of this, if we are to adequately respond to President Nixon's Inaugural call to "enlist the legions of the concerned and committed," we must make maximum use of the ability of businessmen to get things done through organized effort.

The challenge which today faces the business community—and which the business community is accepting—calls for "men to match the mountains."

But, as our common sense tells us, it is far too big a challenge for any individual or corporation to try to face up to alone.

Fortunately, the business community already has all the organizational structure it needs for effective united action.

Our cue is to make maximum use of this machinery—covering every industry and every city and town in the country—and to use the ability of businessmen to get things done by voluntarily working together—and by working with other groups in our society and with government, local, state and national.

Let me give you a quick example—

On Christmas day of last year, men circled the moon. Maybe you thought the cost was too high, but, at least, you will be interested in the steps which made this possible. Here they are—and they apply to any gigantic problem:

1. A completely exhaustive study of every aspect of the problem to be solved;
2. Agreement on what is available to meet the needs outlined—and on what can be done, and by whom;
3. A decision not to be intimidated by the magnitude of the task, or by its expense, or by the time and effort required to perform it.
4. An adequate organization of competent people;
5. Absolute refusal to be stampeded into shortcuts or unrealistic time scheduled for meeting goals;
6. The capacity to rebound from failure and to learn from mistakes.

These clear-cut steps enabled our country to attain a seemingly impossible goal through deliberate planning, massive organization, and a systematic commitment of the necessary human and natural resources.

I urge that we apply this pattern to the

solution of the equally vast social and economic problems of our cities.

In the business community, in the year 1969, ladies and gentlemen, we know what it takes to do the job—pioneers, men with a sense of responsibility and determination—men working together—"men to match the mountains."

Today's challenge is to fight not just for good causes, it is to fight to find and apply sound solutions.

EAST-WEST TRADE BILL OF 1969

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the East-West trade bill of 1969 which would authorize the President to extend the benefits of most-favored-nation tariff treatment to any Communist country with which we maintain diplomatic relations and which is a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Poland and Yugoslavia, already members of GATT, now receive MFN treatment.

Czechoslovakia is a member of GATT but does not receive MFN and Rumania, also without MFN, has made application to join GATT. The President presently has no authority to extend MFN to Czechoslovakia, Rumania, or any other Communist countries.

My bill would give the President authority to use trade with Communist countries as a flexible tool to normalize relations with these countries.

The major substantive provision would be authority to extend MFN tariff treatment to certain individual Communist countries when this is determined to be in the national interest. The authority could be exercised only in commercial agreement with a particular country in which such MFN treatment would be granted in return for equivalent benefits to the United States. MFN treatment for the products of any country would stay in effect only as long as the commercial agreement with that country would be in effect.

In addition to peaceful trade there would be other benefits for the United States. For instance, before the trade agreement would be effective it would be necessary for satisfactory arrangements to be made for protection of industrial rights and processes, settlement of commercial differences and disputes, establishment or expansion of trade and tourist promotion offices, and settlement of outstanding financial and property claims.

I consider it crucial that these benefits be made part of the trade package and do not believe they would represent obstacles to normalization of trade. Certainly any trader has the right to insist on satisfactory and binding agreement for protection of industrial property and for settlement of disputes arising under a trade contract.

At the same time if the United States is going to allow these countries to open offices here to expand their commercial promotion, then we must insist on the same privilege in their country. Outstanding financial and property claims should also be resolved at the time of

normalization of relations. Obviously the nature of the agreements finally reached in each of these matters would follow hard bargaining in which there would have to be some give and take on both sides, but it is crucial that some agreement be reached.

Likewise it is desirable not only from our viewpoint but from the Communist country as well that both trading partners be members of GATT. GATT normalizes trade relations between the industrial countries of the world and establishes certain guidelines which must be followed if the normal exchange of goods is to continue unimpeded. The United States would take an economic risk in carrying on commercial relations with a state trading company of a country that is not a member of GATT.

Here is the text of the legislation I introduced today:

H.R. 10569

A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreement with Communist countries, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the House Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "East-West Trade Relations Act of 1969."

AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO COMMERCIAL AGREEMENTS

SEC. 2. The President may make a commercial agreement with a Communist country with which the United States has diplomatic relations providing most-favored-nation treatment to the products of that country whenever he determines that such agreement—

- (a) will promote the purposes of this Act,
- (b) is in the national interest, and
- (c) will result in benefits to the United States equivalent to those provided by the agreement to the other party and further determines that the government of such country is a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

BENEFITS TO BE PROVIDED BY COMMERCIAL AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. The benefits to the United States to be obtained in or in conjunction with a commercial agreement made under this Act shall include the following but need not be restricted thereto:

- (a) satisfactory arrangements for the protection of industrial rights and processes;
- (b) satisfactory arrangements for the settlement of commercial differences and disputes;
- (c) arrangements for establishment or expansion of United States trade and tourist promotion offices, for facilitation of such efforts as the trade promotion activities of United States commercial officers, participation in trade fairs and exhibits, the sending of trade missions, and for facilitation of entry and travel of commercial representatives as necessary;
- (d) most-favored-nation treatment with respect to duties or other restrictions on the imports of the products of the United States, and other arrangements that may secure market access and assure fair treatment for products of the United States; or
- (e) satisfactory arrangements covering other matters affecting relations between the United States and the country concerned, such as the settlement of financial and property claims and the improvement of consular relations.

PROVISIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN COMMERCIAL AGREEMENTS

SEC. 4. A commercial agreement made under this Act shall—

- (a) be limited to an initial period specified in the agreement which shall be no more than three years from the time the agreement becomes effective;
- (b) be subject to suspension or termination at any time upon reasonable notice;
- (c) provide for consultations at regular intervals for the purpose of reviewing the operations of the agreement and relevant aspects of relations between the United States and the other party; and
- (d) be renewable for additional periods, each not to exceed three years.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT

SEC. 5. (a) In order to carry out a commercial agreement made under this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may by proclamation extend most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the foreign country entering into such commercial agreement: *Provided*, That the application of most-favored-nation treatment shall be limited to the period of effectiveness of such commercial agreement.

(b) The President may at any time suspend or terminate any proclamation issued subsection (a). The President shall suspend or terminate such proclamation whenever he determines that—

- (1) the other party to a commercial agreement made under this Act is no longer fulfilling its obligations under the agreement; or
- (2) the suspension or termination of the agreement is in the national interest.

ADVICE FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND OTHER SOURCES

SEC. 6. Before making a commercial agreement under this Act, the President shall seek information and advice with respect to such agreement from the interested Departments and agencies of the United States Government, from interested private persons, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

TRANSMISSION OF REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the commercial agreements program instituted under this Act. Such reports shall include information regarding negotiations, benefits obtained as a result of commercial agreements, the texts of any such agreements, and other information relating to the program.

RELATION TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 8. (a) This Act shall not apply to any agreement made with a country whose products are receiving, when such agreement is made, the benefits of trade agreement concessions extended in accordance with section 231(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. sec. 1861(b)).

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to modify or amend the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. sec. 2021 et seq.) or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. sec. 1611 et seq.).

(c) The President may by proclamation terminate headnote 4 to schedule 1, part 5, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (77A Stat. 32, 19 U.S.C. sec. 1202) with respect to the products of any country to which it is applicable upon the entry into force of a commercial agreement made under this Act with such country.

(d) Any commercial agreement made under this Act shall be deemed a trade agreement for the purposes of title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. sec. 1901 et seq.).

(e) The portion of general headnote 3(e) to the Tariff Schedules of the United States that precedes the list of countries and areas

(77A Stat. 11; 70 Stat. 1022) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Products of Communist Countries. Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this headnote, the rates of duty shown in column numbered 2 shall apply to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of the countries and areas that have been specified in section 401 of the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, in sections 231 and 257(e)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, or in actions taken by the President thereunder and as to which there is not in effect a proclamation under section 6(a) of the East-West Trade Relations Act of 1969. These countries and areas are:"

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to remove some outmoded, self-defeating restrictions on trade with Communist countries and restrictions on MFN are among them.

Many of them arise from false assumptions about the role of China in the Korean war, others from mistaken theories about the impact of trade on the behavior of Eastern European countries.

Review and modification are timely because of both political and economic factors.

Our political interests would be served by initiatives to exploit the deep and relatively permanent split between China and the Soviet Union, and persistent pressures within Eastern Europe for greater external and internal independence.

Our economic interests would be served because increased cash markets overseas will help to meet income problems of American farmers and others as well as our worsening problems in national trade and payments balances.

Here is what I propose, in addition to legislation on MFN:

First. Lift the total embargo on U.S. trade with China. Treat trade with China the same as trade with the Soviet Union. This requires an end to the totally irrational double standard now followed.

Second. Rescind the requirement that 50 percent of certain grain cargoes to Eastern Europe must be carried in U.S. vessels.

Third. Rescind the requirement which prohibits full-cargo grain shipment to Eastern Europe.

Fourth. Rescind the requirement of specific license for agricultural exports to Communist countries, except of course for commodities in short supply.

Fifth. Request permission to establish a trade mission in Canton, China, site of the semi-annual trade fair.

Sixth. Establish agricultural attaches in each embassy in Eastern Europe.

These changes can be accomplished by Executive order.

Overnight President Nixon could clear away serious obstacles to the expansion of our agricultural trade and at the same time improve our position relative to the Soviet Union in the field of world power politics, all without firing a shot, pointing a gun or even building new arms. Political improvement would occur almost instantly, even though actual trade expansion might be months or even years in developing.

Even when trade expansion develops, no strategic disadvantages can be anticipated. My recommendations would im-

pair in no way whatever the system of controls on the export of strategic goods. This would remain in full force. Nor would the new policies in any sense subsidize unfriendly regimes, because they deal entirely with trade, not aid.

The restrictions which I suggest be terminated have not caused Communist countries to do without. Rather, by imposing costly hindrances on U.S. commercial enterprise, they have caused American farmers and other business interests to do without.

Most of these policies developed before it became clear that the Korean war was almost entirely a Soviet enterprise, with the Chinese role comparatively modest. The war was both started and stopped by the Soviets—not China—yet we trade with the Soviets and refuse to trade with China.

In Eastern Europe the development of trade will help to make the Soviet satellite nations less dependent on Moscow, and bring them more into the habits of the private marketplace.

It would be a mistake, of course, to assume that these new policies will soon lead to substantial markets. It would also be a mistake to expect too much in the way of political returns from these initiatives. At the same time, I firmly believe that U.S. moves showing we want to normalize relations with China and Eastern Europe will do more than anything else to make Soviet behavior more reasonable.

LIFT THE CHINA EMBARGO

Presently the United States prohibits all trade with China. This embargo was not initiated because the Communists took control of the mainland. It was initiated because of Chinese intervention in the Korean war.

The Communists proclaimed their republic October 1, 1949 and U.S. trade with China was normal, although small, until December 1950, when Chinese troops crossed the Yalu River. Although the Korean armistice was signed in June 1953—almost 16 years ago—the embargo continues, because the national emergency proclaimed shortly after the war started has continued in effect.

This is difficult to justify.

Although the United Nations labeled China the aggressor in the Korean war, it is now a clearly established historical fact that it was North Korea, aided and encouraged by Russia that was the aggressor. North Korea was heavily supplied by Moscow. As a practical fact, the Korean war was both started and stopped by the Soviet Union. Chinese troops entered only as U.N. forces approached the China border.

Yet we trade with Russia, and refuse to trade with China.

Moreover, 15 other nations fought alongside the United States in the Korean war, among them France, Britain, Canada, and Australia. Each suffered considerable losses, yet each now carries on substantial trade with China. Is everyone out of step but us?

Political considerations alone make desirable a review of our trade embargo against China. China is no longer a satellite of Moscow, if it ever was. Doubtless Moscow and Peking have cer-

tain doctrinal solidarity and other common interests, but they have deep, abiding differences.

Foremost among the differences are border disputes. The vast common border between the two states is the longest in the world, and tension is certain to mount as China asserts its historical claims on territory.

In formulating our policies, we would be wise to recall the advice of Klauswitz:

Support the weaker of your two adversaries. Accept the risk of abetting a potential future menace in order to check the present one.

Lifting the embargo would serve to end the curious, irrational double standard we now apply in dealing with China and the Soviet Union. In dealing with the Soviet Union we have sought to build bridges, political contracts, and trade, believing this in the long run will help to modify Soviet behavior and make Moscow a more responsible member of the world community. In dealing with China, our policy has been just the opposite. While we seek to expand contacts with Russia, we reject them with China. While we seek to enlarge Soviet participation in world affairs, we oppose such by China.

Attempting to justify this double standard is especially difficult in light of the fact that Chinese forces were long ago withdrawn from Korea, in striking contrast to the Soviet armies still present in Poland, Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia.

It just is not true that the Soviets, like the Dodge boys, are always presumed to wear the white hats.

Our action lifting the trade embargo may not yield early results. It takes two to trade. Given the mutual suspicion and distrust which have marked recent United States-China history, relations will not improve overnight.

In fact, our action lifting the embargo should be accompanied by a statement listing several other important new policies.

The United States should declare that—

First. We will have no part in any effort to gang up with Russia against China.

Second. We have no military designs on the mainland, and will not support any such adventures.

Third. We stand ready to exchange diplomats, tourists, businessmen and cultural groups whenever China is ready.

New policies certainly make good sense from the standpoint of American farmers.

Although recent wheat shipments to China have declined, the overall trend shows great potential. In the period, 1960-67, Canada shipped 454 million bushels of wheat to China. Australia shipped 532 million bushels, Argentina 159 million, France 78 million.

Of this market totalling over a billion bushels, American farmers provided not a single one.

Ironically, in 1961 when the Canadians first started shipping wheat to China, the minister for agriculture in the Canadian conservative government offered, in a private meeting with President Kennedy,

to split the China order with the United States. President Kennedy refused.

TRADE HANDICAPS IN EASTERN EUROPE

Agricultural trade with Communist states in Eastern Europe involve still different problems and handicaps. No embargo exists with Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary or the Soviet Union. Two of these countries, as members of GATT, have most-favored-nation treatment which puts their tariff schedule on par with all free world countries.

Nevertheless, our trade languishes.

Although our total trade with the East is very small, most of it is composed of agricultural products. Improving this trade is hindered by four principal factors: One is tariff discrimination against all of these countries except Poland and Yugoslavia. Lifting this discrimination requires legislation.

The other three limiting factors can all be removed by Presidential Order. Each of them adds unfair competitive costs to U.S. shippers. One is the requirement that 50 percent of certain shipments must go in U.S. vessels. This applies to all wheat and feed grain shipments to the Soviet Union, and to all wheat shipments to Eastern Europe except Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. This adds about 25 percent to the cost of shipment and effectively blocks U.S. farmers from most deals. This requirement is therefore no help to the U.S. merchant fleet and clearly hurts the farmer. If our merchant fleet merits subsidy, the subsidy should be provided directly.

Another requirement provides that certain shipments must be partly unloaded at non-Communist ports. This applies to all feed grain shipments to Eastern Europe except Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia.

How foolish this can get is illustrated by the fact that a shipment of corn to Czechoslovakia cannot meet the part-cargo requirement by stopping off at Poland, even though a full-cargo shipment to Poland is permitted. This too impairs the competitive position of the U.S. shipper, because it prohibits efficient full-load bids.

The final restrictive provision requires a specific license for each shipment to most of these countries. The legality of this requirement may be questioned, but it is being enforced and of course adds to the cost of doing business.

In many instances these countries manufacture few items the United States is interested in. But the most serious restriction is that goods imported from these countries, with the exceptions of Poland and Yugoslavia, are at present required to pay higher duties than those levied on similar goods from other countries. This is the result of congressional action providing for the withdrawal of equal tariff treatment or the so-called most-favored-nation treatment. This provision was first enacted in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as a result of the Korean war.

Since the Korean war has been over for 16 years it would make good sense to allow the President the authority to extend the benefits of equal tariff treat-

ment to those Eastern European countries, with the exception of East Germany, not now receiving it.

Accordingly, I will soon introduce the East-West trade bill of 1969, which will authorize the President to extend this tariff treatment to any country which is or becomes a member of GATT but which does not now receive MFN.

Before we can realistically expect to increase agricultural exports we must extend MFN to these countries. This is so because in order for these countries to buy agricultural products from us they must earn U.S. dollars. These dollars, in the absence of long-term credit arrangements, can be secured in only one way: through selling their exports.

What are the prospects for agricultural trade in these countries?

Let us take the example of wheat. In 1967 our neighbor, Canada, a strong friend which has supported us in many ways, sold 228.7 million bushels of wheat to Communist countries. Canada sold 5.13 million bushels to Albania, 6.18 to Czechoslovakia, 5 to East Germany, 18.5 to Poland, 110.6 to Russia and 82.5 to China.

Although the United States is the world's largest wheat exporter, Eastern Europe has not been an important U.S. market. For instance, during the second half of the 1950's, U.S. exports to Eastern Europe accounted for only 2.5 percent of U.S. wheat exports. In the 1960's it is still less than 5 percent.

The Soviet Union has been the principal wheat supplier in Eastern Europe, but because Russian agricultural output is unpredictable and often tied with political strings, Eastern European countries look for alternative sources. And they have been looking to the West. Unfortunately, the United States has been left out. While U.S. wheat shipments account for 1 percent of Eastern Europe's imports, Canada supplied 16 percent and France 35 percent.

Eastern Europe, like China, is a net importer of wheat. In fact, the countries of the East generally account for 10 percent of the world wheat import total. We have been closed out of this market. When one considers that we are closed out of the China market, too, we compete in only 75 percent of the total world wheat market, whereas Russia, France, Canada, Australia, Argentina, and the other major wheat producers compete in 100 percent of the market.

What is the trend for the future? Although increases in yield are expected, Eastern Europe will continue to be a wheat deficit area. For instance, in 1970 it is estimated that five countries of Eastern Europe will have a wheat deficit of 3,835,000 metric tons.

What is the situation for other agricultural commodities? It is promising. In the period since World War II, the Eastern European countries have been importers of bread grains, soybeans, soybean meal, ground grains, and grain sorghums with protein supplements such as soy and fish meal. Thus they might well absorb some of the bulge which is likely to result as the United States is squeezed in the highly protectionist-oriented Common Market.

On balance, it appears there will be

a growing market for about three major American agricultural products which we produce in abundance—cotton, feed grains, and soybeans.

In looking at the potential trade aspects of Eastern European countries one must not, of course, overlook the fact that these are Communist countries, dominated and run by a single party system in firm control of all aspects of human and business activity. They are firmly tied ideologically to the Marxian Socialist principle.

However, it must also be observed that at the present time each of these countries is insisting on making its own interpretation and application of these principles and some of their economic activities are straying far from basic doctrines. There have developed capitalistic incentives and, indeed, capitalist methods. In trade and economic matters, there seems to be a major move in all countries to play an in-between role, thus taking advantage of both Eastern and Western trade and economic contracts.

As I see it, the United States should deal imaginatively, but realistically with the several different competing centers of Communist power. Trade can be a most important method to normalize relations with Eastern Europe, realizing, of course, that there are severe limits on the extent to which the United States can reduce Soviet influence there. United States policies toward these Communist countries have been based more on what we would like to see happen, rather than reality. In the long run the natural desire for national self-assertion will rise regardless of United States policies. The Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia can no more prevent this than Pope Leo X could prevent the Reformation.

The United States commitment to peace, democratic government, and orderly change is a long term affair. While it does not preclude our readiness to participate in defensive alliances, or to take appropriate measures against acts of aggression, our national policy is basically committed to the building of a peaceful world. The long term interests of the United States would, therefore, be best served by reducing tensions wherever possible and by establishment of normal and durable commercial, technical, scientific, and cultural relations with Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and China when they show a reciprocal interest in the pursuit of normal relations. In other words we should be prepared to go as far as they are. In this manner hopefully the nations of the East will see that we have no political or territorial designs on them.

In that regard we need not preach to them of the advantages of national independence and self determination. They already know the advantages. What we should seek is to shape our policies in such a manner as to permit reasonably extensive, profitable, and durable relations with individual Communist nations. This requires that we stop viewing the world in terms of an irreconcilable and permanently deadly struggle between all that calls itself Communist and all that does not. We must recognize instead that trade can be among one of

the most promising forms for improvement.

The potent movement toward self-determination, national identity and political diversity within the Communist camp is a development of real significance to the world. It is gradually changing the political content of communism, impelling the leaders of these countries, especially in Eastern Europe, to give a higher priority to domestic economic and social problems rather than to ideological crusades and territorial expansion. There can be little doubt that a steady, unimpeded mutually profitable exchange of goods between the East and West helps to support this clearly discernible trend toward the more pragmatic, efficiency-minded and consumer-oriented Communist societies of Eastern Europe.

What I propose is trade, not aid.

I do so with a word of caution. If, as I recommend, we lift our embargo on China trade, let the President extend tariff equality to Eastern Europe, start actively promoting our agricultural products in the Communist world, and terminate present requirements on part-cargo, specific licensing and U.S. vessels—even so, I would not anticipate dramatic new advances in trade volume, or in peaceful behavior by Communist authorities. Such advances will take time.

Nor should we drop our military guard, or lessen our diplomatic vigilance. Zealous and fanatical elements—Communist and non-Communist alike—may well for some time seek to impose arbitrarily their political and economic system on us. In the Communist world especially, political and military power is won and kept by intrigue. No one can accurately forecast what tomorrow will bring.

But, while vigilance and preparedness is rational, so is communication. And one of the best and most persuasive means of communication is commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in my remarks some additional material concerning my bill, including a memorandum on East-West trade prepared in my office which sets forth some of the essential background information regarding the timely subject. As a part of this memorandum, I have included several items in the appendix.

The material follows:

MEMORANDUM: TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE INCLUDING THE SOVIET UNION

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States has been engaged in trade with the countries of Eastern Europe for many years. (See Appendix I.) Today, the critical question in any discussion of East-West trade is not whether there shall be any trade, but the conditions under which such trade will be conducted. In 1965 the United States exported \$139 million in goods to the Eastern European countries, excluding Yugoslavia, and imported \$138 million in goods from them. (During the same period the countries of Western Europe and Japan exported \$7.8 billion in goods to Eastern Europe and imported \$4.5 billion from them.) Accepting the fact of trade, this memorandum is concerned with the present trade policy of the United States and strategic considerations for future trade policy. The most relevant issues involve the effect of trade on the economies of Eastern European countries and political and eco-

conomic benefits which the United States may expect to receive through continued participation in East-West trade.

This memorandum will analyze first the factors contributing to the comparatively limited volume of trade between the United States and Eastern Europe, and, secondly, the study will discuss political and economic advantages which the United States should seek to gain in future trade policy.

II. LIMITATIONS ON UNITED STATES-EASTERN EUROPE TRADE

A. Reserves: Of all the Communist countries, only the Soviet Union possesses substantial gold reserves and ore deposits which can and have been sold on the world market for dollars or other international currencies to finance increases in imports. Most Soviet bloc countries find it necessary to pay for imported goods and services with exports of merchandise, and the problem of generating sufficient quantities of marketable exports has become increasingly active.¹

The foreign exchange reserves of the bloc countries are kept to a minimum "consistent with maneuverability in foreign trade."² Most probably, Soviet bloc countries have little more than a working balance of foreign exchange except temporarily through accumulations from seasonal exports. Should temporary financial difficulties arise because of a shortage of funds, the satellite countries can make limited use of the loan facilities of Soviet-controlled banks in London and Paris and of normal commercial facilities available up to six months from Western banks. "Beyond this, most European satellite countries have little or nothing to fall back on aside from the largesse of the U.S.S.R."³

B. Credits: In order to mitigate their financial difficulties, the Soviet Union and other bloc countries have sought and continue to seek credits from the West to finance capital goods imports. Most Western industrial nations guarantee long-term export credit to the Eastern European nations. These supplier credits are normally granted by local banking institutions and are usually insured by a government or quasi-governmental export credit insurance organization in the exporter's country.

Although export credit insurance or guaranty facilities were not erected specifically as an aid to East-West trade, such facilities do act as a stimulus to such trade.

"Export credit guarantees benefit both the Western exporter and the purchasers. They allow the exporter to obtain local bank financing enabling him to meet production and construction costs and to offer credit terms sufficiently attractive to complete his sales. In the case of bloc countries, Western credit insurance programs permit purchases of capital goods by the Soviet bloc in greater quantities than would be possible if only the proceeds from current exports could be used for such purchases. Because export earnings of many bloc countries are often less than required for import programs, Western credit insurance schemes are a real boom to bloc purchases."⁴

In comparison with other Western nations, the United States severely restricts the availability and terms of export credits to Communist countries. (Details concerning representative types of Western export credit insurance systems are shown in Appendix III.) Such restrictions have been authorized by the Johnson Act of 1934, amended in 1945. However, in 1963, an opinion by the United States Attorney General expressed the view that the extension of credit in a foreign trade transaction was not a "loan" within the meaning of the Johnson Act.⁵ At the end of 1963 the foreign aid bill for Fiscal 1964 included a prohibition on United States Government guarantees through the Export-Import Bank of the credit of Communist gov-

ernments. A waiver clause in the bill permits the President to authorize such guarantees if he deems them to be in the national interest. To date the President has authorized credit guarantees for exports to all Eastern European countries except Albania and East Germany. Agricultural credits have been granted to the U.S.S.R.⁶

Current United States credit restrictions place "American exporters at a disadvantage in relation to other Western nations in their competition for credit-seeking customers in the Communist bloc."⁷ However, United States policy has been based on the assumption that it is impolitic to provide economic aid to countries which are basically hostile to Western purposes. (For an analysis of strategic considerations of credit policy, see below, page 5ff.)

C. Embargo on Strategic Items: Exports from the United States may be prohibited or curtailed by the President under authority granted by the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended. Primary responsibility for controlling exports is delegated to the United States Department of Commerce and is administered by that agency in the office of Export Control of the Bureau of International Commerce.

National security controls are instituted to provide control of exports from the standpoint of their significance to the security of the United States. At the present time these controls include an Embargo to Communist China, North Korea, the Communist controlled area of Vietnam, and Cuba, as well as broad controls over exports to the Eastern European countries. On October 12, 1966, the President reduced export controls with respect to approximately 400 non-strategic items for export to these countries. Writing in 1965—a year before the President reduced export controls—Brzezinski suggested that the general volume of East-West trade is affected "only to a very limited extent" by the embargo policy.⁸ Thus, while the embargo prevents export of strategic goods, East-West trade is not seriously restricted.

D. Most-Favored-Nation Policy: Currently, the United States denies most-favored-nation treatment to all of the Soviet-bloc nations except Poland and Yugoslavia which are extended the benefits of MFN status under the terms of section 402, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

Reciprocal granting of MFN status by the United States and the Communist nations would enable the United States to benefit from reduced tariff rates and other trade concessions. However, it should be noted that the enhanced competitive position of the United States would be meaningful only in respect to competition with other Western sources of Communist imports. Imports in a Communist country do not compete with domestically produced products, but only complement them.⁹

III. STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS OF EAST-WEST TRADE

A. Effect on the Soviet Economy: To discuss East-West trade intelligently two myths must first be dispelled. First, United States trade with the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries is not going to significantly strengthen the Communist economies and build-up their war-making capability. This contention is often made even though the Soviet Union already is a major power with the second largest GNP of all countries. The quality of Soviet industrial technology is exemplified by the fact that they launched the first Sputnik and the first men in space. Many Soviet scientists have been decorated for their achievements.¹⁰

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (the Battle Act) provides "for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the

security of the United States."¹¹ However, the Soviets can and often do buy industrial goods in Western Europe when refused an export license in the United States. For example, during the late 1950's export licenses were refused for tire plants in the Soviet Union and Poland. Subsequently, a British consortium obtained a contract to supply such a plant to the Soviet Union. In 1959 a polyethylene plant was denied for the Soviet Union, and a British firm later built the plant. Ethylene glycol or oxide plants were consistently denied to several Eastern European countries in the early 1960's. In 1964 an Italian firm built one of these plants in Czechoslovakia.

The range of goods covered by unilateral export controls of the United States is far more comprehensive than embargo coverages provided by the agreements with Western Allies under the Battle Act.¹² However, given the present strength of the Soviet economies and the availability of many goods from Western countries, U.S. trade with the Soviet Union is not going to strengthen their war-making ability.¹³

A second myth which must be dispelled in discussing East-West trade is that United States trade will encourage a major change in their pattern of resource allocation. The Soviets are not so much interested in purchasing consumer goods as they are in obtaining industrial processes and the Soviet Union won't voluntarily place itself in a position of political and military impotence. It is hardly to be expected that the Soviets will enter into a trade arrangement which will be to their disadvantage. On the other hand, United States trade with the Soviets may very well encourage long-term reallocation of resources so that domestic needs are given greater emphasis.

With regard to credit policies, one authority has suggested that coordination of terms of credit within the western alliance is of greater importance than the actual credit limits which are determined.

"On the one hand, the 'aid' provided to the communists is likely to be marginal even if agreed credit terms are liberal; and on the other, the loss of trade to Western countries as a result of credit restrictions is likely to be quite small. In any event, the disadvantages of ill-feeling among the Western allies seems a high price to pay for the limited rewards of independent, national credit policies."¹⁴

Even though short-term credit guarantees tend to force a greater immediate reallocation of resources, the effect on the Soviet economy of either short or long-term credit is debatable. For a more detailed analysis of the Soviet economy and the effect of trade with the United States, see Appendix IV.

B. Benefits for the United States:

1. In suggesting ways in which East-West trade can serve the national interest of the United States in the future, the first and most obvious benefit is increased financial returns. As shown above, trade between the Western European countries and the Eastern Europe area amounted to more than \$8 billion in 1965 and total United States trade was only \$217 million. This United States trade represented 0.59% of total United States exports and about 0.7% of United States imports. According to a high official in the Department of Commerce, "While we do not foresee matching Western Europe's trade with Eastern Europe, we believe there is room for substantial improvement in the United States' share of such trade."¹⁵

2. The major issue in future United States trade policy with Eastern Europe concerns the conditions under which such trade will be conducted. It is not realistic to expect the Communist countries to agree to conditions involving dramatic and spectacular political concessions (removal of the Berlin Wall, for example) in exchange for broadening trading opportunities. One of the Soviet Union's principle trading partners is

Footnotes at end of article.

West Germany, a country with which the Soviet Union has hardly improved political relations.

On the other hand, need for trade and domestic economic pressures are capable of "profoundly changing . . . communist views and practices . . . The climate surrounding Western businesses in East Europe and Russia improved enormously during the early sixties."¹⁶ That important political concessions can be encouraged by economic necessity is illustrated by the establishment of diplomatic relations between West Germany and Rumania. According to *The Reporter* (April 20, 1967), relations were established with "West Germany against the Kremlin's wishes and over the protests of East German Chairman Walter Ulbrecht." (p. 24). The volume of Rumanian-West German trade is approaching \$200 million annually. West Germany is second only to the Soviet Union as Rumania's leading commercial partner.

The experience of Rumania, Yugoslavia, and the reforms which have taken place in other Eastern European countries (such as Poland and Czechoslovakia) indicate that the liberalization of domestic policy and independence of foreign policy is far from being unrelated to East-West trade. However, there are other specific actions which the United States should consider and perhaps demand of the Communist countries in return for increased trade. Examples of such actions include the following:

a. Settlement of the outstanding indebtedness to the United States by respective Communist countries. (See Appendix V.) "There appears to be no serious objection in principle on the part of Communist nations involved against the settling of their debts by a debt agreement."¹⁷

b. Publication by Eastern European countries of financial data such as gold and foreign exchange reserves, total foreign indebtedness and repayment schedules.

c. Increased contact between United States businesses and the ultimate consumer/supplier.

A most significant way in which East-West trade could prove advantageous for the United States at the present time is through encouraging and facilitating a reorientation of communism as a disruptive force. There are two ways of meeting a disruptive force: immobilization (containment) and reorientation. The United States should move beyond the policy of simple containment and seek to reorient the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries to accepting the rule of law, especially impartial third party adjudication as the basis for settling disputes. Although it is premature to believe the Soviets will accept impartial third-party adjudication for solving political disputes, their desire for East-West trade can function as an inducement to settle commercial disputes by rule of law. Ideally, if the Soviets have a good experience with this concept in business relations, they may be more willing to accept rule of law as a way of resolving political disputes.

In negotiating credit arrangements and in seeking to extend "Most Favored Nation" treatment to the Soviet Union and East European countries, the United States should consider insisting on certain conditions designed to advance the rule of law:

First, adherence to the Multilateral Copyright Convention and Protocols dated at Geneva, September 6, 1959, or an appropriate equivalent. Of the Eastern European countries only Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia are parties to this convention.¹⁸

Secondly, adherence to the Madrid Convention of 1891 for the Prevention of False and Misleading Indication of Source.¹⁹

Thirdly, greater compliance with the general rules of GATT.²⁰

Fourthly, and most importantly, acceptance of satisfactory arrangements for impar-

tial third party adjudication of commercial disputes. The only specific governmental bilateral agreement with an Eastern European country that mentions arbitration is the joint United States-Rumanian Communiqué of June 1, 1964, which included an agreement "that commercial contracts between United States firms and Rumanian state enterprises could provide for the settlement of commercial differences and disputes by arbitration in third countries or by appropriate international tribunals is agreed to by the parties to the contracts."²¹

The Soviet Union and probably other Eastern European countries under special conditions will permit United States companies to stipulate third country arbitration in their commercial contracts at their requests.

Contracts between Western firms and Eastern European enterprises may contain a clause referring the arbitration of disputes to the Chamber of Commerce in Stockholm or Zurich. There have also been a limited number of cases where the rules of the American Arbitration Association or the International Chamber of Commerce have been specified.²²

The Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania are parties to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards of June 10, 1958, which was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Commercial Arbitration. The Convention constitutes a considerable improvement over former international agreements.

"The Convention permits the winning party to obtain satisfaction of the award regardless of the place of arbitration, the nationality of the arbitrators, and, in general, the domestic arbitration statute prevailing at the place of arbitration. The burden is on the losing party (against whom enforcement is sought) to prove that the foreign award has not become binding or has been set aside or suspended. Thus, the autonomy of the will of the parties plays a decisive role when the arbitration is conducted properly."²³

The Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia are also parties to the European Convention on International Arbitration of April 21, 1961, which was elaborated by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. This Convention provides for a rather complex formula for settling commercial disputes through arbitration procedures which is based on the fact that none of the states of Eastern Europe is a member of the International Chamber of Commerce. The Convention had to overcome different attitudes regarding institutional arbitration which are greatest between West and East Europe.²⁴

The fact that the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries are parties to both of the Conventions, 1958 and 1961, and the fact that the Eastern European countries have previously agreed to third country arbitration under special conditions suggests that the Eastern European countries would agree to third country adjudication of all disputes if requested by United States firms. The United States should seriously consider insisting on agreement to third party adjudication as a condition for increased trade with the communist countries. Such an agreement on the part of the Soviet Union would represent a significant step toward more peaceful and harmonious relations with Western nations and enhance the force of international law.

An interesting aspect of international trade is the fact that the United States is not a party to any convention establishing arbitration panels or other procedures for the settlement of international commercial disputes. Various business firms and legal groups (including the American Bar Association) in the United States have recommended that the United States become a party to the June 10, 1958, Convention on

the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards.²⁵ According to a leading authority on international trade, United States businessmen face a definite disadvantage regarding foreign law enforcement, vis-a-vis their foreign counterparts, because the United States Government has not been a signatory to any of the multilateral conventions concerning arbitration.²⁶ Indeed, the United States could contribute to a rule of law by acceding to the 1958 Convention even though economic and political necessity may not demand such accession.²⁷

In conclusion the reader should realize that East-West trade is, at least in one respect, more important to the communists than to western countries.

"For the East, trade with the West has been a unique source of industrial imports; for the West it has been mainly a source of nonindustrial items, many of which are available from other sources."²⁸

Communist exports do not enjoy a strong competitive position with respect to products of western nations. While western countries have alternative sources of supply for their imports from the East, Communist imports of capital equipment are an important factor in domestic economic planning. The loss of such imports, while not calamitous, "would be disruptive of current communist economic plans. In addition, trade with the West provides the smaller communist countries with a measure of freedom which they would not otherwise enjoy."²⁹

Given the basic strength of the Western position, the United States should be prepared to encourage a reorientation of communism so that this philosophy becomes less of a disruptive force in the world and more of a positive factor in supporting rule of law.

The attitude of the United States toward trade relations must depend in part on the extent to which the communist states are willing to make adjustments in domestic and foreign policies. The current Administration has not taken full advantage of the buying power of the United States. For example, Most-Favored-Nation status was extended to Poland not only in recognition of changes in Poland's internal policies but also because Poland made a settlement on debts owed to the United States. However, since December 1966 internal liberalization has been abated, and Poland foreign policy has become less independent. The Administration apparently has taken no steps to encourage a reversal of these recent trends.

According to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, trade alone cannot be expected to change the fundamental nature of the communist system in any Eastern European country; however, the United States may expect that the very close relationships normally growing out of trade will provide opportunities for influencing the development of communist societies toward more internal freedom and peaceful relations with the free world.³⁰

Even though East-West trade will encourage greater interaction between communist and non-communist peoples, definite, concrete steps must be taken to influence the attitudes of the ruling elites of these countries. One step would be to compel communist nations to adhere to established modes of behavior in international commerce. Such adherence would encourage the communists to modify their rigid dogma in political matters just as trade with Western European nations has already stimulated changes in the formally centralized economic structure of the Eastern European countries.

The real goal of future United States policy with respect to East-West trade should be to move the Eastern European countries toward acceptance of principles safeguarding private property (industrial processes, literary works, inventions) through adherence to established conventions on patent protection and copyright laws. For example, the Soviet Union does not adhere to either of the major copyright conventions.

Footnotes at end of article.

Given the fact that trade between the United States and countries of Eastern Europe does exist, it would seem wiser to develop trade relations which emphasize the advantages of closer ties with the West than to pursue policies which may drive the communists back to a reliance on their own resources. However, the United States should insist on Soviet adherence to established rules of international commerce as one means of promoting wider respect for peaceful co-existence and international law.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A Background Study on East-West Trade, prepared for Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate (April 1965), p. 60, and "The Proposed 'East-West Trade Relations Act of 1966': Analysis of its Economic Aspects," by Vladimir N. Pregelj, Economics Discussion, Legislative Reference Service (July 25, 1966), p. 32-33. Cited below as Pregelj. For statement on gold reserves see Appendix II.

² Background Study, p. 60.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid, p. 61.

⁵ Cf. Government Guarantees of Credit to Communist Countries, Hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate (November 20, 21, and 22, 1963), pp. 27-32.

⁶ Data supplied by Vladimir N. Pregelj, Analyst in International Trade and Finance, Economics Division, Legislative Reference Service.

⁷ Pregelj, p. 34.

⁸ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Alternative to Partition* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 61.

⁹ Pregelj, p. 29.

¹⁰ Since 1956 the U.S.S.R. has had six Nobel prize winners for physics and one in chemistry. (See Appendix IV)

¹¹ Cited in Congressional Digest, Vol. 46, no. 6-7 (June-July, 1967), p. 166.

¹² Background Study, p. 42. Efforts on the part of the United States to enlarge the COCOM list of strategic goods have consistently failed because the Western Euro-

pean allies do not agree with the United States as to the extent of that list. Cf. Professor Peter Hay, "Common Market Countries' Approach to East-West Trade" in *Proceedings, International Society, Stanford Law School*, Gene Armstrong, ed., Vol. I, (1966), p. 71.

¹³ Earlier rantings of communist statesmen against Western trade controls indicated they hurt, even if sometimes the damage was mainly psychological. "Nevertheless, the resource base of the communist world is such and its determination to accord such a high priority to its defense establishment is so firm, that we should not expect either to reduce their power significantly or to deter them from their purposes by the control of trade." Cf. Philip E. Uren, ed., *East-West Trade* (Toronto: The Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1966) p. 122.

¹⁴ Philip E. Uren, "Some Strategic Considerations Relating to East-West Trade," op. cit.

Berne Union policies on the limits of export credit have almost completely disappeared with British, French, and Italian extension of 12-15 year credits as against the 5 year limit of the Berne Union which the United States continues to follow. Cf. Professor Peter Hay, "Common Market Countries' Approach to East-West Trade," Op. Cit., p. 71.

¹⁵ The Honorable Robert S. McNeill, United States Deputy Assistant to Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy, quoted in *Congressional Digest*, vol. 46, no. 6-7 (June-July 1967), p. 186.

¹⁶ Brzezinski, p. 68.

¹⁷ Pregelj, p. 35.

¹⁸ With the exception of the Soviet Union and Albania, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe subscribe to the 1886 Berne Copyright Convention, revised at Brussels in 1948, which affords essentially the same protection as the 1952 Copyright Convention. The United States has not signed the Berne Convention. The Soviet Union has not signed either the Berne or 1952 Convention.

¹⁹ Neither the United States nor the Soviet

Union has signed this Convention. Thus, at the present the United States could hardly compel the Soviet Union to sign. Both the United States and the Soviet Union adhere to the major multilateral Convention for protection of industrial property, the Convention of the Union of Paris, 1883, revised at Lisbon in 1958.

²⁰ Cf. Brzezinski, p. 64, ff.

²¹ Data supplied from William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State.

²² State Department source.

The Yugoslav Federal Economic Chamber systematically encourages firms to stipulate ICC arbitration. Cf. *The American Journal of International Law*, vol. 59, no. 3. (July 1965), pp. 581ff.

²³ Martin Domke, *Commercial Arbitration* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 105.

²⁴ Uren, pp. 101, 102 ff.

²⁵ Domke, p. 105 and Steven Lazarus, et al., *Resolving Business Disputes* (New York: American Management Association, 1965), p. 176.

²⁶ Lazarus, p. 173.

²⁷ From 1945 to the present the United States has added impetus ably in a most restrained manner, to international arbitration through a series of "Friendship, Commerce and Navigation Treaties" with foreign governments. Such bilateral treaties have been signed with Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Korea, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, and Vietnam.

The concept of comity also affords the United States businessmen a great degree of international enforceability of arbitration awards. Cf. Lazarus, pp. 139 ff. and Domke, pp. 105ff. For histories of United States treaty policy on commercial arbitration see Martin Domke, ed. *International Trade Arbitration* (New York: American Arbitration Association, 1958).

²⁸ Brzezinski, p. 65.

²⁹ Uren, pp. 174-75.

³⁰ Quoted in *Congressional Digest*, op. cit., p. 174.

APPENDIX I

U.S. EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC MERCHANDISE TO SINO-SOVIET BLOC COUNTRIES: TOTAL AND AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, 1947-66

[Values in millions of dollars]

Year	Albania		Bulgaria		Czechoslovakia		East Germany ¹		Hungary		Poland		Rumania		U.S.S.R. ²		China ³	
	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural	Total	Agricultural
1947	4.5	0.6	1.4	0.2	48.6	18.6			12.7	2.4	106.2	54.2	15.1	10.1	149.0	5.4	352.6	104.1
1948	.3	.2	2.1	1.6	20.5	6.8			7.1	1.2	54.9	23.6	7.5	2.9	27.6	.8	240.1	110.8
1949	.1	(⁴)	1.4	1.0	21.6	12.6			5.3	3.2	23.1	13.2	3.2	2.6	6.5	5.1	82.5	37.7
1950	.2	.1	.9	.2	10.1	6.4			3.5	2.5	8.6	4.8	2.0	.8	.6	.1	46.4	37.3
1951	(⁴)		(⁴)		1.0	.4			.6	.5	.7	(⁴)	.4	(⁴)	.1	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
1952	(⁴)		(⁴)		(⁴)	(⁴)	.6	.5	(⁴)	(⁴)	.3	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
1953	(⁴)		(⁴)		(⁴)	(⁴)	1.1	1.1	(⁴)	(⁴)	.7	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
1954	(⁴)		(⁴)		1.0	.9	.6	.6	2.5	2.5	1.5	(⁴)	.1	.1	.2	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
1955	(⁴)		(⁴)		2.2	1.6	.4	.4	.8	.8	3.2	.7	.2	.2	.2	.1	(⁴)	(⁴)
1956	(⁴)		(⁴)		(⁴)	(⁴)	.4	.2	2.0	1.7	3.7	1.8	.5	.2	3.8	1.3	(⁴)	(⁴)
1957	(⁴)		(⁴)		2.0	.7	.3	.2	5.3	3.3	73.1	62.6	1.0	.7	4.4	3.4	(⁴)	(⁴)
1958	.1	(⁴)	.1	(⁴)	1.5	.6	.4	.3	1.7	.6	104.6	79.2	.8	.6	3.4	.3	(⁴)	(⁴)
1959	.8	.5	2.4	.9	2.4	.9	.8	.1	1.1	.5	74.9	60.7	1.8	1.3	7.4	.1	(⁴)	(⁴)
1960	(⁴)		(⁴)		4.4	.7	3.9	1.0	1.6	.5	143.1	131.1	1.0	.1	39.2	2.7	(⁴)	(⁴)
1961	.1	.1	.1	.1	7.2	4.3	2.8	2.6	1.3	.6	74.7	63.9	1.4	.3	45.6	18.1	(⁴)	(⁴)
1962	(⁴)		(⁴)		7.0	3.9	1.7	1.7	.8	.2	94.4	84.5	.8	.3	20.1	11.0	(⁴)	(⁴)
1963	(⁴)		.1	.1	9.8	5.7	6.4	6.1	17.3	16.5	108.6	101.9	1.2	.1	22.9	9.1	(⁴)	(⁴)
1964	(⁴)		4.8	4.4	11.3	8.5	19.9	16.0	13.6	12.8	137.9	127.1	5.1	2.1	153.3	129.4	(⁴)	(⁴)
1965	(⁴)	(⁴)	3.6	2.5	27.6	23.7	12.6	10.9	9.3	8.0	35.2	26.4	6.3	3.4	44.3	29.3	(⁴)	(⁴)
1966	.2	.1	3.6	1.7	37.2	32.0	24.7	21.0	10.0	7.7	52.9	44.4	27.2	6.4	41.7	23.3	(⁴)	(⁴)

¹ No data available in source for 1947-51.

² Includes Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

³ Mainland China and Manchuria. Exports after 1951 consist essentially of shipments to foreign diplomatic missions in China.

⁴ Less than \$50,000.

⁵ Excludes shipments of U.S. wheat earlier stored in Canada and shipped through Canadian ports as follows: in 1963, \$4,100,000 to Poland; in 1964, \$1,100,000 to Hungary, \$2,800,000 to Poland, \$7,200,000 to U.S.S.R.

⁶ Preliminary.

Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, U.S. foreign agricultural trade by countries; calendar years 1947-65. U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. exports; country by commodity groupings (FT420), December 1966.

Note: Due to rounding, identical figures in "Total;" and "Agricultural" columns do not necessarily indicate no trade in nonagricultural products. In years for which data are available, there was no trade with North Korea and North Vietnam; only exports to Outer Mongolia were in 1964 of negligible value.

APPENDIX II

THE INFLUENCE OF EAST-WEST TRADE ON SOVIET ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

Western trade with the Soviet Union may exert some indirect influence to change their

pattern of resource allocation. Any changes at all will be very small, and these changes will be decided internally, by the Soviet leadership, not directly by East-West trade, since the leadership will decide what will be pur-

chased. Consideration of present trends shows that the status quo is strongly opposed to a major reallocation of resources.

The Soviet Union is a highly industrialized nation, although there is a very small, stable

increase in production of consumer goods. U.S.S.R. consumers get only about 20% of the Soviet GNP. Per capita consumption in the U.S.S.R. in 1964 of food products was 53% of that in the U.S.; of non-food products, 13%; of services excluding health and education, 17%; for health and education, 54%.¹

In the early 1950's, Premier Malenkov attempted to reform the Soviet economy in favor of the consumer. After the Korean War, the Soviet economy was overextended. Many projects had to be cut back. The resulting tense situation required some boost for consumers. Prices were cut. Then consumers had money, but no goods to buy. Malenkov said both consumer goods and heavy industry could be developed. But there was more talk than action. Malenkov was forced out of power by two events: a crop failure, and alarm over successful U.S. H-bomb tests. In January, 1955, Malenkov's defeat was made clear when the Soviet position was printed in *Pravda*, assailing proponents of the pro-consumer line:

"If opinions of this kind were to become general, it would greatly damage the entire cause of communist construction. It would completely confuse our cadres. . . . Practically, it would mean that development of our heavy industry, which is the backbone of the socialist economy, would tend downward, leading to a decline in all branches of the national economy and producing a drop rather than an increase in the working people's living standards. It would undermine the economic power of the Soviet Union and weaken its defense capacity."

The Malenkov era had limitations other than its short life.² Abram Bergson finds that—

"between 1952 and 1954 consumption's share of the Soviet GNP (total output of all goods and services) rose from 44.4% to 51.2%. Over the same period the share taken by the defense appropriation in the Soviet budget declined from 12.7% to 10.3%, and the share taken by gross investment fell from 28.7% to 25.5%. These changes were not negligible. As a result, in 1954 Soviet consumers received a higher share of national output than in any other year over the period 1941-55. But in 1928 Soviet consumers had received directly 64.7% of the GNP, and even in 1940 they had received 51.0%. . . . Soviet steel production increased about 7,000,000 metric tons between 1952 and 1954, roughly 20%. Oil output rose almost 25%. . . . The amount of electricity generated increased . . . by 25%. . . . The reality was much more a further advance in the economic and military power of the Soviet state."

Schwartz adds that the Malenkov era made new beginnings. "The Soviet people saw that their rulers had made some concessions and the issue of the standard of living had been brought into the forefront of public discussion . . . the new forces thus set in motion could not be reversed. . . ."

The changes of the Malenkov era were small, and have thus far been kept under control by the Soviet leadership. The situation is described by Alfred Zauberman, who discusses "the remarkable stability of the rate of industrial progress over a considerable period . . . [and] the set of canons evolved in the U.S.S.R. . . . that require continually faster growth rates in producer-goods than in the consumer goods sector."³

In the face of the power and prestige that the Soviet Union gains from their present pattern of resource allocation, it would seem unlikely that this pattern will be changed significantly.

Indeed, Soviet interest in trade is largely due to the present pattern of allocation. In an address delivered to the April 1966 Party Congress, Premier A. N. Kosygin said:

"It is becoming more and more obvious in our time that the scientific and technical revolution at work in the modern world calls for freer international contacts and creates conditions for broad economic exchange between socialist and capitalist countries. . . . In the past 5 years foreign trade helped us solve a number of important economic problems. . . . The time has come for us to reappraise the role of foreign trade."⁴

Trade with the West better enables the Soviet Union to pursue its policy of emphasis on heavy industry and capital goods.

As Schwartz says, Western goods provide continued injections of advanced technology and equipment into Soviet economy. That trade with the West contributes to the strength and prestige of the Soviet Union is an international fact of life. As Uren writes:

"It may be said that all western exports to the communists improve their strength; this is as true of consumer goods as it is of special steels, although the increment to strength is different in quality. Such general increases in strength cannot be easily separated conceptually from an increase in military strength. While almost everyone will readily agree that we should not provide arms to communist countries, the precise definition of a list of strategic goods is extremely difficult . . . Quite naturally, and it seems properly, the list tends to lengthen when international tension is high and to shorten in periods of detente. The list is, in part, an expression of the political climate and imposes inconveniences upon the communist nations when their intransigence warrants some tangible sign of disapproval . . . on the other hand, it opens up opportunities to them when they seem inclined to some measure of political accommodation . . . the resource base of the communist world is such and its determination to accord a high priority to its defense establishment is so firm, that we should not expect either to reduce their power significantly or to deter them from their purposes by the control of trade."⁵

As a result of this emphasis, the Soviet Union has grown to great prestige in science and technology. Since 1956, the U.S.S.R. has had six Nobel prize winners for physics and one in chemistry. In 1962, the last time an estimate was made, the Soviet Union allocated 2.2% of its GNP to research and development, compared with 2.2% for the United Kingdom, and 3.1% for the U.S.⁶

The Soviet space successes further demonstrate the highly developed nature of industry. A strong industrial power base is essential for any nation that wishes to participate in space exploration. Moreover, a trained corps of space scientists and technicians is needed. That there is a correlation between the Soviet space program and the Soviet capacity to develop the economic base of a modern industrial state can be demonstrated by citing some of their space successes. Great industrial ability was necessary to build the Soviets' superior 27,000 pound Proton space vehicle and a rocket with an estimated first stage thrust of between two and three million pounds to boost it to orbit. The same point can be made for the development of the highly sophisticated deep space systems (e.g. Lunik, Venus, Mars), in addition to their development of communications and meteorological space systems now in operation.

The correlation between the economic base and space exploration is further demonstrated by the following excerpt from a study of the Soviet space programs recently published by the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee:

"In the economic sphere, the leadership of the Soviet Union has consistently used the extraordinary political powers at its disposal to pursue two major goals: (1) to build up as rapidly as possible the heavy industrial sector of the economy and (2)

to maximize current output of military and products on the basis of a rapidly growing and largely self-sufficient heavy industry.

"In the pursuit of these goals, the leaders . . . have recognized the critical role played by research in the attainment of a high level of industrial and military technology under modern economic conditions. They became aware at an early stage that in their own production system, which was consciously isolated from the international economy by way of autarky, an elaborate research and development structure would be required to substitute for the normal economic interaction among the individual national economies of the world. . . . Accordingly, scientific and technical research was established as an organized state activity, highly centralized and liberally financed by the federal treasury of the U.S.S.R. . . . State expenditures on scientific research doubled between 1951 and 1957, and by 1963 the science budget of the Soviet Government was six times as large as it was in 1951. By 1966 the U.S.S.R. was spending five times as much as in 1956 on funding its research . . ."

"The Soviet Union today spends as much on maintaining its research and development apparatus every year as it spends [on] new housing . . . the equivalent of \$22.8 billions."⁷

It is evident, then, that the Soviet Government is deeply committed to a very high percentage of expenditures for defense and heavy industry. Changes in this pattern of allocation of resources will depend on various factors, only negligibly on the factor of trade. One variable is the success of the Brezhnev-Kosygin team and those who may follow it in providing greater incentive for farmers, so that production will be increased to permit more consumer spending without any change in priorities. Another factor is how powerfully the winds of change now blowing through the Soviet economy will affect the outmoded, clumsy and frequently irrational mechanism directing that economy, to produce the same result as above. Finally, there is the variable of the burden of arms expenditures the Soviet Union will have to bear in the years ahead.⁸ As Schwartz writes:

"Any major reduction of these expenditures could permit the Soviet government to shift large quantities of resources and many of its finest managers and technicians to the task of meeting the needs of the civilian economy. Such a shift could do much to counteract the retarding influences . . . operating upon the Soviet growth rate. Here political developments, both Soviet relations with the West and . . . with Communist China will be decisive. From an economic point of view, the case for Soviet arms reduction is strong, but Soviet military pressure against this is probably felt strongly by the post-Khrushchev regime."⁹

These factors—ability to up production so there can be more "butter" as well as "guns," internal pressure of the existing but embryonic consumer demand, and international situation effects of defense spending, are some of those which will influence resource allocation. The Soviet leadership, on this basis, decides what goods will be included in trade. Trade is not a directly causal factor in this process of allocation.

Present trends indicate that the western nations will take no advantage of one way in which trade could have some small effect directly on allocation of resources. Refusal to extend long-term credit to the Soviet Union could force some allocation away from defense in order to pay for goods—provided it didn't force abandonment of East-West trade, Schwartz writes:

"Partially reducing the pressures for curtailment of arms spending is the ability of the Soviet Union to gain long term loans from the West. The decision of British au-

Footnotes at end of article.

thorities in 1964 to underwrite long term 15 years credits for Soviet purchases of chemical machinery for production of synthetic fibers could mark a major turning point, since presumably other Western sellers will be under great pressure to extend similar long term credits."¹⁰

And nevertheless, whether the point of considering what sort of credit is used is ever reached depends primarily on the effects of the above three variables.

There are several factors which make it easier for the Soviet Union than for the West to concentrate on capital investment rather than consumer production: For one thing, it's cheaper, since there are no rent or interest rates in the U.S.S.R. And since the Soviets are on the defensive, want to catch up with the West, they are willing to sacrifice more. There is less uncertainty about the future and greater standardization as a result of central planning. Finally, any change must be slow, since the Stalinist managerial elite not only resists change, but because of its training perhaps could not cope with changes in the economy.¹¹ The situation at present then shows a preponderance of factors in favor of emphasis on production of capital goods.

The single factor working against this situation is a small, stable impetus in consumer demand. This was briefly encouraged under Malinkov, but has been taken in stride and controlled by the leadership. As long as the goods imported by the Soviet Union are chiefly capital goods, rather than finished consumer goods, East-West trade will have little effect on this consumer impetus. More influence in this respect can be exerted in Eastern Europe where more U.S. exports are consumer goods. As the Soviet Union uses pragmatically more and more profit incentives, markets and hence consumers are bound to become more and more important.¹² Here exposure to superior Western goods through East-West trade could encourage the consumer impetus, if the leadership chooses to continue on its increasingly pragmatic course. But for the most part, imports from the West are capital goods or raw materials and could contribute either to defense or consumer materials, depending on the policy of the Soviet Government.

Trade will not simply cause a reallocation of resources toward consumer goods just because Western consumer goods are available. The U.S.S.R. is more interested in capital goods. If any influence is to be exerted by East-West trade, it will be indirect: If the Soviet Union does import Western consumer goods, it may commit itself to secondary investment in this area. This is encouraged by the limited consumer demand in the Soviet Union, and by the attraction of Western capital goods. Western machinery is more efficient whether it produces more machines for industry or refrigerators for families.) But any commitment depends upon the will of the leadership.

An example of how such secondary commitment could occur is the Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant. "While it might be tempting to jump to the conclusion that construction of such a huge auto assembly plant signals an abrupt change in allocation of Soviet resources toward consumer products, such a conclusion would be premature at this time. Nevertheless, this is a huge undertaking and one that could lead to further expansion of Soviet consumer goods industries at a later time."¹³ The plant which Fiat will build will cost the Soviet Union approximately \$800,000,000, for which Italy has extended the U.S.S.R. what amounts to a nine-year credit. The plant "is capable of quadrupling current Soviet passenger automobile production."¹⁴ But "essentially, the new Soviet program is designed to produce automobiles for the bureaucratic and managerial elite, not for the average citizen."¹⁵ And "announced plans are not so grandiose as to require a significant altera-

tion in traditional Soviet economic priorities, and would leave military and space programs unimpaired."¹⁶ "Indirect investment required for the supporting facilities for the production of steel, gasoline, and tires has not been fully calculated, but appears to be on the order of \$400 million—substantially less than the direct investment."¹⁷ As for so-called tertiary investment, "An examination of Soviet plans for highway development during the next five years reveals that these call for only a modest increase over the previous five years."¹⁸ "Not until there is a large, widely distributed stock of automobiles does a rapid acceleration take place."¹⁹ The Soviet leadership can control whether wide distribution takes place—and the effects of trade on secondary and tertiary investment and allocation depend on the priorities assigned by the Soviet leadership, depend on, as discussed above, other internal aspects of the Soviet economy and upon the international situation.

The Fiat report says:

"The leaders of the [Soviet Union] no longer seem to be either willing or able to continue to repress economic discontent indefinitely and indiscriminately. Above all they have become aware that they cannot afford to remain indifferent to the mood among those groups of citizens that are contributing importantly to the growing fund of scientific, technical, and economic power at the disposal of the state. These are persons and groups with their own unique frame of reference. They know their own worth to the regime, and they are also fairly well informed about the style of life enjoyed by their peers in the modern industrial society around the world."²⁰

There are then trends toward change in the Soviet Union which depend on internal conditions and the Soviet leadership. But Western trade, waiting in the wings, could perhaps encourage or at least take advantage of every Soviet shift. Some feel that the fact that the Soviet leaders "are placing their hopes on gradualism" "will fail" to produce any significant progress from socialism to capitalism, since the essence of the system can remain intact. But perhaps these gradual changes are most important, if as Lenin said, The economy is the main field of battle for Communism.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Joint Economic Committee, *New Directions in the Soviet Economy*, Part IV. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, p. 1032.

² Harry Schwartz, *Soviet Economy Since Stalin*. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1965, p. 72.

³ Alfred Zauberman, *Soviet and Chinese Strategy for Economic Growth*. International Affairs, July 1962, p. 345.

⁴ Joint Economic Committee, Part I, p. XI.

⁵ Philip E. Uren, *East-West Trade*. Ontario, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1966, p. 115.

⁶ Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Research and Development Expenditure in Western Europe, North America, and the Soviet Union*. Paris, 1965.

⁷ U.S. Senate, Soviet space programs, 1962-65. Staff report prepared by the Library of Congress. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, pp. 12-13.

⁸ See Schwartz, p. 239-41.

⁹ Schwartz, p. 239.

¹⁰ Schwartz, p. 239.

¹¹ Angus Maddison, "Soviet Economic Performance," *Banca Nazionale del Lavoro*. Rome, March 1965, p. 20.

¹² Time, "Russia," February 12, 1965, p. 23.

¹³ House Subcommittee on International Trade, "The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant," U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1, 1967, p. 3.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 12.

²⁰ Joint Economic Committee, Part I, p. 17.

APPENDIX III

Outstanding loans and other obligations owed United States by Soviet bloc, Yugoslavia, and Cuba as of June 30, 1963 (other than lend-lease)

Bulgaria: War and other claims of U.S. nationals....	\$3,143,398
--	-------------

Czechoslovakia:	
World War I indebtedness....	257,647,080
Surplus property credits....	7,536,459
Total	265,183,539

Hungary:	
World War I indebtedness....	3,935,600
Surplus property credits....	8,993,069
Export-Import credit guarantees (wheat and other commodity sales through Mar. 2, 1964) ..	20,700,000
Total	33,628,669

Poland:	
World War I indebtedness....	435,478,984
Surplus property credits....	17,338,000
Public Law 480 sales (dollar repayments not due until 1967)	477,300,000
Claims of U.S. nationals....	34,000,000
AID development loans....	59,554,000
Export-Import Bank credits....	18,888,000
Total	1,042,558,984

Rumania:	
World War I indebtedness....	107,569,371
Claims of U.S. nationals....	500,000
Total	108,069,371
U.S.S.R. World War I indebtedness	621,420,405

Yugoslavia:	
World War I indebtedness....	78,168,718
AID development loans....	184,900,000
Public Law 480 sales....	433,856,000
Export-Import Bank loans....	63,000,000
Total	759,942,718

Cuba:	
Export-Import Bank loans....	36,300,000
Expropriation of Nicaraguan nickel property, valued at	133,000,000
Loans considered in default (other than World War I loans)	

	Principal	Interest
Czechoslovakia	\$1,948,000	\$1,160,000
Hungary	3,782,000	-----
U.S.S.R.	42,272,000	-----

Source: Hearings, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 88th Congress, second session, on East-West trade, part I, Mar. 13, 16, 23, April 8, 9, 1964, p. 29.

PROPOSAL TO MAKE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CABINET-LEVEL DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the executive branch of the Government of the United States there are seven agencies with budgets in excess of \$5 billion. Six of these agencies are Cabinet-level departments; one is not. That one is the

Veterans' Administration, with a budget of approximately \$6.6 billion.

There are four agencies which have more than 100,000 full-time permanent employees. Three of these agencies are Cabinet-level departments; one is not. That one is the Veterans' Administration which has 176,000 in personnel and is exceeded only by the Defense and Post Office Departments.

There are three agencies which in fiscal 1970 will make outlays for education, according to budget estimates, in excess of one-half billion dollars. Two of these agencies are Cabinet-level departments; one is not. That one is the Veterans' Administration.

Again in fiscal 1970 there are two agencies which will expend more than \$1 billion in providing direct Federal hospital and medical services, and there are two agencies which will expend more than \$5 billion in the form of cash benefits for income security programs. In both of these cases, one agency is a Cabinet-level department, and one is not. The one that is not is the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Speaker, veterans and their families make up 49 percent of the total population of the United States. If ever a branch of Government reached out to the people, and closely affected the lives of the people, that branch is the Veterans' Administration.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced legislation to elevate the Veterans' Administration to Cabinet rank. Surely, the VA should be represented in the highest council of our Government. It should not be just another Federal agency, for certainly the voice of the veteran should be heard and heeded in the important decisions made at the top level of Government.

As it exists now, the Veterans' Administration is an organizational monstrosity. It should be a Cabinet-level department, and it is high time that something be done to correct it.

AIR SERVICE IN THE PACIFIC

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. island areas in the Pacific are of ever-growing importance to our national interest. They represent, in effect, our western perimeter. Their strategic importance is known to many; their economic difficulties are known to few.

The U.S. island areas to which I refer are Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or Micronesia. The last mentioned group of islands have been entrusted to the United States under a U.N. mandate. We have a fiduciary responsibility to their inhabitants.

All of these islands have comparatively little natural resources. They do, however, have beauty and cultural charm. In a word, they represent potential tourist attractions. By the same token, tourism offers these islands the only practical means of economic development which could lead to their self sufficiency. Fundamental to the development of tourism

to the U.S. island areas is vastly improved and expanded air transportation. Like other fields of endeavor, the stimulus of effective competition is what is so sorely needed.

In the actual proceeding, the Department of Interior and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee set forth identical positions. Counsel for the Department of Interior stated:

The Transpacific Route Investigation provides the principal opportunity in the foreseeable future for assuring the development of these important U.S. island areas. I do not believe that I can overstate to you the great importance which we attach to the development of American Samoa and Guam as U.S. territories and the equally great obligation which we owe to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which has been entrusted to our care by the United Nations for more than two decades now. . . . These Pacific Islands present the prospect not only for new vacation areas for travelers from our 50 states, but also for tremendous potential in drawing tourists from the Orient and the Lands Down Under. . . . I would urge, therefore, that in establishing the pattern of service in this investigation that you place great importance on the development of Guam and American Samoa as new transportation hubs in the Pacific, that you provide single carrier service between the Trust Territory and the U.S. Mainland and the Orient, and that you provide for routings between American Samoa, Guam and the Orient.

I would further urge that in your carrier selection you give full consideration to assure—even to guarantee—that the carrier or carriers selected will undertake the tremendous development required.

The record was replete with evidence of the need of service to these U.S. island areas. For example, the Governor of Guam testified on the "oppressive consequences of inadequate commercial air service." Similarly, the Governor of American Samoa testified that the handicaps encountered "because of its inadequate air transportation services are tremendous."

I was indeed gratified when the Civil Aeronautics Board recognized the interests of these island areas and found a need for the establishment of a route through the mid-Pacific which would serve American Samoa, the U.S. Trust Territory Islands of the Pacific, Guam, and Okinawa. As to this routing the Board noted:

The Interior Department and the Government of American Samoa have both strongly urged the establishment of a route linking Samoa with the Orient; at present, only extremely circuitous service via Hawaii or Australia is available. Interior and the Government of Guam also urge the establishment of a Guam-Okinawa link (footnote omitted) as an additional means of access into Guam and the Trust Territory for Orient traffic. Both of these objectives will be achieved by the route we are setting up, which will also permit direct access from Hawaii.

With reference to the selection of an airline to provide service to these areas the CAB stated:

A number of factors persuade us that Continental should be selected in place of Eastern. It has shown itself an extremely vigorous competitor when placed in competition with carriers many times its size. It is a low-cost operator, and its policy has been to share its low costs with its passengers by aggressively pushing economy and promotional fares. This will, in our view, be a particular-

ly important factor in developing large-scale tourism to the far-flung American dependencies in the Pacific. Another important factor will be hotel and similar tourist-plant development; here again, we find Continental's plans more aggressive than Eastern's.

I congratulate the CAB on its understanding and appreciation of the needs of American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory.

I, as I am sure others, was surprised and distressed to learn that this forward-looking decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the views of the Department of Interior, our committee, and the Governments of American Samoa and Guam were rejected in President Nixon's decision of April 11th in the Transpacific Route Investigation. However, the President did state that there is to be a second carrier to serve the South Pacific from midwest and eastern points and postponed decision on a route between the U.S. island areas to a later decision. It is critical that the route already created be reestablished. It is further essential that the carrier selected to serve this route and the related South Pacific route be willing to assume the responsibility for needed tourism development, and hotel development in particular. Such matters of responsibility are related to management policies and performance and not the size of a company.

In summary, to a very significant extent the future of the U.S. island areas is at stake. Their economic growth and well-being can best be served by giving proper consideration to those elements which were heretofore taken into account by the Department of Interior, the governments of American Samoa and Guam and the CAB.

POLICE COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill providing for a 10-year Federal program to improve the quality of law enforcement in our cities by upgrading our local police forces. Specifically, the bill authorizes Federal grants to be used in increasing the compensation paid to policemen, and in adding more men to the force in cities where this is needed.

The cities of this Nation, faced with the gravest crisis of law enforcement in our history, urgently need to improve the caliber of their police forces by increasing the financial attractiveness of police work to our best young men. To achieve this goal the revenue-starved cities need aid from the Federal Government. They need aid now, with a minimum of red-tape, and in amounts sufficient to make a meaningful impact on the police salaries they are able to pay.

The need for higher police salaries was dramatically documented in 1967 by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. The Commission discovered that the median starting salary for police recruits in the United States was \$4,600 in small cities and \$5,300 in large cities.

In comparison, a young man beginning work as a skilled laborer can expect to earn between \$6,000 and \$9,000, depending on the section of the country. Furthermore, the recruits in most cities will never be able to make more than \$1,000 per year above their starting pay, no matter how long they remain on the force. The benefits of seniority in private industry are far greater.

Mr. Speaker, a young man considering police work is aware that we demand more of our policemen today than ever before. Police work has always been challenging and dangerous, to be sure. But today we also ask that our policemen deal with hippy happenings, bitter political protests, and college insurrections, without "losing his cool" or ignoring his duty to protect the public. We ask that he serve in areas of the cities where he may be treated as a scapegoat for the racial and economic frustrations that we have all failed to alleviate. We ask him to make on-the-spot decisions in these areas which may make the difference between riot and reason.

It is asking too much to expect this young man to enter a career filled with these challenges if we refuse to offer him compensation at least competitive with that available in less demanding lines of work. Police work requires men of sound judgment, emotional maturity, and personal courage. Many of our policemen today have all of these qualities, and they deserve our praise and gratitude. But unfortunately, too many do not have such qualities. Our cities find themselves unable to recruit men of high caliber in sufficient numbers because of the low compensation paid by their police departments. Because of their recruitment difficulties the cities are unable to raise their police entrance requirements to a level which would insure a force of high quality.

Ideally, local governments would recognize the need for higher police pay, as most do, and then utilize their own revenues to realize this goal. But we live in a country where the need for governmental services is increasingly outstripping the financial ability of city governments to provide them. It is in our major cities where the need for more and better policemen is most acute, and yet it is in these same cities that the revenue crisis of local governments is most severe and grows more desperate with each year. Hopefully, within the not-too-distant future, we will adopt some form of revenue-sharing plan with local governments which will increase their capacity to finance local services, including police protection. But the need for improved law enforcement is too crucial to await this uncertain day. We need to aid the cities in this area now, and that is what my bill will do.

But in our anxiety to achieve a prompt increase in police salaries, I believe we should be careful to avoid creating a permanent lien for this purpose on the Federal Treasury. The fiscal hazards in such a course are obvious. But just as important, we should avoid permanent Federal financing of police functions because law enforcement should remain a local responsibility. Local responsibility

in this area has been a keystone of our governmental system, and it should be preserved.

What Congress can and should do is provide an effective but temporary shot in the arm for our police forces until the adoption of a general program of revenue-sharing makes possible full funding by the cities themselves. It should be noted that the Safe Streets Act of 1968 does not really attempt to do this.

My goal has been to devise a program which will achieve a prompt increase in police salaries through Federal aid during this current period of local fiscal crisis, but looks in the long run to a reassertion of local financial responsibility for the increased salaries. While in effect my bill defines "long run" in terms of 10 years, this of course is subject to expansion or contraction by later Congresses as the progress of revenue-sharing dictates. My program concentrates chiefly on our major urban areas, where the crime problem is the greatest and the police recruitment handicaps most severe.

The basic outline of my bill is simple. The sum of \$100 million is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Of this amount \$10 million is reserved specifically for grants to cities having populations of less than 100,000 which the Attorney General, acting through his Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, determines have an urgent need for grant assistance. The remainder of the appropriation, \$90 million, will be apportioned on a per capita basis among all cities which have a population of over 100,000. Whether the grant be of this per capita variety, or a discretionary grant by the Attorney General, the bill provides that the grant is to be phased out over a 10-year period, the city gradually accepting full financial responsibility for the increased salaries.

Each city may use its grant to increase the compensation of its policemen in any way it sees fit. Presumably it will expend the bulk of the grant on its salary schedule, increasing both the starting pay and the succeeding increases with seniority. But it might choose also to increase retirement or injury benefits, institute a bonus system for educational achievements by men on the force, or supplement its payments to the wives and children of deceased policemen. It could also expend up to 25 percent of any grant to create new positions on the force. This one limitation on the use of grant funds is present because of the evidence that many cities do not need more policemen but better policemen. Therefore, Congress should insure that its grants are used chiefly to increase the attractiveness of existing police positions through increased compensation. But even here a city may exceed this 25-percent limit if it can convince the Attorney General that it has an urgent need for additional police manpower.

It has been 2 years since the President's Commission established beyond doubt the urgent need for higher police salaries in this country. The crisis in law enforcement has become more severe since the Commission's report was made public, and yet we still have not ade-

quately responded to this crisis in a manner which may be most relevant to its solution—improving the caliber of our police forces by increasing the compensation offered to young men considering a police career. The intent of my bill is to initiate prompt and responsible action which will improve law enforcement now and during the next decade.

MONTANA 4-H CLUB MEMBERS

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be visited today by representatives of the 4-H Clubs from Montana. All of us know the tremendous contribution 4-H has made to the development of young people in rural America, and, in a day of considerable unrest among our younger people, it is indeed refreshing to see this fine organization continue to flourish.

I ask at this time that the report on 4-H activities in Montana which our representatives presented to me today be inserted in the RECORD.

SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG MONTANANS

Many young Montanans have a wonderful opportunity to attend a whole field of events that have been offered to them by the 4-H program. A few of these are:

Black Hills Recreation Leaders Laboratory, which is held at Camp Bob Marshall, Custer, South Dakota.

Rec Lab is people—working, playing, and having fellowship together. It is a week filled with leadership development. Through workshops and social activities, the lab seeks to help people develop both as individuals and as members of the group, these principles and techniques are then brought back and used constructively with others in their community. Last year sixteen people attended this camp from Montana.

Montana 4-H Fire Prevention and Control School, which is held at Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

This is a two-day short course and training school held at Montana State University in which participants receive the latest information in fire preventions and control. In addition to talks, movies and demonstrations members visit the Bozeman Fire Department and make trips to nearby forest areas where they have an opportunity to learn first hand about the devastation of fires and how to prevent them. They study and discuss educational programs which they can take back to their communities to help prevent waste of uncontrolled fires. Last year seventeen people attended this.

4-H Production Awards Trip, held at both Duluth and Minneapolis, Minnesota.

The purpose of this trip is to help 4-H members learn more about grain marketing, processing, and handling; and to visit related agricultural businesses. Emphasis is given to the educational and vocational guidance aspects of the trip. Five Montanans went on this trip.

Western Regional 4-H Tractor Operators Contest, which was held at Lincoln, Nebraska. Three Montanans attended this event.

Minneapolis Grain Marketing Trip, which is held at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Three Montana 4-H'ers had an opportunity to see the actual processing and sale of grains on a three-day visit and tour of the largest grain marketing centers in the United States.

National 4-H Congress, which is held in Chicago, Illinois.

Over 1,500 4-H delegates from 50 states gather annually at the World's largest hotel in Chicago for this event. The week is devoted to educational tours, discussion programs, special entertainment, and unforgettable banquets. Club members are selected on the basis of their excellent project work, leadership, and personal growth through 4-H. 35 Montanans attended National Congress.

National Western 4-H Club Roundup, which is held at Denver, Colorado.

Delegates from western states selected because of their excellence in project work, demonstrations and judging, meet together for a four-day conference held in connection with the National Western Livestock Show. Some members have an opportunity to participate in Livestock Judging Contest and all participate in discussions, tours, and special entertainment. Sixteen members attended from Montana.

National 4-H Conference, which is held at Washington D.C.

Four 4-H'ers who have demonstrated excellence in 4-H club work and junior leadership attend this meeting. This week features tours of the Nation's capital and many surrounding shrines. The 4-H'ers have a chance to discuss their role as citizens in this country with other young people from all parts of the nation.

Northland Recreation Laboratory, held at Camp Ihduhapi, Minnesota.

This program varies from year to year and includes such activities as crafts, dramatics, nature, games, folk dancing, music, stunts, discussions, and many others. One delegate from Montana attended this Lab on a 4-H scholarship.

International Land, Pasture, and Range Judging School and Contest, which is held in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

This land appreciation training school and judging contest features the training of young people to understand basic soil differences, soil properties and how these affect crop growth, management practices, land types, their production and treatment, as well as the relationship of soil management to water conservation. Seven Montanans attended this event.

Chatcolab Northwest Leadership Laboratory, which is held at Lake Chatcolet, Plummer, Idaho.

This lab is a week filled with leadership development opportunities for everyone. Eight from Montana attended this meet.

Junior Leader Camps. Four camps, one at Lions Camp, Red Lodge; Camp Needmore, Ekalaka; Methodist Camp, Nelhart; and Methodist Youth Camp at Rollins are designed so that young people can practice democratic procedures and processes with adult support and guidance so that they will become new effective citizens in any situation. Return campers selected at these camps help plan and carry out the camp.

Montana 4-H Conservation Camp, which was held at Little Bitterroot Camp, Flathead County.

This camp is devoted to methods and ways by which young people may learn to appreciate and conserve their natural resources. The camp features special instruction in the fields of range conservation, recreation area management, water conservation, wildlife conservation, and emergency preparedness. The principal feature of the camp is the reporting phase which members do upon returning home to their local communities.

Exchanges Programmed by the Counties.

Montana counties continued to arrange exchange with other states and with provinces of Canada.

National 4-H Citizenship Short Course, which is held at the National 4-H Center, Washington, D.C.

The week's program at the Nation's capital gives 4-H members and leaders an opportunity to learn more about their government, gain better understanding of national problems and our citizenship responsibilities, de-

velop some understanding into 4-H club work as a nationwide program with the Cooperative Extension Service. Montana sent 99 people in two different groups to attend this course.

Alberta 4-H Club Week, which was held at Vermillion, Alberta, Canada.

This is an exchange in which four Montana 4-H club members visit a 4-H club week at Vermillion or Olds, and in turn four young people from Alberta come to our Montana 4-H Congress in August. The exchange has as its principal objective the opportunity to exchange ideas and to learn more about what our neighbors are doing in 4-H club work.

American Youth Foundation, Camp Miniwanca, which is held at Stony Lake, Michigan.

Montana sent two delegates to this camp. International Farm Youth Exchange.

This features an exchange of Montana young people who visit and live as members of families in another country. In turn, young people from abroad come to Montana to live as family members on Montana farms and ranches. Montana had three delegates last year, and six exchange delegates came to Montana.

Montana 4-H Congress, which is held at Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

The Congress features a program of educational events and activities aimed at improving the talents and abilities, understanding and knowledge of 4-H club members as it relates to themselves, their community and their role as citizens.

PRESIDENT NIXON DECLARES WAR ON AMERICA'S LIBRARIES

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the President has just proclaimed National Library Week with hosannahs and oratorical flourishes. Simultaneously, the President has mangled 1970 budget requests for major library programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Library Services and Construction Act. The original request was \$134.5 million. He has trampled it down to a trifle over \$46 million. Among programs imperiled by the President's rash action is our Brooklyn Public Library's \$200,000 wholly federally financed program of "roving librarians at large" within neglected neighborhoods.

Under the President's mangled program, equipment and instructional materials for schools, public and academic libraries would be reduced or terminated altogether.

This is a difficult-to-understand action by the administration. In recent years, our Nation's libraries, especially our own Brooklyn Public Library, have labored diligently to become more relevant to those who are culturally deprived. Their new programs have brought the library into places where its resources and dedicated personnel can strike ignorance at its roots. All the more reason why our libraries should be given more rather than less funds.

Recent programs have delivered library services to the urban poor, racial minorities, migrant workers and other disadvantaged groups. I have seen personally how innovations by our own Brooklyn Public Library have opened up an entire new world to many of the deprived.

The President proposes to eliminate the entire \$200 million original authorization for library materials under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; to cut funding for the Library Services and Construction Act from \$166 million to \$23.2 million; and to pare funds for library training, research and services under the Higher Education Act from \$114 million to \$23 million.

To the ruination of Job Corps and cutting of water pollution programs we now can add this feather to the administration's cap. Defense spending rages unchecked. Only the poor, our environment and precious things like our libraries are suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the public library helped lift millions of immigrants out of slums of an earlier America. My own forebears had cause to bless its facilities more than once. Dedicated people of the library profession have updated their institution, keeping it relevant to a new generation of deprived Americans. Now it is to be hamstrung by an administration which preaches catchwords of morality and uplift while it snatches away tools with which people can help themselves.

We worship weapons and ignore books. There is something very wrong in a society which demands more missiles and starves libraries, which fights wars in Vietnam and ignores learning, which speaks of crushing crime while insuring that it will grow by crippling one of the major weapons in our fight against roots of those immediate causes of crime and urban unrest. Another new direction; away from enlightenment and forward to the rear in the name of ignorance. How tragic.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES MUST BE QUESTIONED AND SCRUTINIZED BY CONGRESS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, time has come for major reconsideration of the amount of defense spending as well as more significant scrutiny of defense requests submitted to and approved by Congress.

For a start, Mr. Nixon's revised budget has not cut enough military money. In light of major demands for budget cuts and negative decrees slashing away at essential domestic programs, a time has arrived for the same type of action in regard to military spending. For every civilian dollar cut, there should be a military dollar removed from the budget—a ratio prevailing in budget cuts of the past. Already we can see non-Vietnam military spending mounting at an alarming rate, menacing hopes for reductions once our Vietnam commitment is ended.

This only serves to point up the pressing need for more intensive, searching debate into our military budget and military policy by the Congress. It is our duty to do so. Our military is doing its job, while Congress abrogates its responsibilities. Some view probes of military requests and policies as actions which are less than patriotic. I consider such probes as the very essence of enlight-

ened fulfillment of constitutional responsibility.

Congress and the Bureau of the Budget have consistently examined domestic programs as if they were plots to steal the Constitution and destroy the Revised Statutes. It is time we exercised such healthy skepticism toward military budgets.

In such a climate of scrutiny, the public would better know what such vast sums are going for and why. Popular ignorance and fear would be considerably lessened. Today we see an all too familiar sight of men in high places capitalizing upon lack of military knowledge by citizens to drive them in apprehension toward acceding to erroneous policy decisions through adroit use of demagogic catchwords. Because many people have not been informed of the true situation in regard to military needs, we are in danger of approving programs which are wasteful and prohibitively expensive. An enlightened people and a questioning Congress make for meaningful decisions.

For instance, what debate was there in Congress over spending \$6 billion annually on forces ready to fight China? Why are 15 carrier task forces necessary when the Soviet Union possesses one helicopter carrier? Why are we continuing to build F-111's? Why are we continuing to spend funds on the main battle tank? When will Lockheed deliver the C5A, and how much more will it cost? It is imperative that we ask more pointed questions in the immediate future in regard to all major military expenditures. It is the duty of this House, which is the originator of such legislation, to exercise its constitutionally assigned prerogatives.

Expenditure of massive sums of money on military projects is out of hand completely. We now have information that the Pentagon is moving toward construction of the AMSA, which is a new manned bomber. It is expected to cost between \$12 billion and \$20 billion. Add to this the proposed ABM and MIRV programs, and solvency is adjourned permanently.

For these reasons alone, Congress must intently examine such massive fund requests. Already proposed programs stretch on into the future indefinitely, requiring expenditure of staggering sums. With the course of world events accelerating constantly, we must establish national checkpoints somewhere, and there are constitutional guarantees allowing us to do so here.

CORRIDOR OF SHAME

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Metroliner is a wondrous innovation with which I am much taken. It holds one of the answers to transportation problems now choking our cities. Yet I wonder how many here have taken that trip and looked out at its route—our corridor of shame.

Such a trip takes one from Washington to Baltimore, to Wilmington and Philadelphia, through New Brunswick and Newark. By observing where the train passes we can see where America

hides her disgrace. On both sides of the tracks in every one of these communities we pass through block after block of rotten, dilapidated old buildings, crammed to the rafters with people of the slums. Their washing hangs in pitiful tatters from back porches of many of these buildings.

Playgrounds are few. Abandoned warehouses are many. Glass has long since disappeared from their windows. Filth of all types lies in clusters in muddy puddles and in building corners all along the tracks. Grime covers everything, including houses along the right-of-way, people in them and the lives they try to lead.

Filth pours into the air from dozens of factories along the route, as they blithely pollute air we breathe and people who must live in their shadows.

No more depressing landscape can be imagined than that presented by this trip. When one travels on a slower train it is even more wrenching, for then one can take a close look at the warts on America's face in the corridor of shame. If ever our national urban problems were presented in microcosm, it is here. Look at it. Feel it. Breathe it. Smell it. Know it.

I commend this trip from Washington to New York on the Penn Central. May I say that my remarks are not aimed at the railroad. These problems are national difficulties, reflected in the right-of-way of a railroad.

I remember a wonderful, most touching poster used by that great labor union, the International Ladies Garment Workers. It showed a little girl working in a textile mill, gazing out a window. That caption read as follows:

The golf links lies so near the mill, that nearly every day
The laboring children can look out and see the men at play.

Verse used is by Sarah N. Cleghorn, who died in 1959. We could use another verse from her now.

Mr. Speaker, it is highly indicative to me that a few children who live in these slums have of late taken to throwing rocks at the Metroliner. I wonder why.

I commend this trip through the corridor of shame to my colleagues. Perhaps then they may have some new opinions on violence. Or perhaps they may want to comment further on closing down the rest of the Job Corps.

UNNECESSARY MISSIONS FROM UNNEEDED BASES

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, since the cold war became the unending international faceoff we know it as, America has extended her military presence over the face of our globe. Our flag flies today at military outposts with outlandish names in far-off places. Because of such major commitments and presence, we have become involved in regional nationalisms, local conflicts and civil wars. The very presence of American forces has made them targets for the trigger-happy and scapegoats for the unscrupulous. Further, our military activities have brought

us into brushes with potential conflicts with which we have no real concern. America cannot be the policeman of the world, just as she cannot be the financier and conscience of mankind.

Why must we maintain innumerable expensive bases in so many places? How is it necessary for American planes to fly reconnaissance missions that can better be performed by satellites? Was it absolutely essential for the EC121 to be flying its mission? Could not a satellite have performed it equally as well? Or an SR-71? When we are informed that such spy-in-the-sky satellites can make out individual telephone lines and listen in on telephone conversations, we cannot help but wonder.

Because we are so exposed through omnipresent military facilities, we become automatic targets. Provocative missions of a spying nature leave brave men unnecessarily exposed. Further, we can see that a "pirate state" such as North Korea recklessly wishes to involve great powers in major conflict. Why give them further opportunity? Are they not adequately quarantined by geography already?

Our very power and presence limits our options. Can one kill a flea in a rug with a sledgehammer? the flea is free to bite and strike again and again.

Technology has allowed us to see what we wish without close physical proximity, lessening risk of confrontation through incident. It also gives us power to strike if necessary without innumerable forward bases. Why not take advantage of what science makes available to us?

The United States possesses too many foreign military installations which serve no real purpose except to drain funds overseas. Curtailing their operations poses minimal harm or risk to our total intelligence-gathering network.

By phasing many of them out, we would withdraw our presence from many areas where it only serves to inflame local feelings and provides convenient targets for those with more selfish goals.

Often we maintain such installations to please a local satrap or provide significant income to national leaders who would not recognize democracy if they bumped into it in their bedrooms.

A major review is now underway by the administration of our total international commitment and bases. It is to be fervently hoped that the American flag will be phased out of such areas, without, of course, harming basic defense postures.

Finally, it is my sincere hope that intelligence gathering will rely upon satellites and other means that will in large part obviate further need for missions of the kind that brought such grief to the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and EC121.

HOSPITAL EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, as part of the domestic crisis facing the entire Nation, which so many choose to ignore,

hospitals of our country are facing a crisis that starts with overcrowded facilities and ends with inadequate services. Many public and nonprofit private hospitals cannot meet present urgent health service needs of communities they are supposed to be serving. Recent situations which have cropped up all over the country, including my own home city of New York, are classic illustrations of our problem.

These hospitals are presently unable to participate in any form of comprehensive health services program or plan to meet future needs due to a critical lack of adequate facilities and services. As of right now, there does not exist an adequate source of public or private financing with which to provide direct emergency assistance needed to meet this critical condition. End result: A catastrophic threat to physical health and safety of all communities involved.

Extent of the dilemma confronting us is amply illustrated by some simple figures. In 1968, our general hospitals required construction of 85,007 new beds and modernization of 240,624 other beds.

Therefore, I am today introducing the Hospital Emergency Act of 1969, aimed at establishing an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in form of direct grants to hospitals in critical need of new facilities, in order to meet increasing demands for service. The bill amends section 314 of the Public Health Services Act by including a new section providing emergency grants to hospitals.

Grants, to be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, could be up to 66⅔ percent of cost of any project providing necessary facilities and services. For the purpose of these loans, \$100 million would be authorized for appropriation for this program for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1970. No single grant could exceed 7½ percent of this full amount.

Public and nonprofit private hospitals must qualify as critical hospitals to be eligible for these grants. The following criteria must be met: First, heavy overcrowding to render the hospital ineffective for community service; second, full use being made currently of existing facilities; third, needed assistance unavailable elsewhere; and fourth, failure to provide needed facilities constitutes a threat to the health, welfare, and safety of the community.

For hospitals unable to secure the other 33⅓ percent of the money, there is provision made for them to apply to HEW for a loan of up to 90 percent of remaining costs at 2½ percent interest annually. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$45 million is authorized for appropriation for such loans.

Mr. Speaker, in this era, thousands of Americans die or are permanently harmed because of the shameful state of our hospital facilities. Agony as they wait is the daily lot of too many others. Uncounted patients are relegated for extensive periods to hospitals terribly out of date. It is a further sad commentary on this country and the way we are arranging our priorities that several other nations are far ahead of us in the hospital field.

Passage of this measure would make emergency assistance available to hospitals desperately in need of such aid to modernize their plants, extend their services, reduce waiting lines which are scandalous and ease the burden of pain for so many.

Our choices and preferences are clear. As we act on them, so shall we be judged.

FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 the President of the United States sent the Congress a message urging repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit effective as of that date.

On that same day I endorsed President Nixon's call for repeal of the investment tax credit for several reasons but primarily because I believe such action is necessary to curb inflation and thus shield the American people from the repeated blows of price escalation.

Yesterday I was shocked to learn that the cost of living had jumped eight-tenths of 1 percent during March, a rate of price rise which runs to nearly 10 percent on an annual basis.

Mr. Speaker, as the proverb in the greatest book ever written so wisely warned: "As ye sow, so shall ye reap." We are today continuing to suffer from the inflationary policies of the past 3 years and the failure of the Johnson administration to take timely action against inflationary pressures that surfaced as early as late 1965. Now the battle against inflation is infinitely more difficult to win.

Mr. Speaker, the sharp cost-of-living jump in March strengthens my earlier judgment that the Congress should respond as quickly as possible to President Nixon's call for repeal of the investment tax credit.

Although it is possible to read too much into 1 month's cost-of-living index figures, the warning signal in the March data is unmistakable.

To me it says that the fiscal and monetary measures already taken by the administration and by the Federal Reserve Board to slow down the economy and bring inflation under control are inadequate for the task.

There is always risk involved in actions taken to dampen down the economy. But we must take such risks, carefully and judiciously, if we are to bring inflation under control.

The impact of investment tax credit repeal will not be felt in the economy immediately. When it does register, cutting the income tax surcharge in half next January 1 as proposed by President Nixon will probably be needed as a stimulus to the economy.

We must win the fight against inflation, for it weighs most heavily upon the poor. And runaway inflation would inevitably be followed by a deep recession and heavy unemployment.

I hope the Members of this House will support the President in his efforts to repeal the investment tax credit.

GONZALEZ ACKNOWLEDGES THE DEBT OF THE MANY TO THE FEW SERVICEMEN SERVING ADDITIONAL TOURS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, all citizens of our Nation owe a tremendous debt to the servicemen who are fighting our battle in the unfamiliar land of Vietnam. We owe a particularly heavy debt to the soldier who is serving his second or third tour of duty there, and to the marine who is serving his third or fourth tour. It is these servicemen, their families and their relatives, who are bearing the brunt of the burden of this ugly, complicated, deadly little war.

The waging of the Vietnam war does not seem equally burdensome for the general population. Business activity is vigorous, and wages are up. Most complaints about our wartime situation are indirect ones—about those pesky taxes, and inflation, and high prices.

Perhaps it is impossible to equalize the sacrifices of all segments of a country at war. Certainly there is a vast difference between involuntarily conscripting men to fire the cannons, while conveniently picking up the tab for the cannon maker's costs and guaranteeing him a healthy profit—a profit I have tried to show on other occasions, is frequently excessive. The draft itself is inequitable, clearly less burdensome on the young men who are able to attend college.

Since April 1967, more than 60,300 servicemen have started a second tour in Vietnam. Those who did not volunteer directly to return to Vietnam, voluntarily reenlisted, possibly elected to attend a training school, and then employed their new skills in another Vietnam assignment.

Perhaps the greatest accomplishment of these volunteers is that they have found for themselves the meaning of patriotism. It is plain that patriotism to them means service—service to the stated aims of their mother country. Willingness to put your life on the line is the highest and noblest expression of devotion to country.

The extent of their willingness to serve their country at war is placed into dramatic perspective by the marked contrast with the refusal of some of our young men to serve in this war in any capacity.

War is a great leveler, literally and figuratively. The 34,000 American servicemen killed in battle in Vietnam, if visualized rank upon rank, would make a grim parade. The Vietnam struggle has leveled forever a terrible many of our native sons, who were once so strong and upright.

Yet, to the living soldier, war is a leveler in another sense. At war, all that counts is whether the buddy next to you is a man to be trusted in the heat of the battle. His ancestors, his creeds, his education hardly matter.

This comradeship is well known to the serviceman who volunteers for another tour of duty in Vietnam. His loyalty to his comrade in arms will not allow him to

quit before the fight is ended—he cannot leave while his buddies are still out there.

And then there is the career soldier, who may not volunteer for Vietnam, but who philosophically accepts reassignment to the front because he is a professional. The service has been fair to him—fair in sending him to training schools, fair in promotions, fair in recognizing him as a man. He knows that the shortcomings of service life by and large fall equitably upon all members of the Armed Forces. He is loyal to his branch of service, and to the country he has sworn to serve.

We owe an unrepayable debt to our servicemen who have served and are serving in Vietnam. If they must fight, we must support them in battle. We must do our utmost to see that they have not struggled or died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at the end of my remarks a list of the number of men in each branch of service who have accepted additional tours in Vietnam. They are listed by quarters, from April 1, 1967, to December 31, 1968:

Number of servicemen who have served additional PCS (permanent change of station) tours in Vietnam is available by quarters since June 30, 1967. The next report, for March 31, 1969, is due in approximately May 10, 1969.

Army	1,889
Air Force	579
Navy	2,678
Marines	873

Total, June 30, 1967	6,019
----------------------	-------

Army	2,257
Air Force	484
Navy	628
Marines	986

Total, Sept. 30, 1967	4,355
-----------------------	-------

Army	2,772
Navy	2,277
Air Force	614
Marines	1,403

Total, Dec. 31, 1967	7,066
----------------------	-------

Army	3,831
Navy	1,582
Air Force	897
Marines	2,866

Total, Mar. 31, 1968	9,176
----------------------	-------

Army	3,417
Air Force	984
Navy	2,120
Marines	3,148

Total, June 30, 1968	9,669
----------------------	-------

Army	7,388
Air Force	1,246
Navy	356
Marines	3,993

Total, Sept. 30, 1968	12,983
-----------------------	--------

Army	5,575
Air Force	1,337
Navy	149
Marines	3,971

Total, Dec. 31, 1968	11,032
----------------------	--------

Grand total	60,300
-------------	--------

Total number of servicemen in Southeast Asia (including Thailand and offshore bases) since Jan. 1, 1965	2,000,000
---	-----------

Estimated total prior to Jan. 1, 1968	2,250,000
Breakdown by service:	
Army	1,100,000
Air Force	280,000
Navy	315,000
Marines	342,000

WILLIAM J. DRIVER

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I regretted to learn that the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the Honorable William J. Driver, had submitted his resignation.

The veterans of this Nation are losing a courageous and compassionate leader. The Federal Government is losing one of its most brilliant career men, and we on the Veterans' Affairs Committee shall be without the logical, factual guidance he gave in our deliberations.

I have worked very closely with Mr. Driver. He is an Administrator who cares. Under his supervision, we have passed more meaningful and constructive legislation for our veterans and their dependents than in any period in the history of the VA.

For more than 20 years Bill Driver served the Veterans' Administration. His rise to the office of Administrator has been accompanied by many honors; yet, he remains a modest man.

Mr. Driver served his country during World War II. He left his job with the Veterans' Administration to again serve his country during the Korean crisis. He returned from Korea to continue with the Veterans' Administration. In some way he found the time to finish law school at George Washington University. He later became Director of the Compensation and Pension Service, Chief Benefits Director, Deputy Administrator, and in December 1964, was named by President Johnson to be Administrator. He became the first career employee to administer the affairs of America's veterans.

As the head of an agency employing more than 170,000 employees with a budget exceeding \$7,000,000,000, Bill Driver's record is unequalled.

I deem it a rare privilege to have worked with him in the pursuit of a just veterans program. I thank him for serving our Government faithfully and well. I commend his record to all who would follow a Federal career.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for Bill Driver and his lovely wife, Marian, and family, every continued success and our best wishes always.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S OUTSTANDING ADDRESS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United States has produced in all of its history no greater officer than our Chief of Staff, Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He epitomizes and personifies to the highest degree the traditions, principles, and ideals

of the U.S. Army and, indeed, all of our Armed Forces.

The United States is proud of General Westmoreland. South Carolinians are particularly proud of this native son.

Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1969, General Westmoreland delivered a superb address at Kansas State University which I highly commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people. It follows:

ADDRESS BY GENERAL WESTMORELAND

Seemingly, I stand at this moment in two worlds. As a member of the military, I stand in the world of the Establishment . . . and as a lecturer at this University, I stand in the world of the educator—overlapping the world of the student. Supposedly, between our worlds there is a great distance—not just from this podium to the front row—but a gigantic chasm—the abyss called the “generation gap.” This alleged gap is particularly wide since from what I hear, it begins at age thirty . . . and I must confess that I more than qualify.

In any event, without falling into the chasm, I hope to bridge that alleged gap today . . . if even for a moment . . . if even with a thread of understanding . . . understanding concerning your Army.

In my judgment, thorough knowledge and understanding of the military establishment and of the role that it plays in our society are matters of importance to all informed citizens. In this regard, the higher the proportion of American citizens who make a real effort to be informed, the better the likelihood that the citizenry will endorse, through our democratic processes, basic decisions affecting our national welfare . . . national security as well as in other areas.

It is not the task of the professional military to lead in this informing process. We in uniform should not—must not—become public advocates for particular courses of action. We must meticulously avoid actions which challenge the doctrine of civilian supremacy or which smack of Service partisanship.

Still as citizens, the military should not remain silent. It is difficult to associate silence with any kind of educative dialogue. Professional military men must be appreciative of their role in our society when they speak. On the other hand, it seems to me that our citizenry—specifically those of you who are being educated for future leadership—must also be aware of the functions of the military and of the limits of these functions.

Definitive formulations of roles are hard to come by in this area. Once again, you share with me a continuing concern as citizens for problems which are infinitely easier to state than they are to solve.

Consequently, in talking about the Army, I shall go back to its beginnings to discuss its foundation and, then, its necessity to have interface with our society. I will discuss its role as part of the military establishment, fundamental characteristics of the Army, wellsprings or sources of capabilities; and finally, I will comment on specific Army capabilities . . . what it can do, what it cannot do.

The foundation of our present military establishment was laid in the cornerstone of our government—the Constitution of the United States. Our founding fathers had a great fear of a large permanent military. They had inherited from Europe a distrust of the military which had for years been the bulwark of the personal armies of Kings. They were terrified of the legislative army of Cromwell. Because of this inheritance, our founding fathers feared for the liberties of the people.

The framers of our Constitution correctly took care of watching the Army. They incorporated into the Constitution certain provisions which for over 190 years have success-

fully regulated and directed our military—a situation which is unique in the world, I might add.

The then new government received through the Constitution sufficient authority to develop a military establishment—an establishment as large as needed for the defense of our Nation, and one which could be supported by our national resources. The size of this establishment in a representative government depends on the current mood of the public.

Our Constitution states that—

"The Congress shall have power . . .

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

"To provide and maintain a Navy . . .

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions . . ."

Several concepts are immediately apparent in these constitutional provisions.

First, notice the contrast between the phrases "raise and support armies" and "provide and maintain a Navy." It is clear that the framers of our Constitution wanted a citizen army which could be raised in time of emergency. Their desire was the basis for our civilian-soldier concept—one that was intended to continue.

On the other hand, "to provide and maintain a Navy" conceived of a force in being. Such a concept is quite consistent with the maritime nature of our original States, and our founders were well aware of the tremendous time lag between developing and producing capital ships. They reasoned that without such a force in being, no naval threat could be engaged.

However, over the years technology has virtually eliminated the former luxury of time and distance—the threat to our national security has increased at the same time. Technology has rapidly advanced in all Services; weaponry has become increasingly sophisticated. Consequently, the need for an army in being has become an essential factor to our national security.

Going back to the Constitution, we see in its provisions concerning the militia the need to draw on the civilian in times of emergency. Conditions have not altered this need.

And in order to regulate and control the Navy, the Constitution implied control through use of its purse strings. However, to assuage the new government's fear of powerful standing armies, the unique two-year appropriation rider was attached to the acts of raising armies.

In order to further the system of checks and balances, the Constitution vested military command in the Executive Branch with the President as Commander in Chief of the Services and of the militia, when activated. Authority over the military was further fragmented by giving States control of their own militias. Thus, they became another effective check against a large standing federal army and as a byproduct precluded America from ever having a legislative army of the Congress or a personal army of the President.

So, we see that from the very beginning, our Constitution affirmed the American historic concept of a dual military system under civilian control. That dual system is visible today in your "One Army"—one army of the people made up of regulars, reserves, National Guard, selectees—all being interdependent, but being supervised by the people through the Congress, the President, and the States.

Throughout the years our Army has kept pace with a dynamic American society—but always under civilian control.

Our Armed Forces are the staunchest supporters of our form of government. They themselves would resist all efforts to change that basic policy.

The Army is profoundly aware that it exists for the American people and operates

under the command and control of dedicated civilians who owe their position and authority to constitutional processes. Therefore, the Army can accomplish for an extended period only those missions which are accepted by the American Nation which the Army exists to support. Composed of a representative segment of the American people, the Army must believe as an institution that what it is doing is right, proper, and directed by the people.

Further, as I stressed earlier, the Army is acutely conscious that it is not and cannot become a political force within the United States. Each individual may, and as a citizen must, responsibly consider national issues and exercise his mandate to vote; but as an institution, the Army must not attempt to influence domestic political processes.

For this reason, the Army is reluctant to engage in domestic tasks which involve domestic politics. However, it does have a role in civil works and disaster relief, and civil emergencies.

As an Agency within the Executive Branch, the Army is only one of many instruments of policy. The Army blends its military capabilities into an integrated whole, involving all of the instruments of national policy—political, economic, diplomatic and psychological—all a part of a well-orchestrated national effort.

The Army must not only be prepared and flexible to meet new and unforeseen requirements to support national programs, it must also be prepared to do so effectively within the bounds of our national style.

Traditionally, the American people have cherished the concept of the citizen-soldier. Deeply imbedded within the American ethos is the idea that every citizen is a soldier. Our Army and our country have grown and developed on the precept of civilian and military teamwork.

Above all, we seek to maintain a balance between the citizen-soldier and the professional soldier.

To stay healthy, the military establishment is dependent on America's citizenry. I am talking, of course, about the continuous movement of citizens in and out of the Service . . . the movement which maintains the needed citizen contact and awareness between our military establishment and our citizenry, and without which the Army might become a danger to our society—a danger which our forefathers so carefully tried to preclude.

Allow me to talk for a moment about the dependence of the military on the people.

In an effort to remain apolitical, let me acknowledge my awareness of the Selective Service issue. It is a deep philosophical question. If all are not to serve, who should serve? What are the economic and social implications of an all-volunteer force?

As you know, President Nixon has recently appointed an Advisory Commission, composed of leading citizens, to study this matter in depth.

I have purposely not gone into specifics on the Selective Service System—commonly called the draft—but I do want to make a point in passing. Contrary to what many people think, the Army has nothing to do with running the draft. The draft is run by an entirely separate agency of the government over which neither the Army nor the Department of Defense has any control.

Having set the record straight on that one, I shall continue.

Perhaps one of the distinguishing characteristics of our century is the movement of all professions toward the concept of specialization. Yet, I believe that recently we have witnessed in our society a gradual reversal toward generalization. Certainly, as never before in our history, our entire Nation has need for well rounded thinkers—spherical thinkers, as I prefer to call them—not men with a single vision. Rather, we need enlightened men who can relate . . . men who

can see the mutual dependence—or nondependence—of matters . . . and yet, at the same time, men who can view the several parts as a whole.

Although the military profession has had its share of specialization, it has only been an extracurricular effort.

A brief look at the educational credentials of the Officer Corps of the Army shows both their high quality and their broad basis. For example: Nearly 90 percent of the career officers in the Army today hold baccalaureate degrees—our goal, of course, is 100 percent. Also, under a civilian schooling program, specifically selected officers are trained at leading universities in order to meet specific needs which demand the higher disciplines associated with masters degrees and doctorates. Today, some 20 percent of our career officers already hold advanced degrees; and we estimate that approximately 75 percent of our career officers may expect the opportunity to gain advanced degrees during their service.

The day when wars were fought by military tactics alone has long since passed . . . if, indeed, it ever existed. Rather, the waging of war and the maintenance of peace and security are the products of national efforts which include all instruments of national policy—the political, the socio-economic, the psychological, and the military.

Obviously, current demands have added new dimensions to the challenges faced by our military commanders. As never before, the military is in need of generalists, not specialists—officers who are military men first and foremost but who have an awareness and appreciation of the other factors that inevitably have a bearing on military policy. Vietnam is, undoubtedly, the best example of our need for this type of leader.

Five wars are being waged in Vietnam today at one and the same time. It is unrealistic to speak of them separately because they are so closely meshed and mutually supporting. And yet for analysis, it is often necessary to view each individually to discover its complexities and its interrelationship with the others. I shall cite these wars briefly:

1. The war in Vietnam is fundamentally political. Such is the case with all wars.
2. The war is sociological.
3. The war is economic.
4. The war is psychological.

However, the existence of these four separate—but related—wars tends to be obscured by the tempo of the fifth, the military war. Violence is more easily depicted—and more readily perceived—than are the rather undramatic, but vital, actions of nation building.

This so-called war of national liberation being less than total—and I'm referring to total war in the sense of World War I and World War II—is often more complex . . . often more demanding.

And thus, we need more than ever before the leader who is the spherical thinker . . . not the man with stovepipe vision. We need the man who finds exhilaration in the study of all aspects of mankind; man's capacity to love and hate, his willingness to serve and desire to govern, his thirst for truth . . . the man who is just and compassionate . . . the man who is a humanist. We need the leader who looks out for his men, who knows his position as a servant of our people . . . who has wisdom to see beyond his present actions to what their consequences might be.

There is only one place that this type of man can originate. He must be the product of a liberal education. He must come from our institutions of higher learning—the fountainheads of humanism. Surely, the late General Eisenhower—who came from this "heart of America"—was one of these men.

All of us—you and I—wish within our hearts that armies could be forever eliminated from the face of the earth. Only a fool

would ever hope for war. One who has tasted the bitterness and witnessed the cruelties of war certainly would never become its advocate. Yet, while we work to achieve peace—to see that day when armies are eliminated from the face of the earth—we must continue to face the harsh realities of life. And, violence between men and violence between nations are harsh realities with which we must be able to cope.

I have talked about the foundations of the military establishment as they relate to the Army. I have discussed the citizen-soldier concept, and I have touched upon the Army's leadership needs as they both pertain to the Army's reflecting the will of our society.

With the foregoing background as food for thought, I should further like to reinforce some of the points I have attempted to make in addition to accomplishing my mission of stimulating responsible thought concerning our Army.

I have organized these additional thoughts to discuss in turn: the role of the Army within the military establishment . . . fundamental characteristics of the Army . . . wellsprings or sources of capabilities . . . and lastly, several remarks on specific Army capabilities.

In addition to the checks and balances established by the Constitution, your Army operates within very precise guidelines that establish its statutory responsibilities to the Nation. The military establishment as a whole is directed—" . . . to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; to insure by timely and effective military action the security of the United States, its possessions, and areas vital to its interests; to uphold and enhance the national policies and interests of the United States; and to safeguard the internal security of the United States."

In short, the military establishment is tasked to defend and secure the Nation, its citizens, and its interests. The primary role of the Army is its responsibility " . . . for the preparation of land forces . . . necessary for the effective defense of the Nation."

In carrying out this role, the Army is able to physically seize and occupy the land and thereby assert prolonged influence on the will of man who is a land-being. And in influencing man, the Army is capable of applying force selectively and in measured fashion. It may be—

"Force" represented by the power to influence action through assistance or advisory relationships, or

"Force" as represented by the restrained use of conventional land power as in Vietnam, or

"Force" implied in the possession of nuclear weapons.

The most important characteristic of the Army is its dependence on man. Because the Army relies on man and not machines, and because it is composed of men from every field of endeavor, it is capable of unique flexibility—a flexibility which permits the Army to adapt to any mission it may be assigned. Many times in history your Army has demonstrated its flexibility in meeting the needs of our Nation—needs which emphasize construction rather than destruction:

The need to map and survey our new and growing nation caused our young republic to send its small Army west of the Appalachians.

A need for engineering talent to develop our Nation led to creation of the first higher engineering school established in the United States—the United States Military Academy founded in 1802. (Incidentally, the Military Academy has kept up with the increasing complexity of modern defense. As a result, West Point now has a broad curriculum, balanced between the sciences and the humanities. In his four year academic program a cadet completes 19 courses in the mathematics-science-engineering field, 21 courses in the social science-humanities field, and 8

elective courses which he may choose to pursue in either field, or a combination of both fields.)

Needs for increased arteries of communication in a developing nation caused Army engineers to plan and construct roads, railroads, and canals . . . to include the Panama Canal and the Alaskan Highway.

Needs of health gave impetus to the Army Medical Corps to conquer typhoid and yellow fever . . . to develop a means of water purification through chlorination . . . to develop blood plasma substitutes. Incidentally, the first American psychiatry text was written by an Army doctor.

Needs of the Nation during the Great Depression of the 1930's led to extensive Army involvement in the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), a massive effort in social welfare which was a predecessor of the present Office of Economic Opportunity and specifically the Job Corps.

Needs for research in space vehicles led to Army development of Explorer I, the only ready satellite with which the challenge of Sputnik could be met.

The need to chart the Antarctic led Army experts in 1962 to map parts of that vast frozen continent.

A need to meet aggression led to our commitment in Korea and in Vietnam.

The Army has always been a pioneer. Not only has it built roads, written textbooks and charted virgin wilderness . . . it has also, many times, led the way toward social change.

The Army helps many men who would not ordinarily be able to serve in the Armed Forces because of a lack of education. These men are given special training which enables them to become effective soldiers and—very important—gives them an opportunity to learn skills and develop attitudes and habits which will make them more productive citizens. Thus, the Army, the individual, and the Nation benefit by this program.

The interest of the Army does not end when the youth of America take off their uniforms.

Through a special project that we call Transition, we assist soldiers about to be discharged to prepare themselves for civilian life. For several months prior to completing their Army service, soldiers can receive special training to prepare them better for civilian jobs in government and industry—training which improves their future prospects and again adds strength to our Nation.

The Army led this Nation in creating a truly integrated society where race plays no part and any man can advance in accordance with his demonstrated abilities.

Through their military service, our youth have learned how to live and work together as Americans. Men from every race, creed, and color are working, living, and fighting side by side in the Services of our country.

Today, a Negro soldier is dragged from the battlefield by a white medic. A white soldier lives to see another dawn only because a Negro soldier threw himself upon an exploding grenade. And a Protestant soldier is counseled and led in prayer by a Catholic Chaplain. These are experiences that will serve to strengthen our Nation by overcoming the parochial images and the misunderstandings associated with social changes taking place within our—within their—country.

In my opinion, these examples illustrate that the Army is equally interested in the peaceful aspects of its role. It accepts those responsibilities with the same fervor that it does its others, and always for the same purpose—the continued security of our Nation.

I could cite many other contributions to our society through the constructive side of the Army. However, let me make it perfectly clear that I am not attempting to paint a picture of sweetness and light. The

Army is equally capable of performing its mission of providing security to our Nation through its complete mastery of the art of warfare.

We have seen that the Army reflects the flexibility and adaptability of the American citizen. The Army's capabilities are derived from—or come from—what I shall call the Wellsprings of Capability . . . wellsprings which are continuously charged by the constant relationship between our Army and our society.

The most important wellsprings or sources of capability are: the Army as a profession, the nature of the threat to our Nation, and our national policy.

The primary Wellspring of Capability is the nature of the Army, and the other military services, as a profession. It is unique as a profession, for it demands the ultimate commitment—service, if necessary, to the point of death.

The professional military man must bear the awesome responsibility not only for his own life but also for those who serve under his command. Further, when an officer takes his oath of office he swears that he " . . . will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic . . . without any mental reservation. . . ." Through this oath, responsibility of the military profession goes beyond self and those under one's direct command. It extends to the survival of our Nation. With total commitment and total responsibility comes the total dedication to country which characterizes the American soldier.

As the Army places unique demands upon a man, so also it develops unique perspectives within the individual—perspectives which also contribute to the Wellspring of Army Capability. The soldier must believe that what he is doing is contributing in some some manner to the resolution of what "really matters" to our citizenry—that is in the best interests of his country.

In earlier days this direct association was relatively easy to establish. The Indian fighter saw and knew the settlers whom he protected. Today, it tends to be more difficult to establish such a relationship due to our global commitments and our larger and far more complex society. However, it has been my experience that this relationship has been successfully bridged by those young men and women who have continued to step forward when their country needed them.

Another contributor to the Wellsprings of Capability is also derived from the professional nature of the Army. It is what I term the "search for adequacy." In this tumultuous world, one can never completely be certain of his enemy's capabilities, much less of his intentions. Yet, the professional military leaders continue by his oath to be responsible for American lives and the security of the Nation. He must strive to develop the capabilities in being which will deter attack or which, at least, will defend the interests of the United States at the lowest possible cost in lives. Contrary to some voices, this leader is not a grasping megalomaniac. Nor is he part of a cabal—the so-called "military-industrial complex"—a complex which allegedly generates ever-increasing military requirements and, in turn, military capabilities. Rather, the military leader's judgment represents, in the aggregate, a considered judgment . . . a judgment of dedicated and experienced professionals with one goal in mind—our Nation's survival against the threats of an uncertain tomorrow.

Many will argue that the military wants too much . . . that it inflates its requirements and deprecates its capabilities to grow larger at the expense of other national needs. This debate is good. It is healthy. It is the unique product of an open society. The Army's voice is only one of many in the great defense debate. All voices must be

heard. But one important fact stands out in our form of society; it is the responsibility of the people to establish the final priority.

The second Wellspring of Capability is the nature of the threat. It is the standard against which your Army determines its requirements and measures its capabilities.

The threat is complex. It is bipolar at the strategic nuclear level and multipolar in its potential for conducting conventional warfare. In addition, there are literally tens of nations capable of supporting aggressive insurgency within the borders of their neighbors.

The threat is further complicated by a spectrum of weaponry which extends from the highly sophisticated weapons possessed by the Soviet Union to the sharpened stake and cross bow which have been employed in undeveloped countries.

Areas of possible commitment range from tropical jungle to arid desert, to frigid arctic. Each of these extreme environments requires its own adaptations of Army capabilities and techniques of employment.

Never before in the history of war has the military force of a nation faced such a diverse challenge. Today it is conceivable that a combat unit could be required to move from the jungles of Vietnam to mountainous southern Germany in a matter of days. Overnight, the threat the unit must address changes drastically—from the jungle ambush to massed Soviet tanks operating in an advanced tactical environment with the ever present threat of the enemy's use of nuclear weapons.

The range of problems facing the U.S. Army today is unique. For example: our Army must be prepared to act equally effectively against threats to the safety of United States citizens abroad; against acts of deliberate aggression under the guise of insurgency; and against overt attack accompanied by nuclear assault. No other army faces a wider range of challenges.

The third and last Wellspring which I wish to discuss is "national policy"—an omnibus term which I use to describe the range of decisions made at higher national levels and which delineate the Army's capabilities. "National policy" in this sense would include decisions such as the basic national military strategy which the Nation shall pursue and the resources—men, materiel and money—which are to be allocated to the Army to meet that strategy. The Army is offered full and adequate opportunity to have its views considered, but the decision very properly rests within the civilian national leadership.

There are other less obvious factors which influence Army capabilities. Here I am thinking of such aspects as the rate of technological advance in our society which poses problems in developing and producing weapons. If we delay purchase of a new weapon, we may be able to buy a new, radically better weapon later; but, if we wait too long, we may find ourselves facing an enemy fully armed with weapons better than ours. Decisions regarding research and development are difficult, but they at least imply freedom to influence the future.

The weapons the Army possesses today reflect procurement decisions made five to ten years ago. As in all worldly affairs, "You pay your money, and take your choice." All things in life have costs. And as resources devoted to national defense are reduced, so also is the level of defense readiness reduced.

The Army is most certainly not a slave to the past . . . a slave unable to react to the present . . . a slave unable to prepare for the future. Its capabilities are directed by decisions which lie beyond its power—in authority or in time. This is the third Wellspring of Capability.

Up to this point my remarks have purposely been general in nature—and perhaps a bit theoretical. Hopefully I have set the

stage for several specific thoughts that I would like to leave with you.

Naturally, the degree of proficiency with which the Army can fulfill any particular capability is, of course, dependent on the wellsprings which I have discussed in terms of the men, materiel, and money provided to the Army.

However, at almost any reasonable level of resource allocation the Army has certain capabilities; but at the same time there are capabilities which the Army cannot possess—regardless of its level of resources—capabilities which money cannot buy. Let's take a look at what the Army can do . . . and also, what it cannot do.

For example:

The Army can conduct offensive operations to attain specific objectives, but it cannot insure the desirability, viability, or reliability of the political situation which results. The Army can help win a war, but every element of government and the Nation must help to win the peace.

The Army can provide forces designed to defend in Europe or Asia in order to represent the national will to defend, but it cannot constitute the national will. While our Army should be and is a mirror of the society which it represents, the possession of capability alone does not deter aggression. There must be the will to employ in order to deter. That will must come from the Nation—not the Army.

The Army can prevent a guerrilla army from achieving its military objectives, but it cannot resolve the political problems from which an insurgency is derived. Successful elimination of the sources of insurgency involves far more than a military effort. It requires a coordinated national effort in support of an allied nation willing to institute political, military and economic change.

The Army can equip, train, and advise a foreign army, but it cannot insure that the army will be used to advance representative government or economic development. Increasing the military capabilities of a foreign army does not guarantee that the army will be used as we may wish, nor does it insure the favorable solution of internal political or economic problems.

The Army can be employed to alleviate the symptoms of domestic discontent, but it cannot remove the sources of discontent. The Army can, within carefully prescribed limits, contribute its expertise to resolution of grievances, but it cannot do this to the detriment of its primary mission of providing security against foreign threat.

I have described the upper and lower limits of capability—in each case extreme examples. Current and probable Army capabilities generally fall between the two. Precisely where they fall can only be determined by decisions made by the Executive Branch, by the Congress and, ultimately, by the electorate.

We are now at a point in history where we are conducting a major review of our commitments and policies. That review naturally requires that numerous questions be asked and answered. If the informed citizen is to properly evaluate proposals, he must be aware of these questions:

Is the most significant threat to the United States foreign or domestic, or is it a combination of the two?

To what extent can we safely rely on the support of overseas allies to insure our national security? Is their degree of support commensurate with our degree of reliance?

Who are our enemies? What are their intentions? Do we base our actions on what they are capable of, or do we base our actions on our assessment of intentions?

Today, in seeking to bridge the so-called generation gap, I have stressed the continuous need for interface between America's citizens and her Army. I have stressed the Army's role in our society, in particular as an element provided by the Constitution with safeguards as to its use.

It is an element which as a social force has spearheaded integration, improved education, and has trained thousands for leadership.

It is an element which, in conjunction with the other Services, provides security for our Nation.

It is an element which is always ready to respond to constituted civilian authority in support of our Nation's commitments.

It is an element which does not make policy, but is an instrument of that policy.

It is the shield behind which our democratic processes have thrived and our Nation has developed.

In talking to you, I have addressed my remarks recognizing fully your dual status: both as students concerned with the present, and as students faced with the awesome responsibility of the future leadership of our society.

Accordingly, I ask that in each role:

You understand the constitutional basis for the formation and utilization of the Armed Forces of our Nation.

And finally, that you recognize that these forces are essential elements in the society of which you will soon become an active and—most certainly—a constructive participant.

THE 60TH ANNUAL NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the 60th annual National Raisin Week, the Nation's oldest food festival, which we are celebrating during the period April 20 through 26, gives special recognition to one of California's most vital industries. All of America's raisin production and one-half of the world's output of raisins comes from within a 75-mile radius of Fresno in the geographical center of California.

The vineyards and related industries engaged in producing, processing, and distribution supply 250,000 tons of delicious raisins a year for eating out of hand, for cooking, for use in baked foods, and in gourmet dishes. National Raisin Week calls attention to a quarter billion dollar industry, one of the few agricultural industries to maintain its market place position while over the years many other farm products were falling by the wayside.

The California Raisin Advisory Board, as the industry's research, promotion, and advertising arm, deserves high commendation for its role in the raisin industry's success. Despite the great competition from other food products produced in this country, and also from the increasing supply of raisins produced in Australia, Greece, Turkey, and Iran, it has effectively created and maintained the market for California raisins.

For instance, the California Raisin Advisory Board has developed the practically nonexistent Japanese market to the No. 1 export market, which now consumes some 20,000 tons of California raisins each year. In cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service, the State raisin advisory board operates a total of 12 overseas market research and development programs.

I also wish to point out the important role of the Federal Raisin Advisory

Board and the Federal Raisin Administrative Committee. Operating under Federal marketing orders, which have done so much to bring about the orderly marketing of our raisin crops and have also been instrumental in the development of export markets.

In addition, I wish to commend the Raisin Bargaining Association, which during the brief span of less than 3 years has brought the raisin growers together in a concerted effort to give them a better voice in determining what they will get for their crops.

Raisins, grown by the Egyptians and Persians in 2000 B.C., are today produced and sold by the most modern methods—the methods that have made America great. The raisin industry well deserves a special salute during this National Raisin Week.

HISTORICAL BLACKOUT

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful members of the Armed Forces of the United States who fought in Europe, Africa, and the Pacific and witnessed the frightful destruction of World War II and its consequences, have increasingly pondered what history will record on our country's involvement.

Unfortunately, few of our historians have undertaken to write the history of the Second Great War in accord with documented facts. Even today few Americans have been permitted to learn of the overtures for peace from Germany and Japan between the outbreak of the conflict in the Orient in 1937 and the U.S. involvement in both Europe and Asia in 1941. Very few Americans were permitted to know, relative to the European theater, that a special provision in Britain's supposed guarantee to Poland rendered that pact not only inoperative should there be Soviet aggression against Poland, but also, in effect, extended to the Soviets an invitation to seize part of, or possibly all of, Poland without remonstrance from Britain. Thus, in the war launched on the pretense of saving Poland, that country was betrayed by Britain with the knowledge of Washington politicians even before the first shot in World War II was fired.

Why, for example, were the American people never permitted to know the substance of the message that Rudolph Hess risked his life to bring to Britain in May of 1941?

Obviously no military secrets could be involved at this late date. So why, after 29 years, is Rudolph Hess still held incommunicado, unless to distort history by hiding truths. Who would hide historical facts except involved parties who would dread to be revealed?

One who tried to correct the distortions in the writing of pre-World War II history was Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes—1889-1968—whose extensive contributions reflect a lifetime of study and observation. See "Who's Who in America," 1968-69.

It is historically fitting that there was recently published a memorial volume on

"Harry Elmer Barnes: Learned Crusader," edited by Arthur Goddard and recently reviewed by Henry M. Adams, professor of modern European history, University of California, Santa Barbara. Furthermore, it is understood that the extensive papers and historical notes of the late Dr. Barnes are being edited for publication by another distinguished historian, Dr. James J. Martin, famous for his two-volume study entitled, "American Liberalism and World Politics," Devin-Adair Co., New York.

Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century has now passed since the end of World War II when all peoples sought a lasting peace. Instead of peace the strongest nations face each other in undisguised hostility with focal points of discord. And World War II prisoners of war remain imprisoned in various countries undergoing unusual punishments. Rudolph Hess is not only one of these, he has the most important disclosures to make about World War II of any man now alive. This fact, Mr. Speaker, invites this query: Why has not the American Historical Society shown interest in securing his testimony concerning the history of the Second Great War? Why has our Government not attempted to secure a general amnesty for all prisoners of war suffering such prolonged imprisonment. But more especially, why should we not liberate the truth?

The indicated book review, together with an accompanying editorial note on its author follow as parts of my remarks; also a news story on Hess:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune,
Apr. 20, 1969]

FIGHTING A BLACKOUT

(By Henry M. Adams)

(NOTE.—"Harry Elmer Barnes, Learned Crusader," is the source of today's column, which appears here by permission of Ralph Myles, Publisher, Inc., of Colorado Springs. This testimonial volume, edited by Arthur Goddard, honors a man distinguished as historian, sociologist, penologist, journalist, teacher, and lecturer. Dr. Barnes died Aug. 25, 1968, at the age of 80. The following is from the contribution written by Henry M. Adams, professor of modern European history at Santa Barbara college of the University of California.)

Just as in 1922 Barnes had demanded that the current interpretations of the causes of World War I be revised, so at the end of 1947 he made a similar demand with regard to World War II, only to find that the difficulties in the way of getting any truth published about the responsibility for World War II were all but insuperable. So he wrote the slender first edition of his brochure, "The Struggle Against the Historical Blackout," to define and clarify the nature of these difficulties, to compare and contrast the situation following the First World War with that following the second, and to open the attack of the revisionists against the perpetrators of the "historical blackout" by exposing their errors of fact and argument.

Barnes defined his terms. Revisionism meant "bringing history into accord with facts." The efforts to prevent this he colorfully labeled "the historical blackout," and its operators the "blackout boys." Then he went on to explain the obvious reasons for the extent and ferocity of this attempt to restrain and suppress the truth about the responsibility for World War II and America's entry therein.

The vested national political interests of the last 15 years had their reputation deeply

involved in maintaining intact the myth of the superb ability and impeccable integrity of their chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The maintenance of the Roosevelt myth was closely tied up with the wisdom and honor of Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy. Further, the interventionists who had aided and abetted Mr. Roosevelt and his entourage in his war program had to defend the wisdom and outcome of their own war mongering. The special pressure groups which had striven ardently for war had likewise to justify their works. Finally, and very important, American leadership and policies had been directly and deeply involved in the outbreak and extension of World War II.

In addition to the opposition of public groups to the truth about responsibility for World War II, many of the professional historians and other social scientists had a vested interest in perpetuating the prewar and war time mythology. They had veritably swarmed into the various war time agencies after 1940, especially the office of war information and the office of strategic services. They had been intimately associated with the war effort and with the shaping of public opinion to conform to the thesis of the pure idealism and innocence of the United States and our sole and exclusive devotion to self-defense and world betterment thru the sword.

Barnes pointed out that the numerous methods of those who sought to "black out" historical truth fell pretty much into four patterns. The first was the ignoring or obscuring of any material which revealed unwelcome facts. The second was the "smearing" of the authors of such material. The third was contending that, whatever the devious deceptions practiced by Mr. Roosevelt and his supporters from 1937 thru 1941, all that was more than justified in the interest of national self-preservation. And the fourth was maintaining that the successful deception of the populace is the cornerstone of sagacious statecraft under our system of government.

These patterns Barnes then illustrated in a thoro survey of the published evidence, a survey which became larger and more comprehensive with each revised and enlarged edition of the brochure. Citing from the leading newspapers and periodicals, he showed how, by the space and position assigned to reviews of revisionist books, these books were obscured or smeared.

Barnes recalled for the reader the propaganda for war of Mr. Roosevelt and the interventionists before Pearl Harbor, propaganda which spoke again and again of the discovery of secret Nazi plans to invade the United States, even via Dakar and Brazil, and [he] reiterated the main point then made by the fighters to keep America out of war, namely the absurdity of such talk in the face of the inability of the Nazis in the summer of 1940 to cross the less than 20 miles of the Dover strait to invade a helpless Britain.

Barnes demonstrated that, in the face of documentary evidence that the President had "led us into war," the defenders of the Roosevelt myth had taken a new line. Instead of continuing their former argument for the unswerving integrity and veracity of the chief, they now admitted that he had lied about his foreign policy, but they claimed it was for a "noble cause." It was maintained . . . that Roosevelt had tricked the people into acting for their best interests and that the political lie was a sound technique of statecraft.

Barnes cited the secret Anglo-American agreement of Sept. 2, 1940—the destroyer deal—which really put the United States into the war, and the campaign speech of Mr. Roosevelt in Boston two months later, in which he promised American mothers and fathers that their boys would not be sent into any foreign wars. As for the "noble cause" for which Mr. Roosevelt lied so profusely, Barnes provided abundant evidence

to show that it was as much a fiction as the earlier dogma of his unimpeachable veracity.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 21, 1969]

HESS NEARS 75 WITH ONLY BIRDS FOR COMPANY

BERLIN, April 20.—Twice a day the birds wait for Rudolf Hess. They are the only companions the former deputy Fuehrer and No. 3 Nazi has left. And next Saturday marks his 75th birthday.

Hess brings crumbs to the birds from the vast Spandau Prison where he has been since 1946. Then he stands and watches them eat.

By the gathering of birds it is possible to tell when Hess will be in the spacious garden of the 19th century prison on the outskirts of West Berlin.

Weather permitting, he always shows up. He is known to curse "this rotten German weather" and talk of sunny Alexandria, Egypt, where he was born April 26, 1894, the son of a German exporter.

Hess has fared well for his almost three decades in prison. He is in his third year of virtual solitary confinement.

In April it is always the Americans' turn to furnish the prison's external security, hence Hess usually fares well on his birthday.

In May 1941, Hess parachuted into Scotland. He never fully explained that mission, but apparently thought he could end the war by convincing the Britons they could not win.

He was made a prisoner of war and was convicted as a war criminal by the International War Tribunals.

THE GRAND DESIGN

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking presentation of the problem confronting the American people is contained in "The Grand Design," a lecture on U.S. foreign policy, by G. Edward Griffin, of Thousand Oaks, Calif.

Mr. Griffin reminds us that the greatest use of the atomic bomb has been in psychological warfare and the American people have been bombed psychologically every single day through movies, TV, and the programed propaganda network designed to condition American minds that nuclear war is more to be dreaded than a peace under communism.

Simultaneously, our people are rarely permitted to view scenes or hear of Communist horror, bestiality, and the true condition of what a living death life under communism would be.

I include his lecture following my remarks:

THE GRAND DESIGN

THE GRAND DESIGN STATED

Ladies and Gentlemen: It's really a pleasure to be able to welcome so many of you into my home—not only those of you who actually are here—but also those who are here indirectly through the medium of motion picture film.

As you know, the title of this presentation is "The Grand Design." But I should explain at the outset that the real subject behind this title is U.S. Foreign Policy. Now, I realize there are some who might think that I was trying to be funny or sarcastic with that statement, because for a long time there's been a generally accepted view that our foreign policy has been so bungled and confused it couldn't possibly have followed any design, much less a grand one. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, the purpose of this presentation is

to show, not only that there is a Grand Design, but also that it has been the consistent, dominant force behind absolutely every major move by the United States in the foreign policy field since at least the end of World War II. This Grand Design has provided the motivation for all we have done in the past, and unless some basic changes are made, it will determine everything we shall do in the future. Regardless of one's opinion of this Grand Design, it's the outgrowth of a powerful and compelling argument, a profound statement of philosophy, and a deceptively attractive appeal to reason. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, unless we are able to counter this argument and to offer a superior philosophy, we'll continue to be like putty in the hands of its advocates.

So, it's important, to say the least, for us to understand what the Grand Design is, to analyze it in order to discover its flaws, if any, and then to offer a superior alternative, if we can. These three requirements, then, will constitute the general outline of the material and the ideas to be presented here: First, identification; Second, analysis; and Third, solution.

To plunge right into the core of this challenge, what I'm going to do now is advocate the Grand Design just as though I really believed in it—which, in all honesty, at one time I did. In fact, I'm going to teach it to you just the way it was taught to me—and accepted by me—at the University of Michigan.

Following the form of what we might call an extended syllogism, here is how the argument begins: One: We are living in a new age—and, of course, you can hardly argue with that. We're always living in a new age. But nevertheless, we're reminded of that profound fact rather elaborately: We're living in an age of marvelous and incredible technological advances; an age in which men travel faster than the speed of sound, in which satellites forge communication links between continents, in which space itself has become a limitless frontier of exploration. And then, at the end of the list of all these wondrous and productive scientific achievements, always we are reminded, with ominous overtones, that we also have with us now something called *The Bomb*! End of step one, ready now for step two.

By the way, everything up to this point not only is true, it's so obviously true that it's really not part of the argument at all. It's merely thrown in at the beginning as a kind of conditioner, to get us nodding our heads in agreement in hopes that the habit will carry over into the next step which is where the going gets tricky and where we need to be far more on our guard.

The next step, then—the real premise of The Grand Design—is this: If all-out war should develop today between major powers, both sides would lose. No one could come out ahead in that kind of a war. Everyone would lose. It wouldn't make any difference who the good guys were or who the bad guys were. It wouldn't make any difference who started it, or even if it were started by accident. Both sides would lose.

Having acknowledged existence of The Bomb, and having concluded that risking war is unthinkable in this modern age, we move now to step number three, which is this: Since the Communists have nuclear weapons, and since they certainly would use them in their own self-defense, that means, doesn't it, that victory over Communism is impossible. Now, we may wish that it were possible. We may wish that we were living in a by-gone era in which, if one had an enemy, he could meet him on the open battlefield and get it over with. We may wish that a lot of things were different in this old world. But instead of moaning and weeping and longing after those things which are no longer possible, let's grow up, be mature, intelligent human beings and face life the way it really is.

Rather than living in a fantasy world, dreaming and longing after those things we want but can never have, instead let's find out what is the best we can get, and then work for that.

All right, now the next step: It's not enough for us just to know that victory is impossible. For our own safety, we must conduct our foreign affairs in such a way as to reflect this knowledge to the other side. We must be extremely careful never to give the enemy any cause to question our benign intent. We must avoid using any words or committing any acts which might even suggest that we were pursuing a goal of victory. We can't afford to gamble on what the enemy might do in response. In other words, we mustn't frighten the Communists or give them any cause for self-defensive panic. In fact, to take it one step further, we must avoid the temptation even to embarrass the Soviets in the eyes of the world.

You see, the argument is, that it's like being locked in a cage with a dangerous animal. You can't get out of the cage and you can't kill the animal. So what do you do when it becomes hungry and restless? You feed it—hoping that, if it is full and comfortable and contented, then it won't eat you.

The people who have created U.S. Foreign Policy over the past two decades view the United States as being locked in a worldwide cage with a dangerous animal called Communism. We can't get out of the cage, obviously. And since victory is impossible, remember, we can't destroy the animal.

So, to minimize the chances of Communism turning on us, these planners not only have avoided frightening the animal with any overt moves which it might mistakenly view as a threat to itself, but they've done everything possible to keep the beast fed, comfortable and content. It's in our own interest, they say, to see that Communist regimes remain reasonably stable. If they need wheat, or other agricultural commodities, send it to them. If they need industrial know-how, invite their scientists and engineers to tour our factories so they can learn how best to produce. If they still can't manufacture the goods they need, then send our own people over there to build their plants and set up their production lines. If that doesn't work, then sell the products to them on easy credit terms, and don't really expect to get paid. In fact, if they need money, give that to them, too. Give them anything they need so they won't become restless and aggressive. And, yes, as harsh as it may seem on the surface, it's even in our best interest to see that Communist regimes can successfully put down internal anti-Communist revolts. None of this because we're pro-Communist, only because we're mature, objective, intelligent people who recognize that, in this modern nuclear age, we can't afford the risk to our own survival which would be inherent in having so powerful an adversary struggling defensively to maintain his position.

All right, now we're ready for the final step in The Grand Design, which concerns itself with the question of realistic, attainable goals. What is the best we can hope to achieve in this new age with all of its complexities? How do we resolve this dilemma before we all go up in a mushroom cloud of nuclear dust?

The answer that is offered to us is this: We should encourage the Communist world gradually to move toward us—ideologically, politically and economically—while at the same time, we must be willing to move toward them—ideologically, politically and economically—to the point where, hopefully in the not-too-distant future, we'll be able to merge our system with theirs—and of course with those of the rest of the world—to form some kind of a world brotherhood, a world union, a World Government, to be

exact, which, by definition, would hold a monopoly over all these weapons of mass destruction. And then nuclear war between nations finally would be impossible—for the simple reason that there no longer would be any nations, including our own. There would remain only a group of disarmed political subdivisions of an all-powerful world government.

Of course, the Grand Designers scoff at the suggestion that such a concentration of power in one place might ideally be suited for a total consolidation of control into the hands of a small group of power-hungry world politicians. They particularly scoff at the possibility of this power falling into Communist hands through the tactics used so successfully by their agents working within every other coalition government in which they've participated. We are assured that, since this would be a world coalition government, for that reason the Communists wouldn't try to seize power, they'd be content merely to share in it.

Well, without going into that particular little fantasy, just for the sake of discussion, let's grant the point and assume that a world coalition government with the Communists really would result in a merger of our systems rather than the domination of theirs over ours. What then?

First of all, we would have to be willing to give up certain things that we would rather retain—such as our sovereignty and our independence. In other words, we must be willing to abide by the political dictates of the majority of other nations—one man, one vote in a world democracy. We must merge our monetary system with those of other nations, eventually to form a world currency. We must willingly submit all international disputes to a World Supreme Court, and abide by those decisions regardless of the outcome. And, above all, we must turn over our most powerful weapons and even our armies to international control so that the new world government will possess sufficient military might to compel the various political subdivisions by force, if necessary, to comply with the dictates of its laws and the decrees of its Court.

Now, to be sure, we'd prefer not to have to do any of these things because, obviously, if we're going to merge with other countries, other cultures, other legal systems and political ideologies, we can't expect the whole world to adopt our way of doing things. It'll be a give-and-take situation in which we'll have to seek a common denominator, a middle-ground between our way of life and the way things are done in other parts of the world. And of course, the result of such a compromise of systems predictably would have to be a mixture of the volatile dictatorships of Latin America, the tribal customs of newly emerging Africa, and the Socialist regimes of Europe and Asia. Add to this concoction the necessity to absorb the doctrines and methods of Communist regimes, and it's rather obvious that we're just going to have to give up certain cherished traditions and customs, and learn to adjust to a way of life substantially different from that which we inherited. But it won't be so bad. We'll get used to it. And future generations won't know the difference. Besides, we really don't have any choice in the matter. It's that or The Bomb! So let's get on with the job of putting an end to our own nationhood, as it has been historically defined.

The men who have formulated this Grand Design consider themselves to be part of the intellectual elite. In other words, in their opinion they're just a little smarter than the rest of us. They feel that the average American doesn't quite have the intelligence or the aptitude to understand the wisdom of their Grand Design. As a matter of fact, they're rather worried that, if enough of the American people suddenly discovered what was really going on, they might get out of

hand and insist on their leaders doing something silly—like *winning* for a change!

And so, in order to keep us contented at the polls, and to prevent us from asking too many questions, sometimes it's necessary for them to put on a pretty good show of standing firm against the Communists, to make some strong nationalistic statements now and then, and perhaps even to get us involved in some "limited" wars which, although they're clearly not waged to endanger the enemy or weaken his position in any way, still, with the daily loss of American lives in a "shooting" war against Communists, who would dare suggest that our foreign policy is soft on Communism!

And in this way the Grand Designers are confident that the American people will remain satisfied that their leaders are really standing firm and doing all that is humanly possible. But in reality, they're merely buying time. It's their plan that the old-timers among us—those of you who've been raised with those old-fashioned and outmoded concepts of patriotism and love of country—that, in time, your generation will pass away or at least become the minority voice. And at the same time they're catching the younger generations coming up through the high schools and colleges—like they caught me—and the Grand Designers are confident that in just a few more years—especially if they can lower the voting age—the political majority of the American people can be conditioned to accept the total abandonment of our national sovereignty.

I realize that, for those who have never before heard the Grand Design spelled out in detail like this, it's almost impossible to believe that it's real. And there may be some of you who are wondering if, perhaps, I haven't just dreamed up all this. So, let's turn now to the actual words and documents of the men who not only fully endorse the Grand Design, but those who've been instrumental in creating it in the first place, and who helped put it into action.

Now, I'm going to try not to bore you with a lot of long quotations, but in order to give you some idea of just how real and consistent this Grand Design is, I think it's necessary to offer concrete examples from a broad spectrum of American leadership and over a wide time span. For the philosophy which I've just summarized has been held and preached for many years by opinion-molders in the communications media, by Congressmen and Senators, by high ranking personnel in all agencies of the Federal Government, by Secretaries of State, Secretaries of Defense, Supreme Court Justices and even Presidents of the United States.

A good place to begin is with a speech delivered by Joseph E. Johnson on February second, 1959. Mr. Johnson, as you may recall, formerly was the number one man in charge of our State Department Policy Planning Division. But at the time of these remarks, he was President of the Carnegie Endowment Fund for International Peace, one of the many tax-exempt foundations that, all together, spend millions of dollars each year just to promote the Grand Design. Speaking at a luncheon in New York, Joseph E. Johnson said:

"From now on, every decision facing the United States in this field must be taken in the light of the fact that a good part of this country could be destroyed. . . . We must be prepared to fight limited wars, limited as to weapons and as to goals, to stabilize the situation temporarily, tide things over. But victory is no longer possible."

Moving from the State Department to Pentagon, we come across this feature article syndicated by the Associated Press on February fourth, 1968 entitled *Robert S. McNamara: Reflections After Seven Years on the Hot Seat*. I think you'll find most reveal-

ing this direct quote from our former Secretary of Defense:

"It became clear that we couldn't win a strategic nuclear war, that nobody could. . . . The concept of massive retaliation was ruled out. . . . Then it was necessary to educate the public and the Congress that you cannot win a strategic nuclear war. We said it in different ways over a period of time. I consider getting that concept across our greatest single accomplishment."

In the transcript of hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February twenty-fifth, 1966, again we find McNamara, this time testifying officially as our Secretary of Defense. He said:

"To declare war [in Vietnam] would add a new psychological element to the international situation, since in this century declarations of war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy. It would increase the danger of misunderstanding our true objectives."

The August second, 1961 issue of the Congressional Record contains a statement by Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and long-time exponent of the Grand Design. Fulbright said:

"In the long run it is quite possible that the principle problem of leadership will be . . . to restrain the desire of the [American] people to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas."

Returning to the State Department, we find that by 1962, the man who was then running the Foreign Policy Planning Division was Walt Rostow, President Kennedy's Special Advisor on Foreign Affairs. In a report to the President entitled "Basic National Security," Rostow stated:

"Rising tensions or pleas . . . of the American public must be ignored in any crisis with Russia. The temptation must be avoided . . . to degrade or embarrass the Soviets in the eyes of the world."

If you've been wondering why it is that we can't seem to win any wars against the Communists, it's simply because it's our policy not even to embarrass them, much less defeat them!

In 1963, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency financed a report by the Peace Research Institute. Published in April of that year, here's what our tax dollars produced:

"Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200 million odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The break-up of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order."

In other words, according to the Grand Design, supposedly it's in our own self-interest for the Soviet police state to remain intact, to remain stable, and to maintain its death grip over the captive nations.

That kind of reasoning leads us next to the pages of one of the most influential newspapers in the world, *The New York Times*. On August sixteenth, 1961, the *Times* ran this editorial:

"We must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must under our principles live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citizens of freedom to slow death by strangulation."

Shocking? Well, if you accept the premise of the Grand Design, it shouldn't be. It's then merely a cold and objective appraisal of our limited alternatives in this nuclear age.

Now let's bring this philosophy to its ultimate conclusion and see what the world

planners have to say about the future role of American sovereignty.

Returning again to the words of Senator Fulbright, we find this most revealing book by him entitled *Old Myths and New Realities*. And bear in mind that this was written by the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, one of the most influential legislative committees in Washington.

On page 25, Fulbright says:

"The problem for American policy, however, is not in defining what we would like; it is rather, . . . how to live with the best we can get."

Then, on page 87:

"Indeed, the concept of national sovereignty has become in our time a principle of international anarchy . . . Our survival in this century may well turn out to depend upon whether we succeed in transferring at least some small part of our feelings of loyalty and responsibility from the sovereign nation to some larger political community."

And so we don't miss the point he's trying to make, he repeats on page 108: ". . . the sovereign nation can no longer serve as the ultimate unit of personal loyalty and responsibility."

I think it's pretty obvious that many of our leaders in Washington long ago have transferred substantial portions of their personal loyalty and responsibility from the sovereign nation of the United States to the larger political community called the United Nations. In their own minds it's quite likely that they consider themselves to be citizens of the world first, and citizens of the United States second. In any decision where the interests of America are in direct conflict with those of the "larger political community," you can be sure that America will wind up on the short end.

Our former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in a lecture at Ohio Wesleyan University entitled "Toward World Unity," phrased it this way:

"The significance of what I initially propose . . . involves an organization dedicated to the general welfare—the peace and order of mankind—and the assuming of an allegiance to this goal superior to that of any national allegiance."

Returning again to the words of Walt Rostow, our former Chief of the State Department Policy Planning Division, we find an unusually open and frank summary of the objectives of the Grand Design spelled out in his book, *The United States in the World Arena*, which, incidentally, was subsidized by the C.I.A. On page 549 Rostow states:

"It is a legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations—including the United States—the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the root of national sovereignty . . . it is therefore, an American interest to see an end to nationhood as it has been historically defined."

Justice of the Supreme Court, William O. Douglas, wrote an essay entitled *The Rule of Law in World Affairs* published in 1961 by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which in turn is financed by another of those tax-exempt foundations, The Fund for the Republic. On page 32 Douglas wrote:

"There is no reason for us to get tangled up in legalisms that march inexorably to the conclusion that total and complete sovereignty must be retained. For we now know that when that claim is pressed by all nations, everyone faces extinction in a nuclear holocaust."

This is a very precise summary of the Grand Design. In just two sentences we're told that it's either World Government or The Bomb! Take your choice. By the way, the general theme and purpose of this pamphlet was to generate public support for increasing the power and prestige of the U.N. World Court, and also to lend support to a

drive at that time for the repeal of the Connally Amendment.

Without getting too involved in this, I should explain that, when the Senate ratified the U.N. Statute of the International Court of Justice and agreed to commit the United States to accept the final decisions of the U.N. World Court, it was generally understood that the Court would never meddle into our purely domestic affairs. But, there were some who feared that, in time, the World Supreme Court would begin to find legalistic ways to declare what we think is strictly our own business and no one else's, it's, in a larger sense, also the concern of "mankind." So, to prevent the World Supreme Court from extending its jurisdiction into our local affairs the same way in which the Federal Supreme Court gradually has assumed jurisdiction over what was once considered to be the local affairs of our own States, the Senate voted for an amendment to the Statute proposed by Senator Tom Connally. This amendment still stands and simply says that what is or is not a domestic affair of the United States will be determined by the United States, not by other nations or by the World Court, itself.

And so it's understandable why the Grand Designers have felt the need to generate greater public support for the international World Court and to repeal the Connally Amendment.

On April fourth, 1960, Vice President Richard Nixon issued a statement under the official letterhead and seal of his office which read, in part, as follows:

"Many well-intentioned people have raised the basic question—why have an international court in the first place? The answer, putting it in its simplest and bluntest terms, is that even nations that are friends are bound to have disputes. If those disputes are not settled by negotiation, the only alternatives left are to settle them either by force or by law. At a time when the use of force means unleashing nuclear weapons which would destroy civilization, all sensible people agree that we must find some alternative to force for settling international disputes."

That's really an incredible statement, because, in passing, we should keep in mind that law also is force. If the courts don't have the police and the armies to back up their decisions with force if necessary, then there's no law. Law is force, legalized. And so with this reality in mind, Mr. Nixon's statement continues:

"There are some today who believe that the prospect of the use of atomic weapons to settle international disputes is so terrible that we should set up a new, all-powerful world organization which would have jurisdiction over disputes between nations. I disagree with this approach. I believe that rather than setting up a new international institution we have to begin to use the one we already have."

And then the Vice-President's statement concludes with strong assurances that we have nothing to fear and much to gain by repealing the Connally Amendment.

The international institution we already have, of course, is the United Nations. Most Americans good-heartedly accept the U.N. as a kind of farcical debating society. But I can assure you that the Grand Designers have other thoughts and plans. The May, 1964 issue of the official U.N. *Monthly Chronicle* contains these glimpses into the future through the eyes of Secretary-General U Thant:

"If we are to make the next step toward world authority and then onward to a world government, it will be by the growth in authority and prestige of the institutions and agencies of the United Nations, and by the development of the . . . Statute of the International Court . . . Regulatory international machinery of Government in the true sense of the word is required . . . Such

an authority can not merely consist in a paper constitution and must be based on a certain degree of power."

A "certain" degree of power doesn't sound very menacing. But just how much power would it take to make the vision of a world government come true? Obviously, it would take whatever amount is required to be superior to that of any political subdivision beneath it. It would have to be so powerful that no nation would be able to challenge it, without risking nuclear annihilation at the hands of the U.N. army. But if that happened of course no one could possibly object because it wouldn't be called an act of war, it would be a "peacekeeping" maneuver by a "peacekeeping" force, and the mushroom cloud would rise from a "peacekeeping" bomb.

I know this must sound fantastic to some of you, so let's get back to the record. In 1961 the State Department published document 7277, a booklet entitled *Freedom From War*. The sub-title explains what it is: "The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in A Peaceful World." This was our proposal submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations for disarming and transferring to the U.N. complete control over our atomic weapons, our missiles, and our national Army, Navy and Air Force as well—everything except what we might need for limited internal police function. After eighteen pages of detailed proposals to bring this about, we finally discover in plain language the ultimate goal of our disarmament programs—and this is a direct quote: "Disarmament . . . would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force."

Of course, 1961 was a long time ago, and it's true that State Department Publication 7277 is no longer our official position on disarmament. It was replaced by this one: *Blueprint for the Peace Race*, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication Four, General Series Three. And on page thirty-three we find the "new" position:

"The Parties to the Treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force . . . until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."

And so it has gone, year after year, and revision after revision. The basic objective of our disarmament proposals has been—and is today—the objective of the Grand Design: The creation of a true world government with sufficient military force to compel all nations, including our own to obey.

The January-February issue of *Vista* magazine, published by the United Nations Association, featured an exclusive interview with former President Eisenhower dealing with exactly this subject. The reporter, Mary Kersey Harvey, a senior editor of McCall's Magazine, wanted to get the President's reaction to a proposal by Grenville Clark which would establish a permanent U.N. world army. After outlining the Clark proposal for President Eisenhower, here is what Miss Harvey reported:

"The President studied the above plan quickly and, as I had expected, caught the ball and ran with it. You'd have, he began to plan out loud, world Marshals, comparable to our U.S. Marshals. Backed by armed forces similar to our National Guard . . . Non-compliance with U.N. law and you send in the U.N. forces. He orchestrated this point at some length."

"And too, he hammered away, the U.N. needs nuclear power. He bore down hard on the word 'nuclear' . . . Take this example, he hurried on. You have two countries in a border argument. The U.N. orders the matter to be taken to the International Court. One or both of the disputants refuses to submit to compulsory arbitration . . .

"The U.N., which by now has in its possession a fleet of submarines armed with nu-

clear missiles deployed around the world, orders one of the submarines to proceed to the area. The world is then told that if firing breaks out for any reason whatsoever, a tactical nuclear weapon will be delivered onto the disputed territory. If this threat fails to prevent armed conflict, you back it up with action."¹³

And that, is the Grand Design for preventing nuclear war.

That's all the quotations and exhibits that time permits—which, in a way, is unfortunate, because the examples I've used so far have been slightly top-heavy with Republicans. If we had more time, I could balance it out and then get everybody mad at me! Seriously, it's just as easy to find the sentiments expressed here within the top ranks of one major party as it is the other. The Grand Design has absolutely nothing to do with partisan politics.¹⁴ These men aren't nearly as much Republicans or Democrats as they are world politicians. They've got bigger things to occupy their minds than mere party labels. To them, partisan politics is only a game to amuse the masses who crave the showmanship of big national conventions, the excitement of partisan campaigns, and the satisfaction of casting a vote in the illusion that, somehow, they're really helping to decide the important issues of the day. But, with precious few exceptions, for the past two decades the American voter has had to make his choice between Grand Designer A and Grand Designer B.

It's always a source of amazement to me when I hear someone criticize our leaders for being confused in the area of foreign policy, or reversing their position, or bungling the job and not having any long-range goals. These men are *not* bungling the job. They're acting in accordance with a definite, well thought out plan, and they've been executing that plan with brilliant precision. We may or may not like the plan, but let's not kid ourselves into thinking that there isn't any.

I, for one, don't like the plan. And you may wonder why not. As you recall, earlier I said that when I was first exposed to the Grand Design, it seemed like a compelling argument. After all, each of those steps do seem to progress logically, one to the other. So, having taken this much time merely to expound and explain a point of view which I no longer accept, I think the least I can do now is to offer the reasons for having changed my mind, and to expose what I consider to be the fatal flaws of the Grand Design.

THE GRAND DESIGN REFUTED

There are at least two major fallacies that need to be understood if we're to overcome the arguments for containment, coexistence, accommodation, and ultimate merger with world Communism. First of all, the premise behind these arguments is *wrong*. And you know you can't do much with a piece of logic if you start out with a faulty premise. The premise underlying the entire Grand Design is this: "If all-out war should develop between major powers today . . ." Well, stop right there. We've already passed it. Back up all the way to the very first word "if." If? Ladies and Gentlemen, when are we going to get it through our heads that all-out war is being waged against us right now—and has been for a long time. And by all-out war, I mean *total war*, not just military war. We're so used to thinking in terms of the old-fashioned concepts of warfare, in which the primary weapons were guns and bombs, we've failed to realize that, for the first time in history, we're facing an enemy that has mastered the concept of *total warfare*. World War III that rages around us right now is a political war, an economic war, a psychological war, a spiritual war and a military war, but the military aspect is the least important of all. The only way that military strategy plays a role in the Communist blueprint, is in the form of guerrilla tactic aimed at creating

internal chaos and anarchy, to create the kind of conditions conducive for the quick seizure of power-centers by a small group of organized and well trained revolutionaries. That's the kind of military strategy you'll find in the Communist manuals, whether written by Lenin, Mao-tse Tung or Che Guevara. And even this kind of limited military activity could never succeed without the simultaneous waging of non-military war. The Communist guerrilla bands wouldn't stand a chance of succeeding in most countries without other Communists operating secretly among people to create the appearance of popular support, operating within the communications media to generate propaganda, and operating inside the government itself to create the necessary corruption, bickering, and apparent inefficiency to prevent that government from moving strongly against the guerrilla groups.

In Cuba, for instance, almost everyone remembers that, when Batista fled the country, an army of over 45,000 soldiers surrendered without a fight to only about 1800 revolutionaries under Castro. But very few people were aware that the General who surrendered these forces was, himself, a member of the Communist Party in Cuba—a perfect example of the non-military strategy of infiltration and treason producing an apparent military victory.¹⁵

The favorite weapons of Communist conquest are not engines of mass destruction in the hands of soldiers wearing a recognizable uniform. They are, instead, propaganda, the slanted view of history, the preaching of hatred to incite civil disorder, the tactics of internal subversion, treason, blackmail, the smear, political assassination—all committed by soldiers who wear no uniform and who claim to be loyal citizens of the target country marked for conquest from within. This is how Communism has spread across the globe, not with invading armies of bombs. And it's extremely unlikely that they'd abandon this non-military strategy, which has been so effective for them, right at the zenith of their success.

Without a doubt, the Atomic Bomb is the most powerful weapon in the Communist arsenal. But it's as a psychological weapon, not a military one. The Soviets have gained more by using The Bomb as a psychological weapon than they ever could have using it as a military weapon. Under the constant threat of nuclear annihilation, we've accepted concessions, compromises and defeats one after another, which would have been unthinkable without that spectre of a giant mushroom cloud fixed deep in our subconscious. As a matter of fact, The Bomb, as a psychological weapon, is being dropped on the American people every single day. Movies such as *On The Beach*, *Seven Days In May*, *Dr. Strangelove*, *Fall Safe*, *Planet of the Apes*—those well-produced and entertaining movies have done really a professional job of strengthening, subconsciously at least, the premise of The Grand Design.

Motion pictures of course, aren't the only source of this conditioning of the public mind. Radio, TV, books, magazines and newspapers have all played more than their part. The "message" that's been drummed into us all these years more or less follows the general pattern presented in this illustrated brochure entitled "Let There Be a World," written by Felix Greene.¹⁶ Greene is well-known in ultra-Leftist circles as an importer of propaganda film from Red China, and for his lectures and motion pictures extolling the virtues of life under Communism in Asia. By the way, I picked this up not too long ago at the Communist book store in Los Angeles—the "Progressive Book Shop." It's called, Every once in a while I browse around in there just to find out what the "progressives" and "intellectuals" are reading now-a-days. And this is a classic example: Page after page of beautifully reproduced photographs depicting in minute detail all the

horrors of nuclear war and all the beauty of disarmament and "peace."

Just take a quick look at some of these.^{16a} Naturally, just for openers, we see the fireball and the mushroom cloud. Then the charred bodies at Hiroshima and Nagasaki—grim reminders of the pain and suffering of any war, but particularly of nuclear war. Then, for those of us with weak imaginations, we're shown what could happen to our own cities. According to this map, if one of the super-bombs were dropped on Manhattan Island, we could cross-off everything clear out to Bridgeport, Connecticut, and fall-out would take care of the rest, probably clear to California!

Speaking of fall-out, there's a special section here just for the ladies. Preserved in jars of formaldehyde, there are the grotesque remains, after autopsy, of tiny infants, still-born and deformed supposedly as a result of radioactive fall-out. What woman can look at these—or what man for that matter—without some kind of a lasting emotional reaction against even the mere thought of risking nuclear war? Here, rather graphically represented, supposedly is the only way to prevent this from happening to us: Disarmament, of course! And finally, the appeal to the heart-strings, "Let There Be a World." It's really quite well done, I think. You have to give these people credit for knowing how to merchandise an idea. By the way, these are generally the same people who like to label anti-Communists as "fright peddlers."

With regard to this particular book, I'm not saying that these pictures are phoney, or that the devastating effects of nuclear war have been exaggerated to the public for propaganda purposes—although there's now a great deal of evidence to support both of these contentions. But that's not the point. The point is that the motion picture producers, the TV commentators, and the publishers who are so creative in their ability to convey to us all the horrors of death under a nuclear bomb, for some reason, never get around to portraying the fact that there are other horrible ways to die. We're shown the mushroom cloud but not the mass graves or the torture devices that exist behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We're shown the charred bodies at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but not the emaciated bodies of the living dead in Soviet concentration camps or the mutilated corpses of innocent civilians hacked to pieces by Communist terrorists in one country after another. It's not there aren't pictures like this available, it's just that we're seldom allowed to see them or be reminded of them through the accepted channels of mass communication.

Here are just two examples out of many that could be offered—two documents that have been readily available for a long time. Yet, they contain material which almost has been totally denied to the American people.

The first is a government pamphlet entitled "Lest We Forget! A Pictorial Summary of Communism in Action."¹⁷ It consists primarily of photographs smuggled out of Eastern Europe, providing documentary proof of Communist atrocities committed in those lands in order to liquidate anti-Communist opposition and to terrorize the people into submission. There's no professional touch here, but the pictures still tell the story: The mass graves, the sound-proofed torture rooms, and the pitiful victims of a deliberate program of mass starvation. It's hard to believe, but all of these children, even down to age two, were starved in this fashion in Communist forced-labor camps.

The other example is a pamphlet entitled "On the Morning of March 15th" consisting of photographs and factual descriptions of the results of a Communist terrorist raid in Northern Angola on the morning of March 15, 1961.¹⁸ Over 200 Europeans and 300 Africans were murdered on that one day alone. Over 50 widely separated places along a 400 mile front were attacked almost simultaneously.

Footnotes at end of article.

In most places, every man, woman, child and infant; every living creature—even the cats and dogs—were killed in the most brutal and sadistic manner imaginable.

Here are some of the *less* nauseating photographs, which hardly need any verbal description.

Seeing that picture of the infant in the bassinet, reminds me of one account which, forgive me, I *must* relate even though it sickens me just to read it:

"On the morning of March 15, a group of some 400 terrorists attacked the experimental farm at M'Bridge. One of the few survivors of this attack, Manuel Lorrenco Alves, relates what happened:

"The assault began at six in the morning and all the houses on the farm, whether they belonged to Europeans, Africans or mulattoes, were attacked simultaneously. . . . [The] women were dragged out of their houses together with their children. In front of the mothers, the terrorists then proceeded to cut off the legs and arms of the children, and then started to play a grotesque game of football with the twitching bodies. The women and girls were then led away, stripped, raped, and cut up."

I've discussed these scenes and shown these pictures, not because of any desire to be sensational, believe me, but merely to help balance the scales of our judgment; to emphasize the almost forgotten fact, now-a-days, that there are *other* horrible ways to die—ways, as a matter of fact, that makes the instant flash of a nuclear bomb seem merciful by comparison. And keep in mind that these other horrible ways to die are not the result of an event that happened almost a quarter of a century ago. We're talking about events that are happening *right now* to thousands of helpless human beings, somewhere, every day, millions every year. And we're not examining the unfortunate bi-product of an effort to bring an end to a long and bloody war. These incredible acts of brutality are the deliberate, pre-meditated works of men whose sole purpose is the destruction of human life and human values. But we're so saturated with peace propaganda and the spectre of the mushroom cloud that we seldom have occasion to ponder these facts. And because of this one-sided exposure, millions of Americans have been conditioned without their even knowing it, to fear the horror of a nuclear war far more than they fear the terror of a Communist peace.

The Communists have been winning this war because they've mastered the art of *total* warfare, while we've been conditioned to cower in fearful expectation of a war limited only to weapons of mass destruction.

And, so, the *premise* of the Grand Design starts right off with a faulty assumption. Instead of wondering what might happen *if* all-out war should develop, we must wake up to the fact that *we are* in an all-out war right now for our very survival. And instead of allowing ourselves to become afflicted with a nuclear war fixation, we must recognize that, because Communist strategy is what it is, the chances of this war ever involving an exchange of nuclear warheads is so remote as to be almost incalculable in the overall equation.

But that isn't all that's wrong with the Grand Design. Another fallacy that needs to be exposed once and for all is the absurd conclusion that victory is impossible. Victory not only is possible, it's inevitable. Let me repeat that because it's so important. If you remember nothing else I've said, remember this: *Victory not only is possible, it is inevitable.* The only question is, for which side? It's inconceivable that the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery can coexist side by side indefinitely. One or the other is going to triumph in our lifetime.¹⁹ And, if you want to satisfy your curiosity as to which side it's going to be, all you have to do is take a pencil and a piece of

graph paper, and mark off one side with the years starting 1945. On the other side, using whatever measure you wish, mark the relative level of prestige, power and influence of the United States and of World Communism. Chart the progress throughout the years right up to the present. And I think you'll find the resulting bar-graph to be highly instructive. With hardly any deviation in the line, the power of World Communism has been moving steadily upward, while that of the United States has been sinking from one new depth to another. Take a ruler, then, and project both of these lines into the future. And you can see in very graphic form that, unless there are some drastic changes in U.S. foreign policy, a policy that has been followed consistently by all Administrations and both political parties since 1945, *we are going to lose!* It's as simple as that.

Now, don't misunderstand what I mean. I'm not a prophet of doom. I'm not saying that we're going to lose. I'm saying only that, in order for us to have any chance to win, we must first wake up to the reality of that Grand Design that is U.S. foreign policy, and then we must set about to change it. And that, of course, leads us to the third and final question: Change it to what?

Now, you'd better hang on tight for this next part, because I know from experience that the ground ahead gets pretty rough in places. Some of you are going to be shocked, and the rest probably scared right out of your wits, because I'm now going to propose my own "grand design." I call it the *Grand Design for Victory*, and it's not for the faint-hearted.

Step One in my Grand Design for Victory is the premise that we must be captains of our own ship. We must restore our military, economic and political independence from the strangling entanglements of that budding World Government called the United Nations.

Instead of phasing out our best weapons, we should phase out all disarmament programs and those who propose them. As we should have learned at Pearl Harbor, disarmed and militarily unprepared nations are far more apt to become involved in war than those fully prepared to strike back. The best way to preserve the peace is to be prepared for war. And the best way to end the arms race is to move so far out in front that it ceases even to be a race.

Instead of seeking ways to water down our principles and our traditions to the point where they can be accepted by and merged with those of the majority of the rest of the world, we should be striving actually to improve and upgrade our American way of life even beyond present standards, and then let the rest of the world follow our example, if they so wish.

With regard to World Communism, we must face up to the reality that, whether we admit it or not, whether we like it or not, we are now engaged in World War III, a *total* war in which the stakes are nothing less than our lives and our freedoms. And in this war, our goal must not be containment or coexistence with Communism, it must be *Victory over Communism*, in order for us even to survive. It's not that we want it that way, it's just that we have no other choice.

Before you nod in agreement with this goal of victory over Communism, let me clarify just what that means. I'm not thinking in terms of those empty phrases and platitudes that so often fall from the lips of politicians. When I say victory over Communism I mean exactly that. Wherever the Communists choose to advance by overt military force—whether that force manifests itself in the form of a Berlin Blockade or a Vietnam guerilla war of so-called National Liberation—no matter what form it takes, it must be destroyed immediately by superior military force. And notice I didn't say check-

mated, I said *destroyed!* International crime not only must be stopped, it must be punished.

Of course, the question that rushes to mind at this point is what about the danger of escalation? The total objective of military warfare, once it breaks out, is to escalate it as rapidly as possible to beyond the endurance of the enemy so he'll quit fighting. Without escalation, the slaughter continues on and on with no end in sight and, in fact, no goal worthy of the sacrifice. "Come to the table," we say to the Communist thugs. "We mean you no harm. All we ask is that you stop killing people for a while, long enough for us to hold a conference to see if we can't negotiate to you something that you want." I wonder how many of you would be willing to give your lives for *that*? And yet, that is the goal for which we've asked over a million Americans in uniform to be willing to die if necessary. And I don't think it's worth a single drop of American blood. When you put a young man in uniform and ask him to face an enemy in mortal combat, you'd better give that boy every chance in the world to *win* so he can come home. And that, Ladies and Gentlemen means escalation!

In Southeast Asia, instead of fighting the Communist forces on the ground in an exchange of manpower, we should have followed General MacArthur's proposal to take the war directly to the nerve-centers of the enemy's home base using our superior air power. Fighting on the ground, man-for-man, against the limitless population reserves of Communist Asia is just about the *only* way the United States possibly could lose a war. Destroy from the air the source of supplies and leadership. Then the guerilla fighting on the ground would soon wither to no more than a local police problem. When the enemy suddenly realizes that the cards are no longer stacked in his favor, that he no longer has privileged sanctuaries, and that he might even stand to lose something for starting a war, he'll come to that peace table so fast it'll make your head swim. And, when he gets there, there's only one thing we discuss with him—his surrender terms, nothing else!

Any serious plan for victory over Communism must recognize the need to accept the help of all willing and trustworthy allies. Yet, in Korea and again in Vietnam, the Nationalist Chinese have begged us to accept over a half a million of their well-trained fully equipped, strongly motivated troops, either to fight along side our boys or to replace them altogether, and we decline to accept! Why? Well, of course, it's not really so hard to understand when you recall the Grand Design. If the Nationalist Chinese were ever allowed to get into what is basically their own battle against Red China, they just might get an uncontrollable urge to go home to the Mainland. They might not stop when they got to the Yalu or the D.M.Z. In fact, they might even try to *win* and that would ruin everything!

But this is precisely my point. Instead of cowering and trembling in fear at the dreaded possibility of Red China coming into a war, we should hope and pray that the anti-Communist Chinese and Koreans and Vietnamese would *drag* Red China into a war screaming and kicking, and then, by triggering internal revolts, liberate her people from the yolk of Communist slavery once and for all! And we mustn't back away from this one bit, if we're really serious about victory. For our goal must not be merely to keep the Communists out of South Korea or South Vietnam—that isn't victory, that's containment. It must include *removing* the Communists from North Korea, North Vietnam, Red China, Cuba, Eastern Europe and from the very first captive nation, Russia, itself. Just as we could not rest in World War II until every last vestige of Nazism was stamped out everywhere, for ten times that reason we can never hope today to have peace or security until every last Communist regime is removed from the face of the earth.

If this sounds risky, it's because it is! Let's not kid ourselves. The proposal I have just outlined is *very* risky business. The only thing more risky is the Grand Design we are now following. For if we continue on that course, we'll have no odds at all for survival!

This doesn't mean that we have to invade all these countries with soldiers, and it certainly doesn't mean that we should go around dropping The Bomb on everybody. And if you're thinking that this is what my proposal implies, then that's a pretty good indication that you're still thinking in terms of old-fashioned warfare. It's true that, occasionally, whenever the conditions seem ripe, the Communists do resort to brute force and semi-military tactics to advance their cause. When this happens, then the contest clearly must be won with military means. But, because of the very nature of Communist strategy, these "hot spots" never have been and never will be more than diversionary tactics to implement their larger strategy in the *total* war, which is predominantly non-military. Just as we are losing this war through non-military means, if we ever hope to win it, we'll have to do it through exactly those same non-military means. Let me give you a few quick examples of how this can be achieved.

First of all—and the most obvious of all—we must stop all trade with and aid to Communist regimes. Let these so-called socialist paradises try to exist on their own unproductive and bureaucracy-bound systems for a change, without being able to run to Uncle Sugar every time they're in trouble, and then see how long they last. I don't think they'd make it two years.

Secondly, I propose that we recognize all Communist regimes—for what they are—our mortal enemies! And if we do that, then we withdraw *diplomatic* recognition from them, no longer invite their leaders to dine in the White House, and we send their espionage agents, posing as diplomats, packing from our shores!

Our non-military strategy for victory over World Communism must take into account that our strongest allies and our greatest army already is within the enemy camp. But these captive peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains have learned the hard way that, although American leaders talk a good line about world freedom, when the chips are down, they don't deliver the goods. Do you want to meet some bitter people? Talk to a few Hungarian Refugees, or some Cubans whose loved ones were abandoned at the Bay of Pigs.

I'll never forget one conversation with a young Hungarian Freedom Fighter. He described how, for months prior to the revolt, American radio transmitters in Europe had been beaming broadcasts into Hungary encouraging the people to revolt, and promising full support. To men and women who are fighting for their lives, full support does not mean *moral* support and good wishes, it means guns and ammunition. And so, when the revolt finally broke out, this young man told how *sure* he and his friends were that America would come to their help. After all, we promised! Each day, they'd radio a desperate plea to the free world for military supplies—particularly bazookas and hand grenades, something that would be effective against the Soviet tanks that were forming an iron ring around Budapest. And then they'd go to the airport and wait.

Finally, on about the fourth day, an American transport plane circled the field for landing. And when they looked up and saw that big beautiful American Star on the side of the plane, he said they began to cry like babies, because at last, Americans had come through! When the plane landed, they were so anxious to find out what kind of weapons had been sent, they scrambled aboard and began to pry open the wooden crates with their bare hands. Do you know what they found? Powdered milk. They were stunned. They just couldn't believe it. And

then one of them got the idea that maybe the Americans had been clever enough to camouflage their shipment by hiding hand grenades or at least bullets inside the cans. And so they got a can opener and began desperately to open one can after another, but each was the same, powdered milk.

Actually, it was disclosed later that, at the same time we were declining to offer any real help to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters, our State Department sent a communique to Communist Yugoslavia, and thus indirectly to the whole Communist world, that made it clear we would not take any action to prevent the Soviets from putting down this revolt in Hungary. The message read as follows: "The United States looks with disfavor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union."²⁰ And, since Hungary lies on the border of the Soviet Union, with the assurance of non-intervention from us, the fate of the Hungarian Freedom fighters was sealed.

But, returning to the young refugee telling the story, after describing the scene at the airport, he looked at me and he said, "When we needed your help, you chose, instead, to be friends with the Soviets. My people will never trust the United States again—or, at least as long as the American flag flies over your Embassy in Budapest as a reminder to us that your ambassador of good will continues to exchange cordial greetings with our hated masters. On the day that you lower your flag and call home your Ambassador, on that day, my people will fight again." And these are just about the exact words that he used.

I've had reason to reflect on that statement many times since. And I've come to the conclusion that, if the captive peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains were ever given any reason to believe that we were really on *their* side instead of seeking an accommodation with their masters, it's my conviction that they would take courage, rise up as one, and topple their Communist regimes the same way they were imposed in the first place—from the inside. And we wouldn't have to fire a shot. But we do have to stop *helping* the Communists, we *do* have to stop dignifying their leaders as legitimate representatives of the people, and we *do* have to stand firm for a change and declare openly in word and deed our uncompromising dedication to victory over Communism everywhere in the world!

Now, that probably would be an easy place for me to end—three cheers for victory! But it's not quite that simple. I'd be less than honest with you if I closed it off at this point, because we still are missing one final but very important consideration. Even though it's true that The Bomb is primarily a psychological weapon today, and even though the chances are microscopically small that the Bomb would be used in either our victory or our defeat, nevertheless, we can't *entirely* rule out the possibility. No matter how remote, it still exists. So now what is our position? Do we give up the whole idea and return blindly to the hope that, somehow, we can coexist—at least for a little while longer so we can enjoy life to the fullest in the time we have left, I think not. I have too much faith in the American people, once they fully understand what the choice is.

Putting it very bluntly, if we are not willing to risk our lives, our beautiful cities, and all the material things which we value for those principles in which we believe, then how can we have the audacity to send our sons onto a foreign battlefield and ask *them* to give *their* lives for those principles? Are their lives any less precious than ours? As far as I'm concerned, Ladies and Gentlemen, when we send that first American soldier into battle, when we first ask him to be willing to lay down his life for us, we put the whole nation right on the line behind him. And if we are not willing to, then this is no

longer the home of the brave, nor *much* longer the land of the free.

These are the heavy thoughts I leave with you. And I don't know quite how to close this presentation without running the risk of sounding corny, because the sentiment I want to express has been ridiculed by some as being just that. But, to me, it's far from corny. It's an article of faith that needs to be reaffirmed in the public mind openly without shame or embarrassment, and it's simply this: As Americans today, we are truly a privileged people in a privileged land. But with our blessings come responsibilities, and with responsibilities come risks. The challenge of our time is that we must accept both the responsibilities of our blessings and the risks involved in defending them for ourselves and for future generations. And we must do this without hesitation if we are to be worthy benefactors of that precious heritage of freedom passed on to us, through the epic sacrifices of those who have gone before. That is *not* flag-waving, and it is *not* clichéd patriotism. That's a simple statement of the obligations of citizenship in this glorious land—*our* land—which, with God's help, we shall preserve.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "New Factor Seen in Foreign Policy," *New York Times*, Feb. 2, 1959. At a news conference on October 12, 1967, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said: "It is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. We Americans are an impatient people . . . But our overriding object is—and must be in this modern world—the establishment of a reliable peace. It is easy to rush into total catastrophe. It requires courage and determination to act with both firmness and restraint in the interest of peace." See "Rusk: 'Our Commitment Is Clear,'" *U.S. News & World Report*, October 23, 1967, p. 40.

² "Robert S. McNamara; Reflections After 7 Years on the Hot Seat as The Secretary of Defense," by Saul Pett, *L.A. Herald Examiner*, Feb. 4, 1968, p. A-3.

³ It is interesting to note that, over a year later, Secretary of State Dean Rusk used exactly the same phraseology. Testifying on July 31, 1967 before a joint subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, Rusk declared: "In this century, declarations of war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy." See "Rusk Says No to War Declaration," *L.A. Herald Examiner*, July 31, 1967, p. A-6.

⁴ "Memorandum On Propaganda Activities of Military Personnel Directed at the Public" (The "Fulbright Memorandum") *Congressional Record*, August 2, 1961, pp. 13434, 13437.

⁵ See "Rostow Outline Raising A Storm" by Max Frankel, *New York Times*, June 22, 1962, p. 7. Also see "Drafts Foreign Policy Revision Bowing to Reds," and "Rostow Backs 'Education' on Soft Red Line," by Willard Edwards, *The Chicago Tribune*, June 17 and 18, 1962.

⁶ "The Political Control of An International Police Force," by Walter Millis. Published by the Peace Research Institute, Inc. April 1963 under U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Grant ACDA/IR-8, Volume II, p. A-14.

⁷ Fulbright, *Old Myths and New Realities*, (Random House, New York, 1964).

⁸ Dulles, "Toward World Order" (pamphlet), A Merrick-McDowell Lecture delivered at Ohio Wesleyan University on March 5, 1942, on the occasion of the Conference called by authority of the Federal Council of Churches to study the Bases for a Just and Durable Peace, p. 19, as quoted by Alan Stang, *The Actor; The True Story of John Foster Dulles*, (Western Islands, Boston, Mass., 1968) p. 102.

⁹ Rostow, *The United States in The World Arena*, (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1960).

¹⁰ Douglas, "The Rule of Law in World Af-

fairs," (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., 1961) p. 32.

¹¹ This was a printed form letter and was sent to anyone who inquired into Mr. Nixon's stand on the Connally Amendment.

¹² Thant, "The League of Nations and The United Nations," and "Strengthening the United Nations," *U.N. Monthly Chronicle*, May 1964, pp. 75, 84.

¹³ "Of War and Peace and the U.N." by Mary Kersey Harvey, *Vista* magazine, Jan.-Feb., 1968, pp. 32-33.

¹⁴ As Secretary of State Dean Rusk phrased it: "The abiding goal of American policy is the kind of world envisaged in the preamble and articles one and two of the Charter of the United Nations . . . That is the kind of world which . . . we are trying to bring into being. And by 'we' I mean not just one President or one political party . . . Four successive Presidents of both parties, and most of our major national leaders have supported the basic policies intended to build this kind of world." See "The United States and Japan; Common Interests in the Building of A Peaceful World," *Department of State Bulletin*, Feb. 17, 1964, p. 231.

¹⁵ My very good source for this statement is none less than Fidel Castro's former Chief of Air Force, Major Pedro Diaz Lanz. Major Lanz was the first Cuban official high in Castro's organization to discover that he was a Communist and to expose him publicly. After denouncing Castro, Lanz then fled to an incredulous America where he was labeled as an extremist for falsely defaming the "Robin Hood of Cuba." In time, of course, Major Lanz was vindicated, and the truth of his words now has become painfully obvious to all Americans. When I talked to Major Lanz over the telephone recently, I asked if he had any documentation to "prove" that the man was a Communist. After a moment of tactful silence, he replied, "You know, they asked me that same question when I told them in 1961 that Castro was a Communist. And I must apologize for making the same oversight as I did then. It was so thoughtless of me, of course, but when I left Cuba fleeing for my life, somehow I forgot to ask Castro for a photographic copy of his Party card so I could 'prove' to the American people that he was a Communist. How thoughtless of me not to do that." Major Lanz's point was well made, and I do not hesitate to stand on his statement alone as ample authority.

¹⁶ Greene, "Let There Be A World." (The Fulton Publishing Co., Palo Alto, Calif., 1963).

^{16a} Note: The text of this pamphlet is a verbatim transcript of a 16mm motion picture titled, "The Grand Design". Documents discussed in this text were shown to the viewer.

¹⁷ Consultation with Mr. Klaus Samuli Gunnar Romppanen, House Committee on Un-American Activities, January 13, 1960.

¹⁸ This pamphlet was published by the Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs, 20 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.

¹⁹ The Communists are very realistic on this point. While their agents in our midst encourage the American people to dream of a peaceful merger of our rival systems, the leaders and the theoreticians of World Communism make it clear in their own doctrine that they, themselves, have no such illusions. As one Communist spokesman phrased it, "The concept of a future in which capitalism and communism will 'converge' on an 'equal footing' is utopian through and through. The time will come, of course, when there will be a world government, but it will be the government of a world Socialist (Communist) community . . ." See "Speaking Different Languages" by A. Solodovnikov, *International Affairs* No. 11, Nov. 1963, p. 48.

²⁰ Entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable Michael Feighan on August 31, 1960, p. 17407.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HOUSE URBAN AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial which pertains to the proposal by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) of a resolution to establish a House Urban and District of Columbia Affairs Committee.

Such a committee, I feel, has immense possibilities to benefit not only the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, but also all of our urban centers which are facing ever new and more critical problems. The House, as we know, now reacts to these urban crises in several different committees, among them the Banking and Currency Committee for housing shortages, Interstate and Foreign Commerce for narcotics problems, and Education and Labor for the poverty program. The new committee proposed by Mr. GUDE would have the opportunity of over-viewing urban problems in general, and would have substantive authority over such problems facing our metropolitan areas as water and air pollution, public and private housing, and mass urban transportation, as well as executing the extent of Congress' constitutional jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. Mr. GUDE feels that coordination in dealing with urban problems is essential not only among the local jurisdictions within each metropolitan area, but also in Congress.

Restructuring Congress in this way may bring about jurisdictional conflicts in the House, but I would certainly hope that the magnitude and the urgency of the crises in our urban centers which demand our immediate attention would cause these jurisdictional conflicts to blanch in comparison.

I now respectfully submit for your consideration the aforementioned editorial from the Baltimore Sun of April 17, 1969:

URBAN PANELS

Representative Gude has publicly proposed a new House committee to deal with District of Columbia affairs and urban problems in general. Senator Tydings is known also to have an interest in something like this. The idea is alluring. For one thing, congressional handling of urban problems now is terribly fragmented—when Senator Ribicoff introduced a comprehensive "urban package" of bills a few years ago, they were assigned to three different committees. For another thing, the District's uniqueness as an entity apart dramatizes the central problem of cities, their apartness from their suburbs.

The suburbs have become middle class havens, leaving cities burdened by a disproportionate number of those who pay relatively little taxes while needing relatively expensive services. There are two ways to handle this problem in the long run: extend city boundaries to include suburbs; or increase greatly state and federal aid to cities. Congressional committees handling urban problems and the District of Columbia's affairs might be biased in favor of federal aid, since that is clearly the avenue the district will take. Even those who prefer annexations will admit this bias would be easily controllable, and a small price to pay, anyway, for creation of truly urban problems committees in Congress.

THE BAY-DELTA STUDY—AN APOLOGIA

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the California Legislature several years ago authorized the undertaking of a full study of the San Francisco Bay-Delta area to determine how that area would best meet the threat of pollution and diminution of water quality by proposed water diversions and inflows of waste effluent from municipal and industrial plants.

Regrettably, this study appears to back certain contentions of the State department of water resources, which in my own opinion will result in a real threat to the ecology of the bay-delta area.

On Monday, April 21, I made a statement regarding this study, before the State water resources control board in Martinez, Calif. I would like, at this time to insert that statement in the RECORD:

SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA WATER QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

(Statement of JEROME R. WALDIE, U.S. Congressman representing the 14th District of California)

I sincerely regret not being able to personally appear and express my views upon the "Final Report (Preliminary Edition) on the San Francisco Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Program" (hereinafter referred to as the Bay-Delta Study), but you may be sure that my absence today does not even remotely suggest any lack of concern for preservation of the ecology and the quality of one of the world's most valuable estuarine bodies of water, the San Francisco Bay-Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta System.

You may also be certain that, before the California State Legislature receives this Report in final form, I will, in the very near future, make every effort to reinforce, by way of personal appearance, these short comments being submitted today—and, if at all possible, appear at your Hearing scheduled for May 2nd in San Francisco.

I would, however, like to take this opportunity to at least generally indicate my profound dissatisfaction, disappointment, and, yes, even my dismay with the Bay-Delta Study as it stands before this body today. The simple fact that the Study:

Assumes that the Peripheral Canal is "the simple physical solution to the highly complex and intricate Water Quality Problems of the Delta;"

Assumes that Delta outflows will be drastically reduced by virtue of the operation of the State Water Project and the Federal Central Valley Project;

Assumes that the nefarious "November 19, 1965 Memorandum of Understanding" (which sets out extremely deleterious salinity control standards for the Delta) is firm and binding; and

Gives no real consideration to ocean disposal of San Joaquin Valley wastes, nor measures the damages to the Bay-Delta Area should these wastes, in fact, discharge at the Antioch Bridge.

This leads me to believe that the Bay-Delta Study, conceived in good faith and with the hope of real accomplishment in protecting the Bay-Delta system, turns out to be, in fact, an apologia for the State Water Project and the State Department of Water Resources and represents an attempted "whitewash" of the very real threat of ecological disaster that awaits the Bay and Delta should the Peripheral Canal be implemented or the "November 19th salinity standards" be estab-

lished and maintained or San Joaquin Valley Wastes empty into the Delta, at the Antioch Bridge.

The Bay-Delta waters have been over-studied and over-debated by the Department of Water Resources from one over-riding standpoint, i.e., the extraction of the maximum amount of these waters for the benefit of San Joaquin Valley and southern California. It is our hope that the Bay-Delta Study would fill the gap with an honest and objective evaluation of the Bay-Delta water quality problems and solutions upon which an intelligent and informed course of action could be based. It is a little short of tragic that this Bay-Delta Study has completely failed to achieve this salutary goal. The reason for this failure, I believe is easy to determine.

That the Department's knee-bending subservience to the whims and wishes of the giant economic interest to the south has attached itself to the Bay-Delta Study and drained it of integrity is a tragic, but not an unexpected, occurrence, in view of the political domination of State Government by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

We, of the San Francisco Bay-Delta area, cannot sit idly by while our greatest natural resource is irreparably damaged, if not totally destroyed. It is particularly galling, as well as fatuous that this imminent destruction is attempted to be justified by a deluge of official reports, rhetoric and lofty pronouncements, based upon sophistry and the fallacious premise that, what is good for Los Angeles is good for the San Francisco Bay-Delta-Estuarine System. This wholly unsubstantiated premise is pure and simple hogwash.

The time for the gentlemanly confrontation in hearing rooms is nearing its end. The time for litigation, the "legal Frankenstein Monster", as the late Senator Clair Engle called it, is near at hand. We, in the Bay and Delta Area, are sickened and we are tired. Now we are going to go to Court. The State Administration has "stacked" every possible administrative and executive forum so that non-customers of the State Water Project have only one place to go—the Courts.

On the matter of litigation as a means of saving our environment, I would like to quote the remarks of Victor Yannacone, of the Environmental Defense Fund, who said:

"Sad experience has shown that at this time in American history, *litigation* seems to be the only way to focus the attention of our Legislators" (in our case, Mr. Gianelli, Director of the State Department of Water Resources, and the Governor) "on the basic problems of human existence short of a bloody revolution." (Emphasis added.)

In relating these remarks to California history, I have formulated this opinion. At this time the traditional efforts of conservationists to influence the politicians, the dam builders, the water diverters, are outmoded. No longer can we hope to change the course of the Department of Water Resources by letter writing or by luncheon speeches. We have no other recourse but to enter the Courts.

All of Northern California has something vital and precious to lose if the schemes of the California Water Project, as it is now planned, come to pass. Our friends and allies on the North Coast of California now know the crushing price of not being militant in the defense of their natural resources—the Dos Rios Project, is that price and with more to come. The Dos Rios Project is only the first costly installment the North Coast will have to pay if it vacillates in rejecting the current flood of propaganda emanating from State sources.

We, in Contra Costa County, have long led the "courteous" fight to protect the Bay-Delta Estuarine System. I pledge to you today

that this County will now take the lead in a more militant effort.

We hope to enlist the concerned cities and counties and the people of the Bay Area and the North Coast as well as concerned citizens throughout the entire State in a long legal struggle to protect our precious Bay-Delta environment and our invaluable and irreplaceable water resources.

And, Gentlemen, we shall win that struggle!

STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY DEDICATED TO THE DESTRUCTION OF OUR DEMOCRACY

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the following two documents clearly indicate that the so-called Students for a Democratic Society is dedicated to the destruction of our democracy and should be called the Students for the Destruction of a Democratic Society.

This group, consisting of anarchists and Communists, is not interested in solving problems. These articles are a blueprint for disruptive action by this group.

The titles of these documents are: "Crucible of the New Working Class: Long-Range Studies for Student Power Movements," by Carl Davidson, and "Work-In: A National SDS Summer Project."

I commend them to you for your study: CRUCIBLE OF THE NEW WORKING CLASS: LONG-RANGE STRATEGIES FOR STUDENT POWER MOVEMENT

(By Carl Davidson)

PART III.—THE PRAXIS OF STUDENT POWER: STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Socialism on one campus: An infantile disorder

Perhaps the single most important factor for the student power movement to keep in mind is the fact that the university is intimately bound up with the society in general. Because of this, we should always remember that we cannot liberate the university without radically changing the rest of society. The lesson to be drawn is that any attempt to build a student movement based on "on-campus" issues only is inherently conservative and ultimately reactionary. Every attempt should be made to connect campus issues with off-campus questions. For example, the question of ranking and university complicity with the Selective Service System needs to be tied to a general anti-draft and "No Draft for Vietnam" movement. The question of the presence of the military on the campus in all its forms needs to be tied to the question of what that military is used for—fighting aggressive wars of oppression abroad—and not just to the question of secret research being poor academic policy. Furthermore, the student movement must actively seek to join off-campus struggles in the surrounding community. For example, strikes by local unions should be supported if possible. This kind of communication and understanding with the local working class is essential if we are ever going to have community support for student strikes.

Radicalizing the new working class

If there is a single over-all purpose for the student power movement, it would be the development of a radical political consciousness among those students who will later hold jobs in strategic sectors of the political economy. This means that we should reach out to engineers and technical students rather than to

business administration majors, education majors rather than to art students. From a national perspective, this strategy would also suggest that we should place priorities on organizing in certain kinds of universities—the community colleges, junior colleges, state universities, and technical schools, rather than religious colleges or the Ivy League.

One way to mount political action around this nation is to focus on the placement office—the tie link between the university and industry. For example, when DOW Chemical comes to recruit, our main approach to junior and senior chemical engineering students who are being interviewed should not only be around the issue of the immorality of napalm. Rather, our leaflets should say that one of the main faults of DOW and all other industries as well is that their workers have no control over content or purposes of their work. In other words, DOW Chemical is bad, not only because of napalm, but mainly because it renders its workers powerless, makes them unfree. In short, DOW and all American industry oppresses its own workers as well as the people of the Third World. DOW in particular should be run off the campus and students urged not to work for them because of their complicity in war crimes. But when other industries are recruiting, our leaflets should address themselves to the interviewers' instincts of workmanship, his desires to be free and creative, to do humane work, rather than work for profit. We should encourage him, if he takes the job, to see himself in this light—as a skilled worker—and of his self-interest of organizing on his future job with his fellow workers, skilled and unskilled, for control of production and the end to which his work is directed. The need for control, for the power, on and off the job, to affect the decisions shaping one's life in all arenas; developing this kind of consciousness, on and off the campus, is what we should be fundamentally all about.

Practical-critical activity: Notes on organizing

There are three virtues necessary for successful radical organizing: honesty, patience, and a sense of humor. First of all if the students we are trying to reach can't trust us, who can they trust? Secondly it takes time to build a movement. Sometimes several years of groundwork must be laid before a student power movement has constituency. It took most of us several years before we had developed a radical perspective. Why should it be any different for the people we are trying to reach? This is not to say that everyone must repeat all the mistakes we have gone through, but there are certain forms of involvement and action that many students will have to repeat. Finally, by a sense of humor, I mean we must be life-affirming. Lusty, passionate people are the only kind of men who have the enduring strength to motivate enough people to radically transform a life-negating system.

Che Guevara remarked in *Guerrilla Warfare* that as long as people had faith in certain institutions and forms of political activity, then the organizer must work with the people through those institutions, even though we might think those forms of action are dead ends (41). The point of Che's remark is that people must learn that those forms are stacked against them through their own experience in attempting change. The role of the organizer at this point is crucial. He or she should neither passively go along with the student government "reformer" types nor stand apart from the action denouncing it as "sell-out." Rather, his task is that of constant criticism from within the action. When the reformers fall, become bogged down, or are banging their heads against the wall, the organizer should be there as one who has been with them throughout their struggle to offer the relevant analysis of why their approach has

failed and to indicate future strategies and tactics.

However, we also need to be discriminating. There are certain forms of political action, like working the Democratic Party, that are so obviously bankrupt, that we need not waste our time. In order to discern these limits, an organizer has to develop a sensitivity to understand where people are at. Many radical actions have failed on campuses because the activists have failed in laying a base for a particular action. *It does no good to sit in against the CIA if a broad educational campaign, petitions, and rallies on the nature of the CIA have not been done for several days before the sit-in.* It is not enough that we have a clear understanding of the oppressiveness of institutions like the CIA and HUAC before we act in a radical fashion. We must make our position clear to the students, faculty, and the surrounding community.

The cultural apparatus and the problem of false consciousness

In addition to its role in the political economy, it is important to deal with the university as the backbone of what Mills called "the cultural apparatus." (42) He defined this as all those organizations and *milieux* in which artistic, scientific and intellectual work goes on, as well as the means by which that work is made available to others. Within this apparatus, the various vehicles of communication—language, the mass arts, public arts, and design arts—stand between a man's consciousness and his material existence. At present, the bulk of the apparatus is centralized and controlled by the corporate rulers of America. As a result, their use of the official communications have the effect of limiting our experience and, furthermore, expropriate much of that potential experience that we might have called our own. What we need to understand is that the cultural apparatus, properly used, has the ability both to transform power into authority and transform authority into more overt coercion.

At present, the university's role in acculturation and socialization is the promulgation of the utter mystification of "corporate consciousness." Society is presented to us as a kind of caste system in which we are to see ourselves as a "privileged elite"—a bureaucratic man channelled into the proper bureaucratic niche.

In addition to strengthening the forms of social control off the campus, the administration uses the apparatus on campus to legitimize its own power over us.

On the campus, the student press, underground newspapers, campus radio and television, literature tables, posters and leaflets, artist and lecture series, theaters, films, and the local press make up a good part of the non-academic cultural media. Most of it is both actively and passively being used against us. Any student power movement should (1) try to gain control of as much of the established campus cultural apparatus as possible, (2) if control is not possible, we should try to influence and/or resist it when necessary and (3) organize and develop a new counter-apparatus of our own. In short, we need our people on the staff of the school newspapers, radio stations, etc. We need our own local magazines. We need sympathetic contacts on local off-campus new media. Finally, we all could use some training in graphic and communicative arts.

What this all adds up to is strengthening our ability to wage an effective "desanctification" program against the authoritarian institutions controlling us. The purpose of desanctification is to strip institutions of their legitimizing authority, to have them reveal themselves to the people under them for what they are—raw coercive power. This is the purpose of singing the Mickey Mouse Club jingle at student government meetings,

of ridiculing and harassing student disciplinary hearings and tribunals, of burning the Dean of Men and/or Women in effigy, etc. People will not move against institutions of power until the legitimizing authority has been stripped away. On many campuses this has already happened; but for those remaining, the task remains. And we should be forewarned: it is a tricky job and often can backfire, de-legitimizing us.

On the correct handling of student governments

While student governments vary in form in the United States, the objective reasons for their existence are the containment, or pacification and manipulation of the student body. Very few of our student governments are autonomously incorporated or have any powers or rights apart from those sanctioned by the regents or trustees of the university. Furthermore, most administrations hold a veto power over anything done by the student governments. Perhaps the worst aspect of this kind of manipulation and repression is that the administration uses students to control other students. Most student government politicians are lackeys of the worst sort. That is, they have internalized and embraced all the repressive mechanisms the administration has designed for use against them and their fellow students.

With this in mind, it would seem that we should ignore student governments and/or abolish them. While this is certainly true in the final analysis, it is important to relate to student governments differently during the earlier stages of on-campus political struggles. The question we are left with is how do we render student governments ineffective in terms of what they are designed to do, while at the same time, using them effectively in building the movement?

Do we work inside the system? Of course we do. The question is not one of working "inside" or "outside" the system. Rather, the question is do we play by the established rules? Here, the answer is an emphatic no. The establishment habits of student politics—popularity contest elections, disguising oneself as a moderate working for "better communications and dialogue" with administrators, watering down demands before they are made, going through channels—all of these gambits are stacked against us. If liberal and moderate student politicians really believe this kind of crap, then we should tell them to try it with all they have. But if they continue to make this play after they have learned from their own experience that those methods are dead-ends, then they should be soundly denounced as opportunists or gutless administration puppets.

We should face the fact that student governments are powerless and designed to stay that way. From this perspective, all talk about "getting into power" is so much nonsense. The only thing that student governments are useful for is their ability to be a temporary vehicle in building a grass-roots student power movement. This means that student elections are useful as an arena for raising real issues, combatting and exposing administration apologists, and involving new people, rather than getting elected. If our people do happen to get elected as radicals (this is becoming increasingly possible) then the seats won should be used as a focal point and sounding board for demonstrating the impotence of student government from within. A seat should be seen as a soap-box, where our representatives can stand, gaining a kind of visibility and speaking to the student body as a whole, over the heads of the other student politicians.

Can anything positive be gained through student government? Apart from publicity, one thing it can be used for is money. Many student-activities funds are open for the kinds of things we would like to see on campus: certain speakers, films, sponsoring conferences, etc. Money, without strings, is

always a help. Also, no political services, such as non-profit used-book exchanges, are helpful to many students. But in terms of radical changes, student government can do nothing apart from a mass, radical student power movement. Even then, student government tends to be a conservative force within those struggles. In the end, meaningful changes can only come through a radical transformation of both the consciousness of large numbers of students and the forms of student self-government.

Reform or revolution: What kind of demands?

Fighting for reforms and making a revolution should not be seen as mutually exclusive positions. The question should be: what kind of reforms move us toward a radical transformation of both the university and society in general? First of all, we should avoid the kinds of reforms which leave the basic rationale of the system unchallenged. For instance, a bad reform to work for would be getting a better grading system, because the underlying rationale—the need for grades at all—remains unchallenged.

Secondly, we should avoid certain kinds of reform that divides students from each other. For instance, trying to win certain privileges for upper classmen but not for freshmen or sophomores. Or trying to establish non-graded courses for students above a certain grade-point average. In the course of campus political activity, the administration will try a whole range of "divide and rule" tactics such as fostering the "Greek-Independent Split," sexual double standards, intellectual vs. "jocks," responsible vs. irresponsible leaders, red-baiting and "non-student" vs. students. We need to avoid falling into these traps ahead of time, as well as fighting them when used against us.

Finally, we should avoid all of the "co-management" kinds of reforms. Those usually come in the form of giving certain "responsible" student leaders a voice or influence in certain decision-making processes, rather than abolishing or winning effective control over those parts of the governing apparatus. One way to counter administration suggestions for setting up "tripartite" committees (1/3 student, 1/3 faculty, 1/3 administration, each with an equal number of votes) is to say, "OK, but once a month the committee must hold an all-university plenary session—one man, one vote." The thought of being outvoted 1000 to 1 will cause administrators to scrap that co-optive measure in a hurry.

We have learned the hard way that the reformist path is full of pitfalls. What, then, are the kinds of reformist measures that do make sense? First of all, there are the civil libertarian issues. We must always fight, dramatically and quickly, for free speech and the right to organize, advocate and mount political action—of all sorts. However, even here, we should avoid getting bogged down in "legalitarianism." We cannot count on this society's legal apparatus to guarantee our civil liberties; and, we should not organize around civil libertarian issues as if it could.

Rather, when our legal rights are violated, we should move as quickly as possible, without losing our base, to expand the campus libertarian moral indignation into a multi-issues political insurgency, exposing the repressive character of the administration and the corporate state in general.

The second kind of partial reform worth fighting for and possibly winning is the abolition of on-campus repressive mechanisms, i.e., student courts, disciplinary tribunals, deans of men and women, campus police, and the use of civil police on campus. While it is true that "abolition" is a negative reform, and while we will be criticized for not offering constructive criticisms, we should reply that the only constructive way to deal with an inherently destructive apparatus is to destroy it. We must curtail the

ability of administrators to repress our *need to refuse* their way of life—the regimentation and bureaucratization of existence.

When our universities are already major agencies for social change in the direction of 1984, our initial demands must, almost of necessity, be negative demands. In this sense, the first task of a student power movement will be the organization of a holding action—a resistance. Along these lines, one potentially effective tactic for resisting the university's disciplinary apparatus would be the formation of a Student Defense League. The purpose of the group would be to make its services available to any student who must appear before campus authorities for infractions of repressive (or just plain stupid) rules and regulations. The defense group would then attend the student's hearings en masse. However, for some cases, it might be wise to include law students or local radical lawyers in the group for the purpose of making legal counter-attacks. A student defense group would have three major goals: 1) saving as many students as possible from punishment, 2) desanctifying and rendering dis-functional the administration's repressive apparatus, and 3) using 1) and 2) as tactics in reaching other students for building a movement to abolish the apparatus as a whole.

When engaging in this kind of activity, it is important to be clear in our rhetoric as to what we are about. We are not trying to liberalize the existing order, but trying to win our *liberation* from it. We must refuse the administration's rhetoric of responsibility. To their one-dimensional way of thinking, the concept of responsibility has been reduced to its opposite, namely be nice, don't rock the boat, do things according to our criteria of what is permissible. In actuality their whole system is geared toward the inculcation of the values of a planned irresponsibility. We should refuse their definitions, their terms, and even refuse to engage in their semantic hassles. We only need to define for ourselves and other students our notions of what it means to be free, constructive, and responsible. Too many campus movements have been co-opted for weeks or even permanently by falling into the administrations' rhetorical bags.

Besides the abolition of repressive disciplinary mechanisms within the university, there are other negative reforms that radicals should work for. Getting the military off the campus, abolishing the grade system, and abolishing universal compulsory courses (i.e., physical education) would fit into this category. However, an important question for the student movement is whether or not *positive* radical reforms can be won within the university short of making a revolution in the society as a whole. Furthermore, would the achievement of these kinds of partial reforms have the cumulative effect of weakening certain aspects of corporate capitalism, and, in their small way, make that broader revolution more likely?

At present, my feeling is that these kinds of anti-capitalist positive reforms are almost as hard to conceive intellectually as they are to win. To be sure, there has been a wealth of positive educational reforms suggested by people like Paul Goodman. But are they anti-capitalist as well? For example, we have been able to organize several good free universities. Many of the brightest and most sensitive students on American campuses, disgusted with the present state of education, left the campus and organized these counter-institutions. Some of their experiments were successful in an immediate internal sense.

A few of these organizers were initially convinced that the sheer moral force of their work in these free institutions would cause the existing educational structure to tremble and finally collapse like a house of IBM cards. But what happened? What effect did

the free universities have on the established educational order? At best, they had no effect. But is it more likely that they had the effect of strengthening the existing system. How? First of all, the best of our people left the campus, enabling the existing university to function more smoothly, since the "trouble-makers" were gone. Secondly, they gave liberal administrators the rhetoric, the analysis, and sometimes the man-power to co-opt their programs and establish elitist forms of "experimental" colleges inside of, although quarantined from, the existing educational system. This is not to say that free universities should not be organized, both on and off the campus. They can be valuable and useful. But they should not be seen as a primary aspect of a strategy for change.

What then is open to us in the area of positive anti-capitalist reforms? For the most part, it will be difficult to determine whether or not a reform has the effect of being anti-capitalist until it has been achieved. Since it is both difficult and undesirable to attempt to predict the future, questions of this sort are often best answered in practice. Nevertheless, it would seem that the kind of reforms we are looking for are most likely to be found within a strategy of what I would call "encroaching control." There are aspects of the university's administrative apparatus, financial-physical, and social apparatus that are potentially, if not actually, useful and productive. While we should try to abolish the repressive mechanisms of the university, our strategy should be to gain control, piece by piece, of its positive aspects.

What would that control look like? To begin, all aspects of the non-academic *life of the campus* should either be completely under the control of the students as individuals or embodied in the institutional forms they establish for their collective government. For example, an independent union of students should have the final say on the form and content of *all-university* political, social, and cultural events. Naturally, individual students and student organizations would be completely free in organizing events of their own.

Secondly, only the students and the teaching faculty, individually and through their organizations, should control the academic affairs of the university. One example of a worthwhile reform in this area would be enabling all history majors and history professors to meet jointly at the beginning of each semester and shape the form, content, and direction of their departmental curriculum. Another partial reform in this area would be enabling an independent union of students to hire additional professors of their choice and establish additional accredited courses of their choice independently of the faculty or administration.

Finally, we should remember that control should be sought for *some specific purpose*. One reason we want this kind of power is to enable us to meet the self-determined needs of students and teachers. But another objective that we should see as radicals is to put as much of the university's resources as possible into the hands of the underclass and the working class. We should use the student press to publicize and support local strikes. We should use campus facilities for meeting the educational needs of unsung organizations of the poor, and of rank and file workers. Or we could mobilize the universities' research facilities for serving projects established and controlled by the poor and worker, rather than projects established and controlled by the government, management, and labor bureaucrats. The conservative nature of American trade unions makes activity of this sort very difficult, although not impossible. But we should always be careful to make a distinction between the American working class itself and the labor bureaucrats.

The faculty question: Allies or flaks

One question almost always confronts the student movement on the campus. Do we try to win faculty support before we go into action? Or do we lump them together with the administration?

The knowledge machinery and sabotage: Striking on the job

One mistake radical students have been making in relating to the worst aspects of the multiversity's academic apparatus has been their avoidance of it. We tend to avoid large classes, lousy courses, and reactionary professors like the plague. At best, we have organized counter-courses outside the classroom and off the campus. My suggestion is that we should do the opposite. Our brightest people should sign up for the large freshman and sophomore sections with the worst profs in *strategic* courses in history, political science, education, and even the ROTC counter-insurgency lectures. From this position, they should then begin to take out their frustrations with the work of the course while they are on the job, i.e., inside the classroom. Specifically, they should be constant vocal critics of the form and content of the course, the prof, class size, the educational system, and corporate capitalism in general. Their primary strategy, rather than winning debating points against the prof, should be to reach other students in the class. Hopefully, our on-the-job organizer will begin to develop a radical caucus in the class. This group could then meet outside of the class, continue to collectively develop a further radical critique of the future classwork, to be presented at the succeeding sessions. If all goes well with the prof, and perhaps his department as well, they will have a full-scale academic revolt on their hands by the end of the semester. Finally, if this sort of work was being done in a variety of courses at once, the local radical student movement would have the makings of an underground educational movement that was actively engaged in mounting an effective resistance to the educational *status quo*.

Provo tactics: Radicalization or sublimation?

There is little doubt that the hippy movement has made its impact on most American campuses. It is also becoming more clear that the culture of advanced capitalist society is becoming more sterile, dehumanized and one-dimensional. It is directed toward a passive mass, rather than an active public. Its root value is consumption. We obviously need a cultural revolution, along with a revolution in the political economy. But the question remains: where do the hippies fit in? At the present time, their role seems ambivalent. On the one hand, they thoroughly reject the dominant culture and seem to be life-affirming. On the other hand, they seem to be for the most part, passive consumers of culture, rather than active creators of culture. For all their talk of community, the nexus of their relations with each other seems to consist only of drugs and a common jargon. With all their talk of love, one finds little deep-rooted passion. Yet, they are there; and they are a major phenomenon. Their relevance to the campus scene is evidenced by the success of the wave of "Gentle Thursdays" that swept the country. Through this approach, we have been able to reach and break loose a good number of people. Often, during the frivolity of Gentle Thursday, the life-denying aspects of corporate capitalism are brought home to many people with an impact that could never be obtained by the best of all of our anti-war demonstrations.

However, the hippy movement has served to make many of our people withdraw into a personalistic, passive cult of consumption. These aspects need to be criticized and curtailed. We should be clear about one thing: the *individual* liberation of man, the most

social of animals, is a dead-end—an impossibility. And even if individual liberation were possible, would it be desirable? The sublimation of reality within the individual consciousness neither destroys nor transforms the objective reality of other men.

Nevertheless, the excitement and imagination of some aspects of hippydom can be useful in building critiques of the existing culture. Here, I am referring to the provo (provocative) tactic on campus, can cause the administration to display some of its most repressive characteristics. Even something as blunt as burning a television set in the middle of campus can make a profound statement about the life-styles of many people. However, people engaging in this kind of tactics should 1) not see the action as a substitute for serious revolutionary activity and 2) read up on the Provos and Situationists rather than the Haight-Ashbury scene.

From soap-box to student strikes: The forms of protest

During the development of radical politics on the campus, the student movement will pass through a multitude of organizational forms. I have already mentioned several: Student Defense League, Teaching Assistants' Unions, Non-Academic Employees' Unions, and of course, SDS chapters. Another important development on many campuses has been the formation of Black Student Unions, or Afro-American cultural groups. All of these groups are vital, although some are more important than others at different stages of the struggle. However, for the purpose of keeping a radical and multi-issue focus throughout the growth of the movement, it is important to begin work on a campus by organizing an SDS chapter.

From this starting point, how does SDS see its relation to the rest of the campus? I think we have learned that we should not look upon ourselves as an intellectual and political oasis, hugging each other in a wasteland. Rather, our chapters should see themselves as *organizing committees* for reaching out to the majority of the student population. Furthermore, we are organizing for something—the power to effect change. With this in mind, we should be well aware of the fact that the kind of power and changes we would like to have and achieve are not going to be given to us gracefully. Ultimately, we have access to only one source of power within the knowledge factory. And that power lies in our potential ability to stop the university from functioning, to render the system dysfunctional for limited periods of time. Throughout all our on-campus organizing efforts we should keep this one point in mind: that sooner or later we are going to have to strike—or at least successfully threaten to strike. Because of this, our constant strategy should be the preparation of a mass base for supporting and participating in this kind of action.

What are the organizational forms, other than those mentioned above, that are necessary for the development of this kind of radical constituency? The first kind of extra-SDS organization needed is a Hyde Park or Free Speech Forum. An area of the campus, centrally located and heavily travelled, should be selected and equipped with a P.A. system. Then, on a certain afternoon one day a week, the platform would be open to anyone to give speeches on anything they choose. SDS people should attend regularly and speak regularly, although they should encourage variety and debate, and not monopolize the platform. To begin, the forum should be weekly, so that students don't become bored with it. Rather, we should try to give it the aura of a special event. Later on, when political activity intensifies, the forum could be held every day. In the early stages, publicity, the establishment of a mood and climate for radical politics, is of utmost im-

portance. We should make our presence felt everywhere—in the campus news media, leafletting and poster displays, and regular attendance at the meetings of all student political, social, and religious organizations. We should make all aspects of our politics as visible and open as possible.

Once our presence has become known, we can begin to organize on a variety of issues. One arena that it will be important to relate to at this stage will be student government elections. The best organizational form for this activity would be the formation of a Campus Freedom Party for running radical candidates. It is important that the party be clear and open as to its radical consciousness, keeping in mind that our first task is that of building radical consciousness, rather than winning seats. It is also important that the party take positions on off-campus questions as well, such as the war in Vietnam. Otherwise, if we only relate to on-campus issues, we run the risk of laying the counter-revolutionary groundwork for an elitist, conservative and corporatist student movement. As many people as possible should be involved in the work of the party, with SDS people having the function of keeping it militant and radical in a non-manipulative and honest fashion. The party should permeate the campus with speeches, films, and leaflets, as well as a series of solidly intellectual and radical position papers on a variety of issues.

Furthermore, we should remember that an election campaign should be fun. Campus Freedom Parties should organize Gentle Thursdays, jug bands, rock groups, theatre groups for political skits, and homemade 8 mm. campaign films. Finally during non-election periods, the Campus Freedom Party should form a variety of CFP *ad hoc* committees for relating to student government on various issues throughout the year.

The next stage of the movement is the most crucial and delicate—the formation of a Student Strike Coordinating Committee. There are two pre-conditions necessary for its existence. First, there must be a quasi-radical base of some size that has been developed from past activity. Secondly, either a crisis situation provoked by the administration or a climate of active frustration with the administration and/or the ruling class it represents must exist. The frustration should be centered around a set of specific demands that have been unresolved through the established channels of liberal action. If this kind of situation exists, then a strike is both possible and desirable. A temporary steering committee should be set up consisting of representatives of radical groups (SDS, Black Student Union, TA's Union, etc.) This group would set the initial demands and put out the call for a strike within a few weeks time. Within that time, they would try to bring in as many other groups and individuals as possible without seriously watering down the demands. This new coalition would then constitute itself as the Student Strike Coordinating Committee, with the new groups adding members to the original temporary steering committee. Also, a series of working committees and a negotiating committee should be established. Finally, the strike committee should attempt to have as many open mass plenary sessions as possible.

What should come out of a student strike? First, the development of a radical consciousness among large numbers of students. Secondly, we should try to include within our demands some issues on which we can win partial victories. Finally, the organizational form that should grow out of strike or series of strikes is an independent, radical, and political Free Student Union that would replace the existing student government. I have already dealt with the general political life of radical movements. But some points

need to be repeated. First of all, a radical student union *must* be in alliance with the radical sectors of the underclass and working class. Secondly, the student movement has the additional task of radicalizing the subsector of the labor force that some of us in SDS have come to call the new working class. Thirdly, a radical union of students should have an anti-imperialist critique of U.S. foreign policy. Finally, local student unions, if they are to grow and thrive, must be federated on regional, national, and international levels. However, we should be careful not to form a national union of students lacking in a grassroots constituency that actively and democratically participates in all aspects of the organization's life. One NSA is enough. On the international level, we should avoid both the CIA and Soviet Union sponsored International Unions. We would be better off to establish informal relations with groups like the Zengakuren in Japan, the German SDS, the French Situationist, the Spanish Democratic Student Syndicate, and the third world revolutionary student organizations. Hopefully, in the not too distant future, we may be instrumental in forming a new International Union of Revolutionary Youth. But there is much work to be done between now and then. And even greater tasks remain to be done before we can begin to build the conditions for human liberation.

WORK-IN: A NATIONAL SDS SUMMER PROJECT

During the past few weeks and for several years before them, students have been demonstrating their opposition to the Vietnam war and the draft. Our demonstrations have grown, and the war has grown with them. This has been a frustrating and often demoralizing experience.

Our frustration is shared by millions of others. It comes at a time when living conditions are getting worse for the majority of the American people. The war has taken its toll—in blood and in dollars. Tens of thousands are dead and crippled. Taxes take a greater and greater share of peoples' earnings; less and less remains for food, clothing, heat, rent. But these necessities cost more. These conditions plus deteriorating schools and hospitals, increased unemployment, particularly among youth, and intensified police persecution are behind the hundreds of rebellions of Black people from Harlem to Watts to Washington, D.C.

Another great movement is simultaneously shaking the country. Some say that workers are "bought off," and not interested in trying to change their conditions. But a strike wave has been sweeping the U.S. for the last several years. The New York City sanitationmen's walkout, the Memphis sanitation strike, and the national telephone strike are only three of the most recent examples. These strikes have come from rank-and-file pressure against corrupt union leaders. Nor have the workers hesitated to oppose what highly paid politicians claim is the "national interest."

Our frustration comes from our isolation from the millions of Americans engaged in these struggles. Students and middle-class people also are not powerful enough to stop the war machine. Closing down our schools is not enough. Workers produce and move the goods that are used in the war, and it is they who are primarily forced to fight the war. They can stop it. When threatened with a strike by 80,000 G.E. workers, "Mr. Johnson said in his appeal that U.S. forces in Vietnam need the products of G.E.'s military output now—not next week or next month." (Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1966)

Last summer about 130 students in the anti-war movement got jobs in factories and other work sites in Boston, Rochester, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, Baltimore, Newark and New York City. This summer we hope to involve more students in the Work-In

and, using the experience of last year, do it better.

We want to combat isolation by learning about workers from the workers, not just from newspapers or professors. Are they "strangling the public" with unfair war propaganda? What are conditions like in factories or department stores? What do workers think about unions, union leaders, the war, the draft, and ghetto rebellions?

Bring to workers the idea that the only just demand for peace is the immediate withdrawal of the U.S. from Vietnam. To explain that Kennedy and McCarthy were enemies of labor, are not friends of the anti-war movement either. Even though "Peace" negotiations are in the making, draft calls increase and more reserves are being called up. Evidently the government is planning to stay in Vietnam, as well as leaving troops in other Southeast Asian countries, and in Africa and Latin America.

We want to combat isolation by fighting against white racism among the workers, for government and the press try to whip up racism by portraying the struggles of black people as against white people. We want to show that among the hundreds of black rebellions, *not one* has attacked a white community. They have fought the police and the national guard, the same forces that the government employs against strikers and anti-war demonstrators.

We want to combat isolation by explaining what the struggles on our campuses are about and by showing workers that there are students who support their struggles and who want to organize other students to do so.

WHO CAN PARTICIPATE IN THE WORK-IN

Women play a vital role in the economy of this country. They are often discriminated against, for instance by being paid less than men doing the same job. Women students participated in the Work-In last summer, and it is absolutely necessary they do so this summer if we are to relate to women workers. Women can get in department stores, hospitals and large offices as well as in factories.

High School students have special difficulties in getting jobs. Nevertheless, a School Work-In is being organized. Contact the Work-In organizer in your area for further information.

Summer school students and others who will be unable to get jobs can play an important role in the Work-In. Throughout the summer there will be a need to put out literature at plants where we are working on the war and draft, the rebellion, the ghettos, and other important issues affecting workers. Groups doing independent, electoral work and anti-draft work can coordinate activities with the Work-In.

The Work-In is preparing an organizers' manual which discusses how and when to get a job, how to relate to workers on the job, and how to follow up the summer. Students working-in will meet in groups every week or two to share our successes, mistakes and discuss questions as they arise. The groups will help put out a news letter describing our experiences on the job so that other students can benefit from what we are learning.

Our goal is not to organize the United States working class in one summer. We want to learn as much as we can, and to make friendships that will remain after summer with a few workers, and if possible to involve them in organized political activity. In this way, the movement, through us, will gain some of the urgently needed ties to the workers of this country.

If you are interested in working-in, or for further information, contact:

In Manhattan: Roger Taus, 662-9187, Columbia; Chris Lockio, 228-9480, N.Y.U.; Rick Rhoads, 368-2562, City College.

In-the-Bronx: Chuck Dugan, 631-3459, Fordham.

In Brooklyn: Ira Perlson, 683-4531, Brooklyn College.

In Queens: Fernando Quijano, HI 6-8572, Queens College.

In Newark, N.J.: Joy Schulman, (201) 926-3926, Rutgers-in-Newark.

In Princeton, N.J.: Macklin Smith, (309) 924-9644, Princeton Univ.

The Work-In needs money. Please make checks payable to the "SDS Work-In." Send contributions and inquiries to: New York Regional SDS Work-In, 50 East 11th Street, New York City, 10003.

THE WORK-IN ORGANIZERS MANUAL

(NOTE.—This manual is intended to help Work-in organizers in selecting and getting jobs. It also contains some pointers on approaches to the political issues that we will be raising and encountering at work.)

I. HOW TO RESEARCH THE JOB SITUATION IN YOUR AREA

In every large city and in all states, a Directory of Manufacturers is published which lists all the manufacturing plants in the large metropolitan areas and in the state, city by city. It usually reports the number of workers employed in each plant and sometimes give the breakdown of male and female workers. These directories are usually found in the main (large) city libraries.

These books usually cover only manufacturing. For transportation (railroad, maritime, longshore, airline, teamster) possibly the simplest method is to consult the yellow pages of the phone directory, although there may be additional directories in the library. Consult the librarian about that. This is also true for utilities, etc.

In addition, some people will already know of large plants in their area in which they or friends have worked in the past, which might be helpful since knowledge of hiring practices might be gained thereby.

II. WHAT JOBS TO LOOK FOR

Job-seekers should try to get hired in plants or transport depots that have several hundred (let's say a 400 minimum) workers. Reasons for this include: a) If we want to reach workers with literature, the potential audience is greater; b) The larger the company facility, the better chance that it will be in a basic union, that the workers will have some sense of organization (even if they think the union is a sellout one), and that therefore there will be a tie-in to workers nationally. In larger plants, such as GM, GE, United Airlines, Pennsy RR, etc., there is a greater tendency for workers to regard themselves as workers, with less illusions about becoming some kind of a "boss". In small shops, where bosses and workers are closer together, more illusions exist about "moving up". c) In large plants in national unions there is a greater chance that the workers will become part of (and have a history of) mass strike movements, rebellions against sellout leaderships, conflict with the government due to "national interest" injections, etc., which might create the basis for greater mutual exchange about questions relating to opposition to the government's policies; d) the larger the company the likelier the existence of masses of unskilled jobs (assembly lines, platforms, etc.) creating a better basis for hiring, especially as replacements for workers taking vacations. Of course, if summer is slack in a particular industry, this situation wouldn't necessarily hold (i.e., auto, where production on the old model fades into a summer lay-off-changeover before hiring starts around August to September for the new model).

Within the larger plant situation, it might be desirable for students seeking jobs in the

area or city in which their school is located, to pick a place which would have follow-up possibilities in the Fall through contacts established within the plant; in line with an on-going worker-student alliance activity.

In general, people should seek unskilled jobs (probably couldn't get a skilled one anyway) and, if given the chance, a job where one would contact larger numbers of workers. If you are white, select a plant where the majority are white. (If possible. In some places; for instance, N.Y.C., this is difficult, although not impossible). While Black workers might be thought of as more politically conscious, what we as white students are trying to do is reach white workers on the questions of the war and racism, to name but two areas (in addition to the day-to-day grievances, trade union questions, etc.) If Black, a student would of necessity, have to (and should) get a job where there are large number of Black workers. Women should give special consideration to jobs where many women are employed. These include, in addition to basic industries (like electric), department stores, telephone companies, hospitals, and even some large offices which are unionized, etc.

In cases where people cannot travel to (or don't want to get jobs in) auto industries, large wholesale and retail outlets within the city proper could be as advantageous—large mail-order houses (Sears-Roebuck, Montgomery Ward department stores (preferably those with unions); possibly as non-professional workers in hospitals (although here in many large cities there are large majorities of Black workers, a factor for white students to consider.) Other such places could include the telephone company, gas and light company, mass utilities (if privately owned; government-owned usually requires a civil service test and waiting period).

III. HOW TO GET A JOB

Some places hire students specifically for the summer as replacements for workers on vacations (although usually bosses try to get away with not filling in, unless the union contract has specific stipulations and they are enforced). Others won't hire you if they know you are a student or if they think you're only working for the summer. In MOST cases it would probably be best NOT to mention that you are a student (unless you have advance knowledge that they are specifically hiring students for the summer—which might be found out by someone being sent there first who's NOT looking for a job, saying he's a student and seeing if they are hiring). If, then, it is the case of not being able to state you're a student seeking summer work, you have to come in as a job-seeker who has worked since graduating high-school (you should say you're a high school graduate), which means you have to have a place or person who will say you worked there for the past 1-4 years. Each area should develop "background" like this for their group. In indicating the kind of work performed, try to slant it to what you presume the work is in the particular plant or depot (assembly, maintenance, shipping, loading platform, etc., and in most every case indicate that whatever you did on your "previous job" involved some kind of manual, heavy work. You're not afraid to work, is the idea to get across.

If getting to the place requires a car (or if that is easier even though you use public transportation) say you have one or a friend who "works around there drives near there every day. Some places won't hire you if they think that you are potential late-comer.

Draft status may be a problem. Job applicants with a 1-Y or even 4-F often find difficulty in getting work. Also, a 2-S classification immediately identifies you as a student. Persons with a 3-A deferment (supporting a parent or child) has an easier

time. If you're a 1-A (and possibly someone's tested the draft situation at the place beforehand) you might be able to say you're 1-A and get hired, but here again you may have to "use your wits." If you've been in and had an honorable discharge, tell it the way it is. If you've had something other than an honorable discharge, avoid mentioning it; you've been "working since high school."

In cases where you can't mention college, and use a "background", make sure you state you were "laid off" from your last job because it was "slow" or the company's "contracting" or maybe even "going out of business". Whatever salary you decide on (usually around \$85/week—that is, not too much lower than what you expect to make, and not too much higher) make sure that your "former boss" knows what it is. For example, if you're going for a teamster platform job that pays \$110 or \$120 a week, say you make about \$100, not \$75. On the other hand, if you're getting a job in a hospital or a department store for \$65 a week, say you made that figure in your old job, not \$120. Anyway, since most large places will or may (unless you're specifically being hired as a temporary worker who's going back to college in the Fall), make sure your "former boss" has the story straight.

Some places give aptitude tests. Don't show off. If you're taking the test with other job-seekers, try to see how far (number of questions) they're getting and adjust accordingly. If you do too well, they'll either be suspicious or want to use you in the "front office." Of course, it may be hard to judge, not wanting to do below what's required, but again, the first job-seeker's experience will be helpful here. A group should gather ALL information from each successive job-seeker so that the next ones will be better prepared.

If you have any physical defects which can't be detected from a normal physical examination, don't mention them. Companies won't hire people with previous injuries or defects which might be re-injured, creating the basis for suits against them, you may have to go somewhere else where it's a defect that's noticeable, either play it up to figure a way to cover it up. If you can't you may have to go somewhere else where it's not so important. If you wear glasses, some jobs are out (i.e. railroad brakeman, which usually requires 20/20 vision without glasses). However, most jobs only require 20/20 or even less with glasses.

You should be at your first place looking at around 8:30 or 9:00 A.M. It's hard to get a job if you start at 2:00 P.M. You generally should not wear a suit and tie or fancy dress, but don't dress like a slob. Slacks and sports shirt, with or without a sport jacket, depending on the weather, and skirt or summer dress with low heels (or at least not 6-inch spikes) for women.

If places require a "non-communist" or "non-subversive" signature, sign it. You're not breaking any law. If it's engaged in government work, and you would be breaking a law, it will be so stated on the application. Discuss this beforehand with your group.

Be straightforward in any interview; you're getting the job because you "need the money." Don't use 20 words. Don't put on a tough guy act. Just plain, simple language and attitude. Usually the less said, the better. 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. Do your work, learn your job. Don't goof off on someone else's back, but if all the workers are goofing off, or taking a break, go ahead (unless it might cost you—as a new worker—your job, which the older workers understand). Remember, we're here for a short-term opera-

tion. While you can't expect to win over workers in three months, you don't have to wait as long as you might, if it were a permanent job, to "open up" on political questions. Learn from the workers. About the work, the job, the history of the plant, company, union, their attitudes on every question. Listen. You might find out who the links are. Participate in the bull sessions, the lunch discussions, talking on the job where it's normal, but take it slow the first 3 or 4 weeks. (If the job were to be permanent, this process might take six months or longer) listening and sounding out workers.

Don't be shocked by the racist remarks of the white workers, by confused political impressions, by pro-war talk, by "keeping-up-with-the-Joneses" chit-chat. If the workers understood racism, the war, the capitalist class, middle class morality, etc., we'd on the way "home" already. Do let them know you're a student fairly soon, within the first 2 or 3 weeks, as long as the foreman won't find out (or someone else who might use it to get you fired). But this isn't fool-proof. You've got to play it by ear. But if you don't say you're a student, they'll know it and you won't be able to do an honest, straightforward job. Remember, although workers may think students are snobbish (and many are), they also respect education and want their kids to go to college. (That's why they're working so hard, among other reasons). Your job is to bring across the identity of interests of students and workers—the fact that without workers, there would be no universities, that the working class is the class with the power, that workers really create the value of society, that without them basic changes in the system can't happen, etc.

But you're there with a purpose—to bring out the relationship of the Vietnam and the other imperialist wars to their immediate demands, to the fact that they and their sons die in the war, that it is a war for the rich—the Class perspective. And also, among white workers, the use of racism against their other interests. Black workers aren't "threatening" their jobs. The boss is. He controls both. As long as workers are divided—by race, union, sex, craft, nationality, it's easier for the boss to sit on them. This is no easy task. It normally takes a lifetime, so don't expect to do it in two or three months! But at least you are able to question, to point out relationships they might not have thought of or might be afraid to express out loud. Try talking to workers individually, especially those who seem more receptive. Don't start by using a lunchroom or platform for a "soap-box oration." Literature could be given out individually or stuck up in bathrooms at the beginning. Discuss in your group when to start giving it out en masse (often by students not working at that plant, at the gates.)

Try to make a few friends among the workers that might last beyond the summer. Two or three—or even one. And try to get their addresses and phone numbers before you leave the job. Otherwise it might be difficult to ever contact them again. Join the bowling league or the baseball team. Avoid running home at the end of the day to the "safe" company of your old friends and political buddies. Concentrate on making new friends. Go to the bar or whatever hang-out they go to after work. Don't try to overdo yourself here. If you can't hold your liquor, don't make a fool of yourself trying to be what you think is "one of the boys". Get to work early—sit around and talk. This is very much worth the extra effort.

Don't talk to workers like you know everything and they know nothing. First of all it's not true (probably the reverse). Secondly, even if you do know more about a particular subject (i.e. the facts about the Geneva

Agreement, the U.S. support of the Diem dictatorship) 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. You'll make plenty of mistakes. Discuss them in your group. Don't give up the first time you do something wrong. After all, these workers were rookies too once, but they had to survive it because they had to eat.

It would be a good idea to record your experiences by day or week, a few notes in the evening about relevant events during the day will be invaluable for other people participating in the work-in this summer, for those in next summer's program and for people to whom we publicize our work. You'd be surprised how much important information you forget; don't trust to your chances of remembering anecdotes.

Come in to work on time. That's the thing that may keep you in the job above all else. Lateness is the first cause of being fired in the trial period. Don't start in with broadsides against the union leadership, even if workers initiate the sellout talk. Listen, ask questions, ask if anything was ever done to overcome it, suggest types of fights around grievances, immediate things, if you can figure some out. But don't feel compelled (in your three-month sojourn) to give leadership on any and all questions. One important result of your job may just be an appreciation of what workers are up against in the fight against the boss, the government, and a sellout leadership. And knowledge of what the in-plant grievances are will help if there is to be follow-up along lines of worker-student alliance activity when you get back to school. You will be able to relate leaflets, etc. to the actual problems inside the gates.

Lastly, remember when you start talking about the war (and about how students are seriously opposed to the war for good reasons, not simply engaged in "beatnik pranks") many workers who feel the same way keep silent while those who support the war are many times the most outspoken. Don't get into knock-down, drag-out arguments with the latter, but rather talk individually first to the ones you're making friends with. Don't get into the habit of making it appear that it's you against the workers. Know the facts about the war not just the polemics. Facts make a deep impression on workers. If you get involved in discussions with workers whose sons are in Vietnam and want to "support them by going all out", be careful. That's an emotional area in which it may be very hard to convince such a father that your line on supporting his son is correct. Start by understanding his position of having been brainwashed all these years and seeing his son in daily danger of "being killed by the other side". In learning how to put forth an intelligent approach in such situations, you will really be learning how to talk to people who are not simply on your side or sympathetic.

After being there about a month, try to pick out a few workers who might be more advanced than the rest, concentrating more on individual discussion, with the hope of keeping them as friends or contacts after you leave the place. Talk about the possibilities of the students offering the workers assistance in any struggles coming up in the future, on picket lines, demonstrations, even doing research for them. Don't necessarily start asking about union meetings. Many times they are suspended in the summer. If not, most workers don't attend and you're not going to build up any active attitude caucus movement in that direction in three months (most of which is spent on trial period and during which you may not even be in the union). If, of course, there's something special going on and lots of workers appear headed toward a union meeting, you

can go with them, but more to listen and learn than to orate.

Not everything can be put down here about what you'll face. Keep in constant contact with your group and discuss all problems with them. If possible, try to have at least two students (possibly more) get jobs in the same plant so they can compare notes, exchange experiences, criticize each other's mistakes, and (probably most important) make it possible to get a broader view of the place than that which comes from working in just one department. However, if you do team up, don't hang around together. It will be a constant temptation to talk to, eat and travel with the one person in your work-site who will be easier to communicate with. This is not to say that you should ignore each other's existence on the job, just that your primary aim will be to work and communicate with the permanent workers in the plant.

V. COORDINATORS

In Manhattan: Roger Taus, 662-9187, Columbia; Dave Meitzman, 447-2446, N.Y.U.; Rick Rhoads, 368-2562, City College.

In the Bronx: Chuck Dugan, 631-3459, Fordham.

In Brooklyn: Ira Perlson, 683-4531, Brooklyn College.

In Queens: Fernando Quijano, HI 6-8572, Queens College.

In Newark, N.J.: Joy Schulman, (201) 926-3926, Rutgers-In-Newark.

In Princeton, N.J.: Macklin Smith, (609) 924-9644, Princeton Univ.

The Work-In needs money. Please make checks payable to the "SDS Work-In. Send contributions and inquiries to: New York Regional SDS Work-In, 50 East 11th Street, New York City, 10003.

CONSERVATION AWARDS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues notice of the first "Conservation Service Awards" made under this administration by the Secretary of the Interior. On April 21, the Department chose to honor three of the most outstanding conservationists in the land: Mr. Frank E. Masland, Jr., of Carlisle, Pa.; Dr. Ralph W. Chaney, of the University of California at Berkeley; and Mr. Harold P. Fabian, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The caliber of the men to whom the awards were given is an indication of their commitment and dedication to the cause of conservation. Each recipient is most deserving of the Interior Department's highest conservation award.

There is a double pleasure for me in noting these awards for I have been privileged to have known and worked closely with the recipients over many years, and during times of great national controversy on conservation matters.

In presenting the award to Mr. Masland, Secretary Hickel noted:

Your dedication efforts in behalf of the welfare of mankind and of the wise management of the natural resources upon which he is dependent have been productive and substantial, both in the national and international fields. Your advice and counsel as a member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, your effective leadership during two terms as Chairman of the Board, and your

continued service as Council member and as Consultant to the Department of the Interior have contributed greatly to the policies and programs of the Department of the Interior.

In making the award to Dr. Chaney, the Secretary said:

You have earned worldwide renown for your contributions to knowledge recorded in numerous scholarly publications, in the field of paleobotany. This body of knowledge, together with your wise counsel, has greatly enhanced the preservation and interpretation of geological and paleontological values in the national parks, and the understanding and appreciation of botanical resources generally. Largely through your efforts the relict *Metasequoia* of China was made known, and its perpetuation as a species insured. As member and Council member of long standing of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, you have demonstrated a dedication to public service and to the cause of conservation that is in the highest tradition. As a member of this Board, through your active and effective participation in the work of the Save-the-Redwoods League, and as a citizen, you have contributed most substantially to the preservation of magnificent Coast Redwood groves, and to the establishment of Redwood National Park.

And in awarding the Nation's highest conservation award to Mr. Fabian, Secretary Hickel commented:

Your contributions to the conservation movement span a 50 year period. Your personal endeavors and support have had a profound effect upon influential conservation groups and movements which led to establishing two great National Parks—Grand Teton and Canyonlands. The several conservation awards, which have been bestowed upon you in the past, stand as testimonials to the many contributions you have made toward preserving our natural resources. Your present work with the Yellowstone-Grand Teton Master Plan Team indicates that your efforts in behalf of the preservation and enjoyment of our natural areas will carry into the future.

The remarks of Secretary Hickel tell only a part of the story, but I would like my colleagues to know the background of the recipients as seen from the point of view of the Director of the National Park Service. In each case, the Director, with the concurrence of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources, sent a letter to the Chairman of the Interior Incentive Awards Committee, fully describing the contributions of these men to the conservation of our natural resources. I have appended to my remarks the letters to show in bold detail why these eminent men were honored by the Department of the Interior:

CONSERVATION SERVICE AWARD, FRANK E. MASLAND, JR.

(By Director, National Park Service)

On behalf of the National Park Service, it is my pleasure to nominate the very distinguished citizen and outstanding conservationist, Frank E. Masland, Jr. of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, for the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award.

Mr. Masland's commitment to conservation began long before his association with the Department of the Interior. From the time he graduated from Dickinson College in 1918, where he later became Vice President and member of the Board of Trustees, he gained a wide knowledge of the national

parks and their problems through private travel. Mr. Masland has maintained a deep interest in and has made a concerted study of the social and economic problems of the Navajo Indians of the Southwest. He has lectured extensively on both national parks and Indians before conservation and outdoor groups, using movies of a professional quality which he himself produced.

Mr. Masland explored the Colorado River by boat in 1948, 1949, 1954, and 1956. His travels, explorations and studies have given him a personal familiarity with conservation issues that render his counsel invaluable.

In 1956 Mr. Masland was appointed to the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, and served with distinction as Chairman in 1960 and 1961.

While Mr. Masland served on the Board, Cape Cod became a reality, Point Reyes was on the threshold, and a very substantial number of other proposals advanced toward ultimate approval. Mr. Masland's personal contribution to the Canyonlands cause, to the Everglades environmental problems, and his efforts in behalf of the preservation of the Valley of the Goblins and Monument Valley were especially noteworthy.

Upon termination of Mr. Masland's appointment on the Advisory Board he was invited to become a Consultant to the Department.

In 1960, following an address before the Atlantic Chapter of the Sierra Club in New York City, Mr. Masland was invited to become a member of the Executive Committee of the National Parks Association. He served as Trustee of this Association for 3 years and as Vice President for a year. He is held in high esteem by other conservation organizations.

Mr. Masland's advice and counsel to the Service and to the Secretary ranged over a wide variety of conservation, resources management, interpretative and park planning issues.

In 1963 after a tour of East Africa, Mr. Masland reported on the problems, the potential development of Tanganyika national parks, and on the inter-relationship of tourism and wildlife conservation. His thoughtful suggestions about the Masai people, the cattle industry, and development and educational programs stimulated involvement by the United Nations Special Fund, and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

In 1965 he served on a Task Force on Leisure at Princeton University and, a Task Force on Relationships of People to Resources. The recommendations made by the group were responsible and incisive.

In 1966 Mr. Masland, in his official capacity as an observer without remuneration, attended the General Assembly of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources at Lucerne, Switzerland. On this same trip he visited Jordan to "devise an overall interpretive plan" and a "detailed interpretive plan for a single park" to encourage the management of national parks and monuments in that country. During this same tour he journeyed up the Nile to Abu Simbel and to the Red City of Riela. Mr. Masland's suggestions to the responsible government officials in Jordan and the U.S. A.I.D. Mission in Amman influenced the assignment of a team of park planners to Jordan which produced detailed plans for three major historical areas in that country.

Also in 1966, Mr. Masland called on his Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, as the Secretary of the Interior's personal emissary, and initiated discussions concerning the preservation of Ethiopia's natural beauty, historical heritage, and wildlife. Mr. Masland was a member of the small team which subsequently

was assigned to visit Ethiopia, and to make further recommendations on cooperation between the two countries on these matters.

Mr. Masland has provided similar advice and counsel with respect to Hawaii, Japan, Burma, Thailand, India, and Nepal.

Mr. Masland's observations on African wildlife, endangered species and illegal importation of hides led to recommendations for legislation to prohibit importation of any wild animal, its hide, or other parts, without an official export permit issued by the country of origin. He thus pioneered the existing movement to establish such international controls.

Mr. Masland's explorations and observations in the Florida Everglades extend over many years. In 1967 he investigated the potential for developing canoe trips in the Florida Bay, Cape Sable, and Gulf Coast areas of the park and for routes for motor propelled boats in areas adjacent to the major water routes. These will offer opportunities for primitive waterway experiences unequaled in the country. He also made recommendations on campground criteria, the location of patrol stations, on the types of control required, and on administrative philosophy concerning the safety of visitors and the preservation of resources.

Mr. Masland's interest and contacts in Africa influenced the establishment of a college of African Wildlife Management at Mweka, Tanzania. A staff member of the National Park Service and another from the B.S.F. & W. are teaching courses at this institution ranging from interpretive techniques and museum technology to range management and botany. Training safaris for the African students are conducted, which prepare them for national park and wildlife management work in Africa. Much goodwill and cooperation with other countries have been brought about through the personal efforts and expense of Mr. Masland on behalf of the Service and the Department.

In August of 1968, Mr. Masland was appointed to a nine-member Advisory Committee on International Conservation Affairs of the National Park Service whose purpose is to advise on international conservation of natural resources. His contributions on this committee have been most helpful.

Mr. Masland is a member of the Board of Governors of Wesley Theological Seminary and has honorary degrees—Doctor of Humanities, Lycoming College, 1957, and Doctor of Laws, Lebanon Valley College, 1959. In church affairs, he is a member of the Executive Committee of the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief (Refugees Work), and, in 1958, was a Delegate to the World Council of Churches convened in Geneva, Switzerland, to consider world refugee problems. Likewise, in 1960, he attended refugee work sessions in Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan, and, in 1963, in South America. He is a member of the Board of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia; member of the Executive Committee, Council of Conservation, and a Trustee for Conservation. He is a member of the Explorers Club, Camp Fire Club, Colorado River Canyoners, Utah State Historical Society, British Ocean Cruising Club, Museum of Northern Arizona, Arizona Sonora Desert Museum, the Boone and Crockett Club, and the Sierra Club. He is a Fellow of the American Geographic Society.

His efforts both personally and officially over a span of more than 50 years have had a lasting effect in preserving such areas as Canyonlands for future generations, and the goodwill generated on his several visits and conferences with Government officials of other lands has indeed furthered the cause of conservation throughout the world.

In recognition of the numerous and extraordinary contributions to the conservation and preservation movement in this country and in other lands, Mr. Frank E.

Masland, Jr., is considered to be eminently qualified to receive the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award and most worthy of the high honor it represents.

CONSERVATION SERVICE AWARD, RALPH W. CHANEY

(By Director, National Park Service)

On behalf of the National Park Service, it is my pleasure to nominate the renowned paleontologist and botanist, Dr. Ralph W. Chaney of the University of California, Berkeley, California, to receive the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award.

Dr. Chaney served as Professor of Paleontology at the University of California from 1930 to 1957. He has remained there as Emeritus Professor of Paleontology since 1957 to the present. He accepted membership on the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments in 1943 and served until 1953. One of his main concerns while on the Board was the retention of Fossil Cycad National Monument as a classic area of valuable fossil material, under the protection and administration of the National Park Service. Since 1953 Dr. Chaney as a Collaborator without compensation has continued to offer his advice and counsel on paleontological matters in the National Park Service and the Department.

Dr. Chaney's profession has taken him to many parts of the world. He is noted for the field work he did in Cenozoic paleobotany in Western America since 1916, and in Central America during the 1930's. He has exerted a profound influence on present scientific knowledge about the natural scene in America and its conservation. Recognized for almost a half century as one of the world's eminent paleobotanists, we are indebted to him for much of our knowledge of the geological antiquity and changing patterns of distribution of the various species of Sequoias and other forest trees of the world. His imprint is present in all publications and interpretive programs dealing with forest trees in areas of the National Park System, including the famed Giant Sequoias and Coast Redwoods.

He travelled to China in 1948 to see the newly discovered Metasequoia, or Dawn Redwood, in its natural setting and insured the perpetuation of this extremely rare species by collecting seeds and subsequently distributing them to botanical gardens and arboreta throughout the world. This species was thought to have been extinct for many millions of years, yet through Dr. Chaney's persistence it was rediscovered and his efforts assured its survival.

Dr. Chaney's other significant contributions are legion. We owe to him much of our knowledge about fossil trees and plants, including the Sequoia, in Tertiary rocks of Yellowstone and the Pleistocene deposits of Alaska. He provided the fossil evidence which has helped establish the geological time table for the evolution of the Cascade Range including Crater Lake, Lassen Peak, and Mount Rainier. For many years, the National Park Service and other natural resources bureaus of the Government have beaten a path to his door to seek information and counsel on forest—tree research and management programs.

He is and has been a prominent member of the Geological Society of America, American Philosophical Society, National Academy of Sciences, Paleontology Society of Japan, Fellow of the Geological Society of America, President of the Paleontological Society in 1939, and Director Counselor of the Save-the-Redwoods League, serving as President of the League in 1961.

The fame of Dr. Chaney as a paleobotanist is matched only by his role as an ardent conservationist. He has long been a strong sup-

porter of moves to save the Redwoods and contributed significantly to the preservation of Coast Redwoods areas through his work with the Save-the-Redwoods League, and in establishment of the Redwood National Park. In his own scientific specialty, as well as the conservation movement affecting national parks and other lands set aside for public enjoyment and use, Dr. Chaney, has been a pioneer and motivating force of considerable influence.

In recognition of Dr. Chaney's highly noteworthy scientific contributions to conservation of the natural environment in America and other lands, he is uniquely qualified to receive the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award and most worthy of the high honor it bestows.

CONSERVATION SERVICE AWARD, HAROLD P. FABIAN

On behalf of the National Park Service, it is my pleasure to nominate the very distinguished citizen and one of the outstanding conservationists of the country, Harold P. Fabian of Salt Lake City, Utah, and Jenny Lake, Wyoming, to receive the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award.

Mr. Fabian first became interested in conservation during an extended visit to Yellowstone National Park in the year 1900. Sixty seven years later he was appointed, along with other distinguished conservationists, as a member of the Yellowstone-Grand Teton Master Plan Team to look to the future of this great area.

His first direct contact with National Park Service activities was in 1926 when, through the office of Horace M. Albright, then Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, his law firm was engaged to represent Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in the Grand Teton Project. Ultimately, he became Executive Vice President of Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc.

From 1946 to 1952 he was Treasurer and Trustee of the Jackson Hole Wildlife Park. Since 1955 and his retirement from active law practice, Mr. Fabian has devoted his time, wide experience, and boundless energies to the field of conservation.

In 1949, along with Mrs. Fabian, he was instrumental in rehabilitation of the historic Menor's Ferry complex in Grand Teton National Park. He was a member of the Pony Express Centennial Committee in 1957-58 and on the Golden Spike Centennial Commission. He is a Trustee of the Utah Heritage Foundation and a member of the South Pass Historical Commission.

In 1957 he was appointed by Utah Governor Clyde to organize and set in motion the State Park and Recreation Commission. He was Chairman for nearly eight years and was reappointed in 1965 by Governor Ramp-ton for an additional four years as a member of the Commission.

Through his personal efforts, such historic landmarks as The Pony Express Station in Fairfield, Utah, the winter home of pioneer leader, Brigham Young, at St. George, and several other historical sites have been restored and are now operated under the direction of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission.

At the request of President David O. McKay, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Mr. Fabian . . . not a Mormon . . . made an investigation of the feasibility of the restoration of the area of one of the early settlements of the Mormons in Nauvoo, Illinois. He is now Vice President and Trustee of the Nauvoo Restoration, Inc., and the motivating factor in the entire project. He obtained the concurrence of President McKay that the work done at Nauvoo would not be solely slanted toward religion, but would be a part of the historic westward expansion movement.

In 1958 the Secretary of the Interior ap-

APRIL 1, 1969.

pointed him to membership on the Advisory Board for National Parks. He was Vice Chairman for three years and Chairman the last two years of his term, which ended in 1964. Canyonlands National Park was established during his term of office.

Following his service on the Advisory Board, he continued as a consultant and participated in the Master Plan studies for Great Smoky Mountain National Park. These studies helped to guide the Service in solutions to some very critical problems relating to wilderness recommendations.

In 1964 the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society of New York awarded Mr. Fabian the very coveted Cornelius Amory Pugsley Gold Medal for his work in national conservation. He has also received special awards from the Utah Historical Society, as well as the Forestry Conservation Award. In May 1965 he was invited by President Kennedy to attend as a delegate the White House Conference on Conservation.

In recognition of his contributions in many fields Governor Rampton of Utah proclaimed October 8, 1967, as Harold P. Fabian Appreciation Day in Utah. He was presented with a citation, expressing appreciation for his conservation efforts.

His efforts on behalf of conservation have spanned a half century and now in his young eighties he continues his contribution as a member of the Yellowstone-Grand Teton Master Plan Team.

In recognition of the many contributions he has made for the conservation movement in this country, Harold P. Fabian is considered to be eminently qualified to receive the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award and worthy of the high honor it represents.

U.S. DESK NEEDED IN STATE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a U.S. desk is desperately needed in the U.S. State Department in order to protect the interests of American farmers.

The State Department so far is waging a winning battle with the Agriculture Department, to the distinct disadvantage of wheat farmers, and now is considering plans which will hurt soybean farmers.

The State Department's Bureau of Economic Affairs is obviously stacked with many people who have scant understanding of the problems our farmers are encountering in world markets. Either that, or they feel called upon to subordinate the interest of our farmers to that of foreign competitors.

In any event, these top policymakers are now locked in a struggle with officials of the Department of Agriculture over the future of the International Grains Arrangement, a wheat treaty which has hurt U.S. markets, and have under consideration Common Market trade compromises which would substantially destroy our soybean markets in Western Europe.

The International Grains Treaty is a dramatic example of State Department indifference to the U.S. farmer.

Just yesterday a letter arrived at my desk from an official writing to me for the Secretary of State asserting that the International Grains Arrangement "has worked, on balance, to our advantage."

This startling conclusion was based on the supposition that world wheat prices were higher than would otherwise be the case, and therefore our balance-of-payments position was improved.

Actually, the United States is experiencing the worst wheat export year in a decade. Because of the treaty, we have been foreclosed from many deals. Obviously, prices paid are items of relatively small importance either to our farmers or payments balance when the parties to the sales are both foreign.

Ironically, the same day that the State Department letter applauding the International Grains Arrangements arrived, a letter with a far different tone and content arrived from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin.

In his letter, Secretary Hardin plainly acknowledged the difficulties which have developed under the treaty and still exist. He came to no such conclusion as did the State Department that the treaty was to our advantage.

In fact, he closed his letter by stating that—

We may have to press for such structural modifications of it (the treaty) as will more effectively serve the interests of the U.S. wheat producers.

A further example of State Department indifference to the problems of American farmers, and also lack of understanding of marketplace factors, has come to my attention.

The Common Market has under consideration an internal tax which would effectively end our soybean market there. Last year, sales topped \$500 million.

When I was in Bonn, Germany, early in February, I talked with German Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss and received from him a pledge that he would oppose this tax. As finance minister of the largest trading member of the Common Market, his voice could be very influential.

Unfortunately, I have just learned that the policymakers in the Bureau of Economic Affairs in the U.S. State Department, the same people who were the architects of the International Grains Arrangement in the last administration and remain in positions of influence, look with favor on two compromises, either of which would severely injure soybean interests in the United States. These are the same people who are exponents of another effort to rig world markets, erroneously called the Voluntary Textiles Agreement. The political forces behind an extension of the textiles deal, which really is not voluntary at all, may be brought to bear in favor of a compromise which scuttles the soybean farmer's markets in Europe.

Here is the text of my letter to Secretary of State Rogers of April 1, regarding the International Grains Arrangement, and the comments on it made to me by Secretary Rogers' assistant, Mr. Macomber, on April 21, and by Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin on April 22, also the text of a telegram I dispatched April 22 to Mr. Clarence Palmby, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who is in Europe on trade talks:

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY ROGERS: Since we began the International Grains Arrangements last July 1, the U.S. is having its poorest wheat export year in the past decade. At the same time the U.S. Department of Agriculture is projecting increased wheat exports over last year for Australia, France, and Canada. It's understandable why these countries want the treaty preserved.

In studying the testimony given both in support and opposition to the Senate ratification of this grain treaty last spring, and recently the expert analysis of the workings of the treaty printed in March 20 Congressional Record, I have come to the conclusion that the arrangement is structured and geared to the consistent disadvantage of the U.S. in world wheat trade. The minimum prices for most U.S. wheat are set so high that for the first time in our history, an export tax is levied on wheat in order to comply with the treaty. This export tax—euphemistically called an inverse subsidy—has been most heavy on Soft Red Winter wheat which is commonly produced in my state of Illinois, and the export of Soft Red Winter wheat this year is running less than one-third the level for the same eight month period last year.

The basing point for applying minimum prices under the treaty was set at our U.S. gulf ports from which we export most of our wheat. This has turned out to be a particularly crippling handicap for our exports. This is so because other exporting countries enjoy all the greater competitive flexibilities that accompany the ocean freight calculations in reference to a basing point that is distant from their port of export. Also, the relationships between minimum prices on wheat from different origins, spelled out in the IGA, give additional advantage to French, Swedish, Greek, and Spanish wheats by special treatment; and to Australian and Argentine wheats by incomplete quality description.

Finally, the Soviet Union, Romania, and Bulgaria did not sign the treaty. There appears to be mounting evidence that the high minimum prices specified in the treaty are stimulating wheat production in these countries as well as all over the world. But, because they do not belong they are consistently undercutting us, particularly throughout Western Europe and the Mediterranean area.

Because the IGA is proving itself in almost every conceivable way to be prejudicial to U.S. wheat exports, I respectfully request your department to initiate immediately those steps provided for in Article 21 of the Wheat Trade Convention of the treaty that would get us out of this agreement by the end of this current crop year. It is noteworthy that the marketing year 1967-68, during which no international agreement on wheat existed, U.S. farmers enjoyed their third best export year in history.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1969.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of April 1 requesting the Department to take steps under Article 21 of the Wheat Trade Convention to get the United States out of the International Grains Arrangement.

Article 21 of the Wheat Trade Convention provides for the possibility of withdrawal from this treaty in the event that United

States interests have suffered serious prejudice by actions of other members and the United States was unable to obtain relief under the procedures provided in the Convention.

The Department of State shares your concern about the current level of wheat exports and it is our intention to ensure that the United States retains a fair share of the world commercial market under the Arrangement. The sales record, however, does not seem to bear out your assessment that the Convention is operating to the consistent disadvantage of the United States in world wheat trade.

While it is true that our wheat exports are down this year from the high volume of the past few years, this decline reflects the turn-around in the supply/demand situation rather than the operations of the International Grains Arrangement. The most important factor in this situation is the recovery of grain production in the USSR, record harvests in India and Pakistan and larger crops in Western Europe and other importing countries. The resulting decline in import demand has affected all major wheat exporting countries. The proportionate share of the United States in total commercial sales has remained at about the average reached during the past few years (the highest in recent decades), despite the adverse effects of the dock strike and the sprouted wheat problem with Japan. It would appear, therefore, that overall, the United States has been able to remain competitive in the world wheat market.

As you point out, problems have arisen in the operations of the Arrangement which may adversely affect our exports of certain types of wheat and our position in certain markets. Some of the other exporting countries have encountered similar difficulties. The Department of State and the Department of Agriculture are working closely with other exporting countries with a view to improving the functioning of the Arrangement. We are also mindful of the desirability of including wheat exporting countries which are not yet members of the IGA in the Arrangement.

The Department considers that despite the difficulties which have been experienced, the Arrangement has worked, on balance, to our advantage. Although various technical problems have impeded the full implementation of the price provisions, the Department believes that the arrangement has helped to keep prices higher than would otherwise be the case. This has helped our balance of payments. The Food Aid Convention has been helpful in diverting some foreign supplies from commercial markets, thus making room for US commercial sales, and generally, by promoting a more equitable sharing of responsibilities for non-commercial disposals.

The major wheat exporting countries have recently reviewed the world wheat situation and they recognized that further steps will have to be taken to adjust supplies to the reduced demand. It is our continuing concern to ensure that the burden of this adjustment should be shared fairly among the major exporting countries. We are encouraged, in this connection, by indications of a 12 per cent reduction in wheat acreage this year in Canada and the proposals for delivery quotas which would substantially reduce deliveries to the Australian Wheat Board.

As you will recall, the President and Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada last month agreed "to work closely together with other exporting and importing countries to find positive solutions to the current problems of the world wheat market within the framework of the International Grains Arrangement." They further agreed to work "to overcome present market instability and to

strengthen prices consistent with the provisions of the Arrangement." This is the basis on which we are proceeding.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and hope you will continue to call on us whenever you believe we might be helpful.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 22, 1969.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: This is in reply to your letter of April 1 with which you enclosed a copy of your letter to Secretary Rogers which urges the United States to take the necessary steps under Article 21 of the International Grains Arrangement to withdraw from that Arrangement.

We fully support your objective to keep United States wheat competitively priced in the world markets in order that the U.S. can retain its fair share of these markets. In recent weeks we have discussed ways and means of resolving some of the knotty pricing problems in the Arrangement.

On April 2 we called a meeting of U.S. producer, farm organization and trade representatives in the hopes of developing a U.S. position on the I.G.A. acceptable to all parties present. The producers were represented by the National Association of Wheat Growers, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., and the Western Wheat Associates. They were unified in recommending against any downward adjustment in the minimum price scale but requested that the Department take such actions it deemed necessary under other provisions of the Arrangement to maintain competitive export prices on U.S. wheats in order to insure that U.S. wheat retains its fair share of the world wheat trade.

Representatives of the four major farm organizations were present. Three of them actively endorsed viewpoints very similar to those expressed by the producer representatives, while one voiced strong opposition to continued U.S. participation in the Arrangement. Representatives of the grain trade and their associations urged immediate consideration to reduction of the minimum prices and a concurrent reappraisal of the price differentials for the wheats listed in the scale. All persons present agreed that U.S. wheats should be kept competitively priced, but by the time of adjournment no solid consensus was reached as to the best means to accomplish this under the I.G.A.

On April 3 and 4 meetings were held in the Department with representatives of the other major exporting countries (Canada, Australia, Argentina and the European Economic Community). The purpose of the meeting was to find ways to strengthen world wheat prices to at least the minimum price level prescribed in the Arrangement. Detailed discussions covered the subjects of ocean freight, the basing point system as it affects price evaluations, price differentials between wheats, effects of wheat traded by nonmember countries, selling procedures and trading practices. Two full days of discussions were held and agreement was reached that necessary adjustments would have to collectively and individually be made if the Arrangement was to operate effectively. Because of the complexity of the issues, no agreement was reached at this meeting on specific and meaningful steps which could or would be taken by representatives of the countries present to implement the broadly stated objective, but consultations will continue.

As you know, there are this year other contributing factors which have materially affected our wheat exports. India and Pakistan enjoyed bumper crops last year

and appear to be headed for a second good season. Exports and sales to these two countries are off more than 175 million bushels from last year.

In the latter part of 1968, Japan experienced some quality problems with U.S. wheat which was occasioned by weather damage and she was out of our market for over two months. The dock strike at East and Gulf ports cut off wheat exports for over three months.

We are seriously concerned about our current level of wheat exports and share the view which you hold that the I.G.A. should not impair the ability of the U.S. to remain competitive in the world wheat markets. We are also concerned by what we believe has recently been an overstimulation of wheat acreage in some other exporting countries and believe it desirable that this be stabilized, and in some instances cut back. In this regard Canada expects acreage to be down for the 1969 crop and Australia is considering a delivery quota system. Our ability to make I.G.A. an effective instrument of world trade in this period when world supplies substantially exceed world demand will be taxed to the utmost. If workable solutions are not found in the near future within the existing framework of the I.G.A., we may have to press for such structural modifications of it as will more effectively serve the interests of the U.S. wheat producers.

Sincerely,
CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary Agriculture.

APRIL 22, 1969.

HON. CLARENCE PALMBY,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, the American Embassy, Paris France:

Stick to your guns with no compromise or deals on Common Market soybean tax issue. Distressed to learn that compromised positions are under consideration in the U.S. State Department. One version would acquiesce in the tax despite its clear violation of GATT rules provided Common Market agrees not to increase internal feed grain prices. Such deal would be cruel to U.S. soybean farmers. Feed grain prices already so high in Common Market they must by economic necessity be lowered. Further increase totally absurd. Another version would be to acquiesce in oil part of proposed tax provided meal part is dropped. This would be almost as cruel as first. Fight also against trading off interests of soybean farmers for so-called voluntary textile deal.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department's defense of the International Grains Arrangement ignores the fact that the United States is currently enjoying its worst export year in a decade, and the further fact that three other major wheat traders, the Soviet Union, France, and Australia are enjoying substantial increases in exports.

It is absolutely misleading for the State Department to conclude, as it does, that our export decline reflects increased world supplies. Working in that same supply situation, other major wheat producers boosted exports while ours went down.

Including that "the arrangement has worked, on balance, to our advantage," the State Department could not possibly have meant "our farmers" in using the word "our." Conceivably the setbacks our farmers sustained under the treaty may have been offset by gains made by hard goods or other U.S. interests, but if such occurred they are not itemized.

The basic factor overlooked by State Department policymakers is the impossibility of controlling by international agreement the price of a commodity unless supply control can also be established. The dismal experiences the United States has encountered over more than 30 years trying to control its own farm supplies should show the futility of worldwide price-supply rigging deals.

CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES: UNIQUE MONUMENT TO AMERICA'S WAR DEAD

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to have in my district the unique Cathedral of the Pines in Rindge. Since the time when this cathedral was founded by Dr. Douglas Sloan in memory of his son, Sanderson, who was killed in World War II, the concept has grown and spread.

It now embraces all faiths and is dedicated to all American dead in all our wars. It is, as far as I can determine, the only shrine anywhere containing a monument—the Memorial Bell Tower—devoted solely to the memory of women who were the victims of war.

The mountaintop Altar of the Nations, made up of stones contributed from every State, is another unique memorial.

Rather than expand a personal description of the cathedral, I will refer my colleagues to the following article by Carl C. Craft, the Associated Press correspondent in Concord.

Mr. Craft has done a masterful job in explaining how the cathedral has developed. When they have read it I think it will be clear why the Cathedral of the Pines has drawn the attention and personal contributions of Presidents, world leaders, and other persons, both prominent and obscure, from around the world.

The article follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE SHRINE MEMORIAL TO WAR DEAD

(By Carl C. Craft)

RINDGE, N.H.—Here's peace, brotherhood, understanding and consecration.

Peace found by five million pilgrims to this remote pine knoll during nearly a quarter-century.

Brotherhood shared through prayer by 49 faiths in a cathedral with heaven as its roof.

Understanding through development of a successful ecumenical experiment accomplished with the donations of stones, flags and other treasures from 111 nations.

Consecration first by a family in memory of a son who died at war and eventually by a nation—through Congress—in dedication of the main altar as a memorial to all of America's war dead.

Here's the Cathedral of the Pines, visited annually by thousands in honor of the spirit of servicemen who died for their country.

Mt. Monadnock is just ahead—majestic 3,165-foot centerpiece of scenery exposed to view from this knoll by the 1938 hurricane that mysteriously circled and spared the fine young pines on the crest.

About 100 feet below is Bullet Pond, one of four bodies of water visible in the view toward Vermont.

"The still waters, the valleys, the shadows . . ." come the words from spiritual leaders of many faiths and many nations—men and women of white skin, black skin, yellow skin, brown skin, all following the call to love their Creator and love their neighbor.

"I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills . . ." come the words of cardinal, bishop, president, princess, rabbi, monsignor, doctor, reverend.

To those reared in Rindage, now a community of 1,800, this knoll was known as "Halo Hill" long before this monument to love was assembled—they'd seen heavy fog rise from the waters and a rainbow form when the sun appeared.

Douglas Sloane, now in his 80s, had been with his family's furniture firm W. & J. Sloane in New York City and head of the Boston office's wholesale end of the business by the time he retired in 1940.

He purchased property here and offered his children their choice of sections of the farm on which they'd like to build a home. His son Sandy's selection was a spot near the present cathedral.

When Sandy—Lt. Sanderson Sloane—died in 1944 after his plane was shot down over Germany, the site became a memorial to him and was made available to all for prayer and meditation and to recall what Sandy had meant to the Sloanes and what the sons and daughters who died in war had meant to other parents throughout America.

Stones were sought—and received—from every state to be placed in an "altar of the nation" as a national memorial to all war dead.

Through the years, 8,000 stones arrived from throughout the world—each with its story, each as a symbol. The stones are united in an altar, in a credence table, in altar rail posts, in a lectern, in a baptismal font, in a chaplains' altar, in an altar at a chapel. Plaques are in a field-stone pulpit. Religious gifts were donated: Books, plants, pens, music, fragments of bones of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Vincent de Paul, and there are flags.

Presidents Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson contributed stones: sandstone from Missouri, a stone from Normandy's Omaha Beach, Chelmsford granite, and a stone from the LBJ Ranch.

Adm. William D. Leahy sent a stone from Washington, Gen. George C. Marshall a stone from Virginia, Gen. Douglas MacArthur a stone from Japan's Atsugi airfield, Adm. Chester W. Nimitz a blue and gold stone from California, Adm. William F. Halsey a stone of coral from the atolls of the Pacific, Gen. Omar N. Bradley a stone from Virginia, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway a stone from Suwon, Korea.

High Chief Tufele of the South Pacific Islands sent a stone from a sacred mound of rocks. From the abbey of Arbroath, Angus, Scotland, came a stone. From the Kimberley mines of South Africa came diamonds. A piece of lava from the volcano Mauna Kea, Hawaii, same, to rest with a stone from the Grace MacKinnely Mountains of Antarctica.

A stone came from Mt. Surabachi, Iwo Jima; another from the white cliffs of Dover; another the foot of the Minuteman statue in Lexington, Mass.

There came olive wood from Jerusalem and a heart-shaped pebble from the shore of the Dead Sea in Palestine near the mouth of the River Jordan.

For Sloane, it "began in a very simple way." He found it expanded beyond what he had expected—carrying the message on the entrance boulders, etched in Hebrew and English, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In 1949, Sloane and his wife established a trust for the benefit of the public—400 acres of peace and prayer, with never an admis-

sion and never a collection, never a parking fee, basing its entire support on free-will offerings. There is no advertising.

Members of the cathedral's board of trustees are distinguished lay people representing different faiths.

Sloane points to the cathedral's bell tower as the only monument in the world dedicated specifically to recognition of the role of women in the nation's war effort—ranging from those who died on the battlefield to those who released men for combat duty and took places on the supply lines.

"War would be impossible," he said as he looked across the New Hampshire granite cross on the altar of the nation, "if we would simply love God and love our neighbors."

"That's the value of this peaceful place—up here you can find answers, everything up here preaches its own sermon," he added.

Then, he looked to the gates of the altar, where he found the two words he considers the most inspirational:

"Our Father."

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: A MOVING TRIBUTE BY ED DECOURCY, EDITOR OF THE NEWPORT, N.H., ARGUS-CHAMPION

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Edward DeCourcy, editor of the Newport Argus-Champion in my district, wrote a superb editorial at the time of President Eisenhower's death. Of all the tributes which I saw and heard I have found none finer or more moving than this. I congratulate my friend E. DeCourcy. One of the measures of Dwight Eisenhower's noble character is surely in his power to evoke as beautiful a tribute as this. I offer this at this point in the RECORD:

THE SPECTATOR

(By Edward DeCourcy)

"No man is an island, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a Mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde; And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

JOHN DONNE (1573-1631)

It was not only General Eisenhower who died last Friday. A little bit of a lot of us—many right here in Newport—died too.

When that coffin was lowered into the rich Kansas earth yesterday, midnight passed. It was the final end of a day whose night had fallen almost a decade ago.

It was the end of an era that had been a major part of our lives, those of us who can still hear the General's stern, calm mid-western voice on June 6, 1944, as he reported that a landing had been made that morning on the coast of France and said, "I call upon all who love freedom to stand with us now. Together we shall achieve victory."

Nostalgia burnishes the pleasant and banishes the unpleasant. We'd rather think about the joys of V-E Day than the horror of Pearl Harbor. We'd rather remember the photograph of Ike recuperating in Denver with "Much Better Thanks" embroidered on his pajama pocket, than the shock when John Daley interrupted the "Weston Family" broadcast at dusk on April 12, 1945, to announce, "President Roosevelt is dead."

We'd rather remember the return of full gas tanks, the scramble to buy new cars, the

birth of the ballpoint pen, the ruptured duck, than the Bulge, Anzio, Guadalcanal, Omaha Beach or ration points. We'd rather remember that little red schoolhouse in Reims where Jodi and Friedeburg stood in defeat before a five-star General Eisenhower, than those days of November, 1942, when troops in North Africa under Lt. Gen. Eisenhower were temporarily being thrown back by Nazis.

Today's woes may have been budding during the Eisenhower presidency, but we remember Eisenhower efforts to prevent them—the White House Conference on Education urging massive new efforts to make education adequate in quantity and quality for the enormous need ahead—thawing of the Cold War—the NATO conference in Paris—admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the statehood—the offer for an end to atomic testing—creation of the National Aviation and Space Agency—heroic efforts to unify the armed forces—trips to many foreign lands to build peace—that ominous and prophetic warning of the military-industrial complex.

What died in each of us was our part in an era that we now realize is gone forever.

If we did not know it before, we knew it this week when we talked to young people to whom that era that we regard as hardly passed, is an obscure page in ancient history; young people who knew that the name Eisenhower was famous, but weren't quite sure why. Millions of today's voters were tender teenagers when Dwight Eisenhower turned the White House over to young John Kennedy, and most of today's voters think Edward Kennedy is a Senator from Massachusetts forgetting that it was a man named Edward Kennedy, chief of the Paris bureau of the Associated Press, who stirred the Eisenhower wrath when he barked into a telephone on May 7, 1945, "Germany has surrendered unconditionally," hours before Supreme Headquarters was to give the official release.

Something did die in a lot of us who are over 30 last Friday, our part in an era that has passed.

But something more important has been given new life. In death General Eisenhower has made the world recognize anew the virtues that made him widely loved and respected, virtues that hordes have been trying to discredit. Frank Reynolds of ABC put it crisply the night President Eisenhower died when he asked his listeners to "try to think of somebody else in public life you trust."

INTRODUCTION FOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE COLLEGE BENEFITS SYSTEM OF AMERICA

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to incorporate the College Benefits System of America. Early in this century Andrew Carnegie established a system of free retirement pensions for educators in the realization that to attract and keep good faculties, some financial incentives had to be offered. With the rapid growth of higher education, Mr. Carnegie's original endowment did not prove adequate to the purpose. As a result, beginning in 1915 and working with a group of outstanding educators, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching formulated principles for a sound self-supporting pension system for higher education. The principles established at

that time comprise the basic structure of the present retirement system. The Carnegie Corp. endowed Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association with working capital, and thus began the first pension system in the United States in which annuity pensions are fully funded, vest immediately in the beneficiary, and are portable. They are vested in the individual and move freely with him from campus to campus. Those principles were guideposts in the establishment of the Federal social security system in 1935. It should be noted also that the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds and Other Private Retirement and Welfare programs recommended in 1965 that these same principles of vesting, portability and full funding be incorporated into all private pension plans for industry and labor.

At the conclusion of World War II, TIAA initiated a detailed study of the effects of inflation on fixed-dollar annuities. As a result of the study, at the request of the TIAA, the New York Legislature created the college retirement equities fund—CREF—as a charitable and education membership corporation to provide variable annuity pensions without regard to sex, creed, or color, only for the faculties and staffs of educational institutions. Following the example of TIAA, these pensions are fully funded, vest immediately in the beneficiary, and are portable. CREF was the first to provide a nationwide variable annuity pension system in the United States.

TIAA-CREF is the nationwide pension system for higher education in the United States. It has more than 300,000 annuity contracts outstanding to faculty and staff members of more than 2,000 institutions of education. More than \$3 billion in pension funds are represented.

TIAA-CREF has proven to be a model for all private pension systems. It has functioned effectively and inexpensively. It has met the needs of changing times and a changing economy. It has grown along with our system of higher education.

Now, after more than 50 years of successful operation, the pension system is faced with a threat of taxation by various States on the periodic contributions of faculty and staff members, and their institutions. This threat of taxation is due to the vesting and portability provisions of the pension contract. Such contracts may be considered insurance products under State insurance codes and therefore subject to multistate regulation and taxation.

Tax exemptions are widely applied to retirement plans. The vast majority of our citizens are covered by private and public tax-free pension plans. Certainly those engaged in higher education are entitled to the same consideration.

The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to preserve the private pension plan of higher education free of State taxation and regulation so it may continue to offer equal services at equal cost in all 50 States. The charter will in no way add to the burdens of the Federal, State, or local governments.

CBR: 10 YEARS LATER

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, some very thoughtful and provocative criticisms of chemical, biological, and radiological warfare have been advanced by our colleague from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY). I believe that the gentleman from New York has made a great contribution to the public discussion of this vital issue through the pertinent questions and revealing answers he has received from cabinet officers and other high officials.

Many of us have been deeply concerned with the secrecy and apparent failure of our military leaders to furnish the public with full and meaningful explanations concerning the development of this form of warfare. In a democracy, the people are entitled to have the facts on these terrible weapons of war before this means of warfare totally engulfs the world and we are helpless to control its application.

I recall that this subject concerned me, and also concerned many of my colleagues, the very first year I served in the Congress, in 1959. In an effort to contribute to the dialog on this vital subject, I would like to submit the text of remarks which were made 10 years ago by my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), delivered on September 3, 1959, and also my own remarks which were delivered in the House on the following day:

INCREASED EMPHASIS BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ON CBR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BROOKS of Texas). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor today to speak to you about a problem which I feel is important to us as a nation of free people who honor and protect life, and hopefully, represent and live as a moral and good people. Since this problem involves the defense of our country, there are no simple answers; only bewildering paradoxes and basic questions.

The subject of my talk is the increased emphasis by the Defense Department on the CBR program; that is, the chemical, biological, and radiological warfare program, and possible changes in American defense policy in this field. On June 16 and June 22 of this year, the House Science and Astronautics Committee held hearings on the CBR program. These hearings were limited for the most part to a technical review of what the Defense Department was doing in this area, besides considering the possible uses of CBR in wartime. The committee did not fully explore certain basic moral and policy considerations about the use of CBR in the event of war, which I believe we as legislators must consider very carefully. I would, however, like to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and the members of the Space Committee for the fine job which they did in getting at the facts regarding CBR—and I urgently commend a reading of the hearings and report to every Member.

The Space Committee in its investigation of the CBR program established the fact that the Defense Department is interested in increasing the CBR program from an approxi-

mate current level of \$40 million to \$125 million. It was established that such an increase represents a basic change in the thinking of the Defense Department in the CBR area.

It was further established that although some uses were found for CBR, it was duly noted that CBR is not a panacea to our defense problems. The committee pointed out on page 14 of its report that—

"CBR weapons are not a complete answer. They do not replace the nuclear deterrent, and they do not replace the elements of seapower, or the infantryman. But they could readily turn out to be the weapon which toppled a tremendous investment in some previously efficacious strategy. * * * Research cannot guarantee results in every instance. Perhaps CBR research for another decade would not alter the general military balance of power. But if it does, and the United States has not gained the same capability as others, the cost to the Nation would be beyond calculation."

These remarks suggest that the committee feels that it really is not that sure of the necessity of CBR, but if we are to err as to their need, we should err on the side of national security. This is, of course, a powerful argument and must be considered with due gravity by the Congress. On page 15 of the report under recommendation 9, the committee states that it "cannot bring itself to describe any weapon of war as 'humane' and makes no moral judgment on the possible use of CBR in warfare." This, of course, is the basic problem involved with CBR which I shall discuss in this speech. Another recommendation of the committee, No. 15, states that—

"It is also recognized that in the present world situation with other countries pursuing vigorous programs of CBR development, the best immediate guarantee the United States can possess to insure that CBR is not used anywhere against the free world, is to have a strong capability in this field, too. This will only come with a stronger program of research."

This recommendation does not raise certain basic problems which occur when other nations will begin developing CBR weapons. It should be duly noted that at this point it is only the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union that have a capacity for developing CBR weapons, and are, in fact, the nations that are developing these weapons in any large-scale program. Thus, the policy actions of these nations with regard to their use will be watched very closely by other nations. If the United States and the Soviet Union create an atmosphere which suggests that it is quite all right to use CBR in wartime, these nations will have given the go-ahead to other nations to build these weapons. We should note that it does not take a great level of technological skill or great amounts of money to build chemical and biological weapons; consequently, the cost of these weapons and the skill involved in their production make them well within the range of other nations. It is not unlikely that smaller nations that are less responsible would begin using these deadly weapons against each other. This, of course, is why it is of paramount importance that the United States set a moral tone in this area. If we do not, we will have done much to initiate the production of these weapons by smaller nations who might otherwise have compunctions in manufacturing and using these weapons.

The hearings before Congress on CBR raised many problems. For example, it is quite clear that the United States is woefully unprepared in case of attack by an enemy with chemical and biological weapons. We certainly have no adequate civil defense in this area. Indeed, it is questionable whether there is any kind of defense to certain of the

chemicals and bacteria that could be developed and used on our people and cities.

In the spring of 1958, when confronted with the question by the Senate Armed Forces Committee, "Are there any BW agents for use against humans or animals for which there is no countermeasure or an inoculant?" Gen. William Creasy, the former head of the Army Chemical Corps, replied, "Yes, sir. We do know that in the case of any kind of vaccine, you can override it with massive doses, and the doses we use are massive doses."

Another problem which was raised by the CBR hearings is that there is no truly adequate method of ascertaining whether or not a nation is producing and developing CBR weapons. Consequently, it is very difficult to conceive of an international inspection system in this area similar to the one which could be initiated in the nuclear area. Thus, in order for any international agreement to be effective in the CBR area, it is imperative that these agreements have behind them a moral force at least as strong as the inspection system in the nuclear area.

For now, however, I wish to leave the Space Committee report and its recommendations and the many problems such as these that it raised, to consider the subtle but real change in policy which has been instituted by some, or for which adoption is pressed by others, by those connected with the CBR program. The purpose of this change, of course, is to gain acceptance for chemical and biological weapons, as just another weapon in our arsenal which should be used as an offensive as well as retaliatory weapon. For example, General Creasy suggested before the Space Committee that CBR be used as an offensive weapon. He stated on page 15 of the hearings that—

"I am not advocating preventive war but we must change our policy, which is that we don't hit back until you hit us."

General Creasy also pointed out on page 17 of the hearings that—

"I would hate to see us enter into any agreement with anybody regarding CBR so that if we are going to fight we are going to do it with our hands tied behind our backs."

It is only within the last few months that there has been mention of the CBR program in the popular press. For the most part, the writers in this area have been present military officers in the Chemical Corps and retired military officers of the Chemical Corps. The theme that runs through these articles is that, first, the veil of secrecy should be lifted in the chemical and biological areas within the limits of security; second, we should build up, develop, and research in this area faster and more actively than we are presently doing; and third, the historic strictures that have been placed upon our Armed Forces as to the use of CBR should be removed. With the first two points, I am in agreement.

However, the argument of the Defense Department, through General Stubbs, is that a war fought with chemical weapons is a more humane war. The description by the Defense Department of these chemicals is, indeed, rather disarming. For example, they talk about their psychochemicals which can make cowards out of brave men and vice versa; they tell of the possibilities of sleep chemicals which will put populations to sleep for hours, while soldiers march in and take over the area. This, of course, is not the whole story. General Creasy, the former Chemical Corps Chief, has stated that CBR weapons are as deadly or deadlier than nuclear warfare.

General Rothschild, in an article in Harper's magazine, page 22, has stated:

"Incredibly dangerous amounts of biological material can be carried in very small bulk. For example, a single ounce of the

toxic agent which causes the disease called Q fever would be sufficient to infect 28 billion people."

How would these weapons be used? Judging from the testimony before the Space Committee hearing these instruments of warfare would be used in the so-called brush-fire localized war. CBR would take the place of nuclear weapons in this kind of encounter. But we should note that the primary and ancillary of the lethal CBR weapons are not that different from nuclear explosions; that is, poisoning of the atmosphere, destruction of the civilian population, and for that matter, destruction of all life within a given area, is possible.

Consequently, depending on the kind of bacteria or chemical used, the results could be just as horrendous, indiscriminate, and inhumane killing as if nuclear weapons were, in fact, used. Indeed, there are those that take the position that we should not build these weapons or increase expenditures for research in this field, arguing that the range of destruction which we have in our defense arsenal would seem to be quite complete without an expanded CBR program. Given the present world situation, I am sure that this is not a realistic position. There is strong evidence to suggest that the Soviet Union is engaging in a buildup of biological and chemical weapons. Much of the Soviet civil defense is aimed at protection from a biological and chemical attack. Hence, the realities of the situation appear to demand that we ourselves engage in an increased program of research and development in this field. I might add that I agree to this view only reluctantly.

The fact, however, that we might have to have an expanded program in this field does not mean that we should change the basic policies of the United States which were reiterated by President Roosevelt on June 8, 1943, when he stated that the United States under no circumstances would use poisonous or obnoxious gases unless used first by our enemies. This policy is being attacked on all fronts by various officials close to the Defense Department. For example, General Rothschild stated:

"We must reject once and for all the position stated by President Roosevelt that an enemy can have the first chemical or biological blow wherever or whenever he wishes. That blow could be disastrous. We must make it clear that we consider these weapons among the normal usable means of war."

Mr. Speaker, our policy in this area is one which was not laid down casually. It stems from our basic belief that even in war we must preserve the essence of humanity. In 1921 the United States itself called an international conference in Washington for the specific purpose of outlawing poisonous gases and other similar weapons. This conception of the use of such weapons is one which is generally accepted by all nations. For example, the international agreement through the Geneva protocol of 1925 specifically prohibited the military use of chemical and biological weapons.

The Soviet Union has been quick to recognize and seize upon the fact that these weapons are abhorrent to the people of the world. I wish to quote to you a message that was sent only last week to a conference of scientists in Canada who have been discussing the problem of chemical and biological warfare:

"In his message Khrushchev stated: 'In the name of the Soviet Government, and personally, I would like to send greetings to the members of the Pugwash Conference of Scientists, meeting to study problems arising from the threat to humanity of biological and chemical weapons. We share the concern of scientists, who justly point out that the use of these weapons may have no less horrible a consequence than the use of

atomic or hydrogen weapons. Not by chance were chemical and bacteriological weapons condemned by mankind, and their military use prohibited by international agreement through the Geneva protocol of 1925. As is well known the Soviet Union strongly supports the prohibition of all types of weapons of mass annihilation, including nuclear as well as chemical and biological weapons. We hold that their use runs counter to humane principles, the rules of international law, and the conscience of all peoples. You, as authoritative scientists, can make a significant contribution in the struggle against preparations for war, employing nuclear, chemical, biological, and other mass annihilation weapons. I warmly wish the Pugwash participants success in their noble work."

It is disturbing to me that the Soviet Union is able to clothe many of its international policies in morality when basically its approach to international policies is quite Machiavellian. Conversely it is disturbing to me that our Nation, which repudiates naked power politics, is utterly silent on this question. Fortunately, however, I believe that our true intent as to our basic moral position is generally known and more often than not reaches the peoples of the world. For example, few people anywhere believe that the United States used biological weapons in the Korean war. However, the effectiveness of the propaganda of the Chinese Communists about our use of such weapons during the Korean war was in the planting of suspicions of its use. If the United States was now to change its chemical and biological warfare policies, we will have both added fuel to the propaganda mills of the Communists and strengthened their false charges about our use of such methods during wartime.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions about CBR which go unanswered. We do not know whether we can, in fact, develop a successful civil defense to a CBR attack. We do not know whether any kind of international agreement could be implemented in this field. It is questionable whether having these awesome weapons on hand will act as a deterrent to attack.

However, I believe that there is an answer to the question of preemptive use of chemical and biological weapons. We should not accede to the judgment of the certain military officers who want the right to the use chemical and biological weapons as preemptive attack weapons. We should not accede to the wishes of those in the Defense Department who want to change the policy restated by President Roosevelt in 1943, at the height of World War II, that we would not under any circumstances use chemical and biological weapons unless first used by our enemy. I feel that now is the time that we must reevaluate, before it is too late, where we are going in the field of CBR.

It is now imperative that we as a nation follow our history and good sense in not using chemical and biological weapons for preemptive attack. Although it is important to be prepared in this field, if the facts show this as being a necessity, we must not fall into the propaganda and moral trap which the Soviets have laid for us.

Mr. Speaker, we are losing the propaganda battle, and unless we are willing to express publicly a moral national policy on this issue we will be creating the impression that we are oblivious to the horrors that these weapons bring if unleashed. I do not believe the American people want such a state to come into being. Because of this, and because of the urgency of the problem, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution which will reaffirm our policy of nonuse of biological and chemical weapons unless they are first used by our enemy. This, I believe, is what the peoples of the world are waiting for us to say. This, I believe, is the way our historical

heritage and our moral values can be reaffirmed.

Therefore, I conclude that while we are constrained to develop these weapons qualitatively, and quantitatively at an increased rate, we must concurrently reaffirm and announce as an ethical notion our resolve not to initiate use of these weapons in war or in peace.

We cannot allow the concept of survival to obliterate our spiritual and moral values, for if we do survival will have no meaning.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) for the excellent resolution he has introduced today. I think his statement on the subject will clarify the point for the people of America, and I feel deeply that his resolution deserves serious and immediate consideration. I, too, have been vitally concerned about the danger of chemical and biological warfare, and I pray that somehow we will be able to avert the use of these terrible weapons in war. It should be pointed out, however, that the Soviet Union seems to have a strong program of development and production in the chemical, biological, and radiological area. Coupled with the great number of Soviet submarines—500—which have missile launching capabilities, and the fact that chemical and biological weapons may be attached to these missiles, we must be on our guard both as to our civil defense in this area and as to development of our own weapons as a deterrent.

It should be made clear, however, that we must take every reasonable step toward reaching agreement with the Soviet Union on chemical, biological, and radiological weapons.

Again, let me congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin for calling the attention of the Congress to this vital subject.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to congratulate my colleague from Wisconsin for an excellent presentation. As we know, he is one of the new and younger Members of the Congress. By my association with him I have found him to be a very serious person who has done a lot of hard work, a lot of extra work, thinking about problems that have to be thought out, seeking solutions. I know that he has many good and many progressive ideas, and I am very happy to be associated with him and to congratulate him for his statement. With my own background, with some study in pathology, and with my work associated with quite a few biological scientists and chemists, some of the leading ones in the country, I know, through my own experience, that this field of biological and chemical warfare can present problems that will be of great concern to the American people and to the people of the world. We can only hope that these new weapons may never be used. We can also hope that through a coordination of effort we may prevent the use of these weapons and that we, the American people, as a people dedicated to peace and the welfare of all peoples, will be willing to take that step and say that we will not first use weapons of this type to bring about future great horrors to people all over the world. And I want to say again that I congratulate my colleague and friend for his excellent presentation and for the great service he is performing in bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman.

OUR CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, AND RADIOLOGICAL POLICIES ARE MORALLY INDEFENSIBLE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker this body yesterday had the opportunity of listening to a wise, factual, and thought-provoking speech

by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] on the increasing emphasis being placed on the Nation's development of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons.

My colleague, who has obviously devoted a great deal of research, study, and thought to this grave subject, expressed very precisely and thoughtfully the sobering moral issue which is parallel to and rising in importance with the accelerated development of these weapons.

I wish to concur fully with this able presentation, to congratulate my colleague on the excellence of his presentation, and to commend the reading of his remarks to every Member of this body.

I particularly want to applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin for the emphasis which he placed on the deplorable, but apparently growing tendency of our military leaders who are charged with the development of this program to disregard the essential inhumanity of these weapons and to attempt to sell them to the American people and to the world as clean or humane.

I also heartily concur with his deep concern over the abandonment by these same officials of the principle that the United States must use its strength and military might only for defensive and retaliatory purposes.

While these generals decry the notion that they might ever be accused of advocating preventive war, they speak plausibly against agreements "that if we are going to fight we are going to do it with our hands tied behind our backs," and urge that "we must change our policy, which is that we do not hit back until you hit us."

These pseudo sabre rattlers describe this recommended policy of striking first if it is evident that an enemy is about to strike us as preemptive war.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is self-evident that preemptive war is nothing more than preventive war. They are all policies that are totally alien and unacceptable to a democratic society filled with the fervent desire for real, lasting peace throughout the world.

The attitudes of many of our military leaders who now or in the past have been directly associated with the development of chemical and biological weapons is morally outrageous, and wholly indefensible in a world already groping for a solution to the awesome nuclear stalemate.

These individuals, of course, are entitled to their opinions. However, in the powerful, secrecy-cloaked offices they administer, they are given unique power to activate their philosophies in a manner that, I am sure, is detrimental to the welfare of the Nation and mankind.

Expressions of this frightening philosophy and actions which have sprung from it, have come frequently to my attention in hearings held before the House Science and Astronautics Committee, on which I am privileged to serve.

Maj. Gen. William M. Creasy, former head of the Army's Chemical Warfare Corps, for example, scoffed at the very concept of disarmament negotiations in response to a question I put to him at one of these hearings. He went so far as to question the wisdom of disarmament discussions even in the field of nuclear weapons.

Yet just a few moments earlier he had conceded that he would use nuclear weapons to devastate four places in the Soviet Union if the Communists should start any more "brushfires" or regional agitation.

But at the same time, General Creasy was describing the biological and chemical agents which the Army is developing as "humane," and saying that they were designed to prevent war as deterrents.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the following excerpt from hearings before the

House Committee on Science and Astronautics on June 16 and 22, 1959:

"Mr. HECHLER: 'It is not the province of this committee nor do I want to get you into any discussion of high policy strategy here, but I was disturbed a little by what you inferred about outlawing these weapons, and I would just like to ask you, are you in favor of disarmament, providing it is gangster-proof, providing you have guarantees?'"

"General Creasy: 'Yes, sir; I would like utopia, also.'"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'The way you answer that question—'"

"General Creasy: 'I just don't believe it is practicable. I think your basic premise is you are dealing with people of integrity, and since your contract is no better than your judgment of the integrity of the people who made the contract, clearly a contract of this type would be self-voiding.'"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'So, in other words, you believe not even in the nuclear field our Government should carry on negotiations for disarmament?'"

"(No response.)"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'I don't want to press this too far, except I would like to relate your answer to this whole area that we are discussing.'"

"General Creasy: 'I don't believe I could qualify myself as an expert in that area, but I think it is a fruitless exercise.'"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'I can't get it through my thick head how it prevents a war to start a war. Here I think we might get into a rather long discussion which we could draw out at length which would not be profitable to this committee. But I do think it is dangerous and borders on the irresponsible to suggest this.'"

"General Creasy: 'Yes, I think I dissavowed any intention of talking about preventive wars. But you prevent wars by occupying a position, a posture, if you will, as well as a position, that makes it undesirable for other people to start wars with you.'"

"Your posture is the thing that keeps him from wanting to slug it out with you. But your relative position must also be maintained. If you permit him to push you further back into a corner, whether he does this geographically or financially, you have lost the war."

"Someplace in this series of withdrawals, he has really struck this blow. He has started this war. I think we must further define what this point is."

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that more information about our potential in the CBR field must be made known to the American public and to the peoples of the world. Likewise, the American people and other peoples must be informed of what the Soviet Union and her satellites are doing in this area. On the one hand we are advertising these awesome, terrible weapons as deterrents to war, and on the other simultaneously denying the world all but the sketchiest of details about them—and this usually disseminated in the lurid, sensationalized format of the Sunday supplement.

If we are truly developing these weapons to discourage the Communist bloc from ever daring to make war upon the free world, then where is the wisdom of keeping any information which might indeed deter an enemy in the darkest and most heavily guarded classified file?

And if an enemy knows nothing of the potential which we have developed or are developing, how can the generals possibly suggest that the primary nature of these weapons are defensive or deterrent?

I am not suggesting that we strip our work in this area nude to the point that the technical or academic details—which might be of value to an enemy—are even remotely visible. But even the Military Establishment, with its preoccupation for secrecy, surely could give out enough information to justify

the repeated insistence that theirs is a retaliatory operation.

Now if it seems illogical to say we are scaring the Communist hobgoblin away by not mentioning a word about the weapons which we possess for the alleged sole purpose of scaring him—and this does indeed seem highly illogical—at least it is no less senseless that the concurrent policy of keeping our own people in the dark about the weapon which might be used against them.

We can hardly conceal discussion of our own progress in the field without belittling and discrediting any progress by the Russians in the same line.

Thus our own people are denied the information that might some day save their lives. I assure you that the same is not true in the Soviet Union.

Another hearing of the Committee on Science and Astronautics brought out the startling information that possibly today even more than 30 million people in the U.S.S.R. have been trained and have become imbued with the need for this defense, CBR-wise, among the civilian population. That statement was delivered by Dr. Nathan Gordon, Chief of the Army Chemical Corps Intelligence Agency.

And the present director of the Chemical Corps, Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, said that "the Soviet civilian population receives thorough training in defense against chemical and biological warfare."

How many Americans have been similarly trained to protect themselves against this exotic new means of visiting death or incapacitation against our people? Thirty million? Thirty thousand would be an overly ambitious estimate, I would imagine.

But while the leaders of this program see the necessity for such a program of civil defense, virtually nothing has been done to instrument such a program. I must admit here that from the hearings we have held, it seems evident that some efforts have gone into protecting the lives and maintaining the combat effectiveness of our soldiers, but this is little comfort to the civilian population, who certainly would become the major casualties in any widespread chemical or biological attack.

From a standpoint of sheer survivability, it seems incomprehensible that some of our leaders would suggest preemptive use of CBR weapons against a populace well trained to cope with them, knowing full well that the enemy would retaliate with similar weapons against an American people ill trained and uninformed about the horrors of chemical and biological warfare.

I think there has been a feeling that we have not had the national leadership in the past few years in order to lead the people, pinpoint their thinking and really to stir their feelings about the absolute necessity for disarmament and peace. I think that this, very frankly, is the job of the President of the United States. And I think that he could help to wake up our people to the dangers of CBR warfare and alert them to the need for planning defenses against these horrible weapons.

Recently, I had an opportunity to appear in a taped interview with correspondent Tris Coffin, discussing the moral and strategic aspects of this terrible new form of warfare. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this interview in the RECORD following my remarks.

"Author, Columnist, and Radio Correspondent Tris Coffin: 'How is your moral fiber tonight? Well, the Army has found a way to tear it down completely—quite simply and cheaply, too. It's all part of a delightful new program which is being presented to the taxpayers in little, sugar-coated drops, and it's known as CBR. This stands for chemical, biological, and radiological warfare.'"

"It was arranged to have the chemical

warfare boys spread their tray of goodies before the House Science and Astronautics Committee. The committee was told that CBR is capable of tearing down the moral fiber of men, altering human behavior, and killing people with no mess at all.

"One witness, a major general, described a psychochemical drug in these words: 'There's a material in the human system that acts as a transmitter of a nerve impulse from one nerve joint to another. The nerve gas stops the production of this material and you do not have any nerve transmission. If this happens to nerves around the heart, the heart constricts and stops.'"

"One member of the committee was particularly startled at the prospect of the Army chemists' brave new world. He is Congressman KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, a former Princeton professor and White House assistant. I asked him if he did not think that the testimony was not like Aldous Huxley's famous fantasy, 'Brave New World.' The Congressman replied, on tape recording:

"Mr. HECHLER: 'Well, it certainly was; and just sitting as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee hearing about these new and terrible forms of warfare can be quite a depressing experience. I think that the reaction of some of the members of the committee was a little bit different. Others seemed to feel that this would provide a powerful new weapon in America's arsenal, but my own reaction was different. Looking at it from the standpoint of humanity and civilization itself, what steps are we going to have to take in order to protect not only our own country but all of civilization against its destruction?'"

"Now, to my mind, it's very different to think in terms of a 'clean' bomb or 'dirty' bomb or certain types of warfare that are more or less destructive than others and therefore more or less humane. Naturally, all types of warfare are inhumane. Yet, it seems to me that this is an extension and a new type of warfare that's going to mean taking a lot of educational work on the part of our civilian defense to alert our people as to what is involved."

"In addition to that, it's a great challenge to our social scientists, international lawyers and others who will have to figure out means of getting this within the framework of our thinking on international disarmament."

"Mr. Coffin: 'What are some of the types of CBR that were displayed or discussed before the committee?'"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'There were several types. There are the so-called nerve gases, which in a sense change a person's personality and cause him to lose the will to fight. Then there are the more destructive agents which, if they touch the skin, can cause death in a very, very short space of time; or, if they even get on the clothing, can cause death in a few minutes.'"

"There are agents which can be sprayed very easily from the exhaust of motor cars or motor boats, without any visible sign as these death-dealing agents are dispersed among the populations of our cities or military installations.'"

"Mr. Coffin: 'I detected, I thought, just an example of the "soft sell" when General Creasy was testifying.'"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'I wasn't exactly sure what you meant by that phrase, the "soft sell," Tris. What do you mean?'"

"Mr. Coffin: 'Well, I mean he used the word "humane" so many times as if this were something that ought to be taken up and accepted by mankind.'"

"Mr. HECHLER: 'This has been a tendency, I notice, among all chemical warfare officers. When I was in the infantry during the war, and we were going through basic training, the chemical warfare office assembled us and tried to get every member of our outfit to admit that the use of gas was more humane than any other type of warfare.'"

"Mr. Coffin: 'Congressman, you also spoke about social scientists. Is there any way in which we can start from the beginning and, in effect, teach mankind that war is—as you suggest—inhumane and that we had perhaps start working from the bottom to learn how we can eliminate it.'

"Mr. HECHLER: 'I think this is highly important, Tris. You know we recognize the necessity of catching up with Russia in the training of our scientists, engineers and others who can aid in the defense of the country, by producing more death-dealing missiles and agents of war. It seems to me that equally important is the training of social scientists in the ideals and imagination that can enable us to control and live in a better world. This is a challenge to social science and it's a challenge to civilization to produce this kind of thinking that has the idealism and the willpower to move ahead and make this a safer, better and more peaceful world.'

"Mr. Coffin: 'I think that one problem is that peace is never presented as very heroic to people. We put up statues of our generals and write our great epic poetry about wars.'

"Mr. HECHLER: 'That's true. You may recall William James' book entitled 'The Moral Equivalent to War.' During wartime people feel a great sense of patriotism and national unity. Peace is a hard thing to come by, and it's for this reason, I think, that we are going to have to stir up the spirit of the people to realize that peace on earth, good will toward men is one of the greatest ideals that we can strive toward.'

"Mr. Coffin: 'As a Congressman, of course, you are very close to the people. Do you find that there is an underlying hope among people in your own district whom you talk to for peace, so we won't have to use all these weapons?'

"Mr. HECHLER: 'It's a rather vague hope, Tris. I'm afraid that people tend to be a little pessimistic about the future. They rather vaguely hope that something may come out of it, and there's a feeling that we haven't had the national leadership in the past few years in order to lead the people, pinpoint their thinking and really to stir their feelings of the absolute necessity for disarmament and peace. I think that this, very frankly, is the job of the President of the United States.'

"I believe he's made some fine general speeches about disarmament, but on this question we were talking about—chemical, biological, and radiological warfare—the President has not really informed the American people of what these issues are. And he has not informed them of the nature of the challenge in trying to produce a peaceful world.'

"Mr. Coffin: 'I read a memorandum—I suppose it's supposed to be confidential—by Arthur Schlesinger in which he suggested that the people a few years ago were not ready to be led, but they are coming to the place where they are seeking leadership. Do you think that's true?'

"Mr. HECHLER: 'Yes, I think there's a great deal of that. Of course, after World War I, we had an opportunity to rest for a few years. And then during World War II, the people were stirred to quite a great pitch and then they were left emotionally tired after the war. During the late 1940's and the 1950's their noses were kept to the grindstone by the worst cold war in history followed by the worst and most frustrating limited war in history, in Korea.'

"As a result, there was a great tendency to want to let down at some point, and I'm afraid that this letdown, which I feel has occurred in our national leadership, has really hurt us over the past few years. Yet there is a certain ferment which I believe portends a new feeling on the part of the people that we can and must move forward. What we need now, of course, is national

leadership and I believe that that can be supplied only by the White House itself.'

"Mr. Coffin: 'Thank you, Congressman KEN HECHLER, for this thoughtful discussion. This is Tris Coffin.'

FRASER KENT ON "BLACK LUNG"

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer during the period February 16 to 20, 1969, printed several excellent articles by Fraser Kent which I believe deserve the consideration of all Members as they ponder the effects of this dread disease among coal miners. A reading of these articles should spur new support for the pending legislation on coal mine health and safety:

OFFICIALS IGNORE DEADLY LUNG ILLS OF COAL MINERS

(By Fraser Kent)

The coal miners call it "black lung."

Their doctors describe it as a pneumoconiosis.

Either way, it's a disease that affects thousands of miners, crippling some and hastening the death of others. It results from fine coal dust clogging and shriveling the lung.

There is no known cure, nor any way to reverse the damage.

According to a survey by the U.S. Public Health Service, 125,000 miners (working and retired) have the disease.

In Ohio, State officials say "there is no such thing."

It is not generally covered by workmen's compensation, because it may first appear long after the miner has quit work underground.

The United Mine Workers has done so little to protect its members, West Virginia miners recently asked the national union president to come to that state to answer charges of neglect.

Coal operators have reduced coal dust levels, but not to the point where it will no longer cause black lung.

The U.S. Bureau of Mines takes no responsibility for health measures underground, but limits itself to safety precautions. It conducts dust counts to prevent explosions, not to prevent black lung.

The Public Health Service collects mine data, and sponsors conferences on coal workers' pneumoconiosis. It is powerless in the coal mines.

The Ohio Bureau of Mines has done nothing. It, too, is concerned only with the miners' safety.

Ohio Department of Health personnel aren't allowed into the mines to inspect them for health hazards.

Meanwhile, coal miners die from chronic lung diseases four times as often as do other American men of the same age. The percentage of miners dying from these diseases has more than doubled in the last 20 years.

If statistics from other states are valid for Ohio, there should be more than 4,100 miners—past and present—who either have X-ray evidence of black lung, or have been disabled by it.

About 165 Ohio men die from black lung and its complications every year, if the national figures apply here.

In 1965, there were actually 228 "dust deaths" in this state. That would include jobs in dusty trades outside of the coal mines, but the figure has been cited to support the argument that Ohio miners suffer from pneumoconiosis at about the same rate as those in other states.

National interest in black lung comes at a bad time for the coal industry, which must recruit 49,000 miners for the 100 new mines that are expected to open within the next five years.

Although pneumoconiosis is serious enough in itself, it is only a small part of the national problem of industrial health. According to Dr. Philip R. Lee, assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, more than 300,000 workers are disabled each year as a result of occupational disease.

He said it wasn't because of greed or laziness, but because of ignorance.

You may not want to read this with your morning coffee. But this is the story of pneumoconiosis. Or black lung. The disease that is ignored in Ohio's coal mines, because "there is no such thing."

DEADLY BLACK LUNG IS INCURABLE

(By Fraser Kent)

If you live in a city, breathing the polluted air and smoking two packs of cigarettes a day, you have blackened lungs.

They may not be as healthy as a farm baby's bright pink lungs, but the chances of this crippling or killing you are far less than those reported for a coal miner's "black lung." Or coal worker's pneumoconiosis, the internationally accepted medical term.

Those who minimize the long-term impact of breathing coal dust eight hours a day are quick to talk about the evils of air pollution and smoking. This is particularly true in the Industrial Commission of Ohio, which handles workmen's compensation, and in the state's Department of Industrial Relations, which supervises mining.

The disease is covered by workmen's compensation laws in three states, but not here. If black lung were covered, no state agency could enforce methods of preventing it, because none has the authority.

The disease is not new or exotic. It has been recognized for 150 years.

Emile Zola described its effects in "Germinal," a novel about French coal mining in the 1880s. And it has been described dozens of times in medical journals.

There are many types of pneumoconiosis, which literally means "reaction to dust in the lung" and is pronounced newmooneyosis. Types are classified by the cause, appearance of the lung and other physical effects, and the origin of the dust and its chemical, physical or toxic properties.

Among the most common of the offending dusts are those from silica, asbestos, aluminum, mineral talc, iron, cotton and moldy silage.

Coal worker's pneumoconiosis is found both in miners and in those who work on coal boats. It is believed to result from fine dust being breathed deep into the lung where it accumulates.

Removing a man from the dusty environment has been found to stop the disease from getting worse, although there is no cure.

The problem was first reported when solutions to the problems of ventilation, lighting and flooding permitted miners to go deep into the earth. The disability was first called "miner's asthma" and was stoically accepted by workers and doctors as part of the job.

It has since been found in every coal mining country in the world. At the start of the 20th century, improved ventilation in the coal mines was said to have practically eliminated black lung. Coal dust was described as "inert" and "non-toxic," and was said to cause little or no damage to lung tissue.

In fact, some experts claimed it was not only harmless, but could be beneficial. For example, coal dust might prevent tuberculosis from entering the lung. That view is seldom heard today.

"It would seem obvious the lung cannot become a dust trap and still retain its normal structure and function," argues Dr. Lorin E.

Kerr, medical officer of the United Mine Workers' welfare and retirement fund.

Around 1915, silica dust was first recognized as a dangerous substance to inhale, and silicosis became an occupational disease for which compensation was paid. This has complicated things, Dr. Kerr believes, because the definition of silicosis now excludes all other coal dusts from the danger list.

"As far as many lawyers and physicians are concerned, silicosis is still the only important occupational respiratory disease," he said.

This "maverick view" is held by Dr. Benjamin Felson, professor and director of Cincinnati General Hospital's department of radiology.

"Coal worker's pneumoconiosis is probably the same disease as silicosis," he wrote recently in *Seminars in Radiology*, of which he is the editor.

"All the X-ray manifestations of the two conditions are identical to my eye, and wherever coal miners get the disease, there silica also lurks in potentially hazardous concentration."

D. H. S. Van Ordstrand, head of the Cleveland Clinic department of chest diseases, agrees it is difficult to tell the difference between some types of silicosis and black lung and notes one man may have both.

But he also agrees with the majority view that the diseases are different and distinct.

This concept was first proposed in the 1930s, when British radiologists found lungs that had been damaged by something in the coal dust other than silica. This was called "pseudo-silicosis" or "anthracosis-silicosis."

Finally, it was determined the unknown agent was the coal dust itself. It not only produced jet-black spit (which can continue 20 years after the worker leaves the mine) but explained the strange X-ray findings that could not be traced back to silica dust.

It was apparent that with every breath, the miner was sucking microscopically small particles of coal deep into his chest.

Bits of dust, 1/5000th of an inch across, were imbedded in tissue and gradually clumped together to form constricting "cuffs" of coal around the lung's tiny air and blood vessels.

In most cases, the problem stops there. The miner has no symptoms, and the condition may be found only if the black-speckled lung is examined at autopsy.

When researchers say 80% of coal miners have "some evidence" of black lung, they do not mean this percentage is handicapped by it.

On the other hand, the disease can progress to forms of bronchitis and emphysema. Eventually, air can not pass easily through the constricted air passages of the lung, and the miner finds he becomes short of breath just walking uphill. He may dismiss this as middle age, and his doctor will tell him to cut down his smoking.

Again, it can stop there. In fact, it may halt at almost any stage; there is nothing inevitable about black lung until it reaches the most complicated stages.

But if the disease continues past the early "breathless stage," there is a shrinking of tissue and an enlargement of the lung's tiny air sacs. Their walls may break down, opening one sac into another and then another, so that an autopsy reveals a lace-like pattern.

Not all the changes are recorded on the X-ray; some are seen only on autopsy.

"Some radiologists who aren't familiar with the characteristic appearance of pneumoconiosis are inclined to regard the changes as trivial and not necessarily diagnostic of the disease," Dr. Kerr said.

"But 30 years ago, leading radiologists considered the X-ray appearance of asbestosis to be within normal limits."

When the disease reaches its most advanced stage, fibers have formed in the tissue at the edge of the lung, producing dark, firm

and rubbery masses. The lung continues to disintegrate into shredded fragments of useless tissue.

Meanwhile, there has also been a strain on the right chamber of the heart, which receives blood from the veins and pumps it through the lungs to get a fresh supply of oxygen.

Dr. Hawey A. Wells Jr. of Beckley, W. Va., has described the process as "a pile of coals being heaped on the small arteries of the lung," because the dust also blocks those blood vessels.

Eventually the right heart fails, due in part to the obstructed lung and in part to a lack of oxygen in the blood that feeds the heart muscle. In this respect, pneumoconiosis is the same as many other lung disorders—in fact, the problem mimicks many other well-known diseases, making diagnosis difficult for the doctor who is not aware his patient once worked in a coal mine.

This can be a problem in Cleveland and other industrial centers. Many miners who can not continue to work underground leave the mining areas to find other work in the city, and are then treated by doctors who have never encountered black lung. In mobile America, there is no longer any local disease.

This picture of black lung, drawn from the medical literature, is still the subject of medical controversy. Many experts argue against such an overly simple explanation, and point out that many miners develop no such condition. Why?

Those who are most active in research agree there are many factors involved: the concentration of dust in the air, the period of the miner's exposure, his breathing rate, his smoking habits, his actual job in the mine and outside infections.

Another factor may lie in the lung itself, suggests Dr. Edgar Mayer of New York.

"The lungs," he said, "have remarkably efficient mechanisms for self-cleansing which protect the vast internal surface which is constantly exposed to vast quantities of foreign material."

"It is logical to assume that this complex function if probably compromised in pneumoconiosis, which would be best described as a failure of the lung's self-cleansing function."

If this theory is valid, the problem might be solved by finding a way of measuring this mechanism, as a guide in the hiring of miners.

Impatient with any theoretical discussions that may delay action on black lung, some mine-area doctors dismiss such details as "academic fine points."

Dr. Wells said, "If a man has been in the mines for 20 years and has a chronic lung disorder, he should be taken out of the mines and compensated for his illness, regardless of whether it's silicosis or anthracosis or anything else you call it."

A Public Health Service study found 9.6% of working miners and 18.6% of former miners had some X-ray evidence of black lung damage. This is a frequently quoted study, even though all the results have not yet been published.

It was designed to define the problem by combining X-rays with tests of lung function. One part of the study involved a cross-section of 2,500 working miners and 1,200 retired or disabled miners, ranging in age from 35 to 64.

It was impossible to link X-ray evidence to symptoms, nor could the PHS establish levels of disability "in absolute terms," said Dr. William Lainhard, director of the PHS laboratory in Cincinnati.

However, the lung function test results could be correlated to age, the number of years underground, and symptoms.

If these findings can be extended to the 137,000 soft-coal miners in the United States today, about 13,150 men now working under-

ground have damage to their lungs visible on X-ray. Of these, about 350 are in Ohio mines.

A man who works in the mines longer has a greater chance of lung damage. In this study, 4% of those with 10 to 19 years of underground work had the disease, while 8.6% of those with 20 to 29 years exposure were afflicted.

Another part of the study dealt with nonminers in the same districts and with the wives of miners and nonminers. None was found to have much evidence of black lung.

Another Ohio study looked just at 153 miners with X-ray evidence of black lung. It was conducted by Dr. Milton D. Levine and Dr. Murray B. Hunter, who both then practiced in Bellaire.

They eliminated those who had heart disease and those who did not return for follow-up studies. The remaining 60 miners were matched, by age, with another group of 74 miners with no X-ray evidence of black lung.

In the study group, 32 had physical symptoms of chest disease and only eight still worked in the mines. In the control group, 23 had chest complaints and 22 were still working underground.

Breathlessness was noted in 37 of the study group, and 22 of the controls; a chronic cough was reported in 44 in the study group and 25 in the controls. Some emphysema was found in 48 of the study group (including all complicated cases) and in 34 of the controls.

The Bellaire doctors also reported that 20 of the pneumoconiosis patients—and none of the controls—had a swelling of the heart, apparently resulting from an obstructed lung.

Dr. Levine has since left Bellaire. His successor, Dr. T. H. Korthals, said last fall he had not yet seen a case of black lung. "The men I see—about 10 a week—have a breath restriction that isn't much more than that seen with heavy smoking. My impression is that three packs of cigarettes a day are more of a threat than coal dust."

Only four years ago, the Bellaire findings of heart damage were supported with sensitive new cardiac tests. Dr. Harold B. Warren visited the Appalachian Regional Hospital in Beckley, where pneumoconiosis studies had been under way for some time.

The cardiologist was working with a technique that shows the size and direction of blood flow within the heart. In coal miners he found an unexpected shift, indicating that the right chamber of the heart was meeting some resistance as it pumped blood to the lungs.

Dr. Wells argues this research indicates "tremendous vascular damage," and suggests that many cases are missed because the patient apparently died of heart failure. Sometimes, too, the disease is confused with lung cancer.

"It isn't recorded as the cause in many deaths," agreed Dr. Kerr, blaming this on "an awful lot of doctors who don't understand the disease or don't believe it exists."

Dr. Donald Rasmussen, a pulmonary disease specialist at Beckley, has tested 3,000 miners, measuring heart and lung action while the man is exercising. He found changes in heart action which escaped ordinary diagnostic techniques and is convinced that the "primary lesion" of pneumoconiosis is in the lung's small arteries.

If this can be proven it might be possible to develop a procedure that would identify black lung in its earliest stages, before breathlessness.

Some such early diagnosis is needed, because of the slow and insidious onset of the disease. Once it appears, doctors can only treat the symptoms and minimize the infections that can be hazardous for anyone with a chronic lung disease.

Because it is often not recognized while the miner is still working, it can be hard to establish a clear-cut cause and effect.

BLACK LUNG VEXES MINE BOSSES, TOO

(By Fraser Kent)

Americans have long known how dangerous coal mining is. In the last 60 years, about 90,000 men have died in coal pit accidents. In the last 30 years alone, more than 1.5 million men have been hurt in the mines, including about 50,000 permanently disabled.

Until recently, there was little notice of "black lung or coal workers' pneumoconiosis, which also cripples and kills miners in every coal-producing country around the world.

Ohio's 123 underground soft coal mines are centered in Belmont, Harrison and Jefferson counties, stretching out in a southwesterly strip to Lawrence County in southernmost Ohio. In 1967, there were 3,563 men in these mines, many of which are two or three-man operations.

These small mines will find it particularly hard to install new equipment to lower dust levels to healthy limits. The owners don't have the expertise or the funds to detect health hazards, nor can they contribute much to research programs.

According to Ford Sampson, an Ohio Coal Association executive, the owners are as upset by the black lung problem as are their workers. Unlike state officials, they recognize the problem but feel powerless to deal with it.

"In addition to the human values involved the owner is concerned if only because he pays the cost of recruiting and training a worker who must then quit," Sampson said. "If the man can't work at top capacity because his breathing is impaired, there is less efficiency in the whole operation.

"The owners want to do something, but they're waiting for federally sponsored research to show them what must be done."

The "black lung crusaders" aren't convinced by such statements. They insist that the mine operators have hidden the problem out of sight for years, intimidating company doctors and miners who complained about the effect of coal dust in the lungs.

Commenting on wide variations in reports of pneumoconiosis, Dr. Hawey A. Wells said the most important factor "is not the quality of the coal being mined, nor the region from which it comes, but the effort—or lack of it—made by the individual mine operators to control dust."

His colleague, Dr. I. E. Buff, is even more caustic. "Their attitude is easy to illustrate," he told a congressional committee. "I asked the owners of eight mines I visited to install chemical toilets underground.

"They calculated it would cost 25 cents per man per day, and turned it down as too expensive. If they won't pay that, imagine them spending, say, \$3 per day for dust suppression."

Right now, the most serious problems arise not in the small mines, but in the large, mechanized operations. "Continuous" mining is done with a mechanical cutter that has revolving heads which corkscrew their way through the vein, clawing the coal out and stuffing it on to a conveyor. The process rips the coal seams apart at a fast—and dusty—rate.

There are three ways to lower this dust, said Kenneth M. Morse, director of industrial hygiene for the U.S. Steel Corp. "You can prevent the dust from being generated, you can knock down the dust that arises, and you can pull the dust away from the worker, or dilute it."

The first two steps involve using water sprays on the cutting edge of the bit at the face of the mine and spraying the mine floor and conveyor. Improved machine design might also help.

The third condition is met with high-vacuum ventilation that sweeps the mine face with air, to remove both dust and gas.

Respirators and nose-mouth masks have been worn to reduce levels in the lung, but

they haven't been satisfactory. "Many of the men chew tobacco, and they can't spit it out with a mask around their face, so it ends up around their neck all the time," Sampson said.

The men complain that the masks block their breathing; this is particularly difficult for any worker with an impaired lung.

And finally, the dust found in a black lung is so fine it passes through the masks. Remember, you can place 5,000 of these particles side by side in one inch.

To prevent explosions, the safe level for coal dust is five million particles per cubic meter of air for 40 hours a week, for a lifetime. This represents about 50,000 milligrams of dust per cubic meter.

The Public Health Service is aiming for a level of 3 or 4 milligrams per cubic meter (mg/m) which would be almost dust-free by present standards. This level was set on the basis of British experience which coal companies say (as they have of almost all British black lung research) may not be applicable in the United States.

Morse said that moving from the present to the proposed level is "like jumping off a 1,000-foot cliff," and argued for a steady, gradual reduction of dust "to levels that can be reached by almost all mines, and moving forward from there."

Even, then, he added, it will be "difficult" to reach 4 mg/cm and "almost impossible" to hit 3 mg.

Public health officials argue that it is not much harder to cut levels to 3 mg. than it is to reach 100 mg or 50 mg. Once steps have been taken in this direction, it is just as economical to go all the way.

This, too, may not be enough, said H. B. Charnbury, secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries. Rigid inspection is needed to achieve "total control" of dust levels (without waiting for the mine owners to invite an inspector in) and enforcement must be strict.

Such inspection may require new ways to accurately measure and analyze coal mine dust. Then it would best be done by an industrial hygienist—but this poses a problem here.

Harold C. Cutter, secretary of the Northeast Ohio unit of the American Industrial Hygiene Association, reports there are only about 130 hygienists in the state, including about 50 in U.S. Public Health Service laboratories in Cincinnati. Ohio now employs seven industrial hygienists: four in the Department of Health and three in the Industrial Commission. There is none in the Bureau of Mines.

Which brings us to the state's role in this problem. When asked about the problem of black lung, William O. Walker, director of the Department of Industrial Relations (of which the Bureau of Mines is part), said flatly, "There is no such thing."

Even if he were aware and concerned, Walker has no authority to order a reduction in coal dust, such as that needed to curb pneumoconiosis. His inspectors deal only with safety hazards.

(By the way, Ohio has 79 industrial safety inspectors in all departments, and 109 game wardens.)

"Our inspectors are concerned about the workers' health, though," Walker said. "I mean, a worker isn't safe if he isn't healthy, and he isn't healthy if he isn't safe." But he agreed nothing is done to lower dust levels below those set as safety standards.

Nor can the Ohio Department of Health take action. Its authority stops at quarries and its inspectors cannot enter the underground mines.

Ultimately, the disabled worker might seek workmen's compensation. Then he enters the jurisdiction of M. Holland Krise, chairman of the Industrial Commission of Ohio. He believes all black lung is silicosis, and still uses the term "anthracosis."

He also insists that "everybody has some black lung, from smoking and things like that."

Appearing before a congressional committee on industrial health and safety last year, Krise said "Ohio votes no" to federal intervention in such things as mine health. The government wouldn't do a good job, he said; it is unable even to make the streets of Washington safe.

Anyway, Krise added, there is no need for help with mine health because the state "can do a far better job" than the federal government. He didn't say how this was being achieved.

Workmen's compensation specifically covers black lung in Virginia, Pennsylvania and Alabama. In Ohio, it is included as "a disease peculiar to a particular industrial process, trade or occupation . . . to which an employee is not ordinarily subjected or exposed outside of or away from his employment. The compensation terms are almost the same as for silicosis.

To date, there have been three applications for such compensation from workers in all Ohio industry. The Bellaire study, alone, uncovered 52 men unable to work in the mines because of pneumoconiosis.

Dewitt Huffman, of the State's Division of Safety and Hygiene, believes many applications for black lung compensation have been disguised as silicosis claims. Between 1962 and 1966, 31 silicosis claims were submitted. It isn't known how many were "verified" and "accepted."

In this state, the worker files a claim and this is verified by an administrator of the Industrial Commission. It is then referred to a review board, which conducts a hearing. That decision may be appealed either by the administrator or the claimant. The claim then goes to the Industrial Commission for a final ruling, which cannot be appealed in common pleas court, as can injury claims.

The worker must prove he was exposed to coal dust for at least three years, that he contracted the disease in the course of his work, and that the disease has produced total disability within eight years of the last exposure.

(Black lung and silicosis may not even be diagnosed in that period, let alone incapacitate a miner.)

There is no provision made for partial disability: that is, when a man is no longer able to work in a mine but may be able to do light work elsewhere. If he's not a total black lung cripple, he gets nothing.

In any case, workmen's compensation takes care only of an already bad situation. George F. Meany, AFL-CIO president, puts the point this way:

"When I was seeking legislation to set up a state department of industrial hygiene in New York, a state senator told me I was crazy, that I was not protecting my people.

"He said, 'Why, you get a much better verdict in common law in these silicosis cases, than by putting these people under compensation. You can't lose the case. The lungs are petrified. You lay the lungs on the table before the judge and jury, and you get a tremendous verdict.'

"I said, 'The fellow has to be dead?'

"He said, 'Oh, yes, that is necessary.'

"Well, I am not for putting the lungs on the table. I am for keeping the dust out of the lungs."

Other union leaders admit their organizations have "gone easy" on industrial health, including pneumoconiosis. Jack Suarez, health and safety director of the Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, told the congressional committee that "in negotiating contracts, it appears that safety and health clauses come after coffee breaks.

"When you try to draft contract demands, the workers want to see the dollar sign: what am I going to get that I can see?" In such

cases, safety protection is an invisible fringe benefit.

The United Mine Workers' position was put by Michael Wildman, of its marketing staff: "It may seem easy to say to a coal operator, do this or don't do that. It may be easy to pass regulations and edicts, to dictate what can and cannot be done."

"But it will not be so appealing to face the human debris that a declining coal industry will leave in its wake."

It's hard to see how new health standards, fairly applied, would harm an industry in which profits have doubled within the last six years.

Are these the only alternatives, though? Must the mines be closed, or will nothing be done until the miners' lungs are "on the table"? Many experts believe much can be done, and their proposals will be presented tomorrow.

BLACK LUNG PREVENTION RESEARCH UNDERWAY (By Fraser Kent)

Faced with such a bleak description of "black lung," or coal workers' pneumoconiosis, there seems to be little that can be done without taking the men out of the mines.

However, Dr. Lorin E. Kerr believes there are ways of preventing the disease—and if these methods aren't completely satisfactory, that better methods can be found. He is medical officer for the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund.

"Dust suppression is primarily an engineering problem, but to be effective, it is essential that our engineers, physicians and coal miners operate as a team," he said recently.

In the last 20 years, the Welfare and Retirement Fund (which is separate from the United Mine Workers Union itself) has focused its attention on spreading information on black lung, and helping formulate state and federal disability policies.

It has also arranged for the care of coal dust victims at teaching hospitals, to advance knowledge of respiratory dust diseases. It has provided drugs, oxygen equipment and other supplies for hospitals and ambulatory patients, Dr. Kerr said.

Most of all, it has zeroed in on research.

Much of the black lung studies up to now, have dealt with the prevalence of the disease. It has seemed necessary to prove that inhaling fine coal dust for many years will cause harm in some men by clogging the minute vessels of the lung. Not everybody is convinced, but researchers are now moving on to other areas.

"Research is needed to help solve many fundamental questions," Dr. Kerr said. "We must understand the precise role of coal dust in this disease, the cause and the correct assessment of disability, the safe limit of coal dust exposure, and the benefits of various therapies."

The same thing could be said of almost every occupational lung disease.

In black lung, the questions begin with the role of coal dust. Is the "migration" of dust into clumps caused by something in the lung, or is it the result of infection and inflammation? Is there a chemical exchange involved?

Why doesn't the lung flush out such fine particles of dust? Why do one-third of all coal miners remain practically free of X-ray signs of the disease? And why do some pneumoconiosis patients slip over into complications, while others do not?

To answer these questions, researchers will have to leave the laboratory.

Several years ago, Dr. Adolph Kammer argues that "our best observations will be those that encompass the breathless coal miner as a total man, living in a particular kind of community and working in a particular kind of job."

He criticized the "American peculiarity" of relying to much on animal experiments,

which showed coal dust to be nontoxic in the laboratory. Black lung was then claimed to be either "unreal" or "non-occupational" in man, Dr. Kammer said.

Dr. Hawey A. Wells, a pathologist who has concentrated on black lung, also argues in favor of taking research to the mine's working face. "It is impossible to correlate the disease we find at autopsy with the work environment," he said.

"We have to guess at the work environment that caused it. We never know the precise duration of exposure, the exact chemical nature of the particles, or the concentration."

He said it could be compared to the surgeon of 200 years ago, "poking around inside a man with acute appendicitis without knowing the anatomic structures and functions involved that produced all the confusing symptoms and signs and deaths, from what now seems to be a very simple disease."

Such direct studies mean researchers must be free to go into a mine at any time, so they can be on the spot and stay there to conduct their research. This, in turn, must not interfere with the normal work process or the study might just as well be done in the laboratory or library.

Even current work studies may not be enough. Doctors will still have trouble relating the miner's present physical condition with the dust factors under which he worked long ago.

Diagnosis is now possible only when symptoms appear, or when X-ray evidence of lung damage can be seen. Methods must be found to spot pneumoconiosis at an early stage, when prevention will be most effective.

Better mine machinery, and better methods of dust control and removal are needed. It has even been suggested that miners wear helmets that would protect them from the "inner space" of the dusty mine.

"There are no shortcuts," emphasized Dr. William Lainhard, of the Public Health Service laboratory in Cincinnati. "Painful, time-consuming examinations" may be needed, just to duplicate and verify the research that has already been conducted in Britain.

All these studies will need federal financial support because "industry is simply unable to police itself in the detection and definition of these health hazards," said Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, a New York environmental scientist.

Also, since men go from mine to mine (or to other jobs) and from state to state, "no employer can be expected to follow his employees long enough for long-term effects to be defined," Dr. Selikoff said. "Only bodies such as the PHS can be expected to detect such effects and to maintain the long observation needed."

However, the PHS already has run into trouble with the limited research it has started in this field. The 1962-66 study of pneumoconiosis has not been published, but is still undergoing "editorial review."

Medical World News reported that the Division of Occupational Health Laboratory at the West Virginia University Medical Center "is practically at a standstill. For instance, a two-year research project designed to study the heart and lung damage of 400 miners has completed the examination of only 35 men."

In addition to federally sponsored research, there may be a need for nationally established standards. Otherwise, the conscientious mine owner in a health-conscious state would be penalized by the costs for its dust-reduction programs, while irresponsible owners in other states would get away with cutting corners.

The Nixon administration has promised to introduce a new occupational health and safety bill before the end of March. The UMW might offer more direct support for that law than they did during hearings on last year's proposed legislation.

Dr. Donald Rasmussen, of Beckley, W. Va.,

has urged annual examination of the coal miner, to detect the first signs of chronic lung disease. He said none of the 3,000 miners he has examined has had "anything like a regular chest X-ray," or lung function test.

Such examinations are already required in some professions, such as food handling, for public protection; a Cleveland lawyer pointed out. Now the concept would be extended to employ protection.

In Ohio, recognition of black lung as an occupational disease might mean more help for the small mine owner (most underground mines here employ five men or less) in coping with health hazards State officials could also be more aggressive in spreading information to the mine operators, and implement research carried on at the federal level.

An obvious and immediate need is for a change in workmen's compensation law to cover men slowly crippled by black lung. This would mean eliminating a "time factor" in applying for compensation years after leaving the mine, and should cover partial disability and retraining for the working-age miner.

This means the medical profession must come up with a better method of diagnosing pneumoconiosis, so that claims can be processed with minimum fuss and delay.

In turn, this requires an end to what a Cincinnati public health worker described as "kid stuff squabbling among the doctors, a sort of did-didn't is-isn't thing that's gone on too long already."

There are several "crusaders" seeking immediate relief for black lung victims—both doctors and journalists—who have done the cause a disservice, he said. They never concede that opponents are mistaken or ill-informed; they are "company stooges," or are involved in a conspiracy to cover up the disease.

He said that when the number of pneumoconiosis cases is inflated to include any and all lung disorders, conservatives can dismiss the whole problem as "exaggerated" or "ridiculous," instead of being forced to face scientific data.

"What we have is a division of the medical community into two name-calling camps—just at a time when concerted action is needed to find out everything we can about all these occupational lung diseases," the health worker said.

This can be seen in West Virginia, where the "Physicians for Miners Health and Safety Committee" has collided with the state and county medical societies in a quarrel that spills over the state borders.

Dr. Wells, Dr. Rasmussen and Dr. I. E. Buff have travelled throughout the state, organizing thousands of miners in the fight. They seek to dramatize the issue, but emotional presentations evoke equally emotional replies that can obscure the scientific cure of the problem.

Dr. Wells holds up a black and brittle shaving from a diseased lung and crumples * * * described by a doctor who has in compensation cases represented coal companies "inciting the coal miners" and "spreading alarming publicity."

Dr. Buff fights the recruitment of new miners. He said "representatives of coal companies are allowed to speak to school assemblies about the rewards awaiting such work. But the school boards won't allow anyone to speak on the health aspects of the occupation . . . and this most degenerative and debilitating disease."

Instead of refuting this charge, his opponents just say Dr. Buff doesn't even know what black lung is.

(In Dille's Bottom, a coal town in Ohio's Belmont county, students in a mine school are told about black lung, but the instructor said emphasis is placed on safety—"something the men can do something about.")

Dr. Kerr is as blunt as Dr. Buff: "The medical profession has barely begun to overcome its ill-informed complacency, and to

discover the true state of affairs regarding pneumoconiosis.

"The failure to take earlier action constitutes what may be labeled in the future as the greatest disgrace in the history of American medicine."

Dr. Philip R. Lee, assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has attempted to be more conciliatory. "We are dealing with hidden health hazards," he said. "Management is, for the most part, apparently unaware of health dangers or of how to ascertain proper health procedures."

"But this is not a case of willful sacrifice of the health or life of an employee for a dollar. The villain is not greed. It is ignorance."

Added W. Willard Wirtz, former Secretary of Labor: "We have grown beyond the point of argument by accusation. We won't succeed on the basis of charging employers with callousness or human exploitation."

"There are laggards. There is incompleteness of know how. But the case is not against heartlessness—it is for health and safety."

The greatest need in the battle against black lung may be a rising public demand for action on the part of state and federal governments, mine owners, unions, engineers and doctors.

Said Rep. Ken Hechler (D.W.Va.), "Without such widespread public support, we will falter. We will not be able to sustain the drive that is needed to wipe out black lung."

"This goes beyond those who work in the mines. This involves the conscience of every American."

PUBLIC LACKS CONCERN FOR OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESSES

(By Fraser Kent)

With the conquest of so many other diseases, researchers are now turning their attention to occupational diseases, most of which they believe can be prevented. Coal workers' pneumoconiosis is only one example of the illnesses that hit the family breadwinner on the job.

"I doubt if we'll ever prevent all diseases and injury," Dr. William H. Stewart, U.S. Surgeon General, said a year ago. "There will always be need for compensation of injury and disease."

"But we can do a lot better job. We can prevent some of the injuries and disease which are occurring now; we can try to keep people from getting hurt or sick."

Dr. Philip R. Lee, assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said the precise toll of occupational disease is not known. Therefore, it has made little impact on medical and safety experts, the public, responsible leaders in labor and industry, "and particularly the victims."

"We are dealing with hidden health hazards," he said. "The onset of occupational lung diseases often occurs after years of exposure to the agents that cause them, but also years after the last such exposure. By then, irreversible damage has already occurred."

Dr. Stewart put a statistical tag on this. The Social Security Administration now receives about 35,000 claims each year for emphysema. "About 7,000 of these originate in occupations where the emphysema rate is excessive, and where the occupations are known to involve exposures to materials that damage the lungs."

"It is also receiving about 8,000 claims a year for disability from pneumoconiosis and tuberculosis of occupational origin."

As an example of the slow onset of such disease, he cited the brass and zinc foundries where workers were exposed to beryllium.

"The worker who breathes its metal fumes on the job will not show the symptoms of chill, fever and malaise until many hours after exposure," Dr. Stewart said.

"Not until after he has gone home, and at a time when he is not likely to connect the exposure with his illness."

The onset of berylliosis has been reported 23 years after the last exposure to the material, reports Dr. Harriet L. Hardy, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Stewart also noted that many chronic diseases have multiple causes, both on and off the job—no one of which, by itself, may be enough to bring on illness or disability.

"We also need to know those situations where hyper-susceptible people need to be removed from certain work conditions," he said. "And we must probe some workers' increased susceptibility caused by their age, sex, or other physical condition."

It is generally conceded that research and regulation must be on the federal level. One example of this is the case of beta-naphthylamine, a chemical used primarily in dye manufacture. Its use is illegal in several countries because it produces cancer of the bladder in workers exposed to it.

After trying to get the industry to stop using the chemical, Pennsylvania authorities finally outlawed beta-naphthylamine. The process promptly turned up in Georgia, where it is still legal.

There is a shortage of manpower in the industrial health field: doctors, nurses, engineers, hygienists. There isn't enough research, either. But most of all, the public doesn't seem to care much about occupational disease.

"In this country, we spend an amount on cancer research equivalent to \$415 per death from that disease," pointed out Willard Wirtz, former secretary of labor. "On heart research, we spend \$95 per death."

"On occupational diseases and health, we spend \$6.57."

THREE-WAY ATTACK ON BLACK LUNG

There are three things that badly need doing to meliorate the problem of the coal miner's disease called pneumoconiosis, or "black lung."

The first is to recognize that there is a problem. Ohio's director of industrial relations, William O. Walker, does not. "There is no such thing," he told Plain Dealer medical writer Fraser Kent. This is a ridiculous attitude.

If there is no such thing, why is it that the incidence of chest disease is higher among coal miners than nonminers? Why do autopsies of affected miners reveal black and shriveled lungs and enlarged hearts? Call it pneumoconiosis, "miner's asthma," silicosis, anthracosis or what, it is a disease that cripples and kills; and denying that it exists will not make it go away.

The second need is for more research into the disease and into ways of controlling the coal dust which causes it.

The U.S. Public Health Service must take the lead in medical research, which should be supported by state health bureaus and the medical profession in general. The medical community in coal mining areas must stop bickering about terminology and get together, as one health worker put it, "to find out everything we can about all the occupational lung diseases."

No cure is known for black lung, nor is it known why some miners are affected and others are not. The disease can be arrested if the afflicted miner quits the coal dust atmosphere of the mines in time. A method of early diagnosis must be developed so that he can leave before the symptoms appear.

The U.S. Bureau of Mines, supported by state mine bureaus and the mining industry, must attack the problem of coal dust control. Techniques should be developed to wash down the dust or filter the air more effectively.

An occupational health and safety bill planned by the Nixon administration offers promise of broader research in both fields. As Kent noted in his series of articles on black lung, the bill could use more support from the United Mine Workers than the union gave legislation considered last year.

The third need is compensation for those

coal miners partially or fully disabled by pneumoconiosis. Ohio does not recognize black lung as an occupational disease. It should.

Projections of Public Health Service statistics on the incidence of the disease indicate some 350 Ohioans have it. Some will become disabled by it, developing shortness of breath, chronic cough, emphysema. They will be unable to continue working. They should receive workmen's compensation payments.

Black lung does not get the attention that mine safety receives after some terrible mine disaster. It develops slowly and insidiously. But it can be just as deadly as an explosion. It must get attention until it is finally conquered.

DEDICATION SERVICE IN HONOR AND IN MEMORY OF THE LATE GEORGE GOTTWALD, JR.

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1969, there was held in Roslindale, Mass., a dedication service in honor and in memory of the late George J. Gottwald, Jr. George Gottwald gave his life in the service of our great country. He entered the U.S. Army in October 1968 and served with honor and distinction in the service of his country in Vietnam. While performing his duties he was killed and was awarded posthumously the Silver Star by direction of the President of the United States on March 8, 1968. In his memory the citizens of Roslindale named a square in the city after him, which square bears his name. On that day I sent a telegram to the chairman of the dedication ceremonies reading as follows:

PETER L. CAPARELL,
Roslindale, Mass.

I received your letter of March 18 in relation to the dedication services to be conducted this Sunday in Roslindale to memorialize the intersection of Metropolitan Avenue at Washington Street as the George J. Gottwald, Jr. Square. Will you kindly convey to all present my deep regret at not being able to attend the dedication ceremonies on Sunday because I have to remain in Washington this weekend because of important legislation coming up in the House of Representatives. Will you also convey to the parents of the late George J. Gottwald, Jr. my deepest sympathy in the loss of their beloved son. A soldier who falls in the line of duty, especially when he sacrifices his life to aid a comrade, deserves our humble respect and our profound gratitude. George J. Gottwald, Jr., was such a soldier. His spirit and courage, his dedication to duty, place him among the hallowed ranks of patriotic Americans whose unfailing love of country and loyalty to their comrades in arms have, since the birth of our country, secured the blessings of liberty for all Americans.

Specialist Four George Gottwald never planned great battles nor did he lead an army in the field. He did more than that: He gave his life that another might live. He gave his life for his country. There is no greater sacrifice. There can be no honor paid to his memory that can fully express how much we revere it. Yet the American Legion is doing what it can by dedicating the George J. Gottwald, Jr. Square to the memory of this brave boy. The Legion's National Commander William C. Doyle has said of the patriotism exemplified by George Gottwald, Jr.: "It is a respect for the rights of our fellow man. It is a concern for the freedom of man, as our God-given rights, but a recognition also

that every right carries with it an accompanying responsibility." George Gottwald did not shirk that responsibility. By his heroic act he has upheld the honor and tradition of the military service of the United States of America. May every Bostonian, as he passes through the George J. Gottwald, Jr. Square remember the man for whom it is named and soldiers like him who have sacrificed in order that others can enjoy the blessings of democracy and freedom. My heart goes out to family and friends assembled at this dedication ceremony. It is my prayer that this fine American will not have died in vain—that through his heroism we have been brought a little closer to a just and lasting peace.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, M.C.,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

I enclose in my remarks a transcript of the proceedings of that day together with the invocation offered by Reverend Father William P. Smith of St. John Chrysostom Rectory, West Roxbury, Mass. As I said in my remarks at the ceremonies there can be no greater honor paid to his memory that can fully express how much we revere it. George Gottwald's spirit and courage will live forever in the minds of his family and friends. We all hope that through his heroism we have been brought a little closer to a just and lasting peace.

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM RECTORY,
West Roxbury, Mass., April 17, 1969.

JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House.

DEAR SIR: In the following letter you will find the invocation given at the dedication of SPC. 4 George Gottwald Square in Roslindale, Massachusetts on March 23, 1969.

"Our Father in heaven, we gather here today to pay tribute to a young man who gave his life on our behalf. At this time of the year we are also mindful of another man who gave his life for other men almost two-thousand years ago. As His Spirit has animated men of all races and nations throughout the world, so we ask that the dedication of SPC. 4 George Gottwald may be an inspiration to the people of the West Roxbury-Roslindale area, especially to the young, so many of whom are here with us today. We ask this in the name of your Son, Jesus Christ, Amen."

Sincerely yours,

Rev. WILLIAM P. SMITH.

GEORGE J. GOTTWALD, JR., DEDICATION CEREMONIES AT THE INTERSECTION OF WASHINGTON STREET AND METROPOLITAN AVENUE, ROSLINDALE, MASS., MARCH 23, 1969

Opening remarks by master of ceremonies Peter L. Caparell: "In behalf of all Military Units participating here today and in the Spirit of True Democracy in Action; I bid you welcome. We are assembled here this Sunday afternoon, to pay tribute to the memory of Specialist Fourth Class George J. Gottwald, Junior, who died heroically in the service of his country."

"In behalf of your host, the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion of Hyde Park, Massachusetts, I declare these ceremonies open and ask each Commander, at this time, to bring their Units to Attention."

(So complied.)

Mr. CAPARELL. I present to you our Reverend Chaplain Father William Smith of Saint John's Chrysostom Church of West Roxbury, to deliver the invocation.

(So complied.)

Mr. CAPARELL. Thank you Father Smith. I now read a cablegram at hand and received on this date of March 23, expressing the sentiments of a *Patriot Giant* of this—Generation.

(Reading of Speaker McCormack's message.)

Mr. CAPARELL. I am so moved by the sentiments in depth of our beloved Speaker that I am not able to adequately add any comment worthy of this personal and inspiring salute by this great *Patriarch of Democracy*.

I now direct your attention to our first guest Speaker, who, like Speaker McCormack, is a genuine and dedicated soldier in the ranks of our Free Society.

I call upon and present to you State Senator Samuel Harmon of Dorchester.

State Senator HARMON. Thank you Peter. I am very proud to be here, not only as a guest, but also as an observer at this very solemn occasion.

I extend not only my personal greetings to the family of this heroic boy, but I want them to know that every member of the State Legislature shares with us today the grief which this family endures.

I convey to them the condolences and personal good wishes of Speaker David Bartley of the General Court and also Maurice A. Donahue, President of the Massachusetts Senate.

In the words of Massachusetts first citizen, Speaker McCormack; I, too, when I pass by this Square—will always remember this day—and always remember the George Gottwalds of America.

Mr. CAPARELL. Thank you Senator Harmon for expressing so beautifully your own and the legislators sentiments, and I'm quite certain the sentiments of every man, woman and child, neighbor and friend assembled here today. One cannot, in the presence of our Country's colors, cannot but help to feel a stirring proud heart beat for the valor of this courageous soldier, George J. Gottwald, who gave his life so that those glorious colors may wave ever so proudly over the heads of a free and grateful people.

I call upon our Principal Speaker who sponsored the Resolution making this day possible. A veteran of World War 2—and since then—always a vigilant Champion of Veterans—It gives me great pleasure to salute in pride and to present to you—our Honorable City Councillor at Large, Patrick F. McDonough.

Councillor McDONOUGH. Thank You, Peter. As one of your nine City Fathers and the Father of the George J. Gottwald, Junior Square, having in deep humility offered the—Resolution to dedicate this corner of America; I wish to state at the outset that what I am about to read was written by your Master of Ceremonies.

I can think of no finer way to pay tribute to the Nobility of this boy's character and to the Sacred and the Supreme Sacrifice that he made; than to utter the sentiments of his older friend and neighbor—a World War II Combat Medic himself, Peter Caparell. I now read Peters' tribute to George J. Gottwald, Junior.

(So read.)

Mr. CAPARELL. Thank you Councillor McDonough for speaking the words that sprang from my heart and at this very moment I could not find the strength of voice to utter them so firmly and without blemish. I salute you, Sir.

(Introduction of family.)

Mr. CAPARELL. Before we proceed with the unveiling of the sign post, I wish to introduce to you the proud members of the Gottwald Family.

First, the Supreme Soldier in any Family, the inspiring Mother of George J. Gottwald, Carolyn. On her right, her strong and courageous life mate, himself a veteran of World War II, George J. Gottwald, Senior.

Behind me, wearing the uniform of his country and a volunteer to Viet Nam; Private Frederick Gottwald, now on Leave from Fort Jackson, South Carolina. Standing in front of Mother is 5 year old Denise. (That's a good girl! Put up your hand, honey. Isn't she a doll? Thank you sweetie.) Next to

Denise is Jeanie who just turned thirteen years old. Next in line is Eddie. The bunting on the stand is hiding Eddie (so to show them you are not a little shoe shine box Eddie—move—put up your hand. That's a good boy, bless you.) Eddie is 8 years old and the big guy next to him is—ten year old Tommy. Incidentally, Tommy and Eddie are fans of Bobby Orr. They are not bad athletes either. They're going to be great someday. Standing alongside of Mother and holding her hands is Carolyn. Namesake to her most charming Mother and has a lot of her fine looks. Carolyn is 17 years old and attends Roslindale High School, the same school brother George graduated from.

Behind me and to my left and standing next to Dad is Billy, he is the tall Gregory Peck type that you see and he is 18 years old a year younger than Private Freddie and three years older than Dickie who is that handsome blonde adonis right alongside of him.

(Acknowledgments.)

Mr. CAPARELL. While the rifle squad makes preparation; I wish to acknowledge at this time a tireless work horse for veteran causes and a prominent citizen and honored Legionnaire of Hyde Park. It is my pleasure to present to you a past Commander of the George K. Menichios Post and a friend of George J. Gottwald, Junior, Commissioner of Boxing, Emmanuel Aronis.

Commissioner ARONIS. Thank you Mister Chairman, and with your permission Sir, I turn, face this family and Salute them. I cannot improve on the great tribute of our great Speaker, John W. McCormack. God Bless each and every member of this beautiful family.

Mr. CAPARELL. I call upon Commander Charles O'Brien.

Commander O'BRIEN. In behalf of every officer and member of the William Doyle Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Hyde Park, I salute the family.

Mr. CAPARELL. I call upon Commander Edward Goudet.

Commander GOUDET. Each Officer and Member of the Roslindale, All Boston Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Salute the Family.

Mr. CAPARELL. I call upon Adjutant Sam Molner of the Irving K. Adams Post.

Adjutant MOLNER. I salute the Family.

Mr. CAPARELL. I see that the Rifle Squad is now prepared. I wish to thank Commander Thomas Lynch of the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion of Hyde Park. The Fogg Post is the host chapter and sponsor of these ceremonies. Also, Commander Fogg, I wish to single out one man down there in ranks. He is dead center ahead of me and I salute Jim Ramey who has been the liaison officer between the family and myself. No time of day—no hour of morning was too late to call upon him for his counsel and guidance. God Bless You Jim.

Mr. CAPARELL. It is good to see the blue uniform of the Boston Fire Department Band blending with the olive drab and blue of the V.F.W. and the Legion. Also, in ranks, I observe the patch of the big red 1 of the First Infantry Division of which George J. Gottwald, Junior, was a member. I mean is a member. He is a departed brother who joined the eternal ranks of those we must one day follow. Bless you boys! Finally, a salute to Charles Kantos of Roslindale, here on the reviewing stand and wearing the hat of the Disabled American Veterans of Post 44 of Boston.

Unveiling ceremony (conclusion).

Mr. CAPARELL. I now call upon Commander Thomas Lynch of the Cecil W. Fogg Post of the American Legion of Hyde Park and Private Frederick Gottwald, to jointly perform the unveiling ceremony.

(NOTE.—The unveiling of the sign post bearing the gold script lettering: George J. Gottwald, Junior Square, was followed by

three volleys of rifle fire by the six man rifle squad with Taps sounded by the bugler and closing with the Star Spangled Banner as played by 2 military bands and the Band of the Boston Fire Department.)

Mr. CAPARELL. A chip of the fibre of Plymouth Rock—has drifted like a twinkling star into the vastness of eternity. George Gottwald, Junior, has returned to his Maker—Maker of all Men.

In behalf of each member of the family of George J. Gottwald, Jr., We thank you for paying your tribute to his memory by your appearance here today. I yield the platform to Commander Lynch.

Commander LYNCH. I invite all participants to attend a dinner in honor of the Gottwald Family at the Cecil W. Fogg Post and I close these ceremonies with Speaker McCormack's prayers that: "Through his heroism we have been brought closer to a just and lasting peace."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 1 hour, on April 28; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. McKNEALLY), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. McKNEALLY), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois to revise and extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD following the President's statement on the postal rate increase.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin to revise and extend his remarks immediately following the President's message on the postal rate increase.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKNEALLY) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. REID of New York in two instances.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. WATSON in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) to ex-

tend their remarks and to include additional matter:)

Mr. SHIPLEY.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BURTON of California in two instances.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. HICKS in two instances.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 28, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

700. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the third annual report of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 705(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

701. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation (1) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes; (2) to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; (3) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to utilize its employees more effectively and to improve administrative efficiency; and (4) to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for judicial review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

702. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report on "Fundamental Nuclear Energy Research—1968," supplementing the Commission's annual report for 1968; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7311. A bill to amend item 709.10 of the 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, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-163). Referred to the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 254. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4182. A bill to authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District of Columbia institution providing care, education, and treatment of mentally retarded persons (Rept. No. 91-165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9526. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations (Rept. No. 91-166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 10537. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 10538. A bill to protect consumers by providing a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 10539. A bill to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 10540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 10543. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10544. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the disruption of the administration or operations of federally assisted educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10545. A bill to amend sections 2(3) and 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to

permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 10546. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 10547. A bill to increase to 5 years the maximum term for which broadcasting station licenses may be granted; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10548. A bill to raise the Veterans' Administration to the status of an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 10549. A bill to increase to 5 years the maximum term for which broadcasting station licenses may be granted; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 10550. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to assist in providing means for portability of credits under certain private pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. MYERS):

H.R. 10552. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 10553. A bill to provide educational assistance to children of civilian employees of the United States killed abroad as a result of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. FARBERSTEIN):

H.R. 10554. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 10555. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 10556. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10557. A bill to amend section 228 of the Social Security Act to provide that small municipal pensions shall not operate to reduce the monthly benefits otherwise payable to certain uninsured individuals thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 10558. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain joint newspaper operating

arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 10559. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10560. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 10561. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of National Forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10562. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10563. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require the establishment of national uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 10564. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H.R. 10565. A bill to provide safer working conditions in the construction industry in the United States by establishing a Construction Safety Standards Board in the Department of Labor and by providing grants to States for State programs for State construction safety programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 10566. A bill to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of individuals to ignore unwarranted governmental requests for personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 10567. A bill to provide for the inscription of "Justice," "Mercy," and "Humility" on U.S. currency in the denomination of \$1; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10568. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act to require certain prior approval of the activities of the National Capital Housing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10569. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreement with Communist countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 10570. A bill to create a Federal Higher Education Mediation and Conciliation Service; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10571. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10572. A bill to improve law enforce-

ment in cities through a temporary Federal grant program for the purposes of increasing the compensation of policemen and creating additional positions on local police forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 10573. A bill to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself, Mr. GLAIMO, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. WINN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. WHALLEY):

H.R. 10574. A bill to designate the Washington National Airport as the "Dwight David Eisenhower National Airport"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 674. Joint resolution, expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 675. Joint resolution, to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress that the likeness of Dwight David Eisenhower be placed on the 25-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

137. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the closing of the Job Corps training center at Moses Lake, Wash., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 10575. A bill for the relief of William George Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 10576. A bill for the relief of Dolores P. Allanigue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 10577. A bill for the relief of Capt. Betty M. McGough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Res. 374. Resolution to refer the bill, H.R. 10449, entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims, in accordance with section 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John R. O'Keefe, Boston, Mass., et al., relative to extension of the income tax surcharge, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.